

Violence-free childhoods: New Zealand nine years post prohibition of corporal punishment. What now?

Beth Wood Wellington Sept 2016 bethwood@xtra.co.nz

1 Background

Violence free Childhoods

Forty-nine states world-wide have now prohibited the use of corporal (physical) punishment¹ of children. Violence to children perpetrated in the name of “punishment” (often confused with “discipline”) can range between minor assaults to severe forms of physical abuse.

This year (2016) the UK based Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GI) began collecting information on how the law banning all corporal punishment is being implemented in those states that have achieved full prohibition. The GI has developed a questionnaire, *Non-violent childhoods: Moving from prohibition to elimination of corporal punishment*, which is being sent to Governments in countries that have achieved full prohibited of corporal punishment including the New Zealand Government. The questions asked of the Government of New Zealand included:

- what is being done to disseminate knowledge of the law and children’s right to protection from all corporal punishment?
- how are cases of corporal punishment responded to?
- what guidance/training on implementing and enforcing the law are given?
- what is being done to promote awareness raising of the dangers of corporal punishment?
- what is being done to promote positive, non-violent discipline?
- what is being done to identify the government ministries, agencies and other bodies that are responsible for implementation?
- what research into the impact of the ban on the prevalence of, and attitudes towards, corporal punishment has been conducted?
- what plans or proposals are there for accelerating progress from prohibition to implementation?

At the time of writing the GI is still waiting for a response from the New Zealand Government to its questionnaire.

This questionnaire set me thinking about what more needed to happen in New Zealand if, as a country, we are to make further progress in moving towards “violence free childhoods’. I consulted with others.

¹ The term corporal punishment is used in this paper to be consistent with the term used by the Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children. In New Zealand physical punishment was the term commonly used during the campaign to have the law changed. That was because many New Zealanders regarded the term “corporal punishment” as applying only to physical punishment used in schools. Corporal punishment in schools became illegal in 1990.

Violence to children in New Zealand (including corporal punishment)

In May 2007 corporal punishment of children was prohibited in New Zealand with the passing of the Crimes (Substituted Section 59) Amendment Act. Corporal punishment in schools and early childhood centres had been prohibited in law since 1990. It had already been prohibited in 1985 in child care regulations and in 1986 in residential institutions caring for children. The law change was preceded by lengthy and heated public and parliamentary debate accompanied by much media attention. There had been small numbers of individual voices calling for law change for many years – dating back into the 1960s but from the 1990s onwards increasing numbers of individuals and organisations added their voice and advocacy efforts to what became a very active campaign, a social movement, for law change. By the time the law changed policies and practices (including the provision of parenting support and information) within organizations committed to law change already reflected their strongly held belief that hitting children damaged their health and development and breached their rights.

When I reflect back on the many years of active advocacy that I was involved with preceding law change in New Zealand I am convinced that the most important thing we did was to engage visible and vocal backing, from organisations and individuals that supported children’s rights and worked with children and families. Without this backing engaging political support would have been even more difficult than it was. Because much of the public remained opposed to law reform over the years the issue was a difficult one for politicians. Changing the law was not a vote winner. Lobbyists spent many hours meeting with politicians and supplying them with relevant information. Although in time many politicians privately agreed that the existing law should go it took a few brave individuals to show leadership and publicly support law change to move things forward². The views of many credible community organisations and individuals were very influential.

At the time of law change media comment reflected the public’s ambivalence about it. In 2008 a year after the law change³ around one third of respondents to a survey still strongly opposed the new law. Some of the factors influencing those that opposed the law change were: religious convictions, resentment of state interference in family matters, fear that parents might be criminalised for minor infringements and personal experience of having used and or experienced

² Wood, B et al. *Unreasonable Force: New Zealand’s journey towards banning the physical punishment of children. Save the Children, Wellington 2008.* <http://www.epochnz.org.nz/images/stories/documents/s59%20Book.pdf> Retrieved 15 August 2016.

³ Children’s Commissioner. *Omnibus Report. One Year On: Public attitudes and New Zealand’s child discipline law.* Office of the Children’s Commissioner. Wellington. 2008. <http://www.occ.org.nz/assets/Publications/OCC-UMR-Research-141108.pdf>

corporal punishment and believing it was beneficial. Five years later in 2013 around one third of the public still opposed the law change and only one third strongly supported it. The remaining third were neutral⁴.

There has been no major public campaign to publicise or support the new law. All political parties have been largely silent about their views on the law. The New Zealand National Party has been the Government in power since late 2008. It was forced to make some public comment after a non-binding referendum held in 2009 favoured the reintroduction of a statutory defense. The Government fortunately did not agree – and set in place further reassurances to placate anxious parents. Police implementation of the law was monitored until 2012 and the Government continued to claim that the law was working well in New Zealand and disagree with those that claimed well-meaning parents were being penalized.⁵ It appears that very few minor incidents of use of corporal punishment are reported to the police and those that are reported are responded to supportively⁶. On the other hand there has been an increase in reporting of more serious assaults.

Despite some discomfort with the law attitudes about the use of corporal punishment are changing in New Zealand. Over 90% of respondents to surveys in 2008 and 2013⁷ knew that use of corporal punishment is prohibited in law. In 2013 the proportion of parents who thought it was sometimes alright to physically punish children had reduced from 58% in 2008 to 35%.

⁴ Wood, E.. *Physical punishment of children in New Zealand – six years after law reform*. EPOCH New Zealand, Wellington, 2013.
<http://epochnz.org.nz/images/stories/pdfs/2013%20physical%20punishment%20of%20children%20in%20new%20zealand%201.pdf> . Retrieved August 15 2016.

⁵ NZPA Smacking law appropriate as it is, says Key. *NZ Herald*
http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10614013 9 December 2009. Retrieved 15 August 2016.

⁶ New Zealand Police. *11th Review of the Crimes (Substituted section 59) Act 2007*. NZ Police April 2013.
<https://www.Police.govt.nz/sites/default/files/resources/other-reports/11th-review-section-59.pdf>
Retrieved 16 August 2016

⁶ Omnibus Report. *One Year On: Public attitudes and New Zealand's child discipline law*. Office of the Children's Commissioner. Wellington. 2008
<http://www.occ.org.nz/assets/Publications/OCC-UMR-Research-141108.pdf>
Retrieved 15 August 2016.

⁷ EPOCH New Zealand.. *Physical punishment of children in New Zealand – six years after law reform*.
<http://epochnz.org.nz/images/stories/pdfs/2013%20physical%20punishment%20of%20children%20in%20new%20zealand%201.pdf> Wellington 2013. Retrieved August 15 2016

A recent Ministry of Health Survey found that:

The percentage of children who had received physical punishment (in the four weeks prior to an interview with a parent) reduced from 10% in 2006/07 to 6% in 2014/15.⁹

Family violence in New Zealand

Family violence (child abuse and partner violence) rates remain unacceptably high in New Zealand¹⁰. Until effective preventive measures are identified and implemented there will be too many children exposed to a range of violent behaviours. Associated with family violence are high levels of family poverty and stress, and drug and alcohol abuse and far too many families have intergenerational histories of very violent offending within families..

Vocal opponents of the law change in New Zealand frequently say publicly that what they call “banning smacking” has not led to a reduction in child abuse and thus the law change is said to be “not working”. They base their “evidence” on:

- notification rates to the child protection authorities which are notoriously complex and known to reflect a range of circumstances including an increase in willingness to report and
- child deaths from abuse. Child death rates from abuse have remained constant at an average of about 9 a year for over 20 years. It has always been illegal to kill your child so why would a ban against physical punishment change the far end of the spectrum. On the other hand a reliable statistic that can be tracked over the years, “hospitalization for non-accidental injuries in children”, is showing a small but significant decline¹¹.

I cover this topic in some detail because if change movements grow in other ex-British colonies detractors will say the law change in New Zealand has not reduced child abuse. We never expected that law change on its own would reduce child abuse at the most heavy handed end of the spectrum. A lesson from the New Zealand experience is that calls for change are best based on children’s human rights underpinned by the huge volume of evidence that now exists about

⁹ *Annual Update of Key Results 2014/15. New Zealand Health Survey. 2016. Ministry of Health. Wellington.* <http://www.health.govt.nz/system/files/documents/publications/annual-update-key-results-2014-15-nzhs-dec15-1.pdf> Page 50

¹⁰ New Zealand family Violence Clearing House. *Child abuse statistic and policy change.* <https://nzfvc.org.nz/news/child-abuse-statistics-and-policy-change> Retrieved 16 August 2016/ And New Zealand Government. *Family Violence: Its not Ok.* 2016 Wellington <http://areyouok.org.nz/family-violence/statistics/>. Retrieved 16 August 2016.

¹¹ New Zealand Child and Youth Epidemiological Service. *Child Poverty Monitor.* 2015. Dunedin. https://www.google.co.nz/?gws_rd=ssl#q=child+poverty+monitor+2015+technical+report Retrieved August 16 2016.

the damaging effects of corporal punishment of children¹² and that it is not about ending more extreme forms of child abuse.

Current New Zealand Government policy has a strong focus on measures to reduce risk of violence to “vulnerable” children – that is children who have been abused or are assessed as being at high risk of abuse especially those in the care of the State. The emphasis on improving the quality and availability of services to high risk children contains some hopeful, but as yet not fully developed directions¹³. Of concern is the Government’s very limited focus on primary prevention - addressing the determinants of violence in particular poverty and inequality, substance abuse and intergenerational family violence. There are also fears that government funds will be redirected away from families at the margins to those at extreme risk end resulting in still more children moving into the high risk category because supportive services are less available..

2 The consultations

I do not see follow-up to law change as an exclusive Government responsibility and I set out to find out something of what is happening in the “community” or “non-government” sector. I was also interested in the views of people who have contact with children and their caregivers about what should be happening currently to help us progress towards “*violence free childhoods*”.

Many professional groups come in contact with young families and are in a position to support parents and guide their parenting behavior. These include, but are not limited to: paediatricians, wellchild health care workers, early childhood educators, parent educators, teachers, ministers of religion, family support workers and social workers. Child advocates and many researchers work to influence policy affecting children and families.. Organisations that educate relevant professionals are in a position to influence those who will work directly with children and families

I therefore held conversations with individuals from a range of organisations (see Appendix 2).. I sought information about current policy and practice within their organisations, their views on what needs to happen now to make progress with eliminating corporal punishment of children and reducing violence to children more generally All participants were given the opportunity to review my report. Many strongly endorsed the findings.

¹²Heilman, D., Kelly, Y and Watt, R. *Equally Protected? A review on the evidence on physical punishment*. NSPCC Scotland, Children 1st, Barnardos Scotland, Children and Young Persons Commissioner Scotland. Scotland 2016. <https://www.nspcc.org.uk/globalassets/documents/research-reports/equally-protected.pdf> Retrieved 16 August 2016.

¹³ See Children’s Action Plan website <http://childrensactionplan.govt.nz/>

Some of the organisations consulted provide services nationally. There are many other organisations working with children throughout New Zealand that I did not consult and it is possible that not all of these are as clear about ending corporal punishment as those I met with. However the findings represent the views and practices of some significant organisations in New Zealand with a widespread reach. .

The conversations were held around the following questions:

- What could or should be done to further reduce use of corporal punishment with children in New Zealand?
- Are there ways in which your organisation actively encourages positive non-violent parenting? (Policies, practices and programmes).
- How does your organisation respond to witnessed or reported incidents of corporal punishment of children?

The conversations did not follow a strict questionnaire format and issues discussed overlapped more than one question. Therefore comment arising from the conversations are presented under topic headings rather than restricted to responses to the questions above.

3 The findings

A Ending corporal punishment is not a stand-alone topic

As aspects of follow-up to the law change were discussed, it became very apparent that participants did not see “progress with elimination” that is, further reducing the use of corporal punishment in New Zealand, as a stand-alone goal. Achieving law change was a distinct goal essential to achieving wider aspirations: respect for children’s rights, better outcomes for children and reduction of violence to children. Changing attitudes and behaviour about corporal punishment over time sits within the wider contexts of child development, child-rearing, child protection, public policy and societal values.

B A public campaign promoting the law is unlikely to be helpful at this time

There was very limited support for a major public campaign (for example, using television and newspaper advertisements), to promote the law at this stage in New Zealand, eight years after law reform. A campaign would be costly and unlikely to be funded by Government. Some participants that commented on this approach feared a negative backlash from the public if such an approach was taken because of the cost involved and were concerned that such a campaign would reignite resentments associated with the law change. The law is well known and there was seen to be no need to place undue emphasis on it or to allow debate about the law change itself to overtake opportunities to facilitate positive parenting.

C More resources providing information are needed

On the other hand a number of participants commented on the need for more resources for use in educating staff, parents and communities, for example, easily accessible written material or a DVD, providing information about research into the effects of corporal punishment, the difference between discipline and punishment and addressing misunderstanding of the law.

A very “up to date” resource developed for parents by SKIP should be mentioned here. The team has developed an “app” for smart phones on which parents can enter the age of a child and a behaviour management situation they are dealing with and immediately receive positive intervention suggestions.

While many of us do not like being told how to behave we are sometimes able to change our views and behaviour when provided with compelling evidence of the value of doing so.

D There are many excellent parenting education and support measures in place

During the conversations I heard about some impressive parent support and information programmes producing excellent outcomes. Some of these were universally available to all parents but many were targeted at specific groups, for example, fathers or “hard to reach families”.

Participants whose organisations delivered parenting education and support programmes were all very clear that they were explicit in their focus on positive approaches to discipline and clear to parents about corporal punishment being harmful and illegal.

There is a very strong emphasis on approaches to parenting education that are “strength based”, “parent centred” or “parent led” or in ‘partnership’ with parents. These approaches work in a relationship of respect and equality between facilitator and parent and information is provided in the context of what is currently relevant to the parent involved. Where possible, parents are supported to find positive solutions for themselves. Positive interventions are modelled where appropriate.

Some participants thought there was too much reliance on teaching child management skills and that more effort should go into facilitating attachment and enhancing the relationship between parents and babies. Information on brain development and attachment were regarded as particularly important and reportedly such information makes a strong impression on parents.

Although there are a wide variety of parenting education and support programmes available in New Zealand many participants thought there were still not enough. It is not clear which parents are missing out.

E For many parents being a parent in New Zealand today is a challenging, even stressful experience

Most participants commented that it was not possible to think about elimination of the use of corporal punishment without acknowledging and addressing the stresses affecting families today. The primary stress factor is poverty. It is estimated that nearly one in three New Zealand children live in relative poverty¹⁴. Poverty can exist even when one or both parents are in employment.

The rising cost of accommodation is a major contributor to poverty and family stress.

Factors such as rising cost of housing and student debt mean that in many families both parents work. In these families parents are under great pressure and have limited time with their children. Children spend long periods of time in formal and informal care and may have several changes of caregivers in a day. Young parents are frequently isolated – away from family and in uncaring communities.

It is well recognised that helping stressed parents to provide their children with appropriate care and positive discipline involves helping them address other issues in their lives.

Children are at risk of abuse when there is partner violence in the home. The same is true of living in a home where there is drug and alcohol abuse. The two are often associated with each other. Too little attention is paid to the needs of child victims of partner violence.

Until these related societal problems are addressed further reduction in violence to children may be limited.

F More could be done to make communities and society “child friendly”

Community-led development initiatives exist in some parts of New Zealand. These are aimed at creating more family friendly communities and at changing attitudes about violence (including reducing violence to children)¹⁵. There is undoubtedly room for many more community led social change initiatives.

¹⁴ New Zealand Child and Youth Epidemiological Service. *Child Poverty Monitor*. 2015. Dunedin. https://www.google.co.nz/?gws_rd=ssl#q=child+poverty+monitor+2015+technical+report
Retrieved August 16 2016.

¹⁵ Inspiring Communities, Plunket, Every Child Counts and unicef New Zealand. *Child Rich Communities. Aotearoa New Zealand’s Bright Spots: Local and community led projects making a difference to children and families*. Wellington. 2016. http://cdn-flightdec.userfirst.co.nz/uploads/sites/everychildcounts/files/Child_Rich_Communities_-_full_report_lowres.pdf

Some participants felt there was a need for more to be done to change societal values, for example, by teaching empathy and self-regulation in schools, and parenting to high school students.

Parenting is seen as not valued strongly enough in communities and by employers. The rationale that becoming a parent is a personal choice and that therefore parenting is a personal responsibility undermines notions of family friendly communities and a caring society. Much more could be done to make workplaces family friendly and extend paid parental leave.

Likewise there is much that needs to be done to change the way children are seen and respected, understood and their rights met including valuing their views. The need for children to be viewed differently and valued is especially acute for children with disabilities. Lack of human and other resources contribute to the incidents of inappropriate management that are sometimes reported.

G Agency policies strongly support positive discipline

It is very clear that the agencies involved in this project who delivered services and/or parent education had policies in place to discourage parental use of corporal punishment. These policies permeated the whole service and its philosophies. In some cases policies were stand alone or explicit within a wider policy. In other cases they were regarded as covered less explicitly in a wider family violence, child protection and/or child discipline policy.

H At least one educator of early childhood teachers/carers nationally includes the law and positive discipline in their courses

The one organization involved in this project that is a major educator of early childhood teachers nationally reported that it covered the relevant law and positive discipline at both under-graduate and post graduate levels. There are a large number of organisations providing education to people who work with children and the one example given here is not necessarily true of all relevant courses.

I There are good polices in place to guide staff response to incidents of violence to children

I was interested to know how well equipped staff in various organisations were to respond to witnessing a parent or care-giver smacking a child. Although they might not have a stand-alone “smacking” policy, organisations had clear protocols about responding to any inappropriate behaviour with a child. This included not only recording the incident but reporting within the organisation so that management could make decisions about intervention. Some organisations had mandatory reporting requirements (within the organisation) of any violence to a child.

Importantly, participants did not believe that reporting an incident to the Police or the child protection service is always the intervention of choice. A supportive and informative discussion

with the parent may be more appropriate. Opportunities often exist for a staff member to support the parent and/or make a referral for family support and guidance.

4 Conclusions

It seems likely that both parental and political attitudes about use of corporal punishment have changed significantly in New Zealand since corporal punishment was prohibited in law in 2007. In 2014 New Zealand Prime Minister got it right in response to being pressured by a lobby group to relegalize corporal punishment when he said, *We could spend a long time in Parliament and a lot of discourse of public debate, and in the end it would look like the Government is saying 'we were sanctioning parents to belt kids'*¹⁶. Indications are that for many children in New Zealand violence is not now experienced as part of discipline. The 2007 law change and the public discussion that accompanied it played a big part in achieving positive change as did the support from, and involvement of, a wide range of organisations that work to improve the lives of children and families.

Moving from prohibition of, to the elimination of, corporal punishment is an appropriate goal within the wider goal of achieving “non-violent childhoods” for all our children. Despite changing attitudes and behaviour violent childhoods are still a reality for a significant, and perhaps discrete, part of New Zealand society – children living in families severely disadvantaged by both poverty and histories of intergenerational violence.

A critical question therefore is whether an effort to further reduce the use of corporal punishment is a stand-alone goal that can, or should, be sought in isolation from wider social policies and programmes? Certainly law reform in itself was a stand-alone goal the achievement of which is fundamental to addressing children’s rights and progressing attitudinal and behavioural changes over time.

My consultation with leaders in significant child and family related organisations affirmed what I already suspected. The law is well known and major publicity about it in isolation at this stage is likely to be counter-productive. As far as we can tell the law is being implemented sensitively. A lot of very positive work is being done to support and inform parents about positive parenting and assist them to manage their children in non-violent ways in the context of family support and parent education and guidance. Further heated public debate is unlikely to change all the public’s hearts and minds. The current focus on empowerment of parents in parent education

¹⁶ John Key rules out repealing anti-smacking law. *Newshub*. Auckland 4 July 2014
<http://www.newshub.co.nz/nznews/john-key-rules-out-repealing-antismacking-law-2014070413> Retrieved 20 August 2016.

programmes is a very positive one. Also positive are as community led initiatives to change attitudes about violence.

On the other hand much more needs to be done to address the determinants of violence to children. This will take shifting public attitudes about the place of children in society and probably changes in political ideology.

Organisations that work with children and families had been required by regulation, legislation or policy in New Zealand not to use physical means of disciplining children for some years before the 2007 law change. Many were active in advocating for law change. They were committed to promoting positive non-violent discipline well before the law change and their current programmes, policies and practices reflect this. It is therefore not surprising that many innovative and supportive initiatives exist today. Tribute is due to all the incredible people who work so hard to ensure a positive future for children.

Advocates in countries seeking legal prohibition of corporal punishment of children will do well to engage a support network of child and family related organisations in order to achieve eventual engagement of political support and as a basis for long term positive parenting education.

Questionnaire: Non-violent childhoods

Moving from prohibition to elimination of corporal punishment



The Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children works with governments and others to achieve universal prohibition and elimination of corporal punishment of children in all settings, including the home. To promote this aim, we are collecting information on how the law banning all corporal punishment is being implemented in all states that have achieved full prohibition, and on its impact. Our aims are practical: to encourage states that have not yet prohibited all corporal punishment to do so, and to support those that have in moving effectively from prohibition in law to achieving elimination of violent punishment in practice.

We very much hope you will support this by completing this short questionnaire and linking us to relevant materials – or putting us in touch with someone who can. Many and sincere thanks; please send your completed questionnaire to triona@endcorporalpunishment.org.

1. Information about the law

In the annex to this questionnaire, you will find information about the law in your state. We aim to collect full information on the law banning corporal punishment and on other laws relevant to the protection of children from corporal punishment (e.g. laws under which parents and other carers can, if necessary, be prosecuted for assaulting children) and any official explanation of the purpose and interpretation of the law.

Please review the information provided in the annex and send us your comments and additions – particularly any subsequent laws/legal reforms that have strengthened/reinforced the prohibition.

Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Dissemination of the law and children's right to protection from all corporal punishment

What steps have been taken to ensure knowledge and understanding of *the law* banning all corporal punishment among:

- The public generally
- Parents
- Children
- Professionals involved with families and children (teachers, social workers, health workers, etc.)
- The police, prosecutors, courts

Please provide examples of any materials used and details of dissemination, use of communications media, etc. Please indicate who funded and who carried out these activities.

Click or tap here to enter text.

What steps have been taken to ensure knowledge and understanding of *the right of children*, like all other citizens, to be protected from being hit or hurt deliberately, among:

- The public generally
- Parents
- Children
- Professionals involved with families and children (teachers, social workers, health workers, etc.)
- The police, prosecutors, courts

Please provide examples of any materials used and details of dissemination, use of communications media, etc. Please indicate who funded and who carried out these activities.

Click or tap here to enter text.

3. Responding to cases of corporal punishment

What responses are available for cases of corporal punishment of children by parents, and by others (teachers, carers, etc.)? What are the prosecution/conviction rates for cases of corporal punishment of children? What are the rates of alternative responses (referral to parenting classes, etc.)?

Please provide details.

Click or tap here to enter text.

What challenges have arisen in responding to cases of corporal punishment?

Please provide details.

Click or tap here to enter text.

4. Guidance/training on implementation and enforcement of the law

What, if any, guidance and/or training has there been on implementation and enforcement of the law banning all corporal punishment, to ensure implementation in the best interests of the child, to:

- Social workers, health workers and others working with families or in child protection
- The police, prosecutors, courts

Please provide copies of any guidance used and details of its dissemination; please also provide details of any training programmes which have addressed the law banning all corporal punishment. Please indicate who funded and who carried out these activities.

Click or tap here to enter text.

5. Awareness-raising of the dangers of corporal punishment

Has there been any awareness-raising among the public or parents and other carers of the dangers/harmful impact of corporal punishment?

Please provide examples of any materials used and details of dissemination, use of communications media, etc. Please indicate who funded and who carried out these activities.

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Promotion of positive, non-violent discipline

What advice and support is available to parents and to other carers (foster care, alternative care, day care, etc.) on positive, non-violent discipline? How widely is this advice and support available?

Please provide, or refer us to, any programmes and/or materials used, and any evaluation of their impact. Please indicate who funded and who carried out these activities.

Click or tap here to enter text.

7. Identifying the responsible government ministries, agencies and other bodies

What government ministries, agencies and other bodies are responsible for implementation of the law prohibiting all corporal punishment, and are involved in working for its elimination?

Please provide details.

Click or tap here to enter text.

8. The impact of the ban on the prevalence of, and attitudes towards, corporal punishment

In the annex to this questionnaire, you will find details of identified research into the prevalence of, and attitudes towards, corporal punishment in your country.

Please provide details of, or link us to, any additional research – particularly any information on changes in prevalence or attitudes since the law banning corporal punishment came into effect. Please also provide details of any planned or ongoing research to monitor the impact of the ban. Please indicate who is responsible for funding and carrying out the research.

Click or tap here to enter text.

9. Ideas for accelerating progress from prohibition to elimination of corporal punishment

What plans or proposals, if any, do you/your government/others have for accelerating progress towards elimination of corporal punishment?

Please provide details.

Click or tap here to enter text.

Are there any examples from your country of successful public/parent education campaigns on other issues which could be used as a model to disseminate key messages about the law banning corporal punishment, and to accelerate its elimination? For example, awareness campaigns on violence against women, smoking laws and dangers, immunisation, etc.

Please provide details.

Click or tap here to enter text.

Thank you.

Please send your completed questionnaire to triona@endcorporalpunishment.org

Appendix 2 : List of those consulted

Dr Janis Carroll-Lind – Director Research and Postgraduate Programmes Te Rito Maioha Early Childhood New Zealand. Te Rito Maioha provides early childhood teacher education at an undergraduate and postgraduate level.

Toni Christie – Owner of early childhood education centres (Childspace) and early childhood teacher educator.

Janet Dixon – A former trustee of EPOCH New Zealand and facilitator of the Government funded "Incredible Years" parenting programme available to some parents and teachers in New Zealand. The Incredible Years programme takes a parent-led, positive parenting approach.

Trish Grant – Director of Advocacy at IHC. IHC is New Zealanders largest provider of services to people with intellectual disabilities

Viv Gurrey - Chief Executive of Parents Centres - a national organisation that runs parent education programmes throughout New Zealand including one-off parenting sessions, anti-natal courses and a variety of parenting education classes.

Andrea Jamison - Editor of the Child Wellbeing Network Bulletin and a parent of two school aged children.

Deborah Morris-Travers – Advocacy Manager UNICEF New Zealand.

Clair Trainor – Senior Policy Analyst Royal New Zealand Plunket Society (Plunket). Plunket provides well-child health care to a large proportion of children in New Zealand between 6 weeks of age and 5 years and provides a wide range of parenting education services including Pepe and Parents as First Teachers. Plunket also runs Plunketline, a toll free parent helpline. Additional material was provided in writing by the Plunket National Advisor Parenting Development Brigid Wilkinson.

Dr Sarah Te One – Chairperson Action for Children and Youth Aotearoa (the organisation that researches and writes the NGO report to the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child) and previously lecturer in early childhood education at Victoria University of Wellington.

Jeff Sanders and Jenny Corry - Chief Executive and Advisor Policy and Advocacy Service respectively at Barnardos New Zealand. Barnardos provides a wide range of social services to families throughout New Zealand including family support, parenting education, early childhood education and care and residential and foster care.

Emeritus Professor Anne Smith – previously with the Children’s Issues Centre at the University of Otago - a researcher and author with a strong interest in children’s rights generally and in ending corporal punishment, in particular. Anne was the leader of the team which produced the

publication *The discipline and guidance of children: A summary of research*¹⁷. This report has strongly influenced the nature of some parenting education initiatives, in particular SKIP.

Dr Russell Wills – Children’s Commissioner and Community Paediatrician.

Josi Wilson and Carmel Irwin – Strategies with Kids - Information for Parents (SKIP). SKIP is run from the Ministry of Social Development and provides parenting resources for communities, organisations and parents. It partners with national NGOs to strengthen what they do and find new ways of working with parents and it funds local organisations to support local parents. Its vision is for all children in New Zealand to be raised in a positive way. SKIP was set up in 2004 to encourage parents to become aware of and use non-physical discipline.

I acknowledge the wisdom and dedication of the participants and thank them for giving their time and involvement in the conversations that informed this paper.

¹⁷ Smith, A., Gollop, M., Taylor, N., Marshall, K. *The discipline and guidance of children: A summary of research*. Dunedin: Children’s Issues Centre, University of Otago 2004..