

PARENT EDUCATORS CALL FOR ACTION

(PARENTING FOR PEACE: 23.11.99)

In summary this forum identified the following calls for action.

The “Common Thread” which links parent educators is a belief in non-violence and the promotion of alternative, positive parenting styles.

- **Local Action Required.**

- Publish workshop content/outcomes
- Create and publish list of day's participants, of parent educators, of parent education programmes.
- Find umbrella organisation for Parent educators' network and database
Healthy Cities
**SAFVPN - option of choice for participants (*agreed by SAFVPN*)
National Advocate -Commissioner for Children. (*This report and a letter to be sent to Roger McLeay who is already releasing press statements following Peter Newell's visit to Wellington*)
HFA for Funds??
- Seek approval and support from own agencies for participation and commitment in P.E. Forum
- SAFVPN and Strengthening Families to progress this forum further. (*See date enclosed for next forum*).

- **Lobby Action-Issues to be addressed at a National level**

- Disjointed services and messages for children and families
 - Change the current emphasis on Parental Rights and Zero Tolerance to children's behaviour to an emphasis on Children's Rights and Zero Tolerance to abusive behaviour inflicted on children
 - Information wanted on any cultures which do not use physical punishment
 - Government **commitment** to funding a range of parent education initiatives and support for effective, quality P.E.
 - Teacher training to ensure better understanding and therefore identification of the whole range of child abuse symptoms, appropriate interventions including documentation and knowledge of school protocols, and how to advocate for the rights of the child.
 - Promote positive discipline in schools with outreach to families, stop mixed messages to kids, and parents.
 - More resources for professionals to respond to parents who are using violent punishment.
-

**SOUTH AUCKLAND FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION NETWORK/
STRENGTHENING FAMILIES
WORKSHOP TUESDAY NOVEMBER 23**

PETER NEWELL

It clearly isn't the case here, judging by your invitation to me, but corporal punishment - smacking, spanking and so on - tends to be the issue that drops off adult agendas when family violence is debated. In the UK our government is happy to embrace what it sees as the consensus issue of ending violence between adult family members. Ministers launch new, well-resourced programmes and materials. "Zero tolerance" has been adopted as a central theme.

But children still seem to be largely outsiders to this focus on violence in the family. Recently, there has been some focus on the effect that witnessing adult violence has on children. But the most common form of family violence, far more common now in our societies than violence between adult partners, is direct violence by adult family members to children: the slapping, smacking and beating that starts with babies - three quarters of a large sample of English mothers in recent government-commissioned research admitted to smacking their babies before the age of one, 97 per cent of four year olds had been hit, many of them more than once a week and a quarter of the seven year olds had been hit with an implement.

When we get to this issue of physical punishment of children, a policy of zero tolerance suddenly becomes deeply controversial.

But the visibility of family violence now, and the general acceptance of the priority of challenging it presents an opportunity to make quick progress: if everyone involved in challenging family violence took a logical decision to extend the concept of zero tolerance to cover children and pursued the policy and legal implications of doing so we would quickly get the reforms we need.

In any campaign on social issues it is vital to pursue the unpopular and difficult parts of the agenda with more energy than those where a political consensus already exists. So - don't let corporal punishment fall off your agendas.

Why - I am often asked - is it not enough to pursue educational strategies and leave legal reform until public opinion comes round? There are various reasons. First, this issue is primarily one of human rights. Human rights are universal and there is no conceivable reason why children should wait patiently for public opinion to catch up with the concept before their human rights are properly respected. Can you imagine anyone getting away with such an approach to domestic violence against women - "Let's wait until men are fully employed and unstressed..."

Secondly, there are no signs that educational programmes are enough to significantly challenge a habit which is so ingrained. Most baby care books have been saying it's not a good idea to smack your baby for a few years now. Of course it is having some effect, but not much.

In any case, at long last internationally and within many individual states, things are changing and clear legal reform to give children the same protection as adults under the law on assault is becoming a serious possibility, creeping onto and up political agendas.

This is of course because of the growing movement, in the context of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, to accept that children, too, are holders of human rights.

Respect for human dignity and rights to physical integrity and to equality of protection under the law are three fundamental human rights principles, principles of supposedly universal application upheld in the 50 year-old Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the two International Covenants.

Yet as part of their daily lives, children all over the world are spanked, slapped, hit, smacked, shaken, kicked, pinched, punched, paddled, caned, flogged, belted, beaten and battered by adults — mainly those they trust the most. This violence may be a deliberate act of punishment or just the impulsive reaction of an irritated parent or teacher. In every case, it is a breach of fundamental human rights principles.

Corporal punishment of children often becomes inhuman or degrading. Always, it violates the child's physical integrity, demonstrates disrespect for human dignity and undermines self-esteem. Furthermore, the existence of special defences for violent punishment of children in your country and mine, in otherwise universally applicable laws on assault, deliberately removes the equality of protection under the law which is also guaranteed by the human rights instruments.

The adult invention of disreputable legal concepts such as 'reasonable chastisement' and 'lawful correction' arises from the perception of children as the property of their parents. Traditional attitudes to slaves, servants and women were also reflected, only a century or two ago, in the 'rights' of their masters and husbands to beat them — and the attitudes behind these laws are still entrenched in many societies today.

Children have had to wait until last to be given equal legal protection from deliberate assaults — a protection the rest of us take for granted. It is surely extraordinary that children, whose developmental state and small size is acknowledged to make them particularly vulnerable to physical and psychological injury, should be the ones singled out for less protection from assaults on their fragile bodies, minds and dignity.

For women, challenging legal and social acceptance of violence, in particular the daily experience of routine violence in their homes, has been a fundamental part of the struggle for equal status. So it is with children: there is no more telling symbol of their low status as less than people than adults' continuing assumption that they have a 'right', even a duty, to hit children.

While it is intolerable that children should have had to wait until last, it is understandable, because of the deeply personal nature of the issue - most people were hit as children; most parents have hit their children. We like to think well of our parents, and of our parenting. But this can get in the way of compassionate and

The 191 States which have ratified the Convention have to report to the Committee, first after two years and then every five years. The Committee's Guidelines for Periodic Reports, adopted in October 1996, asks "whether legislation (criminal and/or family law) includes a prohibition of all forms of physical and mental violence, including corporal punishment, deliberate humiliation, injury, abuse, neglect or exploitation, inter alia within the family, in foster and other forms of care, and in public or private institutions, such as penal institutions and schools".

Just as the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women has been preoccupied with domestic violence to women, so the Committee on the Rights of the Child is now leading the challenge to violence to children. When representatives of these two Committees met in 1998 in Geneva to discuss action against family violence, they agreed that 'zero tolerance' is the only possible target. As with violence to women, the problem was recognised to be rooted in traditional attitudes and culture, sometimes underpinned by religion. But a practice which violates basic human rights cannot be said to be owned by any culture, nor dictated by any religion.

The imperative for prohibiting all corporal punishment of children is one of human rights. It has always been wrong to hit children, just as wrong as to hit adults. As the extent of legalised violence to children in their homes (and also in schools and other institutions) has become more visible, so we have begun to learn about the short- and longer-term dangers of hitting them, accumulating other compelling arguments for eliminating the practice, beyond the human rights imperative. First there is the immediate danger of physical injury from even "gentle" forms, because most corporal punishment is directed at very young, very small children, including babies. There is always the risk of escalation too. Then there are the longer term effects: corporal punishment and other humiliating forms of discipline are now identified as a highly significant factor in the development of violent attitudes and actions, both in childhood and later life. Here again, in the context of this meeting, ending corporal punishment must be seen as a key strategy for reducing violence to women in the family too; also for reducing school bullying and of course generally as a violence prevention strategy.

Have you noticed how adults tend to find it easier talking about violence between children, and violence by children than they do about the almost invariably preceding violence to children by adults - mostly their parents?

I have looked in depth at the research literature on the causes of violence and on the effects of physical punishment. None of it is terribly satisfactory research - cause and effect in this extremely complex area of childrearing and family relationships is not easy to untangle with certainty. But there is no question whatsoever that - apart from the fairly obvious fact that in the very short term physical punishment may stop an undesired behaviour - the overwhelming direction of the evidence points towards bad, unwanted effects, and certainly no positive long-term effects whatsoever.

I feel we have to be careful not to put too much emphasis on this sort of research; it can become an unproductive diversion. The fact is that even if we had excellent researchers proving that physical punishment worked, it would in no way reduce the

logical consideration of the arguments. Frankly, it is an issue which sees adults at their most hypocritical. We have invented a whole vocabulary of words and phrases to make us feel more comfortable about hitting children - smacking, spanking, tapping, a good hiding, six of the best... I've no doubt there are some special New Zealand versions, although we should be clear that if we are competing for responsibility for peddling this habit of hitting children around the world, the British are in line for a special prize. If anyone's culture owns corporal punishment and has imposed it on others, it is the British.

I'm not sure how much you all know about the Convention on the Rights of the Child and its monitoring body, the Committee on the Rights of the Child, but I will run briefly through the significance of the Convention to this issue. The particular purpose of the Convention on the Rights of the Child is to assert that children, too, are holders of rights. And the Convention is the first international human rights instrument to address the protection of children from violence expressly: Article 19 requires states to take "all appropriate legislative, administrative, social and educational measures to protect the child from all forms of physical or mental violence, injury or abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation, including sexual abuse, while in the care of parent(s), legal guardian(s) or any other person who has the care of the child...."

Given the holistic nature of the Convention, various other articles reinforce the child's right to physical integrity and protection of his or her human dignity. The Preamble recognises the "inherent dignity and ... equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family". It also affirms that precisely because of their "physical and mental immaturity", children need "special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection". Article 37 requires protection from "torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment".

It is not surprising, therefore, that the Committee on the Rights of the Child has consistently stated that legal and social acceptance of corporal punishment of children, whether in their homes or in institutions, is not compatible with the Convention. The Committee has recommended prohibition of all corporal punishment, including in the family, and campaigns to raise awareness of the negative effects of corporal punishment and to encourage the development of positive, non-violent child-rearing and educational practices. It made these clear recommendations to the UK government and to yours. In both cases with little effect to date.

In 1994, in a concluding statement to the General Discussion on Children's Rights in the Family, organised as the Committee's contribution to the International Year of the Family, it stated, "As for corporal punishment, few countries have clear laws on this question. Certain States have tried to distinguish between the correction of children and excessive violence. In reality the dividing line between the two is artificial. It is very easy to pass from one stage to the other. It is also a question of principle. If it is not permissible to beat an adult, why should it be permissible to do so to a child? One of the contributions of the Convention is to call attention to the contradictions in our attitudes and cultures." The Committee has, accordingly, criticised any attempt to draw a line between acceptable and unacceptable forms of corporal punishment.

fundamental case against it. Again, can you imagine a research debate about the pros and cons of slapping women, or cats or dogs?

Really the only useful forms of research in terms of furthering the campaign to end all corporal punishment now is research into prevalence - detailed interview research, preferably asking children as well as their parents (it was interesting to find in recent UK research that if you ask each parent in two parents families about prevalence you get a result which roughly doubles the amount of physical punishment the child is receiving).

Another particular and valuable piece of research carried out recently in the UK interviewed 75 five to seven year old children about their perspective on smacking. These children defined smacking as hitting; most of them described a smack as a hard or very hard hit. Smacking hurts. They said children responded negatively to being smacked, and that smacking was "wrong".

So - where are we internationally?

Where corporal punishment is most visible - in penal systems and schools and so-called caring institutions - it is under serious threat now in all continents. In the home, where children are hit most often, it has only been challenged seriously in a tiny handful of countries. But the context of the Convention and the clear recommendations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child are leading to accelerating reform across the world.

As yet, it appears that only eight countries — all in Europe — have explicitly banned all corporal punishment of children. In addition Italy's Supreme Court has outlawed it, but this is not yet reflected in statute. Sweden was the first to do so, 20 years ago. When the Swedish law was coming into force in 1979, the International Year of the Child, a Ministry of Justice official explained: "By the prohibition of physical punishment, the legislator wanted to show that a child is an independent individual who can demand full respect for his or her person, and who should thus have the same protection against physical punishment or violence as we adults see as being totally natural for ourselves".

The legal provision forms part of Sweden's family (civil) law: "Children are entitled to care, security and a good upbringing. Children are to be treated with respect for their person and individuality and may not be subjected to corporal punishment or any other humiliating treatment". But its purpose is to emphasise beyond doubt that the criminal code on assault covers physical punishment, although trivial offences remain unpunished just as trivial assaults between adults are not prosecutable. The purpose of criminalizing all corporal punishment is not, of course, to prosecute and punish more parents. It satisfies human rights by giving children equal protection of their physical integrity and human dignity. It gives a clear message that hitting children is wrong - at least as wrong as hitting anyone else. Thus it provides a consistent basis for child protection and for public education promoting positive forms of discipline. As attitudes change, so the need for prosecution and for formal interventions into families to protect children will diminish.

A rigorous and detailed research review of the effects of the Swedish ban, published in 1999 by Save the Children UK, has identified very positive trends. The goals of the ban were to alter public attitudes towards corporal punishment, establish a clear framework for parent education and support, and facilitate earlier and less intrusive intervention in child protection cases. Public support for corporal punishment has declined markedly. Whereas in 1965 a majority of Swedes were supportive of corporal punishment, the most recent survey found only six per cent of under-35-year-olds supporting the use of even the mildest forms. Practice as well as attitudes has changed; of those whose childhood occurred shortly after the ban, only three per cent report harsh slaps from their parents, and only one per cent report being hit with an implement (contrast the position in the UK and other countries where a quarter or more of young children with implements). Child abuse mortality rates are extremely low in Sweden; from 1976 to 1990, no child died as a result of abuse.

Increased sensitivity to violence to children in Sweden has led to an increase in reporting of assaults, but there has been a declining trend in prosecutions of parents, and a substantial reduction in compulsory social work interventions and in numbers of children taken into care. The proportions of young people who consume alcohol, experiment with drugs and commit suicide have also all declined. The review concludes: "While drawing a direct causal link between the corporal punishment ban and any of these social trends would be overly simplistic, the evidence presented here indicates that the ban has not had negative effects. In terms of its original goals of modifying public attitudes toward corporal punishment and facilitating early identification and supportive intervention, it has certainly been successful."

In Finland, the ban on physical punishment formed part of a comprehensive reform of children's law. The Child Custody and Right of Access Act 1983 begins with a statement of positive principles of care for children, and continues: "A child shall be brought up in the spirit of understanding, security and love. He shall not be subdued, corporally punished or otherwise humiliated. His growth towards independence, responsibility and adulthood shall be encouraged, supported and assisted". Here again, the reform in family law puts beyond doubt that the criminal law applies equally to assaults committed against children by parents and other carers.

Norway and Austria implemented similar reforms in the late 1980s. In 1997, the Danish Parliament approved an amendment to the Parental Custody and Care Act which reads: "A child has the right to care and security. He or she shall be treated with respect as an individual and may not be subjected to corporal punishment or other degrading treatment". In 1986, the Danish Parliament had amended its civil law to state that "parental custody implies the obligation to protect the child against physical and psychological violence and against other harmful treatment". But this was interpreted as allowing milder forms of corporal punishment, and research found that they were still prevalent; hence the need for further and more explicit reform.

Cyprus, Croatia and Latvia have also passed laws that prohibit all corporal punishment, and several other European countries, including Germany, Spain and Ireland have proposals to do so under active consideration. In Belgium, the recent National Commission against Sexual Exploitation of Children proposed that an article should be added to the Constitution recognising the right of every human being to

physical, psychological and sexual integrity. The Commission concluded: "The absence of violence in relations with children cannot be limited to a self-imposed obligation nor to a personal style of child-rearing practised by certain people. The absence of violence should be a norm respected by the whole of society, not only because even today too many children are the victims of acts of violence, but because children and their integrity as persons should be always and everywhere respected... Respect for children and violence against them can never go together. If one of the characteristics of a society which thinks of itself as civilised is the absence of violence, there can be no justification for violence against children". A proposal to prohibit corporal punishment in the family is currently before the Belgian Senate.

Where human rights principles are enforceable through regional or domestic courts, there has been recent progress in challenging corporal punishment, which may speed up the process of banning it in some regions and ultimately worldwide. I certainly hope that appropriate NGOs in New Zealand are exploring how they might use domestic or international courts or other similar arenas to speed up the process.

The Supreme Court of Namibia in 1991 ruled that the constitutional guarantee of human dignity precluded the possibility of corporal punishment for both adult and juvenile offenders, as well as the use of corporal punishment in schools. In Namibia's initial report to the Committee on the Rights of the Child, it stated that the Ministry of Education "has been advocating a new approach to discipline embodied in the concept 'Discipline from within'. In contrast to the emphasis on physical punishment in the schools in the colonial era, this new approach emphasises self-discipline based on the co-operative effort of students, teachers and parents."

The Constitutional Court of the new South Africa declared corporal punishment of juvenile offenders unconstitutional in 1995, and the Government went on to ban it and all school corporal punishment in 1996. Since then, the Government has also banned corporal punishment in all other institutions and in foster care.

The Supreme Court in Rome, Italy, in a landmark 1996 judgement quoted the Convention and stated that "the use of violence for educational purposes can no longer be considered lawful. There are two reasons for this: the first is the overriding importance that the legal system attributes to protecting the dignity of the individual. This includes minors, who now hold rights and are no longer simply objects to be protected by their parents, or, worse still, objects at the disposal of their parents. The second reason is that, as an educational aim, the harmonious development of a child's personality, which ensures that he/she embraces the values of peace, tolerance and co-existence, cannot be achieved by using violent means which contradict these goals".

The European Court of Human Rights unanimously found in 1998 that corporal punishment of a young English boy by his stepfather constituted degrading punishment in breach of the European Human Rights Convention, and that current domestic law, which allows "reasonable chastisement", failed to provide adequate protection. The case involved repeated caning of the boy between the ages of five and eight. The Court did not, however, review whether, in addition, it violated the child's right to physical integrity and was discriminatory, given that such treatment of an adult is plainly unlawful. The British Government was ordered to pay the boy £10,000

compensation and his legal costs. It has accepted that the law must be changed to give children better protection, but is currently resisting removing the defence of "reasonable chastisement" altogether, preferring to try to define 'reasonable' forms of corporal punishment (hardly a dignified task for a serious government - at what age can you hit a child? Where? How hard? How much pain?). We are expecting a consultation document from the Government late this year or early next. In response to this unique opportunity to make real progress. EPOCH together with major children's organisations like the NSPCC and Barnardos has formed a new Alliance "Children are unbeatable" to argue for a clear, Swedish-style ban. We have over 250 organisations and about the same number of prominent individuals - celebrities, journalists, eminent professionals and increasingly people quite near to new Labour, like Richard Branson and Elizabeth Murdoch.

It seems clear that without the European Court judgment we would not have achieved any legal reform from this Government. Now all 40 Council of Europe countries need to review their law on parental discipline.

In Canada, parents' and teachers' use of corporal punishment is currently being tested against all the fundamental human rights principles. A challenge under the Canadian Charter of Human Rights seeks to have section 43 of the Criminal Code, which allows the use of "reasonable force" to correct children, declared unlawful. The Charter includes the principle of equality of protection under the law. In defending the case, the Canadian Government has to prove some demonstrable justification for breaching this and other constitutional principles. The Government appears to have accepted that corporal punishment of children is harmful. The Ministry of Health, for example, has widely distributed material promoting positive, non-violent discipline and listing the dangers of spanking children. Nevertheless, the Government is mounting strong opposition to the Charter challenge, presumably because it perceives a ban on spanking to be unpopular with voters.

In doing so, the Canadian Government is also resisting the clear recommendation of the Committee on the Rights of the Child, which in its Concluding Observations on Canada's report suggested that the Government "examine the possibility of reviewing the penal legislation allowing corporal punishment of children by parents, in schools and in institutions where children may be placed". The Committee recommended that the physical punishment of children in families be prohibited and suggested that the Government consider the possibility of introducing new legislation and follow-up mechanisms to prevent violence within the family. These measures could be accompanied by educational campaigns aimed at "changing attitudes in society on the use of physical punishment in the family and fostering the acceptance of its legal prohibition".

So - there is quite a lot going on. In a new global initiative, some of us are working to get the broad human rights community behind this reform, and also UNICEF and other UN agencies.

We need to be impatient. We also need to be aware of the threats to progress. They mostly come from what is now a global network of fundamentalist Christians and what I would term right-wing family campaigners who peddle absurd misconceptions

about the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which is in no sense whatsoever an anti-family document... They also spread lies - simply lies - about Sweden and the effects of law reform there. The Swedish Government has become sufficiently irritated by this to issue its own rebuttal. In the UK, we find that the people in these campaigns have begun to retreat, now carefully limiting the sort of smacking they defend, while continuing to do anything they can to discredit us.

Of course law reform without public education will not achieve much, and public education will need to continue for some time after a law is past. In Sweden now ...

But public education is relatively easy; the messages can be built into all the other vital messages about parenting and early development and child care, and of course taught throughout the parenting cycle. The challenging task is to get people to accept that legal reform to give children the same protection under the law on assault as the rest of us is now long overdue.

Now - what are the arguments you hear against law reform to end smacking?

Parenting for Peace: Parent Education Workshop, 23.11.99

FEEDBACK

1. ISSUES RAISED DURING MORNING SESSION.

• CHANGING OUR CULTURE of ACCEPTANCE OF VIOLENT PARENTING

We need:

-To acknowledge parenting as a key ingredient in the evolution of our culture(s).and promote Parent Education as a key violence prevention strategy which must be accompanied by:

Leadership from Politicians, and legal reform, to remove the current legal permission our society gives to parents to use 'reasonable force'.
Elimination of mixed messages currently given to parents by the law vs parent education Education

-Funding for Parenting work.

-To promote the difference between Punishment and Discipline
To challenge parental physical abuse/violence constructively.

-To Assert Children's Rights.

-To establish active Media watch.

-Childcare facilities to be available during parenting programmes;
unavailability of appropriate childcare support to be addressed.

• PROVIDING QUALITY PARENT EDUCATION SERVICES. ACHIEVING QUALITY CONTROL-

We need:

-Parent Educator Support Networks.

-Facilitator training.

observer opportunities, apprentices?

Access to NZ appropriate resources,

-Programme evaluation

Effectiveness of informal/unstructured/I:I/whanau education models
..... and.....formal/structured/special purpose group models of
parent education.

-Recruitment of Pacific Island male facilitators.

-Recruitment of male facilitators from all ethnic groups.

2. REPORTS FROM AFTERNOON DISCUSSION GROUPS.

These groups addressed some of the key issues raised in the morning session, then reported back to the whole forum.

Group 1.

- **Endorsement of need for National Support Network with local (eg: Counties-Manukau) networks for Parent Educators, to provide for:**

- development of culturally appropriate knowledge/resources
- general resources
- information sharing
- peer supervision/sharing
- co-ordination of programmes in regions/localities
- funding information
- facilitator training

- **Ways of Challenging Physical Abuse constructively.**

-Out and about in the community:

- use joining statements "Being a parent is really hard"
- "Three year olds really challenge us"

-Within family group/friends:

- Affirm good parenting etc., support effort.

- Challenge directly about unacceptable behaviour, inappropriate/abusive discipline.

- Make known available resources eg: group programmes, written materials.

-In organisations, your agency or work place:

- Ensure policy statements are reflected in workplace practice.

- Display material etc promotes non-violence, positive parenting.

- Supportive process.

- Group discussion- involve whole staff

- Opening it up with love/respect.

Group 2. P.I.Group.

- **How to Challenge physical violence.**

-Differentiate between violence and discipline

- Have consistency between the law and educational messages.

- Target Churches who are teaching 'Spare the rod and spoil the child'.

- (Good scripture schools for pastors and ministers). (Also see 'discussion' section below.)

-Lessons in consequential thinking

- Cultural protocols, when to use these and when not to- *not as an excuse for abuse.*

- Involve children in family dialogue

-Encourage **healthy** hierarchical structures (*non- abusive positional power*)

- **Punishment vs Discipline**

- Education about the difference.

- School programmes on discipline.

- Teaching parents to use appropriate language.

- Encourage community caretaking, ie: shared responsibility for discipline.

- Reflect on losses and gains of using punishment or discipline.

- Teach knowledge of the law

- Acknowledge and enhance spirituality

- Demonstrate proper communication eg: explaining clearly to child what is expected.

- **Quality Control**

- Support in Q.C. techniques

- Establish uniformity of programme goals, expectations, consistency of message.

- Sharing/learning together, ie: building our resources.

Group 3

- **Establish Parent education as a major Violence Prevention Strategy.**

- **Positive Parent Education Strategies (vs 'put downs')**

- Draw out/enhance existing skills

- Build on "dreams" we all have for our children/families

- Explore use of family meetings, listen to feedback, take time to listen, value, acknowledge child opinions and feelings, give children the words for their feelings

- Talk talk talk with children, and Listen , listen, listen

- Separate whole child from child's behaviour. Parents can help to shape behaviour but must respect the child as a person.("Love the sinner, hate the sin")

- Protect and build the child's self esteem.

- Promote 'good' touch (smacking is not 'good' touch)

- Learn how to play with our children

- Teach: problem solving-

- find out who owns the problem, parent or child?

- Jungle Justice- natural consequences

- Use role modelling

- Establish Zero Tolerance to violence - 'if you hit you sit'.
- Assertive Discipline' = 'Respect'
- Following through vs 'idle threats' or 'armchair parenting'

Group 4

Strategies for getting the parent education messages to parents.

- Recognise two opportunities in life cycle for parent education.
 - a) We learn to be parents before we become parents (Pre-parenting)and
 - b) after we become parents (Post-parenting).
- Pre -parent learning opportunities
 - from our own parents as role models
 - from our experience of being parented
 - Opportunities for learning in school
 - eg Cool Schools and
 - other whole school programmes,
 - High school curriculum,
 - helping in childcare facilities
 - School practices which develop in our young people, our future parents, high levels of self-esteem and confidence, the ability to express feelings appropriately, healthy life skills and coping skills
- **Post-Parent learning opportunities:**
 - Reinstate and resource further Plunket and child and parent support services
 - encourage parenting programmes in preschools (like Playcentre), and schools, 0-17,
 - give parents positive reinforcement

Media

- messages to general population-
 - 'parenting is the most important job',
 - how to parent positively
- more, more and more public speaking
- add to critical mass
- media watch
 - open our eyes to public violence such as TV , movies, games, politics, sport, role models,
- Community and Private messages of support for positive parenting role:
 - Honour fathering
 - through work place,
 - local authority facilities,
 - Positive reinforcement of parenting role,

acknowledgement and support of challenges facing parents

Discussion:

The fullness and usefulness of these discussions reflected the stimulation provided by the keynote speaker, and the openness and willingness to share of all participants. The skills and knowledge of participants needs to be celebrated here, as does their enthusiasm and commitment to working towards a more positive society, and towards promotion of the rights of children.

The interchange of ideas which took place between the groups around experiences of dealing with the use of the scriptures as endorsement of physical punishment exemplified the benefits of such sharing. It was suggested that the problematic literal interpretation of 'spare the rod and spoil the child' could be exchanged for perceptions of the 'rod' as a shepherd's crook, or a staff, used to guide rather than punish. This image supported the forum's view that while punishment becomes 'a lesson in bad behaviour', discipline is 'a guide to good/wanted behaviour'.

**THE FORUM AS A WHOLE IDENTIFIED THE FOLLOWING IDEAS
TO PROMOTE EFFECTIVE PARENT EDUCATION -
AND ENCOURAGE POSITIVE PARENTING**

- Lobby for establishment of a National network - to be headed by Commissioner for Children
- With Regional branches
- Find an existing network for regional networks/forums to tap into as an Umbrella organisation, eg: -Healthy Cities Project? Or Violence Prevention?
- Resource network forums to extend and enrich these networks and the work of their members.
- Use Strengthening Families database to include wide range of helping agencies.
- Activities in which National/Regional Forum might be involved.
 1. Make Parent Education someone's responsibility
 2. Funding of Parent Education.
 3. Someone to lobby for Parent Education
 4. And parent advocates
 5. Register of Parent education programmes
 6. Facilitator database
 7. Facilitator training
 8. Role models to visit and observe
 9. Register of facilitator supervisors and peer supervision

10. Peer supervision in like fields

- Make Parenting information and support readily available to parents.
- Establish Directory booklets and Community data bases of Parent Education opportunities at libraries, CABs etc.
- Promote Conferences
- Promote Websites on Internet for Positive Parenting information
- Ensure Costs of accessing information is affordable/free to parents

ATTENDANCE LIST FOR PARENTING FOR PEACE :PARENT EDUCATION WORKSHOP, 23.11.99

NAME.....	ORGANISATION.....	ADDRESS.....	PHONE.....	FAX.....
Judy Patterson	Te Whare Marama o Mangere	PO Box 43201 Mangere	2767922	2767926
Naomi Lange				
Suzanne Holland				
Betty Cole	Foundation For Peace Studies	19 Zion Rd, Birkenhead	3732379	
Rahui David	PIDAS	PO Box 22176 Otahuhu	2761606	2760755
Halo Asekona				
Kava Ki				
Huria Chisolm	James Family TeHononga	73 Kolmar Rd Papatoetoe	2782546	
Sam Latu	Latu Counselling Group	33 Cape Rd, Mangere	25660675	2561115
Sue Smith	HFA	Private Bag, 92522, Wellesly ST	5809030	5809001
Julie Greig	Barnardos	PO Box 43092, Mangere	2754481	2754484
Helen Panchia	Barnardos Family Support		2759336	
Sheryl Hogan	St Georges Christian Care Centre	5 Landscape Rd, Papatoetoe	2783412	
Vic Rigden	CY&F, St Georges Christian Care Centre	CY&FS, Mangere		
Cabrini K.	Friendship House	Manukau	2622322	2631729
Filipo Tipoi				
Pat Edwin	Pakuranga Children's Health Camp	1-9 Pigeon Mountain Rd, Half Moon Bay	5344017	
Paula Stockley				
Tina Van Den Bogaard	Counties Playcentre Association	PO Box 326 Papakura	092382329	
Gwen Reekie	Anger Change Trust	PO Box 105 Manurewa	2684679	
Priscilla Kenna	Asian People	20 Balance Ave, Papatoetoe	2781497	
Elizabeth Reid	C/O SAFVPN			
NAME.....	ORGANISATION.....	ADDRESS.....	PHONE.....	FAX.....

Candy Smith	CCS Early Intervention SthAuck	Hingaia Road, Karaka R.D.	2983634	
Karen Barnett				
Marin Adams	S.E.S.	PO Box 23-638 Papatoetoe	2796600	2796604
Margaret Martin	Sisters of Mercy	14 Trevor Hoskins Drive, Wiri	2796600	2796604
Eileen Palmer	Child Youth and Family Service PO Box 22-444, Wiri	Wiri	9129150	9129139
Betty Mc Pherson	RTLB Pukekohe North School	C/O Princess St, Pukekohe	092391555	092391555
Margaret Cunningham				
Val Boag	Relationship Services,	PO Box 11550, Ellerslie	5251051	5251052
Eva Dimmendaal	RTLB, Holy Cross School	PO Box 23033 Papatoetoe	2788224	2788224
Sulieti Latu	PI Family Support Service	10 Beatty St, Otahuhu	2763729	
Irene Taelima				
Hinemoa Buffet	Fairburn School	Pukeoria Rd, Otahuhu	2701132	2701139
Mereana Ruri	Dept. of Youth Affairs	Wellington	044712158	
Leone Pesamino	Mapu I Manurewa Trust	18 Christmas Rd, Manurewa	2675879	
Brenna Skeates	Confident Parenting	48 Burbank Rd, Manurewa	2673723	
Jean Golschmidt		Stanforth Road, RD5, Wellsford	094315096	
Sister Marie Brown	Te Waipuna Puawai ^{Mercy} Oasis	5A Waddell Ave, Glen Innes	5276380	
Duncra Reid	Anglican Trust for Women & Children	671A Gt South Rd, Otahuhu	2769519	2769761
Jenny Redmond	Counties Playcentre Association	PO Box 326 Papakura	2977172	
Lorraine Stewart	Toughlove Auckland	PO Box 38667, Howick	5347022	5374345
Pauline Thomas				
Phyl Brock	James Family, Manukau	PO Box 76140, Manukau City	2636245	2623692

Caroline Kaa, Truancy Services, Manurewa, Karakia, Welcome, and Closing, Dr Peter Newell, UNICEF, Keynote Speaker, Beth Woods, EPOCH, Robert Ludbrook, EPOCH, Ken Allen, Strengthening Families
Marilyn Burton, Auckland Healthcare, Rosemary Nash, SAFVPN.