

**'Spare the rod and spoil the child': Discipline, Rules and Punishments in Schools**

**From the Garton Archive at Lincoln Christ's Hospital School**

**Occasional Paper No 7**

**by**

**Peter Harrod**

**February 2012**

## **'Spare the rod and spoil the child': Discipline, Rules and Punishments in Schools**

### **Introduction**

The subject of discipline in schools remains a perennial topic discussed in staffrooms throughout the world and is a major cause for concern of students training to be teachers. The press too have a fascination for the subject, and attitudes towards it cover the full spectrum of social attitudes among the public. These range from those who advocate bringing back corporal punishment, to liberal views espousing a more positive and tolerant set of values. Spoil the rod and spare the child? Parker-Jenkins (1999) sets the scene for such a debate, stating that Britain was the last country in Europe to end the use of physical chastisement, and that some would have us be the first to re-introduce the practice! As many of my generation would claim, perhaps looking back with rose-coloured spectacles, 'It didn't do me any harm.' This paper draws mainly upon Charles Garton's 'ex-libris' collection of books and documents housed in the Garton Archive at Lincoln Christ's Hospital School, and other surviving documents from the four schools that combined in 1974 to form LCHS.

### **An Historical Perspective**

The published histories of our public schools provide fascinating insights into the development of practices over the centuries. Edwards (1957) in his *History of the King's School Canterbury*, relates a story told by the monk Eadmer which indicated strict discipline in the 11<sup>th</sup> century. Eadmer stated that all the boys in the School were flogged by custom each year five days before Christmas, apparently as part of the Advent penance. During the 17<sup>th</sup> century there were many references to corporal punishment, and one schoolmaster was described as a '...shrewd tanner of boys' fleshy parts'. Even the monitors, selected from the 'steadier' pupils, were not immune, and the more negligent ones, who failed to supervise the other boys, were flogged as an example to the rest. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century there were suspicions that one headmaster enjoyed the task of discipline. His headmastership apparently ended in a rebellion in 1873! Corporal punishment persisted into the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, however, when beatings by the school monitors (later named 'prefects'), before morning school were all too frequent, and corporal punishment and 'fagging' were still recorded in the 1950s.

Raine (1926) describes discipline at St Peter's School York in Norman times as 'severe, with a good deal of flogging with both rod and birch found to be necessary for the inculcation of sound learning'. In medieval times, however, rod and birch were apparently insufficient to keep the unruly boys in order. Religion was also invoked, and the pupils lived in fear of the 'schoolboys' devil'. A window in York Minster depicts a schoolboy captured by a fearsome pink devil with curly hair, the wings of a dragon and a sweeping bushy tail.

In the Middle Ages, corporal punishment was a universal discipline. Orme (1973) writes that even royal childhoods '...throbbed with continual reverberation'. He informs us that

schoolmasters had no monopoly of cruelty; they merely exercised at school the same authority that parents imposed at home. As such they were acting *in loco parentis*, a somewhat woolly and loosely defined term, but one that still enjoys legal credence.

Outlining the history of discipline at Merchant Taylors' School in Crosby, Luft (1970) writes that it was characteristic of the great majority of endowed and proprietary schools in the 19<sup>th</sup> century to resort to the cane or birch, merely following a precedent dating back at least to the 16<sup>th</sup> century. He describes the early days of the grammar schools in which the 'ferula' (Latin for 'rod') was applied vigorously to the shoulders of the 'dullard and disobedient' by strict schoolmasters. His researches suggest that methods of discipline were even stricter during the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and that it was fair to assume that Crosby boys had been flogged regularly since the School's inception in 1620.

The history of Rugby School is lovingly recorded by Rouse (1898), who informs us that the infamous headmaster Thomas Arnold did not in the least suffer from that 'false sentimentality' common in our own generation, which condemns all corporal punishment as 'degrading'. He defended his judgement by suggesting that corporal punishment, '...if judiciously and calmly administered, never leaves a grudge behind, as impositions often do.' Perhaps Rouse should have adhered to the historical facts, rather than pepper his work with such value judgements? Closer to home, Harmston and Hoare (2003) write about the history of Carre's Grammar School, Sleaford, and describe discipline as severe during its early days in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. There was always the threat of the rod, and any deviation from the straight and narrow was met by punishment considered to be appropriate to the sin.

Of course corporal punishment, although it tended to be the ultimate sanction, was not the only means by which harassed schoolmasters sought to discipline the disobedient and the dullards. The History of Bristol Grammar School by Hill (1988) reports that any infringement of the 'direct and emphatic' rules of 1862 which outlawed talking, idling, neglect of work and disturbing a class would be punishable by an imposition. Every moral offence, such as falsehood, impertinence, disobedience, etc., would be punished by the headmaster. Expulsion was an option for 'serious' offences, employed on several occasions by headmaster Caldicott, who '...relied very heavily on his own autocratic and aggressive personality'. The punishments in regular use at the School were impositions, detentions, extra school, and 'caning, very rarely' in private'. However old boys spoke with feeling of the severity with which the second master used the 'whack' on their hands, causing 'stinging pain'. Memorising passages of classical prose or poetry was also used as a deterrent. It is also interesting to note that Hill wrote of the '...failure in home influences to foster and support the discipline of the School'. We tend to think of that as a contemporary phenomenon.

It is interesting to read Sylvester's (1970) account of punishment in Tudor and Stuart grammar schools. He cites the work of John Brinsley in 1612, which outlines a staged punishment system from lesser kinds of punishment to the highest and severest forms, as follows;

1. *To use reproofs; and those sometimes more sharpe according to the nature of the offender, and his fault.*
2. *To punish by losse of place to him who doth better according to our discretion.*

3. *To punish by a note, which may be called, the blacke Bill. This I would have the principal punishment, I meane most of use: for you shall finde by experience, that it being rightly used, it is more availeable than all other, to keepe all in obedience; and specially for any notoriously idle of stubborne, or which are of evill behaviour any way.*

The ultimate form of punishment was described by Brinsley as 'correction by rod', or for 'greater faults', to give *'three or four jerkes with a birch, or with a small red willow'*. At the discretion of the Master, *'halfe a dozen stripes or moe, soundly laid on'* could be administered. Equally as interesting as the form of punishment is the evolution of English spelling and grammar.

Oral history plays its part in recalling tales of sadistic schoolmasters, although reliability cannot always be guaranteed. In a televised interview in 1984, John Arlott, the legendary cricket commentator and journalist, spoke with some bitterness about his experiences at Basingstoke Grammar School in the late 1920s. He recalled that the headmaster enjoyed wielding a cane which was as thick as his thumb and four feet long. The punishment was administered by the washbasins because the sound echoed around the School, and supposedly acted as a deterrent. Bruises lasted for about two weeks, and those who were given 'six of the best' were allegedly left unconscious. With a touch of irony Arlott added, 'But he enjoyed it, poor fellow'.

Literature, too, has been an instrument of social history. In *Nicholas Nickleby*, Charles Dickens describes an episode in the life of Dotheboys Hall School, in which the aptly named headmaster, Wackford Squeers, administered punishment to the 'incorrigible young scoundrel', Bolder, whose previous thrashing had not had the desired effect;

*'With this, and wholly disregarding his cry for mercy, Mr. Squeers fell upon the boy and caned him soundly: not leaving off indeed, until his arm was tired out.'*

In Thomas Hughes' well-known story of *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, which was probably the most influential of the genre of school novels, Tom was flogged by the Headmaster, and mercilessly bullied by the infamous Flashman. Hughes based his novel on his own experiences at Rugby School in the 1930s. Frank Richards' stories of Billy Bunter at the fictional Greyfriars School also contained graphic accounts of the 'Owl of the Remove' bending over a chair and being caned by his form master Mr Quelch. As Quelch's cane *'swished and descended, Billy Bunter's trousers fairly rang under the swipe'*, accompanied by appropriate sound effects such as *'Yaroooooh! Wow! Yow-ow-ow-ow'*.

## **Discipline and Rules at the Lincoln Schools**

Turning from general issues to the more parochial matters of discipline, rules and punishments at the four schools that combined in 1974 to form LCHS, the Garton Archive reveals some interesting facts and figures. The long and complex history of Lincoln Grammar School, whose name was later changed to Lincoln School, has its own tales to tell about discipline. The Lincoln School Rules of Discipline are clearly laid down in an undated document that probably dates back to the early days on the Wragby Road site in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Under Section 3, 'Punishments', it states that;

*The School endeavours to make the necessary punishments suitable and useful. No corporal punishment is inflicted by the Headmaster, and is reserved for grave offences only. Saturday afternoon is 'Detention' day. Any boy who absents himself from 'Detention' without leave will be dealt with by the Headmaster.*

This rule was modified later in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, as corporal punishment was certainly administered by some masters in the 1940s and '50s. I recall at least three masters who would regularly resort to the threat of the cane, and who would exercise their right arms from time to time. There was one master who was famed for using a long cube-shaped stick. Another gave you the option of receiving the cane or being given two 'stars', three of which would put you in masters' detention. A third had an array of instruments hidden under his desk and would give you the choice of which one to be used. There was one occasion when three sixth-formers were unceremoniously caned for tying articles of female underwear to the School clock-tower, and this is recorded in greater detail in Occasional Paper 5. One former pupil recalls a senior master who had a sadistic streak. Any misdemeanour would be rewarded by one, two or three strikes on the bottom with a cricket bat. He also cites an anecdote from Steve Race's autobiography in which another master lined up the class and with great good humour gave each one a stroke on the bottom with a ruler. Steve suggested that it was just like Tom Brown at Rugby!

Other methods of punishment included 'lines' or memorising poems. I do not recall prefects administering corporal punishment as was the case in some schools (Mitchell (1976) reports that the Headmaster of the Perse School in Cambridge had to put a stop to it as there had been cases of undue brutality by the prefects), but at Lincoln School prefects had their own 'Detention' on Wednesday afternoon, which was a traditional sports period. Offences recorded in the Prefects' Book during the 1930s and '40s included ragging in form, general insubordination, failure to wear a cap, disgusting table manners, fighting on the top corridor, general foolery at dinner, loitering down town, and misuse of free periods. Neville Marriner, later to become Sir Neville (see Occasional Paper 4), was given lines for fooling in the library and cheek following several warnings, and a detention for foolery on the top corridor after being kicked out of the library! It didn't do him any harm!

There is an interesting preface to the masters' Detention Book of 1970-'74, which states that 'Detention is being used increasingly for offences which perhaps qualify for a more personal punishment by tutors.' It was also noted that Detention was an effective instrument when used sparingly for offences against school rules outside the classroom, and as an ultimate punishment after others had been tried. Offences such as repeated inattention, impertinence, disobedience, creating a disturbance, and lateness of work were frequently recorded, but being caught smoking also seemed to be on the increase during the last days of Lincoln School as a separate institution. The final entry was on 11<sup>th</sup> May 1974 when two boys from form 4M were given detention for fighting in the classroom on two separate occasions during lunchtime, having been ejected after the first fight by the duty master.

There is one surviving document on Corporal Punishment from St Giles Secondary Modern Boys' School. It is dated from 23 April 1968 to the closure of the School in 1974, and contains details of all forms of corporal punishment during that period. Punishment consisted of either one or two strokes on the hand or buttocks, although the number of two-stroke administrations seemed to diminish in the 1970s. Interestingly the women teachers seemed to pass on the responsibility of wielding the cane to a male teacher of their choice! During

the 6-7 years there were over 1,000 cases of corporal punishment recorded for crimes such as bullying, disobedience, missing or disrupting lessons, smoking, fighting, lying, persistent stupidity, using abusive language, insolence and infiltrating the girls' playground! Some boys were clearly persistent offenders, and some teachers' signatures occur more often than others. Curiously one poor lad was given one stroke on the hand for going to the toilet! Another received one stroke on the buttocks for the use of obscene language. Well, his father did play for Lincoln City! One boy was punished for throwing a board rubber, which is somewhat ironic since many teachers of that era were in the habit of throwing them indiscriminately in the general direction of a miscreant. Health and safety had not yet been invented! The boy who received a stroke on the hand for hitting a girl with a stone from a homemade catapult presumably won the annual prize for design technology! There were seasonal pranks too such as letting off fireworks in school in October and November. Ah well, boys will be boys, as I found to my cost when I was caught chasing the girls into the girls' toilets at St Giles Junior School! The headmaster, my father, was not averse to using the slipper on his son! The final entry in the Punishment Book, before the school closed and the boys were transferred to LCHS, records that two boys received a stroke on the buttocks for urinating against the wall! All names have been omitted to protect the innocent! Some degree of caution must be exercised about punishment books, however. Newell (1972) points out from his research that many episodes of corporal punishment went unrecorded, and that recorded punishment, although the only objective available means of evidence, is an underestimate of actuality.

The education of girls is a topic beyond the scope of this paper, but the punishment of girls must be set in its historical context. Sylvester (1870) informs us that corporal punishment was a common means of bringing girls to order in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, and in that respect there was no differentiation in the treatment of the sexes. He writes that girls of wealthy parents were educated like their brothers in the households of the nobility or in nunneries. They were trained in some of the domestic arts as well as in social pursuits such as singing and dancing, and moral and religious training was imbibed informally through the habits of the household. Sylvester cites the work of a French noble, Geoffroy de La Tour-Landry, whose book on the instruction of his daughters was widely used in England for the education of girls of noble birth. It aimed to give young ladies an understanding of the need for chastity, for obedience to husbands, and for piety, courtesy, modesty and temperance. It warned women against using too much powder and paint on their faces, of trying to keep up with all the latest dress fashions, of extra-marital relations and of over-indulgence in drink. It drew heavily on the Bible, from classical literature, and from legend and history to make its case.

Purvis (1991) offers an overview of the history of the education of girls from 1800 to 1914. She points to the pioneering girls' public boarding school Cheltenham Ladies' College, opened in 1854 by its founders who made it quite clear that they considered a girl's future place to be in the home rather than the professions. Under the heading 'high' schools, Purvis charts the growth of the number of such schools during the last three decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Lincoln Christ's Hospital High School for Girls (herein referred to as Lincoln Girls' High School) was established in 1893.

The Wikipedia article on 'Caning' states that schoolgirls were caned much more rarely than boys, and if the punishment was given by a male teacher, nearly always on the palm of the hand. Rarely, girls were caned on the clothed bottom, in which case the punishment would probably be applied by a female teacher. Newell (1972) cites legal cases in the 1960s of

girls who had been physically chastised by teachers of either sex, by using a cane or other implement on girls' hands.

Punishment during the last decades of Lincoln Girls' High School was apparently rather more genteel. Reports from several alumnae from the 1940s and '50s suggest that there was no corporal punishment, or throwing of board rubbers or chalk. One alumna suggests that this was a relief after the cane-wielding at primary school! For shoddy or incomplete work there were 'red inks' that were totted up at the end of each term and deducted from the House 'commendeds' totals for which a cup was awarded. For more serious misbehaviour there were 'refusals', which led to extra work being set. Learning French verbs or Latin vocabulary was a more common punishment than lines, and 'detention' for persistent or even more serious misbehaviour meant having to return to school on a Saturday morning. Pupils could also be sent to the headmistress for such crimes as misbehaviour in public, being overheard swearing, for being late for school, or for failure to wear the school beret. Apparently whole-form and whole-school tellings-off by the head were unforgettable, and were administered by the head during assemblies in the school hall. One former pupil describes her worst humiliation when she had to kneel on the floor of the Head's office and made to eat the congealed remains of a school dinner which she had confessed to leaving on her plate! The role of prefects was largely supervisory. They could report pupils to staff but had no authority to impose their own punishments. Another former pupil described LHS as a well-disciplined and happy place in which to learn. Pupils learned respect by constant example, expectation of good behaviour reinforced by occasional punishments, and subtle forms of humiliation which were thought to be more effective than canings would have been.

## School Rules

Of course there has always been a close relationship between punishment and the school rules. The Garton Archive contains some particularly interesting documents relating to the rules of both Lincoln School and Lincoln Girls' High School. The document in Appendix 1 is unfortunately undated, but probably dates back to the early years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. It shows how the school rules at Lincoln High School were somewhat draconian when compared to today's less stringent ones! Several decades later in 1958, Miss I.V. Cleave, Headmistress from 1943-1964 wrote the following letter to parents;

*There is a school rule, which you will have seen on the list when your daughter came here, to the effect that no magazines, 'comics' or books of fiction may be brought into school. This rule has been broken more and more frequently lately and I am therefore bound to take some measures to see that it is observed. In future, therefore, any girl who brings such books or papers into school will have them confiscated until the last day of term. If they are not then claimed, they will be destroyed.*

One former pupil recalls that teachers would cast an eagle eye along the rows during assembly to check the girls' skirt length, which were required to be touching the floor when kneeling down for the prayers. There were also strict rules about etiquette. There is a fascinating set of photographs in the Garton Archive which show how young ladies should hold their soup spoons and eat their desserts!

A set of rules at Lincoln School, similar to the ones shown in Appendix 1 at LHS, is also located in the Archive. This is also undated but probably relates to a similar period, and may be found in Appendix 2 below.

### **Alternative Modes of Punishment**

This paper has focused on those negative forms of punishment, including corporal punishment, which were the traditional means of controlling behaviour. Even in the 1950s, I cannot recall any positive forms being used, such as building positive relationships between staff and pupils, or inviting pupils to have their own voice through a School Council, or similar forum. Once corporal punishment was banned by parliament for UK state schools in 1987 and for English and Welsh independent schools in 1997, alternative means were sought. A Scottish study (Cumming et al, 1981), anticipating its abolition, examined the process of the abolition of corporal punishment, and published a composite list of alternative sanctions employed by teachers. The list was produced in a 'staged' form, with the least serious at the top, and official suspension or exclusion as the ultimate form. The following is a conflated version of the list of 21 sanctions listed, in order of seriousness;

- Disapproving gestures, rebukes, tellings-off, etc.
- Lines, extra homework, punitive exercises, etc.
- Threat of movement to another seat, movement of seat, isolation, time-out, etc.
- Unofficial detention in classroom, threat of report to Year Head or 'office', etc.
- Report and possible intervention by Year head and guidance
- Withdrawal of privilege, official school-organised detention
- Threat of parental involvement, on report, etc.
- Letter or telephone call to parents
- Pre-suspension; pupil sent home; parental visit to school
- Withdrawal to Special Unit; tactical or unofficial suspension
- Official suspension/exclusion

There is an increasing trend, especially in primary schools but also in many secondary schools, to use a combination of negative and more positive means of controlling behaviour; a 'stick and carrot' approach. A 'Relationships' model of discipline for example focuses not on the breaking of school rules, but on building relationships and trust. Talking through problems and guidance are key elements in this process, although the way in which the model is implemented varies from school to school. Few schools rely exclusively on this approach, and sanctions are also employed where judged to be necessary.

Jim Baker, a retired teacher of many years' experience at LCHS, now working as a freelance educational consultant, describes his own positive behaviour management policy on his website ([www.jimbakersonlinelearning.co.uk](http://www.jimbakersonlinelearning.co.uk)). Basing his views on Lee Canter's 'Assertive Discipline' approach (Canter, 2010), Jim believes that the key to successful behaviour management is to teach students to make responsible decisions about their learning. Key features of his approach include the following;

- Positive behaviour should be recognised and rewarded; recognition is the key to motivating students



- Teachers should look out for positive behaviour and praise and reinforce it
- Good proactive relationships with parents are a vital component
- There should be clear observable rules and expectations backed up by reasons and consequences

Jim has evolved a 'staged' approach which he calls a discipline hierarchy, as follows;

1. Warning
  2. 5 min break detention
  3. 10 min break detention
  4. Removal from the class to Mr Baker, a letter/phone call to parents and a 30 minute after school detention with Mr Baker
  5. Referral to Head of Year/or school detention
- Failure to comply with steps 1, 2, 3 above automatically takes you to step 4. Failure to comply with step 4 takes you to step 5.
  - Any student whose behaviour requires removal should be sent to Mr Baker in the first instance, with the option of referral to senior management.

### **The Current System at LCHS**

The present system of discipline at LCHS espouses the model of a staged approach to sanctions, based on the Behaviour and Discipline Procedure, and supported by guidance and counselling where deemed to be appropriate. It is an important part of the School's mission statement that every single student is cared for. The staged procedure may be summarised as follows;

- Removal to a 'safe-haven' classroom (first offence: internal exclusion))
- Referral to Head of Year
- Referral to other members of staff
- External exclusion for 1-5 days depending on seriousness or repeated offences
- Permanent exclusion

NB Taking corporal punishment out of the equation, this approach is not dissimilar to the staged approach in Tudor and Stuart times described by Sylvester (1970) above.

### **Conclusion**

I began this paper by stating that the subject of discipline is a perennial topic for discussion. I conclude by raising some of the issues relevant to the discussion, which might be used as stimuli for debate among staff and students. They are in no particular order of significance;

- Is there a case for bringing back corporal punishment in schools? Do we spoil the child by sparing the rod?
- Is the claim that, 'It didn't do me any harm' a valid one?
- What forms of punishment are likely to act as deterrents?
- Should punishments have an educational function?

- Is there a case for pupils/students being consulted about school uniform, for example through the School Council?
- Is it appropriate to expect girls to wear ties?
- Is society too tolerant of misbehaviour among pupils/students?
- What part should parents and carers play in supporting the schools?

## Sources

Canter, L (2010) Assertive Discipline: Positive Behaviour Management for Today's Classrooms. Solution Tree Press

Cumming, CE (1981) Making the Change: a Study of the Process of the Abolition of Corporal Punishment. SCRE. Hodder & Stoughton

Edwards, DL (1957) A History of King's School Canterbury. Faber & Raber

Harmston L & Hoare, D (2003) Carre's Grammar School Sleaford. Tucann Design & Print

Hill, CP (1988) The History of Bristol Grammar School. Alan Sutton Publishing, Gloucester

Luft, HM (1970) A History of Merchant Taylors' School Crosby 1620-1970. Liverpool University Press

Mitchell, SJD (1976) Perse: a History of the Perse School 1615-1976. Oleander, Cambridge

Newell, P (ed) A last Resort? Corporal Punishment in Schools. Penguin Books

Orme, N (1973) English Schools in the Middle Ages. Harper & Row

Parker-Jenkins, M (1991) Sparing the Rod: Schools, Discipline and Children's Rights. Trentham Books

Purvis, J (1991) A History of Women's Education in England. OUP

Raine, A (1926) History of St Peter's School York. London. G Bell & Sons Ltd.

Rouse, WHD (1898) A History of Rugby School. NY. Charles Scribener's Sons

Sylvester, DW (1970) Educational Documents 800-1816. Methuen

Documents from the Garton Archive at LCHS, including the 'Punishment Book' for St Giles Secondary Boys' School, Lincoln 1968-74, and Lincoln School Detention Books

Oral history from former pupils of Lincoln School and Lincoln Christ's Hospital Girls' High School, including Mary and Richard Lucas, Ruth Miller (nee Montgomery) and Linda Richardson

An Interview with John Arlott by Mike Brearley, originally shown on BBC television in 1984

References to novels by Charles Dickens, Thomas Hughes and Frank Richards

Jim Baker's website: [www.jimbakersonlinelearning.co.uk](http://www.jimbakersonlinelearning.co.uk)

Extracts from Wikipedia articles on Punishment in Schools

## About the Author

Peter Harrod is Archive Assistant and a Foundation Governor at LCHS. He was a pupil at Lincoln School from 1952-59 and a Senior lecturer at Bishop Grosseteste College, Lincoln from 1967-2001.

**Note:** The term **'fagging'** refers to a practice, widespread in public boarding schools and mirrored in some grammar schools, in which younger pupils were required to perform menial tasks such as cleaning football boots and running errands for the prefects and other senior boys. The practice declined in the 1960s and 70s.

**(Please scroll down to see Appendices 1 and 2)**

**Appendix 1: Lincoln High School Rules in the early 1900s**

# Lincoln Girls' High School.

---

## RULES.

### ATTENDANCE.

Regular and punctual attendance is required.

LEAVE IN CASES OF URGENCY.—No pupil may be absent without leave previously obtained from the Head Mistress, on a written request from the Parent or Guardian.

RETURN AFTER ILLNESS.—If absent from illness or any unforeseen cause, an explanatory note must be sent to the Head Mistress.

In cases of recovery from infectious disease no girl is allowed to return to School without a medical certificate to the effect that she is free from infection; and no girl is allowed to attend School from a house in which there is, or has been, infectious disease without the permission of her medical adviser and of the Head Mistress.

HEALTH CERTIFICATES.—At the beginning of each Term a printed form signed by the Parent or Guardian certifying that there has been no infectious illness in the house during the holidays, must be brought by each Pupil, and no pupil will be admitted without one.

### PROPERTY.

- 1.—Everything brought into the School must be marked with the owner's name.
- 2.—Purses and money must be kept in the pocket, and not left in the dressing room or elsewhere.
- 3.—Any papers or story books brought into School must be taken at once to the Form Mistress.
- 4.—Pupils are not to borrow, lend, or exchange stationery without permission.
- 5.—Pupils are not allowed to borrow money from one another. In cases of difficulty application must be made to the Form Mistress.
- 6.—Unnecessary jewellery must not be worn.
- 7.—Girls are required to pay for School property which they have damaged or destroyed.

### SPEAKING.

There must be silence always in the Corridors and on the Staircases. Also at 8-55.

### HOME-WORK.

- 1.—Work that has been refused must be done at School in the afternoon under supervision.
- 2.—Pupils must understand that all work given up must be their own work, unless they state on the paper that they have received help.
- 3.—No marks are allowed for work not produced at the appointed time.

[P.T.O.]

### DRESSING ROOM.

- 1.—Girls must be out of the Dressing Room at 1-10 at the end of morning school, and at 4-10 in the afternoon.
- 2.—All satchels and pinafores must be taken home at the week end. Tidy and presentable bags must be used.
- 3.—The blue shoe bags are not to be removed from the Dressing Room.

### GENERAL.

- 1.—No communication is allowed between pupils out of School, except with the knowledge and approval of their Parents or Guardians. Pupils other than those in the Sixth Form shall not visit places of public amusement or refreshment except in the charge of some responsible person.
- 2.—The School hat must be worn in coming to and from the School or playing field.
- 3.—No pupil shall take part in any street selling or collecting.
- 4.—No sweets may be brought to School.
- 5.—Shoes must be changed both morning and afternoon, and when necessary, in wet weather stockings also. Slippers with high heels are not allowed.
- 6.—A medical certificate is required for more than temporary exemption from Gymnastics. No corsets may be worn during the gymnastic lesson.
- 7.—While in School girls must wear their hair tied back.

**Please scroll down to see Appendix 2**

**Appendix 2: Lincoln School Rules of Discipline in the early 1900s**



# Lincoln School

## RULES OF DISCIPLINE

(1) **ILLNESS.**—Every boy is expected to attend school regularly without intermission unless prevented by illness or by some really urgent cause. After absence, however brief, a boy is required to bring a note certifying that his Parents are aware of the fact. If the absence is prolonged beyond a single day, information should be sent on the *second* day to the Headmaster. It is particularly requested that every boy shall be present on the first and last days of each Term. Full Boarders are not allowed to go home except at the half-term when, if desired, special leave may be granted for the week-end.

(2) **ABSENCE.**—No cause except illness is considered a sufficient excuse for absence. Exception to this rule will be made only when there is some very serious reason. *Leave is not given when no cause is stated or when the object is merely amusement.*

(3) **PUNISHMENTS.**—The School endeavours to make the necessary punishments suitable and useful. No corporal punishment is inflicted except by the Headmaster, and is reserved for grave offences only. Saturday afternoon is "Detention" day. Any boy who absents himself from "Detention" without leave will be dealt with by the Headmaster.

(4) **INFECTION.**—Whenever a boy has suffered from an infectious or contagious complaint or has been accidentally exposed to infection or contagion of any kind, he must not attend the School till the Headmaster's consent has been given. Every boy is required to bring back with him at the beginning of each term a Certificate that he has not been exposed to infection during the holidays.

(5) **TRAIN-BOYS.**—Day-boys who come by train are not allowed to leave the School Premises without permission during the dinner hour or after School until half-an-hour before the departure of their train. The various Railway Companies running into Lincoln issue Season Tickets at specially reduced rates to day-boys attending Lincoln School from Stations on their lines.

(6) **PREPARATION.**—The time required for home-work is in the Junior School from 1 hour to 1½ hours; in the Senior School 2 to 2½. The Parents of day-boys who frequently take more or less than the specified time, should communicate with the Headmaster. No excuse except that of illness should be brought for neglect of home-work. Reports of each boy's progress and conduct are sent to Parents at the close of each term.

(7) **PREFECTS.**—For the protection of younger boys and for the upholding of good conduct in the School buildings, Prefects are selected by the Headmaster, and are entrusted with limited powers.

(8) **DAMAGE.**—Breakages and damage done to School property must be paid for.

(9) **INTERVIEWS.**—The Headmaster can usually be seen after 6 p.m. any day. He is also at home to receive Parents on the two days previous to the commencement of each Term. An interview can be arranged at any other time by appointment. Telephone 238.

(10) **DRESS.**—All boys are expected to wear the School cap or a black and white straw hat with the School ribbon, and either black, dark grey or dark blue coats. School caps may be obtained from Mawer & Collingham, Lincoln. It is particularly requested that no boy may use any cap except the School cap during term whether going to and from School or not.

(11) **MARKING OF PROPERTY.**—Names are to be written legibly in books, caps, coats, gymnasium shoes, bags, umbrellas, etc.

(12) **NOTICE OF REMOVAL.**—A Term's notice in writing or in lieu thereof the payment of a Term's fees (in the case of Boarders these will be Boarding as well as Tuition Fees) is required before a boy can be removed from the School.

(13) **RESIDENCE.**—Boys who attend the School must be either (1) boarding in one of the Masters' houses; or (2) residing with their Parents or next of kin; or (3) living in the house of some person authorized by the Governors to receive Boarders.

(14) No boy who stays to dinner is allowed to leave the School grounds, and so be "out of bounds" between 9.30 a.m. and 4.30 p.m.

(15) **MORALE.**—A high standard of good manners, self-respect, and discipline is expected of all boys, who, so long as they remain members of the School, are answerable to the School authorities for their conduct out of doors as well as in School.

