A STUDY OF SCHOOL STAKEHOLDER PERCEPTIONS OF THE SAFE SCHOOLS PROGRAMME OF THE WESTERN CAPE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT AS IMPLEMENTED AT A PRIMARY SCHOOL IN THE MITCHELL'S PLAIN DISTRICT

by

JOY L. POWRIE

Thesis submitted in part-fulfilment of the degree of

Master of Technology

in the Faculty of Science

at the **Peninsula Technikon**

Supervisor: J. Koeberg

March 2004

DECLARATION

A study of school stakeholder perceptions of the Safe Schools Programme of the Western Cape Education Department as implemented at a primary school in the Mitchell's Plain district.

I, Joy L. Powrie, hereby declare that the work on which this thesis is based is my original work (except where acknowledgements indicate otherwise), and neither the whole work nor any part thereof has been submitted for another degree in this or any other Technikon or University.

Joy L. Powrie   **March 2004**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

Teaching and Learning cannot take place in an unsafe environment. The school plays a central role in the socialisation of a child and it is critical that schools offer a safe environment in which learning can take place. This study attempts to investigate school stakeholder perceptions of the Safe Schools Programme of the WCED and its impact on the learning environment of one primary school in the Mitchell's Plain district.

The study as a whole is set against the research literature on crime and violence in schools. The literature surveyed covered the following aspects: (1) What constitutes crime and violence in schools; (2) The effects of crime and violence on the school environment; and (3) Approaches to reducing crime and violence in schools.

This research project is a case study of school stakeholder perceptions of the Safe Schools Programme of the WCED as implemented in one primary school. Qualitative research techniques were employed and data was collected by means of individual semi-structured interviews with the acting principal and the safety officer of the school. A focus group interview was held with a group of educators and support staff members. Learners were excluded from the study as the aim was to determine the perceived impact of the Safe Schools Programme on the learning environment at the school. Primary school learners may perhaps not be able to articulate their views on the issue under research. Parents were not included in this research process but could be a valuable source of data for future research.

The research study reveals the following aspects: (1) Respondents believe that the safety measures introduced by the Safe Schools Programme have had a positive impact on the learning environment as far as reducing vandalism and controlling access to the school premises; (2) Certain shortcomings have also been identified by the respondents which include the lack of a coordinated and collaborative approach between government departments, the lack of diversion programmes for learners, the lack of training for educators, the lack of education programmes for parents and learners and the failure of the programme to sustain community involvement.

This thesis then examines, analyses and discusses these findings with recommendations that follow in Chapter 5.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

REFERENCES

APPENDICES

CHAPTER 1

CONTEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 RESEARCH CONTEXT

The Safe Schools Programme of the Western Cape Education Department (WCED), operating under the inter-directorate key project "Bridge the Fence", has been in existence since 1998 and a number of schools have benefited from the implementation of certain anti-crime strategies like fencing, including electric fencing, security gates and alarm systems. The schools in the programme are all disadvantaged schools where socio-political and economic factors exacerbate the propensity for crime and violence.

Crime and violence have been part of many South African societies due to poor socio-economic conditions. Crime and violence have been prevalent especially in disadvantaged communities. Young people in schools reflect the social patterns of their communities and society at large (ELRU, 1999). It is therefore not surprising that crime and violence have become part of the culture at many schools. Clashes between rival gangs have also often led to the school grounds becoming a battlefield. Due to the recruitment of young people of school going age into gangs, many schools have become sites of gangster activity. According to a World Health Organisation report, crime and violence contaminates the school environment and jeopardises the educational process. Crime and violence are also severe threats to peace, democracy and economic stability in

South Africa (Eliasov & Frank, 2000).

In 1999 Kader Asmal, Minister of Education, condemned the unacceptably high levels of violence within schools, saying that schools have to be reclaimed as spaces of peace and stability from those who are violent in both word and deed (Secretariat for Safety and Security, 1999). Steve Tswete, the erstwhile Minister of Safety and Security, also identified the reduction of youth violence in South African schools as a priority (National Crime Prevention Strategy, 1996).

Against this background that the Safe Schools Programme of the Western Cape Education Department came into existence, initially in response to a school shooting incident in Guguletu due to gang violence in 1997. The Safe Schools Programme in turn initiated an inter-sectoral, inter-directorate project known as "Bridge the Fence" (WCED, undated). The project strives to create a safe environment, conducive to nurture whole-school development with the aim of achieving quality teaching and learning. Schools have only recently been identified as a crucial area of intervention in relation to crime prevention (Henkeman et al, 1999). According to Eugene Daniels, former Safe Schools Programme Manager, schools should, in the absence of other effective social institutions, be sites of transformation and the restoring of the damaged moral fibre. The Safe Schools Programme has a three- pronged strategy to create a safe, effective and conducive learning environment in schools: (1) Environmental Programmes, where the physical structure of the school is protected through fencing, alarms, mesh wire and razor wire; (2) Behavioural programmes

2

which aim to support, modify and influence the behaviour of role players and the surrounding community; and (3) Systems Programmes which involve system-wide changes in the content and operation of the school. The Safe Schools Programme is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2.

The Safe Schools Programme was introduced in a period of dramatic political change to an educator force already overwhelmed by the implication of changes such as the restructuring of school governance and finance, the democratisation of education, the implementation of Outcomes-Based Education and Curriculum 2005, the rationalisation of Education Services and the redeployment of educators as well as new approaches to discipline and control according to the Abolition of Corporal Punishment Act 33 of 1997 (Henkeman et al, 1999). These demands on the resources of the school, both physical and human, are acknowledged as having an influence on the control of violence in schools.

It is against this background that this research study aimed to investigate school stakeholder perceptions of the Safe Schools Programme of the Western Cape Education Department (WCED) as implemented at one primary school and its impact on the learning environment at that school.

1.2 RESEARCHER'S POSITION

After having taught for twelve years five years at a secondary school in a rural area then for seven years and six months at a primary school in the urban area of Mitchell's Plain on the Cape Flats, I had a rude introduction to what many learners have been exposed to on a daily basis: The terror of gang violence that brings your own personal safety and that of family and friends under threat.

Having been redeployed to a neighbouring school in July 2001, I was soon exposed to the trauma of violence in the community. A shooting battle between rival gangs resulted in frantic parents fetching their children from school, not wanting their children to walk home unsupervised while the terror of gunfire raged on. This incident, an all too common occurrence at my new school, led to the early closure of the school on that particular day. Even though I was aware of how gang violence terrorised communities on the Cape Flats because of incidents of gang fights related to me by frightened learners, or accounts of gang-related violence dramatised in detail by desensitized youngsters, sometimes even idolising these "heroes" among the gangsters, and the trauma experienced by individual learners who are exposed to this violence, I had suddenly been thrust into a seemingly accepted culture of terror waged by gangs in the community.

The shock of realising that the education of learners, desperate to escape their own circumstances, could be jeopardised by mindless acts of violence, was frightening. Why

was this intolerable situation allowed to continue unabated? What was the Education Department doing about the situation? Why should educators come under threat while trying to provide an education to children already hard-hit by poor socio-economic conditions where life is often already a daily struggle for survival? How is the Education Department serving the needs of these unfortunate children and fulfilling its obligation towards them?

This research study was motivated by a quest to uncover the answers to these questions by investigating how the Western Cape Education Department was responding to the needs of schools under similar threat through its Safe Schools Programme.

1.3 CONDITIONS WHICH LED TO THE SCHOOL BECOMING PART OF THE SAFE SCHOOLS PROGRAMME

The school in this case study became one of the initial 83 schools that were part of the Safe Schools Programme of the WCED in 1999. This was a result of numerous occasions on which the school day was disrupted by gang violence in its immediate surroundings, including an occasion where the gang warfare between two rival gangs spilled over onto the school premises and frantic parents ran to collect their children from school. During times of shooting between rival gangs, the insistence of parents on fetching their own children as well the children of family members, friends and neighbours necessitated the early closure of the school. Traumatised staff members usually also insisted on leaving the dangerous

5

area. The local offices of the WCED were then informed by the management of the school about the decision to close the school early. This situation left panicky children running home unsupervised or roaming the unsafe streets while their parents were at work. On one occasion some teachers refused to enter the area during the height of gang fights and stayed at the local offices of the WCED until they were escorted to school by the local police. The school also had two full-time security guards who were employed by the WCED to guard the school premises. These two security guards were found murdered on the school premises in 1996.

1.4 PROBLEM STATEMENT AND RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Violence in schools has a direct impact on the learning environment. This study therefore proposes to ascertain stakeholder perceptions of the Safe Schools Programme of the WCED.

The aims of the research project are:

❖ to ascertain school stakeholder perceptions of the WCED's Safe Schools Programme in addressing crime and violence in a primary school in a disadvantaged community; and

❖ to establish whether its implementation has brought about a safer learning environment.

1.5 DELIMITATIONS OF THIS RESEARCH STUDY

This study of stakeholder perceptions of the safe Schools Programme of the WCED was conducted at one primary school in the Mitchell's Plain district. The findings only pertain to that particular school and only reflect anti-crime strategies implemented at that school.

1.6 DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

❖ Anti-crime initiatives - Any programme which aims to reduce the level of crime and violence in schools;

❖ Learning environment - The climate created by schools in which the academic needs of the learners should be met;

❖ Crime - This includes activities such as theft, vandalism, assault, burglary, drugs, gangsterism and rape;

❖ Violence - This includes behaviour such as insolence, intimidation, bullying, physical fighting, aggressive cliques and possession of weapons;

❖ Gangsterism - Any gang-related activity;

❖ Disadvantaged schools - Schools situated in poor socioeconomic areas.

1.7 POSSIBLE BENEFICIARIES OF THIS RESEARCH PROJECT

The WCED may benefit from the recommendations of an independent research study on stakeholder perceptions of the Safe Schools Programme as implemented by one primary school and its impact on the learning environment at that school. These recommendations could provide direction for the WCED's own or commissioned research into the effectiveness of their Safe Schools Programme. Learners and educators at schools affected by crime and violence may benefit from the recommendations of this study, in this way making the necessary adjustments for the effective implementation of an anti-crime programme.

1.8 OVERVIEW OF THIS RESEARCH REPORT

This research report has been set out in five chapters. The first chapter is the introduction that gives an overview of the context in which this research study is based, clearly defines the problem statement, the objectives of this research study, as well as its delimitations. The research questions investigated were :

(1) What are the school stakeholder perceptions of the Safe Schools Programme in addressing crime and violence in a primary school? and

(2) Has the implementation of the Safe Schools Programme brought about a safer learning environment?

Chapter 2 is a review of the relevant research literature that was conducted to gather information on the issue of safety in schools. In this chapter school violence is defined, the effects of crime and violence on the school investigated, possible solutions to the problem of school safety discussed and the Safe Schools Programme of the WCED is investigated as one response to the threat of the safety of learners and staff at schools in the Western Cape.

Chapter 3 presents the methodology and the procedures that were followed in this study, from identifying the primary school where the research was conducted to selecting participants for this research study. Two individual semi-structured interviews were conducted with the acting principal of the school, as well as with the safety officer. A group of staff members were also identified for a focus group interview. The primary school learners were excluded from the study because the aim of the research was to investigate stakeholder perceptions of the impact of the Safe Schools Programme of the WCED, a concept which may be difficult for young learners to articulate adequately. Parents were not included in this research study but could be a valuable source of data for further research. This chapter also examines the advantages and limitations of the selected methods of data collection. After the development of data collection instruments, data was collected through semi-structured interviews with the acting principal and the safety officer of the

school, as well as through a focus group interview with eight education and support staff members.

Chapter 4 deals with the presentation and the discussion of the results of this research. After data was collected from school stakeholders at the identified school, it was captured through detailed transcripts of the interviews. The data was then analysed by using open coding (close examination of the data to generate categories for grouping the data) and axial coding (locating a property of a category along a continuum or range). After interpretation of the data the results were presented and discussed.

Finally, the research findings and conclusions are summarised in Chapter 5. Recommendations regarding the improvement of the safety of school stakeholders are also proposed in this chapter.

CHAPTER 2

VIOLENCE IN SCHOOLS: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

South Africa's first democratic elections on 27 April 1994, together with the acceptance of the basic democratic principles enshrined in the Constitution of South Africa (act 108 of 1996) heralded many changes in the socio-political, economic and educational climate of South Africa. The Bill of Rights enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, protects the rights of all people in our country and affirms the democratic values of human dignity, equality and freedom, among others, stating that everyone has the right to have their dignity respected and protected (section 10). The Bill of Rights specifically states that everyone has the right to freedom and security of the person, which includes "being free from all forms of violence from either public or private sources" (section 12). The Bill of Rights furthermore ensures the right of everyone to a basic education (section 29.1) and the right of every child to be protected from maltreatment, neglect, abuse or degradation (section 28.1 (d) and states that a child's best interests are of paramount importance in every matter concerning the child (section 28.2). Any form of violence in schools is an infringement of these rights.

The Constitution of South Africa places an obligation on the Education Department toward all school communities to put measures in place to ensure that these very basic human

11

rights are protected. In particular children affected by violence in their community, where their basic human rights are infringed upon, need specific government intervention. One of the responses of the Education Department to the challenge of ensuring the safety of learners in schools is the Safe Schools Programme of the Western Cape.

Political reform in South Africa was also accompanied by rapid transformation within the Education System. The dramatic changes brought about by democracy such as the introduction of Curriculum 2005, an outcomes-based curriculum, racial integration, new governance structures, the reduction of staff and the abolishment of corporal punishment posed multiple challenges to schools. This transition destabilised schools and created opportunities for crime and violence to flourish (ELRU, 1999). Violence has always been prevalent in South African schools, especially physical violence perpetrated by educators against learners in the form of corporal punishment. In the absence of this form of discipline, South African schools have been severely challenged to deal with school violence.

While crime and violence are prevalent in the majority of schools, schools located in disadvantaged areas experience more severe problems, particularly relating to physical violence, gangsterism and the possession of drugs and weapons (Eliasov and Frank, 2000). According to Harber (2002), townships and informal settlements represent "the spaces of the most traumatised, victimised and brutalised of South African people".

Frustrated expectations and a culture of entitlement in the post-apartheid era have

intensified the culture of violence and intolerance (ELRU, 1999). Post-Apartheid South Africa is also perceived to be dominated by criminal violence, as media reports remind us daily (De Wet, 2003). South Africa was seen to be flooded by a "crime wave" for which the police services found themselves ill-prepared, given their history of enforcing violent and unjust state policies as opposed to crime fighting (Shaw, 2002).

A search of the current literature on the topic of violence in schools reveals that the issue of school violence is by no means a South African issue, nor is it a recent problem. American research into juvenile delinquency, now termed youth violence, conducted as far back as 1950 highlighted an increase in the phenomenon of "antisocial behavio(u)r on the part of the youth" (Hoffman, 1996). An increase in violence in society has led to an increase in violence in schools (ELRU, 1999; Hoffman, 1996; Goldstein, Apter and Harootunian, 1984; Lowenstein, 1972).

The content of this literature review is organised to reflect (1) A definition of school violence; (2) The effects of crime and violence on schools; (3) How crime and violence have been addressed in schools; and (4) The Safe Schools Programme of the WCED and its approach to school violence. While focusing this study on these four points, some of the varied and complex underlying causes of crime and violence as well as the contributing factors will also be referred to.

Since school violence is such a broad term, it becomes critical to define this concept in

terms of this research project. The next section will address previous definitions from the research literature as a base for the researcher's own definition of the term "school violence".

2.2 DEFINING SCHOOL VIOLENCE

Lamplugh and Pagan (1996), suggest that a "working definition" be sought to define the term "violence", which will widen dictionary definitions. The term "school violence" is broadly used to refer to acts of aggression by or against students or staff at school or school activities or on their way to and from school. In his survey on school violence in British schools, Lowenstein (1972) was faced with the problem of defining the concept of school violence to the satisfaction of his research respondents. The questionnaire he used, did therefore not attempt a definition of violence, but was worded so as to encourage respondents to give their own examples of what they considered to be violent behaviour. From his results he became aware that some educators define violence as sheer physical aggression against other children, educators and property, while other educators view violence as any form of disruption of formal or informal classroom teaching or the breaking of school rules through verbal abuse or other interference. In their research study of crime and violence in South African schools, Eliasov and Frank (2000) were faced with the same problem of defining crime and violence. In their study, respondents were asked to identify what types of criminal and violent activities occur in their school in order to assess how respondents themselves define the problem. Respondents defined criminal activity as theft,

14

vandalism, assault, drug usage, burglary, gangsterism and rape, while violent behaviour included insolence, bullying, physical fighting, aggressive cliques and possession of weapons. In their report on school safety, the Secretariat for Safety and Security (1999) define youth violence as interpersonal violence perpetrated by a young person on another person within the school grounds or in transit to and from the school grounds.

For the purposes of this study, the researcher will acknowledge these previous definitions and broaden the definition of violence to include acts of crime and violence which do not necessarily occur at school but have an impact on the learner's sense of security while at school.

School violence is closely linked to levels of violence in the home or community (Barton, 2000; Goldstein and Conoley, 1997; Lowenstein, 1972). Crime and violence find expression in schools in many different forms. The next section will explore the extent of crime and violence in schools as well as some of the effects crime and violence have on the school environment.

2.3 THE EFFECTS OF CRIME AND VIOLENCE ON SCHOOLS

Teaching and learning cannot take place in an unsafe environment. The school plays a central role in the socialisation of a child and it is critical that schools offer a safe environment in which learning and growth can take place. Learners and educators directly

exposed to violence suffer many consequences, including psychological and social distress, acting out behaviours, constraints to academic progress, a sense of helplessness, perceptions of constant threat to personal safety and a lack of investment in the affected institution by the broader community (Stevens, Wyngaard and Van Niekerk, 2001). Some of these effects that crime and violence have on schools will be investigated in greater detail in this section under the following headings:

2.3.1 Disciplinary problems;

2.3.2 Violent conflict in schools;

2.3.3 Modelling of inappropriate behaviour; and

2.3.4 The effect of crime and violence on the learning environment.

2.3.1 Disciplinary problems

Violence appears to be escalating in schools, aggravating the existing lack of discipline in schools. The public has long regarded lack of discipline as the most important problem facing schools, according to Goldstein and Conoley (1997). Disciplinary problems can range from absenteeism and verbal abuse of teachers to bullying and attacks on learners and staff. Most schools have a disciplinary code or code of conduct to which learners have to adhere (Barton, 2000; Eliasov and Frank, 2000; Capozzoli and McVey, 1999; Goldstein and Conoley, 1997; Futrell, 1996). Despite the fact that schools have some formal procedures for managing problem behaviour, Eliasov and Frank (2000) found that many problems in schools are tackled in an *ad hoc* and reactive manner. The lack of discipline, as

well as the inconsistent application thereof, not only in schools but also in the homes of learners and in their communities, together with the disregard of authority, further lead to an escalation in school violence.

The lack of discipline in schools is seen as a precursor to overt violence in schools of which violent conflict between students or students and staff, is one manifestation.

2.3.2 Violent conflict in schools

Eliasov and Frank (2000), in their study of twenty schools in the Western Cape Province of South Africa, found that cases of assault were reported by 50% of primary and 75% of secondary schools. Gangsterism was reported in 25% of primary schools and 66,6% of secondary schools. The survey also reflects a similarity in the profiles of urban and peri-urban schools. This survey found that disadvantaged schools continue to suffer most severely from both economic and violent crime. Gangsterism and rape are confined almost exclusively to these schools. Most of the schools reported problems with fighting/physical violence (95%), bullying (80%) and intimidation (75%). Insolence (insulting, rude or disrepectful manner) towards teachers was reported in 60% of schools, while 40% of schools identified a serious problem with aggressive cliques of children. All schools reported the presence of weapons, including knives, sharp instruments and sticks/batons, within the school grounds. Firearms were reported in 55% of schools, of which 45% were in disadvantaged areas. A study by Griggs (1998) shows that nine out of the ten secondary

17

schools polled in the Durban area reported gang-related violence as the most pressing problem in their schools, where gangs target schools and reduce them to a state of terror. In his briefing to the Education Portfolio Committee in the National Assembly, Adv. Gaum, MEC for Education in the Western Cape also highlighted the endemic gangsterism as one of the biggest threats to safety at schools in the Western Cape (Parliamentary Monitoring Group, 2002). Children are often the innocent victims of gang violence and many children have been killed or injured in the crossfire between gangs on the Cape Flats.

Now that it has been established that schools are sites of violence, I will outline the influence that witnessing violence, including gang violence, has on the behaviour of children in schools.

2.3.3 Modeling of inappropriate behaviour

Children often model the violent behaviour they are exposed to in their homes, communities or the media. A 1993 report by the American School Boards Association cite the portrayal of violence by the media as particularly threatening to the well-being of children (Cooke, 1996). The findings of Derksen and Strasburger (1996), who have researched the effects of media on violence, aggression and antisocial behaviour in children in the United States, point to this factor as having a significant effect on school violence. According to them, children are exposed to violence in the media in a number of ways: television, rock videos, movies, video games and commercialism in the form of action toys

of fighting heroes, soldiers, weapon-clad mutants and alien beings. This exposure has an impact on children. Particular factors influencing violence and antisocial behaviour in schools include:

(1) How aggression is depicted by the media, often as justified aggression, especially when directed toward women, or, even more harmful, aggression is depicted as justified retribution.

(2) Rewarded aggression, where characters are rewarded for aggressive or antisocial behaviour, with both the character and viewer feeling gratified.

A study by Haugaard and Feerick (1996) also notes a link between child abuse and family violence on violent and antisocial behaviour in schools.

Children are not only exposed to violence in the media but also in their communities. Given the prevalence of gangs and gang activity in disadvantaged communities (Parliamentary Monitoring Group, 2002; Griggs, 1998), with the resultant exposure of children to acts of violence associated therewith, schools often experience similar behaviours of children emulating these gangs. Gang behaviour is modelled by youngsters in schools who dress, speak and act like the "hard core" gangsters they imitate (Blaauvelt, 1999; Hofman and Summers, 1996; Trump, 1996 and Lal, Lal and Achilles, 1993).

While crime and violence have many negative effects on the school environment, their disruption of teaching and learning, the basic functions of a school, is the most regrettable.

19

Some of these effects are outlined below.

2.3.4 Effect of crime and violence on the learning environment

The most negative impact of crime and violence is on the basic purpose of our schools, which had to take a secondary role to securing the school and creating a safe environment in which learners can reach their cognitive and developmental goals (Barton, 2000; Griggs, 1998; Braaten, 1997; Goldstein and Conoley, 1997; Futrell, 1996; Goldstein, Apter and Harootunian, 1984). When learners and educators are more concerned about being harmed or victimized than about education, they cannot concentrate on teaching and learning. Violence or the threat of violence has a direct impact on the quality of the education provided by the school (Stephens, 1997; Futrell, 1996). Many demands are made on the human resources of the school, among others, the assessment of learner achievement, safety issues, cultural diversity, parental involvement, implementation of policies, staff appraissal, and many others (Braaten, 1997). These demands on the human resources of the school create the opportunity for disruptive and violent behaviour by learners to continue unabated and this is counterproductive to constructive teaching and learning.

This atmosphere of violence leads to demotivated learners and educators. The effect of crime and violence on educators and learners will now be explored further.

2.3.4.1 Effect on the morale of educators

Within this atmosphere of school violence, educators are often the victims of violence or are threatened by violence and will therefore not be keen to intervene in fights between learners or to reprimand those learners by whom they feel threatened. Furthermore, if educators fear becoming targets of physical or verbal violence, they will be less willing to insist that all learners adhere to the code of conduct of the school. This is particularly so if educators feel unsupported by the managers (principals) to provide a safe environment in which these standards can be met. This disruptive and violent behaviour in schools is reflected in part by the increasing number of educators in America who are leaving the profession. A large number of educators leave teaching because they are tired of trying to teach in environments that are not conducive to learning and they become demoralized by the lack of appreciation, support and respect (Futrell, 1996). It has not yet been investigated whether this could also be the motivation for South African educators leaving the profession.

The presence of crime and violence in schools leads to a lack of a personal sense of safety among students and staff and adversely affect the achievement of academic goals at the school.

2.3.4.2 Threat to the sense of security of learners and staff

The numbers of young people who are fearful at school also seem to be growing. A 1993 study of 24 000 secondary learners in the United States found that 50% of them "follow conscious strategies to avoid harm at school" (Poland, 1997). According to a survey conducted by Metropolitan Life Insurance Company in the United States in 1994, one in four learners had been involved in a physical fight and two in five parents of high school learners were worried about their children's safety while in school (Poland, 1997). The data for 1997 from the US Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention shows that 5% of learners missed school at least once in the past month because they had felt unsafe at school or travelling to or from school (Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 2001). The presence of gangs in schools also increases the levels of fear among learners and staff and poses the potential threat of violent crimes to escalate due to turf wars being waged, as well as illicit criminal activity like dealing in stolen property, drugs or firearms (Blaauvelt, 1999; Griggs, 1998; Hoffman and Summers, 1996; Trump, 1996; Lal, Lal and Achilles, 1993).

In the absence of data from the Education Department on crime and violence in South African schools, it can only be assumed that these schools will follow the same trend as American schools, given the prevalence of gang activity in disadvantaged communities. Most Western Cape schools in the Eliasov and Frank (2000) survey reported intimidation as a major problem where children threaten to harm teachers or bring their fathers or

gangster friends to the school to do so. An atmosphere of continuing threat can damage staff morale, affect the quality of teaching and service provided by the school and cause significant absenteeism resulting from injuries or the effects of stress, according to Lamplugh and Pagan (1996).

2.4 HOW ARE THE PROBLEMS OF CRIME AND VIOLENCE IN SCHOOLS ADDRESSED?

A very important question that needs to be addressed is whose responsibility it should be to reduce crime and violence in schools? Since crime and violence in schools are linked to high levels of crime and violence in society, should schools be expected to address the problems on their own? Goldstein and Conoley (1997) state that "acts of violence (in schools) should not be viewed as a separate phenomenon but as yet another manifestation of the behavioural trends that characterize contemporary life". As much of violence begins outside of school, violence cannot be regarded, nor dealt with, as the exclusive result of strategies and procedures implemented or not implemented by schools, according to Goldstein and Conoley (1997). Schools, however, have the potential to address some of the causes of violence through education. According to Vestermark (1996), public schools have always been viewed as agencies of social improvement where children of diverse backgrounds would be socialised and educated to become responsible citizens. Schools today are also expected to reduce family and gang violence, as well as other social problems outside the school, through educational programmes. Some might argue whether schools

23

should take on this responsibility and how this could affect its core objective of providing education to students. Should it not be the task of the police and the criminal justice system to eradicate crime and violence?

The next section will explore how the police and criminal justice agencies have attempted to address the issue of crime and violence in society.

2.4.1 Government responses

History has proven that the traditional approaches of boosting policing and the criminal justice systems in order to apprehend, prosecute and incarcerate criminals with greater success have done little to stem the tide of crime. Despite the "war on crime" declared by the United States since 1965, its justice system has been unsuccessful in deterring offenders, and despite its massively increased budget over the years, there is little evidence to support these traditional approaches (Rosenbaum, Lurigio and Davis, 1998). Also in South Africa, the increased spending on the police, which has increased by almost 700% from 1990 to 2000, has not reduced crime significantly (Shaw, 2002). Given South Africa's history of civil repression, the South African Police has also only recently (since 1990) started focusing on addressing crime in society and adopted its National Crime Prevention Strategy, a comprehensive plan to fight crime and reform the criminal justice system, in 1996 (Shaw, 2002). There is consensus among researchers that collaboration between justice and police departments and schools is vital in addressing the problem of violence in

24

schools. De Wet (2003) even supports a special police force tasked with school policing as the ideal.

There have, however, been many private initiatives in South Africa by non-government organisations (NGO's) to address the problem of crime and violence in society at various levels, including community and school interventions. In the following section some of the successful school interventions to combat crime and violence in schools will be reviewed.

2.4.2 School responses

Schools have had to deal with the problem of crime and violence with or without government support. Braaten (1997) maintains that school personnel can no longer isolate themselves and their role from the social issues of their surrounding areas. In the South African context, school governing bodies (SGB's) have the legal obligation to ensure schools are safe, secure and conducive to teaching and learning by ensuring the necessary policies, procedures and structures are in place (Netshitahame and Vollenhoven,2002; Squelch, 2001). This is a major challenge for most schools and, because all schools do not have equal resources, strategies to reduce crime and violence in schools have varied greatly.

The following points summarise the most common practices employed by schools to address crime and violence in schools:

(1) Monitoring of students by staff members;

(2) Implementing a code of conduct for learners;

25

(3) Physical security measures like fences, alarm systems, etc;

(4) Access control in the form of locked gates and doors;

(5) Teacher training programmes in conflict management, behaviour management, drug awareness, etc.;

(6) Learner education programmes like conflict management, drug awareness, etc.;

(7) Involving parents in school activities and discipline; and

(8) Providing counselling to learners (Capozzoli and McVey, 2000; Eliasov and Frank, 2000; Trump, 1998; Futrell, 1996).

Many American schools, given the increase in firearm-related crimes in schools, have also installed metal detectors at doorways, resorted to random checks of students' bags, as well as employing security personnel to patrol school buildings (Futrell, 1996). According to Friday (1996) large urban schools in America are also increasingly using surveillance methods like closed-circuit television to ensure that students do not bring contraband items onto the school premises.

Most strategies to curb violence in schools are designed to respond to violence after it has occurred rather than to prevent its occurrence in the first place (Lowenstein, 1972). Sooner or later every educator will be involved with some aspect of violence and disruption in the school setting. The individual educator's skill and knowledge regarding students' aggressive behaviours will remain a crucial element in addressing violence in schools

26

(Goldstein, Apter and Harootunian, 1984). Teacher training thus becomes imperative.

Many researchers agree that what is currently occurring in schools in terms of addressing school violence is insufficient. If schools intend to alleviate some of the problems of violence confronting it, change of some sort is necessary. Leadership is very important in shaping the culture of an institution. Goldstein, Apter and Harootunian (1984) claim that there is a considerable amount of evidence, both in the United States and Great Britain, which supports the position that what a principal does, affects the "socio-psychological climate" in that school and that this climate, in turn, influences not only the academic accomplishments of the students, but also the "incidence of delinquent behaviour". Braaten (1997) concurs with this view that the principal provides the key to the quality of the school and to its success in providing a safe and healthy learning environment for learners. The Safe Schools Programme also relies on the principle of effective school management for its success.

As already mentioned, schools cannot address the social problem of crime and violence on their own. Any effective and long term solution to crime and violence needs to involve the community.

2.4.3 Community responses

Crime is a social problem interwoven with every aspect of life. Community prevention

strategies are aimed at modifying the social conditions that lead to criminal activity (Rosenbaum, Lurigio and Davis, 1998). Communities are increasingly encouraged by the police to get involved in community crime prevention strategies in partnership with law enforcement agencies and NGO's to solve local crime problems. These strategies take the form of neighbourhood watches and community policing (Department of Community Safety, 2003; Rosenbaum et al, 1998; Shaw, 2002).

2.4.4 Environmental strategies

Environmental strategies are aimed at adapting the physical environment of buildings or spaces to reduce crime. The rationale behind environmental strategies is that changing the physical environment and the way people use it, can prevent crime (Rosenbaum et al, 1998). Target hardening techniques (which make buildings less accessible to criminals) include locks, grills, alarms, fences and reinforced materials (WCED, undated; Rosenbaum et al, 1998; Hoffman, 1996) and are based on the notion that "physical obstacles protect property by making it more impenetrable and less susceptible to criminal actions" (Rosenbaum et al, 1998).

2.4.5 Social crime prevention strategies

Social crime prevention strategies pay attention to the root causes of crime, especially the forces that contribute to criminal activity, drug abuse and many related adolescent problems

(Rosenbaum et al, 1998). Social crime prevention strategies can take many forms, but are usually most successful if the intervention is early and continuous and therefore strategies are often aimed at school-going children. Many of the more successful social prevention programmes of NGO's in South Africa, researched by Griggs (2002), involve primary school students. As Cooke (1996) argues, the social myths regarding violence can only be addressed through education. These myths that perpetuate violence include the beliefs that violence works, that violent acts go unpunished, that relationships are normally sexist and unbalanced, that violence relieves stress, that victims bring trouble on themselves and that success means conquest.

The different crime prevention strategies provide a theoretical background for a review of the WCED's Safe Schools Programme which incorporates some of these elements.

2.5 THE SAFE SCHOOLS PROGRAMME

The Safe Schools Programme came into existence in the Western Cape after a shooting incident in August 1997 in which a grade 10 learner was shot at his desk in Guguletu. At that stage 20 youths had died because of the ongoing gang violence in Guguletu. The Safe Schools Programme was borne out of crisis. An agreement was reached between Safe Schools and 83 schools that were protected by private contract security, to terminate their security guards in favour of a more developmental project. This project would provide infrastructural and developmental support to the schools over a two-year period. In this way

R11 million became available to coordinate safety measures in these schools. An additional R3,1 million was made available by the WCED at the launch of the programme in 1999. Another R 2,6 million was allocated to the programme in 2000. Safe Schools initiated an inter-sectoral (education, media, business and local government), inter-directorate (Departments of Education, Community Safety, Justice, Health and Economic Affairs) project known as "Bridge the Fence" (WCED, undated).

Their programme focuses broadly on safety and has a three-pronged strategy to create a safe, effective and conducive learning environment in schools. These are:

(1) Environmental Programmes, where the physical structure of schools are protected through target hardening strategies (securing the building) like fencing, alarms, mesh wire, razor wire, "no trespassing" signs, etc.

(2) Behavioural Programmes, where parent, educator and learner behaviour are influenced or modified through conflict management, trauma counselling, behaviour modification, human rights education, intervening with learners at risk, peer counselling programmes, entrepreneurial training, sport and cultural activities.

(3) Systems Programmes, which involve system-wide changes in the content or operation of the school, i.e. leadership and management training, organisational development training, community relations, effective school governance, curriculum innovation, etc.

Schools that were part of the programme had to form Safety Committees and then form Clusters and Area Committees. These committees were given a budget and had to address

crime and violence by using a community-oriented problem-solving approach. These Clusters exist in Lavender Hill, Hanover Park, Mannenberg, Mitchell's Plain, Elsies River, Belhar, Bellville, Valhalla Park and Bonteheuwel.

In 2001 a Safe Schools Call Centre with a toll free number was also opened with the aim of addressing or referring emergencies from schools to service providers, to record data on crime and violence in schools and to provide advice and information on a range of issues like drug abuse, AIDS, abuse, rape, etc. A further aim of the Call Centre is to gather and analyse data throughout the Western Cape so as to "devise an integrated, well researched approach to a wide range of threats affecting the safety and well-being of learners and educators" (WCED, undated).

The Safe Schools Programme appears to have operated on an *ad hoc* basis with safety strategies being implemented as funding became available. The initial behaviour programme was also limited to conflict resolution training at 71 schools. Since then, schools have been encouraged to take ownership for their own development and initiate community-orientated strategies that would benefit school safety. The Safe Schools Programme also came into existence before any formal policy was developed but is now guided by the legal framework as outlined in the next section, discussing the South African legal framework for safety measures in schools.

2.5.1 South African legal framework for school safety measures

As no official policy exists, school safety measures are guided by the South African Schools Act of 1996 as amended through the Government Gazette Notice (Vol. 436, No. 22754) regulating safety measures at public schools issued by the Minister of Education in October 2001. Schools were declared violence, drug and dangerous object-free zones which means that no person may enter the public school premises in possession or while under the influence of an illegal drug or alcohol; nor may dangerous objects be allowed in, carried or stored on the public school premises. No person may further cause any form of violence or disturbance which can negatively impact on any public school activities, condone, hide, abet or encourage possession of dangerous objects or refuse or neglect to report the sighting or presence of dangerous objects to the departmental authorities or police. The police, principal or a delegate may also search the premises or person and seize any dangerous objects or illegal drugs. Access to public school premises is also restricted and controlled and any unlawful entrant may be removed from the public school premises if anyone on the premises is threatened. Schools are required to cooperate with the nearest police station to ensure visible policing during sporting and cultural events. Schools furthermore have to develop action plans to counter threats of violence and to ensure the safety of all learners, staff members and parents during school activities. Schools also have to educate the public about these regulations and the school's right to protect itself against violence. It is the responsibility of the Education Head of that province to provide guidelines for the development of action plans.

32

2.5.2 Draft safety guidelines for Western Cape schools

The Provincial Education Labour Relations Council (PELRC, 2003) in the Western Cape briefed its Safety at School Task Team in December 2001 to explore how safety and security measures in place at departmental offices could be extended to schools/institutions and to draft proposals on ways to address educators' safety and security concerns at the workplace. This task team consists of officials from the WCED, mainly officials from the Safe Schools Programme, a member of the PELRC and representatives from three educator unions. The brief of the task team was extended in June 2002 to include drafting a procedural manual, setting out steps and processes that would assist and empower educators to ensure their personal safety and security of their property. The draft procedural manual was tabled at the PELRC in February 2003 and covers the following safety and security measures and procedures: (1) Prohibiting trespassing and limiting access; (2) Limiting the risk to educators on duty; (3) Behaviour modification programmes; (4) Responding to gang violence and (5) Ensuring schools are dangerous object-free zones. These measures are in keeping with the literature reviewed in this chapter, especially American educational research literature, but do not make provision for any extensive or in-depth strategies aimed at individual victims or perpetrators but is rather a blanket and cost-effective approach aimed at accommodating the limited budget of the Education Department.

2.6 CONCLUSION

In this chapter I have sought to contextualize school violence, arguing that this problem needs to be addressed on many levels: government, community and schools. Various strategies to address school violence have been discussed as a background to the discussion of the Safe Schools Programme of the WCED.

In Chapter 3 the methodology employed to collect data from the school stakeholders at the primary school where research was conducted on their perceptions of the impact the Safe Schools Programme of the WCED has had on the school, will be discussed.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

Research design is concerned with making the problem researchable by setting up the study in a way that will produce specific answers to specific questions (Opperman, 1996). The main aim of the research design is to maximize the validity of the eventual results (Mouton, 1996).

A qualitative approach was used, as the intention was to study the perceptions of school stakeholders (the principal, safety officer, educators and support staff) of the support provided by the Safe Schools Programme of the WCED to create a safer learning environment at their school.

There are different stages in the research design (Mouton, 1996):

Conceptualisation; Operationalisation; Sampling; Data Collection; and Analysis and Interpretation.

3.1.1 Conceptualisation

In this study I strove to clearly and unambiguously define the key concepts of this study and integrate the research with the body of existing theory and research, thus ensuring theoretical validity. The research questions investigated were:

(1) What are the school stakeholder perceptions of the Safe Schools Programme of the WCED in addressing crime and violence in a primary school?

(2) Has the implementation of the Safe Schools Programme brought about a safer learning environment?

3.1.2 Operationalisation

During the process of operationalisation an instrument is developed to measure the key concepts in the research question. In this way measurement validity is ensured (Mouton, 1996). An interview guide (Appendix D) was developed for the individual interviews with the acting principal and the safety officer of the school, as well as a focus group interview schedule (Appendix E) for the staff members in the focus group.

3.1.3 Sampling

This concept could not be applied to this research study because of its qualitative nature which did not require a representative selection of population elements.

3.1.4 Data collection

During the process of data collection, the researcher collects various kinds of data through various methods and techniques with the aim of producing reliable data (Mouton, 1996). Data was collected through two individual interviews with the acting principal and the safety officer and one focus group interview with a group of eight education and support staff members.

3.1.5 Analysis and interpretation

According to Mouton (1996), analysis in qualitative research means capturing the research participants' own understanding of the topic, thus ensuring validity.

3.2 RESEARCH PROCESS

3.2.1 Identifying the school where research would be conducted

The school district of Mitchell's Plain was selected not only for convenience since it is the

area where the researcher works, but more importantly because of its socio-political setting

of being a disadvantaged area known for its gangster activity. Identifying the school proved

problematic as the Safety Coordinator (of Safe Schools) at the local Education

Management Development Centre (EMDC) could not provide a list of schools that were

part of the initial Safe Schools group. Through telephonic enquiries to the Safe Schools

headquarters I was referred to the Safe Schools Call Centre, the operational headquarters,

where I was denied access to the list of schools on the grounds that I had not yet made a

formal request to conduct research in WCED schools. A search of the WCED website also

proved unsuccessful. Finally, through negotiation with the manager of the Safe Schools

Programme and after explaining that I first needed to identify the school before I could

apply for consent to conduct research at the school, I was supplied with a list of four

primary schools in the Mitchell's Plain district which were part of the initial 83 schools that

constituted the Safe Schools Programme. The school identified was the nearest school to

the researcher and after initial discussions with the acting principal and safety officer at the

school, a formal request was put to the staff who agreed to allow the researcher to collect

data from staff members.

3.2.2 Selecting respondents for this research study

After an initial telephonic enquiry to both the acting principal and the safety officer of the primary school where my research was conducted, a meeting was set up with the acting principal where the aims of the research, as well as the procedures were clearly explained. This was followed by a formal letter to the staff requesting their participation in the research study, which was discussed at a staff meeting. Following the agreement of the staff at that staff meeting, consent was sought from the Research Unit of the WCED to conduct research at the particular school. All staff members were briefed on the procedures to be followed, as well as their rights not to participate in the study.

3.2.3 Data sources

Data was produced from the following sources:

1. The acting school principal was interviewed using the semi-structured interviewing technique.

2. The safety officer at the school was also interviewed using the same interviewing technique.

3. A group of staff members was interviewed using focus group interview techniques.

The following stakeholders were excluded from this study for the reasons stated below:

1. Learners – The aim of the research study was to investigate school stakeholder perceptions of the Safe Schools Programme on the impact of the learning environment at the school. Primary school learners may not be able to express their views on this issue in a meaningful way and were therefore excluded from the study. Ethical concerns regarding the use of primary school children in the collection of data, as well as logistical and safety concerns of the researcher in obtaining consent from individual parents in their homes in an area known for its high levels of crime and gangster activity, were also considerations in the exclusion of this group of stakeholders.

2. Parents - Although important stakeholders in the process of securing a safe school environment for learners, parents are not involved in any safety structures at the school and have therefore not had any direct input in safety strategies at the school due to their own job obligations. Future research could explore this very important data source in creating a safe learning environment for learners at the school.

3.2.4 Research techniques

Data was collected by means of semi-structured interviews and a focus group interview.

Cohen and Manion (1994) define the research interview as "a two-person conversation

initiated by the interviewer for the specific purpose of obtaining research-relevant information, and focused by him on content specified by research objectives of systematic description, prediction, or explanation". In the semi-structured interview the questions are normally specified but the interviewer is free to probe beyond the answers. Qualitative data about the topic can then be recorded by the interviewer who can seek both clarification and elaboration on the answers given (May, 1997). The semi-structured interview was used to gauge the perceptions of the principal and the safety officer at the school about the effectiveness of the support provided by the Safe Schools Programme of the WCED in creating a safer learning and teaching environment at their school.

3.2.4.1 Interviews as a data collection tool

Commonly tension is thought to exist between subjectivity and objectivity in the interviewing process. On the one hand, interviews are said to elicit knowledge free of prejudice or bias; on the other, a self-conscious awareness must be maintained to let the interview "flow" (May, 1997). The diffculty arises as the researcher is the research instrument and can therefore not be a "standard product" (Gillham, 2000).

A major advantage of interviewing is its adaptability, allowing the interviewer to follow up leads, probe responses and investigate feelings. Some disadvantages are that it is time-consuming, highly subjective and always pose the danger of bias (Wragg, 1978). Because of the time involved in developing the interview schedule, piloting it, setting up

and traveling to and from the interview location, transcribing the interview and analysing it, interviews are costly (Gillham, 2000).

3.2.4.2 Piloting of interview schedules

After having assembled an interview schedule (Appendix D), pilot interviews were conducted with the principal and safety officer of another primary school with similar safety concerns and then modified in order to minimise misinterpretations of the questions.

3.2.4.3 Selection of the focus group respondents

In this research study respondents were selected to include staff members, both education and support staff, whose employment at the school ranges from newly employed staff members to those who have been employed at the school for a very long time. After explaining to the staff members that participation in the research study was voluntary, only nine of the staff members agreed to participate in the research study. I did not probe the reason for the poor response due to ethical reasons. On the day of the focus group interview one of the nine was absent. The focus group consisted of the school secretary, one general assistant, one pre-primary teacher, three junior primary teachers, and two senior primary teachers, totaling eight members, of which one was male. Male teachers are poorly represented on the staff. Of the 17 teachers, only 5 are male. A profile of the focus group participants are presented below:

PARTICIPANT	POSITION AT SCHOOL	EMPLOYMENT AT SCHOOL
Mrs A	Grade 3 educator	13 years
Mrs B	Grade 3 Educator	15 years
Mr C	Grade 6 Educator	2 years
Mrs D	Grade 1 Educator	18 years
Mrs E	General Assistant	10 years
Mrs F	Grade R Educator	2 years
Mrs G	Grade 6 and 7 Educator	13 years
Mrs H	Secretary	5 years

3.2.4.4 The focus group as a data collection tool

A focus group was used to gather data from educators and support staff in order to gain a variety of perspectives on school safety issues. The focus group interview is a qualitative research technique used to obtain data about feelings and opinions of small groups of participants about a given problem, service or other phenomenon (Basch, 1987). Focus groups are also "group interviews that are structured and purposeful ...and allow a great deal of flexibility in questions" (Barton, 2000).

In focus group interviews the researcher plays a key role, acting as the instrument for data collection, using an outline of topics or questions (Appendix E). The researcher has to assume responsibility for, among others, creating a non-threatening, supportive climate that encourages all group members to share their views; facilitating interaction among group

members; interjecting probing comments; transitional questions and summaries without interfering too brusquely with dialogue among participants; covering important topics or questions in the outline while relying on judgement to abandon aspects of the outline to pursue other lines of questioning that seem more revealing; presenting questions in an unbiased way; encouraging participation of all members and determining how group members feel about opinions expressed by other members.

3.2.4.5 Advantages and disadvantages of the focus group as a data collection tool

There are many advantages but also some limitations of using this method of data collection (Basch, 1987). Some of these advantages are listed below:

1. The researcher can obtain a permanent record of verbal and non-verbal communication by audio and audio-visual recording equipment and transcripts.
2. A key asset is the synergism that produces a wide range of information and uncovers important understandings.
3. This method is flexible, allowing for a wide range of information to be obtained from a few or twelve or more respondents. The focus group in this research study consisted of eight members.
4. This method is useful for obtaining information about sensitive topics.

There are, however, also some limitations to using focus groups:

1. They are not useful for testing hypotheses, which was not the aim of this reseach study.

2. They are generally not appropriate for drawing inferences about larger populations.

3. Only individuals who are capable and willing to verbalize their views can be studied in

   a focus group.

4. This method relies heavily on moderation and interpretation and may lend itself to

   providing evidence in support of preconceptions.

3.3 DATA ANALYSIS METHODS

Qualitative analysis is the nonnumerical examination and interpretation of interviews and observations and involves a continual interplay between theory and analysis (Babbie, 2001). Qualitative analysis focuses on understanding rather than explaining social actions and events within their particular context. In qualitative research, the investigator usually works with a wealth of rich, descriptive data. According to Mouton (1996), analysis in qualitative research means capturing the research participants' own understanding of the topic. This leads to the use of methods of data analysis that are more holistic, synthetic and interpretive.

All interviews, the two semi-structured interviews with the acting principal and the safety officer, as well as the focus group interviews were recorded on audiotape. These audiotapes

were then transcribed before any form of analysis could be made. Powney and Watts (1987) take analysis to be the detailed examination of the database that ensues from single or multiple interviews. All data collected was subjected to a descriptive method of analysis. Open and axial coding were used to analyse the data (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). Through the use of open coding the data was closely examined, allowing the researcher to generate categories for grouping the data. These different categories which emerged from the transcripts were further scanned to identify where the property fitted into a continuum or range (axial coding). Analysis of the data involves interpretation and is thus a creative process.

3.4 RESEARCH ETHICS

The researcher was guided by the rules of protocol contained in the evaluation research literature regarding voluntary participation in research, informed consent and the protection of the identity of participants, as well as her commitment to ethical research conduct. Confidentiality was guaranteed and the consent of all stakeholders sought. Permission to conduct the research was obtained from the following stakeholders:

❖ The school staff;

❖ The WCED (see Appendices A and B);

❖ All research participants (seeAppendix C).

In Chapter 4 the analysed data will be presented and then discussed.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter the analysed contents of the transcribed individual interviews as well as the focus group interview will be presented in sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 and discussed in section 4.4.

4.1 INTERVIEW 1: THE ACTING PRINCIPAL

By means of open coding the following categories emerged from the interview with the acting principal of the school:

1. Support from the Safe Schools Programme;

2. Safety structures and procedures at the school;

3. Cooperation with other government departments;

4. Involvement of the school with other structures;

5. Training of staff;

6. Parental support;

7. Safety threats to the school;

8. Impact of the safety measures on the school;

9. The establishment of a safer learning environment and

10. The need for further support from the Safe Schools Programme.

The continuum used here to plot these properties is: none; limited; some; significant; and exceeds expectations.

The content of this interview will now be presented under the ten categories stated above, supported by excerpts from the transcript of the interview (Appendix F):

4.1.1 Support from the Safe Schools Programme

The respondent believes that significant support has been provided by the Safe Schools Programme to the school in the form of physical security measures (environmental) and trauma counselling (behavioural).

> **They (the Safe Schools Programme) safeguarded the school by giving money to the school for the mesh grills against the windows and fencing. For grades one to three they brought in psychology students to help learners to handle trauma, for the grade ones and twos and threes and psychologists to talk to the teachers afterwards. They've arranged different workshops with the safety committee."**

4.1.2 Safety structures and procedures at the school

The respondent believes that the safety structures that exist at the school satisfied the needs

of the school. This includes a Safety Committee which has a formal safety policy and procedures in place to provide for situations which threaten the safety of learners and staff members.

We have a code of conduct. We also have classrooms marked with yellow dots where learners can go to if shootings occur during intervals. We also have regular safety drills.

When asked to expand on the procedures that are followed in the case of a safety threat to the school, the respondent answered as follows:

We close all the gates, code 39 is announced, that means that the teachers must close their doors and the security gates, no-one outside, the safety committee gets together with the principal to evaluate the situation. Parents who come to pick up their children, only those children who the parents ask for, can go. We inform the department, we inform Safe Schools, get hold of the Neighbourhood Watch and with the police's help, we dismiss the children before the official closing time.

4.1.3 Cooperation with other government departments

Cooperation with other government institutions, according to the respondent, is very

49

limited and only extends to the police services, both the South African Police Services and the City Police, who are asked to assist with patrols when learners are dismissed during times when the area is unsafe.

4.1.4 Involvement of the school with other safety structures

Again, the respondent believes that the school's involvement with other safety structures is limited and only extends to seeking support from the local Neighbourhood Watch in escorting children home during times when the area is unsafe. In response to the researcher's question on the school's involvement with community structures, the respondent answered:

Only the Neighbourhood Watch. No other structures.

4.1.5 Training of staff

According to the respondent, training has been very limited. In response to the question of training of teachers, his response was:

Not that I know of... I think the coordinator here at the school went for training, she's the only person.

4.1.6 Parental support

The respondent believes that parental support is extremely limited, as expressed in the following quote from the transcript of this interview:

> **Their (the parents') only concern is sending the children to school and to come and pick them up when there are shootings. They are not that involved in the safety of the school. They believe that it is the responsibility of the teachers.**

4.1.7 Safety threats to the school

The internal disciplinary problems or threats to the safety of learners and staff posed by learners, are very limited, according to the respondent. The security of learners and staff is mostly threatened by gang fights outside the school premises which make the area unsafe for learners and staff, as indicated by th following statement:

> **It's only the gangster activity. Except for children coming here with toy guns, pellet guns, that kind of thing. It was just children playing, but we treated it as very serious.**

4.1.8 Impact of the safety measures on the school

The respondent believes that the safety measures introduced by the safe Schools Programme have had a significant impact on the school:

> **Vandalism dropped a lot. We never had any break-ins after that. Only a few minor break-ins. We have no windows thrown in, as all our windows are now covered with mesh.**

4.1.9 Learning environment

The respondent believes that the Safe Schools Programme has made a significant impact on establishing a safer learning environment. He also further believes that learners and staff feel safe at school:

> **Yes. There is no easy access to the school at the moment, especially with the enclosed boundaries. We've got more control of who's coming in and going out.**

4.1.10 The need for further support from the Safe Schools Programme

The respondent believes that some further support is needed from the Safe Schools Programme. The area he identified is the need for the training of teachers in order to train

52

parents. The training is to empower the community and to encourage ownwership of the school:

> **"My honest opinion is that we should train teachers to run certain courses with parents and with the children. At the moment there is this idea that the school is just a building, it is not for the community. That is my perception. I think it is like that everywhere. If you can have literacy classes for the community, get the parents in, that kind of thing that the people need here in the community, and if Safe Schools can do that through the teachers, that's the kind of support I would go for, that they must provide."**

4.2 INTERVIEW 2: THE SAFETY OFFICER

Through the use of open coding, the same categories were identified as in the first interview and the same continuum is used for axial coding. These categories will now be used to present the data collected through this semi-structured interview, supported by excerpts from the transcript of the interview (Appendix G).

4.2.1 Support from the Safe Schools Programme

The respondent believes that the support from officials of the Safe Schools Programme exceeded her expectations. The head of the Safe Schools Programme as well as the Safety

Coordinators at the time, were very involved in the school and provided hands-on support:

> **Toe ek hier kom, toe was hier niks tralies nie, niks "mesh" aan die vensters nie, hier was niks nie en alles wat jy hier sien het van 1999 af opgegaan. Die tralies rondom, die "mesh", die tralies by die ingange, alles."**

Especially the personal contact and hands-on approach of the former manager of the Safe Schools Programme was frequently emphasised:

> **In 2000, Augustus, was dit net chaos. Toe het die skietery begin. Een oggend voor skool het 2 bendelede met gewere omgehardloop van agter af, *****straat om en deur die skool gehardloop om weer agter uit te gaan. Hulle het, ek het dit nie gesien nie, maar hulle moes iemand gejaag het, natuurlik. Dit het aanleiding gegee dat ek en die hoof vir Eugene gebel het, want van die onderwysers, veral onderwyseresse, het siek geraak, inmekaar gesak, "anxiety attacks" gekry. Onderwysers, sowel as baie van die leerders, het histeries geraak en na daardie voorval was Eugene onmiddelik op die toneel en hy het vir die mense gevra wat wil julle hier hê? Dit is toe dat die veiligheidshekke aangekom het, "mesh" teen die vensters en die ingange van die skool is ook toegemaak.**

She continually emphasised the hands-on involvement of the former manager of the Safe

Schools Programme by stating elsewhere:

> **En nog iets wat ek moet noem, is daardie tyd het Eugene vergader met ons en die "army" het toe ingekom Die weermag was hier vir plus-minus 2 weke op ons skool. En ons was veiliger en het meer gemoedsrus gehad.**

Besides the changes to the physical structure and moral support offered to the school, projects were also started to involve learners:

> **Ja, ek het ook gegaan na 'n "horticulture" projek, dis een van die projekte wat hulle geloods het, en daar het ek gegaan vir 'n werkswinkel na Elgin toe, waar ons vir die naweek geleer het hoe om bome te plant, die verskillende soorte grond,.. Dit was vir selfversorging, maar ook om geld te maak. Ons het ook die groente verkoop.**

She further explained that the aim of this project was to beautify the school and to get learners involved in other meaningful activities that would distract them from the gloom of gang shootings.

There was also another joint project in which learners were involved:

> **Ja, die "cane" projek. Die cluster wat ons gehad het, het bestaan uit skool 1,**

55

skool 2 en skool 3. Ons het heel eerste die "cane" projek begin en daar het ons die probleemleerlinge van graad 4 tot graad 7 geïdentifiseer en hulle elke Dinsdag en Donderdag na skool 1 toe geneem. Daar het ons geleer, eers die onderwysers en dan agterna die leerders. Hulle het ons gewys hoe om te maak. Die projek was 'n reuse-sukses, want die cluster is ook deur Education Express genader om 'n opname te maak en dit uit te saai.

Further support was also provided by the Safe schools Programme in the form of counselling to learners and staff members:

Dikwels, as daar skietvoorvalle is soggens of gedurende skooltyd, dan is baie van die leerders en onderwysers getraumatiseer en dan moet ek die leerders hier inbring tot ek vir Lynn van Safe Schools in die hande kan kry om hulle te hulp te wees. Lynn is die berader van Safe Schools. En dan het ek ook onderwysers gestuur vir sielkundige behandeling ... Ek praat onder korreksie, maar dit is plus-minus 5 onderwysers. Sommige het na private dokters gegaan.

Some learners were also involved in camps sponsored by the Safe Schools Programme:

Ons het die prefekte weggeneem op 'n 3-dae "Team Building"- projek ... Dan is daar die Scripture Union kamp waarheen ons 'n paar leerders gestuur het

vir 'n naweek."

The staff at the school also benefited from conflict resolution training, although the conflict had existed prior to the school's involvement with the Safe Schools Programme and had no links to the safety conditions at the school, according to the respondent:

Ja , die skool het konflikresolusie gedoen, maar dit het te doen gehad met die gebeure wat ek hier gekry het nie. Hier was vreeslike konflik tussen die personeel by die skool. Nee, dit het niks te doen gehad met die veiligheid van die skool nie.

4.2.2 Safety structures and procedures at the school

The respondent believes that the security structures and procedures followed at school were sufficient in addressing the needs of the school:

Want ons veiligheidsmaatreëls wat ons toepas, dit behels dat kinders by ons skool bly. Ons het 'n normale skooldag. Die kinders kan by die skool bly, want as die hekke toe is, en as kode 39 afgekondig word, dan weet die onderwysers hule moet die veiligheidshekke toesluit. Kode 39 is om vir die onderwysers te sê hulle skiet in die area naby die skool. So, dis nie nodig om meer te verduidelik aan die ouers nie. Hulle is bewus en die veiligheidspan word vorentoe geroep. Hulle het hulle punte. Hulle weet waar om te staan en te kyk

hoe die gebied is en dan word die polisie ingeroep. Die prosedure is: ons bel die Safe Schools Call Centre, ons bel die polisie, hulle bel die polisie en natuurlik as daar kontak gemaak moet word, ons doen al hierdie dinge. Die sekretaresse is ook baie betrokke. Sy is ook in die veiligheidspan en sy help ook vir ons met die oproepe. Ek het verskeie selfoonnommers van die polisiekapteins, superintendente. Ons bel hulle sommer direk.

4.2.3 Cooperation with other government departments

The cooperation of the school with other government departments is sufficient, according to the respondent. While this only extends to cooperation with the police departments (SAPS and City Police), communication has been greatly improved over the years:

Ja, ons het eers nie daardie kommunikasie gehad nie ... Ek het verskeie selfoonnommers van die polisiekapteins en superintendente. Ons bel hulle sommer direk.

4.2.4 Involvement with other structures

There is some involvement between the school and other structures that have offered assistance to the school. This includes involvement with the City Council who has assisted the safety committee in drafting a safety policy, as well as involvement with Gun Free

58

South Africa, of which the school is part of a pilot project to promote schools as gun-free zones.

4.2.5 Training of staff

There has been no formal training of either herself as safety officer at the school, or of the safety committee:

> **Nee. Ek het ook geen formele opleiding gehad nie. Ek het maar gehoor by werkswinkels of vergaderings wat ander skole maak, dan het ek dit maar kom oordra ... Ja, maar oral het Safe Schools 'n hand in gehad. Hulle het altyd leiding gegee, gesê X jy kan dit doen, probeer dit of probeer dat ... Nee dit was maar telefoniese gesprekke of as Narriman gekom het, het sy gevra om met my te praat en dan het ons gesels en ek het gedoen wat sy gesê het. Of ek vra haar raad met onderwysers wat nie hulle samewerking wil gee nie en die veiligheidspan wat bedank.**

4.2.6 Parental support

While there was no specific reference to parental involvement in the school during this interview, the respondent had confirmed during an informal discussion on the school's background that the only parent who serves on the safety committee is a governing body

member.

4.2.7 Safety threats to the school

At the moment the threats to the safety of the school is minimal and there had not been any recent events that have posed a significant threat to the safety of learners and staff at the school:

> **Op die oomblik is daar nie eintlik 'n groot bekommernis nie ... Die mees onlangse geval was verlede jaar Oktober. Die oggend toe hulle geskiet het, het die hoof in trane uitgebars. Hier by die robot op die hoek het 'n ou met 'n "gun" vir haar "gepoint" en die robot was rooi, daarom moes die karre stop, en die hoof was vreeslik getraumatiseer. By die hoof was 'n ander onderwyser en nadat ek vir Narriman gebel het, het ons besluit dat die hoof en die meneer huis toe geneem moes word. En daarna, dis waarom ek sê 'n mens kan nie die dinge bepaal nie, het ons personeelvergadering gehad en die skool sou normaal aangaan. En daar het die eerste onderwyser, dit is die onderwyser wat altyd die "anxiety attacks" kry, onmiddellik "ge-collapse" in die "staffroom". Terwyl daar nog gepraat was, het die onderwysers sommer hulle stem dik gemaak en gesê ons moet die skool sluit. Baie het begin huil en gedink die vrou is nou besig om te sterf. Ons het een van die menere gevra om die juffrou dokter toe te neem en ons het besluit die onderwysers moet huis toe**

gaan sodra die kinders almal by die huis is.

4.2.8 Impact of the safety measures on the school

The safety measures introduced by the Safe Schools programme had a significant impact on the school. Whereas parents used to fetch their children from school in the past, also taking along the children of friends and neighbours, parents are now more inclined to leave their children at school where they believe the children are safe.

> **Dit het 'n geweldige verandering gemaak ... Ouers het voorheen net gehardloop na die skool toe en die ouers gaan met die kinders uit, een ouer vat sommer vyftig kinders.**

4.2.9 Learning environment

The respondent believes that the safety measures introduced by the Safe Schools Programme have had a significant impact on ensuring the safety of learners and staff at school. On the question of whether she believes the learners and staff felt safe at school, her answer was an emphatic: **"Definitief!"**

4.2.10 The need for further support from the Safe Schools Programme

The need for further support was minimal. She would like to see activities that would keep the learners busy and distract them from focusing on the shootings in the area, to offer an alternative to the exposure to gang violence in the community. A possibility suggested by her is the establishment of a computer centre at school to keep learners busy:

> **Miskien moet hulle vir ons 'n komper-klaskamer gee ... As hulle (die leerlinge) iets het om hulle hande mee besig te hou en hulle gedagtes is op 'n ander projek**
>
> **gevestig, of wat ook al, voel ek, dit sal 'n groot hulp wees ...**

4.3 FOCUS GROUP

By means of open coding, the following categories were identified from the transcript of the focus group interview:

1. Support from the Safe Schools Programme;

2. Safety structures and procedures at the school;

3. Community involvement;

4. Cooperation with other government departments;

5. The school's involvement with other structures;

6. Training of staff members;

7. Parental involvement;

8. The sense of security of staff members;

9. Support from WCED officials;

10. Education programmes for learners and parents and

11. Identification and referral process for learners at risk of destructive choices

The categories that emerged that were different from those identified in the individual interviews, were the following:

(1)The discussion focused at length on the sense of security of individual staff members and how it has affected their reaction to gang violence around the school.

(2) Another category which elicited strong opinions were expressed, is that participants in the focus group felt unsupported and undervalued by their employer, the WCED. The absence of WCED officials during crisis times and the insistence of the WCED on following the set procedures for early closure of the school, even when following this procedure could potentially endanger the lives of staff members who have to remain at school while gun battles continue in the area, were discussed.

(3) The need for education programmes for learners and parents was also discussed at length by the participants and was identified as one of the shortcomings of the Safe Schools

Programme.

(4) Another new category was the identification and referral procedures to deal with

learners who are using drugs and those who are involved in gangs or have relatives involved with gangs.

The same range was used as descriptors for axial coding as for the individual interviews. This range is: none; minimal; some; sufficient and exceeds expectations.

The data from the focus group will now be presented according to the criteria identified through open coding as set out above, supported by excerpts from the transcript of the interview (Appendix H):

4.3.1 Support from the Safe Schools Programme

Respondents were divided on the issue of the support provided to the school by the Safe Schools Programme. While all members were aware of the physical structures erected to secure the building and property and the impact it has had on the school, only certain members believed that the support provided has been significant. Other members of the group believed that while there was the initial support from the Safe Schools Programme officials, there has been very little support provided recently, especially in the past two years. Excerpts from the group discussion are presented below to illustrate these opposing views:

> **G: Nee, ons kan altyd vir hulle skakel by die "Call Centre", hulle sal kom en**
>
> **...**

H: Hulle is baie behulpsaam.

G: … hulle is ook maar gestasioneer op punte en somtyds is hulle daar dan kan hulle nie op twee plekke op dieselfde tyd wees nie.Maar ek kan nie "complain" van hulle nie.

A: En dan die sielkundiges, ek dink dit was na die laaste skietery gewees, die sielkundiges was deel van Safe Schools.

D: Vir die onderwysers.

A: En vir die kinders.

G: Vir die onderwysers, maar enige tyd as 'n kind getraumatiseer is, kan ons Lynn inroep.

A: Geeneen van die kinders was nog ooit behandel nie.

G: Nee, daar was D, en L ook.

A: Daar was nog nooit kinders behandel wat getraumatiseer is nie.

B: Ek dink daar is net onderhoude gevoer.

H: Ja, ons het baie ondersteuning gekry. Ek dink dit was in 2000 gewees.

C: Ek het nou al gehoor van die dinge wat Safe Schools in plek gehad het nog voor my tyd, maar ek het nie, van verlede jaar af, is daar nie weer … u praat van 'n program, so dit sou vir my die idee gee dat daar meer as een aktiwiteit moet wees om die probleem aan te spreek. Ek self het nog nie kennis gemaak met Safe Schools nie. Hier was nog nie amptenare hier om met die kinders te praat oor veiligheid nie, of wat ook al, wat ek van weet nie.

G: Ja, wanneer ons gebel het, dan was Narriman hier of sy bel.

C: Juffrou, ek het hulle nog nie gesien nie.

G: Ek praat van die tyd toe ons nog oop en bloot was, toe hier nog

niks veiligheidshekke hier was nie, dan het hulle nogal baie gou uitgekom.

C: Maar nou?

G: Narriman het gegaan tot in die area in. Hulle het baie gedoen, maar hulle

het ook 'n werk om te verrig meneer, maar ek meen, hulle kan nie elke slag

ook net uitkom nie, maar vra gewoonlik of ons "oraait" is, en so aan, maar

as mens nou die "Call Centre" bel, bel hulle ook weer terug om te vra of dit

nou veilig is. Hulle is somtyds net so 'n bietjie slap. Maar ek meen maar.

G: Dan het Safe Schools ook nog hulle kampe. Hulle het nie diè jaar een gehad

nie. Safe Schools het ook kampe waar hulle Scripture Union toe gaan.

4.3.2 Safety structures and procedures

The perceptions of the respondents regarding the school's safety structures and procedures
in addressing the safety needs of the school ranged from minimal to sufficient:

G: Daar was fondse beskikbaar en dan was dit ook 'n geval van dat ons

die elemente kon uithou, dat ons meer kontrole kon uitoefen oor wie in- en

uitkom.

A: Want een van die onderwysers se karre was al hier voor gesteel, voor

die kantoor, gedurende skool.

and

D: Ja, daar is die rolle draad, maar hulle kom nog altyd bo-oor die hakiesdraad.

E: Ja, soos die een aand toe die opsigter kom oopsluit vir 'n vergadering toe is daar die volkies (jong mans) wat so kom (dagga)rook hier agter.

4.3.3 Community involvement

According to the respondents there has been very minimal involvement from the community. This extends only to one activity which involved an effort from the Safe Schools Programme to establish safe houses in the community for learners to run to for cover during shootings that occur while learners are on their way to or from school. A march was organised and the Yellow Door Campaign had great initial successes but certain households, fearing for retribution from gangsters in the area, withdrew from the campaign. At the moment the school liaises with a member of the community to alert them to potential danger in the area:

B: Ja en dan het ons 'n optog gehad met mevrou Zille.

G: Dit was die launch van die Yellow Door Campaign.

B: Ja, maar hulle is ook bekommerd oor die kinders se veiligheid as hulle huis toe gaan. En hulle het aan die hand gedoen dat die ouers saam met die

67

kinders moet stap. Die kinders wat dalk betrokke sou raak by

bendebedrywighede moet geïdentifiseer word en hulle doen aan die hand

doen dat die ouers saam met die kinders moet stap.

G: Ons het vir hulle (die gemeenskap) genader met die Yellow Door Campaign

om die stickers op hulle deure te sit, maar party was nogal 'n bietjie

skrikkerig. Maar op die oomblik het ons 'n dametjie met 'n two-way radio

wat vir ons op die hoogte hou om vir ons te laat weet hulle skiet in die area

en die mense in die gemeenskap weet ook sy doen dit, so hulle sal ook vir

haar laat weet daar kom jongens (bendelede) daai kant aan sodat sy die

skool kan laat weet hulle moet die kinders maar binne hou.

4.3.4 Cooperation with other government departments

There is minimal cooperation with other government departments, with the police departments being the only real partners in addressing safety issues in the school. While police escorts are provided on request when learners are dismissed during unsafe situations, one respondent campaigned for more visible police patrols at all times:

G:As die kinders moet huis toe gaan, sal hulle patrolleer. Ons hou die kinders

eintlik binne tot ons sien daar is polisie sigbaar in die area sodat die kinders

68

gou kan huis toe hardloop.

G: Ja, die polisie was ook hier wat ons kom inlig het oor drankprobleme,

dwelms, praatjies gehou het, dit was eintlik praatjies. Dit was nog alles deel

van Safe Schools gewees.

4.3.5 Involvement of the school with other structures

Respondents again believe that the school's involvement with other structures is minimal and only extend to a few uncoordinated activities. The Community Police Forum had one crime awareness show at the school, individual teachers have made referrals of learners using drugs to the Learning Support Officer and the school has been involved with Gun Free South Africa as part of a pilot project to declare schools as gun-free zones:

G: Hulle (die Community Police Forum) was eenkeer hier by ons ook. Toe

hulle die poppekas hier gehad het.

C: Ek weet nie, kom Gun Free nie hier in nie?

G: Gun Free kan hier inkom, ja, maar Gun Free was 'n "pilot project" gewees.

Dit moet nog "ge-gazette" word en dit moet nog ...

C: ...dat daar nie vuurwapens toegelaat word op die perseel nie, jy kan jouself

nie "protect" deur vuurwapens te dra nie.

H: Net die polisie kan met vuurwapens inkom.

4.3.6 Training of staff

The training of staff had been minimal, with one respondent believing that the safety officer of the school underwent formal training at the workshops she attended over weekends:

G: Ja, juffrou X (Veiligheidsoffisier) het baie Saterdae "workshops" bygewoon.

4.3.7 Parental support

Parental support is minimal, according to respondents and there is often no support for the safety measures of the school, nor support in disciplinary procedures:

G: Maar dit was al aangekondig aan die ouers as daar enige skietery daar buite is, hulle moet nie kom hardloop na die skool om die kinders te kom haal nie, die kinders is veiliger by die skool.

G: Ons kry gewoonlik die polisie in as afskrikmiddel, maar as die ouers nie wil saamwerk nie, soos D, het ons gesê sy ma moet hom maar saamvat en maar vir hom 'n ander skool gaan kry. Want die ouers wil nie hê jy moet aan hulle kinders iets maak nie. Toe het ons gevoel, as ons niks met hom kan maak nie.

4.3.8 The sense of safety while at school

Respondents were divided on whether they perceived the school to be a safe place. Their responses ranged from feeling minimally safe at school to feeling safe to a significant degree:

D: Ja, daar is die rolle draad, maar hulle kom nog altyd bo-oor die hakiesdraad.

B: Ja, veral ons kindertuin mense voel soms onveilig daar agter. Jy sien wanneer hulle verbystap daar agter en ek voel dit is niks om oor daai hekke te kom nie.

D: Ja, soos juffrou B gesê het, dit sal veiliger wees as Safe Schools meer kan doen, maar ek voel weer as daar geskiet word, dan wil ek huis toe gaan.

A: Ja.

D: Ek dink al gaan hulle wat in plek bring hier, vir enige persoon wat die eerste keer getraumatiseer is deur die skietery, enige geluid dan voel jy jy wil nou in 'n hoekie gaan sit. Dit is hoe ek voel en ek voel by my huis ook so. Ek weet mevrou E het al op 'n keer gesê die onderwysers is net onnodig, die skietery is nie hier nie, dis daar ver, maar as ek 'n gun skoot hoor, voel ek dat ek wil huis toe gaan, ek wil nie hier wees nie.

D: Die kleintjies is baie senuweeagtig. Daar is van hulle wat huil.

B: En die grotes ook.

A: Die ouer leerlinge ook, hulle kom aan gehardloop en as ons nou in die geel deure ingaan dan is die leerlinge baie vreesbevange. Hulle weet iets is al weer nie reg nie, buitekant. En die ouers kom haal die kinders.

H: Ja.

G: Definitief veiliger as wat dit voorheen was. Want iemand kon reguit hier ingekom het en sommer 'n kind kom uithaal het, maar nou kan ons meer kontrole uitoefen.

F: Ek voel veilig, ja, nou op hede. Ek was mos nou nie deel van al die dinge wat gebeur het nie, sommige kere dink ek daar's mense by ander skole wat nog nie eens gehoor het van hierdie dinge nie, ... ek het vir vriende vertel van dit wat hier gebeur, die skietery, en hulle kon dit ook nie glo nie, want jy's in 'n "comfort zone" daar waar jy is en jy weet nie wat die ander leerkragte deurmaak hier nie. As dit miskien met my gebeur, die dag wanneer dit met my gaan gebeur, dan gaan ek ook miskien die gevoel van onveilig wees kry.

C: ... Ek weet ek is vreeslik bekommerd, miskien wil jy jouself bedrieg deur te glo dat dit nie met jou kan gebeur nie, so nou gaan jy maar voort met jou daaglikse dinge, maar, soos juffrou nou sê, jy gaan na jou klas toe.

A: Van die skietery weet ek nie, maar ek is nogal bekommerd oor die kinders en van my kollegas hierso, want van die kinders is betrokke by "gangs" en enigeen kan so kwaad raak vir die onderwyser en met 'n "gun" hier inkom en skiet en omdat die kinders so betrokke is by die "gangsters" is dit 'n

72

gevaar vir hulle.

C: Op pad skool toe ook, jy weet nooit wat kan gereël word, om iemand op pad skool toe voor te keer nie.

4.3.9 Support from the WCED officials

The support from WCED officials has been minimal, even to the point of cruelty, where it is expected from staff members to remain at school while their lives are potentially placed under threat due to gang violence raging in the area. These respondents felt disempowered to make decisions about their own safety, being expected to follow protocol in informing the WCED, even in crisis situations when their own lives are at risk. They also feel unappreciated and undervalued as employees as no interest is shown in their well-being. Strong opinions were expressed in this regard:

G: Definitief nie. Kyk, soos in die geval, hulle weet ons is in so 'n "gangster-stricken" area, maar jy moet hier bly tot half-vier toe. Sommige dae is die kinders al almal huis toe, dan weet jy nie wat kan gebeur aan die einde van die dag nie. Ons het nou al gevra vir die "EMDC" kan ons nie maar saam met die kinders huis toe gaan nie, hulle was nie te vinde daarvoor nie.

A: Dit het presies gebeur in die situasie soos in die geval van juffrou N, toe die skietery begin, toe sê sy elke keer vir my kan ek nie maar huis toe gaan nie, ek dink nie ek kan bly tot vanmmiddag nie. Ek het by juffrou X gevra,

73

ek het by die hoof gevra kan hy nie die skool sluit nie want ek kon sien die

vrou is besig om siek te raak, en toe is dit "Nee", ons kan, ek weet nie

wanneer nie, huis toe gaan. En toe, terwyl ons nog by die skool is, toe kry

juffrou D 'n aanval.

A: En het ons net vroeër huis toe gegaan, dan het dit nie gebeur nie.

B: Dit is so.

G: Of nie net dit nie, of dan "put something in place" wat vir my gaan sê ek is

nou veilig. "You understand?" Ek "mean", ek is nou hier binne, ek moet

hier wees,   maar ek voel veilig. Wat my veiliger sal laat voel, is om te sien

die polisie patrolleer elke vyftien minute, wat nou weer 'n onmoontlike

taak is, want die polisie kan mos nou nie heeldag by die hekke staan nie,

hulle het mos ander werk ook om te doen. So dis wat ons voorgestel het,

laat ons vroeg huis toe gaan, so should something happen, ok, I'm at home.

Nou, wat die treurigste is, is as hulle begin skiet, twintig voor drie, nou

moet ons huis toe gaan.

H: Ja.

G: Of somtyds dan sien jy die gevaar aankom, jy sien hulle hardloop daaikant

toe, jy kan sien hulle is op 'n ding uit, nou's dit "Kom ons kyk maar". Maar

daar is somtyds net nie 'n toegewing nie. Kan ons nie maar gaan nie, want

dit lyk nie lekker hier buite nie. Nou sodra, sê 10 minute na die tyd, nou's

daar 'n skietery, nou hardloop almal deurmekaar... Maar nou bly dit

"protokol, protokol" , jy moet diè laat weet, jy moet daai laat weet. Ek het

eendag hier gesê: "Kan ons nie maar 'n besluit vir onsself maak nie. Die situasie is onveilig, ons moet hier wegkom". Nee, maar ons moet nou ... ons kan mos môre vir hulle laat weet ons het huis toe gegaan. Ons het gegaan. Want dit was daai dag chaos! Maar ons kry nie vir Eugene in die hande nie, ons kry nie vir dàài in die hande nie, is ons nie eers hier twaalfuur, eenuur weg nie, want ons het niemand van die "WCED" in die hande gekry om vir hulle te sê die situasie is onveilig nie, en niemand wou die verantwoordelikheid vat en sê "Okay, as 'n personeel moet ons dit besluit nie".

C: Kyk, ek praat nou van die mense by die "EMDC", hoofkantoor, of waar ook al. Het daar al tydens die skietery of na die skietery, en ek praat nou van voor my tyd ook al, mense gebel of uitgekom na die skietery om te vra is julle "oraait" en te sê: "Kyk julle is onse 'work force', ons is hier. Is julle "oraait", wat kan ons verder vir julle doen?" Net om te wys hulle gee om.

4.3.10 Education programmes

The respondents identified the need for education programmes to educate learners, educators and parents around safety issues as well as gang awareness and alternatives to gangs. No guidance has been received from the Safe Schools Programme in this regard. They also expressed the view that their task is already more difficult than that of educators in areas not affected by crime and violence:

D: ... soos meneer C sê, dit sal goed wees as hulle iemand of persone stuur vir praatjies met die kindes, want wat ek kan aflei van die ouers, hulle sê die kinders is al hierdie dinge gewoond en ons, ek dink ons skool is nog net tot dusver gelukkig dat ons nog nie 'n kind verloor het in die skietery nie. Want kyk, die kinders is nuuskierig, hulle gaan kyk die dinge, ek meen hulle is nie bang en gaan in die huis in nie. Soos die ouers sê, die kinders hardloop uit om te gaan kyk waar is die skietery.

C: Ek het nie 'n probleem as daar van die ouers ook genooi word nie.

B: Ek ook nie.

G: Ek voel 'n mens moet eers die ouers "educate before you can educate the child."

C: Ek sou wou sien daar moet programme wees vir die kinders om hulle op 'n gereelde basis te leer jy moet versigtig wees, dit kan gevaarlik wees. Ek weet nou nie hoe hulle dit moet struktureer nie, maar die kinders se lewens moet beskerm word. En hulle kan selfs met ons "workshops" hê oor veiligheid. Wat moet jy of wat moet jy nie doen nie sodat jy nie jou lewe kan kwytraak nie. Ek dink net sodat ons onderwysers moet weet wat hulle moet doen.

G: Omdat dit somtyds vir die kind die norm is, voel 'n mens jy wil meer "intervention" van die departement af hê om die kind te laat verstaan dit is nie die norm nie.

76

G: Ek voel nogal, ons onderwysers weet wie die kinders is wat aan gangs

behoort. Hier is van die kinders wat aan "gangs" behoort.

C: Dis hoekom ons 'n program moet kry.

G: Ek dink dis Veilige Skole se verantwoordelikheid, die skool kan

"recommendations" doen, maar daar is nie nog tyd vir sulke dinge nie.

Daar moet iemand van buite af inkom om dit te doen.

D: Ja, ons probeer, maar ons taak is baie groter, baie moeiliker as ander

onderwysers wat in die ander areas skoolhou.

4.3.11 Identification and referral of learners at risk of destructive choices

This process is limited and little attention is paid to the referral of learners in need of support. Two of the respondents have referred learners using drugs to the Learning Support Officer who in turn referred them for counseling to a drug rehabilitation agency (SANCA). There has been no feedback on the cases to the class teachers.

G: Ja, soos van ons graad ses leerlinge, hulle is nou weer betrokke by "drugs"

en hulle maak geen geheim daarvan nie... ons kan hom net straf, ... maar

daar is nie veel wat ons aan hom kan doen nie.

C: Daar was 'n geval van 'n mannetjie in my klas wat so dagga gerook het, en

hy was aangemeld by die Learning Support Officer en sy het hom, ek weet

nie of sy saam met hom was nie, maar sy het hom verwys na SANCA, waar

hy getoets is. Ek weet nie of hy weer teruggegaan het nie.

G: 'n Leerling in my klas was ook al daarnatoe.

The process for identifying "at risk" learners to be sent on the camps, sponsored by the Safe Schools Programme, is also not clear.

G: "Safe Schools" stuur ook leerders na Scripture Unionkampe. Die "target group" is, jy meng hom eintlik op, die minder bevoorregtes en die stout mannetjies. Die verhouding moet lekker kan werk. As daar nou net stout mannetjies is, sal daar nie 'n voorbeeld wees nie, nou stuur jy 'n voorbeeldige kind saam dat hulle kan sien jy kan vir jou so gedra as jy wil.

4.4 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

4.4.1 Support provided by the Safe Schools Programme

All respondents agree that the physical structures provided with funding from the Safe Schools Programme is evident. These typically fall under the most common measures in which schools address crime and violence (Capozzoli and McVey, 2000; Eliasov and Frank, 2000; Trump, 1998; Futrell, 1996). These include fences, alarm systems, access control in the form of locked gates and doors and providing counselling to learners. The installation of an intercom system at the school has also greatly improved the

communication between staff members as the announcement of the "danger" code over the intercom system leads to prompt reactions from staff members.

Both the acting principal and the safety officer at the school as well as some of the participants in the focus group, believe that the Safe Schools Programme has provided significant support to the school in the form of practical hands-on assistance and moral support in the initial phase of the programme. Focus group participants who have not been at the school when the programme was started, have, however, never met any of the Safe Schools Programme officials known on first name terms to older staff members. This reflects the need for staff members to feel valued and be acknowledged for trying to educate learners under very trying conditions. These educators, who often feel that their own safety is at risk while at work, need to be supported by the Safe Schools Programme and measures have to be put in place to ensure this.

4.4.2 Safety structures and procedures

The respondents in the two individual interviews, as well as some participants in the focus group, believe that the safety measures and procedures employed at the school have made a significant impact on the safety situation at the school. Certain participants in the focus group, however, believe that there are shortcomings in the safety procedures at the school as the seriousness of the safety drill and evacuation procedure is lost on some of the senior primary learners at the school. As suggested by some focus group participants, the

importance of the safety drills need to be emphasized and learners have to be educated through programmes and workshops to be constantly aware of the potential for gang violence which could place their lives at risk. The attitudes of the senior learners regarding this safety aspect also need to be addressed.

4.4.3 Community involvement

All respondents are in agreement that community involvement is minimal and only extends to the Yellow Door Campaign that was organised by the Safe Schools Programme in an effort to ensure the safety of learners in transit to or from school. Assistance is provided by one member from the community who reports to the school on shootings in the area and advises the school when it is unsafe to dismiss learners. The local Neighbourhood Watch also assists by providing escorts to learners when the area is unsafe. This is not a favourable position for the school to be in as any effective measure to root out crime and violence in the school will depend on the measure in which partnerships can be forged with the community seeking these same aims (Department of Community Safety, 2003; Rosenbaum et al, 1998).

The situation that exists at the school supports the argument of Stevens et al (2001) that schools in areas affected by violence experience a lack of investment in the institution by the broader community. The school will have to make concerted efforts, with the help of the Safe Schools Programme, to forge closer ties with the community and create greater

involvement in the school's efforts to create a safe learning environment.

4.4.4 Cooperation with other government departments

While it was difficult to draw a conclusion about the school's involvement with other government departments from the interview with the acting principal, as he did not appear to be well-informed about this aspect, the safety officer believed that there is significant cooperation between the school and the two police departments, the SAPS and the City Police, based on an improved relationship and prompt reactions to requests for assistance from the school. This same belief in the success of the partnership could not be found in the focus group, where opinions indicated that cooperation between the school and the police is minimal and only evident when police escorts are requested for learners at dismissal time when shootings in the area occur. The view was expressed in the focus group that regular police patrols would be a much appreciated measure for increasing the sense of safety amongst staff members while at school.

This perceived lack of visible policing by the South African Police Services is not a good indicator and is in direct contrast to the approach advocated by the Department of Community Safety (2003) in assisting schools and communities affected by crime and violence. This also falls far short from the ideal of De Wet (2003) for a special police force tasked with school policing. The school needs to address its need for visible policing by playing an active role in the Community Police Forum or by involving a community group

such as the Neighbourhood Watch to advocate on their behalf.

4.4.5 Training of staff members

This very important aspect in preparing staff members and especially the safety committee for the very important task of securing the learners in their care, has been sorely neglected by the Safe Schools Programme. While all respondents believed the training to be minimal, mistakenly assuming that the workshops that the safety officer attended had provided training to her, the true state of affairs is that there has been no formal training at all. The lack of training of the safety officer at the school has clearly not been communicated to the rest of the staff. The importance of training staff members to deal with the effects of crime and violence and, more importantly, preventing crime and violence from destabilising schools is emphasised by many researchers (Barton, 2002; Eliasov and Frank, 2000; Blaauvelt, 1998; Trump, 1998; Goldstein and Conoley, 1997; Futrell, 1996; Goldstein, Apter and Harootunian, 1984).

It is crucial for the Safe Schools Programme to institute some form of formal training to prepare the staff and especially the members of the safety committee to effectively deal with the demands that would be placed on them for ensuring a safe learning environment for the learners.

4.4.6 Parental support

Respondents all believe that parental involvement is limited. Many parents neither play an active part in their children's education nor in ensuring that a safe and nurturing environment is provided in which the children can learn. Some parents also do not take responsibility in assisting the school with the discipline of their children.

A perception exists among staff members that parents are not prepared to take responsibility for the safety of their children, expecting instead that the school will take responsibility for keeping their children safe while at school. Greater efforts from the school are needed to involve parents in all aspects of the school, but especially in safeguarding the children at school or in transit to and from school. It should be important for the Safety Committee of the school to be more representative in its constitution, in this way empowering parents and involving them in the planning and decision-making for ensuring the safety of learners.

4.4.7 The sense of security of staff and learners

The results of this study confirm that gangs and gang-related violence are the biggest threats to the safety of schools as claimed by the MEC for Education in the Western Cape (Parliamentary Monitoring Group, 2002) and a Durban study (Griggs, 1998).

The acting principal believes that the staff and learners at the school feel relatively safe and secure while at school. This was, however, in direct contrast to the opinions expressed in the focus group, where the respondents' feelings of safety ranged from significant to minimal. There is, however, a disparity shown up in the transcripts of one respondent who claimed to feel significantly safe at school while admitting that more regular police patrols and the immediate dismissal of staff at even at just a potential threat to their safety, would make her feel safer. One of the respondents in the focus group makes no excuse for her haste to immediately escape from the area at the sound of gun shots. As she had been severely traumatised by a past incident at school for which she had to seek counselling, she still feels unsafe at school. Respondents in the focus group also expressed their concern for the learners who are exposed to this threat both at school and in the community and refute the common belief that these learners are used to this situation. They have witnessed first-hand how distraught learners can become when their safety is threatened. The effects on the staff and learners are in keeping with the belief of Stevens et al (2001) that learners and educators exposed to violence suffer psychological and social distress, a sense of helplessness and perceptions of constant threat to personal safety.

4.4.8 Support from WCED officials

This issue only emerged in the focus group where participants strongly feel that there is a lack of support and interest in the safety of staff members. They also feel undervalued and disempowered to make decisions concerning their own safety when they are expected to

follow certain rules of protocol even when doing so could put their own safety at risk. This situation could become a severe threat to staff morale, as warned by Futrell (1996), who believes that teachers who feel unsupported by their administrators will be less inclined to take steps to ensure the safety of students.

If the WCED is serious about convincing the staff at this school of their value as educators, mechanisms will have to be put in place by the WCED to ensure improved communication and the staff needs to be acknowledged for their difficult task of teaching in an unsafe area.

4.4.9 Education Programmes

This issue also only emerged in the focus group where there was consensus on the need for education programmes for learners and parents, provided by experts in their fields and arranged by the Safe Schools Programme. Some of the topics discussed include education on drug awareness, parenting skills, talks on safety issues, as well as diversion programmes for learners displaying potentially destructive behaviour. Many researchers advocate prevention strategies and Rosenbaum et al (1998) in their intensive evaluation studies of successful social prevention programmes in the United States, conclude that strategies are usually most successful if the intervention is early and continuous. Griggs (2002) also found social prevention programmes aimed at primary school learners to be more successful. This is an area that requires much and urgent attention by the Safe Schools Programme if they aim to address the effects of crime and violence at this primary school

effectively.

4.4.10 The need for further support from the Safe Schools Programme

Both the respondents in the individual interviews identified the need to address the lack of community involvement through education programmes for parents, as well as skills programmes for learners (computer literacy skills were mentioned by the safety officer) as important elements that are lacking in the support provided by the Safe Schools Programme. These issues have already been discussed under 4.4.3 and 4.4.9.

4.4.11 Identification and referral of learners at risk of destructive choices

It is clear that the school does not have a procedure in place for identifying learners at risk of destructive choices. Respondents in the focus group stated that they were aware of learners taking drugs or who were involved in gangs, but were not clear on what to do once such learners have been identified. The fact that responsibility for the problem of learners involved with drugs is simply passed on to the Learning Support Officer, while no proper communication is established and no feedback given to the class teacher who has to deal with these children, is worrying. Ignoring these precursors to a destructive lifestyle can simply not be excused. The Safe Schools Programme has a crucial role to play in training and advising the staff members at the school on dealing with and supporting learners at risk of gang involvement and drug abuse.

After analysis and interpretation of the data, a summary of the findings was constructed.

This will be presented in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

As stated in Chapter 3, data was collected by means of semi-structured interviews with the acting principal and with the safety officer of the school. A group of staff members was also interviewed in a focus group. The aim of these interviews was to determine stakeholder perceptions about the Safe Schools Programme of the WCED. A range of opinions were elicited on the implementation of the programme and its benefits as well as its limitations. In this chapter a summary of the research findings will be presented. These will then be used to propose some recommendations in the light of the responses of all respondents who were involved in this study. This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section focuses on the summary of the research findings while the second and third sections focus on the recommendations and the conclusions respectively.

5.2 THE SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

After interpretation of the data collected from the school stakeholders, the following research findings could be drawn:

❖ Stakeholders at the school have suffered severe trauma due to gang violence in the area.

Staff members as well as learners have been exposed to potentially life-threatening situations when caught in the crossfire between rival gangs or when gang fights are opportunistically started by gangs when learners are moving to or from school so that these learners in essence become human shields for the warring gangs.

❖ Some staff members have suffered anxiety attacks, hysteria and emotional turmoil due to these events and have been placed on sick leave as a result, some for lengthy periods, suffering financially due to loss of income.

❖ Learners have also suffered trauma as a result of these conditions and some have been referred for trauma counselling.

❖ Learners are further exposed to this same continued violence in the community they come from.

❖ The social conditions of the community also expose learners to alcohol and drug abuse, as well as other social ills.

❖ The parents of learners often do not take an interest in their children's education as this is seen to be the sole responsibility of the school.

❖ Collaboration between the school and parents is very limited and there is no evidence

that parents play an active role in security measures to safeguard their children while at school or in transit to and from school.

❖ While the local Neighbourhood Watch assists the school in times of crises, there is no other involvement of community structures that collectively seek solutions to crime and violence, especially gang violence, which plagues the school. The only support the school received from the community was through the Yellow Door Campaign through which members of the community made their homes available as safe houses for children on their way to or from school caught in the crossfire between warring gangs.

❖ The Safe Schools Programme and its officials provided financial resources as well as hands-on support to the school. Many safety measures have been put in place to secure the school environment, such as fencing, razor wire, security gates and remote-controlled gates.

❖ The installation of an intercom system has greatly improved communication between staff members during crises.

.

❖ Vandalism has been reduced significantly, as well as access control to the school premises greatly improved.

❖ Some staff members are still not at ease while at work and are ever vigilant in surveying

the surroundings and highly reactive to any noise similar to gun shots.

❖ The introduction of the Safe Schools Call Centre has streamlined the process of reporting threats to the safety of learners and staff at the school as these officials often report these threats to the police themselves and usually follow up on reports.

❖ Some respondents believe that officials from the Safe Schools Programme are not visible enough and are not providing the full range of services that could effect greater change in

the attitudes of learners toward the safety procedures employed by the school. Education programmes on the need for vigilance regarding safety issues could improve the cooperation of the senior learners who are currently not taking these safety measures seriously.

❖ The majority of respondents believe that there is a need for parent education programmes in order to support the learners to make the best choices.

❖ Respondents identified a need for learner education programmes about alternatives to gangs, drug awareness, skills training, goal setting and personal empowerment.

❖ There is a lack of professional diversion programmes for learners involved with drugs and those learners at risk of becoming involved with gangs.

❖ There is no clear referral procedure or policy within the Safe Schools Programme guiding the identification and referral of learners needing professional help in dealing with trauma or substance abuse.

❖ The school has a formal safety policy developed with the assistance of the Disaster Management Division of the City Council which includes emergency procedures. Regular safety drills are conducted by the school and learners are experienced in this procedure.

❖ A good relationship exists between the school and the South African Police Services, as well as the City Police and both services respond promptly to calls for assistance from the school.

❖ The majority of respondents would also welcome a more sympathetic approach from the WCED to their concerns for their personal safety when gang fights pose a threat and would want a more flexible approach to the protocol of requesting permission for early closure of the school, as well as awaiting a response.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations have been drawn from the participants in this research study, the researcher, as well the research literature on school violence:

5.3.1 The School Management Team

The school should be supported and encouraged to identify their own problems and develop strategies that are most appropriate for them. Suggested activities include:

❖ Ensuring that students are engaged in schoolwork that is challenging and rewarding.

❖ Adopting a "zero tolerance approach" in order to reduce school violence and crime by defining clearly what is acceptable and unacceptable behaviour and the consequences of these behaviours. Policies should be consistently applied and followed through.

❖ Educating parents, learners and staff on policies and penalties.

❖ Campaigning against parental apathy. Find creative ways of encouraging parent participation in school events. Create an environment that encourages parents to visit the school by having open days and involving parents in school activities.

❖ Empower educators to meet all the needs of the learners, e.g. identifying learning disabilities and providing tutoring, ensuring in this way that learners will not become frustrated with school and their lack of achievement and thus drop out of school and possibly be recruited by gangs.

❖ Provide a safe and nurturing environment, ensure that healthy and open relationships exist between the staff and learners to ensure that learners with personal problems will seek help from the staff.

❖ Provide after-school programmes and recreation at school as alternatives to gang activity.

❖ Provide parent education programmes on relevant topics such as parenting skills,

conflict resolution, drug awareness, gang activity, as well as skills training for personal empowerment.

❖ Encourage behaviour management and provide workshops to parents on alternative discipline methods.

5.3.2 Department of Education

School staff need to be supported and encouraged and valued for their services provided, often under trying conditions. Recognition should be given to the problems the school is faced with. The school could be supported in the following areas. WCED officials should:

❖ Place a high priority on the safety of staff members. A sympathetic approach is needed to staff members who want to evacuate the school after learners have been dismissed during crisis situations when there is a potential threat to their safety.

❖ Monitor the safety situation of the school by making regular enquiries to the school and by asking the school to report on their safety concerns in their quarterly report submitted to the Circuit Manager.

❖ Provide skills training and build the capacity of staff members through in-service training programmes. Specific training in identifying and supporting "at risk" learners is needed.

❖ Provide beter professional services to help the school deal with social problems by appointing more social workers.

5.3.3 Safe Schools Programme officials

❖ Re-establish close ties with the school. Offer moral support and empathetic guidance to all stakeholders.

❖ Develop formal policies and protocol to guide schools in planning their safety policy. These rules of protocol should also include guidelines for identifying and referring "at risk" learners.

❖ Provide links with other agencies to facilitate specialised professional support for learners involved with drugs or gangs, as well as learners traumatised by the ongoing gang fights.

❖ Establish learner education programmes on relevant topics like conflict resolution, drug prevention, self-esteem building, alternatives to gangs, goal setting and personal empowerment.

❖ Provide skills training to educators in order to teach learners practical skills and encourage entrepreneurial activity.

5.3.4 Police Services

❖ Maintain and strengthen close links with the school.

❖ Maintain high visibility. Provide regular patrols of the school vicinity, not only in times of crises.

❖ Extend awareness programmes to senior primary classes as well. At present only junior

classes are targeted.

5.3.5 Community development

Crime and violence are indicators of underlying social problems and will persist until these problems are addressed. Government should mobilise resources to address unemployment, gangsterism and organised crime.

5.4 CONCLUSIONS

The aims of this research study were:

(1) To ascertain school stakeholder perceptions of the Safe Schools Programme and

(2) To establish whether its implementation has brought about a safer learning environment.

The results of the research will be measured against these aims of the study. The research conducted in this study suggests that considerable efforts have been made by the Safe Schools Programme to meet its overall aim of creating a safer learning environment at the school. The school has benefited from the installation of many environmental strategies such as fencing, razor wire and remote-controlled gates and the installation of an intercom system has also greatly improved coordinating prompt responses to emergency situations. Very little evidence could be found of behaviour modification programmes other than the

conflict resolution training educators underwent in 2000 and the trauma counselling provided to learners. This research study could not produce evidence of diversion programmes, either individual or group programmes.

With the assistance of the Safe Schools Programme, the school has also made considerable gains in organising structures (the safety committee) and procedures (the safety policy) that have produced a coordinated approach in reacting to external threats to the safety of learners and staff at the school. These measures greatly add to the sense of security of the school stakeholders while at school, but do not entirely appease their fears.

As the nature of the threats to the safety of learners and staff is external, in the form of gang violence, the school has no control over the situation. Gang violence is a phenomenon for which there can be no simplistic or instant solution. A multi-faceted approach across the board is needed from government, professional and community and religious associations, private citizens, business and the school. Concerted efforts by stakeholders at different levels will have to be implemented if the tide of gang violence is to be stemmed. This does not render the school powerless against the evils of gang violence since these gangsters emerge from the very schools whose operation they disrupt. Therefore the school needs comprehensive education and diversion programmes for learners. With the support and guidance of well developed education and diversion programmes for learners from the Safe Schools Programme, financial resources from the Education Department and cooperation between the community and the police, a more holistic approach could be developed. The

roles of these stakeholders have to be clearly defined in a collaborative approach.

This research study sought to determine school stakeholder perceptions about the Safe Schools Programme but was limited by the exclusion of two important stakeholder groups: learners and parents. Future research could focus on these stakeholders and could possibly uncover valuable insights from their perspectives of the safety issue at the school. Despite these limitations I believe that this study has successfully managed to determine the perceptions of the school stakeholders about the Safe Schools Programme and its impact on the learning environment at the school. The research study revealed the following aspects: (1) Respondents believe that the safety measures introduced by the Safe Schools Programme have had a positive impact on the learning environment as far as reducing vandalism and controlling access to the school premises to a large degree; (2) Certain shortcomings have also been identified by the respondents, which include the lack of a coordinated and collaborative approach between government departments, the lack of diversion programmes for learners, the lack of training for educators, the lack of education programmes for parents and learners and the failure of the programme to sustain community involvement.

REFERENCES

Babbie, E., 2001: The Practice of Social Research: 9th Edition, Wadsworth, Belmont.

Blaauvelt, P.D., 1999: Making Schools Safe for Students , Corwin Press, Inc. , New York.

Barton, E., 2000: Leadership Strategies for Safe Schools, Skylight Training and Publishing

    Inc, Illinois

Basch, C.E., 1987: Focus Group Interview: An Underutilized Research Technique for

    Improving Theory and Practice in Health Education, Health Education Quarterly,

    Vol. 14(4): 411-448

Bell, J: 1993: Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First-Time Researchers in

    Education and Social Science (Second Edition), Open University Press,

    Buckingham

Braaten, S., 1997: Creating Safe Schools: A Principal's Perspective in School Violence

    Intervention: A Practical Handbook, Goldstein and Conoley, The Guilford Press,

    New York

Capozzoli, T. & McVey, R., 2000: Kids Killing Kids: Managing Violence and Gangs in
    Schools, CRC Press LLC, Florida

Cohen, L. & Manion, L., 1994: Research Methods in Education (Fourth Edition),
    Routledge, London.

Cooke, G., 1996: Safe Schools for All in Hoffman,A. M., Schools, Violence and Society,
    Westport, Connecticut

Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 2001: Trends and Issues: School Safety and
    Violence Prevention (Discussion Paper), College of Education, University of
    Oregon.

Constitution of South Africa (Act No. 108 of 1996)

Department of Community Safety, 2003: Community Police Forum Provincial Conference
    Notes, Cape Town.

Derksen, D. & Strasburger, V., 1996: Media and Television Violence: Effects on Violence,
    Aggression,and Antisocial Behaviors in Children in Hoffman, A.M.,
    Schools,Violence and Society, Westport, Connecticut.

De Wet, C., 2003: A media Analysis on Crime in South African Education, South African Journal of Education Vol 23 (1) 36 - 44

Education Department, 2003: Draft School Safety Framework

Eliasov, N. & Frank, C., 2000: Crime and Violence in Schools in Transition: A Survey of Crime and Violence in Twenty Schools in the Cape Metropole and beyond, Institute of Criminology, University of Cape Town, Cape Town.

ELRU and Quaker Peace, 1999: Baseline Study on Research done on Anti-crime Initiatives at School Level, ELRU, Cape Town.

Friday, J., 1996: Weapon-Carrying in Schools in Hoffman, A.M., Schools, Violence and Society, Westport, Connecticut.

Futrell, M., 1996: Violence in the Classroom: A Teacher's Perspective in Hoffman, A.M., Schools, Violence and Society, Westport, Connecticut.

Gillham, B., 2000: The Research Interview, Continuum, London.

Goldstein, A.P., Apter, S.J. & Harootunian, B., 1984: School Violence, Prentice Hall, Inc., New Jersey.

Goldstein, A. & Conoley, J., 1997: School Violence Intervention: A Practical Handbook, Guilford Press, New York

Government Gazette 22754, 2001: Notice 1040

Griggs, R., 1998: Children at Risk. The Security Situation at Durban Schools, Independent Project Trust, Durban.

Griggs, R., 2002: Preventing Crime and Violence in South African Schools: A Review of Learning and Good Practice from Eight Interventions, Open Society Foundation for South Africa, Cape Town.

Harber, C., 2002: Protecting Your School From Violence and Crime, Independent Projects Trust, Durban.

Haugaard., J. & Feerick, M., 1996: The Influence of Child Abuse and Family Violence on Violence in Schools in Hoffman, A.M., Schools, Violence and Society, Westport, Connecticut.

Henkeman, S., Henkeman, S., Kinnes, I., Solomon, J. & Sylvester, A., 1999: Evaluation of Impact of Electric Fence at Manenberg Secondary, Researched for the Western Cape Education Department.

102

Hoffman, A. M., 1996: Schools, Violence and Society, Westport, Connecticut.

Hoffman, A.M. & Summers, R.W, 1996: The Anatomy of Gangs in Hoffman, A.M. Schools, Violence and Society, Westport, Connecticut.

Lamplugh, D., Pagan, B., 1996: Personal safety for Schools, Ashgate Publishing Ltd. Hants.

Lal, S., Lal, D., Achilles, C., 1993: Handbook on Gangs in Schools: Strategies to Reduce Gang-Related Activities, Crwin Press, Inc. , California

Lowenstein, L. F., 1972: Violence in Schools and its Treatment, National Association of Schoolmasters, Hemel Hempstead, Herts.

May, T., 1997: Social Research: Issues, Methods and Processes (Second Edition), Open University Press, Buckingham

Mouton, J., 1996: Understanding Social Research, J.L. van Schaik, Pretoria.

National Education Policy Act (Act No. 27 of 1996)

Netshitahame, N.E. & Vollenhoven, W.J, 2002: School Safety in Rural Schools: Are Schools as Safe as We Think They Are?, South African Journal of Education, Vol. 22(4): 313- 318

Opperman. A.N., 1966: Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement, Printer Publishers, London.

Parliamentary Monitoring Group, 2002: Education, Safety and Security Departments on Monitoring Gangsterism in Western Cape Schools: Briefing, Education Portfolio Committee

Poland, S., 1997: School Crisis Teams in School Violence Intervention: A Practical Handbook, Goldstein and Conoley, The Guilford Press, New York

Powney J., Watts, M., 1987: Interviewing in Educational Research, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London.

Provincial Education Labour Relations Council ,2003: Draft Procedural Manual for Managing Safety and Security Within WCED Institutions

Rosenbaum, D.P, Lurigio, A.J. & Davis, R.C. ,1998: The Prevention of Crime: Social and Situational Strategies, West/ Wadsworth, Belmont

Secretariat for Safety and Security, 1999: Working Document, <u>Towards an Intervention Strategy to Address Youth Violence in Schools</u>.

Shaw, M., 2002: <u>Crime and Policing in Post-Aprtheid South Africa</u>, Hurst & Company, London.

Squelch, J., 2001: Do School Governing Bodies Have a Duty to Create Safe Schools? An Education Law Perspective, <u>Perspectives in Education</u>, Vol. 19 Number 4: 137-149

Stephens, R., 1997: <u>National Trends in School Violence: Statistics and Prevention Strategies in School Violence Intervention: A Practical Handbook</u>, Goldstein and Conoley, The Guilford Press, New York

Stevens, G., Wyngaard, G., Van Niekerk, A., 2001: The Safe Schools Model: An Antidote to School Violence, <u>Perspectives in Education</u>, 19: 145-158

Trump, K.S., 1998: <u>Practical School Security: Basic Guidelines for Safe and Secure Schools</u>, Corwin Press, Inc. , California

Trump, K.S., 1996: Gangs and School Safety in Hoffman, A.M., <u>Violence and Society</u>, Westport, Connecticut.

Vestermark, S.D. Jr., Critical Decisions, Critical Elements in an Effective School Security

    Programme in Hoffman, A.M., <u>Violence and Society</u>, Wetport, Connecticut.

Western Cape Education Department, undated: <u>Bridge the Fence</u> Project Information.

Wragg, E.C., 1978: <u>Guides in Educational Research</u>, TRC, Oxford.

24 Botha Street
KUILS RIVER
7580
Tel: 021- 9030619(H)/021- 3761321 (W)
Fax: 021- 3761062 (W)

16 September 2003

Dr R. Cornelissen
Research Unit
Western Cape Education Department
Private Bag X 9114
CAPE TOWN
8000

Dear Sir

PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH AT ********** PRIMARY SCHOOL

I am a registered M.Tech student at Peninsula Technikon. For my research component, I would like to conduct research on stakeholder perceptions of the Safe Schools Programme in a primary school in Mitchell's Plain.

I hereby wish to apply for permission to conduct my research at ********** Primary School in *********, Mitchell's Plain. The staff at the school has provisionally agreed to allow me to conduct research at their school pending the positive outcome of this application.

The research will entail the following:
❖ An extensive literature search on school violence and responses to this problem
❖ Collecting input from school stakeholders via individual and group interview techniques.

The following people will be included in the research:
❖ The Acting Principal
❖ The Safety Officer
❖ A sample of staff members

It is my intention to conduct the research outside of normal teaching hours.

I hope that this application will be considered favourably.

Yours faithfully

....
Ms JL Powrie

APPENDIX B

Navrae
Enquiries   Dr R. S. Cornelissen
IMfibuzo

Telefoon
Telephone   (021) 467-2286
IFoni

Faks
Fax   (021) 425-7445
IFeksi

Verwysing
Reference   25/09/03
ISalathiso

Wes-Kaap Onderwysdepartement

Western Cape Education Department

ISebe leMfundo leNtshona Koloni

Ms Joy Powrie
24 Botha Street
KUILSRIVER
7580

RESEARCH PROPOSAL: A STUDY OF THE SCHOOL STAKEHOLDER PERCEPTIONS OF THE SAFE SCHOOL PROGRAMME AT A PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Your application to conduct the above-mentioned research in schools in the Western Cape has been approved subject to the following conditions.

1. Principals, educators and learners are under no obligation to assist you in your investigation.
2. Principals, educators, learners and schools should not be identifiable in any way from the results of the investigation.
3. You make all the arrangments concerning your investigation.
4. Educators' programmes are not to be interrupted.
5. The study is to be conducted from 25th September 2003 to 26th September 2003.
6. No research can be conducted during the fourth term as schools are preparing and finalizing syllabli for examinations (October to December 2003).
7. Should you wish to extend the period of your survey at the school(s) please contact Dr R.S. Cornelissen at the contact numbers above quoting the reference number.
8. A photocoy of this letter is submitted to the principal of the school where the intended research is to be conducted.
9. Your research will be limited to the following school: **Primary School.**
10. A brief summary of the content, findings and recommendations is provided to the Director: Education Research.
11. The Department receives a copy of the completed report/dissertation/thesis addressed to:

The Director: Education Research
Western Cape Education Department
Private Bag 9114
CAPE TOWN
8000

We wish you success in your research.

Kind regards

HEAD: EDUCATION
DATE: 2003 09 25

APPENDIX C

Consent Form for Participants

A study of school stakeholder perceptions of the WCED's Safe Schools Programme in a primary school.

I _____ (*full name and surname in print*) hereby give consent for data collected from me by means of interviews to be used in the above-mentioned research project. I have been informed that permission to collect data in this school has been obtained from the WCED.

The aim of the study has been explained to me as being to ascertain school stakeholder perceptions of the Safe Schools Programme in addressing crime and violence in a primary school. I am also aware that participation in this study is voluntary and that I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time if I so wish; that information gathered from the study will be treated as highly confidential and that neither the school nor any respondent will be identified in the final report.

I am assured that the information will be used for research purposes only and that there is no risk involved in participating in this study.

Signed at .... (*place*) on ....(*date*).

Signature of participant   : ....

Signature of witness   : ....

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. What were the circumstances that led to the school being identified as needing support in terms of safety?
1. Watter omstandighede het daartoe aanleiding gegee dat die skool geïdentifiseer is as hulpbehoewend in terme van veiligheid?

2. What kind of support has the Safe Schools Programme provided to the school?
2. Watter ondersteuning het die Veilige Skole Program hierdie skool gebied?

3. In what way have these measures affected security at the school?
3. Hoe het hierdie maatreëls die veiligheid van die skool geaffekteer?

4. What additional support, if any, do you think your school needs from the Safe Schools Programme?
4. Watter bykomende ondersteuning, indien enige, dink u, benodig u skool van die Veilige Skole Program?

5. What safety structures exist at school?
5. Watter veiligheidheidstrukture bestaan daar by die skool?

6. What are the safety concerns at the school?
6. Watter bekommernisse het die skool rondom veiligheid?

7. What involvement does the school have with other safety structures?
7. Hoe betrokke is die skool by ander veiligheidstrukture?

8. What has been the most recent challenges to the safety of learners and/or staff at the school?
8. Wat was die mees onlangse bedreiging vir die veiligheid van leerlinge en/of opvoeders by die skool?

9. What procedures are followed in the case of a safety threat to the school and are these part of a formal policy at the?

9. Watter prosedure word in die geval van 'n bedreiging van die skool se veiligheid gevolg, en is dit deel van 'n formele beleid?

10. In your own opinion, has the Safe Schools Programme helped to create a safer learning environment?

10. Het die Veilige Skole Program, na u mening, gehelp om 'n veiliger leeromgewing te skep?

11. What do you think other schools could learn from your school's experience with the Safe Schools Programme?

11. Wat dink u kan ander skole uit hierdie skool se ondervinding met die Veiliger Skole Program leer?

APPENDIX E: FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW GUIDE

Interviewees were asked to respond to the following themes:

➢ The school's involvement with the Safe Schools Programme;

➢ The circumstances that led to the identification of the school as an "at-risk school";

➢ The nature of the support received from the Safe Schools Programme;

➢ The safety concerns of the school;

➢ The most recent challenges to the safety of learners and staff;

➢ The safety structures that exist at the school;

➢ The possible need for further support from the Safe Schools Programme;

APPENDIX F: EXCERPTS FROM THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE INTERVIEW WITH THE ACTING PRINCIPAL

I: What kind of support has the Safe Schools Programme provided to the school?

R: They safeguarded the school by giving money to the school for the grills against the windows and fencing. For grades one to three they brought in final year psychology students to help the learners to deal with the trauma of the shooings. Afterwards, psychologists came in to talk to the teachers. They've also arranged different workshops with the safety committee.

I: Did the teachers undergo any training when the school became part of the Safe Schools Programme?

R: Not that I know of... I think the coordinator here at the school went for training, she's the only person.

I: How have these measures affected or how have they impacted on the school? The security measures.

R: Vandalism dropped a lot. We never had any break-ins after that. Only a few minor break-ins. We have no windows thrown in, all our windows are now covered with mesh.

I: What additional support, if any, do you think the school needs from Safe Schools?

R: Additional support...

I: Do you see the need for any further support or do you feel that their job is now done at the school?

R: My honest opinion is that we should train teachers to run certain courses with parents and with the children. At the moment there is this idea that the school is just a building, it is not for the   community. That is my perception. I think it is like that everywhere. If you can have literacy
classes for the community, get the parents in, what the people need here in the community, and if Safe Schools can do that through the teachers, that's the kind of support I would go for, that they must provide.

I: How involved would you say the parents are in the running of the school or as far as securing the children at the school is concerned?

R: Their only concern is sending the children to school and to come and pick them up when

113

there is shooting. They are not that involved in the safety of the school. They believe that is the responsibility of the teachers.

I: Are there any parents on your safety committee?

R: Not that I know of. Only a governing body member.

I: What safety structures exist at school?

R: We have this code of conduct, where the children should go to, we have this yellow door thing at intervals, children can go to classes that are marked with yellow dots. We also have safety drills.

I: What would you say are the safety concerns of this particular school? Or what kind of situations pose a threat to security at the school?

R: It's only the gangster activity.

I: So you don't have any severe disciplinary problems at the school that you feel are a threat to the security of the whole school?

R: No.

I: What involvement does the school have with any other safety structures in the community?

R: None.

I: Is there communication between the school and the police?

R: The police, that type of thing, yes. That's all.

I: But no other structures in the community?

R: No other structures ... And the Neighbourhood Watch.

I: What has been the most recent challenge to security at the school?

R: The most recent challenge?

I: Did anything happen in the past couple of months that posed a challenge to the security of the school?

R: In the past months? Could it be in this year?

I: Yes.

R: No. Except for children coming here with toy guns, pellet guns, that kind of thing, but it was just children playing, but we treated it as very serious.

I: And in the community? Were there any serious incidents within this year? Shooting?

R: No, not while we were at school. We heard shooting in the area and parents came to fetch their children, but not close to the school.

I: When was the last time the school was really affected by something major, even if it wasn't in this year?

R: The only major thing I can think of is the day they were shooting here, that's the only major thing. And after that the principal was caught in the crossfire.

I: When was that?

R: I think that was last year. Around the beginning of last year.

I: Could you expand a bit on the procedures that are followed in the case of a threat to the school.

R: We close all the gates, code 39 is announced, that means that the teachers must close their doors and the security gates, no-one outside, the safety committee get together with the principal to evaluate the situation. Parents who come to pick up their children, only those children who the parents ask for, can go. We inform the department, we inform Safe Schools, get hold of the Neighbourhood Watch and with the police's help, we dismiss the children before the official closing time.

I: In your opinion, Sir, do you feel that the Safe Schools Programme has helped to create a safer learning environment for the children?

R: Yes. There is no easy access to the school at the moment, especially with the enclosed boundaries. We've got more control of who's coming in and going out.

I: And do you think that the learners feel safer and that the teachers feel safer at school?

R: I should hope so.

APPENDIX G: EXCERPTS FROM THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE INTERVIEW WITH THE SAFETY OFFICER

O: Watter ondersteuning het Veiliger Skole spesifiek vir hierdie skool gebied?

R: Toe ek hier kom, toe was hier niks tralies nie, niks "mesh" aan die vensters nie, hier was niks nie en alles wat jy hier sien het van 1999 af opgegaan. Die tralies rondom, die "mesh", die tralies by die ingange, alles. Die laaste hekke wat opgesit was, was by die toilette verlede jaar nadat hulle daar ingebreek het. Toe moes ons die skool sluit, want die pype was alles gesteel uit die toilette uit en toe het ons weer geld gekry om die toilette te beveilig.

O: Was die afstandbeheerde hekke alles in 1999 aangebring?

R: Nee, ons skool het R 60 000 rand gekry in 3 fases. Ons moes'n besigheidsplan opstel vir R 20 000 en dan kom enige koördineerder uit na die skool toe as die werk klaar is om te kyk of die werk wel gedoen is, dan teken hy 'n vorm en dan gaan haal ek die tjek by hoofkantoor. Ek bel net om te hoor of die tjek gereed is. Later het dit meer gevorderd geraak en dan sit hulle dit sommer in die skool se rekening.

O: Was dit R 20 000 per jaar?

R: Nee, dit was per fase. Ons het dit in 3 fases gekry, maar ons het ook baie ander fondse agterna gekry, want in 1999 het dit nie so swaar gegaan nie, maar in 2000, Augustus, was dit net chaos.

O: Wat bedoel u daarmee?

R: Toe het die skietery begin. Een oggend voor skool het 2 bendelede met gewere omgehardloop van agter af, ****straat om en deur die skool gehardloop om weer agter uit te gaan. Hulle het, ek het dit nie gesien nie, moes hulle iemand gejaag het, natuurlik. Dit het aanleiding gegee dat ek en die hoof vir Eugene gebel het, want van die onderwysers, veral onderwyseresse, het siek geraak, inmekaar geval, "anxiety attacks" gekry. Onderwysers, sowel as baie van die leerders, het histeries geraak en na daardie voorval was Eugene onmiddelik op die toneel en hy het vir die mense gevra wat wil julle hier hê? Dit is toe dat die veiligheidshekke aangekom het, "mesh" teen die vensters en die ingange is ook toegemaak van die skool.

O: Watter impak het hierdie maatreels gehad op die skool? Al hierdie veiligheidsmaatreëls wat Veilige Skole verskaf het?

116

R: Dit het 'n geweldige verandering gemaak.

O: Kan u miskien 'n bietjie meer uitbrei?

R: Voorheen het ek en die polisie vasgesit, jy weet mos hoe die onderwysers vir jou druk, "Die skool moet toe, die skool moet toe". Ouers het voorheen net gehardloop na die skool toe en die ouers gaan met die kinders uit, een ouer vat sommer 50 kinders. Later het ons vergadering gehou met die ouers en daar het ons besluit ons gaan 'n groep ouers vra om veilige huise beskikbaar te stel sodat hierdie kinders, as hulle soggens op pad is skool toe of na skool, dan kan hierdie kinders weet waar om skuiling te soek. "Safe Schools" het ook vir ons "stickers" gemaak en daardie "sticker" moet op die venster of die deur geplak wees en dan het die leerders geweet hulle kan by daardie huise inhardloop. Ons het uitgevind die bendes gebruik die kinders as "shields", daarom skiet hulle voor skool en hulle weet wanneer die skole uitgaan. Die polisie het eers baie ongevoelig gestaan teenoor ons. Hulle het nie verduidelikin die eerste plek nie, toe ek nou meer met die polisie gekommunikeer het, het hulle vir my laat verstaan dat die kinders bemoeilik hulle taak. Hulle bly nie in die huis in nie, die kinders is in hulle pad die tyd wanneer hulle die geweld, die skietery, in die area stop. Dan wil ek ook net noem, in 2000, daardie tyd het dit so gevaarlik geraak dat 'n groep onderwysers het, ek weet nie hoe die boodskap by hulle uitgekom het nie, ek was agter by die skolierpatrollie, maar 'n groep onderwysers het teruggedraai en hulle het by die areakantoor gaan wag en hulle is met polisiebegeleiding skool toe gebring. Daar is toe besluit ek gaan 'n groep onderwysers bel as daar skietery in die area is en die hoof gaan 'n groep bel en hulle aansê om te wag by die polisiekantoor of by die areakantoor.

O: Het dit ooit nodig geraak om die plan uit te voer?

R: Ons het dit seker 2 of 3 keer uitgevoer. En nog iets wat ek moet noem, is daardie tyd het Eugene vergader met ons en die "army" het toe ingekom Die weermag was hier vir plus-minus 2 weke het hulle gebly op ons skool. En ons was meer veilig en het meer gemoedsrus gehad. En die onderwysers was later, toe hulle moes vertrek, baie skrikkerig en bekommerd oor wat gaan gebeur.

O: Dit alles het in 2000 plaasgevind?

R: Dit het alles gebeur ....

O: En die weermag was nie agterna weer betrokke by die skool nie?

R: Ja, ek het verskeie vergaderings bygewoon.

O: Maar hulle hulp is deur Veiliger Skole ingeroep? Deur Eugene Daniels op daardie stadium?

117

R: Eugene en Helen Zille. Helen Zille het ook uitgekom en daar is ook 'n "march" gehou om te wys hulle stel belang in die kinders se veiligheid, asook die veiligheid van die onderwysers en die gemeenskap. Maar daar is nooit 'n kind, 'n leerling aan onse skool raakgeskiet of doodgeskiet nie. Ek weet van leerders by ander skole maar nie by ons nie, nooit.

O: Sê u dit ter ondersteuning daarvan dat u glo dat dit wat Veilige Skole gedoen het vir die skool'n groot impak op die veiligheid van die skool gehad het?

R: Ja, dit maak nog altyd 'n groot verskil.

O: Hoe maak dit 'n verskil?

R: Want ons veiligheidsmaatreëls wat ons toepas verseker dat kinders by ons skool bly. Ons het 'n normale skooldag, nie "normale" normaal nie, maar die kinders kan by die skool bly, want as die hekke toe is, en as kode 39 afgekondig word...

O: Wat is kode 39?

R: ...afgekondig word, dan weet die onderwysers hule moet die veiligheidshekke toesluit.

O: Kan u verduidelik wat kode 39 is?

R: Kode 39 is om vir die onderwysers te sê hulle skiet in die area naby die skool. So dis nie nodig om meer te verduidelik aan die ouers nie, hulle is bewus daarvan en die veiligheidspan word vorentoe geroep. Hulle hat hulle punte, hulle weet waar om te staan om te kyk hoe die gebied is en dan word die polisie ingeroep. Die prosedure is: Ons bel die "Safe Schools Call Centre", ons bel die polisie of hulle bel die polisie. Ons doen al hierdie dinge. Die skretarresse is ook baie betrokke. Sy is ook in die span, die "safety team", en sy help ook vir ons met die oproepe. Ek het verskeie selfoonnommers van die polisiekapteins en –superintendente. Ons bel hulle sommer direk.

O: *Dit is natuurlik baie gerusstellend om sommer direk te kan skakel?*

R: Ja, ons het eers nie daardie kommunikasie gehad nie, maar nadat ons ... die onderwysers is nou maar woelig en kriewelrig, maar ons probeer dit so normaal as moontlik, ons wys nie ons is bekommerd in ons hart nie, ons loop maar net vinnig ensovoorts. En ons uitkykpunte is maar altyd daar agter op die hoek, op die trap en hier op die hoek om te kyk na die velde waar hulle altyd skiet.

O: Behalwe vir die beveiliging van die skool, die strukture wat aangebring is om die skool te beveilig, het Veiliger Skole op enige ander manier u ondersteun?

R: Ja, ek het ook na 'n "horticulture" projek. Dis een van die projekte wat hulle geloods het, en daar het ek gegaan vir 'n werkswinkel na Elgin toe. Daar het ons vir die naweek geleer hoe om bome te plant en die verskillende soorte grond. Karen Jansen was daardie tyd die "coordinator" van "horticulture" en ek het 'n pragtige tuin gehad hier buite, maar dit het ongelukkig nou tot niet gegaan. Met die verloop van tyd het ek dit nie meer gedoen nie want daar was nie die ondersteuning gewees nie. Ek het dit later in die hande van twee mans gelaat en toe het daar later klagtes gekom. Mense het begin kla oor wat naweke in die tuin gebeur, hulle rook "slow boats" en toe het dit maar doodgeloop.

O: Wat dink u was die doel met hierdie tuinbouprojek?

R: Dit was vir selfversogring, en ook om geld te maak. Ons het ook die groente verkoop. Ons het baie beet en wortels gehad. Die tuin was pragtig.

O: So dit was vir die skool om fondse in te samel?

R: Ja.

O: Om 'n veiliger leeromgewing te skep? Of wat was die doel daaragter?

R: Om die skool te verfraai. Ouers kon sien hier is nie net 'n skietery nie. Daar kom 'n verbetering en die kind dink nie net heeldag aan skietery nie.

O: So, dit was vir afleiding?

R: Ja.

O: Behalwe die tuinbouprojek, was daar enige ander projekte wat geloods is?

R: Ja, die "cane" projek. Die "cluster" wat ons gehad het, die ****** -"cluster", het bestaan uit skool 1, skool 2 en skool 3. Ons het heel eerste die "cane"- projek begin en daar het ons die probleemleerlinge van graad 4 tot graad 7 geïdentifiseer en hulle elke Dinsdag en Donderdag na skool 1 toe gegaan. Daar het ons geleer, eers die onderwysers en dan agterna die leerdres, hoe om te maak. En die projek was 'n reuse-sukses.

O: Bestaan dit nog steeds?

R: Die "cluster" is so te sê platgeval.

O: En die projek?

R: Dit was 'n reuse-sukses want die "cluster" is ook genader deur die televisieprogram, Education Express, om 'n opname te maak en dit uit te saai.

O: Maar die projek het opgehou en die cluster bestaan ook nie meer nie?

R: Die "cluster" het platgeval. Hy bestaan nog steeds in naam, want daar is nog heelwat fondse in die "cluster"-rekening.

O: Wat is die idee met die geld wat beskikbaar is in die "cluster"- rekening?

R: Mondelings is toestemming gekry deur Brian Jaftha om ons gedeelte van die geld te gebruik om ons trauma-klaskamer reg te maak.

O: Wat is die idee met die trauma-klaskamer?

R: Dikwels, as daar skietvoorvalle soggens of gedurende skooltyd is, dan is baie van die leerders en onderwysersgetraumatiseer en dan moet ek die leerders hier inbring tot ek vir Lynn van "Safe Schools" in die hande kan kry om hulle te hulp te wees.

O: Wat doen Lynn?

R: Lynn is die psychologist" van "Safe Schools". En dan het ek onderwysers gestuur vir sielkundige behandeling in Wynberg.

O: Hoeveel onderwysers was dit?

R: Ek praat onder korreksie, maar dit is plus-minus 5 onderwysers. Sommige het na private dokters gegaan.

O: Op wie se aanbeveling was dit?

R: Dit is op aanbeveling van wat ek hier waargeneem het en op 'n stadium was dit so deurmekaar dat onderwysers nie in die klasse wou bly nie, en dan skree hulle: "Maar hoekom gaan jy nie", en dan neem jy mos waar maar die onderwyser is onder geweldige druk. Dan roep ek die onderwyser . Die eerste wat ek doen is om die skoolkliniek te bel vir hulle sielkundiges en dan praat hulle hier.Agterna dan sien jy maar die onderwyser of daai onderwyser het hulp nodig dan nader ons vir Wynberg vir...

O: Is dit by 'n inrigting in Wynberg?

R: Nee, dis 'n private plek wat "Safe Schools" ook betaal. Daar's ook onderwysers wie se geld al afgetrek is omdat hulle nie meer siekteverlof gehad het nie, want onderwysers was af vir 6 maande en langer, maar hulle het eers verlede jaar vir my genader. Ek weet mos nie wat gaan op 'n onderwyser se "pay slip" aan nie en toe het ek vir Narriman genader om 'n vergadering te hou met van die onderwyseresse en omdat die 9 maande al reeds verstreke was om aansoek te doen dat hulle haar geld terugbetaal, kon ons dit

nie regkry nie. Maar Narriman het ook moeite gedoen en daar is gesien dit is te laat.

O: Ek lei af dat die juffrou a.g.v. stres weens die skietery af was.

R: Dit was. Ek en die hoof het persoonlik die juffrou dokter toe geneem. Toe ontdek ons agterna dat die juffrou nie "medical aid" het nie. Narriman het ook met die onderwysers gepraat wat so siek was en gesê dit is belangrik dat hulle aan 'n mediese fonds behoort. En toe moes ons die juffrou daarvandaan vat na die "general practitioner" toe.

O: Is dit die ergste geval waarvan u bewus is?

R: Nee, hier was 'n juffrou wat weke in die hospitaal was en sy was ook af vir plus-minus 6 maande of langer.

O: Is dit a.g.v. stres of die skietery?

R: Net na die skietery het dit gebeur. Al die onderwysers wat so siek geword het.

O: Is dit die skietvoorval in 2000 waarna u verwys?

R: Dit is so, al die skietvoorvalle.

O: U het genoem van die traumaberading wat leerders kry deur Veiliger Skole, die projekte wat geloods is om die kinders besig te hou, is daar enige ander tipe ondersteuning wat Veilige Skole vir u gebied het? Opleiding van enige aard?

R: Ons het die prefekte weggeneem op 'n 3-dae Team Building projek. Ek was nou nie saam nie. Dan is dit die Scripture Union kamp waar ons 'n paar leerders het op so 'n naweek gestuur.

O: Het die onderwysers enige opleiding gehad? Of het die senior personeel of die beheerliggaam van die kool enige opleiding gehad?

R: Nee. Ek het ook geen formele opleiding gehad nie, ek het maar gehoor by werkswinkels of vergaderings wat ander skole maak, dan het ek dit maar kom oordra. Maar ons het gereelde "safety drills" by die skool. En die kinders en die onderwysers weet presies wat dit behels.

O: Is dit op aanbeveling van Veilige Skole?

R: Dis op aanbeveling van die "City Council" se "Disaster Management"-afdeling.

O: Hoe het die skool by hulle betrokke geraak?

R: Ek het vir hulle geskakel en toe het twee mans uitgekom en hulle het vir ons gehelp.

O: Was dit die skool se eie inisiatief?

R:Ja., maar oral het "Safe Schools" 'n hand in gehad. Hulle het altyd leiding gegee, gesê: "X jy kan dit doen, probeer dit of probeer dat."

O: Was enige van dit op skrif of was dit telefoniese gesprekke of vergaderings wat julle gehad het?

R: Nee, dit was maar telefoniese gesprekke of as Narriman gekom het, het sy gevra om met my te praat en dan het ons gesels en ek het gedoen wat sy gesê het. Of ek vra vir haar oor 'n probleem met onderwysers wat nie hulle samewerking wil gee nie, of die "safety team" wat wil bedank. Sommige kere dan raak onderwysers mos maar kriewelrig en dan dink jy maar ek word net gesê ek moet dit of dat doen en as hulle bedank het, het ek dit maar net gelos en probeer om iemand te kry.

O: Iewers in die literatuur van Veiliger Skole word daar gepraat van konflikhantering. Het julle enige opleiding in die hantering van konflik ontvang?

R: Ja , die skool het konflikresolusie gedoen, maar dit het te doen gehad met die gebeure wat ek hier gekry het.

O: Kan u so 'n bietjie uitbrei daaroor?

R: Hier was vreeslike konflik tussen die onderwysers en die hoof by die skool.

O: So u sê dat dit nie verband gehou het met die veiligheidsomstandighede by die skool nie?

R: Nee, dit het niks te doen gehad met die veiligheid van die skool nie.

O: Maar die befondsing het van Veilige Skole gekom?

R: Daar was nie fondse betrokke nie want Narriman het dit hier kom doen. Narriman en Karen het dit by die skool kom doen. Die kursus was vir omtrent 8 weke, na skool.

O: En altwee van hulle is van Veilige Skole?

R: Ja.

O: So dit was hulle inisiatief, om 'n probleem op te los wat die skool sou bevoordeel?

R: Ja, toe ek hier kom, het die department d.m.v. die areakantoor onderhoude kom voer. Net so 'n dik vraelys het hulle gegee vir die onderwysers en dan moes jy die vrae beantwoord het, en hulle het toe die mense gestuur na die skool toe.

O: Was dit voor die totstandkoming van Veilige Skole?

R: In daardie tyd het Veilige Skole tot stand gekom. Maar hierdie konflik het niks te doen gehad met die skietery nie.

O: U het genoem van die veiligheidspan wat by die skool is. Is dit die enigste veiligheidstruktuur wat by die skool bestaan of watter ander veiligheidstrukture is daar?

R: Dit is al wat hier bestaan.

O: Kan u miskien uitbrei oor die funksies van hierdie span?

R: Sodra die sekretaresse 'n oproep kry van ouers - ouers bel altyd die skool om te se van skietery of ouers hardloop na die skool toe - sal die sekretaresse vir my roep oor die interkom. O, wat ons ook gekry het is die interkom, omdat Eugene besluit het dit is belangrik vir die skool. En dan sê sy my ek moet kantoor toe kom en dan kondig ek sommer oor die interkom "kode 39" af, soos ons besluit he tom dit te doen. Dan weet die onderwysers presies wat dit behels. Hulle sluit die sekuriteitshekke en indien ons skote naby die skool hoor, dan weet die kinders hulle moet plat lê op die vloer in die klaskamer en so ver as moontlik wegkom van die vensters af.
En die onderwyser langsaan sal altyd weet om na my klas toe te gaan om die veiligheidshek te sluit. Die hoof, of ek of die sekretaresse sal die nodige oproepe maak na die polisie toe, of na "Safe Schools" en wie ook al.

O: Watter tipe probleme ondervind u? Wat is die skool se bekommernisse rondom veiligheid op hierdie stadium?

R: Op die oomblik is daar nie eintlik 'n groot bekommernis nie. Al wat nog makeer, is ons moet nog geld kry vir ag veiligheidshekke in die JP departement agter.

O: Verwag u om dit van Veilige Skole te kry?

R: Ek hoop om dit te kry, maar dit is nie 'n prioriteit op die oomblik nie, want volgens my waarneming, en van die seniors se kant af hier by die skool is ons "ge-secure".Daarom bly ons by die skool tydens skietvoorvalle tot 'n sekere tyd en dan volg ons die prosedure van 12.30 af. Die prosedure is dat die kinders voor die amptelike sluitingstyd van die skool verdaag, want dan is die kind al by die huis voor die amptelike tyd.

O: Is dit omdat die bendes die kinders gebruik as ...

123

R: *Gebruik as "shields". En ons het ook kontak met die hoof van die hoërskool* hier naby wat as daar skietvoorvalle is, sy hulp kom aanbied. Ons het ook kontak met die naaste laerskool.

O: Wat was die mees onlangse geval?

R: Die mees onlangse geval was verlede jaar Oktober. Die oggend toe hulle geskiet het het die hoof in trane uitgebars. Hier by die robot op die hoek het 'n ou met 'n "gun" vir haar "ge-point" en die robot was rooi, daarom moes die karre stop. Die hoof was vreeslik getraumatiseer en by die hoof was 'n ander onderwyser. Nadat ek vir Narriman gebel het, het ons bsluit dat die hoof en die meneer huis toe geneem moes word. En daarna, dis waarom ek sê 'n mens kan nie die dinge bepaal nie, het ons personeelvergadering gehad en die skool sou normaal aangaan. En daar het die eerste onderwyser, dit is die onderwyser wat altyd die "anxiety attacks" kry, onmiddellik daar "ge-collapse" in die "staffroom". Terwyl daar nog gepraat was, het die onderwysers sommer hulle stem dik gemaak en gesê ons moet die skool sluit. Baie het begin huil en gedink die vrou is nou besig om te sterf. Ons het een van die menere gevra om die juffrou dokter toe te neem en ons het besluit die onderwysers moet huis toe gaan sodra die kinders almal by die huis is.

O: *Het die skool toe onmiddellik verdaag?*

R: Dit het tyd gevat, maar ons het gesê die onderwysers wat voel om onmddellik te gaan, moet gaan en ons "management" het gebly tot die laaste kind weg is. Want ons het hier plus-minus   vier   leerders   van   Khayelitsha   wat   per   taxi   vervoer   word.

O: U het alreeds uitgebrei oor die prosedures wat u volg om almal in kennis te stel. Wat sou u nog graag wil hê moet Veilige Skole vir u doen? U het reeds baie ondersteuning gekry van Veilige Skole, veral met die beveiliging van die skool, wat anders sou u wou hê van Veilige Skole?

R: *Op die oomblik kan ek aan niks dink nie.* Miskien moet hulle vir ons 'n "computer"-klaskamer gee.

O: Hoe dink u sal 'n komper-klaskamer help?

R: Ek het nou al by verskeie skole in Tafelsig gevra wat die grootste probleem in hulle klaskamers is en hulle sê, behalwe die onbeskoftheid, is dit die kappery op die banke. Ek weet niehoekom
kap hulle nie, want op 'n stadium het ek gesien as die skietery so op hulle ergste is, het ek het dit ook later gedoen en baie onderwysers ook. So het ek opgelet. Jy is nie bewus jy doen dit nie, maar jou hande kap op die tafel. Ek weet nie wat dit is nie, maar die kinders kap op die banke en dit irriteer jou.

124

O: Bring u dit in verband met die spanning in die area?

R: Definitief. Wat ook opvallend is van die leerders by hierdie skool, is baie van die mense wat nie bekend is met hierdie gebied nie, dink die kinders is gewoond daaraan. Die kinders is vreesbevange. En dit is nie dat die kind nou wil "perform" nie, dit is regtigwaar. Ek het dit persoonlik ervaar en sien dit telkemale as daar geskiet word. Die kinders is bang.

O: En hoe bring u dit in verband met diekomperklaskamer?

R: As hule iets het om hulle hande mee besig te hou en hulle gedagtes is op 'n ander projek gevestig, of wat ook al, voel ek, sal dit 'n groot hulp wees, maar ek weet nie of "Safe Schools" dit gaan gee nie.

O: So, u is tevrede met die hulp wat die skool al reeds ontvang het?

R: Heeltemal. Kyk, ons kan sê ons skool het die meeste uit "Safe Schools" hier in die omgewing gebaat.

O: Is dit omdat julle een van die eerste skole was?

R: Ja. En dan ook, toe die skietery op die hoogtepunt was, het e-tv nou betrokke geraak en hulle het onderhoude met die leerders gevoer en dit op televisie uitgesaai. En verlede jaar was ek en 'n leerder genader, maar dit was meer oor "Gun Free", om op Cape Talk 'n telefoniese onderhoud toe te staan.

O: Gun Free? Is hulle betrokke by die skool?

R: Ons is een van hulle "pilot" skole.

O: Sou u sê, na u mening, dat Veilige Skole wel gehelp het om 'n veiliger leeromgewing by die skool te skep?

R: Hulle het 'n geweldige groot verskil gemaak.

O: U het genoem dat daar nog steeds skietery aan die gang is, selfs nadat die skool beveilig is.

R: Nog steeds. Daar is altyd maar skietery. Die afgelope jaar was dit stil tot omtrent middel Augustus, toe begin dit weer. Daar was weer 'n paar voorvalle waar ons die veiligheidsprosedure moes volg.

O: Sê u, ten spyte van die voorvalle wat nog altyd aangaan, is die skool nou veiliger as wat

dit voorheen was?

R: Die skool is baie veiliger.

O: Sou u sê dat die leerlinge en onderwysers ook veiliger voel by die skool?

R: Definitief.

G: Daar was fondse beskikbaar en dan was dit ook die geval dat ons die elemente kon uithou, dat ons meer kontrole kon uitoefen oor wie in en uit.

E: Want een van die onderwysers se karre is al hier voor die kantoor gedurende skoolure gesteel.

O: Juffrou N, u is nou nuut by die skool en meneer T ook. U is albei omtrent twee jaar by die skool. Wat het u persoonlik ervaar? Was daar enige bedreiging vir u veiligheid of die veiligheid van die leerders of ander personeellede?

F: Wel, verlede was daar 'n skietery, dit was nou eintlik die eerste keer wat ek dit nou regtig *ondervind het, en vir my was dit nogal ... ek was nogal bang gewees. Nie dat ek nou* gehuil het nie, maar daai knop het so in my keel gekom en ek het nog nooit gesien die kinders hardloop so in die rondte vir hulle lewe nie en dit was asof dit 'n alledaagse ding was. So vir my was dit ook 'n ondervinding.

O: 'n Baie traumatiese een?

O: Meneer C, het u enigiets ervaar in die tyd dat u by die skool is?

C: Juffrou, vandat ek by die skool gekom het, het ek sommer vinnig dinge uitgevind, van wat alles in plek is en wat gedoen moes word. Daar was natuurlik "safety drills" gewees en ek het geweet na watter klasse hulle na toe moes hardloop en dis hoe ek geweet het wat aangaan. Daar was nie skietery gewees nie, nog nie vandat ek hier is nie, nie op die skool self nie, maar wel in die area. Daar was tye wat ons die kinders moes hou wanneer die klok moes lui, voor die kinders kon huis toe gaan. Eers moes ons seker maak dat die polisie in die area patrolleer. Dit kan traumaties wees, ja. Dan was daar ook tye gewees wat ek by van my ander kollegas kon sien dit was te veel vir hulle. My kollega net hier langsaan my, was dit verlede jaar, verlede jaar, nè, toe moes ek help om my kollega na die dokter toe te neem. Was daai een van die 'anxiety attacks'? Wat my oë ook nog verder oopgemaak het toe ek hiernatoe kom, het ek geweet dis Mitchell's Plain diè, maar ek het vir myself gesê ek gaan my taak kom verrig waarvoor ek verantwoordelik is. Maar ek probeer maar nog my deel doen en my bydrae maak, na die beste van my vermoë. Ek het nou al gehoor van die dinge wat Safe Schools in plek gehad het nog voor my tyd, maar ek het nie, van verlede jaar af, is daar nie weer ... u praat van 'n program, so dit sou vir my die idee gee dat daar meer as een aktiwiteit moet wees om die probleem aan te spreek. Ek self het nog nie kennis gemaak met Safe Schools nie. Hier was nog nie amptenare hier om met die kinders te praat oor veiligheid nie, of wat ook al, wat ek van weet nie.

O: Dit is 'n interessante punt wat u daar noem, want soos u sê, dit is 'n program, en volgens hulle literatuur is daar wel sekere dinge wat hulle in plek het. Hulle het eintlik 3 strategieë om die probleem aan te spreek. Wat het u al persoonlik by die skool ervaar? Na aanleiding van wat meneer C nou opgebring het, dat u nie weet wie betrokke is by "Safe Schools" nie, dat u nie weet wie die amptenare is nie, wie die persone is met wie u moet skakel nie. Wat het u ervaar, rondom "Safe Schools". Was u bewus dat die skool deel is van die program?

G: Nee, ons sal altyd vir hulle skakel by die "Call Centre" en hulle sal kom en …

H: Baie behulpsaam.

G: Baie behulpsaam.

O: Is u deel van die veiligheidskomitee?

G: Ja. Hulle sal altyd kom of hulle stuur die polisie uit. Operation Slasher was ook gister in die area. Hulle kom uit. As die kinders moet huis toe gaan, sal hulle patrolleer. Ons hou die kinders eintlik binne tot ons sien daar is polisie sigbaar in die area sodat die kinders gou kan huis toe hardloop.

B: En die ouers hou ons ook op die hoogte van sake. Ons het iemand in die gemeenskap wat ons laat weet van skietery, dan weet ons nou watter tyd om die kinders te laat uitgaan.

C: U sien, ek is bewus daarvan dat daar 'n "Call Centre" is, maar dit vir my asof dit 'n "body" is, ek weet nie wie hulle is of waar hulle is nie. U praat van 3 strategieë waarvan ek nie eens weet nie. Wat is die 3 strategieë en hoe werk dit? Ek sal wil sien dat hulle ons kinders ook moet kom bystaan op 'n "continuous basis".

O: Is daar nog van u wat voel soos meneer C, dat daar meer ondersteuning van "Safe Schools" behoort te wees?

G: Ja, die polisie was ook hier wat ons kom inlig het oor drankprobleme, dwelms, praatjies gehou het, dit was eintlik praatjies. Dit was nog alles deel van "Safe Schools" gewees.

C: Dit was voor my tyd eintlik.

G: Dit was nog in verlede jaar gewees

A: Ja dit was verlede jaar.

H: Wat was dit nou weer?

128

A: Captain Crime Stop.

D: Ja, Captain Crime Stop. Was dit verlede jaar?

G: Ja, verlede jaar.

C: Verlede jaar?

G: Ja.

H: Vroeg in verlede jaar.

C: Was dit vir die senior grade?

H: Dit was vir die grondslagfase.

C: Dis seker hoekom ek nie daarvan weet nie.

H: Ja.

G: Kyk, "Safe Schools" het vir ons eintlik die interkomstelsel en al hierdie maatreëls in plek gesit omdat hulle ook maar gestasioneer is op punte en somtyds is hulle daar dan kan hulle nie op twee plekke op dieselfde tyd wees nie.Maar ek kan nie "complain" van hulle nie. Ek deel meneer C se sentiment, ek voel ek weet hoe hy voel, maar ek persoonlik het nie "complaints" nie.

O: Goed, daar is dit wat sigbaar is, dit wat "Safe Schools" wel gedoen het, soos die beveiliging van die skool self. Was daar enige ander ondersteuning wat hulle die skool gebied het? Die Captain Crime Stop wat juffrou genoem het, is u seker dat dit 'n "Safe Schools" program is?

G: Ja, dit was 'n "Safe Schools" program.

A: En dan die sielkundiges, ek dink dit was na die die laaste skietery gewees, die sielkundiges was deel van Safe Schools.

O: Vir wie was die sielkundiges hier, juffrou?

D: Vir die onderwysers.

O: En vir die leerlinge?

A: En vir die kinders.

G: Vir die onderwysers, maar as 'n kind getraumatiseer is, kan ons enige tyd vir Lynn inroep.

O: So, u voel dat daar genoeg traumaberading is?

G: Op die oomblik, ja.

O: Is dit almal se mening? Dat daar genoeg ondersteuning is?

A: Geeneen van die kinders is nog ooit behandel nie

G: Nee, daar was D en L ook

A: Daar was nog nooit kinders behandel wat getraumatiseer is nie.

O: Sover u weet, was daar nog nie kinders behandel nie?

A: Ja.

O: Juffrou B, dit lyk nie asof u saamstem nie?

B: Ek dink daar is net onderhoude gevoer.

G: Ja.

H: Hulle het die kinders geroep wat berading gekry het. Ja, ons het baie ondersteuning gekry. Ek dink dit was in 2000 gewees.

G: Want Lynn kom mos altyd uit.

D: Mmm. Maar dit was in 2000 gewees en dan, soos meneer C sê, dit sal goed wees as hulle iemand of persone stuur vir praatjies met die kindes, want soos ek kan aflei van die ouers, hulle sê die kinders is al hierdie dinge gewoond en ons, ek dink ons skool is nog net tot dusver gelukkig dat ons nog nie 'n kind verloor het in die skietery nie. Want kyk, die kinders is nuuskierig, hulle gaan kyk, hulle is nie bang waar hulle in die huis ingaan nie. Soos die ouers sê, as die skietery gebeur, hardloop hulle uit om te gaan kyk waar die skietery is.

B: Ja en dan het ons 'n optog met mevrou Zille gehad.

O: Was dit net om die gemeenskap bewus te maak van die probleme by die skool?

G: Dit was die "launch" van die "Yellow Door Campaign".

B: Ja, maar die kinders ook, as hulle huis toe gaan, hulle is bekommerd oor die kinders se veiligheid. En hulle het aan die hand gedoen dat die ouers saam met die kinders moet stap. Die kinders wat dalk betrokke sou raak by bendebedrywighede, moet geïdentifiseer word. Hulle doen aan die hand doen dat die ouers saam met die kinders *moet stap*.

O: Ons almal weet natuurlik dat die geweld in die area, of die geweld wat rondom die skool woed, wat die skool affekteer, 'n groot sosiale problem is wat op verskillende vlakke aangespreek moet word. Meneer C het verwys na programmme wat hy graag wil sien, so vir wie dink u behoort die programme daar te wees? Wie is die persone wat baat sal vind by programme en wie se verantwoordelikheid behoort dit te wees?

C: Ek het nie 'n probleem as daar van die ouers ook genooi word nie.

B: Ek ook nie.

G: Ek voel 'n mens moet eers die ouers "educate before you can educate the child".

C: Juffrou, u praart van 3 strategieë. Wat is die 3 strategieë?

O: Hulle beveilig die skole, natuurlik met die drraadheinings en veiligheidshekke. Tweedens is daar gedragsprogramme wat daarop gemik is om die gedrag van leerders te wysig, byvoorbeeld deur traumaberading. Dan is daar programme wat gemik is daarop om sekere stelsels wat 'n impak sal hê op die skool, byvoorbeeld die beheerliggam of die senior personeel by die skool, te bemagtig om meer effektief te werk tot voordeel van die skool. Wat het u nou al by die skool gesien?

C: Die beveiliging, wat u reeds na verwys het.

O: Ja.

C: Die tweede een wat juffrou gesê het, is "trauma counseling"

O: Ja, en konflikresolusie.

C: 'n Paar kinders was vir "trauma counseling", daarom kan ek saamstem dat ek dit gesien het. "Systems"?

B: En "conflict rrsolution".

G: "Yes, Narriman had it". Sy en Karen?

O: In watter jaar was dit?

H: 2000.

O: 2000? Het die hele personeel konflikresolusie gedoen?

B+G+D+H: Ja.

A: Behalwe die mense wat agterna gekom het. Het julle dit gedoen?

O: So ver is u nie bewus daarvan dat die beheerraad, of die senior personeel of die personeel as 'n geheel miskien aparte werkswinkels gehad het nie? "Workshops"? Of opleiding gehad het van enige aard wat die skool sou help om meer effektief te wees nie?

G: Ja, juffrou X (Veiligheidsoffisier) het baie Saterdae "workshops" bygewoon.

O: Maar niemand anders van wie u bewus is nie?

G: Nee, ek het net 'n paar keer saam gegaan.

B: Wat van kaptein Brikkels wat hier gekom het?

G: Nee, daai's Gun Free.

O: Die strukture bestaan reeds, maar die skietery gaan nog steeds voort in die area. Laat dit vir u veiliger voel om te weet dat daar hierdie strukture by die skool is?

D: Ja, dit laat vir my veilig voel.

O: So, u voel nie bedreig nie?

G: Nee.

O: En u is glad nie bekommerd wanneer u skool toe kom nie?

G: Nee, wat.

H: Nee, behalwe van ons wat ...

O: Daar is mense wat wel bekommerd is?

(Party lede van groep bevestig kopknikkend.)

O: So sou ek die afleiding kon maak dat dit wat Veilige Skole reeds gedoen het nie genoeg is nie?

G: Definitief nie. Kyk, hulle weet ons is in so 'n "gangster-stricken" area, maar jy moet hier bly tot half-vier toe. Sommige dae is die kinders al almal huis toe en jy weet nie wat kan gebeur aan die einde van die dag nie. Ons het nou al gevra vir die "EMDC" of ons nie maar saam met die kinders kan huis toe gaan nie. Hulle was nie daarvoor te vinde nie.

A: Dit het presies so gebeur in die geval van juffrou D. Toe die skietery begin, toe sê sy elke keer vir my: "Kan ek nie maar huis toe gaan nie? Ek dink nie ek kan bly tot vanmmiddag nie". Ek het by juffrou X gevra, ek het by die hoof gevra of hy nie die skool kan sluit nie, want ek kon sien die vrou is besig om siek te raak, en toe is dit: "Nee", ons kan ek-weet-nie-wanneer-nie, huis toe gaan. En toe, terwyl ons nog by die skool is, toe kry juffrou D 'n aanval.

O: So, juffrou praat van die laaste voorval?

A: En het ons net vroeer huis toe gegaan dan het dit nie gebeur nie.

B: Dit is so.

O: So, sê u nou u wil graag sien dat daar 'n verslapping moet wees in die aantal werksure?

G: Of nie net dit nie, of dan, "put something in place" wat vir my gaan se ek is nou veilig. "You understand?" Ek meen, ek is nou hier binne, ek moet hier wees, maar maak dat ek voel veilig.

O: Wat sal juffrou veiliger laat voel? Wat sal juffrou graag wil sien?

G: Wat my veiliger sal laat voel is om te sien die polisie patrolleer elke vyftien minute, wat nou weer 'n onmoontlike taak is, want die polisie kan mos nou nie heeldag by die hekke staan nie. Hulle het mos ander werk ook om te doen. So, dis wat ons voorgestel het, laat ons vroeg huis toe gaan, "so should something happen, ok, I'm at home". Nou, wat die treurigste is, is as hulle begin skiet, twintig voor drie, nou moet ons huis toe gaan.

H: Ja.

G: Of somtyds dan sien jy die gevaar aankom, jy sien hulle hardloop daai kant toe, jy kan sien hulle is op 'n ding uit, nou's dit "Kom ons kyk maar". Maar daar is somtyds net nie 'n toegewing nie. Kan ons nie maar gaan nie want dit lyk nie lekker hier buite nie. Nou sodra nou, sê 10 minute na die tyd, nou's daar 'n skietery, nou hardloop almal deurmekaar.

O: Wou u iets gesê het?

C: Juffrou, ja. Ek sou wou sien daar programme moet wees vir die kinders om daai kinders op 'n gereelde basis te leer dat jy versigtig moet wees, dit kan gevaarlik wees. Ek weet nou nie hoe hulle dit moet struktureer nie, maar die kinders se lewens moet beskerm word. En selfs met ons "workshops" oor veiligheid het. Wat mòèt jy, of wat moet jy niè doen nie, sodat jy nie jou lewe kan verloor nie. Ek dink net so dat ons onderwysers moet weet wat hulle moet doen.

O: Daar is 'n veiligheidsbeleid by die skool. Voel u dat dit nie genoegsaam omsien na die kinders se veiligheid nie, of is daar sekere onsekerhede, soos dat die kinders nie weet hoe om te reageer nie?

(Stilte)

O: Is daar tekortkominge in die "safety policy"? Wat dink u?

A: Nee.

G: Daar's niks nie. Hy dek alles feitlik.

O: So, dis net die programme om die kinders, en die ouers ook, meer bewus te maak wat ontbreek? Weet u miskien van enige organisasies wat betrokke is in die gemeenskap wat kinders opvoed rondom veiligheid of wat sosiale probleme probeer aanspreek?

G: Ek weet nie. Wat van hier by ***** Park waar hulle altyd daardie "plays" het wat die polisie aanbied. Hulle was een keer hier by die skool ook gewees.

H: Watter "plays"?

C: Gemeenskapspolisie? Die polisieforum?

H: CPF? Is dit nie die Community Police Forum nie?

G: Is dit hulle?

C: Ek weet dis een van hulle goed wat hulle doen.

B: Ja.

G: Hulle was eenkeer hier by ons ook. Toe hulle die poppekas hier gehad het.

H: Ja.

134

O: Is dit die soort programme wat juffrou sou wou sien by die skool?

G: Ja.

O: Is daar skakeling tussen die skool en die polisie? En die Community Police Forum?

G: Hier was iemand van hulle verlede week, nè? Sy sou gekom het om iets te kom doen, maar sy het nooit gekom nie.

O: So daar is niemand van die skool op die Community Police Forum nie?

G: Nee.

O: En u is ook nie bewus van mense in die gemeenskap wat opheffingswerk doen wat miskien skakel met die skool nie?

A: Net die buurtwag. Die Neighbourhood Watch.

O: Wil juffrou S miskien iets byvoeg?

B: Nee.

O: Ons weet dat Safe Schools baie geld in die skool ingesit het, reg? Ek verstaan van juffrou X, in die omgewing van R 100 000 wat gebruik is om strukture by die skool aan te bring om die skool te beveilig.Ek kry die gevoel dat u dink dat dit nie genoegsaam is nie? Dat die probleme op verskillende maniere aangespreek behoort te word. Meneer C het gepraat van programme wat hy graag wil sien by die skool. "En ouers ook", het juffrou G bygevoeg. Wat dink u sal nog help om u veiliger te laat voel of om u te laat glo dat die kinders veiliger by die skool is?

C: Ek het gehoor dat hier voorheen sekuriteitswagte by die skool was. Het daar iets gebeur dat hulle nie meer hier is nie?

H: Hulle het dan saam met die kinders gehardloop. Dan kom die kinders agterna.

E: Hulle is doodgeskiet.

C: Op die perseel?

O: Is hulle op die perseel doodgeskiet?

B: Ja, hier in die kamer hier agter.

D: Ja.

C: In werksure?

G: Ja, in hulle werksure.

H: Net voor die skool begin het.

O: So dit was voor skool?

G: Dit was na skool, in die nag.

O: Wanneer was dit?

B: Hoeveel jaar gelede?

E: Vyf jaar gelede, ja.

O: Maar u het dit genoem omdat u wil se dat u sekuriteitswagte by die skool sou wou he?

C: Nee, ek het net gedink sekuriteitswagte sou groter gemoedsrus gee. Maar hulle was natuurlik hier om die skool te beveilig na ure, om te keer dat daar nie inbrake is nie. Ek weet nie of sekuriteitswagte sou help as daar 'n skietery by die skool is nie.

B: Nee, hulle het dan saam met die kinders tydens die skietery gehardloop.

G: Ja, toe is hulle eerste weg.

B: Ja.

A: Met honde en al.

G: Ja, met honde en al.

O: So, u wat ondervinding het daarvan glo nie dat veiligheidswagte 'n verskil sal maak nie, dat u nie veiliger sal voel by die skool nie?

G: Hulle het nie eers 'n vuurwapen gehad nie.

B: Al het hulle ook 'n vuurwapen, kan hulle dit nie gebruik nie.

A: Ja, dit sal gevaarliker wees.

136

O: So, wat sal u graag wil sien? Hoe sou u wou sien dat die skool verder beveilig word? Dit is vir my duidelik dat die veiligheidshekke nie 'n verskil maak aan hoe veilig u by die skool voel nie.

D: Ja, daar is die rolle draad, maar hulle kom nog altyd bo-oor die hakiesdraad.

E: Ja, soos die een aand toe die opsigter kom oopsluit vir 'n vergadering, toe is daar die Volkies (jongmans) wat so kom rook hier agter.

O: So, u sê mense kry nog steeds toegang tot die skool ten spyte daarvan dat dit beveilig is?

E: Ja, hulle kom nog altyd oor.

B: Ja, veral ons kindertuin-onderwyseresse voel soms onveilig daar agter. Jy sien wanneer hulle verbystap daar agter en ek voel dit is vir hulle maklik om oor daardie hekke te kom.

O: So, voel u gedurig die spanning aan?

S: Ja.

D: Ja, soos juffrou G gesê het, dit sal veiliger wees as "Safe Schools" meer kan doen, maar ek voel weer as daar geskiet word, dan wil ek huis toe gaan.

A: Ja.

D: Ek dink al gaan hulle wàt in plek bring hier, vir enige persoon wat die eerste keer getraumatiseer is deur die skietery, sal dit nie 'n verskil maak nie. Enige geluid wat jy hoor, laat jou voel jy wil nou in 'n hoekie gaan sit. Dit is hoe ek voel en ek voel by my huis ook so. Ek weet mevrou E het al op 'n keer gesê die onderwysers is net onnodig, die skietery is nie hier nie, dis daar ver, maar as ek 'n "gun" skoot hoor, voel ek ek wil nou huis toe gaan, ek wil nie hier wees nie!

O: Hoe ervaar u die leerlinge se optrede tydens die skietery?

F: Die kleintjies is baie senuweeagtig. Daar is van hulle wat huil.

B: En die grotes ook.

A: Die ouer leerlinge ook, hulle kom aangehardloop en as ons nou by die geel deure ingaaaan, dan is die leerlinge baie vreesbevange. Hulle weet iets is al weer nie reg nie, buitekant. En die ouers kom haal die kinders.

G: Maar dit was al aangekondig aan die ouers as daar enige skietery daar buite is, moet hulle nie kom hardloop na die skool om die kinders te kom haal nie. Die kinders is veiliger by die skool.

O: So die ouers kom haal nog steeds hulle kinders ten spyte daarvan dat hulle by die skool gehou word.

G: Gehou kan word.

A: Hulle kom haal hulle nie meer nie.

C: Kyk, die groter kinders, ek praat nou van die graad sesse en sewes, alhoewel hulle weet daar is wel mense daar buite wat skiet, is dit nie werklik vir hulle nie. Hulle vat dit vir 'n "joke". Hulle gebruik dit om geraas te maak. Kyk, die kinders weet mos nou hulle gaan gebukkend onder die
dinge, sommige kyk by die vensters uit waar hulle skiet. Samewerking van die groot kinders is nie daar nie.

O: So, u voel nie dat die "safety drill" genoegsaam voorsiening maak vir die kinders se veiligheid nie?

C: Nee, ek sê nie dit nie. Hulle buit die situasie uit.

G: Hulle vat "advantage" van die "situation".

O: Maar dis net die groter klasse wat dit doen?

A: Ja.

O: As daar gewoonlik skietery in die omgewing is, hoe lank neem dit die skool om te herstel, om terug te keer na normaal?

G: Hoe bedoel jy nou?

O: Kan kinders weer normaal aangaan daarna? Gaan onderwysers voort met hulle lesse? Of wat gebeur gewoonlik?

B: Ja, kyk, hulle gebruik mos nou die kode. Ons kleintjies daar agter verstaan mos nog nie die kode nie, ek weet nie van hier voor nie, maar ons gaan maar voort soos normaal.

O: So, dan gaan u aan met u normale akademiese program?

O: En die groter klasse?

G: Daar is nie eintlik 'n probleem daarmee nie, hulle gaan aan. Omdat dit somtyds vir die kind die norm is, voel 'n mens jy wil meer "intervention" van die departement af hê om die kind te laat verstaan dit is nie die norm nie. Somtyds hoor jy skote, nou kyk ek, dan sê die kinders, "Aag, juffrou, dis ek-weet-nie-wie se begrafnis daai." Eendag, twee jaar gelede toe skiet hulle, toe sê hulle vir wie skiet hulle nou en waar skiet hulle en hulle vertel "Hulle het gesê hulle gaan hom skiet". Dis "fun". Dit lyk my hulle kon nie wag om by die huis te kom nie dat hulle net kan uitvind daarvan nie. Maar nou bly dit: "Protokol, protokol!". Jy moet diè laat weet, jy moet dàài laat weet. Ek het eendag hier gesê "Kan ons nie maar 'n besluit vir onsself maak nie? Die situasie is onveilig, ons moet hier wegkom." Nee, maar ons moet nou … Ons kan mos môre vir hulle laat weet ons het huis toe gegaan. Ons het gegaan. Want dit was chaos daardie dag! Maar ons kry nie vir Eugene in die hande nie, ons kry nie vir diè in die hande nie! Is ons nie eers hier twaalfuur, eenuur weg nie? Want ons het niemand van die "WCED" in die hande gekry om vir hulle te sê die situasie is onveilig nie en niemand wou die verantwoordelikheid op homself neem en sê "Okay, as 'n personeel moet ons dit besluit nie."

O: Is dit net die personeel wat agter gebly het? Was die leerlinge toe al reeds verdaag?

G: Die leerlinge was almal feitlik al weg. Toe wag ons mos nou net vir... Eendag was dit ook so deurmekaar gewees verlede jaar toe Eugene-hulle hier kom. Hy't die ogend hier gekom. Dit is deurmekaar en toe wil hulle gou 'n naweek kom "discuss", 'n "weekend away", en dìs die tyd dat … Jy luister nie eens wat daai man daar sê nie.

C: Kyk, ek praat nou van die mense by die "EMDC", hoofkantoor, of waar ook al. Het daar al tydens die skietery of na die skietery, en ek praat nou van voor my tyd ook, mense gebel of uitgekom nà die skietery om te vra: "Is julle oraait?" en te sê: "Kyk julle is onse 'work force', ons is hier om …"

G: Ja, ja.

C: "Is julle oraait, wat kan ons verder vir julle doen?" Net om te wys hulle gee om.

G: Ja, wanneer ons "ge-fone" het, het dan was Narriman hier of sy bel.

C: Juffrou, ek het hulle nog nie gesien nie.

G: Ek praat van die tyd toe ons nog oop en bloot was, toe hier nog niks veiligheidshekke hier was nie, dan het hulle nogal baie gou uitgekom.

C: Maar nou?

G: Narriman het gegaan tot in die area in. Hulle het baie gedoen, maar hulle het ook 'n werk om te verrig, meneer, maar ek bedoel, hulle kan nie elke slag ook net uitkom nie, maar

vra gewoonlik of ons oraait is, en so aan, maar as mens nou die "Call Centre" bel, bel hulle ook weer terug om te vra of dit nou veilig is. Hulle is somtyds net so bietjie slap.

O: Juffrou, die veiligheidspan by die skool, het hulle enige strategieë aangewend op hulle eie om die veiligheidsprobleem by die skool aan te spreek? Om ouers betrokke te kry? Om ouers op te lei? Of om mense uit die gemeenskap te betrek by programme wat die skool self aanbied of wat die skool voel nodig is om 'n verskil aan die veiligheidsituasie te kan maak?

G: Ons het vir hulle genader met die "Yellow Door Campaign" om die "stickers" op hule deure te sit, maar party was nogal 'n bietjie skrikkerig. Maar op die oomblik het ons 'n dametjie met 'n "2-way radio" wat vir ons op die hoogte hou van wanneer hulle skiet in die area en die mense in die gemeenskap weet ook sy doen dit, so hulle sal ook vir haar laat weet daar kom "jongens" aan sodat sy die skool kan laat weet hulle moet die kinders maar binne hou.

O: So, die Yellow Door Campaign was die enigste skakeling wat u gehad het met die gemeenskap?

G: Ja.

O: Om ouers betrokke te kry?

O: Ons het gepraat oor wat die skool gedoen het om ouers te betrek. Is u ooit genader deur ander strukture om die situasie in die gemeenskap aan te spreek?

G: Ek kan nie nou so lekker dink nie.

O: So die skool probeer maar om die probleme op hulle eie aan te spreek?

C: Ek weet nie, kom Gun Free nie hier in nie?

G: Gun Free kan hier inkom, ja, maar Gun Free was 'n "pilot project" gewees. Dit moet nog "ge-gazette" word en dit moet nog …

O: Wat is die idee rondom Gun Free?

C: Dat daar nie vuurwapens toegelaat word op die skoolperseel nie. Jy kan ook nie jouself "protect" deur vuurwapens te dra nie.

H: Net die polisie kan met vuurwapens inkom.

C: Daar was ook 'n optog van Gun Free gewees.

140

G: Dit was die "launch" gewees.

C: Ek weet nie of dit nou 'n struktuur is nie.

O: Ja.

G: Ja.

O: So, nadat "Safe Schools" by die skool betrokke was vir die afgelope 5 jaar, voel u dat die leerlinge en dat u self ook veiliger is? Veiliger as wat dit voorheen was?

H: Ja.

G: Definitief veiliger as wat dit voorheen was. Want iemand kon reguit hier ingekom het en sommer 'n kind kom uithaal het, maar nou kan ons meer kontrole uitoefen.

O: Juffrou F, u is nog nie so lank hier nie, so u weet nie wat die situasie voorheen was nie. Meneer C ook nie. Voel u veilig by die skool?

F: Ek voel veilig, ja, nou op hede. Ek was mos nou nie deel van al die dinge wat gebeur het nie. Sommige kere dink ek daar's mense by ander skole wat nog nie eens gehoor het van hierdie dinge nie, ... Ek het vir vriende vertel van dit wat hier gebeur, die skietery, en hulle kon dit ook nie glo nie, want jy's in 'n "comfort zone" daar waar jy is en jy weet nie wat die ander leerkragte hier deurmaak nie. As dit miskien met my gebeur, die dag wanneer dit met my gaan gebeur, dan gaan ek ook miskien die gevoel kry dat ek onveilig is.

O: Maar u het self nog nie enige trauma beleef nie?

F: Nee.

O: Meneer C, u ook nie?

C: Juffrou, ek sal nie sê trauma nie. Ek weet ek is vreeslik bekommerd. Miskien wil jy jouself bedrieg deur te glo dat dit nie met jou kan gebeur nie. So nou gaan jy maar voort met jou daaglikse dinge.

O: En juffrou-hulle wat dit nou al wel ervaar het, die trauma, en die spanning wat daarmee saamgaan, voel u veilig? Ek verstaan daar was 'n skietvoorval selfs so onlangs as verlede jaar, wat u baie onveilig laat voel het, maar hoe vel u vandag? Voel u dat die "Safe Schools" Program wel 'n verskil aan u veiligheid en die veiligheid van leerders gemaak het?

141

B: Ja, die hekke, en so.

D: Ja, die hekke en interkom, en so.

A: Van die skietery weet ek nie, maar ek is nogal bekommerd oor die kinders en van my kollegas hierso, want van die kinders is betrokke by "gangs" en enigeen kan so kwaad raak vir die onderwyser en met 'n "gun" hier inkom en skiet en omdat die kinders so betrokke is by die "gangsters" is dit 'n gevaar vir hulle.

C: Op pad skool toe ook, jy weet nooit wat kan gereël word om iemand op pad skool toe voor te keer nie.

D: Ja.

B: Ja, het ons nie een keer 'n "gun", 'n "zip gun", op 'n kind gekry nie?

H: Ja, maar dit was 'n speelgoed "gun".

B: So die kinders is baie aan die dinge blootgestel.

O: Is daar enige "at-risk learners" by die skool geïdentifiseer? Is daar sulke kinders waar dit lyk asof hulle op die verkeerde pad is?

G: Ja, daar was enetjie, maar hy's nou geskors.

H: Wie? E of N?

B: Ja, N.

G: Nee, was dit nie J in B se klas nie?

H: Ja, hy.

O: Wat het gebeur in die gevalle waar kinders geïdentifisser is? Kon die veilgheidspan of Die "Safe Schools" Program voorsiening maak vir sulke leerlinge wat geïdentifiseer is? Wat die gevaar loop om by bendes bertrokke te raak?

G: Ons kry gewoonlik die polisie in as afskrikmiddel, maar as die ouers nie wil saamwerk nie, soos met N, het ons gesê sy ma moet hom maar saamvat en maar vir hom 'n ander skool gaan kry.
Want die ouers wil nie hê jy moet aan hulle kinders iets maak nie. Toe het ons gevoel, as ons niks met hom kan maak nie, moet hy maar gaan.

O: So daar is nie eintlik van "Safe Schols" se kant af 'n program wat die kinders op die regte pad sal hou nie?

G: Nee.

C: Maar ons laat ook nie toe dat die kinders met "gangsters tjappies", wat noem ons die goed,..

G: Tattoos.

C: Ja, dit word nie toegelaat nie. Al is dit ook met 'n pen gemaak.

O: Hoe word die probleem aangespreek? Die tatoeërmerke?

B: Daar is nie eintlik iets wat 'n mens kan doen nie.

D: Ja, niks nie.

G: Ek voel nogal, ons as onderwysers weet wie die kinders is wat aan "gangs" behoort, hier is van die kinders wat aan "gangs" behoort.

C: Dis hoekom ons hulle in 'n program moet kry.

O: So, u glo daar is nog dinge wat aangespreek moet word?

D: Ja.

O: En wie se verantwoordelikheid voel u moet dit wees? Dink u dis die skool se verantwoordelikheid, of dink u dis "Safe Schools" se verantwoordelikheid?

G: Ek dink dis Veilige Skole se verantwoordelikheid, die skool kan "recommendations" doen, maar daar is nie nog tyd vir sulke dinge nie. Daar moet iemand van buite af inkom om dit te doen.

O: So, u dink dis die werk van kundiges? "Experts"?

G: Ja.

D: Ja, ons probeer, maar ons taak is baie groter, baie moeiliker as ander onderwysers wat in die ander areas skoolhou.

A: Ons het vreeslik baie probleme hier.

C: Maar soos ek vir u sê, vir die groter kinders is die veiligheidsaspek asof dit 'n "joke" is. Ek het nou weer bewus geword daarvan.

G: Hulle besef nie die erns van die saak nie.

O: Maar u gevoel is dat daar wel 'n leemte is en dat daar plek is vir 'n spesiale program vir die leerlinge wat so aan al die gevare daar buite blootgestel is.

G: Ja, soos van ons graad-6 leerlinge, hulle is nou weer betrokke by "drugs" en hulle maak geen geheim daarvan nie. Hulle sê nog: "Dis mos nie van hulle geld nie".

O: So, sulke probleme word nie werklik aangespreek nie.

G: Nee, ons kan hom net straf, gaan werk in die tuin of gaan haal jou ma, maar sy ma kom gewoonlik, maar daar is nie veel wat ons aan hom kan doen nie.

O: Diè van u wat wel in die veiligheidspan is, het u al enige verwysings gedoen van leerlinge? Kinders wat betrokke is by dwelms of bendebedrywighede. Het u al enige kinders verwys na kundiges toe?

C: Daar was 'n geval van 'n mannetjie in my klas wat so dagga gerook het, en hy was aangemeld by die "Learning Support Officer" en sy het hom, ek weet nie of sy saam met hom was nie, maar sy het hom verwys na SANCA, waar hy getoets is. Ek weet nie of hy weer teruggegaan het nie.

G: 'n Leerling in my klas was ook al daarnatoe.

C: Ek weet nie of die "LSO" deel is van die "Safe Schools" nie?

G: Ja, dis deel daarvan.

O: U het gepraat van die "Learning Support Officer"? Is dit een van "Community Policing" se inisiatiewe?

A: Dis vir die kinders wat so stokkies draai.

O: U weet nie hoe betrokke "Safe Schools" was by die daarstel van die persoon nie.

G: Nee, toe ons ons kom kry, toe is die persoon maar hier en toe word daar gesê daar gaan 'n persoon aangestel word.

B: Wie betaal hulle, die departement, of wie?

G: Ek weet regtig nie.

O: Werk die persoon nou saam met die veiligheidspan of skakel die persoon met die kantoor?

G: Nee, met die kantoor.

C: Ek weet hulle het die kampe vir leerders, maar ek weet nie wat "ge-address" word op die kampe nie.

O: En wie is die persone wat op die kampe gaan?

C: Van die leerders word geïdentifiseer.

G: Dan het "Safe Schools" ook nog hulle kampe. Hulle het nie diè jaar een gehad nie. "Safe Schools" het ook kampe waar hulle Scripture Union toe gaan.

O: Wie is hulle teikengroep?

G: Die "target group" is, jy meng hom eintlik op, die minder bevoorregtes en die stout mannetjies. Die verhouding moet lekker kan werk. As daar nou net stout mannetjies is, sal daar nie 'n voorbeeld wees nie, nou stuur jy 'n voorbeeldige kind saam dat hulle kan sien jy kan vir jou so gedra as jy wil. "Safe Schools sponsors it fully".