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ABSTRACT

Safety and security is an issue that institutions of higher learning have to deal with and address within their campuses. The focus of this study was to explore first year residence students’ perceptions regarding safety and security at the University of Cape Town (UCT). An exploratory qualitative approach was used in this study. The purposive sample consisted of fourteen first year students from three UCT residences and three residence supervisors from these residences giving a total sample of seventeen participants. The results of the study showed that students see themselves as safer within the confines of UCT whereas they feel relatively unsafe off campus. None of the participants in this study were victims of crime on UCT campuses but two students were victimized off campus. Twelve out of fourteen students in the study said they take precautions to make themselves less vulnerable to crime. Eight students perceive the safety and security system at UCT to be a good system. However, three students were not completely confident with the skills and capabilities of UCT’s Campus Protection Services (CPS).

Furthermore, the results showed that students believe that age, gender and year of study do impact on perceptions on safety and security. Residence supervisors’ perceptions were also explored and the results showed that the three supervisors perceive most students to be careless about their own safety and that UCT’s safety and security service has improved in the last decade. Both students and supervisors gave recommendations to improve safety and security at UCT. It is clear from this study, that there are areas in which UCT can improve safety and security. The main recommendations were:

- UCT security management staff needs to ensure that the out sourced security service is efficient and adequate in meeting student and staff safety needs;
- CPS should be more active in making students adhere to safety and security preventative measures;
- The Student Representative Council (SRC) needs to actively work in collaboration with CPS to raise awareness of safety and security issues.
# ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCTV</td>
<td>Closed Circuit Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCU</td>
<td>Campus Control Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>Campus Protection Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSC</td>
<td>Health Sciences Student Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA</td>
<td>Internal Security Act of 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCPS</td>
<td>National Crime Prevention Strategy of 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>University of Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPS</td>
<td>South African Police Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Student Representative Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction
Crime is an issue that all universities have to address so that their students are not in danger. Campus crime is “a serious issue of concern for current university students, parents of prospective students, campus law enforcement personnel and the campus community as a whole” (Jennings, Gover and Pudrzynska, 2007:192). Concerns over campus crime appear to have increased, hence campus safety and security matters have become an important concern for universities. More research has been conducted to analyse campus crime following studies such as Miller and Pan’s (1987) study on student perceptions of campus police that was conducted in 1987 at Purdue University in America. Most of the research to explore campus crime has been conducted internationally and not much research has been conducted in South Africa hence there is a need to address this gap.

In this first Chapter, the background of campus crime will be presented and the significance of a study of students’ perceptions regarding campus crime. The rationale of the study will be given and the benefits of this study. The research topic, central research questions, assumptions, objectives and concept clarification will be presented. Ethical considerations will be discussed and an outline of this dissertation will be given. Concluding remarks will end the chapter.

1.2 Problem statement
University campuses of South Africa are not exempt from crime hence there is a need for crime prevention through safety and security programmes on campuses. Crime is a complex issue that is difficult to define. In the Oxford English Dictionary (Soanes & Hawker, 2008), crime is defined as an act punishable by law, as forbidden by statute or injurious to the public welfare. However, the difficulty in defining crime is linked to determining which acts constitute crime, whether the existence of law creates crime and what counts as injurious (Muncie & McLaughlin, 1996). According to Thomson (2004:2), “crimes are violations of a specific subtype of norms, that is, the criminal laws of a society”.

1
One of the challenges that South Africa faces as a nation is a high crime rate even though significant strides have been taken by the South African Police Service (thereafter referred to as SAPS) to reduce crime. Recent statistics of crime prevalence in South Africa released in September 2010 indicate that there has been a decrease in crime. In the SAPS annual report for 2008/2009 (South African Police Service, 2010f), crime is categorized as contact crimes (crimes against the person), contact-related crimes, property-related crimes; other serious crime; and crimes heavily dependent on police action for detection. Within these categories there are groupings of crime that are included in each category, for example, contact crime includes murder, attempted murder, sexual offences, assault GBH (assault with the intent to inflict grievous bodily harm), common assault, aggravated robbery and other robbery. Figure 1 below shows overall prevalence of serious crimes in South Africa for 2009/2010. It is clearly shown that contact crime is the most serious crime in South Africa.

Figure 1: Serious crime in South Africa 2009/2010
The figures shown on figure 1 show some decrease in crime in comparison to 2008/2009 figures. During 2008/2009 approximately 2,1 million cases, roughly a third (32,7%) were contact crimes, 26,3% were other serious crimes, 25,4% were property-related crimes and 8,9% and 6,7% were crimes dependent on police action for detection and contact-related crimes respectively (SAPS, 2010f).

Figure 2 below shows a breakdown of contact crime during 2009/2010. There has been significant successes in combating crime specifically murder, attempted murder and robbery with aggravating circumstances (SAPS, 2010a). In 2008/2009 murder was 2.6%, attempted murder was 2.7% and robbery with aggravating circumstances was 17,7% (SAPS, 2010f). Even though there are slight differences, it is clear that there are improvements that are leading to decreases in crime and one can hope that these figures continue decreasing.

Figure 2: Contact crime in South Africa 2009/2010

It is useful to highlight some crime statistics in the Western Cape, since the University of Cape Town (thereafter referred to as UCT) is located in this province. In 2007/2008 the Western Cape
ranked third on murder ratios per 100 000 of the population in comparison to other provinces. Regardless of this ranking, it was noted that the Western Cape was the only province that reached the 7-10% reduction target that had been set while other provinces had increases. For example, in Limpopo there was a 10.1% increase (SAPS, 2010f). Even though the Western Cape ranked third again in 2009/2010, there was a -4.9% decrease in murder ratio from 44.6% in 2008/2009 to 44.2% in 2009/2010 (SAPS, 2010a). The highest incidence of all reported sexual offences was recorded in the Western Cape, where there was an 8.4% increase in sexual offences (SAPS, 2010a). However, the Western Cape has been experiencing some decreases in most criminal activity because the target reduction rates that have been set have been met in the Western Cape (SAPS, 2010f).

The two police stations that are in close proximity to UCT are Rondebosch and Mowbray police station. It is therefore important to highlight the crime statistics linked to these two communities as UCT students live in the proximity. In Rondebosch, in terms of contact crime, robbery with aggravating circumstances was the highest with 141 cases recorded from April 2008 until March 2009. For the period 2009/2010, there was a decrease to 105 recorded cases from April 2009 to March 2010 (SAPS, 2010c). Other significantly high crime statistics for both 2008/2009 and 2009/2010 periods are figures pertaining to malicious damage to property, theft out of or from a motor vehicle and drug related crime. However, these cases have also shown significant decreases in 2009/2010. Similar to Rondebosch, robbery with aggravating circumstances is the highest contact crime in Mowbray with 95 cases recorded from April 2008 until March 2009. In 2009/2010, there was a decrease with 79 cases of robbery with aggravating circumstances recorded in Mowbray (SAPS, 2010b). Other significantly high crimes in Mowbray are similar to those in Rondebosch, which are malicious damage to property, theft out of or from a motor vehicle and drug related crime (SAPS, 2010d).

The most recent crime report for UCT crime is the report for September 2007 to June 2008. According to the Campus Protection Services (thereafter referred to as CPS) report, residence theft was the highest during this period with laptops being the most desired item. Most of these crimes are a result of student negligence, for example, not locking their room doors in their residences. An increase in common assault cases has been noted among students. Furthermore,
off campus robberies rose sharply and on campus crimes also rose with four reported cases (University of Cape Town, 2010a). Table 1 below is an overview of UCT on and off campus reported cases of attempted or unarmed robberies from January 2003-June 2008 indicating a sharp increase in off campus cases in 2007.

Table 1: UCT on and off campus reported robberies

1.3 Rationale and significance of the study

Even though universities are confined communities they interact with the broader society, hence what happens in society affects the university community. It was noted that “having a safe campus does not guarantee staff and students’ off campus safety as they pass through, live, shop or just hang out in these often high-crime areas” (University of Cape Town, 2009). As highlighted, there are relatively high crime rates in surrounding UCT communities such as Rondebosch and Mowbray; hence it is very important for UCT to have safety and security services to protect their students and staff. The University of Cape Town has safety and security services that are offered to students to try to combat campus crime and to keep all campuses and surrounding areas as safe as possible. However, even though these safety and security services are in place, there have been incidences of violent crime around UCT in which two UCT
students have been killed as a result of assault in neighbouring communities close to UCT such as Observatory.

Two students, Benny Pakiso Moqobane (aged 19, 1st year UCT Medical student) and Dominic Giddy (aged 21, 3rd year UCT BSocSc student) were killed off campus close to UCT. The murders occurred on 28 September 2009 and 13 February 2010 respectively (University of Cape Town, 2010e). Benny was shot close to his off campus accommodation on Main Road in Observatory, while walking with a fellow student (Faculty of Health Sciences UCT, 2009). Dominic was stabbed to death near Glendower Residence, a UCT residence located on Main Road while walking with two friends (University of Cape Town, 2010b). In light of these cases, it is clear that even though there are measures to keep UCT students’ and staff safe, incidences of crime can still occur. It is important to note that both incidences occurred at night while the students were walking home with friends. Thus, the question of safety and security is a pertinent issue that needs to be explored in order to determine students’ perceptions of their safety and security and what could be done to keep UCT students safer in and around UCT.

Students could also significantly contribute to their own safety if they are involved in initiatives that are provided by UCT to keep them safe within and around the university. This study will be beneficial to the students who will participate in the study by raising their awareness of safety and security issues. By responding to questions, students will get an opportunity to reflect on their own behaviour so that they can answer questions and this will make them realise the extent of their knowledge regarding safety and security. It would be another benefit if the respondents in this study change their behaviour as a result of being more aware of their safety and security issues. This awareness has the potential to benefit other students if the respondents in this research discuss the issue with their friends. Thus, this study has the potential of raising awareness among first year residence students of their own safety and security.

Findings from this research could inform safety and security services personnel of student perceptions regarding their strategies. The findings could raise awareness for CPS so that they can better understand what students struggle with in terms of safety and how they can address these issues. Griffith, Heuston, Wilson, Moyers and Hart (2004) noted that campus police
typically have no data regarding campus community opinions and perceptions because they do not have the resources or expertise to carry out such research. Hence, the need for such research.

1.4 Research topic
An exploratory study of first year residence students’ perceptions regarding safety and security at the University of Cape Town.

1.5 Central Research Questions
i. What are student perceptions on safety and security?
ii. What security services offered at the University of Cape Town are students aware of?
iii. Does gender and year of study influence perceptions on safety and security?
iv. What are student recommendations to improve safety and security on campus?
v. What are residence supervisors’ perceptions of their students’ safety and security?

1.6 Assumptions
i. That knowing students’ perceptions on safety and security will help in improving security services.
ii. That students in first year are more vulnerable and are at higher risk of becoming victims of crime on and around campus.
iii. That age and gender of students as well as their year of study may influence their perceptions on safety and security.
iv. That familiarity and unfamiliarity to Cape Town may make one more vulnerable and at higher risk of becoming a victim of crime on and around campus.
v. That there may be a need to improve security at UCT and areas surrounding the university’s campuses.
1.7 Research Objectives

The research objectives are to:

i. Determine students’ perceptions on safety and security.

ii. Explore the security services offered at the University of Cape Town.

iii. Find out whether age, gender and year of study influence students’ perceptions on safety and security.

iv. Ascertain students’ recommendations to improve campus safety and security.

v. Determine residence supervisors’ perceptions on student’s safety and security.

1.8 Concept Clarification

Perception

This is a way of understanding or interpreting something (Soanes & Hawker, 2008). In this study, it refers to the perceptions that students have about their safety and security based on the subjective meanings that they give to this depending on their experiences of safety and security. Since this is a qualitative exploratory study, it is pertinent to explore the subjective meanings of the respondents.

Safety

The state of being safe includes exemption from hurt or injury and freedom from danger (Soanes & Hawker, 2008). Students should be able to study, learn and recreate in a safe environment that fosters their potential.

Security

The condition of being protected from or not exposed to danger (Soanes & Hawker, 2008). University campuses may reflect what is happening in the broader society in terms of criminal activity; hence, safety and security issues should be a priority. In this study, safety and security will be used interchangeably.

University of Cape Town

This is a tertiary institution for higher education that is renowned for its research. Since 2003, UCT has maintained its position as the highest ranked South African and African university in
the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU) conducted annually by the Institute of Higher Education at Shanghai Jiao Tong University. In 2007 UCT was the only African university to make it into the top 200 of the Times Higher Education Supplement (THES) World University Rankings (Research Office University of Cape Town, 2010).

**Campus**

Grounds of a school, college or university usually self-contained and distinctly separate from the outside community (Page & Thomas, 1977). The University of Cape Town has a number of campuses namely Upper Campus, Middle Campus, Lower Campus and Medical School. It also has a satellite campus in the Cape Town City Center called Hiddingh Hall. The campuses targeted for the purposes of this study are: Upper Campus, Lower Campus and Medical School.

**Residence**

Campus student accommodation at a college or university. At UCT, residence refers to on or off campus accommodation provided to students; mostly for out of town students or international students. Given the fact that students may not be ‘security conscious’ they are easy prey for burglars and robbers. In this study, three first tier residences (i.e. residences for first year students) have been selected (Figure 2:36).

**Warden**

Member of staff at a college or university who has special administrative and pastoral responsibilities. Usually a warden is a member of academic staff in charge of a residence (Page & Thomas, 1977). A warden is defined as a person in whom the authority of the University Council and the Residences Committee rests for the administration of a student housing unit (General Policies and Rules Handbook, 2010).

**Residence supervisors**

Employees of UCT who manage housekeeping matters, such as maintenance, keys, access cards, telephones and other essentials for comfortable living. They work in liaison with the warden and assist in managing residence matters and addressing student needs. Three residence supervisors were selected as participants in this study (General Policies and Rules Handbook, 2010).
**Student Representative Council (SRC)**
At the University of Cape Town, the SRC is the highest decision-making structure of student governance. It represents all students at UCT, and their overall interest and social well-being, in university committees. It is highly involved in policy-making and co-operative decision-making processes on campus (Student Representative Council, 2010).

1.9 Ethical considerations
Strydom (2005) in De Vos, Strydom, Fouché and Delport (2005:57), defines ethics as “a set of moral principles which is suggested by an individual or group, is subsequently widely accepted, and which offers rules and behavioural expectations about the most correct conduct towards experimental subjects and respondents, employers, sponsors, other researchers, assistants and students”. On the other hand, research ethics refers to individual and communal codes of behaviour based on a set of principles for conducting research (Shrader-Frechette, 1994). In conducting research, researchers have to take into account key ethical considerations when conducting their research. According to Babbie and Mouton (2001), the main ethical issues in social research are voluntary participation, no harm to the participants, anonymity and confidentiality, deceiving subjects and analysis and reporting. These issues are now discussed in relation to this proposed research.

**Voluntary participation**
Voluntary participation refers to the willingness of an individual to participate in research; no one should be forced to participate (Babbie & Mouton, 2001). Strydom (2005) in De Vos et. al. (2005) refers to this consideration as that of informed consent. Participants are supposed to receive adequate information pertaining to the study so that they give their consent to participate and they should be psychologically capable of making such a decision. This consideration was taken into account in that all the selected participants for the research were given adequate information pertaining to the study by the researcher prior to their participation so that they could willingly participate in the study. If the participant refused to be a part of the research, another person was selected.
No harm to the participants

Research should never harm the people being studied (Babbie & Mouton, 2001). According to Strydom (2005) in De Vos et. al. (2005), harm to research subjects can be physical or emotional thus researchers have to be aware of the potential harm that could occur during their research. This ethical consideration links to another ethical issue, namely that of the actions and competence of the researcher. An incompetent researcher can unwittingly cause harm due to poor, insensitive interviewing or lack of knowledge.

The researcher has been equipped to carry out research that does not harm the respondents. In addition, the researcher was equipped to engage in debriefing where necessary because the researcher is a qualified social worker who is currently registered as a student social worker. In addition, the participants could receive further counselling and support from the Student Wellness Center if they needed it. If there was a need to “contain” a participant, the researcher would have been able to do so. The students and residence supervisors being interviewed were able to withdraw from the study at any time. In terms of researcher competence, the researcher was well trained in interview skills and had been trained to behave in an ethical manner. After the interviews with participants, it was clearly stated to them that this is a research study mainly for academic purposes but that their recommendations would be sent to CPS for consideration. This was done to avoid raising false expectations.

Anonymity and confidentiality

Anonymity refers to a situation where “…a researcher cannot identify a given response with a given respondent” (Babbie & Mouton, 2001:523). Confidentiality refers to “…the boundaries surrounding shared secrets and to the process of guarding these boundaries” (Bok, 1983:25). In this research, full anonymity could not be completely guaranteed because the researcher obtained information from identifiable respondents. However, at the beginning of the interview the participants were informed that they should not use their real names and that they should think of an alias that they could use for the study. This ensured that there was anonymity of respondents with regards to anyone who reads or examines the report or in relation to the findings being disseminated. In terms of confidentiality, as a social worker the researcher had an obligation to hold information with confidentiality as Strydom (2005) in De Vos et. al. (2005:62) points out,
“confidentiality places a strong obligation on the social worker to guard jealously the information that is confided to him or her”. Thus, the researcher was required not to disclose any personal information that the participant did not want to be made known to others. However, confidentiality may be breached in certain circumstances where the respondent or someone else may be in danger (Bok, 1983).

Deceiving subjects
Deceiving subjects refers to concealing your identity as a researcher and lying to participants about the purpose of the study (Babbie & Mouton, 2001). In some cases, it may be necessary to hide the purpose of the interview in order to obtain fairly accurate results. In this research, there was no deception on the part of the researcher with regards to her identity or in relation to the purpose of the study. The researcher clearly explained the purpose of the study so that there were no misunderstandings.

Analysis and reporting
The researcher has an obligation to report both positive and negative findings (Babbie & Mouton, 2001). According to Strydom (2005) in De Vos et. al. (2005), “researchers should compile the report as accurately and objectively as possible”. The findings of the research study were presented in a report that was submitted to the supervisor of the researcher. Participants’ anonymity was maintained despite the use of actual quotations. A plagiarism declaration was attached with the report. Thus, the researcher acknowledged that she had reported the information as accurately as possible and that all sources of information used to conduct the study and to compile the report had been acknowledged. The student may be required to present the research findings for examination purposes. Results will be made available to the Student Representative Council and to CPS. Furthermore, depending on the rigour of the study, the findings may also be published in a journal.

1.10 Reflexivity
To deal with biases, the researcher used reflexivity. Reflexivity is “the practice of researchers being self-aware of their own beliefs, values and attitudes and their personal effects on the setting they have studied and self-critical about the research methods and how they have been
applied” (Payne and Payne, 2004:191). It is a process of the researcher knowing the influence that he/she may have on their study. According to Miller and Brewer (2003:259), reflexivity “requires a critical attitude towards data, and recognition of the influence on the research of such factors as the location of the setting, the sensitivity of the topic, power relations in the field and the nature of the social interaction between the researcher and the researched”.

As a UCT student, the researcher was aware that her own perceptions of safety and security might have influenced the research study. Thus, it was essential to make use of bracketing in this research study. Bracketing is a process of suspending and laying aside what is known about the subject under study allowing one to see all the facets without preconceived ideas; “the researcher’s own knowledge and presuppositions are said to be ‘bracketed’ so as not to taint the data” (Crotty, 1998:83). After looking at literature and research related to the research topic, I was aware that I had developed some ideas about some of the student perceptions on safety and security. Bracketing allowed me to take an objective stance and withhold my ideas so that I could better understand the perceptions of students and students’ experiences from their point of view and understand their unique experiences without imposing my ideas on their experiences. Furthermore, the supervisor assisted in the process.

1.11 Outline of the Dissertation

A summary of each of the five chapters in this dissertation will be given by briefly outlining the contents of the chapters, excluding this chapter.

Chapter 1: Introduction

In Chapter 1, the problem formulation of this research study is presented focusing on problem statement, rationale of the study, research topic, central research questions, assumptions, research objectives and concept clarification. Ethical considerations pertaining to the study are presented and discussed. Lastly, reflexivity is presented.

Chapter 2: Literature review

In Chapter 2, a literature review giving a thematic exploration of the key areas that are linked to the objectives pertaining to this proposed research and the context of the topic will be discussed.
Chapter 3: Methodology
In Chapter 3, the methodology used in this research study is explored focusing on the research design, sample, data collection and data analysis. The limitations of the study are also discussed in this chapter.

Chapter 4: Discussion of findings
The findings of the study are presented and discussed in Chapter 4 through discussing the emergent themes.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations
The main conclusions drawn from the objectives of this study are discussed in Chapter 5. Recommendations are also given in this chapter.

1.12 Conclusion
This chapter has focused on the background to this research study. The research topic, central research questions, objectives and concept clarification were presented. Ethical considerations and the outline of the dissertation was also presented.

In the next chapter, a literature review will be presented.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
Safety and security on campuses is a concern for most universities regardless of where the university is located in the world. There are different issues regarding safety and security, which could be explored through research ranging from provision of security services to student fears and perceptions. These issues could be explored using both qualitative and quantitative approaches. According to Volkwein, Szelest and Lizotte (1995:850), “research on crime at colleges and universities consists mainly of descriptive statistics”, with less analytical studies.

In this literature review, a thematic exploration of the key areas that are linked to the objectives pertaining to this research study and the context of the topic will be discussed. The literature review will present some ideas on a theoretical framework, policies geared towards safety and security in South Africa, campus crime, campus safety and security services, student behaviour and perceptions and the role of the Student Representative Council (thereafter referred to as SRC).

2.2 Theoretical models to be considered in this study
The main theoretical perspective that underpins this study is the human rights perspective, which argues that people have basic rights that others have to respect irrespective of citizenship or territorial legislation (Sen, 2004). Furthermore, functionalism, a sociological theory of deviance will be explored and its relevance in explaining crime in the South African context. Safety and security is a human need hence Maslow’s theory of self-actualization and the human scale development theory will be discussed. It is worthwhile to explore Erikson’s (1950) psychosocial theory on human development in relation to university students.

Human Rights Perspective
Proponents of the human rights perspective argue that human rights are basic to all human beings by virtue of their humanity and they are universal (Sen, 2004). Hence, these rights have to be
acknowledged and protected. In the South African context, the Bill of Rights in the South African Constitution of 1996, lists rights that all people in South Africa are entitled to and these are seen as the cornerstone of democracy in South Africa (Juta’s Statutes Editors, 2010). In section 12 of the South African Constitution, it is stated that “everyone has the right to freedom and security of the person inclusive of a right to be free from all forms of violence from either public or private sources” (Juta’s Statutes Editors, 2010:7). The existence of crime in society means that this right is being impinged upon. Various stakeholders in society have the responsibility to address factors that threaten people’s rights. In a university context, the university has an obligation to address safety and security so that their students are protected from harm.

South Africa’s apartheid history has shaped the country’s values and principles as enshrined in the constitution. In order to understand crime within South Africa, it is important to highlight some key features of the country’s history and how these link to crime.

**Functionalism**

Criminal activity has been explained from various theoretical perspectives. One of the sociological theories that explain deviance in society is functionalism. Functionalists view society as having shared values and norms that form the basis of social order (Thomson, 2004). Following this view of society, deviance or crime exists when individuals do not have access to legitimate means to obtain their social goals. This can occur in two ways, when social norms do not sufficiently regulate individual behaviour and when the available means in society are inadequate to achieve social goals (Thomson, 2004). In the South African context, functionalism is one of the theories that explain the existence of crime in the country considering its apartheid history. The majority of South Africans were exploited and oppressed. They were unable to achieve decent standards of living due to restrictive and punitive laws.

It is important to briefly highlight South Africa’s apartheid history to understand some of the developmental challenges that the democratic government is still addressing in present day South Africa and how these have influenced crime. In 1948, the white electorate elected the National Party government after campaigning to implement an apartheid system, which would separate
the races. Blacks, coloureds and Asians would be discriminated against (Explore South Africa, 2010). Only white South Africans had full political rights. Signs to separate use of amenities such as toilets, restaurants, playgrounds and beaches were erected throughout the country, and racial groups were assigned to different living areas. For example, the Group Areas Act of 1950, physically separated the races by creating different residential areas for different races. Legislation was put in place in order to control people’s movement within South Africa and black South Africans were required to carry passes when travelling to work in white residential areas (Coleman, 1998).

The police were feared and people were detained if they showed any resistance to the apartheid government. For example, the Internal Security Act of 1976 (thereafter referred to as ISA) allowed detention without trial and the police force was used to enforce the apartheid agenda of total state control (Coleman, 1998). Numerous deaths were incurred as a result of this; “deaths in detention occurred as a by-product of the detention system” (Coleman, 1998:47). The ISA was revised in 1982 which introduced restrictions to control an individual’s political activity at the individual’s rather than the state’s expense” (Coleman, 1998:74). Restrictions created numerous problems, which affected all aspects of the person’s life. People lived in constant fear of the police. In these circumstances, crime was controlled because people did not have the freedom to lead their lives in the way they wanted and the severe consequences of crime minimized instances of crime.

Taking into account this brief history of South Africa, apartheid left a legacy of community upheaval, family breakdown, poverty, unemployment especially amongst the previously disenfranchised. According to Patel (2005:182), “crime and violence is inextricably linked with poverty, underdevelopment and the history of repression and associated violence in South Africa”. Law and order was enforced by undemocratic means and now in the post 1994 situation when South Africa is still in a period of transition, the new democratic arrangements have in a sense made it easier for crime to flourish.
Social development

In present day South Africa, it has been the government’s challenge to harmonize economic and social goals in order to address the issues that have been left by the apartheid legacy. Midgley (1995:4) refers to distorted development as a phenomenon whereby “economic development has not been accompanied by a concomitant level of social development” which applies to the South African situation. In countries where there is distorted development “the problem is not an absence of economic development but rather a failure to harmonize economic and social development objectives and to ensure that the benefits of economic progress reach the population as a whole” (Midgley, 1995:4).

Midgley (1995:5) asserts that distorted development is “manifested not only in poverty, deprivation, low health status and inadequate housing but in the exclusion of sections of the population from full participation in development”. This has led to a structurally unequal society that has given rise to a high crime rate and poverty in some parts of the country. Not all South Africans were given a chance to realize their basic human needs during apartheid. This situation bred deviant sub-cultures who were going to survive despite the odds. Thus, some engaged in deviant behavior in order to meet their needs.

Considering these factors, functionalism can explain in part the existence of crime South Africa because there are various structural issues and challenges that the nation is still dealing with in post-apartheid South Africa. Patel (2005:182) notes that “the impact of the past and continuing experiences of marginalization and alienation in society are considered to be contributing factors to crime and violence in society”. South African universities are part and parcel of the wider context and are thus not immune to criminal behaviours.

Maslow’s self-actualization theory and human scale development

It is important to consider theories on human needs in order to understand why safety and security are so important. Maslow’s theory of self-actualization is a theory of personality focusing on an understanding of human motives (Weiten, 2004). According to Maslow (1954), human beings have basic needs that are inclusive of physiological, safety, esteem, belongingness and love needs, which are all on a hierarchy from low needs to higher needs. The highest need in
this hierarchy is a need of self-actualization, which is a need to fulfill one’s potential (Maslow, 1954). All of these needs need to be gratified and as each level of needs is gratified then other needs emerge. Physiological needs include needs such as hunger and sexual gratification; safety needs include security, protection and freedom; esteem needs include self-respect and self-esteem and belongingness and love needs include acceptance and affection (Maslow, 1954).

Maslow (1954), proposed that human motives are organized into a hierarchy of needs which can be viewed as “a systematic arrangement of needs, according to priority, in which basic needs must be met before less basic needs are aroused” (Weiten, 2004:497). This hierarchy of needs is usually presented as a pyramid with basic needs at the bottom of the pyramid and growth needs higher up the pyramid. Safety and security needs are the second from the bottom up in the hierarchy after physiological needs such as hunger and thirst (Weiten, 2004). This theory draws attention to the importance of safety and security to human beings hence it is an important need that needs to be satisfied by all human beings. Safety and security needs include long-term survival and stability (Maslow, 1954). Protecting one’s life and belongings are indeed very basic needs.

Max-Neef, Elizalde and Hopenhayn’s (1991) theory on human scale development proposes that there are nine fundamental human needs namely subsistence, protection, affection, understanding, participation, leisure, creation and freedom. These human needs can be understood as a system because they are all interrelated and involved with each other. This implies that the students’ need for safety and protection is linked to their need for creation (work) and understanding (learning), and to their participation in leisure activities. The experience of poverty or the need for safety and protection influences all the other fundamental human needs. According to this theory, human beings strive to satisfy all these needs in their lives using satisfiers, and avoiding destructions of these needs. The need for protection is congruent with Maslow’s safety and security need. This need is closely linked to one’s living space, social environment and dwelling (Max-Neef et. al., 1991).

According to Gil (1992:16), “the evolution of social orders and social policies is motivated by basic human needs”, which are a crucial constituent of the human condition. There are interrelated needs that seem necessary for healthy growth and development namely biological-
material, social-psychological, productive-creative, security, self-actualization and spiritual needs (Gil, 1992). Security needs are reflective of the existential anxiety which all conscious beings experience. Thus, satisfaction of this need is important. Gil (1992) concurs with Maslow’s self-actualization theory and the human scale development theory because he draws attention to human needs that all human beings have. These needs are necessary for the full development and unfolding of human potential.

Thus, it is evident that one’s environment plays a role in the satisfaction of these needs particularly safety and security needs. In the context of universities, students can meet their human needs if their campus environment fosters the satisfaction of their needs. Gil (1992:18) states that people’s capability to satisfy their basic needs “depends on their natural environment and on their ways of life and social policies” hence one’s environment and the structures that exist within that environment enables one to fulfill their needs. Thus, the safety and security policies that exist at universities are of primary importance. Not only are suitable policies necessary, but the implementation of these policies are crucial if the safety and security needs of students are to be taken seriously.

*Psychosocial theory*

There are various theoretical perspectives that explain human development across the life span. Erikson’s (1950) psychosocial theory cited in Newman and Newman (1979:17), “is based on five organizing concepts: stages of development, developmental tasks, the psychosocial crisis, the central process for resolving the crisis and coping behaviour”. According to this theory, human beings go through eight developmental stages in their life span, which are illustrated in Figure 1 that shows the approximate age for each stage and the key features of the stages. Developmental tasks “consist of a set of skills and competencies that are acquired as the person gains increased mastery over the environment” (Newman & Newman, 1979:19). At each stage there is a psychosocial crisis that the individual faces which refers to the person’s psychological efforts to adjust to the demands of the social environment (Newman & Newman, 1979).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage/Age Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust versus mistrust (birth to 1 year)</td>
<td>Infants must learn to trust their caregivers to meet their needs. Responsive parenting is critical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy versus shame and doubt (1 to 3 years)</td>
<td>Children must learn to be autonomous- to assert their wills and do things for themselves-or they will doubt their abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative versus guilt (3 to 6 years)</td>
<td>Preschoolers develop initiative by devising and carrying out bold plans, but they must learn not to impinge on the rights of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry versus inferiority (6 to 12 years)</td>
<td>Children must master important social and academic skills and keep with their peers or they will feel inferior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity versus role confusion (12 to 20 years)</td>
<td>Adolescents ask who they are and must establish social and vocational identities or else remain confused about the roles they should play as adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy versus isolation (20 to 40 years)</td>
<td>Young adults seek to form a shared identity with another person but may fear intimacy and experience loneliness and isolation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generativity versus stagnation (40-65 years)</td>
<td>Middle-aged adults must feel that they are producing something that will outlive them, either as parents or as workers, or they will become stagnant and self-centered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity versus despair (65 and older)</td>
<td>Older adults come to view their lives as meaningful in order to face death without worries and regrets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University students, especially first year students fall in two developmental stages, namely that of adolescence and that of young adulthood. According to Erikson (1950), the developmental tasks of these stages include physical and emotional maturation, autonomy from parents, identity formation and career choice. As adolescents, the key issue is forming an identity of oneself, in which “they are primarily concerned with what they appear to be in the eyes of others as compared with what they feel they are” (Erikson, 1950:261). This leads to over identification with others and needing approval of others, hence, formation of cliques. Adolescence is a time of experimentation in which there is testing out of behaviours and questioning parents’ values (Sigelman & Rider, 2003). Due to the developmental tasks associated with this stage, university
students would tend to take risks in their behaviour as a natural outflow of experimentation. This in turn impacts on their safety. According to Erikson (1950), young adults’ focus is on intimacy versus isolation. The young adult “is ready for intimacy, that is, the capacity to commit himself to affiliations and partnerships and to develop the ethical strength to abide by such commitments, even though they may call for significant sacrifices and compromises” (Erikson, 1950:263). The very natural process of seeking an intimate partner also presupposes some risks that have to be taken (going out, partying, dating etc.).

2.3 Policies geared towards safety and security

It is important to consider macro policy plans and micro policy plans that influence safety and security. In the South African Constitution of 1996 Bill of Rights, everyone has the right to freedom and security and an environment that is not harmful to one’s health or well-being. To uphold these rights, different stakeholders have to be involved in implementing safety and security services. Various other policy frameworks have been developed in order to ensure the realization of these rights by addressing crime and health issues within South Africa.

Macro policies

A macro plan is a plan that affects the whole country thus it can be defined as a national plan to address a particular issue. The main macro plans that have been designed to address crime in South Africa is the National Crime Prevention Strategy of 1996 (thereafter referred to as NCPS) and the White Paper on Safety and Security of 1999-2004 (thereafter referred to as White Paper). According to Newham (2005), the NCPS was developed in order to look at crime from a developmental approach in which crime is seen as a broader social challenge. Considering this, the plan was designed to look at the root causes of crime and improving the criminal justice system. The White Paper was drawn up in 1998, to deepen government’s policy approach to crime prevention in South Africa, and suggested areas for revision of the original NCPS, based, in part, on the experiences captured in the 1997 NCPS Review (Rauch, 2002). There is a need for micro policy plans to be in line with macro level plans so that there is harmonization of goals aimed at creating safer societies. Crime prevention is essential in aiming to create safe environments (Department of Safety & Security, 2010). In the White Paper, crime prevention is defined as:
“all activities which reduce, deter or prevent the occurrence of specific crimes firstly by altering the environment in which they occur, secondly by changing the conditions which are thought to cause them and thirdly by providing a strong deterrent in the form of an active Justice system” (White Paper, 1998).

This is a holistic approach to crime prevention that needs to be considered at all stakeholders that are involved in crime prevention.

**Micro policies**

Following this definition of crime prevention from the White paper, it is essential that all University campuses have security management structures and put programmes in place in order to ensure the safety of their students. Part of this includes having a safety and security policy document that influences programmes and steps taken in addressing safety and security matters. Considering policies designed to address crime is essential because it influences the kind of security services that are implemented. The Health and Safety Policy of UCT (Appendix 1: 83) outlines the university’s aims in provision of health and safety services and its expectations on staff and students to adhere to all safe work standards and procedures. In the policy it is stated that UCT aims to “provide and maintain a safe work environment by implementing structures and programs to ensure that hazards to Health and Safety are identified in a systematic manner and timeously actioned” thus the university has an obligation to ensure student and staff safety (University of Cape Town, 2010d).

Micro-level policies should be in line with broader macro policies hence UCT’s policy on health and safety should be based on what is stipulated in the South African Constitution and the White paper. CPS is involved in implementing the policy by provision of safety and security services. The security services offered need to be effective and their effectiveness can be determined by looking at the impact that they have on their consumers, the students. This broad theoretical background to the proposed study provides part of the conceptual framework. The following section will focus more specifically on the study context and will highlight campus crime and safety as well as student perceptions.
2.4 Campus crime

According to Morris (1993, cited by Jennings et. al., 2007), no higher education institution can consider itself immune to crime hence university campuses have to deal with crime. Crime that occurs is varied and not all crimes committed are the same. Criminology distinguishes between trivial and serious crime, instrumental and expressive crimes, status offences and delinquency and person and property crimes. These distinctions are problematic however, they are a guide in criminal law to promote marginal deterrence but they are of little importance to a theory of etiology (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). Given these distinctions, campus crime is varied with certain offences more common than others. It is estimated that 80 percent of all campus crime is perpetrated by students themselves (Fisher, 1995:19). Thus, students may well be both perpetrators and victims of crime on campus.

Crime rate and violent crime

Studies that have been conducted have indicated that there is generally a low crime rate on campus in comparison to the communities where the universities are located (Griffith et. al., 2004). Research conducted in America indicates that “violent campus crime is relatively rare and that property offenses- such as theft and burglary constitute the majority of campus crime” (Fisher, 1995: 86). In a study conducted by Volkwein et. al., (1995:657), the results showed that in comparison to national trends on violent crime and university campuses trends “campuses are over 10 times safer than the nation in general”. Violent crime includes but is not limited to murder, assault, rape and robbery (Volkwein et. al, 1995). According to Jennings et. al., (2007:193), “most scholars agree that violent crime comprises somewhat small proportions of crime that occurs on college and university campuses”, which indicates that violent crime is less in comparison to other crimes. Thus, generally violent crimes are infrequent on university campuses.

Nature of campus crime

In a study conducted by Sloan (1994), the findings showed that 64 percent of campus crimes consist of burglaries and theft whereas about 10 percent of crime was violent in nature. Drinking and drug related offenses and vandalism offenses are fairly high on university campuses (Sloan, 1994). In a national survey of 10 000 undergraduates conducted at an American university, the
most common crime reported by these students was theft, followed by vandalism, fights or physical assaults, sexually related violence (date or acquaintance rape) and robbery (Fisher, 1995). University campuses are not immune to sexual harassment. A study conducted by Bryden and Fletcher (2007) on safety concerns of university faculty members showed that women faculty members had experienced more harassment and acts of violence against them than their male counterparts. This indicates that there are some gender differences among males and females and their crime experiences.

Various factors contribute to campus crime and there are crime predictors that exist on campuses. Sloan, Lanier and Beer (2000) cited by Jennings et. al. (2007) noted that alcohol and drugs are connected to many of the violent and sex-related crimes that occur on campus. According to Volkwein et. al. (1995), offenders are found in surrounding communities and the student body itself and offenders generally perceive students as easy targets. Students risk increases in the absence of a capable guardian and few academic institutions can afford a large investment in security (Volkwein et. al., 1995). Students need to be responsible for their safety and in some cases, students are not careful with their property, for example, leaving their rooms unlocked (Volkwein et. al., 1995). McPheters (1978) concluded from his research that the proportion of students living in dormitories and the proximity of the campus to urban areas with high unemployment were strong predictors of campus crime. Fisher (1995) noted factors such as campus size, size of the student body, the number of buildings as related to campus crime rates. Furthermore, Fisher (1995) concurs with McPheters (1978) findings that campuses with high crime rates are close to urban areas with high unemployment. Volkwein et. al., (1995) found that campus mission, wealth, and student characteristics are the best predictors of campus crime. Thus, various factors contribute to the existence of crime on university campuses.

**Campus victimization**

According to Fisher (1995), research has shown that approximately one-third of college students will be victimized on campus during their time of attendance. This is a fairly high victimization rate. Jennings et. al, (2007) found that 22 percent of the respondents in their study had been victims of at least one type of crime (robbery, sexual assault, assault, battery, theft, burglary or fraud) since enrolling at their university. In the same study, 46 percent of the respondents
reported having known someone who had been the victim of crime on campus within the previous year (Jennings et. al., 2007). In a study conducted by Barberet, Fisher, Farrell and Taylor (2003) on victimization of students at seven higher education institutions in the East Midlands in the United Kingdom (UK), 31% of respondents reported being a victim of crime in the past twelve months prior to the study. A third of these victims were repeat victims who had been victimized more than once during the same period (Barberet et. al., 2003). In a qualitative study on women’s perceptions and experiences of campus safety the women students who participated in the study “reported either being personally attacked or recounted stories from women friends who had been victimized on campus” (Kelly & Torres, 2006). This shows that there may be higher female victimization on campuses than male victimization.

Victimization associated with violent crime has serious repercussions for the individual, for example, it can damage an individual’s socio-emotional development (Flannery & Quinn-Leering, 2000). Volkwein et. al., (1995) found that “compared to students at two-year colleges, those in medical schools and health science centers are three times more likely to be victimized by violent crime, and seven times more likely to experience property crime”. Thus, there may be an increase in victimization at colleges that offer longer and more prestigious programs.

According to Thompson, Sitterle, Clay and Kingree (2007), sexual and physical victimization is a significant problem among college students. Generally, about half of all violent victimizations are reported to the police. Among college students, this rate is lower with research indicating that only 2% of victimized college women report the incidents to the police (Thompson et. al., 2007). College women who are victims of sexual crime on campus property are more likely to report than those incidents that occur away from campus (Thompson et. al., 2007). A study conducted in Chile on college women’s sexual victimization showed that prior to being at university, “2% of subjects reported that they had been physically forced to have sex (on one or more occasions) since age 14” (Lehrer J., Lehrer V, Lehrer E & Oyarzún, 2007: 171). Furthermore, “4% had been verbally pressured into having sex, and 7% reported that someone had had sex with them while they were under the influence of alcohol or other drugs and unable to stop what was happening” (Lehrer et. al. 2007: 171). Also, 11% of these respondents reported an attempted rape, and 25% reported another type of forced sexual contact. These findings indicate that women are more
prone that men to be victimized especially in sexually related crimes. Barberet et. al. (2003) found that more males were victims of violence (14% males versus 4% females) and burglary (14% males versus 7% females). Most studies have focused on female victimization and there is little on male victimization even though it is equally important. This may be attributed to the fact that women appear to be at higher risk of being victims of crime in comparison to men.

**Reporting and non-reporting of crime**
Various factors are linked to reporting or non-reporting of campus crimes. Barberet et. al. (2003), found that the most commonly given reasons for not reporting were that the incident was too trivial or not worth reporting or the belief that there was nothing the police could do. Similarly, Thompson et. al., (2007) found that most frequently cited reason for not reporting both sexual and physical victimizations was that the incident was not serious enough. Furthermore, it was found that for sexual victimizations, not reporting was linked to: not wanting anyone to know, not wanting the police involved, and being ashamed or embarrassed. For physical victimizations, non-reporting was linked to: not wanting the police involved, not wanting to get the offender in trouble, and not wanting anyone to know (Thompson et. al., 2007). There are thus different reasons that individuals have for reporting or not reporting crime.

### 2.5 Campus safety and security services
The law in America “imputes colleges and universities the duty not only to warn against known risks but also to provide reasonably adequate security protection” (Fisher, 1995). This means that universities and colleges are obliged to provide protection services to their students and address crime on campus because there are legally liable if their students are endangered (Fisher, 1995). In the UCT health and safety policy it is stipulated that “The University of Cape Town has a moral and legal obligation to safeguard and protect its students, staff and visitors against injury, diseases as well as risks to health & safety within the University” (UCT, 2010e). Thus, the university is obliged to offer safety and security services.

Various safety and security services are offered to students on university campuses. Some of the security services offered at American universities are nighttime escort services or frequent shuttles between campus and satellite parking lots and counselling and legal services for the
victim after an incident occurs (Fisher, 1995). Some of these services are also offered at UCT. A nighttime escort service is provided and counselling services are offered through The UCT Student Wellness Service (Health, Counselling and Safety, 2010).

At Purdue University in America, the most frequent types of help given to students by campus police are giving information and responding to the scene of an accident or minor crime (Miller & Pan, 1987). Some universities use hardening tactics to increase their campus security. Hardening tactics include adding security guards, installing video cameras and alarm systems, increasing lighting around campus, establishing a night escort service and restricting access to campus buildings (Flannery & Quinn-Leering, 2000). Universities also provide prevention awareness services to reduce student risks (Flannery & Quinn-Leering, 2000). Prevention programs also include information on alcohol and substance abuse and campus regulations (Jennings et. al., 2007). Alcohol and drugs are often connected to some of the violent and sex-related crimes that occur on campus.

Miller and Pan (1987) note that “many colleges and universities share law enforcement agencies with surrounding communities or contract with private security guard agencies”. At UCT, security services are provided by G4S security services and regulated by a service level agreement between the company and UCT. The CPS personnel on UCT campus are therefore not employees of UCT but of G4S South Africa (SA) Pty. Some of the services of UCT’s CPS are non-crime services because they respond to calls that are not related to crime. Some of the calls received at their head office at Burnage are “service calls related to personal enquiries and difficulties, such as students needing bolt-cutters to cut their padlocks, loud music complaints, requests for escort services and responding to alarms” (Ncube, 1996:23). Officers are sometimes called upon to intervene in domestic disputes between students and they give practical advice in order to restore peace (Ncube, 1996).

Safety and security services offered at UCT

At UCT, the Campus Control’s mission is “To protect and serve” and this mission is achieved through various programmes and services (Ncube, 1996). CPS uses a four-pronged approach to campus security and safety, which consists of presence, engineering, education and enforcement
In terms of “presence”, the uniformed staff maintains a high profile while patrolling the campus on foot and in vehicles, and their presence acts as a positive deterrent against potential criminal actions. “Engineering” relates to all physical equipment that has been installed to enhance security effectiveness, such as fencing, gates and closed circuit television (CCTV). “Education” refers to regular communication with the community as well as meetings and workshops with students and staff. CPS strives to ensure that there is awareness of security issues, and also provides advice on how to deal with various situations. “Enforcement” pertains to those extraordinary circumstances where CPS is empowered to take whatever appropriate action is necessary to maintain order and security on campus (Health, Counselling and Safety, 2010). Bowser (1994) identified some of these services that are still in use in his 1994 study. For example, he stated the following: meeting with new students during orientation, occasional distribution of informational pamphlets and conducting talks on security to student groups on request. CPS is also involved in patrol activity, investigations of campus crime and traffic operations.

Furthermore, UCT safety and security services include security cameras with 215 fixed and 42 PTZ (pan/tilt/zoom) cameras that are installed across campus. There is a Blue Safe Walk Route which is from Upper Campus to Tugwell on Lower campus and bollards in Japonica and Lovers Walk. These routes have nine emergency bollards, evenly spaced along the routes and are covered by CCTV and have an intercom linked directly to CPS. Each bollard has a very distinctive flashing blue light on the top for easy identification (Health, Counselling and Safety, 2010). All residences are fenced and a comprehensive access-control system is in place and a considerable effort has been made to light campuses, minimising dark areas. UCT’s policy on security matters is solid and CPS operates its six service centers, 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Their activities are closely monitored, recorded and they continue with close surveillance of buildings and numerous physical patrols (Health, Counselling and Safety, 2010).

According to Jennings et. al. (2007), campus police departments typically provide a list of safety tips for students such as keeping an eye on one’s personal belongings such as backpack and laptops. Part of UCT’s crime prevention strategies involve a list of preventative measures and safety tips that are listed on the UCT website to make students aware of factors that put them at
risk and what they need to be aware of on campus to reduce their risk of victimization.

**Student perceptions and views of campus security**

Miller and Pan (1987:27) assert that “college or campus population, like the urban population, expects its police to detect criminal misconduct as well as to maintain social order”, thus the campus population has expectations for the university to provide security services. In cases where these expectations are met, students may have positive perceptions and where the expectations are not met, students’ negative perceptions may follow.

Thomson and Hyman’s (1977), cited in Miller & Pan (1987), research found that the general campus population described their campus police force in generally positive terms such as effective and respectful. Student age is a factor that may influence perceptions of the police and security. From Miller and Pan’s (1987) study it was concluded that Purdue students perceived their campus police as being a reasonably effective one capable of maintaining a sense of security on campus and that the students made relatively positive affective judgements about their campus police. Hence, the students had positive perceptions of their campus police force. In addition, the study showed that “gender and race have no significant net effects on students’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the campus police force” (Miller & Pan, 1987).

In a UCT study conducted by Bowser (1994), he noted that students and staff alike perceived the Campus Control Unit (now called CPS) to be at the periphery of university life. In addition, both groups of students and staff felt that providing adequate security was the university administration’s responsibility (Bowser, 1994). In that study, the Campus Control Unit (thereafter referred to as CCU) was seen as more capable of protecting university property than preventing attacks on students. The CCU was seen as a separate entity to university life. However, the new unit CPS is more involved within the university and their work and contribution to safety on campus is more visible to students.

**2.6 Student behaviour and perceptions**

It is important to address university students’ behaviour in order to understand their level of interest in safety and security issues. The key issues that will be discussed are students’ transition
to university, recreation and alcohol use, students’ fears and concerns and students’ safety precautions.

**Transition to university**

Transition to university poses different challenges for individuals depending on how they experience their new university. Students’ adjustments to university life vary, which could be a result of their attachment to their parents. According to Lapsley, Rice and FitzGerald (1990) cited by Sigelman and Rider (2003: 390), “students who are securely attached to their parents display better psychological and social adjustment during the potentially difficult transition to college than students who are insecurely attached”. The university environment plays a role in students’ adjustment whereby residence halls would be an ideal place to have activities for freshmen and help create a sense of connection to the university (Enochs & Roland, 2006). There are some gender differences in adjusting to university. Kenny and Rice (1995) cited by Enochs and Roland (2006), found that developmental processes for male and female college students may differ, in that women tend to rely on relationships and socialization experiences to aid in adjusting to college more than their male counterparts. Thus, various factors contribute to one’s adjustment to university.

Peer relationships and friendships are important to adolescents (Sigelman & Rider, 2003). Due to this, social connections play an important role in assisting students in their overall adjustment to the college environment (Enochs & Roland, 2006). Gitelson and Thomason (1992) cited by Hickerson and Beggs (2007), note that for many young adults, the college years are a period of expanding freedoms and focusing interests. For most students, transition to university is a period of new freedoms away from parents hence they engage in experimental behaviour and new recreational activities. In some cases, the behaviour that they engage in poses a risk to their safety such as experiments with alcohol use.

**Recreation and alcohol use**

University students engage in various activities for recreation, which include going out to nightclubs and alcohol use. According to Palmer and Puri (2006:166), alcohol and drugs are part and parcel of university life. Perkins (2002) cited by Miley and Frank (2006), asserts that alcohol
seems to be the most abused substance on university campuses. Various reasons such as recreation and academic stress contribute to alcohol consumption by university students. Alcohol is sometimes used as a coping mechanism by university students to deal with university pressures. Palmer and Puri (2006) note that alcohol is mostly consumed when individuals are stressed and under pressure or when bored. New students on a university campus face many challenges when adjusting to college life and they negotiate these challenges differently. Senior students are more likely than freshmen to have established their patterns of leisure behaviour due to more awareness of leisure opportunities (Hickerson & Beggs, 2007).

There is a general perception that university students consume large amounts of alcohol. In Miley and Frank’s (2006) study at Richard Stockton College of New Jersey on student’s perceptions on drinking habits, they found that students who drink more on campus are also likely to believe that groups of other students also drink more. Furthermore, many students also believe other students drink more at social occasions than they really do (Miley & Frank, 2006). Thus, alcohol consumption of university students is sometimes overestimated. Recreation and alcohol use play a role in students’ safety because their reckless behaviour may threaten their safety.

**Fears and concerns about safety**

Students tend to be aware of the potential risk of campus crime, which leads to fears and concerns about safety. According to Fisher (1995:99), “studies have shown that many students “feel unsafe” or “are fearful” while on campus especially females at night or that many “worry about crime on or near campus”. Barberet et. al. (2003), found that female students were significantly more likely than males to be afraid of having their mobile phone stolen, of being mugged and robbed, of being raped or stalked by strangers or intimate partners and being physically attacked by strangers. These findings indicate that there may be gender differences in that females have more fear of crime than males. Fisher (1995) states that student fears are understandable because one in three students will be the victim of some kind of crime during his or her college experience. Warr and Stafford (1983) cited by Miller and Pan (1987:30), found that “women tend to express more fear or concern over crime than men”. The results of Miller and Pan’s (1987) study at Purdue University in America showed that the men surveyed believed
their campus to be relatively safe whereas the women surveyed indicated that they were relatively concerned over safety and somewhat afraid to walk on campus alone at night. This indicates that the time of day also influences student’s level of fear of campus crime.

According to Jennings et. al. (2007), research shows that fear of crime is influenced by different factors including personal factors such as age and sex and contextual factors such as campus characteristics, location of residence and time of day. Fisher and Nasar (1992) cited by Jennings et. al. (2007) found that students will be more fearful of their campus if there is no clear view of an area, lack of escape from a potential offender and a high possibility of refuge for the offender to hide. These factors influence the level of fear among students because they heighten the student’s potential victimization. In a study that was conducted it was found that 86 percent of students surveyed reported a high level of concern about being a victim of violence (Jennings et. al., 2007). Sloan et. al. (2000), cited in Jennings et. al., (2007) found that levels of fear are primarily a function of age, gender, race and prior victimization experiences and that women have a greater fear of crime than men.

According to Fisher and May (2009), gender plays a central role in differentiating levels of fear of crime between males and females. There are various cues that are fear provoking for both males and females. “There is not one cue that influences fear but rather a constellation of cues that include specific features of the physical environment to the presence of others to the visibility of police officers whose duty is to provide surveillance and protection” (Fisher and May, 2009:303). Fear provoking cues include but are not limited to lighting of the environment, foliage, loitering groups of people and visibility of police (Fisher and May, 2009). There are gender differences in the way that these cues are perceived.

### Personal safety precautions

Students have a role to play in the provision of their safety. At UCT, it was noted that most of the crime that occurs within residences is a result of negligence of students, for example, not locking one’s room (UCT, 2010a). Some students are aware of the potential risks to their safety and they act responsibly in order to minimize their chances of being victimized. These behavioural changes are known as constrained behaviour and research has shown that fear of crime and
constrained behaviour are strongly correlated (Jennings et. al., 2007). Constrained behaviour is inclusive of but not limited to avoiding certain campus buildings, avoiding night classes and moving around in pairs. Jennings et. al. (2007:201) found that “on average students did not engage in many changes in behaviour to reduce their risk of victimization”, which can lead to the assumption that if students were more careful and alert, campus crime would be reduced. In contrast, Barberet et. al. (2003), found that most students took precautions such as always locking the doors and windows of their premises but almost a third did not. Some of the precautions taken by students included avoiding darkly lit and isolated areas, avoiding going out after dark altogether, telling someone where one is going and when they will be back and asking others to watch their property (Barberet et. al., 2003). Thus, students carry fears about crime and some engage in behaviour that makes them less prone to victimization.

2.7 Role of Student Representative Councils (SRC)
The Student Representative Councils (thereafter referred to as SRC) of universities consider student safety as one of the issues that need to be addressed by a student representative body. The SRC is a very important stakeholder within UCT, as there is no decision that can be taken without the student voice because the university embraces the notion of co-operative governance (SRC, 2010). The SRC is focused on serving the interests of students because the students that are elected onto the SRC take a year off their studies to serve the student body for a year (SRC, 2010).

The SRC has 15 members and one of them is assigned to the health and safety portfolio (SRC, 2010). The main involvement that the SRC has in safety and security issues is to lobby and campaign for student concerns and needs. The SRC works with other student councils in order to address safety and security needs. For example, in 2009 and in 2010 they worked with the Health Sciences Student Council (thereafter referred to as HSSC) to host a safety and security campaign from 1 to 5 March 2010 (University of Cape Town, 2010c). This was in response to violent crime incidents around Medical Campus. The campaign’s objectives were to raise awareness about safety and security in and around campus, to equip students with self-defence skills, as well as make them aware of all the structures and procedures they need to adhere to when they have been victims of a crime (UCT, 2010c). The SRC’s involvement can influence student’s
behaviour and policy making at UCT, thus their involvement in campus safety and security issues is crucial.

2.8 Conclusion
The key themes pertaining to this research study have been discussed in relation to relevant theories and similar studies. Most of the studies referred to are international, with a few South African studies. However, some of these findings will have some relevance for South African universities. However, much more research is needed on campus safety and security in South Africa.

In the next chapter, the methodology used in this study will be presented and discussed.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction
In this chapter, the methodology that was used in this research study will be presented. The research design, sampling approach, data collection, data analysis and data verification will be presented. The limitations of this research study will also be presented.

3.2 Research Design
This research used an exploratory, qualitative research approach. Exploratory studies lead to insight and comprehension of phenomena (Babbie and Mouton, 2001). Exploratory studies are used when a researcher seeks “to examine a new interest or when the subject itself is relatively new” (Babbie and Mouton, 2001:79). Exploratory studies can be conducted through “a review of related social science and other pertinent literature; a survey of people who have had practical experience of the problem to be studied and an analysis of “insight-stimulating” examples” (Babbie and Mouton, 2001:80). For the purpose of this study, interviewing people who have had practical experience with the problem was the method that was used to determine their experiences.

To get personal experiences of respondents, a qualitative approach was taken as opposed to a quantitative approach. According to Tutty, Rothery and Grinnell (1996), qualitative research strives to understand the meaning people’s words and behaviours have for them. According to Fouché (2005) in De Vos et. al. (2005:269), “…qualitative research design differs inherently from the quantitative research design in that it does not usually provide the researcher with a step-by-step plan or a fixed recipe to follow” which enables the research process to be flexible. Qualitative research entails five strategies namely biography, phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography and case study” (De Vos et. al., 2005:269). Phenomenology, which entails identification of multiple individuals who have experienced a particular phenomenon and collection of systematic data, was the strategy that was used in this research study. This approach was selected for this study because it enabled the researcher to understand the students’
experiences from their frame of reference and their subjective experiences formed the basis of this study.

3.3. Sampling of research participants

Sampling refers to “taking any portion of a population or universe as representative of that population or universe” (Strydom, 2005 in De Vos et. al., 2005:193). In this study non-probability sampling was used. According to Strydom (2005) in De Vos et. al. (2005:196), non-probability sampling is a sampling technique “which does not implement randomization”.

Within this non-probability sampling approach, purposive sampling was adopted. Purposive sampling refers to deliberately selecting the sample based on certain criteria, ‘based entirely on the judgement of the researcher, in that a sample is composed of elements that contain the most characteristic, representative or typical attributes of the population” (Strydom, 2005 in De Vos et. al., 2005:202). Students were selected according to their residence using purposive sampling. UCT has a three-tier residence system that provides different services, governance and management at each tier. Please refer to Appendix 2 (on page 85) for a map of UCT’s residences. The first tier consists of catering residences mostly aimed at first year students, the second tier consists of senior catering or self-catering and the third tier consists of semi-autonomous self-catering accommodation (Residences Handbook, 2010).

For the purposes of this research, a sample was selected from first tier residences only because it was the population group that was most likely give the researcher rich information on the topic being researched. First years were selected as richer sources of data because it was the researcher’s assumption that this was the most vulnerable population group. They were also selected because they are new to university life and that they would be the most responsive group. As new students of UCT, their awareness of safety issues was assumed to be limited, thus, by participating in this research study their knowledge on safety and security matters would be enriched. Furthermore, first year students were more closely linked to one of the incidents of crime (described under the rationale of this study: Benny Pakiso Moqobane case) because the incident happened to their peer. Another reason why this was the chosen population group is the fact that most residence students are not from Cape Town hence their unfamiliarity with the
place makes them vulnerable and puts them at greater risk of becoming victims of crime on and around campus.

Within this selected population group of first tier residences, the residences that were sampled for the study are Fuller (a female residence), Leo Marquard (a male residence) and Rochester (a mixed residence). The purposive selection of these residences was based on the assumption that geographical location, gender and first year of studies may all impact on perceptions of safety. The limited sample consisted of 14 students only: 5 students from Fuller, 5 from Leo Marquard and 2 female and 2 male students from Rochester as well as 3 residence supervisors. This gave a total sample of 7 female and 7 male students and 1 male and 2 female supervisors. The total sample was 17 respondents. Hence, 17 qualitative face to face interviews were conducted. Students within these residences were asked to participate in the study on a voluntary basis. Residence supervisors were interviewed as opposed to wardens because they work more closely with students and they are more likely to have insight into safety and security issues. The following Figure 2 illustrates the sampling framework.
Thus, 14 students (7 male and 7 female) and 3 supervisors (1 male and 2 female) were selected.
3.4. Data collection
Data was collected through face to face interviews using an interview schedule.

3.4.1. Data Collection Approach
One-on-one face to face interviewing was conducted with the selected students and residence supervisors. Semi-structured face to face interviews are interviews “organized around a particular area of interest while still allowing considerable flexibility in scope and depth” (De Vos et. al., 2005:292). This was done face to face which involved an interaction between an interviewer and a respondent in which the interviewer established a general direction for the conversation and pursues specific topics raised by the respondent (Babbie & Mouton, 2001).

3.4.2. Data Collection Instrument
According to Greeff (2005) in De Vos et. al. (2005:296), “a questionnaire written to guide interviews is called an interview schedule or guide”. A semi-structured interview schedule was used for interviewing. This served as a guide in the interviews with the researcher permitted to probe for more information depending on the answers given by the research participants. It was important to note that the interview schedule was not rigidly followed but served as an orientation to the themes to be covered.

3.4.3. Data Capturing Apparatus
Data was captured using a Dictaphone with the permission of the respondent.
3.5. Data Analysis

Data from the interviews was analysed manually using an adaptation of Tesch’s (1990) approach in De Vos et. al. (2005). This approach follows steps of qualitative data analysis that the researcher utilizes to understand the data collected. The steps taken were:

i. in-depth interviews were recorded and transcribed for data analysis;

ii. the researcher went through the transcriptions reading for meaning and made notes on the margins;

iii. the researcher assigned labels to these notes on the margins;

iv. the researcher re-read all the transcriptions and tried to categorise the labels;

v. some categories formed part of a theme;

vi. the researcher grouped together themes that belonged together, linking these themes to the research objectives;

vii. the researcher then refined the themes and categories and developed a framework;

viii. the framework was used as a guide to writing up the findings;

ix. in writing up the findings actual quotes were used;

x. these quotes were then compared and contrasted to other studies in the literature review;

xi. a critical analysis was carried out.

3.6 Data Verification

According to Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Olson and Spiers (2002:9), verification refers to “the mechanisms used during the process of research to incrementally contribute to ensuring reliability and validity and, thus, the rigour of a study”. All research albeit qualitative or quantitative, has to be evaluated in terms of its reliability. According to Morse et. al. (2002), rigour refers to researchers’ adoption of verification strategies and self-correcting mechanisms (at each stage during the research process) to actively work towards reliability and validity in the analysis of qualitative data. Lincoln and Guba (1985) cited by Morse et. al. (2002:2) “substituted reliability and validity with the parallel concept of “trustworthiness”, containing four aspects: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability”. These will now be discussed in relation to this study.
**Credibility**

According to De Vos (2005) cited in De Vos et. al. (2005), credibility refers to demonstrating that the inquiry in a study was conducted in such a manner as to ensure the accurate identification and description of respondent’s meanings. In this research study, the subjective meaning that respondents gave was carefully reflected in the findings. The sample was purposively selected based on the assumption that geographical location, gender and first year of studies may all influence perceptions of safety. The criteria used to select participants were year of study, gender and geographical location of the students’ residence. Residence supervisors were selected based on the chosen residences used for the student sample. These set parameters helped to set the boundaries of the study. An interview schedule was developed and refined and was used in in-depth face to face interviews conducted to obtain data from the participants. The research data was transcribed and repeatedly analysed to determine emergent themes and categories. The links between the research objectives and the open-ended questions in the interview schedule are evident. The responses were accurately recorded.

**Transferability**

Transferability refers to a study’s generalisability to other settings (De Vos et. al., 2005). A purposive sample was used in this study; hence, the results cannot be generalized to the wider University of Cape Town community. The findings may be cautiously “transferred” to other students living in the sampled residences since the majority of the students are first year students. The problem may be that an idiosyncratic sample was selected. However, as an exploratory study, the value of this study is that it can inform further studies on campus crime.

**Dependability**

The concept of dependability refers to “the researcher’s attempts to account for changing conditions in the phenomenon chosen for study as well as changes to the design created by increasingly refined understanding of the setting” (De Vos et. al., 2005:346). This also includes whether a study can be replicated. In this study, it is likely that if the study was conducted again with the same interview schedule that was used and the same criteria used to select participants, similar results could be found.
However, it is impossible to validate this since the same schedule used with a different sample may yield different results depending on the variety of perceptions linked to individualized experiences.

**Confirmability**
According to De Vos (2005) cited in De Vos et. al. (2005), “Lincoln and Guba stress the need to ask whether the findings of the study could be confirmed by another”. It is possible that the findings in this study could be confirmed by other studies on safety and security perceptions.

### 3.7 Limitations of this research

According to Fouché (2005) in De Vos et. al. (2005:118), “potential limitations are often numerous even in the most carefully planned research study” therefore, there are some limitations associated with research studies. The potential limitations of this research study are discussed in this section.

**Campus crime literature**
The most recent article that was directly linked to students’ perceptions regarding their safety and security was Jennings et. al.’s 2007 article. Literature that is more recent was not obtained because there were no recent studies that were specific to this research topic and South African context. It is possible that this research topic has not been researched in recent years. This limitation further indicates more motivation towards the relevance of this research study.

**Research design**
The qualitative research approach is used when focusing on the subjective meaning that respondents give to the topic being examined. Thus, researcher bias may occur because the researcher may focus more on certain meanings than on others. In addition, the participants may tell the interviewer what they think the interviewer wants to hear. Despite these limitations, the qualitative approach was ideal for this study because it enabled the researcher to obtain rich data from the respondents using the respondents’ frame of reference and how they understand their safety and security needs. This was also an exploratory study and the design chosen was appropriate for this study.
**Sampling**

Purposive sampling depends on the researcher’s judgement thus not all participants have an equal chance of being selected since this is non-probability sampling. The data obtained cannot be generalized to the larger population. However, the participants chosen had the potential of giving rich data based on the criteria used by the researcher. Although the sample may not be representative of the entire first year population, it does give one a fair idea of students’ thoughts on safety and security.

---

**Data collection approach**

According to Greeff (2005) in De Vos et. al. (2005), the quality of the interview depends mainly on the skills of the researcher as an interviewer. These skills include establishing rapport, listening skills, probing and reflecting. If the researcher is unable to carry out a good interview, this may mean that insufficient or poor data is collected. To counter this limitation, the researcher had training in interviewing skills. Previous experience with interviewing also facilitated this process. Despite the fact that interviewing is time consuming, it was the suitable method for this study.

---

**Data collection instrument**

Semi-structured interviews are defined as “interviews that are organized around areas of particular interest while still allowing considerable flexibility in scope and depth” (De Vos et. al., 2005: 292). In this study, using an interview schedule may have presented problems if it was rigidly followed without probing. However, it was only used as a guide by the researcher.

---

**Data collection apparatus**

Using a Dictaphone or any other recording device may intimidate participants. It was useful to use a recording device because it allowed the researcher to concentrate on the interview and gain rich data without worrying about note taking and also it allowed the researcher to observe non-verbal communication.
Data analysis
Analyzing qualitative data may be complex. If there is much rich data obtained it may be difficult to analyse the data and identify all the important patterns. This can be limiting because some key issues may not be included in the results. To counter this, the researcher sought assistance from the supervisor. Furthermore, reading on data analysis was undertaken.

Time
There was a limited time frame to conduct this research study. This was due to changes in the Masters curriculum in 2009 to have a one year Masters programme instead of a two year programme. Furthermore, the study was approved close to the beginning of the mid-year vacation, thus, the researcher had limited time to conduct interviews before the students started examinations and went away for the vacation. This presented immense pressure on the researcher and it had the potential of hindering an in depth analysis. However, the researcher dealt with this limitation by working very hard to ensure that the research was finished in the prescribed time and that the analysis of the results was rigorous.

Self
As a novice researcher, the researcher may have overlooked certain important aspects of the research. However, the researcher’s supervisor guided the researcher in the research process to ensure that the research was rigorously conducted.

3.8 Conclusion
The methodology that was used in this research study has been clearly explained. The research study limitations were also presented.

In the next chapter, the findings of this research study will be presented and discussed.
CHAPTER FOUR
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction
In this chapter, the findings of this study will be presented and discussed. The profile of the respondents will be given giving the demographic information of these respondents such as age and gender. A framework of analysis will be presented showing themes that emerged from the study and a discussion of these findings. Some concluding remarks will be given to end the chapter.

4.2 A profile of the respondents
The following two tables give the profile of the respondents who participated in this research study showing the student group and the residence supervisors who constituted the total sample of 17 respondents.

Table 2: Profile of respondents (students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ Alias</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tess</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>South African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lerato</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>South African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anne</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>Namibian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Jill</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>South African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Oprah</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>South African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cameron</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Leo Marquard</td>
<td>South African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sakile</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Leo Marquard</td>
<td>South African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Matthew</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Leo Marquard</td>
<td>South African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Siya</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Leo Marquard</td>
<td>South African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Peter</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Leo Marquard</td>
<td>South African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. John</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>South African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ronaldo</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>South African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Jemima</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>Nigerian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Mary</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>South African/Zimbabwean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Names used here are aliases that the respondents chose to use during the interview not their real names.
### Table 3: Profile of respondents (residence supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Respondents’ Alias</th>
<th>Years as a supervisor</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Joshua</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>South African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Sara</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>South African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Whiskey</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>South African</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 Framework for analysis

The following table presents the themes and categories identified in the initial analysis of the findings.

### Table 4: Framework for analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student perceptions</td>
<td>• Personal safety and victimization&lt;br&gt;• Personal Precautions&lt;br&gt;• Residence and campus differences&lt;br&gt;• Drinking behaviour and precautions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security services</td>
<td>• View of safety and security actions&lt;br&gt;• Campus Protection Services (CPS) services identified by students:&lt;br&gt;  ○ Patrolling&lt;br&gt;  ○ Blue Safe Walk&lt;br&gt;  ○ Escort Service&lt;br&gt;• Students’ overall perceptions of CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors affecting student perceptions</td>
<td>• Gender differences&lt;br&gt;• Age differences&lt;br&gt;• Other factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Recommendations</td>
<td>• Student Representative Council (SRC)&lt;br&gt;• University/CPS&lt;br&gt;• Residences&lt;br&gt;• Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence supervisors perceptions</td>
<td>• Students’ behaviour and concerns&lt;br&gt;• Residence safety and security measures&lt;br&gt;• Safety and security services and CPS&lt;br&gt;• Recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. Discussion of findings

The findings of this study will be discussed according to the themes and categories presented in the framework of analysis. The findings will be compared and contrasted with various studies previously reviewed.

4.4.1 Student perceptions

Student perceptions on safety and security within the university context are varied and based on individual experiences such as students’ recreational behaviour. Student perceptions highlighted in this study centered on personal safety and victimization, personal precautions, residences differences and drinking behaviour. These perceptions will now be discussed.

*Personal safety and victimization*

Eight respondents in this study view safety as being secure and free from harm. In differentiating safety and security, six respondents view safety as being free from harm and security as the preventative measures put in place to ensure one’s safety. Student respondents’ understanding of safety is depicted as follows:

“I think safety to me is the feeling of like security um...oh my gosh (chuckled)...um yah...just the feeling of security, comfort and...you know not having you know the absence of fear that’s when you like feel safe. And you know that ok nothing is gonna happen...nothing bad is gonna happen to me here I’m safe” *(Tess)*.

“Safety... safety.... just being in a state where you just feel at ease and relaxed nje... not having to worry about being harmed I guess. Yah there’s a difference. Safety is just the state of being at ease and at peace and then um security is like the measurements that are placed to enforce that state *(Lerato)*.

“Ah safety ah just feeling secure, feeling that ah you know no harm is gonna come” *(Ronaldo)*.

“But security is something more enforced like to make people feel safe. Like... you only feel safe to feel comfortable and in order to make people feel comfortable you just protect them in a way so I’ll say security is protection and safety is just feeling comfortable” *(Sakile)*.

None of the respondents that were interviewed in this study have been personally victimized on UCT campuses nor surrounding areas. In this present study, two out of the fourteen student respondents have been victims of crime off campus when they have gone out to nightclubs
mainly on Long Street in Cape Town. The nature of these crimes has been theft of personal possessions as shown by respondents’ responses:

“I... I haven’t had any problems in the university area. I did, my wallet and my phone did get taken at Long Street (in Cape Town)” (Mary).

“Ah well we’ve all gotten our stuff stolen when we go out. All of us. Cell phones, and all kinds, my friend told me the other day about someone who got a gun held to then in the train... For a cell phone and um so yah we all get stuff stolen everyday so it’s kind of one of those things travel in groups go you know” (Jill).

There is some anxiety and fear among students because of their knowledge of a case involving a first year student (Benny Pakiso Mqobane), who was killed close to UCT Medical Campus on Main Road in Observatory. In this study, four students mentioned this case as shown in these responses:

“I think ah you know the... the thingy that eh that they tell you when there was this guy who was stabbed in Obs... Observatory. Yah. I was kind of scared cause now I was like ok they have security guards around but this is still happening” (Sakile).

“So initially I was always the who’s finding all these places to hide my phone for security reasons, and people were like no it’s chilled so as soon as I started getting relaxed then um I think the other boy was shot um this guy was shot... I’ve forgotten his name. But then the guy was shot then everyone was like no don’t go out, don’t do this, don’t do that...” (Jemima).

“Which is a problem cause I was going to Rochester residence and I had to walk up the street where a year ago a student was murdered. Actually not a year ago it’s a few months... 7, 8 months yah so I’ve never felt as scared as I did walking up”. (John)

Students’ victimization seems to be varied mainly due to going out behaviour. Due to their developmental stage and freedom from parents, first year university students engage in risky behaviour (Hickerson and Beggs, 2007). Students are at risk when they go out to nightclubs, which could explain why there are more incidences of theft off campus than on campus. University students fall in the young adulthood stage in their psychosocial development; a stage whereby young adults seek to form a shared identity with another person but may fear intimacy and experience loneliness and isolation (Sigelman & Rider, 2003). Thus going out behaviour is a normal recreational behaviour. Furthermore, they are negotiating the psychosocial crisis of intimacy versus isolation, which causes most students to engage in behaviour that may make
them vulnerable in an effort to find an intimate partner. Thus, students’ recreational behaviour patterns threaten their safety when they leave campus.

Jennings et. al. (2007) found that 46% of the respondents in their study knew of someone who had been a victim of crime on campus in the previous year. Sloan et. al. (2000), cited in Jennings et. al., (2007) found that levels of fear are primarily a function of age, gender, race and prior victimization. Even though some of the respondents in this study have been personally victimized off campus and not on UCT campus, knowing about another student who was victimized on close to a UCT campus raises safety concerns for them.

Considering students’ victimization, it is evident that the students who were interviewed have been victimized off campus mainly when they have gone out to nightclubs. The fact that two students have been victims of crime off campus out of the fourteen respondents, shows that victimization is closely linked to recreational behaviour. This may indicate that UCT campuses are relatively secure because none of the respondents in this study were victimized while on any of the UCT campuses. Off campus, high crime rates may be linked to the broader societal issues such as distorted development. As a result of South Africa’s apartheid history, it is clear that there is distorted development because in present day South Africa there are structural issues that the government is endeavouring to address. This has led to some individuals in society resorting to crime to meet their needs. Thus, control of off campus crime by UCT is limited due to broader societal issues.

**Personal precautions**

Some students engage in precautions to make themselves less vulnerable to crime while others do not. Twelve students in this present study take safety precautions. Some of the key precautions that are used by these students include moving around in groups, leaving valuables at home when going out, avoiding walking on foot often, avoiding walking or going out at night and avoiding dark places.
These precautions can be noted in these responses:

“Um I think my major precaution is always travelling in a group. And walking on foot as little as possible” (Mary).

“Um yah most of the time, depending on where I’m going I don’t carry everything you know what I’m saying like if you’re going to a party, you don’t need your whole wallet there, carry the amount of money... That you gonna use probably cash, carry a less expensive phone” (Matthew).

“So I usually do that and I’m usually in a group. I try not to walk alone and stuff like that...I usually leave my you know valuables at home and if I’m gonna use a phone then I make sure that it’s on me so I don’t carry any handbags and all those stuff” (Tess).

“Well I avoid the dark cause I’m scared of the dark... And um when I go, when I go out in the dark I just make sure that I don’t have any possessions with me” (Lerato).

Two students do not take precautions to make themselves less vulnerable to crime. These students showed a disinterest in safety and security issues which could be due to the fact that these two respondents were among the students who have never been victims of crime. Some of these students said the following in response to what precautions they take to make themselves less vulnerable to crime. This is shown by the following responses to whether they take any precautions:

“No, I just be... I just go about life” (Cameron).

“Um not really. I don’t have pepper spray, like yah no I don’t have anything” (Oprah).

This finding is consistent with Barberet et. al. (2003) and Jennings et. al. (2007) findings respectively. In a study on university student safety, Barberet et. al. (2003), found that most students took precautions such as avoiding darkly lit and isolated areas, avoiding going out after dark altogether, telling someone where one is going and when they will be back and asking others to watch their property. However, Jennings et. al. (2007:201) found that “on average students did not engage in many changes in behaviour to reduce their risk of victimization”. These two students may not take precautions because they have never been victims of crime and thus are not aware of safety and security risks.
Residence and campus differences

Students have varying views of safety at different residences and campuses. Students who live on Upper Campus perceive themselves to be safer than students who live on other campuses because they believe that Upper Campus is more secure than other campuses. Students who spend more time on Medical Campus (Health Sciences) feel that Medical Campus is more secure than Upper Campus. This is shown in the following responses:

“Ah well from Health Sciences perspective I think we’re quite safe I can’t speak for Upper. But I know with us, everywhere that you wanna go you have to use a student card. So if there’s an outsider they have to sign in or you know they can’t actually get in. On Upper campus it’s easy for people to just jump on a Jammie and claim that they’re a student and they are already on Upper and you never know who the person actually was so I think on Upper maybe adopting the same thing as the Health Sciences...” (Mary: Medical Campus student)

“I think at the different residences they need to up their security. Um literally, from the Rochester residences down there like um I don’t feel safe anytime I go near there, near those residences. Um at Lower Campus, I really feel that CPS isn’t that great at Lower Campus. (Jill: Upper Campus student)”

In terms of student behaviour within different residences, five of the female respondents indicated that they do not walk alone on campus at night and they lock their rooms often. In this study out of the seven female respondents, two females who live on Upper Campus, walk alone at night whereas one female who lives close to Medical Campus does not. Males from both Lower Campus and those who live close to Medical Campus sometimes walk alone at night. One male from Lower Campus and one from Medical Campus said they sometimes walk alone at night.

Concerning locking rooms, respondents said:

“Mmm... um for now you know, I always go to sleep and I do not have a care in the world as long as my door is locked I’m fine” (Lerato).

“I always lock my bedroom door. Although Fuller is actually quite safe as well” (Jill).

“And takes somebody’s belongings around here. So, we all steal within each other as students and that only happens because we don’t lock our doors” (Sakile).
Male students are more likely to walk alone than female students as shown by these responses:

“Well... I prefer like, cause the only time I go out at night is when I like go and study at Leslie Social... I prefer going alone and studying alone” (Lerato: Upper Campus Female).

“Yah. Perhaps and then like when you walk to Upper, mm ok we walk to Upper or walk down from Upper just past midnight cause the last Jammie (UCT staff and bus service) is like 12.30 or something” (Peter: Lower Campus Male).

“But there’ll be one, I could go out actually last night I left this place at 12 o’clock and that’s because we were celebrating finishing exams and it’s probably never gonna happen maybe for the whole year I don’t know. But I felt safe by myself because I’m a guy but I think if I was a girl, yah I don’t know” (John: Medical Campus Male).

In a study on student perceptions at a rural university in Northeastern university in America, found that males walk alone after dark significantly more than females (Santucci and Gable, 1997). Also more females than males lock their doors when they are not in their rooms and when also they are sleeping at night (Santucci and Gable, 1997).

It can be assumed that males walk alone at night more than females because they perceive themselves to be less vulnerable to crime than females due to a number of factors such as being physically stronger than females. Females tend to be more sensitive to safety and security than males hence this could be the reason they lock their rooms more than males to keep themselves safer in their rooms.

*Drinking behaviour and precautions*

University students consume alcohol in different amounts for various reasons. In this study, seven of the students interviewed said they do not drink however, they all have friends who drink. Six students out of fourteen admitted that they do drink alcohol (one male used to drink). Of the six, three are females and three are male.
Students gave the following responses when asked if they drink:

“No…no I don’t drink” (Tess).

“No I don’t” (Mary).

“Occasionally, not like every day like once, three times a year” (Matthew).

“Well yah but not really to that extent” (Anne).

Respondents were asked how intoxicated students could make themselves less vulnerable to crime. All the respondents gave some precautions for students who are intoxicated. Some of the suggestions included moving in groups, travelling with a friend who will look after them, not walking alone but taking a cab home and leaving valuables at home. The following are some of the responses that were given:

“Yoh! I’d say to stay where they are until they become ok or they should just leave with other sober people. Cause you know when you’re drunk eh you become aggressive and stubborn and that’s when a whole lot of things happen to you...” (Lerato).

“I think there has to be someone who is gonna not drink amongst them. Just to be responsible for them even though I know it’s not a nice task. But whenever they go out there should have someone like you know whether it’s the designated driver or just that person who’s not gonna drink...yah” (Oprah).

Sloan et. al. (2000) cited in Jennings et al., (2007) noted that alcohol and drugs are connected to many of the violent and sex-related crimes that occur on campus. Thus, alcohol consumption by university students tends to make them vulnerable to crime. In a study on alcohol and drug use in the United Kingdom (UK), Webb, Ashton, Kelly and Kamali (1996) found that 11% of their respondents were non-drinkers. In a similar study, Williams and Clark (1998) found that males consume significantly more alcohol than females. However, Miley and Frank’s (2006) found that students who drink more on campus are also likely to believe that groups of other students also drink more, thus there is some overestimation of alcohol use by college students.

It is possible that students who participated in this study were not entirely honest about their drinking behaviour. This could be attributed to different reasons one being that they may have
told the researcher that they do not drink to appear more responsible. Thus, it is possible that the students who said they do not drink occasionally drink.

4.4.2 Safety and security services

At UCT, safety and security services are provided through G4S South Africa (SA) Pty, an outsourced security company. Students were asked some questions regarding safety and security services offered at UCT. Their views were on action towards safety, safety and security services offered by UCT Campus Protection Services (CPS) and overall perception of CPS. These will now be discussed.

Views on safety and security actions

Some respondents stated that action towards safety and security issues tends to be taken when something has gone wrong or has happened. They stated that focus should be on prevention of incidences rather than on reactive strategies after the fact. To illustrate this, two students referred to the extreme example of a student being killed off campus close to UCT Medical Campus. These students said:

“And the interesting thing about it was action was only taken when things were bad. Recently people had passed away kind of thing... and I think that’s the worst thing that you’ll do action only when there is trouble” (John).

“There was that march but I haven’t heard anything about it since then you know. And that’s like not right for me you only do it because something has happened. How long are they gonna wait again. Maybe... maybe like another person is gonna get killed and then they are gonna have another march and then another so maybe they shouldn’t do that” (Peter).

Incidences of crime have had significant impact on policies and legislation. Fisher (1995), highlights court cases in America that have had significant impact on changing legislation for example the case: Peterson v. San Francisco Community College District of 1984. The result of the case was that “a college has a duty to warn students about a known risk” (Fisher, 1995:89). This illustrates that in some instances universities and colleges only act when something has happened.
It would appear that universities sometimes take time to effectively deal with issues until they have realised that there is a great need to address the issues because of financial constraints and inadequate security personnel.

**Campus Protection Services (CPS) services identified by students**
Even though all students in this study have not had personal contact and close interaction with CPS, they however, believe that since none of them have been victimized on campus the service is good.

Three respondents out of fourteen were not sure what safety and security services are offered at UCT. The rest of the participants pointed out services after the researcher alerted them to services that they had previously mentioned in the interview. This study showed that students are most familiar with the following CPS services: Patrolling, Escort Service and the Blue Safe Walk.

- **Patrolling**
One of the key security services offered at UCT by CPS is patrolling. CPS guards patrol all campuses and surrounding areas (Health, Counselling and Safety, 2010). In this study, seven students were aware of the CPS patrols as they have seen them around campus and their residences as indicated in these responses:

  “I know that they patrol around like here (Pointed to her room window). They patrol like right here outside my window. Like I can see them at night patrolling. Um...I don’t know other than that...yah I’ve just seen them patrolling around and then escorting” (Oprah).

  “Like you know so... you see them around so it’s nice to just see your safe you know. It’s nice to see CPS around” (Jill).

- **Escort Service**
At UCT, a nighttime escort service is offered whereby students can be escorted on foot or given a lift from campus to their residences when the Jammie Shuttle service has stopped (Health, Counselling and Safety, 2010). Two respondents in this study have used the UCT escort service and one student mentioned that he was not escorted when he asked the security guards to do so.
One respondent was not sure if the Escort service really exists and two were not sure why residences that are close to Medical Campus are considered as off campus residences. Respondents’ said:

“Ah well they just stand around and make sure that all is fine (giggling)...but like if you wanna go somewhere at night. You can call them to escort you” (Anne).

“And I was at, there I went to a security guard and I asked if they could escort me, and they told me they don’t escort to off-campus residences. Which is a problem cause I was going to Rochester residence and I had to walk up the street where a year ago a student was murdered” (John).

“Oh yes yah yah... no I do know about them patrolling and I remember they did have an escort service but now, now um, there’s been some confusion because they say that they don’t escort students to off campus residence and they referred to Rochester and Clarinus as off campus” (Mary).

- Blue Safe Walk

UCT has emergency bollards known as the Blue Safe Walk that students are supposed to use in emergency situations to alert CPS that they are in danger and they need help. Most respondents are aware of the Blue Safe Walk however, three were not sure how the Blue Safe Walk emergency bollards work. Three students did not know that the bollards have a camera that is monitored by CPS and that by pressing the bollard it is a way of alerting CPS of an emergency. Thus, it might appear that CPS needs to clarify their escorting services. The following responses show students’ lack of clarity:

“Um...CPS and those blue thingys you buzz on... That with the blue light flashing” (Sakile).

“You ask yourself where exactly are they and I think they got those push buttons...emergency things... Whatever thing like I don’t really know how that thing works but maybe... do you have to talk, do you have to press it and then talk?” (Peter).

“You can ask somebody to walk you back home but something that seems a bit like we...as worthless is this I think they have this blue...blue dot this... Yah. The Blue Safe Walk. It’s I don’t, it doesn’t seem to make sense if you’re going to St Peter’s at night... Because you’re all alone and like even by the time someone would’ve arrived, cause I take it the closest people are the people here at Roch, so then let’s say you’re in between those gates where the blue, where the safety thing is... There’s no way for someone to actually get there on time to be of any help to you...” (Jemima).

Oh. (Shocked). Do they have cameras? (Oprah).
According to Fisher (1995), universities and colleges are obliged to provide protection services to students and address crime on campus because they are legally liable if students are endangered. Various safety and security services are offered at universities; one of the safety and security services offered at American universities is a nighttime escort service (Fisher, 1995). Other safety and security services offered at universities include responding to incidences that occur on campus (Miller & Pan, 1987). At UCT, some of the services done by CPS include responding to “service calls related to personal enquiries and difficulties, such as students needing bolt-cutters to cut their padlocks, loud music complaints, requests for escort services and responding to alarms” (Ncube, 1996:23). Students’ right to have their safety and security needs met is upheld at UCT because there are services in place to ensure that students are safe. Thus, UCT is endeavouring to create a campus environment that fosters satisfaction of students’ needs. Students’ poor awareness of safety and security services may be because these students have not had personal contact with CPS. Considering students’ confusion about the Blue Safe Walk bollards, some education is needed with regards to the use of these bollards. Pamphlets in residences may be useful to make students aware of how they work. In addition, there is a need to raise students’ awareness of safety and security services.

**Students’ overall perception of CPS**

From the responses of the students who participated in this study, there seems to be some contradictory opinions about CPS. Students believe that the security system is good and others showed a lack of confidence in the abilities of CPS security guards with regards to the skills they have. Eight students in this study stated that the security system is good. Some of them said:

“For me it’s actually been quite good. Yah like I think they’re actually the first few people who are doing their job yah I think it’s actually quite good” *(Matthew).*

“But you don’t hear that often that something has gone missing or someone, something has happened to someone on campus at UCT... So, like that alone speaks for itself that the security and safety here is very good” *(Peter).*

“Um I think that UCT is more secure than other universities. Because like I know UJ (University of Johannesburg), you don’t feel very, very safe there...” *(Mary).*
“I think they are pretty pretty good cause yah at other varsities normally they’ll have like thick walls around the place and there they’ll be like people breaking in and stuff... And but here it’s just, there are no walls like but still security is tight yah there’s absolutely no crime so... that I’ve witnessed” (Siya).

Three respondents stated that they do not feel CPS is capable of helping them if they were under attack. Some of the reasons given were the fact that CPS security guards do not carry any weapons and students are not familiar with the training and skills that the security guards possess. The following responses make these points clear:

“Um I remember I think CPS like it’s nice to have them there but at the same time but ah the general feeling is that if someone was to come in and try to hold everyone at gun point, they wouldn’t be able to do anything about it. Cause they’re not armed, they don’t really have anything you know” (Mary).

“Well except when I’m working in the Com Labs (Commerce Computer Laboratories) at night I don’t really feel safe with the CPS guards because they have no weapons. So it’s kinda like you know if even though I might ask them to escort me back to Fuller... I don’t feel safe you know because if someone comes with a gun what are they gonna do with their torch type of thing” (Oprah).

“Cause I feel for example, like with our university the... the security guards are inadequate in the sense where if I were to be attacked... At gun point and he was standing there he’s do nothing, when we get to court he’d be a witness. They’d probably hurt him also, so I don’t feel safe although I feel secure at his presence um... it’s an intimidating situation I guess if I could say that... yah” (John).

In Thomson and Hyman’s (1977), cited in Miller & Pan (1987), research it was found that the general campus population described their campus police force in generally positive terms such as effective and respectful. This concurs with the finding that some students described CPS in positive terms. There is a need to raise awareness on CPS security guards’ skills since some students do not have confidence in their skills.

4.4.3 Factors affecting student perceptions

Various factors influence one’s perceptions on safety and security. Factors that were explored in this study included gender and age differences. Furthermore, other factors were highlighted by respondents such as one’s upbringing.
**Gender differences**

Seven male and five female respondents view females as more vulnerable to crime and as targeted the most by criminals. They believe that males are stronger and can defend themselves more if they are attacked. Respondents said:

_Yah I think probably definitely females, are well not everyone but mostly more vulnerable I think. Mainly because of I mean male criminals have a greater physical advantage and stuff like that so I’m guessing... Females are more vulnerable so I’m guessing they would be a bit more conscious of stuff like this” (Ronaldo).

“I think... being female does make you a bit more vulnerable because they see you as a soft target. Yah whereas they, males yoh he might fight back so it’s like that yah” (Siya).

“Yah...like I know like most of my male friends like I don’t know like when they walk around like they aren’t as scared as your typical female because they aren’t as vulnerable and susceptible to... Crimes and whatever so yah I think being a female you’ve got so (emphasised so) much more to worry about yah” (Oprah).

According to Fisher and May (2009:307), “research has shown that most females are physically and sexually vulnerable to attack and are physically challenged to thwart off such an attack”. Females tend to be portrayed as inferior to males in the media. However, there are changes in modern day society. Connel (1995) cited by Patel (2005:186) describes the ‘crisis of masculinity’ which is “a concept used to describe the fundamental changes that men are experiencing in modern societies due to changing roles between men and women in the family and community, in the labour market and in the political realm”. Thus, women have previously been viewed as weak and inferior however this perception is changing in modern societies. Due to patriarchal views, it is generally accepted that women are more sensitive and in need of protection as opposed to males.

Two respondents openly highlighted that rape can be an issue that differentiates female and male victimization. It is a general belief among the respondents in this study that females are the ones that are vulnerable to being sexually abused by criminals.
Respondents indicated:

“Cause if some guy just decides to rob me, in the street or whatever, obviously he’ll take whatever he takes but then again something might just tell him she’s a girl you know obviously it’s a girl why don’t you rape her or something like that so it could lead to more things ah.. Yah cause with a guy he might just kick and take whatever and leave but with you then it could lead to something else...” (Tess: Female).

“Mm. I think I’m more safe as a man. Cause mostly with women there becomes the rape issue” (Cameron: Male).

Two respondents mentioned that all people are vulnerable to crime regardless of their gender and that both males and females should be targeted when providing safety and security services. Respondents indicated:

“Like I think it that everyone should have the same type of security cause I mean I could be a very butch girl and then my friend could be a really like wimpy kind of guy you know what I mean. And for me I could maybe take a guy and he can’t. You know what I mean” (Jill).

“I think no. I think people would expect females to need more safety services than males would. I think it’s quite dangerous to think cause if you look at the students who’ve been killed and stuff. They’ve almost all been male” (Mary).

According to Fisher and Sloan’s (2003:644) findings in their study, “college women’s mean levels of perceived risk for all types of nonsexual victimization and for rape were significantly higher than were college men’s”. Thompson et. al. (2007), assert that sexual and physical victimization is a significant problem among college students. In a study conducted in Gauteng in 1996, it was found that “women aged between 19 and 24 years were the most vulnerable age group, at the highest risk of being raped” (Statistics South Africa, 2000:25). Female victimization is more documented than male victimization, hence, females are viewed as more vulnerable to crime.

It is possible that female rape, is reported more than male rape, hence females are seen as more vulnerable to rape than males. More female victimization is recorded possibly due to the fact that males do not report sexual victimization due to the associated stigma in society around male sexual victimization.
**Age differences**

Thirteen respondents in this study considered younger people to be less conscious of safety and security issues. Most believe that through maturity and growth people become more responsible and are better able to take care of themselves. Some also believe that familiarity and experience with a place makes one aware of dangers. According to respondents:

“When you fresh out of high school man like you’re here and it’s just, I think safety cause a lot of times most people who get mugged or lose their phones are 1st years. Because they’re naive and they just think hey nothing is going to happen or they’re just like that’s they’re not thinking that we... But I think once you start, by the time you get to 20 or 21 you realise that ok people steal this and they do this... then you’re more cautious” *(Jemima)*.

“Yah. Like how long they’ve been here like maybe 2nd or 3rd years will tell you because they are so used to this place and maybe they’ve never been robbed of their cell phone like ‘yah don’t worry about it even if you go out at night or whatever you’ll be fine’. And then you know a 1st year or a younger student perhaps because they’re still getting to know the place they’re still getting into the thing for them it might be, they might be a bit more conscious about safety while older students might not because they’re so used to the place already” *(Ronaldo)*.

“Like, um I don’t know if it’s just me but you find older people tend to think I’m old enough and ... I can take care of myself and stuff. Like you find 2nd years going out whenever they want... when you 1st year you’re kinda like just got you know out of your parents protection. And everything, you kind of like just aware and you ...yah you kind of more aware of these things” *(Tess)*.

“Um there is a difference in 1st year...you’re still new and I’m not from SA so I wouldn’t know how it is but when you’re 2nd year you kind of know the ins and outs and know which path not to take and stuff like that, so yah I guess there is a difference” *(Anne)*.

Thus, it appears that age according to the respondents does make a difference in the way one perceives safety. This finding is consistent with Jennings et. al., (2007) who found that levels of fear are primarily a function of age, gender, race and prior victimization experiences and that women have a greater fear of crime than men. Thus, age is a factor that influences perceptions of safety.

**Other factors**

Even though age and gender can influence one’s perceptions on safety and security, other factors can influence perceptions. In this study, some other factors were given as having an influence on
one’s perception of safety and security. These include one’s upbringing, prior experiences to crime and one’s personality. For example, some respondents said:

“I don’t know (Chucked). I don’t ok I think ah there are many factors that can ah influence the way you see safety and security. Maybe your upbringing and things like that I just don’t think gender is one of them” (Siya).

“So yah. I’d say it’s different. Yah. I think it’s personality, their upbringing and all that kind of stuff” (Jill).

“I think it’s a matter of like society how we were raised nje we were raised to be protected girls you know. Cause we like sensitive like that... Whereas guys are the ones who want to be the protectors and just be like we got this covered you know” (Lerato).

Thus, a number of factors influence one’s perceptions on safety inclusive of age, gender and other differences.

4.4.4 Students’ recommendations

All students in this study gave recommendations for the Student Representative Council (SRC), residences and for other students to improve safety and security.

**Student Representative Council (SRC)**

The SRC is an influential part of the student body and they have a role to ensure students’ safety and security. Respondents in this study gave some recommendations on what the SRC could do to promote student safety. These responses focused on increasing more awareness on safety and security issues:

“I think maybe um asking students asking students like what, what they would feel comfortable, like what would make them feel more comfortable on campus” (Mary).

“Probably, like say more safety initiatives maybe they do these, less walking around at night, walk in groups things like that, that do make, I’m sure they do, do that though” (Matthew).

**University/CPS**

Respondents gave recommendations to improve safety that overlap between the University and CPS as the Campus Control Unit. Some of these include increasing security on campus after
lecture times after 6 pm, having more security guards patrolling campuses, rotating security staff regularly during the day and having the safety and security talk at the beginning of the year and again in the middle of the year. These are indicated in the following responses:

“So our attention is not that much great I think if ok if they do it like during the O-week but they can... Just bring it back like even mid semester just to remind us that ah if you ever in trouble they could even put it on the sites you know. They can just put it on the site there or something even the homepage of UCT like CPS services more info about it” (Sakile).

“Um I would say provide CPS with some sort of weapon that they can use against criminals, maybe make people more aware of the services that CPS provides...” (Mary).

**Residences**

Most students highlighted that cameras within residences would help to improve safety inside residences. They also stated that cameras would not be appropriate in rooms and bathrooms but would work within corridors of the residence. Respondents said:

“Yah. Cameras, the security guards are already there... Yah yah around the residences cause yah cause I think UCT is just more worried about how the residence might get affected not actually how the students might get affected. Cause at the end of the day we’re paying the money... And we deserve a service for safety rather than the facilities that already have the safety and security” (Cameron).

“Probably cameras around, put cameras around. That’s like a big thing that would help. Because things do go missing here in res like if you just lock your, you know you don’t wanna lock your door when you take a shower...” (Matthew).

“They could have cameras in corridors. So if they had cameras... Like if something where to happen, I mean of course there’s privacy issues with that, in the bathroom they can’t have that and any of the rooms. But corridors” (John).

**Students**

Most recommendations given for students to improve their safety are focused on being more aware of safety and security and engaging in precautions that minimise students’ vulnerability to crime. Respondents said:

“Um I think they should just they shouldn’t make themselves like whenever they’re carrying possessions like cell phones maybe perhaps keep them in your pockets, don’t play music while you’re walking around at night. Like laptops, instead of carrying a laptop bag put it in a handbag or just wrap it in a school bag or something that doesn’t really bring too much attention” (Jemima).
“They shouldn’t put themselves in situations where like danger can arise any moment you know. They shouldn’t go down in the middle of the night by themselves in the dark and intoxicated. And they shouldn’t um they shouldn't argue with criminals and stuff like that cause those people ehy they are very emotional they can do anything to them” (Lerato).

“I think just ah the thing of walking in groups I think it helps. Cause now, even if there’s somebody who’s trying to do something wrong to you, you can get kind of help if you’re in a group” (Sakile).

“Ok. Seriously mmm... I don’t know maybe, it could help to bring it out there more. Talk about the services that are available. Yah. And... let it not be something that you... go and look for when something bad has happened. Let it be something you know about” (Siya).

Thus, these recommendations indicate some areas that UCT’s safety and security could be improved to ensure students’ safety.

4.4.5 Residence supervisors’ perceptions

Senior housing officials have an “important role to play in raising awareness of the need for campus safety and crime prevention among their staffs, student affairs professionals, students and the campus community” (Gregory & Janosik, 2006:51). At UCT, one of the roles of residence supervisors’ is managing safety and security issues. In this study, it was discovered that these residence management staff are no longer referred to as residence supervisors but Residence Facilities Officers (RFOs). The themes that emerged on their perceptions on student safety and security will now be discussed.

Students’ behaviour and concerns

Residence supervisors have perceptions on students’ behaviour towards their own safety and they expressed concerns that they have of their students’ safety. There is a difference in the way that supervisors and students perceive student safety and behaviour. As noted, students take precautions to make themselves less vulnerable to crime. However, supervisors are under the impression that students behave in ways which compromise their safety and that they do not take their safety and security seriously. Two supervisors said:

“You know I think the time has come that UCT should have either little safe boxes fitted into the cupboards. Where they can lock up their valuables cause these girls are very careless. Very very careless”.
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“But you come a girl is busy packing, her door is wide open and she’s not even in her room. And her wallet is standing there and her computer is still standing there” (Joshua).

“Definitely ah you see it is on the onus of the students to avoid, like I said they have a responsibility but they don’t adhere to what we are saying. We putting up posters... Put a proper lock on your door and they don’t do it. They like these small ones” (Whiskey).

Supervisors also expressed some concerns that they have of their students’ safety mainly based on the behaviour of the students’ within their residences. These concerns include students’ going out habits and not being aware of their surroundings. Two supervisors mentioned the following concerns:

“At the moment yes. My concern would be students going out partying from Thursday nights to Saturday nights. Ah taking these cabs to come home. How can you trust cabs? How can you? I just sort of by the way heard of somebody that said they were raped you know. It hasn’t been official yet... But they said they’d been raped over the weekend and it was an international student. By a cab driver. They had gone out, got drunk and took a cab and this happened. Ah how true it is I don’t know at the moment its hearsay” (Joshua).

“It’s not under any residence it’s in general, young people look at us and they think ‘ah they’re old, they’re old you know what do they know’. And they walk around in the street young people walk around the street with their cell phones... And they’re on ‘Mix it’. You know they totally disregard the danger that’s out there because they think it’s not gonna happen to them. And I’m not saying become paranoid about these things, but become alert” (Sara).

There may be this difference in perceptions whereby students believe they take precautions and supervisors believe the contrary because residence supervisors deal with many cases within the residence. This gives them an opportunity to deal with more students and cases of negligence whereas students are unaware that some of their behaviour increases their vulnerability to crime.

**Residence safety and security measures**

In this study, it was found that there are a few safety and security measures put in place within residences particularly to control students’ behaviour within the residence. There is a rule book within each residence at UCT that has rules pertaining to that particular residence and covers all aspects such as visitors and use of alcohol.
To ensure students’ safety, there are rules pertaining to visitors in all the residences. The main procedure used within the residences is a signing in system whereby students’ visitors are supposed to be signed in and out. There is also a time frame for when visitors can come to the residence and when they should leave the residence. All three supervisors said:

“You come and visit your host will have to come and meet you, sign you in and walk you to their room. When you leave the same procedure. They have to make sure that you walk out, you don’t go to other friends to go and visit there, um and then about quarter to 12 at night we check the register” (Sara).

“Yes. They can come in while there’s day, they can come in any time during the day. As from half past 7, and they have to be out of the building by quarter to 12. And every student who has a male visitor even of it’s the father has to sign in our visitors’ book and has to sign them out again” (Joshua).

“What we have discovered ok the curve is 5 to 12. Then all visitors must be out. No one is allowed to stay overnight. Ok so the receptionist is on duty until 12 o’clock and so before he locks up him and the sub warden they’re supposed to make sure that everybody is out” (Whiskey).

There are strict measures on alcohol consumption within residences. Supervisors highlighted that they are alert about alcohol use and when students are caught with alcohol they are reprimanded for breaking the rules on alcohol consumption. All three supervisors mentioned:

“In the res but I know the warden is very strict with having alcohol in the rooms. Even if she finds empty bottles in the room or empty bottles near a bin opposite a flat she will investigate. So there is like you know discipline they’re disciplined yah. They either get fined or they get community work” (Joshua).

“But we have a strong team. Ah what they do they get you know all the CPS to assist as well and they are quick to bring the situation under control. Ah if anybody comes in here they know the rules of this residence. We have confiscated a box of beers from freshers last year. They came here first day brought in a case of beer and we confiscated it straight away. We are very... alert that way and we don’t allow alcohol in bottles in any case here” (Whiskey).

“Cause they’re so intoxicated they don’t know what they’re doing. So you take away the wine and you discard it um you make sure they get to bed and the next morning you, what we do first as day staff is we try to talk to them. And sometimes the sub wardens would issue a DC (Disciplinary Committee), or a notification that there’s gonna be DC” (Sara).

Residences have safety and security services in place to try to combat crime and protect students
from harm. According to Flannery and Quinn-Leering (2000), some universities use tactics including adding security guards, installing video cameras and alarm systems, increasing lighting around campus, establishing a night escort service and restricting access to campus buildings to keep their campuses safe.

Considering residence supervisors’ responses in this study, it is clear that the Health and Safety Policy is in use at residence level because there are measures that are in place in residences to ensure student safety and well-being. Residence supervisors play a key role in ensuring student safety. They make sure students adhere to safety and security measures by following up within their residences on incidences of crime and other safety threatening incidences. In discussing the Health and Safety Policy, two supervisors had the following responses:

“I think it’s fairly comprehensive. And I know that the university strives to maintain that and to better. So there’s constant awareness um from the Health and Safety side to us in various departments um to be more alert and then to do our fire drills and we have to be aware of hazardous things…” (Sara).

“Well from a Student Housing perspective, I would say yah because we are doing regular checks… To ensure that the health and safety is in place and that the policies are being followed yah. If it’s not being followed then you know we either remove or we will ensure that it is in place” (Whiskey).

Thus, residence supervisors are aware of the Health and Safety Policy and strive to implement it as far as possible in their respective residences. This indicates that at UCT the Health and Safety Policy is utilised in dealing with health and safety issues.

**Safety and security services and CPS**

Residence supervisors believe that there have been significant changes in the assistance and work of CPS over the years that they have been residence supervisors. CPS is more involved in helping residence supervisors to address incidences of crime and prevention of crime specifically within residences.
In discussing CPS, the following responses were given by two supervisors.

“I must say these years they are more on the ball that what they’ve been former years. And they’re very very helpful very helpful” (Joshua).

“I think it’s been good so far purely because we um we don’t play a passive role as staff. We sit down we meet with the security. We talk to them we hear what are their issues. Um we pick up issues that when we see that they’re failing or becoming lax we’ll bring them to their attention. Um encourage try to get them back on the road again (Sara).

Supervisors are more aware of services than students are in comparing their responses. This might be because they work more closely with CPS personnel than students hence they are more aware of the services that are provided. All three supervisors are generally happy with the security system that is in place within residences but they acknowledged that there is always room for improvement in order to have a more efficient security system. They said:

“Ah thus far, I must say I’m quite happy with what’s happening ah, I don’t say our residence is crime free” (Whiskey).

“I must say within UCT I think the security is, I wouldn’t give them a 100%... Cause always there’s always room for improvement and people get very relaxed in certain areas um and take things for granted” (Sara).

Bowser (1994) noted that students and staff alike perceived the Campus Control Unit (now called CPS) to be at the periphery of university life. The fact that residence supervisors have noted a significant change in CPS’s work shows that there have been significant changes in the provision of safety and security services at UCT since Bowser’s (1994) findings. This shows that UCT continually strives to make improvements in safety and security provision.

**Recommendations**

Residence supervisors had recommendations for various stakeholders that need to play a role in improving students’ safety. These included what UCT and CPS could do to improve the safety within their residences, what the SRC could do to promote student safety and measures that students can put in place to ensure their own safety within the university context.
UCT and CPS
Residence supervisors gave some recommendations on what UCT could do to improve their safety and security system. The recommendations overlap between measures that UCT and CPS could put in place to increase the safety and security system. These are illustrated by the following responses from one supervisor:

“The lighting is not strong enough. We need more stronger lighting. know. The areas need to be lit up more especially where students are walking going up to the gym that type of thing”.

“And there’s no shuttles on a Saturday and a Sunday when you have to be in work. So that is something... Yah that’s something that UCT can sort of see to, to prevent or bring more security for the staff. To get shuttles when staff has to be on duty to have shuttles coming up for them” (Joshua).

SRC
Residence supervisors believe the SRC needs to take a more active role in promoting student safety by engaging with students more and raising awareness on safety and security issues as indicated by the following responses:

“Yes the SRC ah well they must be involved especially because they are here to assist the students. So they, they play a vital role here that’s all I can say. They must live out and play that role” (Whiskey).

“Yes from their side perhaps see that in the residences that CPS comes out and have their talks with them. You know. The SRC get behind this drive. Make it compulsory that residences should have these information evenings with the students” (Joshua).

Residences and students
Some of the recommendations that were given in this study to improve security in residences included having a 24hr security presence within residences. One supervisor mentioned:

“I would say to all the residences go the 24hr route. We have noticed that crime within our area has lessened over the years with the 24hr” (Sara).

Recommendations for students were mainly focused on students being more responsible for their safety and being conscious of their environment. The following responses from all three supervisors indicate this:
“Take responsibility. I think that ah that actually just sums the whole thing out. Just take responsibility. Where you are, what you doing, where you’re going, what you’re taking with you?” (Sara).

“I think yes. If they go walk if they do, do it in groups. You still find that odd girl going around I mean alone. You still find that odd girl when I get here in the morning running down the stairs on her own” (Joshua).

“As I said, it’s all up to you as the individual. You need to be alert and you need to take care of yourself somehow” (Whiskey).

Thus, these recommendations indicate that there are changes that could be done to improve the safety and security system at UCT.

4.5. Conclusion

In this Chapter, the findings of this study were discussed based on the themes and categories that emerged in the study. The findings were compared and contrasted with other studies in the literature review.

In the next Chapter, the conclusions and recommendations will be presented.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter gives an overview of conclusions made based on the results explained in the previous chapter. In addition, recommendations to the University of Cape Town (UCT), Campus Protection Services (CPS) and the Student Representative Council (SRC) will be presented.

5.2 Research Conclusions
The following conclusions were drawn from this research study based on the research objectives.

To determine student perceptions on safety and security.
It seems most students that participated in this study perceive themselves to be safe within UCT campuses because none of them have been victimized on campus. Off campus, students feel less safe and some students have been victims of crime off campus. Most students take precautions to make themselves less vulnerable to crime except for two students. There are some differences in the way that students perceive their safety on different campuses and difference residences. Students on Medical Campus view their campus to be safer in comparison to Upper Campus. Furthermore, students who live on Upper Campus perceive Upper Campus to be safer than Lower Campus. It seems that half of the respondents, both male and female, drink alcohol and thus may further compromise their safety.

To explore the security services offered at the University of Cape Town.
Safety and security services offered at UCT campuses seem to be efficient. Students are not well informed of safety and security services. However, they are aware of patrolling, night escort service and the Blue Safe Walk services. Most students view the safety and security system at UCT as good. However, some concerns were raised concerning (Campus Protection Services) CPS’s skills and capabilities to keep students’ safe.
To find out whether age, gender and year of study influence student perceptions on safety and security. The results of this study showed that students view age, gender and year of study as factors influencing perceptions on safety and security. In terms of age, the respondents noted that younger people are less aware and tend to be naïve about their safety and security and that growth makes people more aware of their safety. Females are perceived as more vulnerable to crime with the added dimension of possible rape. Some respondents noted that senior students from 2nd year onwards are more aware of safety because of experience and familiarity with their environment.

To ascertain student recommendations to improve campus safety and security. Students in this study gave recommendations to improve safety and security in residences and on campus. These recommendations included having cameras within residences, having more security guards patrolling and making students more aware of safety and security services. Recommendations for students were mainly focused on students’ becoming more aware of safety and security and being more cautious to make themselves less vulnerable to crime.

To determine residence supervisors’ perceptions on student’s safety and security. Residence supervisors perceive most students to be careless and negligent in their behaviour within residences. Supervisors raised concerns about student safety when they go out. It was highlighted by the supervisors that the safety and security service at UCT has improved in the last decade.

5.3 Recommendations
Based on the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations can be put forward:

University of Cape Town
- Security management staff needs to ensure that the outsourced security service is efficient and adequate in meeting student and staff safety needs.
- A website specifically on safety and security issues could alert students to behaviours that could protect them.
- There may be a need to focus on 1st years when it comes to raising awareness of safety and security matters even though every student regardless of year of study can be victimized.
- That CCTV cameras be placed in and around all university residences.

**Campus Protection Services (CPS)**
- CPS should be more active in making students adhere to safety and security preventative measures by putting in place strategies and programmes that promote student safety proactively rather than reacting to crimes already committed.
- CPS needs to conduct awareness talks throughout the year especially in residences.

**Student Representative Council (SRC)**
- The SRC need to actively work in collaboration with CPS to raise awareness of safety and security issues.
- The SRC should develop campaigns on safety that are creative and appeal to students
- Fun events that are focused on safety and security should be held.

**University of Cape Town Health and Safety Policy**
The recommendations that have been highlighted to improve safety and security are in line with the current UCT Health and Safety Policy (Appendix 1:83). University contexts change due to various factors such as external influences and environmental changes. For example, UCT should consider research findings on crime in the broader South African context and use such information to inform their safety and security strategies and policy. Thus, it is recommended that the current policy should be revised periodically to determine if it adequately addresses health and safety issues in the current UCT context. Amendments to the policy should be made where necessary to make sure that the policy is comprehensive and addressing key issues regarding health and safety.

**5.4 Conclusion**
Based on the conclusions presented in this chapter, it is the researcher’s opinion that all the research questions in this study were answered. Students’ perceptions on safety and security
were determined, the security services offered by the University of Cape Town that they are aware of were given in the study and students’ recommendations to improve safety and security were presented. Gender and year of study were both shown to influence students’ perceptions on safety and security and new factors that influence perceptions on safety and security were highlighted such as one’s upbringing. Residence supervisors’ perceptions of their students’ safety and security were also determined. The discussion of findings chapter, Chapter 4 illustrates how these questions were answered. The main goal of this study was to have an understanding of students’ perceptions on their safety. This goal was achieved because after the study the researcher gained insight on how first year students perceive their safety and security at UCT.

In conclusion, there is a need to further explore the issue of safety and security. Further research could be done by exploring the perceptions of senior students to determine if there are similar perceptions. There is a need to carry out surveys so that ‘hard data’ can be collected with regards to the incidence/nature/extent of various crimes on campus. This study is valuable to universities because they can use studies such as this one, on their safety aspects to market themselves to potential students. The study can also be extended at doctoral level to further determine the status of campus crime in South Africa.
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APPENDIX 1: UCT HEALTH AND SAFETY POLICY

The University of Cape Town has a moral and legal obligation to safeguard and protect its students, staff and visitors against injury, diseases as well as risks to Health & safety within the University.

The Occupational Health and Safety Act places the legal onus for Occupational Health & Safety upon myself as Vice Chancellor of the University of Cape Town.

In turn, this is now formally delegated in terms of section 16.2 of the Act to Deputy Vice-chancellors, Deans, Directors, Heads of Departments, support staff and student bodies who are charged with compliance and required to ensure that all legal duties are effectively discharged.

The University, therefore, aims to:

- provide and maintain a safe work environment by implementing structures and programs to ensure that hazards to Health and Safety are identified in a systematic manner and timeously actioned;
- provide the fire prevention and safety training to all staff & students
- comply with the requirements of the Occupational Health & Safety Act of 1993
- to take a proactive stance on environment matters
- ensure that contractors undertake their duties in a safe and responsible manner.

To ensure the above, the University requires management at all academic and non-academic levels to accept responsibility for this, and to ensure full legal compliance in their areas of responsibility as a condition of employment.

The University requires all staff and students to adhere to all safe work standards and procedures and to:

- identify, eliminate or control all unsafe acts and conditions;
- operate and use equipment and vehicles in such a way that their safety and that of others is ensured;
• maintain and use safety equipment where prescribed or where necessary; adhere to all legal requirements and all other regulations relating to safety.
APPENDIX 2: MAP OF UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN RESIDENCES

Map 1: University of Cape Town Residences
APPENDIX 3: STUDENT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Interview Schedule (Students)
- Explain Purpose
- Contract for confidentiality/anonymity
- Participation voluntary
- Contract for use of tape recorder

Identifying data:
Researcher to note residence…………..
and gender of interviewee……………..

1. Please give a name or an alias for yourself that will be used for this interview to protect you anonymity.
2. Please state your year of study.
3. How old are you?
4. Are you a South African Citizen?
5. If not which country are you from?

Student’s perceptions about safety
1. How would you describe “safety”?
2. Is there a difference between “safety and security”? (Explore what the difference is according to the student).
3. Who should be responsible for your safety and security? (Please motivate your answer)
4. What has been your experience with regards to your own safety at UCT? (explore & probe for examples)
5. Have you been a victim of crime on campus or around campus? (explore nature of crime)
6. Did you report the crime to CPS or SAPS? (Explore the kind of assistance received)?
7. What do you think could have been done differently to help you better in that situation? (explore)
8. What has been your experience with regards to the safety of other people you know at UCT? (Probe for examples – others /friends who have been a victim of crime on or around campus? …the kind of crimes perpetrated?)

**Students’ behaviours with regard to safety**

1. Do you take any precautions to make yourself less vulnerable to crime? Explore for examples
2. Do you often go out at night? (Explore safety issues).
3. Do you usually move around alone or in a group? Explore
4. Have you had some experiences (yourself or your friends) of walking alone at night and being intoxicated?
5. What precautions should one take while intoxicated? Explore
6. Have you had any experiences of being ‘unsafe’ in residence? (probe …)
7. What could be done to keep yourself and your valuables safe in residence?
8. How do you protect yourself when you have to move around campus and surrounding areas carrying valuables? Explore.

**The nature of security services on campus**

1. How have you experienced UCT’s safety and security system? (Explore for examples)
2. What safety and security services are you aware of at UCT?
3. In which ways can UCT’s safety and security services be made more accessible to students?
4. What is your overall perception of UCT’s safety and security services?

**Does gender and year of study influence perceptions?**

1. Do you think the fact that you are a male or female influences your safety? (Explore for examples)
2. Do you feel more or less vulnerable to crime because of your gender?
3. Should there be special security arrangements for male or female students?
4. Are you aware of any special arrangements based on gender? Give examples
5. From your personal experiences, does age impact on how students perceive their safety?
Recommendations

1. What could the SRC do to promote student safety?
2. What do you think residences can do to improve safety within its confines, with regards to your rooms and the surrounding area?
3. What do you think can be done to improve safety on campus?
4. What recommendation would you like to put in place at UCT to improve safety and security?
5. Are there any other strategies that students themselves could put in place to endure their own safety?

Would you like to add any other comments to this discussion?
APPENDIX 4: RESIDENCE SUPERVISORS INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Interview Schedule (Residence supervisors)

- Explain Purpose
- Contract for confidentiality/anonymity
- Participation voluntary
- Contract for use of tape recorder

Identifying data:
Researcher to note residence..............
and gender of interviewee..............

1. Please give a name or an alias for yourself that will be used for this interview to protect your anonymity.
2. Please state how long you have been a residence supervisor.
3. Are you a South African Citizen?
4. If not which country are you from?

Residence supervisor’s perceptions about student safety

1. How would you describe “safety”?
2. Is there a difference between “safety and security”? (Explore what the difference is according to the residence supervisor).
3. Who should be responsible for your students’ safety and security? (Please motivate your answer)
4. What has been your experience with regards to your students’ safety at UCT? (explore & probe for examples)
5. Are all incidents of crime reported to CPS or SAPS? (Explore the kind of assistance received)
6. Is there an incident that stands out for you? (Explore)
7. Did you report the crime to CPS or SAPS? (Explore the kind of assistance received)?
8. What do you think could have been done differently to help you better in that situation? (explore)
9. What has been your experience with regards to the safety of other people you know at UCT? (Probe for examples – others /friends who have been a victim of crime on or around campus? …the kind of crimes perpetrated?).

Residence supervisors’ approaches to student safety
1. How are residence supervisor’s expected to contribute towards student safety? (explore rules and measures to enforce such rules).
2. Which precautions have you taken to enhance student safety? (explore for examples)
3. What concerns do you have about student safety (explore…)
4. Are there any restrictions on students’ visitor’s at night? (Explore how it is kept or how it is ignored and what is done to enforce these restrictions).
5. How are students who are intoxicated in residence dealt with? (Explore)
7. What could be done to keep students valuables safe in residence?
8. Give some examples of how student safety was compromised in residence.

The nature of security services on campus
1. How have you experienced UCT’s safety and security system? (Explore for examples)
2. Are you familiar with the UCT health and safety policy? Explore
3. What safety and security services are you aware of at UCT?
4. In which ways can UCT’s safety and security services be made more accessible to students?
5. What is your overall perception of UCT’s safety and security services?

Does gender and year of study influence perceptions?
6. Do you think that gender influences your student’s perceptions on their safety? (Explore for examples)
7. Do you feel that one gender is more or less vulnerable to crime? Explore reasons
8. Should there be special security arrangements for male or female students?
9. Are you aware of any special arrangements based on gender? Give examples
10. From your personal experiences, does age impact on how students perceive their safety?
Recommendations

1. What could the University/ SRC do to promote student safety?
2. What do you think residences can do to improve safety within its confines, with regards to students’ rooms and the surrounding area?
3. What do you think can be done to improve safety on campus?
4. What recommendation would you like to put in place at UCT to improve safety and security?
5. Are there any other strategies that students themselves could put in place to ensure their own safety?
6. What could residence supervisors do to promote student safety?

Would you like to add any other comments to this discussion?