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ABSTRACT

Child sexual abuse is a prevalent problem in South Africa – one in every three children is sexually abused before the age of 18. Sexually abused children have serious psychological, physical and social problems which cause further difficulties into adulthood. Most abusers are known to their victims and thus, victims do not always disclose the abuse. Therefore, the law compels the reporting of child sexual abuse suspicions by third parties. However, past research shows that mandated reporters do not always report child sexual abuse suspicions.

This study aimed to investigate the factors related to the mandatory reporting of child sexual abuse amongst primary school teachers in South Africa. A cross-sectional research study, using self-administered survey questionnaires, was conducted amongst foundation phase teachers in the Western Cape province of South Africa. Grounded on the theory of planned behaviour, this study investigated the relationships between various independent variables with the teacher’s intention to report child sexual abuse. The independent variables tested included the teachers’ attitude towards reporting, subjective norm, perceived behavioural control, knowledge on mandatory reporting, past reporting behaviour and socio-demographic characteristics of teachers.

From a total population of 1118 public primary schools (and estimated 9542 foundation phase teachers), using stratified random sampling, a total of 2032 questionnaires were hand-delivered to 200 schools randomly selected across the Western Cape. A total of 399 foundation phase teachers participated in this study, representing a 20% response rate.

This study found that about 25% of teachers had reported at least one case of child sexual abuse during their teaching career. About 7% of the teachers in this study had encountered instances in which they had failed to report suspected child sexual abuse. Subjective norm and perceived behavioural control (but not attitude towards reporting) was
found to predict intention to report amongst teachers. A teacher who reported child sexual abuse in the past as well as a teacher with more accurate knowledge on mandatory reporting, was more likely to have intention to report in the future. Contrary to that posited by the theory of planned behaviour, attitude towards reporting did not mediate the relationship between past reporting behaviour and intention to report nor the relationship between knowledge on mandatory reporting and intention to report.

The study further found that older teachers with more years teaching experience, although having a lower education level, were more likely to report their suspicions. Younger teachers, with less teaching experience, although better educated than their older counterparts, indicated less likelihood of reporting. The theory of planned behaviour, although significant, could not on its own effectively be applied to teachers’ intention to report child sexual abuse and further investigation identified other explanatory factors that influenced teachers’ intention to report.

Given the high prevalence of child sexual abuse, the results have important implications. Whilst the teachers’ age, years teaching experience or past reporting behaviour cannot be controlled, teachers must be adequately trained and supported. Knowing how to recognize and report child sexual abuse must be integrated into the tertiary education qualifications of student teachers as well as in continuing in-service training initiatives of current teachers. Furthermore, schools and the entire child protection system, must be supportive to teachers in their reporting duties.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins by providing a background on child sexual abuse and its negative effects as well as the extent of the problem globally. The statement of the research problem, study rationale, as well as the aims and specific research objectives are then examined. Next, the significance of the study to social development and child protection is discussed. Finally, operational definitions of concepts employed in the research questions and hypotheses are given.

Background and context

Child sexual abuse incorporates a large variety of sexual acts perpetrated against children, including both contact and non-contact offenses, which range in physical intrusiveness (Wurtele, 2009). In its simplest definition, child sexual abuse refers to any act of a sexual nature upon or with a child. Included in the definition are activities such as rape which occur for the sexual gratification of the perpetrator as well as those which occur for the sexual gratification of a third party, for instance forcing a child to take part in pornographic activities (Richter & Higson-Smith, 2004). Contact sexual abuse includes kissing, fondling, oral sex, and vaginal and anal intercourse. Non-contact sexual abuse includes making sexual remarks to a child, voyeurism, or showing a child pornographic material (Finkelhor, 1994).

Globally, child sexual abuse been reported in both boys and girls as well as across all demographic, ethnic and family groups (Finkelhor, 1994; Pereda, Guílera, Forns & Gómez-Benito, 2009a). In a synthesis of 39 prevalence studies in 21 different countries, Pereda et al. (2009a) found that child sexual abuse was widespread in most societies. Perpetrators of child sexual abuse are more likely to be known to their victims such as family members or family
friends and acquaintances as opposed to strangers or unknown persons (Richter & Dawes, 2008; Ullman, 2007). In a study amongst 733 college students in the United States of America (USA), a 23% prevalence rate of having been abused during childhood was reported by Ullman (2007). Of those who reported being sexually abused as children, 89% had been abused by people known to them and 11% had been sexually abused by strangers (Ullman, 2007). This is in line with the review of child sexual abuse studies conducted two decades ago by Finkelhor (1994) who found that victims of child sexual abuse indicated that no more than 10% to 30% of perpetrators were strangers to them.

There are serious long-term consequences on a child’s development because of child sexual abuse and most victims experience feelings of shame and guilt throughout their childhood (Fergusson, McLeod & Horwood, 2013; Finkelhor, 1990; Kendall-Tackett, 2002; King et al., 2004; Trickett, Noll & Putnam, 2011). There are also further difficulties for victims because of child sexual abuse including cognitive disturbances, academic problems, physical problems, acting-out behaviours and interpersonal difficulties (Kendall-Tackett, 2002; Trickett et al., 2011).

Mathews, Loots, Sikweyiya and Jewkes (2012) observed that the “consequences of sexual abuse of boys and girls can be severe, and may include Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) symptoms, depression, suicidal notions and attempts and inappropriate sexualised behaviour” (p. 84). Similarly, in a study amongst 939 Cape Town high school learners, King et al. (2004) reported that South African adolescents who were sexual assault victims were more likely to abuse alcohol, behave anti-socially (steal, cause physical damage to property, bully others, physically fight with others), exhibit suicidal ideation and attempt suicide.

In a systematic review of fourteen reviews on child sexual abuse published between 1995 and 2008, Maniglio (2009) reported that survivors of child sexual abuse suffer a variety of medical, psychological, behavioural and sexual disorders. Medical problems included
pelvic pain and non-epileptic seizures. Psychological problems included personality disorders, depression, self-esteem impairment, suicidal tendencies, obsessions and compulsions (Maniglio, 2009). Sexually risky behaviours such as engagement in unprotected sexual intercourse, multiple sexual partners and sex trading (prostitution) was a consequence of child sexual abuse that particularly led to even more problems such as Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) infection and intimate partner violence (Maniglio, 2009). Behavioural disorders such as suicidal behaviour, substance abuse, and self-mutilation were also prevalent amongst child sexual abuse survivors (Maniglio, 2009).

The negative effects of child sexual abuse are reported to follow the victims into adulthood and their subsequent adult relationships (Fergusson et al., 2013; Pérez-Fuentes et al., 2013; Roberts, O’Connor, Dunn & Golding, 2004; Schuetze & Eiden, 2005). In a longitudinal study of over 30 years amongst 987 members of a cohort study in New Zealand, Fergusson et al. (2013) reported the following sequelae of child sexual abuse into victim’s adult lives: mental health problems, PTSD symptoms, declining self-esteem, declining life satisfaction, declining partner relationship quality; sexual risk-taking behaviours such as earlier age of onset of sexual activity, a greater number of sexual partners and more unplanned pregnancies; physical health problems and more doctor/hospital contacts; and socioeconomic problems such as leaving school without qualifications, welfare dependence, and lower gross personal income.

In a study amongst mothers in England who had experienced sexual abuse as children, Roberts et al. (2004) found that child sexual abuse has even longer-term repercussions for parent mental health, parenting relationships and even adjustment problems in the victims’ own children. Mothers who had experienced child sexual abuse were more likely to experience mental problems such as higher levels of depression and anxiety and lower levels of self-esteem, which, in turn, negatively affected their parenting relationships with their own
children (Roberts et al., 2004). In addition, those mothers who had experienced child sexual abuse, were more likely to report poor communication and less satisfaction in their partner relationships as well as negativity in their relationships with their own children (Roberts et al., 2004). Their children, in turn, were more hyperactive, and experienced conduct, peer and emotional problems (Roberts et al., 2004).

Similarly, Schuetze and Eiden (2005) found that mothers in the USA who had experienced child sexual abuse were found to experience higher maternal depression and higher intimate-partner violence. Those mothers who had experienced child sexual abuse tended to be more negative in their parental perceptions and were also more likely to raise their own children with higher punitive disciplinary measures (Schuetze & Eiden, 2005). The children of mothers who had been victims of child sexual abuse were at increased risk for child maltreatment and overall mal-development (Trickett et al., 2011).

Incidence levels of child sexual abuse involve counting the number of child sexual abuse cases that are reported and disclosed to child protection agencies during a given period, usually one year. Because many child sexual abuse cases are unreported and undetected, incidence figures give an indication of the scope of the problem facing a given society but are only the tip of the iceberg (Dawes & Mushwana, 2007; Finkelhor, 1990; Jewkes & Abrahams, 2002). Prevalence studies are considered to determine a more realistic estimate of the problem of child sexual abuse and involve retrospectively asking adults about their childhood experiences of sexual abuse. Reviewing 19 prevalence studies (which used community samples and random sampling techniques) on child sexual abuse from the 1970s to 1990s in the USA and Canada, Finkelhor (1994) concluded that the prevalence of child sexual abuse in American adult women was at 20% and in American adult men was between 5% and 10%. Finkelhor (1994) further hypothesised that child sexual abuse would continue
to be one of the most important public health problems in all societies in which it had been measured.

Pereda et al. (2009a) hypothesised that child sexual abuse prevalence rates would be very similar to those obtained by Finkelhor (1994) and would confirm the widespread continued prevalence of child sexual abuse globally, a decade later. Pereda, Guilera, Forns, and Gómez-Benito (2009b) conducted a meta-analysis of sixty-five child sexual abuse prevalence studies published from 1984 to 2007 covering 22 countries. This meta-analysis confirmed the hypothesis and revealed an overall international average of 19.7% (16.7-23.0, 95% CI) of adult women and 7.9% (6.0-10.3, 95% CI) of adult men had suffered some form of sexual abuse prior to the age of eighteen (Pereda et al., 2009b). The findings revealed that the prevalence of child sexual abuse for females was significantly higher than that for males at the 95% confidence level. Prevalence was found to be moderated by the continent on which the studies were conducted, with the highest prevalence rate of 34.4% (21.1-50.7, 95% CI) found in Africa, represented by Morocco, Tanzania, and mainly South Africa (Pereda et al., 2009b).

More recently, Barth, Bermetz, Heim, Trelle and Tonia (2013) conducted a meta-analysis of 55 studies amongst children under the age of 18 from 24 countries published between 2002 and 2009 to determine a more current prevalence of child sexual abuse worldwide. Prevalence ranged from 8 to 31% for girls and 3 to 17% for boys, indicating that females are two to three times more at risk of being sexually abused during childhood (Barth et al., 2013). These findings were not moderated by continent although the authors recommended that prevention programmes be tailored to be culture-specific (Barth et al., 2013).

Although prevalence studies may also underestimate the extent of child sexual abuse because “there may be many more men and women who were victimized as children but did
not disclose their victimization due to embarrassment, concerns about privacy, not defining it as abuse, or because they did not remember these experiences” (Wurtele, 2009, p. 2), these findings do give an indication of the global extent of the problem of child sexual abuse.

To stem the tide of child sexual abuse, strategies are implemented at three prevention levels namely primary, secondary and tertiary interventions (Goldman, Salus, Wolcott & Kennedy, 2003; September, 2006; Topping & Baron, 2009). Primary prevention strategies are directed at all children and families and focus on preventing child sexual abuse before it occurs (September, 2006; Topping & Baron, 2009). Internationally, primary prevention strategies which have shown some effectiveness include school-based safety lifeskills programmes amongst children, parents and teachers as well as public awareness activities which encourage disclosure and reporting of cases of child sexual abuse (Kenny, 2010; Kenny & Wurtele, 2010; Lalor & McElvaney, 2010; MacIntyre and Carr, 1999).

Secondary prevention strategies focus on families where children are at greater than average risk of child sexual abuse occurring and typically include parenting programmes aimed at dysfunctional, single or teenage parents as well as parents living in impoverished communities (September, 2006; Topping & Baron, 2009). Makoae (2014) reported that socioeconomic development programmes should include parental training in skills and knowledge to influence beliefs about the rights of children and enhance their protective capacity at relationship, family and community levels.

Tertiary prevention occurs when child sexual abuse has already occurred (Goldman et al., 2003; September, 2006). Tertiary prevention strives to rehabilitate the victim and perpetrator so that they can be reintegrated into their families and society. These interventions usually include therapeutic services aimed at the victims and their families as well as the perpetrators (Goldman et al., 2003; Lalor & McElvaney, 2010). Whilst all levels of prevention are considered necessary in a comprehensive child protection strategy, proactive
primary prevention strategies are considered the most cost effective of all compared to reactive tertiary prevention measures – such as alternative care in children’s homes – which are the costliest (Makoae, 2014; Proudlock & Jamieson, 2008; Topping & Barron, 2009). All prevention strategies require cooperation between all government sectors including education, health, social welfare and development, police and judiciary to enhance their efficacy, as well as the necessary funding of these strategies (Lalor & McElvaney, 2010; September, 2006).

**Statement of the research problem**

Child sexual abuse is usually a secretive activity which typically occurs in private. Children are often sworn to secrecy by the perpetrator (often with threats by the perpetrator that they will be punished if found out) and they often fear negative consequences for themselves or others should they disclose their abuse (Goodman-Brown, Edelstein, Goodman, Jones & Gordon, 2003). In a study amongst 218 children in the USA who had disclosed child sexual abuse and whose cases had been referred for prosecution, Goodman-Brown et al. (2003) found that children who feared negative consequences for others such as parents or relatives, took longer to disclose than children who had not expressed these fears.

Studies reveal that many children never disclose their abuse whilst others delay disclosure for years (Goodman-Brown et al., 2003; Smith et al., 2000; Ullman, 2007). Thus, it is imperative that children are assisted in bringing the perpetrators into the open so that new victims do not fall prey to these perpetrators or that re-victimisation of current victims can be stopped. Early detection and reporting by external parties exposes perpetrators and prevents further abuse from continuing. Reporting suspected child sexual abuse cases results in perpetrators being investigated and, if found guilty of the offence, subsequently imprisoned.
Reporting abuse thus starts the process where perpetrators are removed from the environment so that they no longer inflict further harm. In addition, reporting child sexual abuse enables victimised children to be removed to safe places and the victims and their families to receive the necessary psychosocial support from the social development services as soon as possible (Collings, Griffiths & Kumalo, 2005). When victims of abuse received assistance dealing with these traumatic experiences, this facilitate their rehabilitation and they have more chance of self-reliance and independence later in their lives (Dutschke, 2007).

Mandatory reporting of child sexual abuse by professionals and other persons in positions of responsibility for children (such as doctors, nurses, and teachers) is found in many countries across the world, for example, the United Kingdom (UK), the USA, Canada, Australia as well as in South Africa (Goldman, 2007; Kenny, 2001; Mathews & Kenny, 2008). Mandatory reporting requires teachers, after detection and recognition of abuse in the child or if a child discloses abuse, to report the case of suspected child sexual abuse. However, the teacher must decide to report the abuse and then act on this decision. This decision-making process ultimately culminates in intention and behaviour to report or not to report.

In a national study by Burton and Leoschut (2013) amongst 5939 secondary school learners in South Africa, 4.7% of the learners reported being sexually assaulted or raped whilst at school 12 months prior to the study. Of these learners who had been raped or sexually assaulted at school, 61.7% disclosed their abuse to a third party. Action was in turn taken or facilitated by the third party informed in six of every ten (63.8%) instances. Of those third parties who took action, 8.4% reported the matter to the police services and 3.4% reported it to the school. Of those learners who informed others about the sexual violence they had experienced, 49.7% disclosed to school personnel, 31.1% informed their friends and 13.7% told their parents (Burton & Leoschut, 2013). Although the study did not cross-
tabulate the results of action for each type of third party the learner disclosed to, the study’s findings do suggest that not all sexual violence disclosed to school personnel were reported to the relevant authorities.

Furthermore, whilst a study specifically on reporting intentions and behaviours amongst South African teachers has not been conducted previously, overseas studies indicate that school teachers and school counsellors often delay or avoid reporting despite the legal obligation to report child sexual abuse suspicions (Goldman & Padayachi, 2005; Kenny, 2001; Webb & Vulliamy, 2001; Crenshaw, Crenshaw & Lichtenberg, 1995).

In a study on reporting behaviour and intentions amongst 122 school counsellors in Australia, Goldman and Padayachi (2005) found that there is a tendency to under-report suspicions of child sexual abuse where, up to 17% percent of male school counsellors and between 10% and 19% of female school counsellors indicated that they would not report their suspicions to the appropriate authorities. Various reasons for non-reporting were indicated such as a lack of confidence in their knowledge of the symptoms to identify child sexual abuse as well as lack of skills and procedures to work with child sexual abuse victims (Goldman & Padayachi, 2005).

Similarly, in a survey of 197 teachers in the USA, Kenny (2001) found that 11% of teachers failed to report instances when they believed abuse may have occurred. In a qualitative study amongst teachers in the UK, Webb and Vulliamy (2001) reported that there was a belief that reporting child sexual abuse cases was a waste of time because child protection services did not follow these cases through. Crenshaw et al. (1995) reported that schools were both the largest reporting source and the largest under-reporting source as, in their investigation amongst 623 USA school staff, 23% of the study participants indicated that they would not report the suspected child sexual abuse case as indicated in a hypothetical scenario.
Because teachers can observe large numbers of children daily, their role as mandatory reporters is critical (Baginsky & Macpherson, 2005). In South Africa, the Children’s Act 38 of 2005 as amended by the Children’s Amendment Act 41 of 2007, mandates that teachers have a legal obligation to report any suspicions of child sexual abuse to the police services, the provincial Department of Social Development (DSD), or to designated child protection organisations. Despite in-depth protocols, policies and guidelines provided to schools, it is reported that teachers do not follow these in cases of sexual abuse perpetrated against children in their care (Burton & Leoschut, 2013).

**Rationale of the study**

Child sexual abuse is one of the greatest injustices that plagues society and the continuing ramifications after child sexual abuse has occurred have been well documented, with the abuse negatively affecting the victims and their families for generations (Fergusson et al., 2013; King et al., 2004; Pérez-Fuentes et al., 2013; Roberts et al., 2004; Schuetze & Eiden, 2005; Trickett et al., 2011). In addition to physical, emotional and psychological problems, child sexual abuse victims may themselves become perpetrators of child sexual abuse, especially against their own children (Seto, Babchishin, Pullman & McPhail, 2015). A recent meta-analysis amongst 78 independent samples in studies between 1978 and 2013 was conducted to test the explanations of child sexual abuse offenders who abused children in their own families (Seto et al., 2015). The study compared 6605 intrafamilial offenders to 10,573 extrafamilial offenders and found that that intrafamilial child sexual abuse offenders were more likely to have experienced sexual abuse, family abuse or neglect, and poor parent-child attachments (Seto et al., 2015).
As reported by the World Health Organization (WHO, 2014) the personal costs to the victims and their families also relate to substantial direct and indirect social and economic costs associated with child sexual abuse. Medical care, legal services, and social welfare services are some of the various direct costs. Indirect costs include lasting injuries or disabilities, psychological impacts on the victim’s life and own children, disruption or discontinuation of education and subsequent loss of income or economic benefits (WHO, 2014).

Fang, Brown, Florence and Mercy (2012) conducted a study to estimate the economic burden of child abuse in the USA and reported that, in 2010, the average estimated lifetime cost per child abuse victim was $210,012. This equates to R1,607,635 when converting this US Dollar amount to Rand using the 30 June 2010 US Dollar to South African Rand exchange rate. The study demonstrated the huge costs involved with every child abuse victim in terms of short-term childhood health care costs, adult medical costs, lifetime productivity losses, child welfare costs, criminal justice costs, and special education costs (Fang et al., 2012). By using this economic burden estimate, R1,607,635 (June 2010) equates to R 2,262,664 (December 2016), adjusting for inflation over the past six years at an annual increase of 5.9%. This means that victims of child sexual abuse each potentially cost the South African society and economy R2,26 million over their lifetimes in 2016 Rand. This does not even take into account costs to the second generation, namely the child sexual abuse victims’ own children.

This study speaks to the affect that a child’s educational environment, specifically the role of the teacher in that environment, has on the child’s protection from the negative effects and costs of child sexual abuse. Because, whilst the law expects South African teachers to detect and report child sexual abuse, very little research has investigated teachers’ intentions to report child sexual abuse suspicions or the relationship between these intentions and other
influencing factors. For governmental child protection and education systems to be efficient, an evidence-based understanding of what influences teachers’ intentions to report suspicions of child sexual abuse will enhance the child protection mechanisms that are in place. Teachers’ failure to report child sexual abuse places children at risk of re-victimisation and places schools at risk of legal liability for negligence.

This study used Ajzen’s (1988) theory of planned behaviour (TPB), a well-researched model of behaviour, to describe and predict child sexual abuse reporting intention and behaviour amongst South African primary school teachers. Thus, this study aimed to point closer to a solution in this critical area of child sexual abuse detection and reporting by teachers as a specific group of designated mandatory reporters who fulfil a position of responsibility for children. By understanding the factors that influence teachers’ reporting intentions, this study brings fresh perspectives to child sexual abuse primary interventions.

Furthermore, this research study contributes to the elimination of a gap in the child sexual abuse literature as it is evidence-based and theory-based. There are very limited studies on reporting behaviours and intentions of teachers which utilise a theoretical framework to investigate these issues. This study offers a critical analysis of the TPB in the child sexual abuse reporting arena and aims to bring a theory-based approach to the problem.

**Aims and objectives of the study**

This study aimed to examine the factors that influence the reporting of child sexual abuse amongst primary school teachers in South Africa using the TPB. The attitude, subjective norm, perceived behavioural control, and intention of teachers related to reporting child sexual abuse were investigated. In addition, the study examined external factors to the TPB model such as the role of accurate knowledge about mandatory reporting, socio-demographic
characteristics of teachers and past reporting behaviour in predicting child sexual abuse reporting intention and behaviour (O’Toole, Webster, O’Toole & Lucal, 1999). In this way, important factors that will guide social development and child protection interventions aimed at managing and preventing child sexual abuse were identified. The specific objectives of this study were to:

- Assess the prevalence of child sexual abuse reporting and non-reporting behaviour among South African primary school teachers.
- Determine the applicability of the TPB to the child sexual abuse reporting intentions of South African primary school teachers.
- Examine the association between a) child sexual abuse past reporting behaviour and b) knowledge on mandatory reporting with the reporting intentions of primary school teachers.
- Identify factors that influence teachers’ child sexual abuse reporting intentions.

Specifically, this study aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What is the prevalence amongst teachers of reporting and non-reporting their suspicions of child sexual abuse in the past?

2. Does the TPB explain the reporting intentions of South African primary school teachers?

3. Is there an association between past reporting behaviour and knowledge on mandatory reporting with the intention to report suspected child sexual abuse amongst primary school teachers?

4. Which factors influence the reporting intentions of teachers?
Significance of the study

Child sexual abuse is a global problem and incorporates a violation of the rights of children as embodied in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC). Furthermore, South Africa’s Constitution and legal framework also afford protection to children from all forms of abuse and neglect, including sexual abuse.

Although some reports are available, the nature and extent of child sexual abuse reporting amongst teachers, as a mandatory reporting group of practitioners, and the implication for social development and child protection have not been systematically documented in the South African context. An investigation into the factors which influence South African primary school teachers’ reporting intentions and behaviours will contribute to new knowledge regarding child sexual abuse in South Africa. As far as is known, no previous study has used the TPB to investigate South African primary school teachers’ attitudes towards reporting, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control regarding their intention to report child sexual abuse suspicions.

As reported by Walsh, Mathews, Rassafiani, Farrell and Butler (2012), there is insufficient research specifically on teachers’ child sexual abuse reporting. Instead, most recent studies amongst teachers focus more generally on all forms of child maltreatment including physical abuse, neglect and emotional abuse (for example, Feng, Huang & Wang, 2010; Feng, Chen, Wilk, Yang & Fetzer, 2009). According to Walsh et al. (2012) reporting child sexual abuse suspicions should be studied separately to other child maltreatment forms because child sexual abuse has a different aetiology, child sexual abuse is always a criminal act, child protection services usually should respond differently because of the criminal nature of child sexual abuse, and because child sexual abuse may be seen by teachers as more
sensitive than other forms of maltreatment, thus affecting their reporting behaviours and intentions.

This investigation will provide an understanding of the reporting intentions and behaviours of teachers and will help policymakers and practitioners in the management of child sexual abuse in South Africa. By adding to the social development knowledge base, this research may also impact future multi-sectorial integrated strategies in childhood development and child protection. It will be useful in guiding legislative changes, teacher professional development as well as be useful in proposing practical support interventions to increase recognition and reporting of child sexual abuse cases (Walsh, Farrell, Bridgstock & Schweitzer, 2006). This study will also produce important findings for other professional groups which have similar mandatory reporting duties.

In summary, then, this research study will contribute to the existing body of knowledge in the social development discipline that will be useful to practitioners and policymakers engaged in strategies and policies in child protection and prevention of sexual abuse amongst children.

**Definition of terms**

This section provides operational definitions that may be unusual or unfamiliar; it identifies the names of concepts, introduced in the statement of the research problem and specifically employed in the study’s research questions and hypotheses:

*Attitude towards reporting* refers to a personal factor, namely the teacher’s own positive (favourable) or negative (unfavourable) evaluation of reporting child sexual abuse (Walsh et al., 2012). Attitude towards reporting will be based on the teacher’s behavioural beliefs linking the reporting of child sexual abuse to various positive or negative outcomes
(Ajzen, 1988). In other words, the teachers’ personal beliefs regarding their reporting of suspected cases of child sexual abuse, determine their positive or negative attitudes towards reporting (Ajzen, 1988).

A child is defined as a person under the age of 18 years (Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 108 of 1996).

Child sexual abuse is defined as any act of a sexual nature (whether through contact or non-contact) perpetrated on or with a child for sexual gratification of the perpetrator or a third person (Wurtele, 2009). Contact sexual abuse includes kissing, fondling, oral sex, and vaginal and anal intercourse (Goldman & Padayachi, 2005). Non-contact sexual abuse includes making sexual remarks to a child, exhibitionism, voyeurism, someone engaged in sexual intercourse in the presence of a child and showing a child pornographic material (Finkelhor, 1994). This study focuses on the sexual abuse of children in the home or community and not on the commercial sexual abuse of children (such as child pornography, trafficking of children for sexual purposes, and child marriages).

Intention to report refers to the decision the mandated reporter (in this study, the teacher) makes in response to hypothetical scenarios of child sexual abuse, whether they would report the scenarios if they occurred (Crenshaw et al., 1995). Intention to report is an indication of how hard the teacher is willing to try and of how much an effort they are planning to exert, to perform the reporting behavior (Crenshaw et al., 1995).

Knowledge on mandatory reporting refers to the teachers’ knowledge on child sexual abuse mandatory reporting procedures and responsibilities in South Africa (O’Toole et al., 1999).
Mandatory reporting refers to legislation which specifies who is required by law to report suspected cases of child abuse and neglect and the specific requirements concerning reporting that must be adhered to (Goldman & Grimbeek, 2011).

Perceived behavioural control is defined as the teachers’ perceptions of their ability to report cases of child sexual abuse, specifically the ease or difficulty of reporting. Perceived behavioural control is determined by the total set of beliefs about the presence of factors that may facilitate or impede reporting (Ajzen, 1988, 2012). These control beliefs are presumed to reflect past experiences with reporting as well as anticipated obstacles to reporting in the future (Ajzen, 1988, 2011). Perceived behavioural control draws on Bandura’s (1977) self-efficacy theory, in which teachers’ reporting behaviour is influenced by the confidence they possess to perform it.

Subjective norm is defined as the teacher’s perception of social pressure to report child sexual abuse cases. Subjective norm is based on what teachers believe people important to them, known as referents, think about reporting. These subjective norms are in turn influenced by the normative beliefs held by the teachers which refer to the perceived behavioural expectations of such important referents. Referents may include the teacher’s spouse, family, friends, colleagues, school principal or any person with perceived importance to the teacher. It is assumed that these normative beliefs - in combination with the teacher’s motivation to comply with the different referents - determine the prevailing subjective norm (Ajzen, 1988).

Foundation phase teachers refer to educators teaching Grade R to Grade 3 children in South Africa, employed in the formal public schooling system in the Western Cape Education Department (WCED). For the purposes of this investigation the simple term “teachers” will be used to refer to this population under investigation.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter commences by discussing the prevalence and social context of child sexual abuse in South Africa. Next, an overview of relevant international conventions, national legislation and national policies that refer to the protection of children from sexual abuse in South Africa are discussed. Finally, the TPB predictor variables (namely attitude towards reporting, subjective norm and perceived behavioural control) as well as with factors external to the TPB (namely socio-demographic characteristics of teachers, knowledge on mandatory reporting, and past reporting behaviour) are reviewed in relation to teachers’ reporting intention and behaviour.

Prevalence of child sexual abuse in South Africa

There are reports of sexual abuse of children in the South African news media on an almost daily basis. Three alleged cases of child rape in South Africa reported in the news media during the month of August 2016 illustrate the gravity of the problem of child sexual abuse. The first case was reported in Limpopo province where two girls aged eight and eleven were alleged to have been raped by their 44-year-old stepfather (Pretorius, 2016, August 6). The second case was reported in the province of Kwazulu-Natal where a 6-year-old girl was alleged to have been raped by her 51-year-old grandfather (Khoza, 2016, August 25). In the third case reported in the news media, two girls aged eight and nine were alleged to have been raped by a 20-year-old man in East London (Singh, 2016, August 31).

South African official incidence figures indicate that, between 1 April 2014 and 31 March 2015, there were 53617 (147 per day) sexual offences reported to the South African Police Services (SAPS) and, of these, 18524 (51 per day) were sexual crimes against children.
Despite these reports being so numerous, because of the sensitive nature of child sexual abuse, even these figures are considered under-counted and under-reported. One reason for under-reports is that there is misunderstanding of the law and what constitutes rape and sexual abuse at police stations, resulting in cases being incorrectly logged (Bower & Abrahams, 2015).

The Optimus Study South Africa (Optimus study) which was conducted in 2015 amongst 9730 children aged between 15 and 17 years old (divided into a school survey and a household survey) is the most current nationally representative study to date concerning prevalence of child sexual abuse in South Africa (Artz, Burton, Leoschut, Ward, & Lloyd, 2016). In the self-administered school survey amongst 3949 children aged 15 to 17 years old, one in three children (35.4%) reported having experienced some form of sexual abuse in their lifetimes. This was true of both boys and girls in both urban and rural locations (Artz et al., 2016).

In fact, boys experienced child sexual abuse at 36.8%, a slightly higher rate than the 33.9% of girls who experienced child sexual abuse in their lifetimes and child sexual abuse was found to be more prevalent amongst urban children (37.6%) compared to those in rural areas (29.6%); however, all rates are still considered very high (Artz et al., 2016). The Optimus study highlights that boys and girls in South Africa are equally vulnerable to some form of child sexual abuse, although the forms of sexual abuse tended to be different; boys reported higher levels of non-contact child sexual abuse and girls reported being more likely to experience contact sexual abuse (Artz et al., 2016).

The Optimus study further estimated that 351,214 cases of child sexual abuse occurred in South Africa in 2015 alone; at least 332 000 more than the estimated 19000 cases reported each year to the SAPS (Artz et al., 2016). In other words, every case of child sexual
abuse reported in the police statistics represent 17; for every one reported case of child sexual abuse there are 16 more that go unreported and undetected.

**Social context of child sexual abuse in South Africa**

Child sexual abuse in South Africa is closely interrelated with the social environment in which South African children live and develop. Although found globally, child sexual abuse is a major societal problem in South Africa which has resulted from many factors specific to this country (Richter & Dawes, 2008). Studies have found that there are certain risk factors in the household, in community or society, and in the culture, at large – many of which are rife in South Africa – that all have significant influence on the prevalence of child sexual abuse (Fergusson et al., 2013; Jewkes & Abrahams, 2002; Kaminer & Eagle, 2012; Loffell, 2004; Meinck, Cluver, Boyes & Mhlongo, 2015; WHO, 2014; Zwi et al., 2007).

*Risk factors in the household.*

Household-level factors which contribute to a higher prevalence of child sexual abuse include: lack of parental supervision; absence of a father as a role model; marital conflict; presence of a stepfather; an emotionally unavailable mother; having single parents; poor parental attachment; parental alcoholism; domestic violence; and absence of protective adults at home (Jewkes, Penn-Kekana & Rose-Junius, 2005; Meinck et al., 2015; WHO, 2014).

South Africans still bear the negative effects of Apartheid which have filtered into the culture and communities as well as which impact many at the household level. Apartheid, which means "separateness" or "the state of being apart", was a system of racial segregation enforced through South African law from 1948 to 1994. Under this system, non-white people were not allowed to vote, they were segregated into distinct areas where they could live or run businesses and were provided with far inferior public services such as
education and medical care (Barbarin & Richter, 2013). This extreme discrimination over such a long period resulted in the deep-rooted inequality found today in South Africa twenty years later, where most non-whites remain unemployed or live in poverty. Under Apartheid, migrant work was forced upon black people who needed to make a living in the white areas. Thus, many black men left their families and homes to find work in white areas whilst their spouses and children stayed left behind in the black homelands. Twenty years later, the erosion of family structures which resulted from migrant labour and separate living areas, are still seen in the country today and many men (and women) still operate as migrant labourers today, sending money home to grandparents and others who look after their children for them (Barbarin & Richter, 2013; Loffell, 2004). As reported by Madu and Peltzer (2001, p.318) when parents work as migrant labourers, children are often left in other provinces or at places far from home where they may not receive adequate care, thus making them vulnerable to sexual abuse from opportunistic predators.

In 2012, of the 18.6 million children living in South Africa, only 35% lived with both their biological parents, 39% lived with only their mothers, 3% lived with only their fathers, and 23% lived with neither biological parent (Statistics South Africa, 2012). These statistics show the deterioration of traditional family structures causing children to grow up and live without their biological parents. Black families have particularly been disrupted, where only 29% of black children lived with both parents, compared to the 55% of coloured, 80% of Indian/Asian and 78% of white children. Orphans comprised almost 18% of all children in South Africa, representing approximately 3.2 million children (Statistics South Africa, 2012). Neglected children are particularly vulnerable because a lack of supervision and protection by their parents, or other responsible adults, places children in the path of perpetrators seeking to reduce their risk of being caught (Jewkes et al., 2005; WHO, 2014). In the study amongst 939 Cape Town high school learners, King et al. (2004) reported that children who came from
single parent homes or who lived with one biological parent and one step parent were more likely to experience child sexual abuse than those living with both their mother and father.

In a longitudinal study in New Zealand amongst 987 surviving members of a 1977 birth cohort, Fergusson et al. (2013) investigated the linkages between child sexual abuse and developmental outcomes over an extended period to age 30. It was found that parental alcoholism, domestic violence and changes of parents, such as through divorce and re-marriage, increased children’s exposure to child sexual abuse (Fergusson et al., 2013).

The Optimus study also highlighted that amongst the 4086 children interviewed in schools across South Africa, 31.4% reported being exposed to some form of family violence in their lifetime. Of the girls who had experienced child sexual abuse, 37.6% reported family violence in their homes at some point in their lifetime; of the male victims of child sexual abuse, 25.6% reported having experienced family violence (Artz et al., 2016). In addition, the Optimus study reported the following additional risk factors amongst the 5631 children interviewed in their homes: living with neither or just one of their biological parents, parental absence (through hospitalisation or prolonged illness that made the parent unable to care for the child), lack of parental monitoring of the child’s whereabouts, parental substance misuse, and lack of parental attachment and acceptance (Artz et al., 2016).

Risk factors in society.

There are inter-related societal risk factors found in the communities where children live and attend school that contribute to the high incidence of child sexual abuse prevalent in South Africa. These include unemployment, unsafe communities, overcrowding, poverty, as well as alcohol and drug abuse amongst perpetrators (Artz et al., 2016; Richter & Dawes, 2008).

Unemployment. Unemployment results in adults staying home and in the community during the day, with time on their hands. Approximately 32% of children lived in households
without any employed members (Statistics South Africa, 2012). At the same time, long hours of parental work in other households leaves some children to their own devices, unprotected and unsupervised in their homes and local communities. In its survey on living conditions of children, Statistics South Africa (2009) reported that 15% of households did not have an adult at home at all times when children under ten were at home.

Unsafe communities. In its survey on living conditions of children, Statistics South Africa (2009) also highlighted other safety issues that speak directly to the vulnerability and safety of children: 64% did not have somewhere safe to play outside their homes; 52% lived in areas without adequate street lighting; 59% reported not having burglar bars in the house; 30% indicated that their property did not have a fence or wall around it; and 48% of children lived in areas where police did not patrol the streets (Statistics South Africa, 2009).

The Optimus study confirmed the risk that unsafe homes and unsafe local communities posed to children. One in every two (56.6%) children who were sexually abused by adults known to them were abused inside their own homes. Two in every three (66.3%) children who were sexually abused by unknown adults were abused in their local community such as areas close to their homes, nearby streets or local parks (Artz et al., 2016).

Overcrowding. Statistics South Africa (2012) reported that 63% of South African children lived in extended households while 35% of children lived in nuclear households. “Nuclear households are defined as households consisting of household heads, their spouses and offspring, while the extended household would typically include other relatives in addition to the nucleus. Complex households are households with members who are not related to the household head” (Statistics South Africa, 2012, p.9). This varies by population group, where more Indian and white children lived in nuclear families than black and coloured children. Whereas 31% of black children lived in nuclear households and 68% in
extended households, 76% of white children lived in nuclear households and only 19% in extended households (Statistics South Africa, 2012).

In its survey on living conditions of children, Statistics South Africa (2009) reported that households headed by females generally comprised more dependents with a larger average household size than those households headed by males. It was further reported that a significant proportion of children were living in households headed by women that were not necessarily their biological mothers (Statistics South Africa, 2009). The survey also found that seven out of every ten children lived in households with more than five members, while four out of every ten children lived in households with seven or more members. In addition, 32% of children reported that adults and children did not sleep in separate bedrooms at their homes (Statistics South Africa, 2009). Studies have found that, in overcrowded living conditions, where parents are stressed and lack time to care for their children, the children are exposed to sexually active adults (Richter & Dawes, 2008). The Optimus study found that a higher sleeping density (sharing a bedroom with more than one teen or adult) was related to a greater likelihood of child sexual abuse (Artz et al., 2016).

According to the Victims of Crime Survey (2014/2015), persons living in larger household sizes are more likely to be victims of sexual offences (Statistics South Africa, 2016a). It was reported amongst sexual offence victims that 29.5% of them lived in homes comprising three to four members, 44.3% lived in households with five to nine members and 17.5% lived in households comprising ten or more people (Statistics South Africa, 2016a).

Poverty. Widespread poverty and the resulting pressures and deprivation this brings to poor people is another factor reported to contribute to the high incidence and prevalence of child sexual abuse in South Africa (Kaminer & Eagle, 2012; Richter & Dawes, 2008). It was reported by Statistics South Africa (2012) that 65% of children live in households in the bottom two income quintiles that had a per capita income of less than R765 per month.
There is a vast difference between population groups when it comes to poverty. According to Statistics South Africa (2012), 71% of black children live in low income households compared to only 4% of white children. Women and female-headed households are predominantly responsible for the care of children, yet gendered poverty patterns continue (Statistics South Africa, 2012). Female-headed households are reported to be more likely to experience hunger than other households; to have low incomes and be dependent on social grants; and are less likely to have employed members (Statistics South Africa, 2012).

In the recent Optimus study, of the children who reported that they had experienced child sexual abuse in their lifetimes, 87.6% were black, 10.4% were coloured, 1.1% were white, and 0.9% were Indian (Artz et al., 2016). This can partly be explained by the fact that black children make up a large percentage of the population and thus comprise a large proportion of those children who have been sexually abused and vice versa for white children. However, the study further showed that any white or Indian child has a one in four chance of being sexually abused and any black or coloured child has a one in three chance of suffering child sexual abuse (Artz et al., 2016). As observed by Artz et al. (2016), “while there may be a higher risk of sexual abuse among Black and Coloured children in South Africa, this might also have to do with socioeconomic indicators and other structural factors which may create high risk exposure – not to mention reporting and support opportunities – for any child within more impoverished circumstances” (p. 46).

The New Zealand birth cohort study by Fergusson et al. (2013) reported “increasing severity of child sexual abuse is significantly associated with socioeconomic disadvantage as measured by: younger maternal age, lower maternal education, poorer family living standards and lower family income (p <.001)” (p.670).

Jewkes et al. (2005) conducted a qualitative study amongst South African and Namibian children and adults (including parents, men, women, as well as a range of key
informants, community leaders or workers that were some way involved with child care and protection such as police, social workers, and teachers). Their study found that poor children were particularly vulnerable to transactional sexual abuse relationships where they would agree to anything in return for food and clothing (Jewkes et al., 2005). The transactional nature of child sexual abuse was confirmed by the Optimus study which reported that when children were sexually abused by an adult known to them, 11.5% of boys and 10.0% of girls reported being promised something in return (such as alcohol, drugs, transport, food and money) and 33.3% of these sexually abuse boys and 28.6% of these sexually abuse girls reported receiving what had been promised to them (Artz et al., 2016). Also, when children were sexually abused by an adult unknown to them, 16.7% of boys and 11.1% of girls reported being promised something in return (such as alcohol, drugs, transport, food and money) but none of these sexually abuse boys and girls received what had been promised to them (Artz et al., 2016).

*Alcohol and drug abuse.* The Optimus study confirmed that alcohol and drug abuse in communities is a societal risk factor for child sexual abuse (Artz et al., 2016). In a descriptive, epidemiological study of alcohol use (based on data gathered from specialist treatment centres, trauma units, mortuaries, psychiatric facilities, and surveys of school students and arrestees), Parry et al. (2002) reported that alcohol misuse is widespread across South Africa, based on indicator data. Amongst patients for substance use disorders treatment services, 51.1% to 77.0% reported alcohol as their primary substance of abuse, 40.3% to 91.8% of patients in trauma units tested positive for alcohol, and 40.3% to 67.2% of mortality cases tested positive for alcohol (Parry et al., 2002). Additionally, the same study reported that although treatment demand is dominated by men and older persons, alcohol misuse occurs among all sectors. It was found that 53.3% of male students in Durban and 36.5% of
male students in Cape Town reported heavy-drinking episodes by the time they were in Grade 11 at school (Parry et al., 2002).

According to the Victims of Crime Survey (2014/2015), there is greater likelihood of assaults and sexual offences occurring when perpetrators and/or victims are under the influence of alcohol or drugs (Statistics South Africa, 2016a). In cases when assault took place at the victim’s home, it was reported that the perpetrators were influenced by alcohol or drugs in 39.9% of cases and in 20.5% of cases, both the victim and perpetrator were reported to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs (Statistics South Africa, 2016a). Similarly, when assault took place out on the street, it was reported that the perpetrators were influenced by alcohol or drugs in 32.8% of cases and in 21.1% of cases, both the victim and perpetrator were reported to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs (Statistics South Africa, 2016a). In assaults that occurred at entertainment places, it was reported that both the victim and the perpetrator were influenced by alcohol or drugs in 64.8% of cases, the victim was reported to be under the influence in 13.0% of cases, and the perpetrator was reported to be under drug or alcohol influence in 20.5% of the cases (Statistics South Africa, 2016a).

Similarly, in cases when the sexual offence took place at the victim’s home, it was reported that the perpetrators were influenced by alcohol or drugs in 28.8% of cases and in 23.3% of cases, both the victim and perpetrator were reported to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs (Statistics South Africa, 2016a). When the sexual offences took place out on the street, it was reported that the perpetrators were influenced by alcohol or drugs in 28.9% of cases and in 63.9% of cases, the victim was reported to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs (Statistics South Africa, 2016a). In sexual offences that occurred outdoors, it was reported that both the victim and the perpetrator were influenced by alcohol or drugs in 72.1% of cases, and the perpetrator was reported to be under drug or alcohol influence in 27.9% of the cases (Statistics South Africa, 2016a).
Cultural risk factors.

South Africa is reported to have a violent and sexist culture where most men view themselves as superior to women and children, which includes the power to beat them and take sexual advantage of them (Jewkes & Abrahams, 2002; Loffell, 2004; Richter & Dawes, 2008).

Violence. Although violence is a global phenomenon, in some parts of the world violence is more prevalent, South Africa being one such place. The global study on homicide conducted by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) in 2012 calculated the average global intentional homicide rate at 6.2 homicides per 100000 people in the population. Intentional homicide is defined as the unlawful death purposefully inflicted on a person by another person (excluding those in war or conflict situations) commonly known as murder in South Africa (UNODC, 2013). Globally, 9.7 males per 100,000 males and 2.7 females per 100,000 females were murdered in 2012. As reported by the UNODC (2013), 79% of all murder victims and 95% of all murder perpetrators are male. Almost half of all females murdered globally (47%) in 2012 were killed by their intimate partners or family members whereas less than 6% of males murdered globally were killed by their family or intimate partners (UNODC, 2013).

In 2012 Southern Africa (represented by five countries namely Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa and Swaziland) and Central America were reported to have homicide rates over four times higher than the global average (UNODC, 2013). Specifically, South Africa’s reported homicide rate for 2012 was 31.0 homicides per 100,000 people in the South African population (UNODC, 2013).

The most recent crime statistics in South Africa indicate that the levels of violence continue to be exceptionally high as indicated in the 2015/2016 annual crime statistics reported by SAPS. In the period 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016, there were 18673 murders and 18127 attempted murders reported in South Africa (SAPS, 2016a). By utilising the mid-
year population estimates for 2015 produced by Statistics South Africa, this means that the murder rate was 33.98 in 2015/2016 and the attempted murder rate was 32.98 in 2015/2016; there were nearly 34 murders and 33 attempted murders recorded per 100,000 people in South Africa (SAPS, 2016a; Statistics South Africa, 2016b). Of all murders committed in South Africa, 87.5% of the murder victims and 96% of the perpetrators are male (SAPS, 2016b). In the period 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016 in South Africa, a murder occurred on average 51.2 times a day, an attempted murder occurred on average 49.7 times a day, there were 142.2 sexual offences per day, 501.2 assaults (with intent to inflict grievous bodily harm) per day and 451.9 common assaults (causing abrasions and bruises) per day (SAPS, 2016a).

Studies show that many South African children accept violence as a norm and have become desensitised to violence in their lives and communities (Burton & Leoschut, 2013). Many children in South Africa grow up and go to school in violent neighbourhoods. In a national study amongst 5939 secondary school learners, one in every three learners (35.9%) reported witnessing a fight in their neighbourhood in the previous month alone and 48.7% reported ever witnessing community violence in their lifetime (Burton & Leoschut, 2013). The fights and violence was most commonly reported to occur in their communities out on the streets by 69.9% of learners, meaning that it is commonplace to witness people “being beaten, punched, kicked, physically pushed, hit, slapped or attacked with a weapon” (Burton & Leoschut, 2013, p. 55). Learners in the study also reported that they personally knew the victims in 56.4% of the witnessed attacks, with 12.5% of these being people who were related to them. Additionally, in almost half (48.8%) of the witnessed attacks, the learners also knew the perpetrators (Burton & Leoschut, 2013).
Patriarchy and male dominance. Besides violence being commonplace, the social environment in which many South African children develop is overshadowed by patriarchal values which reinforce male dominance over women and children (Mathews et al., 2012). In their investigation, Jewkes et al. (2005) reported that South African cultures and families believe that adults, especially male elders, deserve respect and obedience and children who show disrespect face being punished. These rules of respect make children vulnerable to child sexual abuse as many children find it very difficult to refuse sexual advances from a respected male such as a father or an uncle (Jewkes et al., 2005). From their investigation, Jewkes et al. (2005) found that “it was apparent that the threat of men was perceived in terms of power, privilege, unpredictability, and the inability of men to control themselves when sexually aroused” (p.1814). It was found that there is a strong cultural belief amongst many South Africans that a man, when sexually aroused, must have sex. A child is a convenient object for this purpose. There is also a view that not to follow through, is a sign of weakness on the man’s part (Jewkes et al., 2005).

The view that South African men are dangerous and volatile is a widely-held view amongst both South African men and women (Jewkes et al., 2005). Furthermore, rape of children is used as punishment of mothers in cases where she is unavailable due to pregnancy, post-partum abstinence or marital conflict (Jewkes et al., 2005). In South Africa “many of the instances of baby and child rape which were cited in the media, were incestuous or familial. The most brutal threats to women and children had come from the men closest to them: no longer protectors – fathers, husbands, relatives and friends – had been exposed as predators” (Posel, 2005, p. 249).

Artz et al. (2016) reported the following findings in the Optimus study concerning the gender of the perpetrator in various instances: i) when a child was abused by an adult known to them, male perpetrators accounted for 98.6% of child sexual abuse amongst girls and 50%
of the cases amongst boys; ii) in cases when a child was abused by an adult unknown to them, male perpetrators accounted for 100% of child sexual abuse amongst girls and 66.7% of the cases amongst boys; iii) when child sexual abuse occurred at the hand of a child or adolescent, males were the perpetrators in 100% of child sexual abuse amongst girls but females were the perpetrators of 92.5% male-victim cases; iv) in all cases where someone tried to force the child-victim to have sexual intercourse, both attempted and actual, male perpetrators were responsible for 98.9% of attacks on girl-victims but female perpetrators were responsible for 81.8% of attacks on boy-victims; and v) in cases of sexual exposure (being forced to look at the perpetrator’s private parts, watch them masturbate or view pornographic images or videos), male perpetrators accounted for 91.3% of child sexual abuse amongst girls and 64.8% of the cases amongst boys. As is evident from these findings, male perpetrators are indeed the main threat against girls but both male and female perpetrators are a threat to boys.

The finding of child sexual abuse amongst boys being perpetrated by both male and female perpetrators confirms previous findings by Sikweyiya and Jewkes (2009) who conducted a South African study amongst rural boys in the Eastern Cape. The boys in that study reported that they were physically bullied and forced to have sexual intercourse by both female and male perpetrators. Female perpetrators included older lodgers, domestic helpers and family friends who subjected the boys to unwanted touching or exposed themselves and persuaded the boys to have sex with them. Most of these instances of abuse by men and women perpetrators were not disclosed or reported by these boys (Sikweyiya & Jewkes, 2009).
South African child sexual abuse legal frameworks

With the introduction of a broad range of both international conventions it accedes to as well as its own internal legislation, policies and programmes, it is evident that South Africa is committed to the progressive realisation of children's rights and their protection from all forms of abuse and exploitation (Hendricks, 2014; South African Human Rights Commission [SAHRC], 2002). The literature review will provide an overview of relevant statutes and policies which have had major implications for children and their rights to be protected from child sexual abuse.

International statutes related to child sexual abuse.


In 1995 South Africa ratified the 1989 UNCRC and thereby incurred the Article 19(1) obligation to “take all appropriate legislative, administrative, social and educational measures to protect the child from all forms of physical or mental violence, injury or abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation, including sexual abuse, while in the care of parent(s), legal guardian(s) or any other person who has care of the child”.

Furthermore, South Africa committed itself to undertake measures that included “effective procedures for the establishment of social programmes to provide necessary support for the child and for those who have the care of the child, as well as for other forms of prevention and for other forms of identification, reporting, referral, investigation, treatment
and follow-up of instances of child maltreatment described heretofore, and, as appropriate for judicial involvement” as stated in Article 19(2) of the UNCRC.

*The African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child: Organisation of African Unity, 1990.* In a similar manner, the Organisation of African Unity’s (OAU) African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (ACRWC) echoes the obligations encapsulated in the UNCRC (Hendricks, 2014). South Africa acceded to the OAU’s ACRWC in 1999 and, by doing so, assumed the Article 16(1) obligation to “take specific legislative, administrative, social and educational measures to protect the child from all forms of torture, inhuman or degrading treatment and especially physical or mental injury or abuse, neglect or maltreatment including sexual abuse, while in the care of a parent, legal guardian or school authority or any other person who has the care of the child.”

Furthermore, South Africa committed itself to undertake protective measures that included “effective procedures for the establishment of special monitoring units to provide necessary support for the child and for those who have the care of the child, as well as other forms of prevention and for identification, reporting referral investigation, treatment, and follow-up of instances of child abuse and neglect” as stated in Article 16(2) of the ACRWC.

Thus, by acceding to both the UNCRC and the ACRWC, South Africa conceded to take steps to improve the protection of abused children, to monitor the progress in improving their situations, and to support those who needed to care and protect children.

*National statutes related to child sexual abuse.*

*The South African Constitution, Chapter 2: The Bill of Rights.* The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 108 of 1996 is widely considered to be one of the most progressive in the world. The Bill of Rights which forms chapter two of the constitution, addresses children’s rights and grants special protection for children (Fouché, 2012;
Hendricks, 2014; SAHRC, 2002). There are specific provisions aimed at ensuring the protection, promotion and respect of human rights of all South African people including children.

Section nine of the South African constitution guarantees that everyone is “equal before the law and has the right to equal protection and benefit of the law” and it outlaws unfair discrimination on several grounds including age, race, gender, culture and birth. Section ten of the South African constitution provides that “everyone has inherent dignity and the right to have their dignity respected and protected”. Section 12(1) states that everyone has the right to freedom and security including the rights “to be free of all forms of violence”, “not to be tortured in any way”, and “not to be treated or punished in a cruel, inhuman or degrading way”.

There are also rights specific to children – defined as all persons under the age of 18 years – set out in section 28 of the South African constitution. Children are specifically afforded the right “to be protected from maltreatment, neglect, abuse or degradation” in section 28(1). Although the Bill of Rights does not specifically mention protection against sexual abuse, the word abuse in section 28(1) refers to all forms of abuse, including sexual abuse (SAHRC, 2002). The Bill of Rights affords everyone with the right to have their dignity respected and protected and sexual abuse violates this inherent dignity. Sexual abuse contravenes section 12(1) as a form of violence. Sexual abuse further contravenes sections 12(1) and 28(1) in that it is inhuman and degrading treatment (SAHRC, 2002).

The implementation of children’s rights and protection against child sexual abuse as set out in the UNCRC and ACRWC international conventions and South Africa’s constitution are in turn, governed by three primary pieces of legislation, namely the Children’s Act 38 of 2005, the Children’s Amendment Act 41 of 2007, and the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences

*The Children’s Act 38 of 2005 as amended by the Children’s Amendment Act 41 of 2007.* Chapters seven to nine of the Children’s Act 38 of 2005 as amended by the Children’s Amendment Act 41 of 2007, deal specifically with the areas of child protection (chapter seven), prevention and early intervention programmes (chapter eight) and children in need of care and protection (chapter nine) and each of these dictate specific measures and strategies for an effective child protection system in South Africa.

Chapter seven of the Children’s Act 38 of 2005 as amended by the Children’s Amendment Act 41 of 2007, specifically sections 104 to 128, has strategy, provisioning, as well as norms and standards clauses which place a legislative duty on the national Minister and provincial Members of Executive Councils (MECs) of the DSD to ensure that the child protection system of the country functions well and is accountable (Proudlock & Jamieson, 2008, p. 36). Section 104 states that the child protection system of South Africa must function along a comprehensive inter-sectoral strategy formed in consultation with ministers of Education, Finance, Health, Justice and Constitutional Development and SAPS. In section 105, each MEC for Social Development is tasked with properly resourcing, co-ordinating and managing their provincial child protection services, including services needed to carry out investigations and make assessments in suspected child sexual abuse cases and intervention and removal of children. Norms and standards are required by section 107 to be in place for all prevention and early intervention programmes, assessment of children, therapeutic programmes and education and information programmes, amongst others.

Section 110 of chapter seven of the Children’s Amendment Act 41 of 2007 deals specifically with the reporting of abused children. In section 110 (1), the following
professionals and practitioners are compelled to report cases in the prescribed form where they believe on reasonable grounds that a child needs care and protection:

Any correctional official, dentist, homeopath, immigration official, labour inspector, legal practitioner, medical practitioner, midwife, minister of religion, nurse, occupational therapist, physiotherapist, psychologist, religious leader, social service professional, social worker, speech therapist, teacher, traditional health practitioner, traditional leader or member of staff or volunteer worker at a partial care facility, drop-in centre or child and youth care centre.

However, section 4 of the Prevention of Family Violence Act 133 of 1993 compels any person in a position of responsibility for the care or treatment of the child to report suspected abuse:

Any person who examines, treats, attends to, advises, instructs or cares for any child in circumstances which ought to give rise to the reasonable suspicion that such child has been ill-treated, or suffers from any injury the probable cause of which was deliberate, shall immediately report such circumstances.

The Prevention of Family Violence Act 133 of 1993 has not been repealed by the Domestic Violence Act 118 of 1998 and, therefore, remains in force.

All reports must be made on the prescribed form, namely the Reporting of Abuse or Deliberate Neglect of a Child: Regulation 33 (Section 110) form, also known simply as Form 22 (Jamieson & Lake, 2013). These reports must be made to “the provincial department of social development, a designated child protection organisation or a police official” as stipulated in section 110 (2) of the Children’s Amendment Act 41 of 2007.

Section 110 (4) states that where reports are made to the SAPS, the police services have a duty to ensure that the child concerned is safe and not at risk and, within 24 hours, the SAPS must notify the DSD or a designated child protection organisation of the case. Child protection organisations are those welfare organisations who have been registered and designated by the Director-General or provincial head of social development to perform all or
some of the child protection services contained in the Children’s Act 38 of 2005 (Hendricks, 2014).

All reports to child protection organisations must also be reported to the relevant provincial DSD by these organisations as it is ultimately the provincial DSD that is tasked with the following responsibilities: i) to take appropriate actions to ensure that the child is safe and protected from further harm; ii) to assess the initial reports of abuse; iii) to investigate the case; iv) to take the case further for legal action; and v) to submit the particulars of the case for inclusion in the National Child Protection Register (NCPR). The recent Optimus agency study highlighted some of the specific challenges social workers face in fulfilling these legislated responsibilities. For example, social workers reported that high caseloads impacted their ability to offer child victims and their families comprehensive services and that “generally cases of abuse rarely received the attention and time required to complete an intensive investigation and intervention” (Artz et al., 2016, p. 62). In addition, social workers at the DSD indicated severe resource constraints with some staff reporting little or no access to vehicles, computers, telephones and office space necessary for child abuse cases (Artz et al., 2016).

Once a report is made, the provincial DSD or designated child protection organisation, as per section 110 (7), must take appropriate measures to “assist the child, including counselling, mediation, prevention and early intervention services, family reconstruction and rehabilitation, behaviour modification, problem solving and referral to another suitably qualified person or organisation”. Section 110(7) also makes provision for children to be removed from their homes to a place of safety or, alternatively, the removal of an alleged offender if it is in the best interests of the child victims not to be removed from their homes.
Reporting of suspected child sexual abuse to the relevant authorities must be done as soon as the mandated reporter has reasonable grounds for his or her suspicion. Aucamp, Steyn and van Rensburg (2012) criticise the Children’s Act 38 of 2005 for not being clear enough on what the factors justifying suspicions would be. They list the following factors to consider as suspicions of possible child sexual abuse that should be reported: “behaviour symptoms, including sexualised behaviour, a child playing out age-inappropriate sexual knowledge, as well as tentative disclosures of abuse and possible hearsay evidence by a third party” (Aucamp et al., 2012, p.8). In addition, Collings et al. (2005) affirm that a child’s personal disclosure of abuse is considered very strong evidence to have reasonable grounds for reporting.

As stated in section 110(3) of the Children’s Amendment Act 41 of 2007, all reports of abuse should be made according to the principle of good faith. Hendricks (2014, p.551) defines the good faith principle as “an internationally recognised common-law duty to act honestly, openly and with conscientious impartiality” and that in “the context of mandatory reporting legislation, the person reporting must report his/her belief of wrongdoing without any malicious/spiteful intent”. When reporting is done on reasonable grounds and according to good faith, the person who reports the case to the relevant authorities cannot be sued for damages under these conditions, even if the suspicion is later found to be unsubstantiated. Persons reporting suspected child sexual abuse are thus not required to investigate or prove abuse has taken place as, in most cases, this investigation and search for evidence may be detrimental to the victim. Instead, they are required to report their suspicions to the relevant authorities without fear of civil action against them by suspected perpetrators (Berry, Jamieson & James, 2011; Hendricks, 2014; Walsh, et al., 2006).

Abrahams, Casey and Daro (1992) reported that sixteen USA states afforded mandated reporters additional protection from facing civil action due to the presumption of
good faith. However, the presumption of good faith principle does not apply in South African law and mandated reporters may still have to prove that their reports were not done in spite. This places mandated reporters in a difficult position because they can still be sued by suspected perpetrators on the one hand but, on the other hand, they are guilty of a legal offence if they fail to make the report, according to section 305 (1) of the Children’s Act 38 of 2005. If a mandated reporter is convicted of failing to report when they reasonably should have, then for the first offence they may face fines and/or imprisonment for up to ten years according to section 305(6) of the Children’s Act 38 of 2005 and for any subsequent offences for failure to report, they may face fines and/or imprisonment for up to twenty years according to section 305(7) of the Children’s Act 38 of 2005.

Sections 111 to 128 of the Children’s Act 38 of 2005 mandates the keeping of the NCPR by the DSD Director-General. The NCPR is meant to record the particulars of all cases of abuse inflicted on specific children reported to the DSD (in part A of the register) and to record all persons found unsuitable to work with children (in part B). Specifically, the aim of part A is to use the information in the NCPR to protect the children recorded therein from further abuse, to monitor cases and services to such children and to share information between professionals that are part of the child protection team. The information in the NCPR is also meant to be used for planning and budgeting purposes to prevent abuse and protect children on municipal, provincial and national levels. However, Dawes et al. (2006) reported that, although various child protection services including the police, social and justice services each produced a wealth of information that could be used to monitor cases, there were few linkages and the data was not captured adequately onto the NCPR to produce an accurate, valid, reliable database. Dawes et al. (2006) found that there were several problems with updating the information on NCPR because of incompletely filled-in forms, data collection and data management not considered a priority by child protection services,
insufficient human resources to maintain the NCPR as well as information technology limitations.

Chapter eight of the Children’s Act 38 of 2005 as amended by the Children’s Amendment Act 41 of 2007, specifically sections 143 to 149, has strategy, provisioning, as well as norms and standards clauses which place a legislative duty on the national Minister and provincial MECs of the DSD to provide prevention and early intervention programmes to families, parents, caregivers and children in South Africa. Section 145 states that prevention and early intervention programmes must function along a comprehensive inter-sectoral strategy formed in consultation with ministers of Education, Finance, Health, Provincial and Local Government and Transport. In section 145, each MEC for Social Development is tasked with properly resourcing, co-ordinating and managing prevention and early intervention programmes. Norms and standards must be adhered to assess all prevention and early intervention programme designs and outcomes (section 147). Amongst others, section 144 states that there must be programmes provided: to preserve families and promote interpersonal relationships; to teach appropriate parenting skills that will safeguard children from neglect, exploitation, abuse or inadequate supervision; as well as to provide psychological, rehabilitation and therapeutic services to children who have suffered abuse, abandonment or grief. According to Proudlock and Jamieson (2008), this is a positive development because the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 32 of 2007 does not make provision for funding of service providers who provide counselling and treatment for child sexual abuse survivors.

Chapter nine, specifically sections 150 to 153, of the Children’s Act 38 of 2005 as amended by the Children’s Amendment Act 41 of 2007, states that, amongst other circumstances, when a child is being abused or maltreated in any way, this child needs care and protection. Specifically, section 151 provides for the removal of a sexually abused child
to a temporary safe care facility when this is in the best interests of the child in question. However, if it is in the best interests of the child, section 153 provides for a notice to be served on an alleged offender to leave the home where the child lives and to refrain from entering the home or having contact with the child. However, the recent Optimus agency study highlighted that there is a shortage of places of safety available for child victims of abuse and insufficient monitoring and evaluation of existing places of safety sometimes results in the children placed there in a worse off situation (Artz et al., 2016). Social workers reported that some places of safety for abused children “were unsafe, not run properly, or that abuse occurred within these places themselves (both with carers as perpetrators, as well as other children placed there)” (Artz et al., 2016, p. 62).

*Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 32 of 2007.* In the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 32 of 2007 sexual offences are divided into penetrative and non-penetrative sexual acts. Chapter one defines sexual penetration (rape) as penetration to any extent whatsoever by a sexual organ of a person (or animal) into the mouth, genital organs or anus of another person. Rape is also defined as the penetration into or beyond the genital organs or anus of a person by an object or other body part of another person (or animal). Historically, through common law, only when a man had penetrative vaginal sexual intercourse with a woman using his penis (against her wishes) was it referred to as rape. Now, the definition of rape is broadened to include forced or coerced anal or oral sex, irrespective of the gender of either the victim or the perpetrator as well as penetration with some inanimate object or animal genitalia (Mathews, et al., 2012).

Non-penetrative sexual acts also known as sexual assault or sexual violation are defined in chapter one of the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 32 of 2007. Sexual assault is defined as: i) direct or indirect contact between
genital organs, anus, a female person’s breasts with any other part of another person’s (or animal’s) body or an object; or ii) direct or indirect contact with the mouth of one person and the genital organs, anus, a female person’s breasts, mouth or any other part of the body of another person which could be used for sexual penetration; or iii) direct or indirect contact with the mouth of one person and the genital organs or anus of an animal; or iv) masturbation of one person by another; or vi) insertion of objects resembling genital organs into a person’s mouth.

These definitions of sexual offences cover all instances when penetrative or non-penetrative sexual acts are: i) conducted under circumstances involving abuse of power or authority; ii) where the sexual act is committed under false pretences; iii) where a person may be asleep, unconscious or under the influence of drugs, medication and alcohol; and iv) when a person involved is under the age of 12. The Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 32 of 2007 discriminates between cases where a child is between the ages of 12 and 16 (regarded as statutory rape or statutory sexual assault) and where the child is below age 12.

Chapter two (sections three to 14) of the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 32 of 2007 defines and lists the full range of sexual offences that are illegal. These include: i) rape; ii) compelled rape; iii) sexual assault; iv) compelled sexual assault; v) compelled self-sexual assault; vi) compelling or causing persons 18 years or older to witness sexual offences, sexual acts or self-masturbation; vii) exposure or display of or causing exposure or display of genital organs, anus or female breasts to persons 18 years or older (‘flashing’); viii) exposure or display of or causing exposure or display of child pornography to persons 18 years or older; ix) engaging sexual services of persons 18 years or older; x) incest; xi) bestiality; and xii) sexual acts with a corpse.
In addition to all sexual offences described in chapter two, chapter three (sections 15 to 22) of the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 32 of 2007 defines and lists the full range of sexual offences against children that are illegal, including: i) statutory rape (acts of consensual sexual penetration by a person over the age of 18 with children between the ages of 12 and 16); ii) statutory sexual assault (acts of consensual sexual violation by a person over the age of 18 with children between the ages of 12 and 16); iii) sexual exploitation of children; iv) sexual grooming of children; v) exposure or display of or causing exposure or display of child pornography or pornography to children; vi) using children for or benefiting from child pornography; vii) compelling or causing children to witness sexual offences, sexual acts or self-masturbation; and viii) exposure or display of or causing exposure or display of genital organs, anus or female breasts to children (‘flashing’).

Chapter six of the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 32 of 2007 states that any person who has been convicted of a sexual offence against a child or is alleged to have committed a sexual offence against a child may not: i) be employed to work with a child or work for any organisation which places them in a position of authority, supervision or care of a child or where they can gain access to a child; ii) adopt or foster a child; and iii) manage or operate any business related to children. The National Register for Sex Offenders (NRSO) must contain the particulars of all persons convicted or alleged of sexual offences against children. All employers where children are accessible to perpetrators are obligated to check whether existing or potential employees are recorded on this register and to terminate employment of such employees.

Chapter seven, section 54 (a) of the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 32 of 2007 relates to compulsory or mandatory reporting of sexual offences. Any person who has knowledge of a sexual offence committed against a child must
report this immediately to the police. Part four of the National Instruction 3/2008 to all police members reiterates this compulsory reporting when a person has knowledge of a sexual offence perpetrated against a child.

In contrast, Section 54(b) mandates that any person who has knowledge, reasonable belief or suspicion and not simply knowledge of a sexual offence against a mentally disabled person must report this immediately to the police. Whilst this may be an oversight in the sexual offences law, Hendricks (2014) argues that the word immediately in section 54(a) “can be interpreted as on becoming aware of the sexual abuse or when there is reasonable suspicion of abuse of a sexual nature” (p. 551). Reasonable grounds for suspicion or reasonable belief of suspicion are not concerned with proving that child sexual abuse took place but rather that a reasonable person, when looking at the signs and evaluating the facts and circumstances surrounding the child and suspected perpetrator, would also conclude that child sexual abuse has taken place (Hendricks, 2014). If a person fails to report such knowledge they are guilty of a criminal offence. The penalty for non-reporting is a fine and/or imprisonment for up to five years according to section 54 (1)(b) if convicted.

National policies and programmes related to child sexual abuse.

The National Policy Framework on the Management of Sexual Offences. The National Policy Framework on the Management of Sexual Offences (NPF) was developed by the Department of Justice and Constitutional Development (DJCD) to ensure a uniform and coordinated intersectoral response by all South African government departments and institutions dealing with matters relating to sexual offences (DJCD, 2012). The NPF guides the implementation, enforcement and administration of the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 32 of 2007. The NPF “seeks to establish a criminal justice system that is quick, more protective, least traumatizing, more sensitive to the plight of the victims, and promotes cooperative response between all government departments and
institutions” (DJCD, 2012, p. 13). The NPF sets out to comply with norms, standards and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

There are four overarching principles in the NPF in its approach to sexual offences, namely i) victim-centred; ii) multi-disciplinary and intersectoral; iii) providing specialised services; and iv) equal access to quality services (DJCD, 2012). The first principle rests on the premise that all services relating to sexual offences must be victim-centred; the victim’s emotional and psychological wellbeing must be considered in all services, processes and institutional mechanisms in the criminal justice system (DJCD, 2012). This principle also addresses the vulnerability of children and people with disabilities, as well as sexuality and cultural differences. At all times members of the criminal justice system must minimise all secondary victimisation or traumatisation. Secondary victimisation is defined as the “attitudes, processes, actions and omissions that may intentionally or unintentionally contribute to the revictimisation of a person who has experienced a traumatic incident as a victim through: failure to treat the victim with respect and dignity; disbelief of the person’s account; unsympathetic treatment; blaming the victim; and lack of (or insufficient) support services to assist the victim at interpersonal, institutional and broad social level” (DJCD, 2008, p. 36).

The NPF’s second principle underlines the importance of a multidisciplinary and intersectoral response to sexual offences to ensure an efficient and holistic approach. All services providers whether they are SAPS, medical practitioners, social workers, and prosecutors must participate and contribute collectively to the efficiency of the overall system. At the community level, schools, community-based organisations and religious organisations must be integrated to enhance interventions against sexual offences (DJCD, 2012). The NPF outlines roles and responsibilities of various government departments and
institutions in line with their obligations under section 66 of the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 32 of 2007.

The third principle of the NPF rests on the provision of specialised services to sexual offences victims. Specialised skills and knowledge are needed by all those working with sexual offences victims because of the severe consequences for victims because of being sexually violated (DJCD, 2012). Hence the development of special resources and specialised units to deal with sexual offences matters such as the Thuthuzela Care Centres established by the National Prosecution Authority, court preparation officers, sexual offence courts, anatomical dolls and intermediaries provided in courts as well as one-stop centres managed by the DSD (DJCD, 2012).

The fourth principle of the NPF relates to equal and equitable access to quality services for all sexual offences victims. Victims of sexual offences must be afforded uniform access to services irrespective of their race, class, gender, sexuality, disability or culture. However, in the equal treatment for all required, the vulnerability of some victims over others must still be recognised (DJCD, 2012). Equitable services must be provided for example, when cases are reported; when medico-legal examinations are conducted; when investigations are carried out; when psychosocial services are provided; when preparing for and prosecuting sexual offences matters; and during the incarceration and rehabilitation of sexual offenders (DJCD, 2012). Government institutions are charged by the NPF to provide adequate physical resources (for example, victim-centred facilities) and appropriate human resources to match the volume of work and expertise and knowledge required (DJCD, 2012).

A qualitative agency study comprising of in-depth interviews and focus groups was conducted amongst DSD and other non-governmental child protection agencies registered with the DSD as part of the Optimus study (Artz et al., 2016). It was reported that poor relationships with SAPS made it harder for them to do their jobs, however, some social
workers did acknowledge exceptions where there were good working relationships (Artz et al., 2016). It was further reported that social workers faced a number of challenges working with the justice system, including: cases taking years to be resolved resulting in problems for the child not remembering details of the incident; the court process being difficult, intimidating and taxing on children and their families; inability of caregivers to take children to court, often resulting in cases being struck off the court roll; and courts often granting the alleged perpetrators bail despite social workers’ requests against this which resulted in perpetrators being allowed back into the communities or even the homes where the victims lived (Artz et al., 2016).

Most participants in the Optimus agency study reported good working relationships with the Department of Health (DOH), specifically that the Thuthuzela Care Centres for victims of child abuse were generally considered by them to be a success because there “victims could receive a medical examination, open a case and receive counselling all in one site” (Artz et al. 2016, p. 63).

*The National Instruction 3/2008: Sexual Offenses.* Every member of the SAPS is required to be aware of the processes and protocol as laid out in the National Instruction 3/2008: Sexual Offences to ensure that all police members render a professional service to victims in respect of the investigation of all sexual offences. For instance, section three of the National Instruction 3/2008: Sexual Offences instructs every police station to be able to refer victims to health and medical services, social development services as well as local organisations who can provide counselling and support services.

Section four makes provision of specific instructions to follow when someone comes to a police station to report a sexual offence, including the following: SAPS members must accept and acknowledge sexual offence reports made in person; SAPS members must deal with sexual offence reports even if the person making the report resides in another area or the
sexual offence was committed in another area; and, even if a report is made long after an alleged sexual offence took place, the police member must still follow normal police procedures.

There are victim assistance procedures all police members must follow referred to in section five of the National Instruction 3/2008: Sexual Offences. These include: being mindful of the trauma undergone by the sexual offences victim; lessening any secondary traumatisation of the sexual offences victim; taking a comprehensive report; informing the sexual offences victim of the processes that will follow next; and informing sexual offences victims of the medical examinations they need to undergo. There are other detailed instructions of how to deal with victims at a sexual offence crime scene and the safeguarding of the actual crime scene in subsequent sections of the National Instruction 3/2008: Sexual Offences.

Furthermore, Annexure E of the National Instruction 3/2008: Sexual Offences provides a thorough checklist guideline for obtaining an in-depth statement of the sexual offence from the victim. Police members are required to document in detail the events leading up to the incident, a full description of the crime scene, the victim’s clothing, details of the suspect and the actual sexual offence description.

Likewise, Annexure F of the National Instruction 3/2008: Sexual Offences provides additional guidelines to follow when taking a statement if the victim of the sexual offense is a child. For example, should a parent, guardian, or accompanying adult be the alleged perpetrator, the statement of the child must not be taken in their presence. Also, police members are not to translate the language used by the child into adult language but to record the child’s actual words. However, a statement must be submitted by the police member or the parent/guardian to give an explanation to the meaning of any words used by the child.
The National Sexual Assault Policy: Department of Health. The National Sexual Assault Policy of the DOH details the appropriate physical and psychological care of sexual assault victims as well as the collecting of medico-legal evidence by health workers in South Africa (DOH, 2005). Firstly, strategies and norms and standards to provide the best healthcare immediately after sexual assault to victims are detailed in the policy. For example, victims of sexual assault must be examined promptly with special concern for both the victim’s physical and psychological needs; rape victims must especially receive fast-tracked attention in a private room for counselling and examination; victims must receive the necessary medical treatment of any physical injuries; and victims must receive adequate emergency treatment for preventing unwanted pregnancy (emergency contraception), receive post exposure prophylaxis for HIV within 72 hours of exposure, and receive treatment for any other sexually transmitted diseases (DOH, 2005). However, despite this policy, social workers in the Optimus agency study reported that it was “very rare that children who had experienced abuse received immediate medical attention and examination in public facilities…they often had to wait in long queues…even if the child was the victim of sexual abuse, with no preferential treatment. This could be traumatic for the child because he or she could not wash until evidence was captured, and the environment was often distressing or overwhelming” (Artz et al., 2016).

Because the SAPS and criminal justice system in South Africa relies heavily on medico-legal evidence to support the victim’s account of the case as well as in the sentencing of perpetrators (Kotze, Brits & Botes, 2016), the National Sexual Assault Policy also makes provision for the appropriate and accurate documentation of injuries and collection of forensic evidence needed by courts for the prosecution and conviction of sexual assault perpetrators (DOH, 2005). For instance, only medical practitioners with appropriate and recognised training may conduct examinations of a sexual assault victim; appropriate sexual
assault evidence collection kits and documentation of evidence in the prescribed J88 forms must be adhered to; health workers must ensure the integrity of all physical evidence in collection, preservation and presentation of medico-legal evidence; and all samples and specimens must be appropriately sealed and sent off for forensic science laboratory testing and then either handed to SAPS or carefully stored in dedicated cabinets or refrigerators (DOH, 2005).

However, in the Optimus agency study, social workers reported that “doctors often do not want to complete medical reports, or that they played down the evidence because they did not want to go to court to testify” (Artz et al., 2016, p.60). Kotze et al. (2016) state that the J88 form is a “legal document, which addresses the factual findings of the medical assessment and the opinion of the health worker as to the significance of the facts” (p. 45) and that health workers should realise that it is unethical to attend to a victim and not complete the necessary documentation needed for future court proceedings. The J88 is an integral part of the charge itself as it attests to the validity of the accusation and severity of injuries sustained and helps decide the level of punishment to be handed down (Kotze et al., 2016). Medical doctors or registered nurses completing the J88 should document all injuries whether they seem relevant or not in terms of site, approximate size and age of wounds (Kotze et al., 2016).

Jina, Jewkes, Christofides & Smith (2011) conducted a cross-sectional study in 2005 of 204 sexual assault evidence collection kits from six provinces from which these kits were analysed by the forensic science laboratory in Pretoria, South Africa. The study reported that in 80.0% of the adult rape cases and 65.4% of the child rape cases, foreign DNA was identified. On analysis of the suspect’s blood samples, DNA matches were found in 80.5% of the adult cases and 76.9% of the child cases, but that this mainly occurred when all genital specimens required had been collected. Jina et al. (2011) concluded that health workers
should, therefore, complete all required genital swabs in the kit “as this increased the chance of evidence recovery and obtaining a foreign forensic DNA profile” (p. 758) that matched the suspect.

*South African Integrated Programme of Action Addressing Violence against Women and Children (2013 – 2018).* The South African Integrated Programme of Action Addressing Violence against Women and Children (POA) was developed by the DSD which led an inter-ministerial committee to step up national efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women and children (VAWC) (DSD, 2014). This committee met in May 2012 and incorporated ministers from the following departments: Women, Children and People with Disabilities; Health; Justice and Constitutional Development, Home Affairs; SAPS; Telecommunications and Postal Services; and Basic Education (DSD, 2014). The POA was approved by Cabinet in September 2013 and was to be implemented until 2018 with a review in 2016.

The POA itself states that it cannot be implemented by the government alone to produce all its desired outcomes and “involvement of all levels and segments of society, including government institutions, civil society organisations, media, businesses, communities, families, men and women, and boys and girls” is required to “address such a serious, prevalent and deeply entrenched problem” (p. 9). The recent Optimus agency study highlighted the important role that traditional leaders play in the protection of children from sexual abuse, especially in the rural areas of South Africa. It was reported that in provinces such as Kwazulu-Natal, the traditional leader decides on an amount paid by the perpetrator to the family of the sexually abused child which absolves the perpetrator, resulting in non-report of the child sexual abuse and the perpetrator being allowed to go free and the victim receiving no medical assistance or trauma counselling. However, in areas such as the North West and
Eastern Cape, there is collaboration and support between the social workers and traditional leaders (Artz et al., 2016).

The POA recognises that significant work has been undertaken to ameliorate the scourge of VAWC, specifically in the establishment of various one-stop centres and specialised units. Thuthuzela Care Centres have been established by the DOH for victims of sexual violence based at health facilities which aim to reduce secondary victimization, improve conviction rates and reduce the cycle time for conclusion of cases (DSD, 2014). There is also the Victim Empowerment Programme and the Victim’s Charter for promoting justice for crime victims; the Khuseleka One-Stop centres; One-Stop Child Justice Centres which have specialised courts with magistrates and prosecutors who specialise in youth criminality; and the SAPS Family Violence, Child Protection and Sexual Offences units which investigate adult domestic violence and sexual offences as well as child protection crimes (DSD, 2014). The Khuseleka One-Stop centres are open 24 hours a day for female and child victims of violence; they provide a place of refuge and shelter; they provide services such as trauma counselling, psychosocial support; they facilitate referral and follow-up to the nearest health care facility; and they operate in close partnership with SAPS and court support (Haupt, 2015).

However, whilst significant work has been undertaken, current efforts and approaches tend to be fragmented, uncoordinated, and focus on response services only (Mathews et al., 2012). The POA seeks to “slightly shift away from responsive programming towards a preventative approach that addresses the root and underlying causes of violence VAWC in a holistic and co-ordinated manner” and the POA offers “moving beyond a reactive approach and provides a framework for a comprehensive and systematic approach, which aims to achieve substantial and lasting change” (DSD, 2014, p. 23).
The POA has five main objectives, namely: i) to prevent VAWC from occurring by transforming attitudes, practices and behaviours; ii) to respond to violence in an integrated and co-ordinated manner through a comprehensive package of services to affected women and children; iii) to provide long-term care, support and empowerment of victims of violence; iv) to provide re-integration and rehabilitation services for perpetrators of violence; and v) to strengthen the system at all levels to ensure accountable and co-ordinated action across sectors (DSD, 2014).

Key interventions are incorporated under three pillars of the POA, namely i) prevention and protection interventions; ii) response interventions and iii) care and support interventions (DSD, 2014). To prevent VAWC before it happens, the POA outlines implementing the following measures, amongst others: public campaigns; school programmes; community dialogues; positive parenting programmes; providing support to strengthen and capacitate families, especially in relation to parenting responsibilities to decrease the vulnerability of children to abuse; and national police outreach programmes implemented in schools and local communities to encourage and assist reports of violence and abuse (DSD, 2014, p. 28-29).

To respond to VAWC after it has occurred, the POA outlines measures such as the following: an integrated and coordinated national toll-free 24/7 helpline; a national response centre to allow for effective national monitoring, coordination and intervention in cases; strengthening coordination of prevention and early intervention programmes; harmonising and streamlining the various services units, including the SAPS Family Violence, Child Protection and Sexual Offences units, dedicated health facilities for cases involving violence against children, Thuthuzela Care Centres, Khuseleka One-stop centres and sexual offences courts (DSD, 2014, p. 30-31).
Under the care and support pillar, the POA aims “to prioritise the safety, wellbeing and long-term empowerment of women and children, while ensuring the accountability and rehabilitation of perpetrators to reduce re-offending” through the following measures, to name some: establishment of shelters and safe houses for women and children including Khuseleka One-stop centres; recruitment, training and deployment of victim support workers in the nine provinces to offer door-to-door psychosocial support and referral services; victim empowerment through lifeskills, social and economic programmes to reduce their vulnerability and build resilience; and development and strengthening of statutory and non-statutory rehabilitation programmes for perpetrators (DSD, 2014, p. 31).

To carry out this work the POA recommends the strengthening of the overall system. It suggests the use of retired professionals such as nurses, teachers and social workers as well as the upscaling of the Isibindi model to have more human resources (DSD, 2014). The Isibindi model is based on training community members to serve as professional child and youth care workers to provide care, protection and developmental support to vulnerable children and families (South African Government News Agency, 2014). The POA also states that a national monitoring and evaluation system is vital as well as an integrated information management system with data sharing portals to ensure effective reporting, programming and monitoring (DSD, 2014).

Expected outcomes and time-bound indicators were set in section 3.4 of the POA as it is effective from 2013 to 2018 and various targets are already supposed to have been met. There is only limited reporting available on the POA’s expected outcomes because, as reported in the latest available Annual Report of the DSD, provincial monitoring of the POA has not been conducted yet (DSD, 2015). There were, however, a few outcomes reported in the DSD 2015 Annual Report. Firstly, R17.3 million funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) was used to train community caregivers and their
supervisors on psychosocial wellbeing, child protection and supportive supervision (DSD, 2015).

Also, R4.2 million USAID funding was spent on the DSD’s Gender-based Violence Command Centre which was developed to improve services to women and children who experience violence and abuse. This 24-hour national toll-free call centre with Global Positioning System (GPS) mapping capability is dedicated to provide immediate psychological assistance, support and counselling to victims; to assist in avoiding additional exposure to violence; and to refer victims to SAPS where necessary (DSD, 2015). Between 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015 this command centre attended to 9990 calls and serviced 3503 cases related to domestic violence, sexual assault and sexual violence, physical abuse, and verbal abuse and intimidation (DSD, 2015). With the GPS mapping technology, call centre staff can geo-locate the origin of calls made by affected individuals, where geolocation refers to the estimated real-world geographic location of a mobile phone or internet-connected device such as a computer or tablet (DSD, 2015).

Furthermore, an information management system on children known as Ulwazi Ngabantwana has been developed (DSD, 2015). This system is meant to facilitate the management and analysis of statistical data on children and will assist with monitoring and evaluation of all child protection programmes. At the time of the DSD 2015 annual report, the system had not been launched yet and was awaiting the training of staff before going “live” (DSD, 2015). Bower and Abrahams (2015, p. 32) cautioned that any information management system on children must operate on “agreed-upon and consistent definitions”, establish “inter-sectoral protocols for data collection and data use”, preferably have an “electronic data-collection process” and, be used for consistent reporting on the same issues “so that progress can be tracked”.
Other initiatives were undertaken by the DSD during the 2014/2015 reporting year to strengthen and support community interventions (DSD, 2015). For instance, various government departments and civil society organisations were trained on the approved White Paper on Families in South Africa which is aimed at strengthening families because research shows that safer non-violent communities are dependent on functional, non-violent and resilient families (DSD, 2012, 2015).

In addition, together with the National Association of Child Care Workers, the DSD has implemented community-based child and youth care services using the Isibindi model (DSD, 2015). The DSD reported that it will train 10,000 child and youth care workers over a period of five years to assist with addressing the needs of over one million children (DSD, 2015, p. 75). The DSD (2015) reported that during the 2014/2015 reporting period, a total of 337 Isibindi projects were established and 4879 child and youth care workers delivered prevention and early intervention programmes to 176,190 children at risk.

*Education policies and programmes related to child sexual abuse.*

*The National School Safety Framework.* The National School Safety Framework (NSSF) of the Department of Basic Education (DBE) was developed by the Centre for Justice and Crime Prevention (CJCP, 2015). The DBE’s website states that the “NSSF was formally approved by the Minister of Basic Education in April 2015, and is now being rolled out to all South African schools”. The overall aim and purpose of the NSSF is to establish school safety standards that must be set in place, implemented and monitored in all schools to “create a safe, violence and threat-free, supportive learning environment for learners, educators, principals, school governing bodies and administration” in schools across South Africa (CJCP, 2015, p.3). The NSSF integrates many existing school safety strategies and policies into a comprehensive framework to address violence prevention at schools. All acts of
violence are dealt with in the NSSF of which sexual abuse is one such act of violence (CJCP, 2015).

The NSSF has four main objectives, which are as follows: i) to assist schools in understanding and identifying all security issues and threats by providing standard operating guidelines for provinces to conduct school safety audits and to implement more detailed safety plans; ii) to guide schools to effectively respond to identified security issues and threats by ensuring that security and access control measures as well as the necessary school safety policies and procedures are all in place; iii) to create reporting systems to manage reported incidents in line with school safety policies and procedures; and iv) to help the school monitor their progress over time (CJCP, 2015, p. 20).

The NSSF is divided into two parts. Part A of the NSSF firstly provides the context of school violence and how it impacts individuals, families, communities and the society at large (CJCP, 2015). Next, it provides an overview of the different forms of school violence, including bullying, cyberbullying, xenophobia, corporal punishment versus positive discipline, sexual and gender-based violence, assault and fighting, gang-related violence and homophobia (CJCP, 2015). Thirdly, the importance and role schools play in violence prevention is discussed as well as the inter-relationships between safe schools and safe communities. The NSSF also provides a brief overview of all international and national legislation and policies applicable to schools (CJCP, 2015).

Part A of the NSSF then lists the following minimum safety requirements for all schools: i) safety policies and procedures must be implemented and enforced and learners and all school staff must be aware of these; ii) safety audits must be undertaken annually; iii) safety plans must be formulated, adopted and revised annually to address the safety threats within the school; iv) there must be constant engagement with community structures (such as non-governmental and community-based organisations, law enforcement and care workers).
in addressing violence; v) there must be established and functional school safety committees; vi) there must be appropriate codes of conduct; vii) there must be reporting and response systems which are developed, utilised and reviewed to improve reporting mechanisms; and viii) there must be established and functional referral systems (CJCP, 2015, p. 18-19).

In section six of Part A, the NSSF lists the roles and responsibilities of various school bodies and groups. Teachers are tasked with: reporting “all misdemeanors”, maintaining “a classroom environment that is safe, secure and orderly”, carrying out “job-related responsibilities that impact learner safety” and cooperating “with social services agencies and law enforcement or private security agencies to promote safe, caring and child friendly schools” (CJCP, 2015, p. 25). Part A of the NSSF however, falls short of stating clearly that teachers are required to report any suspicions of child abuse and that this is mandated by law.

Part B of the NSSF comprises a school safety manual and implementation tools. There are useful tools provided for: i) identifying safety issues; ii) reporting incidents; iii) checking the reporting systems; and iv) monitoring and evaluating progress (CJCP, 2015). There are survey forms for learners and teachers which contain questions on all forms of crime and violence occurring at the school as well as their suggestions to improve school safety. The surveys also contain questions to reveal the extent of sexual violence occurring at the school (CJCP, 2015). Part B of the NSSF does not however, supply the necessary detailed instructions on reporting sexual offences. Nor does it contain a copy of Form 22 which is the regulated form to use for reporting abuse or deliberate neglect of a child. The NSSF also makes no mention of screening employees against the NRSO and the NCPR.

*Guidelines for the Prevention and Management of Sexual Violence and Harassment in public schools.* Besides the NSSF, the DBE has produced Guidelines for the Prevention and Management of Sexual Violence and Harassment in public schools (DBE, 2008). The DBE website states that these guidelines “have been developed and distributed to schools to
support schools and school communities in responding to cases of sexual harassment and violence against learners” and that the guidelines “set out clearly how public schools should treat victims of sexual harassment and violence and the steps that must be taken to deal with those who have or are alleged to have committed such acts”.

A review of these guidelines however, showed that they are outdated and in considerable conflict with the Children’s Act 38 of 2005 as amended by the Children’s Amendment Act 41 of 2007, and the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 32 of 2007 in four consequential ways. Firstly, the Guidelines for the Prevention and Management of Sexual Violence and Harassment in public schools state that there are different levels of interventions required dependent on the apparent seriousness of the sexual harassment or violence experienced and that not all instances of sexual violence are considered reportable to the police (DBE, 2008). This is contrary to the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 32 of 2007 which mandates the reporting of all sexual offences against children on knowledge thereof immediately to the police and the Children’s Act 38 of 2005 which mandates teachers to report all reasonable suspicions of abuse to a child protection organisation, provincial department of social development or a police official.

Secondly, in the Guidelines for the Prevention and Management of Sexual Violence and Harassment in public schools, alleged sexual violence and harassment “misdemeanors” are punishable through supervised schoolwork, verbal or written warnings, and conflict resolution. There are no instructions to report these further. Thirdly, in cases of sexual violence such as rape the guidelines state that the matter must be reported to SAPS within 72 hours and not immediately as mandated in the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 32 of 2007. Fourthly, the DBE’s guidelines are silent regarding screening employees against the NCPR and NRSO.
The DBE’s website also refers to a handbook entitled Speak Out - Youth Report Sexual Abuse which is meant to equip learners with knowledge and understanding of sexual harassment and sexual violence, its implications, ways to protect themselves from perpetrators, and where to report. This handbook states that teachers have a duty to stop sexual abuse and states that teachers have a responsibility to investigate all learners’ complaints of sexual harassment and/or sexual violence. This is in direct conflict with the Children’s Act 38 of 2005 (as amended by the Children’s Amendment Act 41 of 2007) which states that it is the provincial DSD’s responsibility to investigate all sexual abuse matters and that a teacher has a duty to report the matter on reasonable suspicion of the abuse.

Besides the Speak Out - Youth Report Sexual Abuse handbook for youth, there are links on the DBE website (under the safety in schools ‘tab’) to three A5 pamphlets directing educators, children and parents, respectively, to speak out against child abuse. However, all these resources are outdated and not aligned with the current laws, specifically mandatory reporting. In addition, there are no guidelines provided by the DBE on the use of the Speak Out - Youth Report Sexual Abuse handbook and the three learner, educator and parent pamphlets.

Provincial Education Department policies and guidelines on child sexual abuse. A review of each of the nine official provincial education department’s websites and a general web-based search was conducted to ascertain whether these have specific policies and guidelines set out for schools in each of their provinces regarding the mandatory reporting of child abuse, and more specifically, of child sexual abuse.

Firstly, it was found that the provincial education departments of the Northern Cape and North West provinces have no provincial policies, protocols or guidelines available on their respective websites. These two provincial education departments do however, refer to the DBE’s Guidelines for the Prevention and Management of Sexual Violence and
Harassment but with no ‘links’ thereto. Thus, it would be dependent on the schools in the Northern Cape and North West provinces to access these materials from the DBE website directly.

Secondly, it was found that the provincial education departments of Limpopo, Mpumalanga and Free State provinces not only have no provincial policies, protocols or guidelines available on their websites but also that these provincial educational departments’ websites make no reference whatsoever to the DBE’s guidelines.

Only the Gauteng, Kwazulu-Natal and Western Cape provincial education departments have their own provincial policies, protocols or guidelines on child abuse and the mandatory reporting thereof. Of all nine provincial departments of education, the WCED protocol is the clearest and most up to date. The Province of Kwazulu-Natal Education Department’s Policy guidelines for the management of child abuse and neglect which, whilst relatively accurate in terms of requirements of the law, are very poorly laid out and very verbose compared to the clarity of the WCED protocol (Department of Education Province of Kwazulu-Natal, 2010).

On the other hand, the Gauteng Province Education Department has produced an Exemplar School Safety Policy wherein it refers to child abuse and child sexual abuse and the legislated duty to report (Gauteng Province Education Department, 2011). However, whilst it is a fair attempt to locate the issue of child sexual abuse in a holistic school safety framework, the important issues surrounding child sexual abuse and the mandatory reporting thereof is somewhat lost amongst all the other school safety issues such as bullying, and the safety of buildings and infrastructure. Thus, the information in this safety policy falls somewhat short of being comprehensive and complete in terms of child sexual abuse. Also, whilst the Exemplar School Safety Policy does advise that the Guidelines and Procedure for Dealing with Suspected and Confirmed Cases of Child Abuse (2008) be followed, a web-based search
on the Gauteng Province Education Department website and generally across the internet produced no such document.

In addition, the Gauteng Province Education Department’s information given in its Exemplar School Safety Policy is inaccurate and against the legal requirements as set out in the Children’s Act 38 of 2005, the Children’s Amendment Act 41 of 2007, and the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act 32 of 2007. For instance, in section 10.5 of the Exemplar School Safety Policy, it states that if child abuse is suspected or confirmed that “such a child should be reported to the Principal” and that it is then the principal’s duty to report the matter further (Gauteng Province Education Department, 2011, p. 13). This policy therefore doesn’t consider the mandatory requirement of the teacher to report the matter to the SAPS or DSD but instead relinquishes this role and places it onto the principal. The problem with this reporting irregularity is that the law is very clear that the teacher who suspects or knows of the child sexual abuse has the duty to report and that, by simply passing the information to the principal, does not absolve the teacher of such legal requirement. Also, the Exemplar School Safety Policy makes no mention of the required Form 22 (nor does it attach Form 22 as an appendix) to be completed in terms of child abuse reporting.

Abuse No More Protocol. In July 2014, the WCED announced its amended Abuse No More Protocol through an official announcement (Circular 0031/2014) to, amongst others, education directors-general, chief directors, circuit team managers, principals, school governing bodies, teachers and learners, in all public primary and secondary schools in the Western Cape (WCED, 2014a).

Section three of the Abuse No More Protocol clearly sets out the legal requirements under the current legislation that teachers are mandatory reporters of child abuse and provides guidelines to follow when a child discloses any abuse to a teacher. Unlike in the DBE’s
Guidelines for the Prevention and Management of Sexual Violence and Harassment and Speak Out - Youth Report Sexual Abuse handbook where the school staff are directed to question and investigate the allegations of sexual violence, this WCED protocol clearly states that “during the disclosure process, the learner victim must under no circumstances be questioned to verify the truthfulness of the allegation, since the educator/principal’s role is merely to receive the report and to further report the matter to either SAPS or a designated social worker” and that this “reporting process is immediate and there should be no delays” (WCED, 2014b, p. 5).

Furthermore, section three documents the process to follow when i) a fellow-learner is the alleged offender; ii) a school employee is the alleged offender; and iii) a parent, family or community member is the alleged offender (WCED, 2014b). There are also comprehensive guidelines given for managing any disciplinary measures against learners or school members if they are the alleged offenders. Section four of the Abuse No More Protocol clearly sets out the responsibilities of all relevant role-players in a point-form easily understandable format (WCED, 2014b).

The Abuse No More Protocol also has some very relevant additional information in appendices to the main document for schools. For instance, Annexure C of the protocol is a copy of Form 22 for reporting child abuse and deliberate neglect according to Regulation 33 of Section 110 of the Children’s Act 38 of 2005 (WCED, 2014b). Annexure E seeks to guide teachers to decide when there is a possibility of abuse (even when children fail to disclose the abuse) and sets out emotional, behavioural and developmental indicators of physical, psychological or sexual abuse (WCED, 2014b). Annexure H provides guidelines to school governing bodies for the screening of teachers against the NCPR and NRSO as well as on how to suspend or dismiss employees who have been convicted or are suspected of child abuse or sexual offences. Annexure K includes a copy of Form 29 which is required to
establish whether a person’s name appears on Part B of the NCPR (WCED, 2014b).

Furthermore, Annexure I of the protocol provides guidelines to school management teams and governing bodies on how to manage public media in terms of suspected or convicted cases of child abuse or sexual offences at their schools (WCED, 2014b).

**Reporting of child sexual abuse suspicions by teachers**

Whilst the global problem of child sexual abuse is discussed widely in the literature, there is a scarcity in the literature on the mandatory reporting intentions and behaviours amongst teachers.

Besides being mandated by law to report child sexual abuse, teachers are in a unique position to play a vital part in the prevention of child sexual abuse. Teachers have daily contact with the children in their classes which should make it easy for them to detect changes in a child’s demeanour and behaviour, to compare the children’s behaviour with peer norms, as well as can detect the signs and symptoms of child sexual abuse (Goldman, 2007; Kenny, 2001; Rheingold, Zajac & Patton, 2012).

According to the TPB, the intention to report suspected child sexual abuse is assumed the best predictor of actual reporting behaviour by teachers. The TPB postulates that intention to report is influenced by three factors, namely attitude towards reporting, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control. The literature was reviewed to ascertain whether these posited relationships were plausible.

Furthermore, one of the major assumptions of the TPB is that factors further removed from the behaviour under investigation, such as socio-demographic characteristics of the teacher, the level of knowledge about the behaviour under review, and past behaviour are assumed to have no direct impact on future intention and behaviour (Ajzen, 1988). The literature was therefore also examined to explore this assumption.
Attitude towards reporting child sexual abuse.

The TPB posits that a person’s attitude towards a specific behaviour is one of the factors that predict this specific behaviour. According to Ajzen (2012), a person’s attitude towards the behaviour is formed from beliefs about the behaviour’s outcomes and evaluation of the likelihood of those outcomes occurring. If this attitude towards the behaviour is largely negative, then it is likely that this person will not perform the behaviour and likewise if the attitude towards the behaviour is largely positive, then a person will more likely perform the behaviour. In this study, teachers’ attitude towards reporting child sexual abuse refers to whether teachers feel positive or negative about reporting cases of child sexual abuse.

In 2013 a telephone survey was conducted amongst 51 of the 363 Grade R teachers who had attended a specific child sexual abuse teacher training programme during the previous eighteen months in Cape Town, South Africa (Rule, 2014). The aim of the study was to evaluate the child sexual abuse teacher training programme regarding teacher outcomes including attitudes towards reporting child sexual abuse. Rule (2014) found that trained teachers held both positive and negative attitudes towards reporting child sexual abuse. Positive attitudes held by surveyed teachers included: 95.9% of trained teachers believed ‘teachers have an important role to play in child sexual abuse’; 91.8% of trained teachers felt ‘prepared for (their) role as mandatory reporter’; and 95.9% of the trained teachers indicated that they would ‘report suspected child sexual abuse even if management advises not to’ (Rule, 2014). However, these trained teachers also held negative attitudes about reporting child sexual abuse which included: 40.4% believed that reporting child sexual abuse brought about ‘more harm than good’, 42.9% believed that reporting child sexual abuse ‘brings more negative consequences for the child’, and 51.0% believed that child sexual abuse ‘reporting may lead to being sued for wrongful accusations’ (Rule, 2014). The evaluation study did not link these attitudinal findings directly to behavioural outcomes, thus
conclusions could not be drawn about the affects these attitudes had on reporting behaviours or intentions amongst these trained teachers.

According to the TPB, teachers who exhibited a positive attitude towards reporting are theorised to also exhibit greater intention to report child sexual abuse. This relationship between attitudes and behaviour is reported by Kenny (2001). A survey was conducted amongst 197 teachers in Florida in the USA to determine the reporting prevalence amongst these teachers of all forms of child abuse, to determine their levels of knowledge on child abuse laws and reporting procedures, to determine their deterrents in reporting child abuse and to determine if certain socio-demographic characteristics influenced teachers’ reporting behaviours and intentions (Kenny, 2001). In the study 11% of teachers reported that they had suspicions of child abuse but had failed to report it. Of the teachers who did not report suspected child abuse cases, 16.1% believed that ‘child protection services did not generally offer help to maltreated children’; 9.7% believed that ‘reporting abuse only brought about negative consequences for the family and child’; 6.5% believed reporting was ‘not my job’; and 3.2% felt that they did not want to ‘get caught up in legal proceedings’. These findings tentatively show that the teachers who failed to report their suspicions, held negative attitudes towards reporting (Kenny, 2001).

Likewise, Walsh et al. (2012) conducted a survey amongst 470 teachers from randomly selected urban and rural primary schools in three Australian jurisdictions. The study focussed on teachers’ actual past reporting behaviour as well as their anticipated future intentions to report child sexual abuse. Walsh et al. (2012) reported that teachers who had reported child sexual abuse in the past were more likely to hold more positive attitudes towards reporting child sexual abuse. Teachers who had reported child sexual abuse in the past, showed positive attitudes to being committed to the reporting role, felt confident in the
effective response of the child protection system to their reporting, and could overcome any concerns about negative consequences of them reporting (Walsh et al., 2012).

In contrast, when mandated reporters do not feel confidence in the efficacy of the child protection services, this negative attitude towards reporting, might influence them not to report a suspicion of child sexual abuse (Feng, Chen, Fetzer, Feng & Lin, 2012). In a qualitative study using in-depth interviews amongst 18 mandated reporters (including doctors, nurses, social workers and teachers) in Taiwan, Feng et al. (2012) reported that the uncertain future for the abused child victim influenced their reporting behaviour and intention. “Professionals were uncomfortable with the uncertain outcome, caring about the child’s future and wishing to do no harm” (Feng et al., 2012, p. 278). Thus, when mandated reporters hold negative attitudes about the outcome of reporting for the child, this may lead to less reports (Feng et al., 2012). The posited relationship between attitudes to reporting and intention to report in the TPB is thus plausible.

Subjective norm related to reporting child sexual abuse.

The TPB posits that subjective norm about a specific behaviour is the second factor that predicts this specific behaviour. According to Ajzen (2012), subjective norm refers to the perceptions a person has of what ‘important others’ (referents) think of as normal coupled with the person’s motivation to comply with these norms. If this subjective norm about the behaviour is largely negative, then a person will likely not perform the behaviour and likewise if the subjective norm about the behaviour is largely positive, then a person will more likely perform the behaviour. In this study, teachers’ subjective norm related to reporting child sexual abuse refers to the teacher’s perception of social pressure to report child sexual abuse cases. Referents include the teacher’s family, colleagues, school principal and any person with perceived importance to the teacher.
In Kenny’s (2001) survey amongst 197 teachers in Florida in the USA, it was reported that 40% of teachers believed that their school administration would not support them if they made child abuse reports. This lack of support from the school administration points to the fact that had subjective norm been measured in this study, it may have been very low for those teachers who did not report suspected cases. The TPB posits that for reporting to be performed, subjective norm related to reporting must be positive and there must be a strong motivation for the person to comply with this norm.

Similarly, in a nationwide study in the USA amongst 568 Grade 1 to Grade 6 teachers, Abrahams et al. (1992) reported that some of the reasons cited by teachers who did not report their suspicions of child abuse was that 14% believed that the school board or principal would disapprove of them reporting and 24% felt that there was a lack of community or school support. The TPB posits that, had more support been felt from school boards, principals and communities, subjective norm would be higher and therefore the likelihood of reporting also greater.

In a more recent study, Feng et al. (2009) conducted four focus groups with 20 Taiwanese kindergarten teachers regarding reporting of child abuse. It was reported that kindergarten teachers in Taiwan “cautiously managed and adjusted their approach and decision according to their evaluation of the context of child abuse in terms of the severity, parental intention, danger to the child and self, institutional support, and the closeness of their relationships with the child and parents” (p. 406). Feng et al. (2009) reported that teachers strived to preserve their relationships with both parents and children but that they were more likely to report the abuse if it was severe and if they thought that the report was critical to the child’s welfare. Additionally, Feng et al. (2009) reported that kindergarten teachers perceived that their own safety was in jeopardy when they reported abuse to the authorities. However, it was found that teachers who obtained approval and validation from people with authority and
power, would be more likely to report their suspicions. Fang et al. (2009) reported that teachers’ reporting anxiety would be eased if the principal approved and helped with child abuse reports. The posited relationship between subjective norm and intention to report in the TPB is thus plausible.

*Perceived behavioural control and child sexual abuse reporting.*

According to the TPB, perceived behavioural control is the third factor that dictates whether a person’s intention translates into action. Perceived behavioural control is determined by the person’s beliefs about the presence of factors that may facilitate or impede the behaviour (Ajzen, 2012). In this study perceived behavioural control is defined as the teachers’ perceptions of their ability to report cases of child sexual abuse, specifically the ease or difficulty of reporting. Perceived behavioural control is determined by the total set of beliefs about the presence of factors that may hamper or promote reporting and these beliefs are presumed to reflect past experience as well as anticipated obstacles (Ajzen, 1988, 2011).

Webb and Vulliamy (2001) reported their findings on a social work study that was based on qualitative research in 15 primary schools and a national questionnaire survey amongst primary school teachers in England and Wales. It was reported that if the school neighbourhood is characterised by violence and school security is a concern, threats towards teachers making reports could be a considerable source of anxiety to teachers in the school (Webb & Vulliamy, 2001). This source of anxiety would, in turn, negatively affect teachers’ control beliefs, according to the TPB (Ajzen, 2012).

In the survey amongst 197 teachers in Florida in the USA, Kenny (2001) reported that the most common reason cited by teachers for not reporting child abuse was fear of making an inaccurate report. Many of the teachers (40%-45%) felt that their pre-and post-service training on child abuse was insufficient (Kenny, 2001). They felt lacking in their knowledge
and skills of reporting and were unsure of the legal requirements. This lack of confidence in their ability would also impact their perceived behavioural control, according to the TPB (Ajzen, 2012).

In the evaluation of a child sexual abuse teacher training programme amongst 51 trained Grade R teachers in Cape Town in South Africa, Rule (2014) found that 98% of these teachers who have been trained in child sexual abuse knowledge and reporting procedures, reported confidence in their ability to apply correct child sexual abuse reporting protocol if a child disclosed abuse. According to the TPB, this confidence in their ability should impact positively on their perceived behavioural control as it relates to reporting intention and behaviour (Ajzen, 2012). The posited relationship between perceived behavioural control and intention to report in the TPB is thus deemed plausible.

Socio-demographic characteristics of the teacher and child sexual abuse reporting.

The TPB assumes that the socio-demographic characteristics of the teacher have no direct impact on future reporting intention and behaviour (Ajzen, 1988). The literature was examined to explore this assumption. Previous studies have reported conflicting results regarding socio-demographics of the mandated reporter as predictors of reporting intentions and reporting behaviour.

In a study amongst 480 public school teachers in Ohio Department of Education in the USA, O’Toole et al. (1999) found that male teachers were less tolerant of abuse and neglect of children than their female counterparts. This was contrary to the findings in Kenny’s (2001) study which revealed that female teachers were 6.1 times more likely to report or assist in reporting suspicions of child abuse than male teachers.

Additionally, in the O’Toole et al. (1999) study, the more children teachers themselves parented, the less likely they were to report cases of child abuse. This finding
contrasted with a study conducted by Ben Natan, Faour, Naamhah, Grinberg and Klein-Kremer (2012) who found that as the number of own children increased, there was an increased likelihood of reports of child abuse being made by Israeli medical and nursing staff.

Webster, O’Toole, O’Toole and Lucal (2005) utilised the same sample of 480 public school teachers as that of O’Toole et al. (1999) but analysed the data to specifically compare those teachers who had recognised child abuse but who had indicated they would not always report their suspicions of child abuse (under-reporters) with those teachers who consistently indicated that they would report the cases they recognised as child abuse (consistent reporters). It was reported that married teachers were found to under-report their suspicions of child abuse whereas white teachers or those having a greater educational level were found not to under-report (Webster et al., 2005). This last-mentioned finding by Webster et al. (2005) was comparable with Goebbels, Nicholson, Walsh and De Vries (2008) who investigated the determinants of teachers’ reporting behaviour amongst 296 primary school teachers employed in 15 Australian schools. It was found that teachers who had never suspected child abuse or neglect during their teaching careers were more likely to have lower academic qualifications (Goebbels et al., 2008).

The number of years teaching experience a teacher had was found to be positively related to reporting behaviour (Goebbels et al., 2008; Kenny, 2001). Goebbels et al. (2008) reported that teachers who had never suspected child abuse or neglect in their entire teaching careers were more likely to have less years teaching experience than teachers who had suspected and reported cases of child abuse. Similarly, Kenny (2001) found that for each additional 5 years of teaching experience, teachers were 4.1 times more likely to report child abuse or assist others with reporting child abuse than those who did not.
Knowledge on mandatory reporting of child sexual abuse.

The TPB assumes that the teacher's knowledge on mandatory reporting will have no direct impact on future reporting intention and behaviour (Ajzen, 1988). Although accurate knowledge about a behaviour is often considered necessary for effective action, empirical evidence provides conflicting support for a relation between accurate knowledge about a behaviour and desired behaviour itself (Ajzen, Joyce, Sheikh & Cote, 2011).

Whilst O'Toole et al. (1999) found that knowledge about abuse and mandatory reporting was related to reporting, Crenshaw et al. (1995) found that knowledge accuracy of child abuse and reporting amongst teachers, did not discriminate between teachers who had intentions to report and those that did not. No evidence was found that improving knowledge, understanding and support of mandatory reporting will increase reporting intention and reporting rates (Crenshaw et al., 1995).

Those who advocate for pre- and in-service training and education of teachers in the accurate knowledge on the signs and symptoms of child sexual abuse as well as knowledge on reporting and mandatory laws, propose that this will influence teachers’ intention to report (Goldman, 2007; Goldman & Grimbeek, 2011, 2014; Kenny, 2001, 2004; Reiniger, Robison & McHugh, 1995). It seems logical and common sense that if teachers viewed themselves as knowledgeable and highly trained in this area and if they knew the possible consequences of non-reporting, they would use this knowledge when faced with decisions to report suspected cases of child sexual abuse. Training was reported to bring about changes in attitudes to reporting amongst trained teachers relative to untrained teachers (Hawkins & McCallum, 2001; Kleemeier, Webb, Hazzard & Pohl, 1988). Thus, it is possible that, as described in Ajzen et al. (2011), accurate knowledge could indirectly change attitudes.

Teachers themselves often cite their lack of confidence in their ability to identify sexual abuse, as well as their ability to respond appropriately when suspicion of abuse arises,
as reasons for not reporting child abuse (Abrahams et al., 1992; Goldman, 2007; Kenny, 2001). Teachers revealed that they lack sufficient training, both during pre-service and in-service, and thus feel unprepared for their role as mandatory reporters of child abuse (Goldman, 2007; Kenny, 2001; Abrahams et al., 1992).

After being trained in child sexual abuse, teachers reported increased knowledge in the dynamics of child sexual abuse, reporting procedures and responsibilities, how to respond appropriately to a child’s disclosure of abuse, and prevention concepts (Hawkins & McCallum, 2001; Kleemeier et al., 1988; Randolph & Gold, 1994; Rule, 2014).

*Teachers’ past reporting behaviour of suspected child sexual abuse.*

Ajzen (1988) contended that intention was more stable than past behaviour as a predictor of future behaviour and that, in the TPB, intention incorporates the effects of past behaviour in its antecedent, namely attitude towards the behaviour.

Ajzen (1988) purported that when people reported their past behaviours, there was a likelihood that they would over-report socially desirable behaviours and under-report or deny performing socially undesirable ones. Such tendencies were “especially likely in the case of ‘sensitive’ behaviors, that is, behaviors that involve social stigmas or violations of the law” (Ajzen, 1988, p.102).

However, there are studies on child abuse reporting which have found that past reporting behaviour dictates future reporting intentions (Goebbels et al., 2008; O’Toole et al., 1999; Webster et al., 2005). Goebbels, et al. (2008) investigated the determinants of teachers’ reporting behaviour amongst 296 primary school teachers employed in 15 Australian schools. Among those teachers who had suspected cases of child abuse and neglect, 82.0% were consistent reporters and 18.0% were inconsistent reporters. This means that having made
reports in the past was likely to be related to making more reports in the future although this was not empirically tested in the study.

In a study amongst 480 public school teachers in Ohio Department of Education in the USA, O’Toole et al. (1999) reported that the number of past reports made by a teacher was a significant predictor of reporting of child abuse. Webster, et al. (2005) utilised the same sample as that of O’Toole et al. (1999) but analysed the data to specifically compare under-reporting of suspicions of child abuse. Webster et al. (2005) found that having previously made a report of child abuse reduced the likelihood of a teacher underreporting their suspicions.

However, none of these studies utilised the TPB and, therefore, whether past reporting behaviour can add any further prediction to the TPB model is a subject for empirical review in this study.
CHAPTER 3
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In most sciences including the social sciences, theory provides a meaningful framework within which to explain interrelationships among the constructs under investigation and provides insights leading to the discovery of new relationships. Lewin’s dictum (as cited in Ajzen, 2011) that there is “nothing more practical than a good theory” (p. 169) has guided and grounded many research studies. Tudge, Mokrova, Hatfield and Karnik (2009) state that theoretical models are useful in providing researchers with “a common scientific language and guiding empirical studies in such a way as to allow findings from different studies to be evaluated with a common rubric” (p. 198).

To understand the child sexual abuse reporting intentions and behaviour of primary school teachers in South Africa, it is useful and practical to utilise an applicable and well-researched psychological theory to aid in our understanding, conceptualisation and explanation of the behaviour under review. Two theoretical models will be used in this study in understanding the reporting intentions and behaviour of teachers, namely Ajzen’s (1988) TPB (a micro theory) and Bronfenbrenner’s (1977) ecological model (a macro theory). The TPB will be used to guide the hypotheses of this study whilst Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model will serve as a lens through which to interpret the study’s findings.

The theory of planned behaviour

Overview of the theory of planned behaviour.

Ajzen’s (1988) TPB as illustrated in Figure 1 is a theoretical model on the micro level, that provides a specific and testable framework in this study for predicting intentions and explaining social behaviours. Ajzen (1988) made the assumption that intentions capture the
motivational factors that influence a behaviour: "they are indications of how hard people are willing to try, of how much effort they are planning to exert, in order to perform the behavior" (p. 113). He further posited that, generally, the stronger the intention to engage in a certain behaviour, the more likely that behaviour will take place (Ajzen, 1988). In other words, in the TPB, intention is considered the main predictor of behaviour. Ajzen further posited that there are three conceptually independent determinants of intention, namely attitude towards the behaviour, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control. In the TPB a person’s intention to perform a certain behaviour is theorised to be stronger when that person’s attitude and subjective norm towards the behaviour is more favourable and when the person’s perceived control experienced is greater (Ajzen, 1988, 2011).

![Theory of planned behaviour](image)

*Figure 1. Theory of planned behaviour.*

The TPB is an extension of the Ajzen and Fishbein’s theory of reasoned action which was formulated in 1980 (Ajzen, 2012). The theory of reasoned action resulted from attitude research from the expectancy value model after Ajzen and Fishbein tried to estimate the discrepancy between attitude and behaviour (Ajzen, 2012). However, the theory of reasoned
action could only be used to explain actions which were under someone’s control i.e. volitional behaviours. It was found that, in many circumstances, performance of a specific behaviour is dependent on non-motivational forces such as the resources needed for the behaviour to take place. The TPB takes these non-motivational forces into account and includes a determinant of control, known as perceived behavioural control. This means that the individual feels that the behaviour is possible and these control perceptions are considered when predicting intent (Ajzen, 2012). With this addition of perceived behavioural control, the new theoretical model was named the TPB because it predicts deliberate and planned behaviour.

The first antecedent of intention is attitude towards the behaviour. Attitude towards the behaviour is formed from beliefs about this behaviour’s outcomes and evaluation of the likelihood of those outcomes occurring. Only specific attitudes toward the behaviour in question can be expected to predict that behaviour. Ajzen’s theoretical model has the principle of compatibility as a central feature (Ajzen, 2012). This compatibility principle states that, for the model to accurately predict the behaviour under review, the other measures or variables in the model must be measured at the “same level of generality or specificity”, meaning that the measures of the dispositions in the model “must involve the same action, target, context, and time elements as the measure of behaviour” (Ajzen, 1988, p. 375).

The second predictor of a person’s intention is posited to be subjective norm (Ajzen, 2012). Subjective norm refers to a person’s perception of what others (who are important to the person) think of as normal (normative beliefs), and the person’s motivation to comply with these norms. Normative beliefs refer to the perceived behavioural expectations of important referents such as a person’s spouse, family, friends, and colleagues.
Perceived behavioural control is the third factor that dictates whether intention translates into action. Perceived behavioural control is determined by the total set of control beliefs – beliefs about the presence of factors that may facilitate or impede the behaviour (Ajzen, 1988, 2012). Control beliefs are presumed to reflect past experience as well as anticipated obstacles (Ajzen, 1988, 2011). This factor draws on Bandura’s (1977) self-efficacy principle, in which people’s behaviour is influenced by the confidence they possess to perform it.

Bandura conceptualised self-efficacy as a major determinant of behaviour. According to Bandura (2011), “among the types of cognitive activities that affect human functioning, none are more central or pervasive than people’s beliefs in their ability to influence events that affect their lives. Efficacy beliefs exert their diverse effects through cognitive, motivational, emotional, and decisional processes. Efficacy beliefs affect whether individuals think optimistically or pessimistically, in self-enhancing or self-debilitating ways” (p. 36). Self-efficacy is defined as an individual’s perceived confidence to perform a specific behaviour in a specific situation (Bandura, 1977, 2011) and this perceived confidence is developed and influenced through past personal experience.

Finally, the TPB posits that people are expected to carry out their intention when the opportunity to do so arises (Ajzen, 2011). However, actual behavioural control is dependent on whether a person has the skills, resources, and other prerequisites needed to perform the behaviour. Successful implementation of a behaviour depends not only on a favourable intention but also on a sufficient level of actual control (Ajzen, 1988, 2011). Although it may be possible to measure actual control aspects to a certain degree, at most times the information on all the possible factors that may facilitate or prevent performance of the behaviour is lacking. As stated by Ajzen (2011), “volitional control is expected to moderate the intention-behavior relation such that the effect of intention on behaviour is stronger when
actual control is high rather than low” (p.75). To the extent that it is an accurate reflection of actual behavioural control, the TPB uses perceived behavioural control to predict behaviour (Ajzen, 1988, 2011).

Main assumptions of the theory of planned behaviour.
One of the main assumptions of the model is that people hold certain beliefs based on information available to them and that they consider the implications of their actions before they decide to engage or not to engage in each behavior. Their behavioural, normative and control beliefs in turn shape people’s attitude, subjective norm and perceived behavioural control (Ajzen, 1988). These beliefs “may rely on invalid or selective information; they may be irrational, reflecting unconscious biases, paranoid tendencies, wishful thinking or other self-serving motives; and they may fail to correspond to reality in many other ways” (Ajzen, 2015, p. 133). Attitude, subjective norm and perceived behavioural control are then assumed to influence intention, which in turn, is assumed to influence behaviour.

A further assumption of the TPB is that factors further removed from the behaviour under investigation, such as socio-demographic characteristics and the level of knowledge about the behaviour under review, are assumed to have no direct impact on the behaviour. According to the TPB, external or background variables of this nature will influence the beliefs that underlie the behaviour’s attitudinal, normative and control determinants, and therefore have an indirect influence on intention (Ajzen, 1988, 2012). This sufficiency assumption infers that the TPB model contains all important variables in the set of determinants, and thus accounts for all non-error variance. The TPB assumes that, although accurate knowledge could indirectly change attitudes (the antecedent to intention), it is not a necessary factor for predicting intention (Ajzen, 2012).

The TPB also posits that past behaviour is not a suitable predictor of future intended behaviour for reasons which mainly revolve around self-reports of actual behaviour. Ajzen
Critique of the theory of planned behaviour.

The usefulness of the TPB as a theoretical model is well documented. The applicability of the model to explain virtually any human behaviour has made this model a useful and important theoretical tool for the prediction and explanation of many specific behaviours of interest to practitioners and researchers alike (Conner, 2015). For example, Albarracin, Johnson, Fishbein and Muellerleile (2001) conducted a meta-analysis to investigate how well the TPB could predict condom use amongst 96 data sets from 42 reports using meta-analytic fixed effects procedures to estimate weighted mean correlations (r.). The meta-analysis revealed that attitude was associated with behavioural beliefs (r. = .56) and subjective norm was associated with normative beliefs (r. = .46). Attitude to condom use correlated most strongly with intention to use a condom (r. =.58), followed by perceived behavioural control (r. = .45) and subjective norm (r. = .39). Future condom use was found to be correlated with intention (r. = .45), revealing consistency with the TPB (Albarracin et al., 2001).

In a meta-analysis on the efficacy of the TPB, Armitage and Conner (2001), found that the TPB has been useful in predicting a variety of behaviours, with mean intention-behaviour correlations ranging from .44 to .62. This meta-analysis was a quantitative integration and review of 185 independent studies, spanning research in diverse behavioural domains, including physical activity, health screening, playing video games, and donating blood (Armitage & Conner, 2001). Many of these studies used the three TPB predictors to account for a considerable amount of the variance in intention of these behaviours. Almost all
the studies showed that attitude towards the behaviour and perceived behavioural control made significant contributions to the behaviour predictions, while results for subjective norm were less conclusive for some studies (Armitage & Conner, 2001).

The TPB is not without its share of criticisms. The first criticism is that the model is too simplistic and that the addition of external factors sometimes accounts for additional explained variance in the behaviour of interest (Sniehotta, Presseau & Araujo-Soares, 2014; Rhodes, 2015). However, this is considered a distinct advantage to the TPB by other researchers as Ajzen himself advocated the addition of external variables to test the sufficiency of the TPB even though the testing of the model as it is has had considerable support in most domains (Ajzen, 2011). The TPB model is thus flexible to test the possibility of additional explanatory variables either as stand-alone predictors of behaviour or as further mediators via intention as opposed to other theoretical models which are considered “sacrosanct and thus less open to testing with additional variables” (Rhodes, 2015, p.157).

For instance, Ajzen & Sheikh (2013) conducted TPB research to test whether adding a measure of attitudes towards not performing a behaviour would explain the frequent finding that the addition of anticipated affect can greatly improve prediction of intentions. Here Ajzen & Sheikh (2013) found that anticipated affect only contributed significantly to the prediction of intentions when the criterion was the intention to perform a behaviour and the anticipated affect was assessed with respect to avoiding the behaviour. However, in the case of eating or avoiding fast food and drinking or avoiding alcohol, they found that the variance in intentions to avoid alcohol or fast food was left unchanged by the addition of anticipated affect associated with avoiding alcohol or fast food. Therefore, they concluded that anticipated affect contributed little to the prediction of the TPB if it was assessed in direct correspondence to the intention (Ajzen & Sheikh, 2013).
The second major criticism is that the TPB lacks direction for its use in behaviour-change interventions (Rhodes, 2015; Sniehotta et al., 2014). But Rhodes (2015) argues that only criticising the TPB on this aspect is biased because the other two theories which have dominated health behaviour research in the last two decades, namely social cognitive theory and the transtheoretical model, also “have failed to show convincing utility in behaviour change after advanced experimental testing” (p.157). The weakness in TPB research lies in the fact that traditionally cross-sectional research designs and not experimental designs have been used in investigations which are not appropriate for examination of theories of behaviour change (Rhodes, 2015; Sniehotta et al., 2014). Proper testing of the TPB has not seen its due in terms of experimental testing and Rhodes (2015) admonishes researchers “to avoid this design-theory rut” (p.157).

In his commentary on Sniehotta et al.’s criticisms of the TPB, Ajzen (2015) states that the TPB is “in fact not a theory of behaviour change. Instead, it is meant to help explain and predict people’s intentions and behaviour” (p.133). However, Ajzen (2015) further advocates that the theoretical model will prove useful in identifying how and where to target strategies and interventions for changing behaviours although there is a paucity of such research in the literature. Ajzen (2015) further reported that “few investigators expend sufficient effort in formative research to ensure an effective TPB-based intervention. Instead, they often take a rather cavalier approach, relying on intuition” (p. 134). Ajzen (2015) reviewed four studies that reported interventions conforming to the requirements of the TPB and concluded that “these interventions reported strong effects on the targeted theoretical components and on actual behaviour” (p. 136).

*The theory of planned behaviour and teachers’ reporting intentions.*

A review of the literature revealed only three studies (namely Ben Natan et al., 2012; Feng et al., 2010; Feng & Wu, 2005) in which the TPB was used as a theoretical framework for
studying the reporting intention and behaviour of all forms of child abuse and neglect amongst professionals. Two of these studies examined the reporting intention amongst nurses and/or medical staff (Ben Natan et al., 2012; Feng & Wu, 2005) and not teachers. Feng et al. (2010) is the only study using the TPB to predict teachers’ reporting intention. None of these three studies however, measured child sexual abuse reporting specifically, as this study sets out to do; but all three investigated only the wider context of child maltreatment and neglect.

Ben Natan et al. (2012) very recently used the TPB to predict medical and nursing staff in Israel’s reporting of child abuse. Their study was amongst 185 nurses and doctors working with children in a central Israeli hospital and an affiliated clinic based in the community. Correlational analysis revealed that certain beliefs regarding abuse were highly correlated with intention to report (Ben Natan et al., 2012). Attitude towards reporting, specifically views of professional responsibility to report, was highly correlated with reporting intention \( (r = 0.60, p < 0.01) \). Also, perceived behavioural control was positively related with actual reporting behaviour \( (r = 0.22, p < 0.01) \). In addition to the TPB findings, Ben Natan et al. (2012), reported that medical and nursing staff’s own number of children (at home) influenced their reporting behaviour. There was a higher intention to report suspected abuse amongst medical and nursing staff if they themselves had more children. Thus, it was found that parental status was an external factor to the TPB factors, which also accounted for predictability of behaviour.

Feng et al. (2010) conducted a quantitative study among 598 kindergarten teachers in Taiwan using an extended TPB model. The attitude measurement was subdivided into three subscales measuring attitude towards child discipline, attitude towards abusive parents, and attitude towards professional responsibility for reporting child abuse. Likewise, the subjective norm factor was subdivided into two measures, namely direct norm and indirect norm. The findings of their study supported the TPB in that the teachers’ intention to report child abuse
was associated with the three attitude measures and perceived behavioural control and accounted for 22.4% of variance. However, subjective norm was not associated with reporting intent in that study (Feng et al., 2010).

In conclusion, then, the application of the TPB is well suited to the investigation of mandatory reporting of child sexual abuse amongst South African primary school teachers. The TPB will be used to predict the reporting intention of teachers based on the three antecedents of intention namely attitude towards reporting, subjective norm and perceived behavioural control. Furthermore, if external factors are found to have a significant residual effect beyond the predictor values contained in the TPB model, then this would mean that these other factors are to be considered when predicting child sexual abuse reporting intention and behaviour amongst teachers. A range of studies have been reported to consider knowledge on mandatory reporting, socio-demographic characteristics and past reporting behaviour as independent variables that predict intention (Conner, 2015).

**Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model**

*Overview of the ecological model.*

Social ecological models derive their origin from the scientific study of the natural world of ecology and natural ecosystems. Concepts from natural ecosystems are used to help understand human interrelations in the various social systems, environments and contexts within which people find themselves. Social ecological models consider people’s development within the context of relationships that form these environments (Ungar, 2002). These models also resulted because there was a movement from individual casework to social work which takes into account interventions at the family, group, community and policy levels to tackle social problems (Ungar, 2002).
Bronfenbrenner (1977) postulated that people develop within social ecological systems which need to be considered to understand human development. According to Bronfenbrenner (1977), this ecological system involves four interrelated systems as illustrated in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model.

The first system or context closest to the individual is the microsystem. The microsystem is any environment, such as home or workplace, in which a large amount of time is spent engaging in activities and interactions. Bronfenbrenner (1993) defined the microsystem as “a pattern of activities, roles, and interpersonal relations experienced by the developing person in a given face-to-face setting with particular physical, social, and symbolic features that invite, permit, or inhibit, engagement in sustained, progressively more complex interaction with, and activity in, the immediate environment” (p. 15).
The mesosystem is defined as a system of two or more microsystems. People spend time in more than one microsystem, for example home and work. The interrelations among these microsystems “comprises the linkages and processes taking place between two or more settings containing the developing person. Special attention is focussed on the synergistic effects created by the interaction of developmentally instigative or inhibitory features and processes present in each setting” (Bronfenbrenner, 1993: p. 22).

The exosystem refers to those important contexts in which the person is not actually situated but which have important indirect influences on their development. An example of an exosystem effect is when a wife arrives home stressed from her workplace and, thus, behaves more irritably than usual with her husband. The wife’s workplace is an exosystem for her husband because he spends no time there, but it has an indirect influence on him through the effect it has on his wife.

Finally, the macrosystem is the outer-most system which envelopes the microsystem, mesosystem and exosystem, and simultaneously influences and is influenced by them. The macrosystem comprises the culture, customs, laws and overall patterns of ideology characterising a given society. Bronfenbrenner (1993) stated that the macrosystem consists of “developmentally instigative belief systems, resources, hazards, lifestyles, opportunity structures, life course options and patterns of social interchange that are embedded in such overarching systems” (p. 25).

The four systems depend on the contextual nature of a person's life and offer an expanding variety of growth possibilities. Relationships are influenced in two directions; bi-directional forces work both away from the person and towards the person in each of the four systems. Because there is the potential and possibility to access these four systems, people are assumed to be able to have more social knowledge, problem solving ability, and accessibility to new dimensions of self-exploration (Bronfenbrenner, 1977, 1993).
Critique of the ecological model.

Although crafted from Bronfenbrenner’s work with early childhood development, the model has been applied to other development contexts and across the lifespan, from childhood to adulthood. For instance, Renn (2003) utilised the model to critically explore the development of race identity in students whose parents were from more than one designated racial or ethnic category. The influences of post-secondary school environments on the identities of mixed race students already at college were examined through this lens of Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model (Renn, 2003).

Similarly, Campbell, Dworkin and Cabral (2009) conducted a review using this model to examine the psychological impact of adult sexual assault on women. This review aimed to understand how factors at multiple levels of the social ecology contributed to the destructive mental health effects that followed sexual assault. With the utilisation of the ecological framework, the research could then “suggest multiple strategies, at multiple levels of analysis, for alleviating the psychological harm caused by sexual assault” (Campbell et al., 2009, p. 226). Some of the findings concluded in their review at the various ecological system levels were: **Micro and Mesosystems:** Social support from family, friends, and intimate partners facilitated sexual assault survivors’ recovery; **Exosystems:** If sexual assault victims did not receive needed services and were treated insensitively, then these systems were found to magnify victims’ feelings of powerlessness, shame, and guilt, constituting a secondary victimization to the initial trauma; **Macrosystems:** African American women were more likely to blame themselves for being sexually assaulted than their white counterparts (Campbell et al., 2009).

This model is useful for addressing social developmental needs by aligning policies and services across the various system levels, including the design of effective interventions, operating across the spectrum from primary prevention to long term care. The ecological
model offers a deeper understanding of the contexts that people with whom social workers must work, find themselves in (Richard, Gauvin, Ducharme, Leblanc & Trudel, 2012). In a study utilising Bronfenbrenner’s model, Richard et al. (2012) identified contextual factors influencing the degree of integration of the ecological approach in disease prevention and health promotion programming initiatives for older adults in Québec, Canada. Their results provided increased understanding of conditions required for planning these disease prevention and health promotion programmes (Richard et al., 2012).

Criticisms of Bronfenbrenner's model mostly centre on the difficulties to empirically test the model and the broadness of the model that makes it challenging to intervene at any given level (Ungar, 2002). It is thought to be a difficult explanatory model to apply because of the extensive scope of ecological detail required, because it does not explain why things happen or why connections exist, and furthermore because it is insufficiently prescriptive to inform practice and research directly (Ungar, 2002).

Despite Bronfenbrenner later criticising himself for discounting the role that people play in their own development and for focusing too much on context (Bronfenbrenner, 1989), the ecological model will still be useful in understanding teachers in their various contexts and how these may influence their reporting intentions and behaviour. The application of Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model has several goals: to both explain and improve people-environment interactions, to nurture people’s growth and development in particular environments, and to improve environments overall (McLaren & Hawe, 2005). In line with this perspective, bodies such as the WHO have made the ecological approach the framework underpinning their thinking and initiatives in the field of the health of populations (Krug, Mercy, Dahlberg & Zwi, 2002).

Because of the complexity of child sexual abuse, the use of Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model offers a useful framework in interpreting factors for devising child
protection interventions as it emphasises the complex transactions amongst individuals, groups and their environment (McLaren & Hawe, 2005; Richard et al. 2012). The effect of social and cultural context on reporting behaviour of teachers will be examined. Furthermore, ecological analysis emphasises studying social behaviour in natural non-experimental circumstances (McLaren & Hawe, 2005) – an approach being used in this investigation.
CHAPTER 4

METHOD

This chapter will examine the research method used to investigate the association of attitude towards reporting, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control with the intention to report child sexual abuse suspicions, as well as examine specific mediator and moderator relationships of knowledge on mandatory reporting, past reporting behaviour, and socio-demographic characteristics of teachers amongst primary school teachers in South Africa. This chapter describes the research design, hypotheses, sampling procedure, instrumentation, data collection, analysis methods, ethical considerations and limitations of this study.

Research design

The research design is the plan that was followed to test the research hypotheses. A research design was chosen that allowed the systematic testing of the variety of independent variables, as well as the hypothesised moderator and mediator variables, that affect the intention to report child sexual abuse amongst teachers.

This study followed a quantitative research approach; this means that its main emphasis was on collecting data in the form of numbers – where behaviours and other variables of interest were counted and recorded in terms of quantity – rather than in the form of narratives or words (Drew, Hardman, & Hosp, 2008). Additionally, as stated by Okeke and Van Wyk (2015), a quantitative research approach places “emphasis on objective measurements and the numerical analysis of data collected” (p.481).

The research design employed was a cross-sectional survey utilising structured self-administered questionnaires. These self-administered questionnaires were hand-delivered to all participating schools and the completed questionnaires were returned via post. According to David and Sutton (2004), a cross sectional design is “concerned with collecting data on
more than one case at a single point in time and is often referred to as the social survey
design” (p. 135). A cross-sectional design was chosen for the following main reasons: the
study environment would not need to be manipulated in any way (such as would have been
necessary in experimental designs); the variables of interest could be measured as they
existed at a point in time; different groups of participants could be compared at a single point
in time; and many different variables could be compared at the same time (David & Sutton,
2004).

Whilst a longitudinal design may have allowed the detection of developments and
changes in the teacher population over a period, this would have involved studying the
teacher population over many years. A cross-sectional design, on the other hand, allowed the
research to be completed more quickly and the results to be reported much sooner (Cohen,
Manion, & Morrison, 2011; David & Sutton, 2004).

Also, important to note is that cross-sectional studies are conventional and relatively
standard practise across social studies such as this one. For instance, Artz et al. (2016)
employed a cross-sectional research design in the 2015 Optimus study which was conducted
amongst 9730 children (divided into a school survey and a household survey) to determine
the prevalence of child sexual abuse in South Africa. Also, Burton and Leoschut (2013) in
their in-depth 2012 National School Violence Study amongst 5939 secondary school learners
in South Africa, utilised a cross-sectional research design.

Furthermore, although an experimental design might have detected causal linkages
between the variables, a cross sectional design could detect possible relationships between
variables and inferences about certain population characteristics could be made (Mouton,
2001).
As stated in chapter one, this study addressed four main research questions, namely:

1. What is the prevalence amongst teachers of reporting and non-reporting their suspicions of child sexual abuse in the past?
2. Does the TPB explain reporting intentions of South African primary school teachers?
3. Is there an association between past reporting behaviour and knowledge on mandatory reporting with the intention to report suspected child sexual abuse amongst primary school teachers?
4. Which factors influence the reporting intentions of teachers?

**Hypotheses**

The TPB was used to examine the associations between the posited TPB variables. Two background variables namely, knowledge on mandatory reporting and past reporting, were also investigated to ascertain whether they were mediated by attitude towards reporting or whether they predicted intention to report directly. The teachers’ socio-demographic characteristics were tested to determine whether they moderated attitude towards reporting child sexual abuse or whether these characteristics were directly associated with intention to report. Figure 3 illustrates the hypothesised associations between the central study variables.

The following hypotheses were proposed:

1. Attitude towards reporting (H1a); subjective norm (H1b); and perceived behavioural control (H1c) predict intention to report child sexual abuse amongst teachers.
2. Past reporting behaviour (H2a); and knowledge on mandatory reporting (H2b) predict intention to report child sexual abuse amongst teachers.
3. Attitude towards reporting mediates the relationships between past reporting behaviour with intention to report (H3a); and knowledge on mandatory reporting with intention to report (H3b).
4. Socio-demographic characteristics of teachers moderate the effect of attitude towards reporting child sexual abuse and intention to report (H4) – alternatively, socio-demographic variables have a direct association with intention to report (H’4).

**Figure 3.** Hypothesised relationships among the central study variables.

**Variables**

The central study variables that tested the aforementioned study hypotheses are defined below:

**Dependent variable.**

*Intention to report:* This variable is defined as the participants’ decision in response to a hypothetical scenario of child sexual abuse; whether they would report the scenario if it occurred. It was measured using an intention to report scale comprising of four scenarios on a
seven-point rating scale adapted from scenario scripts from the Teacher Reporting Questionnaire (TRQ) – a self-administered survey used for child sexual abuse reporting behaviours amongst teachers in Australia (Mathews, Walsh, Farrell et al., 2009).

**Independent and mediator variables.**

*Attitude towards reporting:* This predictor variable refers to the participant’s positive or negative evaluation of reporting child sexual abuse. It was measured using the Teacher Reporting Attitude Scale on child sexual abuse (TRAS-CSA) which comprised 21 items using a five-point Likert scale (Mathews, Walsh, Rassafiani, et al., 2009; Walsh et al., 2010). This variable was tested to ascertain whether it mediated the relationship between past reporting behaviour and knowledge on mandatory reporting (two independent variables) with intention to report (the dependent variable).

*Subjective norm:* This refers to the participants’ perception of social pressure to report child sexual abuse cases based on what they believed people important to them thought about reporting, combined with the motivation to comply with these referents. Subjective norm was measured using a subjective norm scale comprising eight items with five-point Likert scale response options.

*Perceived behavioural control:* This variable is defined as the participant’s perception of his or her ability, specifically the ease or difficulty, of reporting cases of child sexual abuse. Perceived behavioural control was measured using a perceived behavioural control scale comprising four items with five-point Likert scale response options.

*Past reporting behaviour:* This variable refers to whether the participant had reported suspected child sexual abuse cases in the past. Past reporting behaviour – both reports and non-reports of suspected child sexual abuse – was measured by two yes/no items. Reasons for non-reports were also included. Also, participants were asked about both the number of
reports made as well as the number of reports not made when child sexual abuse was suspected in the past.

Knowledge on mandatory reporting: This variable refers to the participant’s knowledge on child sexual abuse mandatory reporting procedures and responsibilities in South Africa. This was measured using a knowledge on mandatory reporting test which consisted of ten true/false/unsure items containing factual assertions regarding mandatory reporting of child sexual abuse in South Africa.

Moderator variables.

The objective was set to examine the effect of attitude towards reporting (independent variable) on intention to report (dependent variable) and whether this effect is different at different values of socio-demographic characteristics (the moderators). The interaction effect these variables had with attitude towards reporting was examined in the study as well as whether these variables were directly associated with intention to report (dependent variable). The socio-demographic characteristics of interest included participants’ age, race, gender, education level, teaching experience, parental status, and marital status.

Instrumentation and measures

The self-administered survey instrument, namely the Teacher Reporting Questionnaire for South African foundation phase educators (TRQ-SA) was developed in both English and Afrikaans (see Appendix A). The TRQ-SA was an adaptation of the TRQ which was developed as a self-administered survey used for child sexual abuse reporting behaviours amongst teachers in Australia (Mathews, Walsh, Farrell et al., 2009; Mathews, Walsh, Rassafiani & Butler, 2009; Walsh et al., 2012; Walsh, Rassafiani, Mathews, Farrell & Butler, 2010). Certain measures were adapted to the South African context. In addition, to align with the TPB directives stipulated by Ajzen (2013), instead of using discrete response formats
favoured by Walsh et al. (2010, 2012), the TRQ-SA used continuous five- or seven-point semantic differential scaled response formats. All items which measured the variables of interest in this study were, thus, closed-ended.

The TRQ-SA consisted of seven parts: a socio-demographic data sheet, a 21-item teacher reporting attitude scale, an eight-item subjective norm scale, a five-item perceived behavioural norm scale, ten true/false/unsure items on mandatory reporting knowledge, four child sexual abuse intention to report scenarios and a past reporting behaviour component. The seven TRQ-SA parts are described in detail below.

**Part 1: Demographic data sheet.** The measures for age, population group (race), gender, education level, teaching experience, parental status, and marital status were based on similar items utilised in standard surveys with categories applicable to the South African context. The items in the questionnaire elicited socio-demographic background characteristics on the participants.

**Part 2: Teacher Reporting Attitude Scale on child sexual abuse (TRAS-CSA).** Attitude towards reporting referred to the participant’s positive or negative evaluation of reporting child sexual abuse (Ajzen, 2012). The 21-item TRAS-CSA is a self-administered scale that was constructed via a systematic literature review and a five-phase validation and testing process to assess teacher’s attitudes toward reporting suspected child sexual abuse in Australia (Mathews, Walsh, Rassafiani, et al., 2009; Walsh et al., 2010). At development of the TRAS-CSA, Walsh et al. (2010), reported that this scale had good internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient reported of .81 when used with teachers in Australia. In the TRAS-CSA responses are given on a five-point Likert scale (from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*) with both positively and negatively worded items, where positively worded items were reverse-coded so that positive attitudes were represented by higher scores.

During pre-testing of the TRAS-child sexual abuse amongst 27 foundation phase
teachers at four primary schools in the Metro South school district, the TRAS-child sexual abuse scale had good internal consistency ($\alpha = .72$) but the data showed removing item g: *I feel emotionally overwhelmed by the thought of reporting child sexual abuse* and k: *There is a lot of sensitivity associated with reporting child sexual abuse* would improve the reliability of the scale. However, because the TRAS-child sexual abuse was a well-validated scale, the full 21-item scale was used in the study because the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient was greater than .70. During the quantitative survey phase of this current study, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient achieved for this attitude towards reporting scale was .74, as shown in Table 1.

In this study the scores that were achieved on the 21 items of the TRAS-child sexual abuse were aggregated and then averaged to constitute a composite attitude towards reporting score for each participant. Thus, possible scores for the attitude towards reporting scale in this study ranged from 1 to 5. Using the median split, the composite attitude towards reporting score was used to categorise the study participants into those with positive attitudes and those with negative attitude towards child sexual abuse reporting. Thus, participants who scored above the median were categorised as having a positive attitude and those that scored below the median were the negative attitude group.

**Part 3: Subjective norm scale.** Subjective norm referred to the participants’ perception of social pressure to report child sexual abuse cases according to what they believed people important to them thought about reporting, combined with the motivation to comply with these referents (Ajzen, 2012). The subjective norm scale was constructed based on items similar in wording to those used by Ajzen et al. (2011) in their study on the behaviour to conserve energy. The Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient for their subjective norm scale was .83 (Ajzen et al., 2011). However, during the pre-testing phase amongst 27 foundation phase teachers of this study’s subjective norm scale, the original scale comprising 5 items had low
reliability (\(\alpha = .43\)). The reliability analysis further indicated that there were no items which could be removed from this original scale to improve the scale’s reliability.

Therefore, the scale was re-constructed, paying closer attention to the normative beliefs expressed by teachers in the qualitative elicitation study. Specifically, the original item which stated *My close friends and family members will support me if I reported child sexual abuse suspicions* referring to close friends and family members was replaced by three separate items referring specifically to the teachers’ Head of Department, their close colleagues at their schools, and their close family members, respectively. Teachers in the elicitation study had mentioned that, when it came to reporting child sexual abuse, their main referents were their spouses and other close family members (such as mothers and aunts), close colleagues at their schools, Head of Departments at their schools, and their school principals.

The final subjective norm scale comprised eight items with five-point Likert scale (from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*) response options. The scale comprised both positively and negatively worded items, where positively worded items were reverse-coded so that positive subjective norm statements were represented by higher scores. In this study the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was .78, as shown in Table 1.

In this study the scores that were achieved on the eight items were aggregated and then averaged to constitute a composite subjective norm score. Thus, possible scores for participants ranged from 1 to 5 for the subjective norm score in this study. Using the median split, the composite subjective norm score was used to categorise the study participants into those with high subjective norm and those with low subjective norm related to child sexual abuse reporting. Thus, participants who scored above the median were categorised as having a high subjective norm and those that scored below the median were the low subjective norm
A higher score indicated that the important referents in the teachers’ lives had greater influence on their intended reporting behaviour.

**Part 4: Perceived behavioural control scale.** Perceived behavioural control refers to the participant’s perception of their ability, specifically the ease or difficulty, of reporting child sexual abuse cases (Ajzen, 2012). The perceived behavioural control scale comprised five items similar in wording to those used by Ajzen et al. (2011) in their study on the behaviour to conserve energy. Their study’s perceived behavioural control scale had a Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of .73 (Ajzen et al., 2011).

During the pre-testing phase amongst 27 foundation phase teachers of this study’s perceived behavioural control scale, the scale was made up of five items which had moderate reliability ($\alpha = .59$). The reliability analysis conducted during the pre-testing phase further indicated that the internal consistency of the scale would increase to .70 if item b: *Whether I report child sexual abuse is entirely up to me* was removed. Because this analysis was only at pre-test, it was decided to include the item for the main study and then decide later should the study data indicate its removal as well.

Therefore, the perceived behavioural control scale comprised a five-item five-point Likert scale (from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*). This scale comprised both positively and negatively worded items, where positively worded items were reverse-coded so that positive perceived behavioural control was represented by higher scores. Although the Cronbach Alpha coefficient had improved from .59 to .69, item b had a very low item-total correlation of only .25 compared to the other four items which had item-total correlations of .5. Thus, based on both the pre-test and study data obtained, item b was considered to be measuring something different to the perceived behavioural control scale as a whole. In addition, reliability analysis revealed that the scale’s overall Cronbach’s Alpha would be improved by removing this item. Because the five-item scale was not an established scale,
item b was removed from the final analyses, resulting in a Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of .74 for the four-itemed perceived behavioural control scale, as shown in Table 1.

In this study the scores that were achieved on the four items were aggregated and then averaged to constitute a composite perceived behavioural control score. Thus, possible scores for participants ranged from 1 to 5 for the study’s perceived behavioural control score. Using the median split, the composite perceived behavioural control score was used to categorise the study participants into those with high perceived behavioural control and those with low perceived behavioural control related to child sexual abuse reporting. Higher scores on this measure indicated teachers perceived that they possessed more control over their reporting behaviour.

Part 5: Knowledge on mandatory reporting test. Knowledge on mandatory reporting refers to the participant’s knowledge on child sexual abuse mandatory reporting procedures and responsibilities in South Africa. The knowledge on mandatory reporting measure consisted of ten true/false/unsure items containing factual assertions regarding mandatory reporting of child sexual abuse in South Africa adapted from a previous study conducted by Rule (2014). There was one correct answer for each item. Where the participant stated unsure as the answer, these were scored as incorrect.

A composite knowledge on mandatory reporting test score for each participant was computed by aggregating all the correct responses to the knowledge items (as demonstrated in Ajzen et al., 2011). The potential total score for each participant thus ranged from 0 to 10. Using the median split, the composite knowledge on mandatory reporting test score was used to categorise the study participants into those with good knowledge and those with poor knowledge about child sexual abuse reporting. Higher test scores indicated more knowledge about child sexual abuse reporting in South Africa.
Part 6: Intention to report scale. The intention to report scale was constructed by adapting four of the TRQ scenario scripts or vignettes (Mathews, Walsh, Farrell, et al., 2009). These four scenario scripts were hypothetical child sexual abuse vignettes, where two had very clear indicators of child sexual abuse and the other two scenarios had less clear indicators of child sexual abuse. All four scenarios, however, contained sufficient detail of child sexual abuse, warranting reporting by a reasonably knowledgeable teacher (Mathews, Walsh, Rassafiani, et al., 2009). Intention to report was not measured by a bipolar response yes/no option as in the TRQ but instead was measured on a seven-point continuum from certainly would not report (1) to almost certainly would report (7) for the item How likely would you report this case? The reliability of the intention to report scale in this study was .79 (Cronbach’s alpha coefficient), as shown in Table 1.

The scores on the 4 vignettes were aggregated to constitute a composite intention to report score. Thus, possible scores for participants ranged from 4 to 28 for the intention to report score in this study. Using the median split, the composite intention to report score was used to categorise the study participants into those more likely to report and those less likely to report. Thus, participants who scored above the median were categorised as being more likely to report suspected child sexual abuse and those that scored below the median were the less likely to report group. The higher the score, the more likely the teachers intended to report the child sexual abuse suspected case.

Part 7: Past reporting behaviour. Adapted from the TRQ, past reporting behaviour was measured retrospectively by asking whether teachers had reported suspected child sexual abuse cases in the past (Mathews, Walsh, Farrell, et al., 2009). Past reporting behaviour was measured by two simple dichotomous yes/no items. The first of these items on past reporting behaviour asked participants whether they had ever reported child sexual abuse during their teaching careers (child sexual abuse reports). Similarly, the second item on past reporting
behaviour asked participants whether they had ever suspected child sexual abuse but decided not to report it during their teaching careers (non-reports). Participants were also asked to include an indication of the numbers of suspected child sexual abuse cases reported and unreported, to measure child sexual abuse reporting and non-reporting prevalence amongst teachers.

In addition, data on factors relevant to the decision by participants not to report suspected cases of child sexual abuse was also collected. These factors were based on previous research on mandated reporters regarding the reasons for their non-reports (Abrahams et al., 1992; Feng et al., 2010; Goldman & Padayachi, 2005; Kenny, 2001).

Table 1: Reliability coefficients of central study variable scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards reporting</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective norm</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived behavioural control</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to report</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population and sampling

Population.

The population of interest in this study comprised all Grade R to Grade 3 teachers (known as foundation phase teachers) in the Western Cape province of South Africa, employed in the public schooling system in the WCED. Figure 4 shows the location of the Western Cape province in relation to the other eight provinces in South Africa.
There was a total of 343,511 foundation phase learners comprised of 59,565 Grade R learners, 104,678 Grade 1 learners, 93,506 Grade 2 learners and 85,762 Grade 3 learners in public schools in the 2013/2014 period. With the reported teacher-child ratio of 1:36 in primary schools, this equated to an estimate of 9,542 foundation phase teachers across this province in the 2013/2014 period (WCED, 2014c).

The WCED has four rural districts (West Coast, Cape Winelands, Eden and Central Karoo, and Overberg) and four urban districts (Metro North, Metro South, Metro East and Metro Central) as illustrated in Figure 5.
Figure 5. Education districts in the Western Cape.
A database was supplied by the WCED detailing all the 2015 public primary schools currently on record. In 2015 there were 1,118 public primary schools distributed across the eight school districts as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Number of primary schools per district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School district</th>
<th>Schools per district</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Winelands</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden &amp; Central Karoo</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overberg</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>586</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Central</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro East</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro North</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro South</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>532</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1118</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sampling procedure.**

This study employed stratified sampling where, according to Okeke and Van Wyk (2015), the entire target population was first divided into various strata (subgroups) and then secondly, the study participants are randomly selected from each of the different subgroups. The first step to stratified sampling meant ensuring that the entire study population – the 1118 primary schools in the Western Cape of South Africa – were divisible into subgroups that were mutually exclusive and exhaustive (Drew et al., 2008). Mutually exclusive meant that every school being studied could be classified into only one subgroup (one school district) and
exhaustive meant that there was a definitive list available of all the schools in the Western Cape (Drew et al., 2008).

The second step to stratified sampling involved drawing a simple random sample from each stratum. A simple random sample of schools comprising one eighth of the sample size was drawn from each stratum using random numbers. The WCED database of schools in each district – provided using Microsoft Excel (2010) – served as a sampling frame from which 200 schools were sampled. I utilised Microsoft Excel (2010) to generate a random number for each school in each district. The schools in each district were then sorted based on the random number assigned to them and the first 25 schools in each sorted list was then included in the study. All foundation teachers at these 200 sampled schools were then invited to participate in the study.

This sampling method ensured that each of the eight school districts were equally represented by the same number of schools in the final sample so that conclusions could be drawn about the entire province as well as at the district level (Drew et al., 2008; Rubin & Babbie, 2011).

Sample size determination.

Due to the underreporting of child sexual abuse amongst teachers, there was a concern about the precision of estimates when determining the sample size for this investigation. For the estimated finite population size of 9,542 foundation phase teachers, the sample size was estimated at 369 teachers with the confidence interval of 95%, the margin of error set at 5% and the proportion of teachers expected to respond to a certain item in a certain way set at .5. The proportion set to .5 was conservatively chosen, because it was unknown what proportion of teachers would respond in any given way and .5 ensures a larger sample (Thompson, 2012).
The sample size was determined using the following formulae (Thompson, 2012):

\[
\text{sample size (ss)} = \frac{Z^2 \times p(1 - p)}{e^2}
\]

where:

\(Z\) = Z value (1.96 for 95% confidence level)

\(p\) = proportion picking a choice, using a normal distribution, 50% was conservatively chosen

\(e\) = confidence interval, expressed as decimal (.05 = ±5%)

\[
ss = \frac{(1.96)^2 \times .5(.5)}{.05^2}
\]

\[
= \frac{3.8416 \times .25}{.0025}
\]

\[
= \frac{.9604}{.0025}
\]

\[
= 384 \text{ participants.}
\]

The correction for finite population formula was then applied because the actual total teacher population was estimated as 9542.

\[
\text{new sample size} = \frac{ss}{1 + \frac{ss - 1}{\text{pop}}}
\]

where: pop = finite population size

New sample size = \[
\frac{384}{1.04} = 369 \text{ participants needed.}
\]

To determine how to achieve this required sample size, a review of research studies amongst South African school teachers and principals utilising the postal method of return of surveys was conducted. It was found that response rates varied greatly. For instance, in a study by Peltzer and Promtussananon (2003) an initial postal survey of self-addressed letters to all secondary school principals in South Africa achieved a 6.8% return rate after the two-month deadline. In comparison, a postal survey by Mathews, Boon, Flisher and Schaalma
(2006) amongst 579 teachers in 193 public high schools in Cape Town, achieved a 56% response rate. However, the latter study reported that this response rate was achieved through extensive reminders, re-sending second and sometimes third copies of questionnaires to schools and personally delivering questionnaires to schools (Mathews et al., 2006).

Fox, Crask and Kim (1998) conducted a meta-analysis of experimental studies which examined factors which increased response rates in mail surveys. Results showed the following aspects increased response rates: pre-notification before the surveys were mailed; follow-ups after the surveys had been mailed; including return envelopes with actual postage stamps affixed to them instead of business reply envelopes; studies sponsored by a university; personalised cover-letters which confirmed confidentiality and anonymity; and using coloured paper to print the questionnaire.

Given the financial and time constraints, it was decided to attempt to increase the response rate of this study through the following means: all sampled schools were notified ahead of time via a personal telephone call to expect the survey; a date and approximate time was arranged with each participating school for delivery of the questionnaires; the required number of English and Afrikaans questionnaires were personally hand-delivered to the participating schools by the researcher; all packages of questionnaires delivered to schools contained a cover-letter from the WCED indicating its permission for the study as well as a personalised cover-letter from the researcher to the school principals appealing for their support of the study and indicating that the researcher was a University of Cape Town doctoral student; each questionnaire included a cover-letter to each participant explaining the study’s purpose and appealing for their participation; return-paid envelopes were provided to assure anonymity and confidentiality; a personalised rubber stamp specially was ordered to stamp the return postage paid envelopes with the researcher’s name in the address; and
schools received a follow-up telephone call to remind their teachers to complete and return the questionnaires via the post.

As the response rate was uncertain, the researcher chose a conservative sample of 200 schools and aimed to distribute about 2000 questionnaires. After confirmation of the number of foundation teachers at all participating schools, a total of 2032 self-administered survey questionnaires, comprising 1059 English and 973 Afrikaans questionnaires, were hand-delivered to the 200 participating schools for the foundation phase teachers at these schools to participate in this study. The number of foundation phase teachers included in each district in this sample is indicated in Table 3.

Table 3: Distribution of surveys delivered to teachers in the sample per district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School district</th>
<th>No. of English teachers</th>
<th>No. of Afrikaans teachers</th>
<th>Total no. of teachers</th>
<th>Average no. of teachers per school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Winelands</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden and Central Karoo</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overberg</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-totals</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Central</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro East</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro North</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro South</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-totals</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A total of 412 questionnaires were returned via post, representing a response rate of 20%. Thirteen questionnaires were not included in the study due to a significant number of unanswered questions. A total of 399 questionnaires were included in the study.

Furthermore, to gauge whether this achieved sample was adequate for the quantitative data analyses to be conducted, various statistical texts were considered (Cohen, 1992; Pallant, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Rules of thumb for calculating sample size for multiple regression are $N >= 50 + 8m$ (where $m$ equals the number of independent variables) to test regression and $N >= 104 + m$ for testing individual predictor variables, assuming a medium effect size between the independent variables and the dependent variable, with $\alpha = .05$ and $\beta = .20$ (power at 80%) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001, p. 123). Because this study was interested in both the overall correlation and the individual independent variables, the sample size was calculated both ways and then the larger number of cases was chosen (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). The calculations produced the following minimum sample sizes: $50 + (8)(4) = 82$ for regression and $104 + 4 = 108$ for testing individual predictors. The achieved sample size of 399 was therefore considered sufficient for the data analyses envisioned.

**Research design implementation**

This cross-sectional study was conducted in four components. Firstly, an elicitation study was conducted to aid the development of the survey questionnaire. Then the survey questionnaire was developed. Next, the survey questionnaire was pre-tested. Finally, the actual survey was conducted amongst foundation teachers across the Western Cape province of South Africa.

_Elicitation study for development of survey questionnaire._ The self-administered survey questionnaire (TRQ-SA) used in the survey component was developed in several steps. As a first phase in the development process, personal interviews were conducted with a small sample of six teachers to obtain direct TPB measures for the perceived behavioural
control and subjective norm scales used to comply with South African teachers’ experiences. Based on the findings of this elicitation study, it was established that the perceived behavioural control scale in the survey questionnaire should include items regarding the teacher’s perceptions of the ease at which they could report suspected child sexual abuse, whether the teachers felt in control or not of their reporting actions, and whether teachers felt it was possible or difficult to report.

Regarding subjective norm scale, the elicitation study participants were asked specifically whose opinions mattered to them the most in their decisions to report or not report suspicions of child sexual abuse. This study thus highlighted which referents were important to teachers. The elicitation study found that the main referents were found at schools and included: fellow school teachers/colleagues, head of departments at the schools, principals and/or deputy principals at the schools, and school social workers or chaplains. Important referents outside the school included close family members living with the participant such as the teacher’s spouse/partner as well as other close family members such as a mother or aunt who themselves were perhaps teachers but did not necessarily live with the participant. Possible other people whose opinions mattered included a religious leader or the family/personal psychiatrist, psychologist or lawyer. Participants did not view the opinions of their friends or other people who were not directly involved with children too highly. These findings were incorporated in the subjective norm scale developed for the survey questionnaire.

Development and translation of the survey questionnaire. The TPB components in the survey questionnaire (TRQ-SA) comprised two existing measures as well as two measures which were specifically developed for this study. The first existing measure used was the TRAS-CSA scale which was used to measure attitude towards reporting. The second existing measure used was the intention to report scale which was an adaptation of scenarios/vignettes
from the TRQ. The ages of the depicted children in the TRQ scenarios were changed to be in line with the age-groups foundation phase teachers would come across. The subjective norm and the perceived behavioural control scales were constructed specifically for this study (as described previously). In addition to these four TPB components, measures for assessing knowledge on mandatory reporting and past reporting behaviour were also developed in consultation with the literature.

Once developed, the English version of the TRQ-SA was checked for grammar and spelling errors. Next, the TRQ-SA was translated into Afrikaans by an independent and experienced Afrikaans Grade R teacher. Then, to limit error in translation (Cohen et al., 2011), the Afrikaans questionnaire was translated back again to English by a second independent Afrikaans specialist. The back translation produced a few minor grammatical discrepancies which were then corrected in the final Afrikaans questionnaire to ensure accuracy in measuring the same factors/variables in both languages.

Pre-testing of the questionnaire. Following the development and translation of the survey questionnaire, the TRQ-SA was pre-tested. Eight schools in the Metro South school district were approached and, of these, four primary school principals consented to allowing their teachers to participate in the pre-test. In total 23 English-speaking and four Afrikaans-speaking foundation phase teachers completed the survey questionnaires.

The survey questionnaires were completed by the teachers and each one was asked to note the time it took them to complete the questionnaire. On average these teachers took 20 minutes, both the median and mean time, to complete the full survey questionnaire. Thereafter, the researcher conducted an interview at each school to ascertain what problems these teachers had encountered when answering the questionnaires and whether they had any suggestions for its improvement. A few minor changes were made to the TRQ-SA, mostly in wording. These changes are detailed hereafter.
In the pre-test, the 27 teachers reported that, on the one hand, the consent form set their mind at ease that the research study was genuine and confidential and that they felt encouraged to take part in the survey. On the other hand, however, signing the consent form made them feel uneasy and concerned for their anonymity. They indicated that they would be far happier to tick within a tick box and date the consent form to indicate their consent. Therefore, the original signature space was removed from the consent form and a tick box provided to indicate consent.

In the pre-test, the demographic data sheet was generally found to be easy and clear to complete. Only the last question ‘population group’ brought a small bit of confusion as one teacher said she was unclear if this referred to her or the children in her class. Thus, the question on ‘population group’ was moved to the second question in this section, after the question asking the teacher’s gender.

All teachers found the sections on attitude towards reporting, subjective norm, perceived behavioural control and knowledge on mandatory reporting easy and clear to complete. A few participants in the pre-test commented that some questions in the first three scales (the TPB variables) seemed repetitive of others. These multi-item scales were constructed as such deliberately and were thus not changed after the pre-test.

Teachers found the four TRQ intention to report scenarios used in Australia easy to understand. Besides changing the ages of the depicted children to be in line with the age-groups foundation phase teachers would come across, these scenarios had not been changed in any other way. In the pre-test, one teacher suggested that the original word “rapport” in scenario 3 (question 16) be changed to “relationship” because “rapport” is also an Afrikaans word for report in South Africa and so she was confused when she read that word. Therefore, this suggestion was followed and the word “rapport” in scenario 3 (question 16) was changed.
to “relationship”. This did not affect the Afrikaans survey form as the word used in this version, namely “verhouding” means ‘relationship’ in English.

The last section on past reporting behaviour which was initially constructed very similarly to that found in the Australian TRQ, resulted in confusion and annoyance amongst teachers in the pre-test. Because many had never reported child sexual abuse nor suspected it during their careers as teachers, they were unable to answer the questions about reasons for non-reporting. The section on past reporting behaviour was therefore divided into two simple yes/no questions, to measure reports and non-reports. In addition, a skip pattern was introduced to direct only teachers who answered positively to having not reported suspicions in the past, to answer the questions about reasons for non-reports. The section also included an indication of numbers of cases reported and unreported, to measure reporting and non-reporting prevalence amongst teachers, which the pre-tested questionnaire had not asked about.

Overall teachers in the pre-test commented that the questionnaires flowed logically from one section to the next and that they understand the question instructions. There was just a suggestion to include the checkmark box more often and so change was made to the final questionnaire.

Administration of survey questionnaire. After piloting the English and Afrikaans survey instruments, a self-administered survey of South African teachers in the Western Cape was conducted during August and September 2015. During August 2015, an initial pre-notification telephone call was made to each school in the sample. This telephone pre-notification served to: briefly inform principals about the nature and purpose of study; enquire as to the number of Afrikaans and English teachers in foundation phase at the schools; give a brief introduction about the researcher; and set a date and probable time of delivery of the questionnaires to the schools. Thereafter, the appropriate amount of English
and Afrikaans survey questionnaires and self-addressed envelopes for each school were then personally hand-delivered by the researcher to the school principals with two letters, one from the researcher explaining the aims of the study and encouraging their foundation phase teachers’ participation (see Appendix B) as well as a copy of the WCED permission letter (see Appendix D). Delivery of the survey questionnaires to the schools was received favourably by all sampled schools.

Follow-up telephone calls to all schools after delivery of the survey questionnaires were then made in October and November 2015. Most principals acknowledged that their teachers had been given the questionnaires. However, some mentioned that they had decided not to hand the survey questionnaires to the teachers at their schools even though they may have initially agreed to do so. These principals indicated that they felt there were too many research projects undertaken at schools for that year and that the teachers did not have the time. Also, a few principals denied ever receiving the survey questionnaires.

These actions on the part of the school management affected the survey’s response rate, since the principals acted as a go-between and the response rate may not accurately reflect teacher attrition. A similar study amongst teachers in Taiwan achieved a 47% response rate (Feng et al., 2010) and a similar study amongst Australian teachers achieved a 55% return rate (Walsh et al., 2012). All completed survey questionnaires returned in the post by 31 December 2015 were included in this current study, resulting in a 20% response rate.

**Data management and analysis**

As noted before, a total of 412 survey questionnaires were returned via post but, after checking each questionnaire for completeness, thirteen of these were not included in the study due to a significant number of unanswered questions. Thereafter, the data obtained from the 399 survey questionnaires were captured in a statistical dataset created with the
Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.0 (IBM Corp., 2015). Statistical techniques available in SPSS were used to test the accuracy of data entry. For example, case summaries were created to check whether there were any unusual data entries. Additionally, descriptive statistics for each variable were used to check whether the range of data obtained on each variable was accurate and reflected the allowed values for that variable.

According to Ajzen (2013), the various items on the developed survey questionnaire needed to be tested for reliability and validity using appropriate statistical tests to measure this. For this reason, items designed to directly assess the TPB constructs such as perceived behavioural control and attitude towards reporting were required to have a high degree of internal consistency as measured by a high Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient.

The survey data was analysed using descriptive, bivariate and multivariate methods. Data analysis and estimation of models used SPSS Statistics version 23.0 (IBM Corp., 2015). The conventional p < .05 and 95% confidence intervals were used for all statistical tests.

Firstly, descriptive statistics were used to describe all the demographic and central study variables. Next, correlations amongst the study variables were examined with Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients. Independent t-tests and one-way ANOVA were conducted to facilitate understanding and interpretation when testing the study hypotheses. Finally, multiple regression was used to test the predictability of the TPB for reporting intention as well as the hypothesised mediator and moderator variables as depicted in Figure 3.

In preparation specifically for regression analysis which was used to test the main study hypotheses, certain assumptions needed to be met to generalise any regression models to the population (Pallant, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Therefore, preliminary analyses were conducted to confirm normally distributed errors (that the residuals in the model were random, normally distributed variables with a mean of zero), linearity between dependent and
independent variables, homoscedasticity of variance (that at each level of the independent variables the variance of the residual terms are constant), independent errors (that the residual terms of two observations are uncorrelated – the Durbin-Watson statistic must be between 1 and 3), and the absence of perfect multicollinearity amongst predictor variables (that the predictor variables are not too strongly correlated among themselves) (Pallant, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). An examination of residual scatterplots and normal probability plots of regression standardised residuals were conducted to satisfy these assumptions. In the normal probability plots, the points were in a reasonably straight diagonal and there was no clear or systematic pattern in the residuals from the residuals scatterplots, as these were all roughly rectangular with most scores concentrated in the centre. All Durbin-Watson statistics were between 1 and 3 and multicollinearity was absent amongst predictor variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

Mediators were tested by calculating bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals using bootstrapping with 1000 re-samples via the Process procedure for SPSS (Hayes, 2012). For mediation to be considered, the relationship between the predictor and the potential mediator needed to be established, and then also the relationship of the mediator to the dependent variable was examined and, if found significant, whether the mediator reduced the direct effect of the predictor variable/s on the dependent variable (Hayes, 2012).

The combined effect of two variables on another is known conceptually as moderation and statistically as an interaction effect (Hayes, 2012). To be considered a moderator, simultaneous regression analyses were run with the centred predictor and centred moderators and the interaction of the two centred variables as predictors. Moderators were tested via the Process procedure for SPSS (Hayes, 2012). For moderation to be considered, the interaction between the predictor and moderator must be found to be statistically significant.
Ethical considerations

*Human participants’ protection.*

The study included interviews with human participants during the pre-testing of the survey questionnaire. Also, the self-administered survey of teachers across the Western Cape province of South Africa included human subject participation. This study received permission from the WCED research department to conduct this research amongst foundation phase primary school teachers (see Appendix B). In addition, approval for this study was also granted by the Ethics Committee of the University of Cape Town after the completion of an ethics review application and the submission of a research proposal. The study commenced once this approval was granted (see Appendix C). The following considerations were observed to address the Ethics Committee’s concerns and other ethical aspects.

*Risks and benefits of the study.*

For a study to be granted permission to be conducted amongst human subjects, it was imperative that any potential risks to the participants had to be minimised. Anticipated benefits to the participants themselves or others then had to be weighed up against the potential risk.

This study involved a survey amongst teachers about the topic of child sexual abuse mandatory reporting. The study carried no physical risks as the participants were not exposed to any physical pain, discomfort or injury because of their participation. However, there was a potential to cause psychological harm that accompanied the disclosure of sensitive information, such as undesired changes in thought processes and emotions. Specifically, participants in the study may have felt distressed, embarrassed or guilty at owning up to the potentially illegal behaviour of not having reported certain suspicions of child sexual abuse that they were legally bound to do. To minimise this psychological risk, the study utilised
self-administered questionnaires which were anonymously returned to the researcher in sealed self-addressed envelopes.

The study also carried a potential of social and economic harm to the participants should the information they disclosed in the survey have been made public within their social groups or at the schools where they were employed. For instance, had participants divulged that teachers at their schools were not supported in reporting instances of child sexual abuse or that most teachers at their schools neglected to report child sexual abuse, and if this information was then disclosed to the principal and other teachers of those schools, this may have been detrimental to the teachers’ social standing at the school as well as impacted on their employment. It was thus imperative that all participants’ privacy be maintained by ensuring that all survey questionnaires were anonymous and confidential.

Furthermore, to ensure risks were minimised, the study obtained approval of the WCED and the Ethics Committee of the University of Cape Town. Endorsement by the school administration was also received telephonically before the research was conducted at the selected schools.

Child sexual abuse has far-reaching and long-term effects on children and society. The expected benefits of this study are that it will add to the body of knowledge available to social development and child protection practitioners and policymakers who wish to tackle the problem of child sexual abuse in South Africa and globally. One of the strengths of this study is its grounding in theory and its utilisation of multiple regression analysis to test hypotheses based on the TPB and other background variables. In addition to the anticipated benefits to others and society at large, there may be benefit directly to the participants in the form of improved training and support to assist them to fulfil their mandatory reporting role. It is thus believed that the expected benefits of this research study outweigh any potential risks of participation.
Informed consent and voluntary participation.

The study sought to obtain the informed consent and co-operation of participants. According to Cohen et al. (2011), the informed consent principle arises from participants’ right to freedom and self-determination. Self-determination means that participants must weigh up the research risks and benefits and then decide for themselves whether to agree to participate or to refuse to participate in the research (Cohen et al., 2011). Thus, informed consent also implies informed refusal as the participant should also be free to withdraw from the research at any time (Cohen et al., 2011).

Informed consent necessitates the following elements: participant competence and comprehension, voluntary participation, and full information of the study being made available to participants (Cohen et al., 2011). In terms of participant competence and comprehension, teachers are highly educated individuals who have undergone tertiary education and training before qualifying as teachers. Therefore, teachers were considered a mature and responsible target population for this study and thus, competent to participate in this study. There was a consent form attached to each questionnaire which explained the study in an easily comprehensible manner - see Appendix A. Teachers who participated in the pre-testing phase of the research reported that they felt comfortable about what the study entailed.

In terms of voluntary participation, principals of sampled schools were pre-notified of the study via an introductory telephone call which informed them about the nature and purpose of the study. The survey questionnaires were then personally hand-delivered to the various schools across the province accompanied by a covering letter addressed to the principal informing of the study’s purpose and stating that participation of the school was voluntary – see Appendix B. Secondly, teachers were informed that their individual participation in the survey was voluntary. The consent form that was attached to each
questionnaire explicitly stated that participants could freely choose to participate in the research and that they had the right to refuse participation entirely or to refuse to answer certain questions.

With regards to full information of the study being made available to participants, the individual consent form which accompanied the survey questionnaire provided information of the study’s purpose and content. It also mentioned that there were no apparent physical risks by participating in the study and assured privacy, anonymity, and confidentiality of individual data. There was also an opportunity provided for participants to ask the researcher further questions about the research via telephone or email.

Teachers were asked not to return the survey questionnaires if they did not consent to the survey as no record was kept at the respective schools nor by the researcher on who had completed the questionnaires or who had not. Return of the completed questionnaire (and ticked consent on the individual consent form) in the sealed envelope provided by the researcher served as indication of the participants’ consent to participate in the study and for their responses to be made available in aggregated form in research reports.

*Privacy, anonymity and confidentiality.*

A person’s privacy is defined as a state of “seclusion or confidentiality – removed from public view or knowledge” (Drew et al., 2008). Therefore, all research invades the privacy of its subjects to a lesser or greater extent (Van der Bank, 2012). This study therefore aimed to avoid risks to the participants because of this invasion of their privacy. Respect for the participants’ privacy was assured in this study through anonymity of the participants as well as confidentiality of the information gathered.

Anonymity is defined as the state of being unidentified by name or any other way (Cohen at al., 2011). Studies have shown that when participants are anonymous, they more readily divulge attitudes, perceptions and behaviours that are considered negative, taboo,
sensitive or illegal. Ong and Weiss (2000) compared various reported behaviours in a study amongst 155 university undergraduates in the USA. They reported that anonymity had a significant impact when students were questioned on negative behaviours (Ong & Weiss, 2000). Regarding cheating, 74% of the students surveyed admitted the behaviour when they were anonymous compared to 25% who acknowledged the behaviour when their personal information was asked for even though confidentiality of this information was assured.

In the current study, anonymity was assured by not asking for participants’ personal contact details nor their names. There were no identifiers on the survey questionnaires and all participants were assigned case numbers during data analysis. This prevented the researcher from matching responses to participants and to guarantee and ensure that they remained anonymous. Participants were not required to hand in their completed forms to anyone at their respective schools but instead were requested to return their completed surveys in sealed envelopes directly to the researcher to maintain their anonymity. These envelopes were pre-addressed to the researcher with a freepost address already stamped on them and these envelopes were all identical, without any identifying marks or symbols.

Confidentiality is defined as the state of keeping something secret or private and as reported by Wiles, Crow, Heath & Charles (2006): “Confidential research cannot be conducted; researchers have a duty to report on the findings of their research and they cannot do so if the data they collect is confidential (i.e. cannot be revealed)” (p. 3). In research confidentiality applies to the extent that the participants’ information they have given in the survey would not be divulged to others in ways that are inconsistent with the understanding of the original disclosure and to which they have consented to (Cohen et al., 2011).

In this current study, confidentiality was assured by ensuring that all raw data collected was used for research purposes only. All teacher demographic details and school survey sites remained confidential as they were not distinguished from one another in any
published research report, article or dissertation. The fieldwork data records and completed survey questionnaires were kept in a locked cabinet. The fact that certain teachers from certain schools participated in this investigation remained confidential because all returned questionnaires were anonymous with no identifiable markers. The dataset in SPSS created for data analysis comprised of participants’ questionnaire data which had been assigned case numbers based on when the questionnaires were received and not any other identifiable basis. Beside the researcher, this dataset was only scrutinised by the researcher’s university supervisor and no one else had access to it. Finally, although the information would be provided to the WCED for teacher intervention and training strategies, this would only be in aggregated form and not through direct access to the research data records.

**Study limitations**

The self-reported measures employed in this study may be limited by social desirability bias which is the “tendency to respond in a way that makes the respondent look good to others” (Lawrence, 2008, p. 110). Although sealed envelopes and confidentiality of questionnaires were employed, participants may still not have indicated their true attitudes, intentions or behaviours, for example, because it is socially unacceptable or even illegal (in the case of non-reporting). Self-report measures may have also been limited by participants failing to recall accurate past behaviours. Being able to complete the surveys in their own time and place afforded the participants the freedom to respond honestly. However, with this freedom, also comes the possible compromise of data integrity where a respondent could have perhaps asked others the answers or looked up their answers, for the knowledge measure, for example.

Another limitation of this study were the scales and language used to measure the various variables of interest. The subjective norm, perceived behavioural control and
knowledge on mandatory reporting scales were developed for this investigation and have yet to be validated in other populations. The use of specific vignettes for the intention to report scale did not take into account various characteristics of the child (victim), perpetrator or situation. All survey participants were given the same four scenarios with no variation of the victim’s gender or age, or the perpetrator’s socioeconomic status, gender or race (for example, see Ortega, Baz, & Sánchez, 2012 and O’Toole, et al., 2009 for a factorial design of vignettes by comparison wherein survey participants received different sets of vignettes which were randomly generated). The questionnaire was available in English and Afrikaans which may have proven difficult for some teachers whose first language were neither of these. Despite pilot testing the survey instrument, there was no interviewer present to explain any misunderstood concepts or language used in the questionnaire as the surveys were self-administered.

This study may be limited through the sampling methods used and relating to external validity of the study's findings. The sample may not be representative of the population, despite using a probability sampling design, because teachers and schools could voluntarily elect to participate or not. Those who participated in the study may be “more sensitive to, interested in, or knowledgeable about child sexual abuse and/or child sexual abuse reporting than non-respondents” (Walsh et al., 2012, p.1944). It was not possible to compare participants with those who had not participated on criteria that would determine representativeness, for example, on measures of knowledge or reporting intentions. Further, this study was conducted amongst primary school foundation phase teachers which means the results are not able to be generalised to crèche, intermediate or senior primary school, secondary school or special education teachers.

Although the study specifies the relevant factors tested in this investigation in a causal sequence as depicted in Figure 3, it is important to keep in mind that regression and
correlation statistical techniques cannot be used exclusively to predict causal relationships
due to the difficulty in determining order of events (Cohen et al., 2011). Future research using
more complex longitudinal or experimental designs would prove more accurate in this regard.
CHAPTER 5
RESULTS

This chapter describes the findings of this study and is divided into three sections. First, descriptive information about the study participants is presented. The second section describes the TPB central study variables. The final section presents the results of the inferential analysis of the TPB central study variables. Bivariate and multivariate analyses of the independent, mediating and moderating variables are presented in this third section.

Descriptive information

Socio-demographic characteristics.

A total of 399 foundation phase educators teaching at schools across the Western Cape Province in South Africa participated in the study. Almost two-thirds of the participants responded in Afrikaans (61.9%, n = 247) and the remaining participants responded in English to the survey (38.1%, n = 152). The clear majority (98.2%; n = 392) of participants were female and 49.0% (n = 192) have children of their own (or of whom they take care). These participants ranged in age from 22 to 70 years, with a mean age of 42.71 years (SD = 12.49), a median age of 44 years and a modal age of 43 years. The number of years these teachers have taught ranged from 1 to 47, with a mean of 16.96 teaching years (SD = 12.00).

As shown in Table 4, the predominant population group amongst the participants was White (48.1%; n = 192), followed by Coloured (29.6%; n = 118) and African (18.3%; n = 73). Only one Indian teacher participated in the study and 3.8% (n = 15) refused to report their population group, as shown in Table 4. The majority (61.2%; n = 241) of the participants are married (or living together) with the remaining being single, separated or divorced, or widowed (38.8%; n = 153), as shown in Table 4.
Table 4: *Population group and marital status of participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population group (N = 399)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status (N = 394)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or cohabitating</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated or divorced</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Figure 6, in terms of education level, about half (51.8%; n=201) of the participants had achieved a teaching diploma, 35.1% (n = 136) had a Bachelor’s degree and 12.4% (n = 48) had completed postgraduate studies. A very small percentage (0.8%; n = 3) of participants reported having only a Lower Primary teaching certificate.

![Figure 6. Highest educational achievement of participants.](image)
All eight school districts in the WCED were well represented in this study (see Figure 7). Amongst those participants who disclosed their school district (N=384) about half (50.5%; n = 194) were from the rural districts (West Coast, Cape Winelands, Eden and Karoo, and Overberg) and 49.5% (n = 190) were from the four urban districts (Metro North, Metro South, Metro East and Metro Central). Fifteen participants refused to report the district in which they currently taught. The district with the most participants (17.5%; n =67) was Eden and Central Karoo whereas the district with the least participants (8.9%; n = 34) was the West Coast.

Figure 7. School district distribution of participants.
Furthermore, of the responses obtained for the grades taught by participants, 14.8% \( (n = 64) \) taught Grade R, 28.5% \( (n = 123) \) taught Grade 1; 29.3% \( (n = 126) \) taught Grade 2 and 27.5% \( (n = 119) \) taught Grade 3. Especially in the rural areas, some teachers taught multiple grades, hence the multiple responses reported by some participants (see Table 5).

Table 5: *Multiple response table of the grade learners taught by teachers*
\((N = 399, \text{responses} = 432)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade taught</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent of cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade R</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>432</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>108.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prevalence of reporting of suspected child sexual abuse amongst teachers.*

In terms of actual past reporting behaviour, about one in every four of the participants \( (25.9\%; \ n = 101) \) indicated that they had reported at least one case of suspected child sexual abuse during their teaching career. As shown in Table 6, almost 61% \( (n = 56) \) of participants who had reported suspected child sexual abuse indicated having reported one case, 27.2% \( (n = 25) \) indicated having reported two cases and 11.9% \( (n = 11) \) had reported 3 or more cases.

*Prevalence of non-reporting of suspected child sexual abuse amongst teachers.*

In terms of actual past non-reporting, almost one in every fourteen of the participants \( (7.4\%; \ n = 29) \) indicated that they had suspected child sexual abuse in at least one case during their teaching career which they had not reported. Table 7 shows that 57% \( (n = 12) \) of participants who had failed to report suspected cases, indicated having failed to report one case and 43% \( (n = 9) \) indicated having failed to report two or three cases.
Table 6: Reporting of suspected child sexual abuse amongst teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting of suspected child sexual abuse amongst teachers (N = 390)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of suspected child sexual abuse cases reported (N = 92)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Non-reporting of suspected child sexual abuse amongst teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-reporting of suspected child sexual abuse amongst teachers (N = 391)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of suspected child sexual abuse cases not reported (N = 21)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows the main reasons stated by those participants who had not reported their suspicions of child sexual abuse. Amongst the 29 participants, the following reasons were stated: didn’t have enough evidence to be sure abuse actually happened (92.6%); did not know how to report (87.5%); thought it best to work through the issue with the family first (72.0%); and thought that child protective services were unlikely to provide effective help (69.2%). Additional reasons indicated by more than 60% of the 29 participants for non-
reporting included fear of being sued (65%), fear of retaliation by parents or community members (65%) and fear that reporting would cause more harm to the child than good (67%).

Table 8: Reasons for non-reporting amongst teachers (N = 29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason given</th>
<th>% of valid responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feared being sued for making an unsubstantiated report.</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feared retaliation by parent(s) or community members.</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feared reporting would cause more harm to the child than good.</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feared the child may be removed from his or her family.</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was concerned about possible damage to the school’s relationship with the child or child’s parents.</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not know how to report.</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thought that child protective services were unlikely to provide effective help.</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn’t have enough evidence to be sure abuse actually happened.</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thought it best to work through the issue with the family first.</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics of the central study variables

Whilst Chapter 4 described the development, composition and reliability of the central study variables, namely, intention to report as the dependent variable and attitude towards reporting, subjective norm, perceived behavioural control and knowledge on mandatory reporting as independent and/or mediator variables, this section presents descriptive statistics of the central study variables. The other independent variable, namely past reporting behaviour has already been discussed above.

Intention to report (dependent variable).

As shown in Table 9, the mean composite intention to report score was 24.38 ($SD = 3.95$) and the median was 25. The intention to report variable was slightly negatively skewed with skewness and kurtosis statistics of -1.23 and 1.83, respectively. The slightly skewed
distribution was also evident from the histogram with a slight pile up of scores on the right-hand side of the graph.

*Attitude towards reporting (independent variable 1).*

As shown in Table 9, the mean composite attitude towards reporting score was 2.55 \((SD = .31)\) and the median was 2.57. Although the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk statistics indicated a significant value \((p < .000)\), suggesting violation of the assumption of normality; this is quite common in larger samples and will therefore not be used because they are likely to be significant even when skew or kurtosis are not too different from normal (Pallant, 2005). The attitude towards reporting variable was considered normally distributed, as indicated by a seemingly normally distributed histogram and by inspection of the normal probability plots (Normal QQ plots) which showed the scores plotted on a reasonably straight line. This composite variable was considered normally distributed with skewness and kurtosis statistics of .12 and .93, respectively (Pallant, 2005).

Table 9: *Descriptive statistics of the central study variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intention to report</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>4.00 – 28.00</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards reporting</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>2.00 – 4.00</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective norm</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>1.00 – 4.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived behavioural control</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1.00 – 4.00</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge on mandatory reporting</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>0.00 – 10.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subjective norm (independent variable 2).

The mean composite subjective norm score was 2.67 (SD = .35) and the median was 2.63. Like the attitude towards reporting variable, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk statistics indicated a significant value (p < .000), suggesting violation of the assumption of normality but, as this is quite common in larger samples and the histogram indicated normality, subjective norm was considered normally distributed (Pallant, 2005) The skewness and kurtosis statistics were -.23 and 2.22, respectively, as shown in Table 9.

Perceived behavioural control (independent variable 3).

As shown in Table 9, the mean composite perceived behavioural control score was 2.97 (SD = .40) and the median was 3.00. The histogram was quite normally distributed. As with the attitude towards reporting and subjective norm variables, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk statistics both indicated a significant value (p < .000), suggesting violation of the assumption of normality. Pallant (2005) indicated that this is quite common in larger samples and that these normality tests are likely to be significant even when skew or kurtosis are not too different from normal. The composite perceived behavioural control variable was considered normally distributed with skewness and kurtosis statistics of -.86 and 3.80, respectively.

Knowledge on mandatory reporting (independent variable 4).

The mean composite knowledge on mandatory reporting score was 4.67 (SD = 2.08) and the median was 5.00, as shown in Table 9. The knowledge on mandatory reporting variable was considered normally distributed, as indicated by a seemingly normally distributed histogram and by inspection of the normal probability plots (Normal QQ plots) which showed the scores plotted on a reasonably straight line. This composite variable is considered normally distributed with skewness and kurtosis statistics of .11 and -.44, respectively.
Inferential statistical findings

Bivariate statistical findings.

Correlations of the central study variables. The findings of the Pearson product-moment correlations of the three TPB independent variables (attitude towards reporting, subjective norm and perceived behavioural control), the proposed mediating variable (knowledge on mandatory reporting) and the dependent variable (intention to report) are shown in Table 10. For regression to serve as an effective inferential model, each independent variable should be strongly correlated with the dependent variable but uncorrelated with other independent variables (Pallant, 2005).

Table 10: Correlation matrix of the central study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attitude towards reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subjective norm</td>
<td></td>
<td>.119*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Perceived behavioural control</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.191***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Knowledge on mandatory reporting</td>
<td>.199***</td>
<td>-.118*</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intention to report</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.125*</td>
<td>.331***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ***p < .001

As shown in Table 10, attitude towards reporting was significantly (but weakly) correlated with subjective norm ($r = .12; p = .033$) and knowledge on mandatory reporting
(r = .20; p < .001). Attitude towards reporting and intention to report were not significantly correlated.

Subjective norm was weakly but significantly correlated with perceived behavioural control (r = .19; p < .001) and knowledge on mandatory reporting (r = -.12; p = .025) and not correlated with intention to report.

Perceived behavioural control was found to be weakly but significantly correlated to intention to report (r = .13; p = .018). Knowledge on mandatory reporting was moderately and significantly correlated with intention to report (r = .33; p < .001).

**Attitude towards reporting relative to other central study variables.** To facilitate understanding and interpretation when testing the study hypotheses, independent-samples t-tests were conducted. The independent-samples t-test is a statistical analysis method used to discover whether there are statistically significant differences between the means of two unrelated groups (Cohen et al., 2011). Attitude towards reporting was dichotomized to create two independent groups namely, those with positive attitudes and those with negative attitude towards reporting child sexual abuse (using the median split; median = 2.57). Participants that scored above the median were categorised as having a positive attitude and those that scored below the median had a negative attitude towards reporting child sexual abuse. The remaining central study variables (subjective norm, perceived behavioural control, knowledge on mandatory reporting and intention to report) were then assessed by means of independent samples t-tests in relation to this two-group attitude towards reporting variable, as shown in Table 11. Levene’s test was used to test whether the variances in the two groups were equal and the appropriate t-statistic produced in SPSS used when this assumption was violated.

It was found that the difference between the positive (M = 5.22; n = 170) and negative (M = 4.25; n = 142) attitude groups relative to knowledge on mandatory reporting was
statistically significant \( t(310) = 4.35; \ p < .001 \). The magnitude of the difference in the means was moderate (eta squared = .06); 6% of the variance in knowledge on mandatory reporting is explained by attitude grouping.

Table 11: Independent-sample t-tests: Attitude towards reporting groups with other central study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude towards reporting</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Eta squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjective norm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge on mandatory reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.025*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>23.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-tailed significance *\( p < .05 \)  ***\( p < .001 \)

In addition, the difference between the positive (\( M = 24.80; \ n = 169 \)) and negative (\( M = 23.83; \ n = 146 \)) attitude groups relative to intention to report was also statistically significant \( t(313) = 2.25; \ p = .025 \). The magnitude of the difference in the means was small (eta squared = .02); 2% of the variance in intention to report is explained by attitude grouping. The differences between positive and negative attitude towards reporting groups relative to subjective norm and perceived behavioural control were not statistically significant.
Subjective norm relative to other central study variables. The subjective norm score was dichotomized to create two groups namely, those with high subjective norm and those with low subjective norm regarding child sexual abuse reporting (using the median split; median = 2.63). The remaining central study variables (attitude towards reporting, perceived behavioural control, knowledge on mandatory reporting and intention to report) were then assessed by means of independent-samples t-tests in relation to this two-group subjective norm variable, as shown in Table 12.

Table 12: Independent-sample t-tests: Subjective norm groups with other central study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subjective norm</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Eta squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards reporting</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>-2.98</td>
<td>.003**</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived behavioural control</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>-2.88</td>
<td>.004**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge on mandatory reporting</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to report</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.025*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-tailed significance *p < .05  **p < .01

It was found that the difference between the high \( (M = 2.60; n = 163) \) and low \( (M = 2.50; n = 162) \) subjective norm groups relative to attitude towards reporting was statistically significant \( [t(323) = -2.98; \ p = .003] \). The magnitude of the difference in the means was small to moderate \( (\text{eta squared} = .03) \); 3% of the variance in attitude towards reporting is explained by subjective norm grouping.
In addition, the difference between the high \((M = 25.78; n = 126)\) and low \((M = 23.71; n = 226)\) subjective norm groups relative to perceived behavioural control was also statistically significant \([t(363) = -2.88; p = .004]\). The magnitude of the difference in the means was small (eta squared = .02); 2% of the variance in perceived behavioural control is explained by subjective norm grouping.

Then, the difference between the high \((M = 23.85; n = 178)\) and low \((M = 24.79; n = 185)\) subjective norm groups relative to intention to report was also statistically significant \([t(361) = 2.25; p = .025]\). The magnitude of the difference in the means was small (eta squared = .01); 1% of the variance in intention to report is explained by subjective norm grouping. The difference between the high and low subjective norm groups relative to knowledge on mandatory reporting was not statistically significant.

**Knowledge on mandatory reporting relative to other central study variables.** The knowledge on mandatory reporting score was dichotomized to create two groups namely, those with good knowledge and those with poor knowledge on child sexual abuse mandatory reporting (using the median split; median = 5). The remaining central study variables (attitude towards reporting, subjective norm, perceived behavioural control and intention to report) were then assessed by means of independent-samples t-tests in relation to this two-group knowledge on mandatory reporting variable, as shown in Table 13.

It was found that the difference between the good \((M = 2.59; n = 118)\) and poor \((M = 2.52; n = 194)\) knowledge on mandatory reporting groups relative to attitude towards reporting was statistically significant \([t(310) = 2.12; p = .035]\). The magnitude of the difference in the means was small (eta squared = .01); 1% of the variance in attitude towards reporting is explained by knowledge grouping.

In addition, the difference between the good \((M = 25.78; n = 126)\) and poor \((M = 23.71; n = 226)\) knowledge on mandatory reporting groups relative to intention to report was
also statistically significant \([t(317) = 5.27; p < .001]\). The magnitude of the difference in the means was moderate (eta squared = .07); 7% of the variance in intention to report is explained by knowledge on mandatory reporting grouping.

Table 13: *Independent-sample t-tests: Knowledge on mandatory reporting groups with other central study variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge on mandatory reporting</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Eta squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.035*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective norm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived behavioural control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>25.78</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>23.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences between good and poor knowledge on mandatory reporting groups relative to subjective norm and perceived behavioural control were not statistically significant.

**Perceived behavioural control relative to other central study variables.** The perceived behavioural control score was dichotomized to create two groups namely, those with high perceived behavioural control and those with low perceived behavioural control (using the median split; median = 3). The remaining central study variables (attitude towards reporting, subjective norm, knowledge on mandatory reporting and intention to report) were then
assessed by means of independent-samples t-tests in relation to this two-group perceived behavioural control variable, as shown in Table 14.

Table 14: Independent-sample t-tests: Perceived behavioural control groups with other central study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived behavioural control</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Eta squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective norm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
<td>.039*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge on mandatory reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>-.295</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>24.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-tailed significance  * p < .05

It was found that the difference between the high perceived behavioural control ($M = 2.72; n = 98$) and low perceived behavioural control ($M = 2.64; n = 267$) groups relative to subjective norm was statistically significant [$t(363) = -2.07; p = .039$]. The magnitude of the difference in the means was small (eta squared = .01); 1% of the variance in subjective norm is explained by perceived behavioural control grouping.

The differences between those with high perceived behavioural control and those with low perceived behavioural control relative to attitude towards reporting, knowledge on mandatory reporting and intention to report were not statistically significant.
Intention to report relative to other central study variables. The intention to report score was dichotomized to create two groups namely, those more likely to report and those less likely to report suspected child sexual abuse (using the median split; median = 25). The remaining central study variables (attitude towards reporting, subjective norm, perceived behavioural control and knowledge on mandatory reporting) were then assessed by means of independent-samples t-tests in relation to this two-group intention to report variable, as shown in Table 15.

Table 15: Independent-sample t-tests: Intention to report groups with other central study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intention to report</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Eta squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards reporting</td>
<td>More likely</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective norm</td>
<td>More likely</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived behavioural control</td>
<td>More likely</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge on mandatory reporting</td>
<td>More likely</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-tailed significance  *** p < .001

It was found that the difference between the more likely to report ($M = 5.37; n = 171$) and less likely to report ($M = 4.08; n = 181$) groups relative to knowledge on mandatory reporting was statistically significant [$t(350) = 6.28; p < .001$]. The magnitude of the difference in the means was moderate to large (eta squared = .10); 10% of the variance in knowledge is explained by intention to report grouping.
The differences between those more likely to report and those less likely to report suspected child sexual abuse relative to attitude towards reporting, subjective norm and perceived behavioural control were not statistically significant.

*Intention to report relative to continuous moderating variables.* The dichotomised intention to report score was used to assess the continuous moderating variables, age and years of teaching, by means of independent-samples t-tests, as shown in Table 16.

Table 16: *Independent-sample t-tests: Intention to report groups with continuous moderating variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intention to report</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Eta squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>More likely</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>44.65</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.006**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>40.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years teaching</td>
<td>More likely</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.005**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-tailed significance **p < .01

It was found that the difference between the more likely to report (*M* = 44.65; *n* = 169) and less likely to report (*M* = 40.99; *n* = 190) groups relative to age was statistically significant [*t*(357) = 2.78; *p* = .006]. The magnitude of the difference in the means was small (eta squared = .02).

Similarly, the difference between the more likely to report (*M* = 18.89; *n* = 171) and less likely to report (*M* = 15.38; *n* = 191) groups relative to years teaching was also statistically significant [*t*(360) = 2.80; *p* = .005]. The magnitude of the difference in the means was small (eta squared = .02).
Intention to report relative to categorical moderator variables. To analyse the relationship between language, parental status, and past reports of child sexual abuse with intention to report, independent-samples t-tests were conducted, as shown in Table 17. It was found that past reporting behaviour of teachers is related to the intention to report \([t(250) = 3.43; p = .001]\). The magnitude of the difference in the means was small (eta squared = .03).

The differences between parental status and language groups with intention to report were not statistically significant.

Table 17: Independent-sample t-tests: Intention to report groups with categorical moderating variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Eta squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>24.64</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>24.35</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>24.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past reports</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>25.34</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-tailed significance  **p < .01

Whereas the independent-groups t-test is used for examining differences between the means of two groups, analysis of variance is used to determine whether there are statistically significant differences between the means of three or more independent groups (Cohen et al., 2011). To explore the impact of population group, marital status, educational qualification and district on intention to report, one-way analysis of variance was conducted, as shown in Table 18. It was found that the differences between population group, marital status and district on intention to report were not statistically significant.
Table 18: One-way ANOVA: Intention to report with moderating variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23.73</td>
<td>2; 358</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>24.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>24.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>24.08</td>
<td>3; 353</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>24.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma or lower</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>24.98</td>
<td>2; 349</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.013*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate degree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Winelands</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25.11</td>
<td>7; 340</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden &amp; Central Karoo</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Central</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro East</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro North</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro South</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overberg</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-tailed significance *p < .05

Participants were divided into three groups according to their educational qualifications (Group 1: Diploma or lower qualification; Group 2: Bachelor’s degree; Group 3: Postgraduate qualifications including postgraduate diplomas, Master’s degrees and doctorates). There was a statistically significant difference at the p < .05 level in intention to report for the three groups [F(2;349) = 4.43; p = .013]. Despite reaching statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was quite small; the
effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .02. Post-hoc comparisons using the Scheffe’s test indicated that the mean score for Group 1 ($M = 24.98; SD = 3.53$) was significantly different from Group 2 ($M = 23.66; SD = 4.04$). Group 3 ($M = 24.37; SD = 4.34$) did not differ significantly from either Group 1 or Group 2.

To further explore why those with a Bachelor’s degree are less likely to exhibit reporting intentions compared to those with a diploma, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted with age as the dependent variable and educational qualifications as the independent variable, as shown in Table 19. There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .001$ level in age for the three educational groups [$F(2;367) = 146.70; p = .000$]. The actual difference in mean scores between the groups was extremely large; the effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .44. Post-hoc comparisons using the Scheffe’s test indicated that the mean score for Group 1 ($M = 50.19; SD = 9.10$) was significantly different from Group 2 ($M = 32.02; SD = 8.73$) and Group 3 ($M = 43.37; SD = 12.14$). Likewise, Group 2 ($M = 32.02; SD = 8.73$) also differed significantly from Group 3 ($M = 43.37; SD = 12.14$).

Table 19: One-way ANOVA: Age with educational qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Qualification</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Eta squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma or lower</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>50.19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>146.697</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>32.02</td>
<td>367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate degree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-tailed significance ***$p < .001$
Test of central study hypotheses.

This section presents data on the multivariate statistical analyses of the central study variables.

Hypothesis #1: Attitude towards reporting (H1a); subjective norm (H1b); and perceived behavioural control (H1c) predict intention to report child sexual abuse amongst teachers.

To test the hypothesised relationship of the TPB variables with intention to report child sexual abuse (as shown in Figure 8), a simultaneous multiple regression analysis was performed with intention to report as the dependent variable and attitude towards reporting, subjective norm and perceived behavioural control as the independent variables.

Figure 8. Hypothesised relationships among the central study variables showing the hypothesised relationship being tested in hypothesis 1: intention to report predicted by the TPB predictors.
There was an overall statistically significant effect \( F(3,311) = 3.79; \ p = .011 \) on intention to report. The three TPB predictor variables together explained 3.5% of the variance in intention to report. When the standardised regression coefficients of the individual predictors were examined, subjective norm (Beta = -.13; \( p = .024 \)) and perceived behavioural control (Beta = .14; \( p = .012 \)), but not attitude towards reporting, were found to contribute significantly to the prediction of intention to report, as shown in Table 20.

Table 20: Coefficients of simultaneous multiple regression predicting intention to report from TPB predictors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>( b )</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>( T )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>95% CI for ( b )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( LL )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>21.568</td>
<td>8.104</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>16.331</td>
<td>26.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards reporting</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>1.323</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>-2.720 - .323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective norm</td>
<td>-1.454</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>-2.261</td>
<td>.024*</td>
<td>-2.70 - .189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived behavioural control</td>
<td>1.440</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>2.537</td>
<td>.012*</td>
<td>.323 - 2.557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. CI = confidence interval; \( LL \) = lower limit; \( UL \) = upper limit

\( *p < .05 \)

Therefore, although the overall TPB three-predictor model was found to be statistically significant in prediction of intention to report, Hypothesis \( H1a: \) attitude towards reporting predicts intention to report was not supported, but Hypothesis \( H1b: \) subjective norm predicts intention to report was supported and Hypothesis \( H1c: \) perceived behavioural control predicts intention to report was supported. This relationship is also shown in Figure 9 which portrays the unstandardised regression coefficients.
Hypothesis #2: Past reporting behaviour (H2a); and knowledge on mandatory reporting (H2b) predict intention to report child sexual abuse amongst teachers.

Simple linear regression analysis was performed to test whether past reporting behaviour predicts intention to report amongst teachers (H2a - as shown in Figure 10). The effect of past reporting behaviour on intention to report was statistically significant \( [F(1,367) = 8.37; \ p = .004] \). Past reporting explained 2.2% of the variance in intention to report. Hypothesis H2a: Past reporting behaviour predicts intention to report was thus not rejected and it was concluded that there was a negative relationship between the predictor and dependent variable as shown in the negative standardised coefficient (Beta = -.15; \( p = .004 \)) – see Table 21. This relationship is also shown in Figure 11 which portrays the unstandardised regression coefficients.
Figure 10. Hypothesised relationships among the central study variables showing the hypothesised relationship being tested in hypothesis 2a: intention to report predicted by past reporting behaviour and hypothesis 2b: intention to report predicted by knowledge on mandatory reporting.

Table 21: Coefficients of simple regression predicting intention to report from past reporting behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI for b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>26.726</td>
<td>32.006</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>25.084</td>
<td>28.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past reporting behaviour</td>
<td>-1.346</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>-2.893</td>
<td>.004**</td>
<td>-2.260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, simple linear regression analysis was also performed to test whether knowledge on mandatory reporting predicted intention to report amongst teachers (H2b - as shown in Figure 10).
The effect of knowledge on mandatory reporting on intention to report was highly statistically significant \( F(1,350) = 43.09; p < .001 \). Knowledge on mandatory reporting explained 11% of the variance in intention to report. Hypothesis H2b: Knowledge on mandatory reporting predicts intention to report was thus not rejected and it was concluded that there is a positive relationship between the predictor and dependent variable as shown in the positive standardised coefficient (Beta = .331; \( p < .001 \)) – see Table 2. This relationship is also shown in Figure 11 which portrays the unstandardised regression coefficients.

**Figure 11.** Unstandardised regression coefficients when testing a) past reporting behaviour and b) knowledge on mandatory reporting as predictors of intention to report child sexual abuse.
Table 22: Coefficients of simple regression predicting intention to report from knowledge on mandatory reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI for b</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>21.444</td>
<td>43.770</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>20.481</td>
<td>22.408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge on mandatory reporting</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>6.564</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit

*** p < .001

Hypothesis #3: Attitude towards reporting mediates the relationships between past reporting behaviour with intention to report (H3a); and knowledge on mandatory reporting with intention to report (H3b).

The analyses described in Hypothesis #2 established a relationship between past reporting behaviour (predictor variable) with intention to report (dependent variable) as well as between knowledge on mandatory reporting (predictor variable) and intention to report (dependent variable). It was further hypothesized that there would also be an indirect mediated effect through attitude towards reporting to intention to report. Figure 12 provides a conceptual diagram of the two mediational analyses conducted.
Figure 12. Conceptual model testing attitude towards reporting as a mediator of the hypothesized association between a) past reporting behaviour with intention to report child sexual abuse and b) knowledge on mandatory reporting with intention to report child sexual abuse.
To be considered a mediator, the strength of the direct relation between the predictor and dependent variables (path c in Figure 12) will be diminished when the mediator is entered into the analysis (path c’ in Figure 12). For mediation to be considered, the relationship between the predictor (past reporting behaviour; knowledge on mandatory reporting) and the potential mediator (attitude towards reporting) needed to be established, and then also the relationship of the mediator (attitude towards reporting) to the dependent variable (intention to report) was examined and, if found significant, whether the mediator reduced the direct effect of the predictor variable/s on intention to report.

*Attitude towards reporting as mediator of the association between past reporting behaviour and intention to report.* A simple regression predicting the mediator (attitude towards reporting) from the predictor variable (past reporting behaviour) was conducted (i.e. path a in Figure 12). The effect of past reporting behaviour on attitude towards reporting was not statistically significant \[F(1,306) = -.88; p = .349\].

Next, a multiple regression was conducted predicting intention to report from both attitude towards reporting (path b in Figure 12) and past reporting behaviour (path c’ in Figure 12). There was an overall highly statistically significant effect \[F(2,303) = 6.70; p = .001\] on intention to report. The two predictor variables together explained 3.2% of the variance in intention to report.
When the unstandardised regression coefficients of the individual predictors were examined, past reporting behaviour ($b = -1.435; t = -3.405; p < .001$), but not attitude towards reporting, was found to contribute significantly to the prediction of intention to report, as shown in Figure 13. The negative regression coefficient for past reporting behaviour indicated that as past reporting behaviour “increased” from “yes” to “no”, intention to report declined and vice versa.

The Process procedure for SPSS (Hayes, 2012) also indicated the total effect of past reporting behaviour on intention to report. The total effect was the effect of the predictor on the independent variable when the mediator was not present in the regression model i.e. path $c$ in Figure 12. With attitude towards reporting not in the model, past reporting behaviour significantly predicted intention to report ($b = -1.466; t = -3.473; p < .001$). This model explained 2.8% of the variance in intention to report. In addition, it was found that the 95%
confidence interval of the indirect effect of past reporting behaviour via attitude towards reporting \( (b = -.031) \) contained zero \( [95\% \text{ CI} (-.204, .023)] \).

Thus, it was concluded that attitude towards reporting did not mediate the relationship between past reporting behaviour and intention to report child sexual abuse (see Figure 13) because the strength of the direct relation between past reporting behaviour and intention to report was not significantly diminished when attitude towards reporting was entered into the analysis. Hypothesis \( H3a: \) Attitude towards reporting mediates the relationship between past reporting behaviour with intention to report was thus not supported.

**Attitude towards reporting as mediator of the association between knowledge on mandatory reporting and intention to report.** A simple regression predicting the mediator (attitude towards reporting) from the predictor variable (knowledge on mandatory reporting) was conducted (i.e. path \( a \) in Figure 12). The effect of knowledge on mandatory reporting on attitude towards reporting was highly statistically significant \( [F(1,299) = 10.81; p = .001] \). Knowledge on mandatory reporting explained 3.6\% of the variance in attitude towards reporting. There was a positive relationship between knowledge on mandatory reporting and attitude towards reporting as shown in the positive unstandardised coefficient \( (b = .029; t = 3.288; p = .001) \): as knowledge on mandatory reporting increased, attitude towards reporting improved.

Next, a multiple regression was conducted predicting intention to report from both attitude towards reporting (path \( b \) in Figure 12) and knowledge on mandatory reporting (path \( c' \) in Figure 12). There was an overall highly statistically significant effect \( [F(2,298) = 18.9; p < .001] \) on intention to report. The two predictor variables together explained 11.4\% of the variance in intention to report. When the unstandardised regression coefficients of the individual predictors were examined, knowledge on mandatory reporting \( (b = .636; t = 5.602; \)
but not attitude towards reporting, was found to contribute significantly to the prediction of intention to report, as shown in Figure 14. The positive regression coefficient for knowledge on mandatory reporting indicated that, as knowledge on mandatory reporting increased, intention to report also increased.

**Figure 14.** Unstandardised regression coefficients when testing attitude towards reporting as a mediator of knowledge on mandatory reporting with intention to report child sexual abuse.

The Process procedure for SPSS (Hayes, 2012) also indicated the total effect of knowledge on mandatory reporting on intention to report. The total effect is the effect of the predictor on the independent variable when the mediator is not present in the regression model i.e. path $c$ in Figure 12. With attitude towards reporting not in the model, knowledge on mandatory reporting significantly predicted intention to report ($b = .639; t = 6.022; p < .001$). This model explained 11.4% of the variance in intention to report. In addition, it was found that the 95% confidence interval of the indirect effect of knowledge on mandatory reporting via attitude towards reporting ($b = .003$) contained zero [95% CI (-.043, .052)].
Thus, it was concluded that attitude towards reporting did not mediate the relationship between knowledge on mandatory reporting and intention to report child sexual abuse (see Figure 14) because the strength of the direct relation between knowledge on mandatory reporting and intention to report was not significantly diminished when attitude towards reporting was entered into the analysis. Hypothesis \textit{H3b: Attitude towards reporting mediates the relationship between knowledge on mandatory reporting with intention to report} was thus not supported.

Hypothesis #4: Socio-demographic characteristics of teachers moderate the effect of attitude towards reporting child sexual abuse and intention to report (H4) – alternatively, socio-demographic variables have a direct association with intention to report (H’4).

The combined effect of two variables on another is known conceptually as moderation and statistically as an interaction effect (Hayes, 2012). To be considered a moderator, simultaneous regression analyses were run with the centred predictor (attitude towards reporting) and centred moderators (socio-demographic characteristics) and the interaction of the two centred variables as predictors, as shown in Table 23. Moderators were tested via the Process procedure for SPSS (Hayes, 2012). For moderation to be considered, the interaction between the predictor and moderator must be found to be statistically significant.

Seven moderator regression models were conducted that tested the following socio-demographic characteristics as moderators of attitude towards reporting: language (model 1), population grouping (model 2), age of teacher (model 3), marital status (model 4), parental status (model 5), educational qualification (model 6) and years teaching (model 7).

Only two of the moderator-regression models were found to be statistically significant, namely the test of age as a moderator – model 3 \([F (3,298) = 3.794; p = .011] \)
and the test of years teaching as a moderator – model 7 \[ F (3,302) = 3.047; p = .029 \]. Both age \((b = .051; t = 2.919; p = .004)\) and years teaching \((b = .047; t = 2.601; p = .010)\) significantly predicted intention to report. However, in both these statistically significant models, attitude towards reporting and its interaction effects with age and years teaching were not statistically significant predictors of intention to report. Thus, it was concluded that, whilst age and years teaching predicted intention to report, none of the socio-demographic characteristics were moderators of attitude towards reporting.

Hypothesis \(H4\): Socio-demographic characteristics of teachers moderate the effect of attitude towards reporting was not supported. However, the alternate hypothesis \(H'4\): Socio-demographic variables (specifically age and years of teaching) have a direct association with intention to report was supported (see Figure 15).

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 15.** Hypothesised relationships among the central study variables showing the hypothesised relationship being tested in hypothesis \(H4\): Socio-demographic characteristics of teachers moderate the effect of attitude towards reporting and \(H'4\): Socio-demographic variables have a direct association with intention to report.
Table 23: Unstandardised coefficients of socio-demographic characteristics as moderators of attitude towards reporting child sexual abuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>-.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards reporting</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>-.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>-1.834</td>
<td>-1.088</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>-5.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{R}^2 = .012; F (3,311) = .871; p = .457 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population group</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>-.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards reporting</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>-.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>-.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{R}^2 = .011; F (3,300) = 1.192; p = .313 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>2.919</td>
<td>.004**</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards reporting</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>-.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-1.423</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>-.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{R}^2 = .035; F (3,298) = 3.794; p = .011* )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>1.628</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards reporting</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>-.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>-1.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{R}^2 = .013; F (3,308) = 1.767; p = .153 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental status</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>-.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards reporting</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>1.406</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>-.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>-3.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{R}^2 = .008; F (3,308) = .768; p = .513 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>-.504</td>
<td>-1.491</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-1.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards reporting</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>1.464</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>-.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>-1.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{R}^2 = .016; F (3,302) = 1.630; p = .182 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years teaching</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>2.601</td>
<td>.010*</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards reporting</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>-.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>-.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{R}^2 = .027; F (3,302) = 3.047; p = .029* )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit

\*p < .05  **p < .01
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the main findings of this study which make several important contributions to knowledge.

One of the crucial aspects of protecting children from sexual abuse is that suspected cases must be reported. Because most victims do not disclose the abuse themselves, the reporting of suspected cases by external parties is critical. Only when a case is reported, can perpetrators be prosecuted and subsequently imprisoned, thereby reducing the possibility of re-victimisation for the child or victimisation of other children. Because this is such an important aspect, the mandatory reporting of suspected child sexual abuse by professionals and other people in positions of responsibility for children has been explicitly included in legislation.

Teachers are amongst those mandated by law in South Africa to report child sexual abuse suspicions. The reason for this is that teachers can observe children’s day to day behaviour and note any changes, they can compare children’s behaviour to peer norms, they can detect the early indicators of sexual abuse and, because sexual abuse is often perpetrated by family members or close family friends, they may be the only source of help for abused children. Because teachers play this important role, it is crucial to understand which factors are related to teachers’ intentions and behaviours when it pertains to reporting their child sexual abuse suspicions.

In terms of actual past child sexual abuse reporting, about 25% of teachers in this study indicated that they had reported suspected child sexual abuse during their teaching careers. This prevalence of child sexual abuse reporting amongst primary school teachers in the Western Cape is comparable to a survey amongst 470 primary school teachers in
Australia which found that 24.1% of teachers had reported at least one case of child sexual abuse during their teaching careers (Walsh et al., 2012).

About 7% of the teachers in this study indicated that they had encountered instances in which they suspected child sexual abuse may have occurred but had failed to report during their teaching career. This is similar to the study by Feng et al. (2010) who reported that, amongst 598 kindergarten teachers in Taiwan, 11% had failed to report a suspected case of child abuse.

The most common reasons cited for non-reporting were: lack of evidence to be sure abuse had occurred, lack of knowledge on how to report, wishing to work through issues with the family first, and lack of faith in child protective services. Additional reasons reported by more than 60% of the teachers for non-reporting in the current study included fear of being sued, fear of retaliation by parents or community members, and fear that reporting would result in more harm than good to the child concerned. This is consistent with the literature where non-reporting reasons given were: lack of confidence in knowledge of the symptoms to identify child sexual abuse (Goldman & Padayachi, 2005), lack of skills and procedures to work with child sexual abuse victims (Goldman & Padayachi, 2005), the belief that child protection services did not generally offer help to maltreated children (Kenny, 2001), the belief that reporting only brought about negative consequences for the family and child (Kenny, 2001), fear of being sued for false allegations (Abrahams et al., 1992), being uncertain about the evidence (Feng et al., 2010), and lack of faith in legal authority (Feng et al., 2010).

This study was grounded on the TPB which postulates that people’s intentions (and subsequently, also their behaviours) are because of three primary factors: attitude towards the behaviour, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control. The research literature suggested that the TPB was a useful theoretical framework for studying child abuse reporting
behaviours and intentions amongst mandatory reporters (Ben Natan et al., 2012; Feng et al., 2010; Feng & Wu, 2005).

The TPB variables were each examined using median splits. This study found that, when measuring teachers’ intention to report child sexual abuse, 48% of the teachers were more likely to report and 52% were less likely to report. When measuring attitudes to reporting, 54% of the teachers exhibited a more positive attitude towards reporting child sexual abuse whilst 46% exhibited a negative attitude towards reporting. Half of the teachers exhibited high subjective norms and the other half of the teachers exhibited low subjective norms related to reporting child sexual abuse suspicions. When measuring perceived behavioural control, 27% of the teachers exhibited more perceived control towards reporting child sexual abuse whilst 73% exhibited less perceived control.

A simultaneous multiple regression analysis was then conducted, to test whether attitude towards reporting, subjective norm and perceived behavioural control would predict intention to report amongst South African foundation phase teachers. Whilst a significant relationship was found, the explained variance in intention to report by the three TPB predictor variables was only 3.5%. Further examination of the standardised regression coefficients revealed that only subjective norm and perceived behavioural control were found to be significant predictors of intention to report whereas attitude towards reporting was not a significant predictor.

This is inconsistent with prior research studies amongst teachers which have found that attitudes were a significant predictor of future reporting (Feng et al., 2010; O’Toole et al., 1999). Specifically using the TPB, Feng et al. (2010) found that attitudes and perceived behavioural control accounted for 22.4% of the variance in intention to report child abuse amongst kindergarten teachers in Taiwan. This may be because the attitude measurement in the Taiwan study was subdivided into three subscales (attitude to child discipline, attitude to
abusive parents, and attitude to professional responsibility for reporting child abuse) and thus violated the compatibility principle as dictated by Ajzen (1988) that the attitude measurement should be at the same level of generality or specificity as the behaviour under review. In addition, unlike in the current study, subjective norm was found not to be associated with intention to report in the Taiwan study (Feng et al., 2010).

This study thus showed that the TPB alone could not effectively be applied to teachers’ reporting decision-making and intentions to report or not to report. Further investigation was conducted to identify and test the possibility of other explanatory factors that influenced teachers’ child sexual abuse reporting intentions and behaviours.

The TPB posits that past behaviour is not a suitable predictor of future intended behaviour and that any effects of past behaviour are incorporated in attitude to the behaviour (Ajzen, 1988). However, this study found that having reported in the past was associated with intention to report in the future as determined through an independent t-test $[t(250) = 3.43; p = .001]$ with a small to moderate effect ($\eta^2 = .03$). Furthermore, simple linear regression analysis also found that the effect of past reporting behaviour on intention to report was statistically significant $[F(1,367) = 8.37; p = .004]$ with past reporting behaviour explaining 2.2% of the variance in intention to report. Thus, this study found that a teacher who reported in the past was more likely to have intention to report in the future.

Further investigation to analyse a mediator relationship (as posited by the TPB) proved that attitude towards reporting did not mediate the relationship between having reported in the past and future reporting intentions because the strength of the direct relation between past reporting behaviour and intention to report was not significantly diminished when attitude towards reporting was entered into the multiple regression analysis.
These findings were consistent with previous studies that have found that past reporting behaviour dictated future reporting intentions (Goebbels et al., 2008; O’Toole et al., 1999; Webster et al., 2005).

The TPB also assumes that, although accurate knowledge could indirectly change attitudes, it is not a necessary factor for predicting intention because people often exhibit intentions and actions based on invalid or selective information, irrationality or act in self-serving ways (Ajzen, 2012, 2014). As an example of this, in a study amongst university students in Australia, Hasking and Schofield (2015) found that having accurate knowledge about the negative effects of alcohol consumption had no moderating effect on the TPB variables. Instead, it was found that having accurate knowledge about the negative effects of alcohol consumption actually strengthened the relationship between students’ intentions to consume alcohol and their actual consumption behaviour. The authors concluded that having accurate knowledge about the effects of alcohol consumption did not necessarily mitigate a socially undesirable outcome as students with more knowledge might be convinced they could handle the consequences of their actions better when they knew the negative effects of that behaviour (Hasking & Schofield, 2015).

Through a median-split, the current study found that 36% of the teachers exhibited good knowledge of mandatory reporting of child sexual abuse whilst 64% exhibited poor knowledge. Based on independent t-tests, those teachers who exhibited better knowledge levels had more positive attitudes to reporting \[t(310) = 2.12; \ p = .035\] as well as were more likely to report child sexual abuse than those with poor knowledge \[t(317) = 5.27; \ p < .001\]. Furthermore, simple linear regression analysis revealed a significant relationship between knowledge on mandatory reporting on the teachers’ intention to report, where knowledge on mandatory reporting explained 11% of the variance in intention to report. Thus, this study found that a teacher who had more accurate knowledge on mandatory reporting was more
likely to report in the future. This is consistent with Feng and Wu (2005) who found that, amongst nurses, knowledge was the best predictor of their intention to report child abuse.

Further investigation to analyse a mediator relationship (as posited by the TPB) proved that attitude towards reporting did not mediate the relationship between knowledge on mandatory reporting and intention to report child sexual abuse because the strength of the direct relation between knowledge on mandatory reporting and intention to report was not significantly diminished when attitude towards reporting was entered into the multiple regression analysis. Therefore, these findings were consistent with previous studies that have found that accurate knowledge on mandatory reporting dictated future reporting intentions (O’Toole et al., 1999). This study also provides encouragement for those concerned with the education of teachers regarding child sexual abuse and those who advocate teacher training as a solution to non-reporting (Goldman, 2007; Goldman & Grimbeek, 2011, 2014; Kenny, 2001, 2004; Reiniger et al., 1995).

Finally, in reviewing previous research, there was an expectation that teachers’ socio-demographic characteristics might affect their intentions to report suspicions of child sexual abuse (Ben Natan et al., 2012; O’Toole et al., 1999; Webster et al., 2005). However, one of the major assumptions of the TPB is that all socio-demographic characteristics have no direct impact on the behaviour but are assumed to be moderators of attitude towards the behaviour (Ajzen, 1988). But, because attitude towards reporting was not a significant predictor of intention to report child sexual abuse, also no socio-demographic teacher characteristic was found to be a significant moderator of attitude towards reporting.

The socio-demographic characteristics of the teachers were thus examined as independent variables and not simply as moderators. In this current study, intention to report was found to be unrelated to the teachers’ population group, marital status, language, parental
status or school district. There were some socio-demographic characteristics that were significant, however, in their association with intention to report.

Those teachers who exhibited a greater likelihood of reporting were older, had more years teaching experience, and had a lower level of education than those with less likelihood of reporting. Further analysis showed that the probable reason why those with an educational diploma (lower education) were found to exhibit greater intention to report than those with a bachelors’ degree (higher education), was probably not because of their lower educational level, but was rather a function of their age. Younger teachers were more likely to be bachelor degree graduates than their older counterparts.

These findings were consistent with Kenny (2001) who found that for each additional 5 years of teaching, teachers were 4.1 times more likely to report than those who did not. This finding was also consistent with Goebbels et al. (2008) who reported that teachers who had never suspected child abuse or neglect were more likely to have less years teaching experience. However, contrary to this study, Goebbels et al. (2008) reported that teachers who had never suspected child abuse or neglect were more likely to have lower academic qualifications.

This study’s finding means that younger teachers, with less teaching experience, although they are better educated than their older counterparts, reported less likelihood of reporting child sexual abuse suspicions. This is a somewhat worrying outcome since one would expect all teachers, despite their length of teaching experience, and with a higher educational level, when presented with a child sexual abuse scenario, to be able to identify it as such and to indicate an intention to report it (Walsh, et al., 2012).
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

This study set out to determine the prevalence of reporting and non-reporting of suspected child sexual abuse amongst teachers in South Africa. Teachers are amongst those mandated by law in South Africa to protect children from child sexual abuse and to ensure that suspicions are reported immediately to child protection services. By timeously reporting their suspicions, teachers enable suspected child sexual abuse cases to be investigated, perpetrators to be prosecuted and victims to receive the psychosocial assistance they need.

In this study, it was found that whilst one in every four teachers had reported at least one case of child sexual abuse, one in every 14 had neglected to report at least one case. The recent Optimus study reported that one in every three South African children aged 15 to 17 years old have been sexually abused in their lifetimes (Artz et al., 2016). Because child sexual abuse is so prevalent amongst South African children, this means that every teacher probably should have encountered at least one case of suspected child sexual abuse in their careers. Therefore, whilst the prevalence of reporting is commendable, there have probably been many over-looked cases amongst teachers.

Secondly, this study set out to investigate whether the TPB could be used to adequately explain the reporting intentions of South African primary school teachers. In other words, the findings of this study incorporate a theoretically based understanding of individual factors which influence teachers’ reporting of child sexual abuse in South Africa. This study found that, although the TPB is a useful model for predicting factors influencing child sexual abuse reporting, it is not sufficient for predicting all factors.

This study demonstrated that teachers’ child sexual abuse reporting intentions are influenced by two of the three TPB variables, namely subjective norm and perceived behavioural control but not attitude towards reporting. This means that teachers rely on the
norms in their family and work circles as well as in the greater community. In addition, self-efficacy also depended on a supportive and empowering environment which poses minimal inconvenience and threat to reporters. There should be a building of partnerships across the child protection system, incorporating families, schools, communities, child protection services, policies and legislation; which all work synergistically for the protection of children.

Finally, this study set out to determine which other factors, besides those posited in the TPB, influence the reporting intentions of teachers. It was found that the number of years teaching experience, previous reporting and having accurate knowledge on their mandatory reporting role were all significant in predicting teachers’ intention to report child sexual abuse, with knowledge on mandatory reporting being the most influential.

Given the high prevalence of child sexual abuse, the results underscore the necessity for teachers to have accurate knowledge, not only about their reporting duties, but also accurate knowledge to identify the signs and symptoms of child sexual abuse amongst the children in their classrooms. There is a need, therefore, to integrate information about mandatory reporting of child sexual abuse into the tertiary qualifications of student teachers as well as in continuing education initiatives.

**Implications for social and educational development**

The host of personal and social sequelae that result for child sexual abuse victims, their families, and society both short-term after abuse has occurred as well as long-term into the future, are strong grounds for investing in interventions which will serve to minimize the exposure of children to this source of adversity. There are two main barriers to mandatory reporting being effective in its aims: firstly, lack of knowledge and recognition of child sexual abuse amongst mandatory reporters and secondly, the decision not to report suspected child sexual abuse cases when the abuse is identified, suspected or disclosed (Sege &
Flaherty, 2008). The WHO (2014) recommends that primary schools should serve as a place for education and primary prevention because these early interventions benefit children (through cognitive development, behaviours, social competence, and educational attainment) as well as society overall (through subsequent reduced delinquency and crime).

Bronfenbrenner’s (1993) ecological model is a useful lens through which to interpret this study’s findings and to advise on interventions which may ameliorate child sexual abuse. As stated by Walsh et al. (2012): “Teachers' reporting of suspected child sexual abuse (CSA) is of interest to governments, legislators, policy makers, school authorities, families and children. Effective reporting is critical to well-functioning child protection systems and to minimise both failure to report and the making of unnecessary reports” (p. 1937).

A teacher’s decision to file a child sexual abuse report is a gradual shaping process with decisions at various subsystems in Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model, and, to encourage effective reporting, there is a need for intervention at all levels.

At the microsystem level, where the teacher interacts daily with the children in the classroom, school-based child sexual abuse prevention programmes taught by the class teacher as part of the life skills curriculum should be employed as part of a primary prevention strategy. Research has shown that children who participate in school-based child sexual abuse prevention programmes at an early age exhibit positive outcomes such as improved safety skills and knowledge, greater self-esteem, and ultimately reduce child sexual abuse because these programmes facilitate child sexual abuse disclosures and may even prevent child sexual abuse from occurring (Walsh, Zwi, Woolfenden & Shlonsky, 2016). When children have more self-esteem, knowledge, and skills, they are more likely to disclose child sexual abuse to a teacher. A disclosure by a child is considered strong and reasonable grounds for reporting, and this assists the teacher in the function of identification of child sexual abuse (Collings et al., 2005).
At the *mesosystem level*, interactions with the school’s administration, principal, and colleagues all come to the fore in the teacher’s environment which either supports or dissuades the teacher from reporting suspected child sexual abuse cases. Here the training of all school staff is important. Firstly, teachers need effective and detailed training in child sexual abuse recognition and reporting. This will increase their self-efficacy or perceived behavioural control as well as increase their knowledge about mandatory reporting. This study found that better knowledge and higher perceived behavioural control were related to teachers having a greater likelihood of reporting suspected child sexual abuse.

This study indicated that younger teachers exhibit less intention to report. Therefore, student teachers at university should be taught the scope and importance of their mandatory reporting role. By investigating whether university degrees include an in-depth course on child sexual abuse and reporting, appropriate courses and pedagogies for student teachers can be planned (Goldman & Grimbeek, 2015). Research also indicates that specific child sexual abuse preventative in-service teacher training programmes increase teacher knowledge and skills in handling child sexual abuse (MacIntyre & Carr, 2000). Rule (2014) found that preschool teachers, who attended an in-service training programme in child sexual abuse knowledge and reporting procedures, reported being confident in their ability to identify the characteristics of suspected child sexual abuse and in their ability to apply the correct child sexual abuse reporting procedures when needed.

Teachers must know how to report so that the legislative reporting requirements are satisfied and so that the report provides useful assistance to child protective services in their ability to follow-up a case. In this training, teachers should be taught how to handle a child disclosing abuse; as research shows that the “approach and style of questioning is crucial when considering the child’s accuracy of recall, including establishing rapport, gaining trust, diffusing anxiety, and communicating at an age-appropriate level” (Goldman & Padayachi,
As part of a secondary prevention strategy, teachers should also be trained to assess which children in their classes may be more vulnerable to child sexual abuse, by gaining knowledge on the risk factors that are associated with sexual abuse such as marital conflict and lack of parental supervision (Fergusson et al., 2013; Kaminer & Eagle, 2012). As part of a tertiary prevention strategy, teachers should also be trained in strategies for implementation once reporting occurs and especially skills on how to handle non-offending parents and caregivers of affected children with empathy, respect and sensitivity (Pietrantonio et al., 2013).

Secondly, because subjective norm is related to intention to report, the current study’s results suggest that professional training programmes should be tailored at positive norm setting which will induce a climate of collaboration amongst all school personnel. School administrative staff as well as school principals must also know how to handle child sexual abuse reports and how to play a supportive role to the teachers making the reports and the children and families affected. All paperwork relating to child sexual abuse, as well as any accurate records being kept of suspected cases, should be handled sensitively and appropriately. Teachers who receive the support and assistance needed from their school administration are more likely to view the reporting process positively, knowing that they have the backing of their schools (Mathews & Kenny, 2008).

Thirdly, as noted by Kaminer and Eagle (2012, p. 235), “The early detection and containment of traumatic responses in children that could be offered by schools is hampered by the dearth of school-based counsellors in the current education system, and children living in high violence, low- income communities are therefore likely to be referred for intervention only once symptoms are impacting severely on their functioning”. It is therefore imperative that schools employ school counsellors, or that school social workers are assigned to schools by the DSD, so that they can provide needed psychosocial support to the affected child and
their families, and in this way, help reduce the harmful sequelae that follow child sexual abuse. This will also be a supportive mechanism to the class teacher who has a commitment to the other children in their classes as well as the affected child and forms part of effective tertiary prevention.

The *exosystem* includes contexts which have important indirect influences on the teacher but in which the teacher does not personally play a part (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). One of the most important of these is the child protection services which includes the DSD social workers, rape/child abuse crisis centres and police services. O’Toole et al. (1999) found that those teachers who rated child protection services highly in terms of their professionalism and responsiveness, reported more abuse. Similarly, Webb and Vulliamy (2001) reported that there was a belief that reporting child sexual abuse cases was a waste of time because child protection services did not follow these cases through. This belief resulted in under-reporting of suspicions.

Child protection services must ensure that they foster effective collaboration, communication and improved relationships between not only themselves but also the teachers who report the suspected cases of child sexual abuse. These services must operate efficiently and effectively in terms of case assessment, response, and case management. Besides their mandated reporting role, teachers play an important part in this integrated system of child protection by providing information on the effects of the abuse on the child’s school performance as well as supporting the efforts of the child protection services (Goldman et al., 2003). Accurate reports and incidence data should be kept about child sexual abuse cases which facilitates monitoring of the greater child sexual abuse problems on community, provincial and national levels as well as effective individual case management (DSD, 2014).

International, national and provincial legislation and policies on effective child protection emphasise integrated multi-sectoral working relationships between all the role-
players in the child protection system (Lake & Jamieson, 2016; Loffell, 2008; Makoae, 2014; September, 2006). Whilst there are instances of collaboration reported in South Africa such as the Thuthuzela Care Centres and the Khuseleka One-Stop centres, these facilities are not found in all communities. Further research into integrated multi-sectoral service delivery models such as the child advocacy centres in the USA may provide useful information on a model of integrated services that can be implemented in South Africa (Goldman et al., 2003). These child advocacy centres are community-based facilities where all key professionals – child protection services, law enforcement, prosecutors, mental health professionals and child advocates – are co-located to provide services to victims of child sexual abuse and severe physical abuse (Goldman et al., 2003).

Interventions at the macrosystem level include those that affect the values, laws and customs in a society. In terms of legislation, South Africa is progressive and complies with international conventions for the prevention of child abuse and the protection of children. However, the key interventions stipulated under the three pillars of the South African Integrated Programme of Action Addressing Violence against Women and Children, namely prevention and protection interventions; response interventions; and care and support interventions must be implemented, monitored and evaluated (DSD, 2014). The ongoing shortcoming of government departments to deliver on their mandate to provide effective child protection services at all three intervention levels must be corrected.

There is also a need to develop interventions that address the underlying social conditions that put children at risk of child sexual abuse. Poverty, unemployment, gender inequality and male social dominance must all be addressed through social development programmes that aim to ameliorate these social ills.

The National School Safety Framework states that teachers should be aware of and implement all policies and procedures which support the protection of children and be
proactive in the protection of children (CJCP, 2015). However, it does not address child
sexual abuse sufficiently, given the seriousness of this social scourge. More focussed
interventions specifically addressing child sexual abuse is needed. The Abuse No More
Protocol of the WCED should be adopted in all provinces and effective training in how to
implement this protocol must be a priority.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: Instruments
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Teacher reporting questionnaire
for South African foundation phase educators

Western Cape, South Africa 2015
INDIVIDUAL CONSENT FORM

Hello, my name is Deirdre Rule and I am a doctoral student in the Social Development Department at the University of Cape Town.

As you know, the sexual abuse of young children is a serious problem in South Africa. In the context of this research study, ‘child sexual abuse’ refers to any act of a sexual nature (contact or non-contact) perpetrated on or with a child for sexual gratification of the perpetrator or a third person. ‘Contact sexual abuse’ includes kissing, fondling, oral sex, and vaginal and anal intercourse. ‘Non-contact sexual abuse’ includes making sexual remarks to a child, exhibitionism, voyeurism, and showing a child pornographic material.

This survey is part of an investigation that tries to discover reasons why teachers report or fail to report their suspicions of child sexual abuse. This survey is being conducted in primary schools across the Western Cape to learn about foundation phase teachers’ experiences and challenges in reporting child sexual abuse. Detecting and reporting child sexual abuse is one of the most challenging tasks a teacher may face, but it is also one of the most important. Specifically I am interested in your personal opinions regarding reporting child sexual abuse.

You have been chosen by chance to participate in this study. Primary schools were selected randomly in each of the eight school districts. All foundation phase teachers working at these schools have been approached to participate in this study. I wish to assure you that all of your individual answers will be kept strictly confidential. Your information will remain anonymous and your individual answers will not be reported. Instead, the frequencies and averages will be used when reporting on my findings. I will not keep a record of your name nor the school at which you teach.

You have the right to choose not to participate in the study at all. You also have the right to skip any questions that you don’t wish to answer. There are no right or wrong answers. Your participation is totally voluntary and there is no apparent physical risk by participating in this survey.

This research has been approved by the university’s Ethics in Research Committee. If you have any questions, please contact me at deirdre.rule@gmail.com or 0822154349 or Dr Johannes John-Langba, my supervisor at the university, at his email address johannes.john-langba@uct.ac.za.

Your participation is very valuable to my studies and your experiences could prove helpful to teachers and children in South Africa and across the world.

This survey will take about 20 minutes to answer.

Do you agree to participate in this study please? Please tick. [ ] YES [ ] NO

If your reply is yes, please date this form below to indicate your willingness to participate in my research. Then complete the attached survey questionnaire, and return both this consent form and the questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope provided. No postage stamp is required as postage is paid by me. Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. I greatly value your participation and appreciate your responses.

__________________________
Date

If your reply is no, then there is no need to return the forms. Thank you for your time.
Part 1: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

1. What is your gender?
   - □ Female
   - □ Male

2. What is your population group?
   - □ African
   - □ Coloured
   - □ Indian/Asian
   - □ White
   - □ Prefer not to answer

3. How old were you on your last birthday? _________ years old

4. What is your marital status?
   - □ Single
   - □ Married or cohabitating (living together)
   - □ Separated or divorced
   - □ Widowed

5. Do you take care of any other children, besides the children you teach at school, as a parent/guardian?
   - □ Yes
   - □ No

6. What is your highest educational qualification?
   - □ Diploma
   - □ Bachelor’s degree
   - □ Postgraduate diploma
   - □ Master’s degree
   - □ Doctorate
   - □ Other (please specify) ______________________

7. Which grade learners do you teach for the majority of the time?
   - □ Grade R
   - □ Grade 1
   - □ Grade 2
   - □ Grade 3

8. In which school district are you currently teaching?
   - □ Cape Winelands
   - □ Eden & Central Karoo
   - □ Metro Central
   - □ Metro East
   - □ Metro North
   - □ Metro South
   - □ Overberg
   - □ West Coast

9. Including this year, how many years have you worked as a teacher? _________ years
### Part 2: ATTITUDES ABOUT REPORTING CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

In relation to reporting child sexual abuse, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Please mark **ONLY ONE** box per statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>I plan to report child sexual abuse when I suspect it.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>I would be apprehensive to report child sexual abuse for fear of family/community retaliation.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>I would be reluctant to report child sexual abuse because of what parents will do to the child if the child is reported.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>The procedures for reporting child sexual abuse are familiar to me.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>I would like to fulfil my professional responsibility by reporting suspected cases of child sexual abuse.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Reporting child sexual abuse is necessary for the safety of children.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>I feel emotionally overwhelmed by the thought of reporting child sexual abuse.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>I would not report child sexual abuse if I knew the child would be removed from his or her home/family.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Reporting child sexual abuse can enable services to be made available to children and families.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>I would consider not reporting child sexual abuse because of the possibility of being sued.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k)</td>
<td>There is a lot of sensitivity associated with reporting child sexual abuse.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l)</td>
<td>Guidelines on reporting child sexual abuse are necessary for teachers.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m)</td>
<td>It is important for teachers to be involved in reporting child sexual abuse to prevent long-term consequences for the children.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n)</td>
<td>I believe that the current system for reporting child sexual abuse is effective in addressing the problem.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o)</td>
<td>Teachers who report unsubstantiated child sexual abuse can get into trouble.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p)</td>
<td>It is a waste of time to report child sexual abuse because no one will follow up on the report.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q)</td>
<td>I would still report child sexual abuse even if my school administration disagreed with me.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r)</td>
<td>I lack confidence in the authorities to respond effectively to reports of child sexual abuse.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s)</td>
<td>I will consult with an administrator before I report child sexual abuse.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t)</td>
<td>I would find it difficult to report child sexual abuse because it is hard to gather enough evidence.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u)</td>
<td>A child sexual abuse report can cause a parent to become more abusive toward the child.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part 3: SUBJECTIVE NORM

11. In relation to others’ opinions of you reporting child sexual abuse, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Please mark ONLY ONE box per statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) People whose opinions I care about would approve of me reporting child sexual abuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The people in my life whom I care about would encourage me to report child sexual abuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) People who are close to me would not approve of me reporting child sexual abuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) My close family members with whom I live would not want me to report child sexual abuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Most teachers like myself would report child sexual abuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Most teachers where I am currently teaching, would not report child sexual abuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) My close colleagues at my school would approve of me reporting child sexual abuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) My Head of Department at my current school would support me with reporting child sexual abuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 4: PERCEIVED BEHAVIOURAL CONTROL

12. In relation to how easily it is for you to act on your convictions regarding reporting, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Please mark ONLY ONE box per statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) If I wanted to, I could easily report child sexual abuse to child protection services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Whether I report child sexual abuse is entirely up to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) For me to report child sexual abuse is completely possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) It will be difficult for me to report child sexual abuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Reporting child sexual abuse is definitely beyond my control.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 5: KNOWLEDGE ON MANDATORY REPORTING

13. Regarding child sexual abuse reporting, state whether the following statements are TRUE or FALSE. Please mark ONLY ONE box per statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Teachers must report only when they are certain (sure) that a child has been or is being sexually abused.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Teachers must report only where the suspected perpetrator is a school employee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Teachers must report whenever they have a reasonable suspicion that a child has been or is being sexually abused.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Teachers must report child sexual abuse suspicions only when there is concern for the child’s safety or welfare.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part 6: INTENTION TO REPORT SCENARIOS

Next comes 4 scenarios that you might encounter as a teacher. Please read them carefully and respond to the best of your knowledge. Please mark only one box per question.

In this section, the term "report" means formal reports to the principal, child protection authorities, police, etc.

#### 14. A 9-year-old boy in your class is usually well behaved, completes homework consistently and performs well academically. However, he has been behaving in an out-of-character way for several weeks. He has been misbehaving in class, often arrives at school without having done his homework, and his grades have plummeted. During a quiet period, he tells you that for some weeks a neighbourhood acquaintance of his parents has been showing him pornography on the internet after school, and that while they looked at the pornography the man would touch the boy's private parts and his own.

| a) Do you think you have reasonable grounds for suspecting sexual abuse has occurred? |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Yes | No | Unsure |

| b) Do you think significant harm has been caused, or is likely to be caused, to the child's physical, psychological or emotional wellbeing? |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Yes | No | Unsure |

| c) Does legislation require you to report this? |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Yes | No | Unsure |

| d) How likely would you be to report this case, on a scale of 1 – 7, where 1 means you will certainly not report the case and 7 is if you will certainly report it? |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Certainly would not report | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Certainly would report          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

#### 15. An 8-year-old girl in your class who is usually sociable and cheerful has gradually become withdrawn over the last term. She has twice even been in physical confrontations with classmates, which is out of character for her. At physical education (PE) class, which she has always participated in with relish, she has become unwilling to change into her PE clothes, and has claimed to be sick. Her school work, which had always been above average, has slipped and she seems to have trouble concentrating in class. On three occasions near the end of the school day, she has cried and has told you she does not want to go home until 5 pm when her Mum gets home from work. She asks to stay at school until that time and offers to help you with jobs. You know that her stepfather is unemployed and is at home all day.

| a) Do you think you have reasonable grounds for suspecting sexual abuse has occurred? |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Yes | No | Unsure |

| b) Do you think significant harm has been caused, or is likely to be caused, to the child's physical, psychological or emotional wellbeing? |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Yes | No | Unsure |

| c) Does legislation require you to report this? |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Yes | No | Unsure |
### Question 16
A 5-year-old girl in your class, with whom you have a good relationship, tells you that her father has been touching her private parts and making her 'do things'. You do not know her parents very well, although from what you have seen, the mother is passive and distant, and the father is, if anything, overprotective. They have two other daughters younger than the girl in your class. The girl has been withdrawn and sombre for the past several weeks, which is not usual for her.

**a)** Do you think you have reasonable grounds for suspecting sexual abuse has occurred?  
- [ ] 1 Yes  
- [ ] 2 No  
- [ ] 3 Unsure

**b)** Do you think significant harm has been caused, or is likely to be caused, to the child's physical, psychological or emotional wellbeing?  
- [ ] 1 Yes  
- [ ] 2 No  
- [ ] 3 Unsure

**c)** Does legislation require you to report this?  
- [ ] 1 Yes  
- [ ] 2 No  
- [ ] 3 Unsure

**d)** How likely would you be to report this case, on a scale of 1 – 7, where 1 means you will certainly not report the case and 7 is if you will certainly report it?  
- [ ] 1 Certainly would not report  
- [ ] 2  
- [ ] 3  
- [ ] 4  
- [ ] 5  
- [ ] 6  
- [ ] 7 Certainly would report

### Question 17
A 7-year-old girl in your class has become socially withdrawn and unwilling to participate in activities in class or playtime. The quality of her schoolwork has deteriorated steadily over several months. She complains regularly of stomach ache (which is unexplained) and various other aches and pains (e.g. headaches) which also are unexplained. You know that her parents have divorced, and that the girl lives with her mother but stays at her father’s house every Wednesday and every second weekend. During a private talk with you, she says she does not like staying with her father, and you have noticed her anxiety and fearfulness are particularly strong around the times she stays with him; on several occasions she has become extremely distressed just before being picked up by her father. She tells you that she would not go to her father’s house except that her younger five-year-old sister needs her to look after her: she says that she is the only one who can protect her.

**a)** Do you think you have reasonable grounds for suspecting sexual abuse has occurred?  
- [ ] 1 Yes  
- [ ] 2 No  
- [ ] 3 Unsure

**b)** Do you think significant harm has been caused, or is likely to be caused, to the child's physical, psychological or emotional wellbeing?  
- [ ] 1 Yes  
- [ ] 2 No  
- [ ] 3 Unsure

**c)** Does legislation require you to report this?  
- [ ] 1 Yes  
- [ ] 2 No  
- [ ] 3 Unsure

**d)** How likely would you be to report this case, on a scale of 1 – 7, where 1 means you will certainly not report the case and 7 is if you will certainly report it?  
- [ ] 1 Certainly would not report  
- [ ] 2  
- [ ] 3  
- [ ] 4  
- [ ] 5  
- [ ] 6  
- [ ] 7 Certainly would report
### Part 7: PAST REPORTING BEHAVIOUR

The following questions are about your past experience of reporting child sexual abuse as a primary school teacher.

**18.** Have you ever reported child sexual abuse?  
- [ ] Yes → How many cases? ____  
- [ ] No

**19.** Have you ever suspected child sexual abuse but decided not to report it?  
- [ ] Yes → How many cases? ____  
  - *please answer Question 20*  
- [ ] No → *please skip Question 20*

**20.** Generally, how important were the following factors in your decision(s) not to report these cases?  

Please mark [ ] ONE BOX per statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>I feared being sued for making an unsubstantiated report.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>I feared retaliation by parent(s) or community members.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>I feared reporting would cause more harm to the child than good.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>I feared the child may be removed from his or her family.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>I was concerned about possible damage to the school’s relationship with the child or child’s parents</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>I did not know how to report.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>I thought that child protective services were unlikely to provide effective help.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>I didn’t have enough evidence to be sure abuse actually happened.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>I thought it best to work through the issue with the family first.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Other reason (please specify)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Other reason (please specify)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Other reason (please specify)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any additional comments regarding this questionnaire or study, please write them here:

..............................................................................................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................................................................................

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your responses will be very helpful to us and to teachers in the future. Please enclose the consent form and survey in the self-addressed envelope provided and return it via the post as soon as possible. No postage stamp is required as postage is paid by me.

If you have any questions, please contact me at deirdre.Rule@gmail.com or 0822154349 or Dr Johannes John-Langba, my supervisor at the University of Cape Town, at his email address johannes.john-langba@uct.ac.za.
Onderwyser verslagdoening vraelyn

vir Suid-Afrikaanse grondslagfase opvoeders
INDIVIDUELE TOESTEMMINGSVORM

Hallo, my naam is Deirdre Rule en ek is 'n doktoriale student in die Departement van Maatskaplike Ontwikkeling aan die Universiteit van Kaapstad.

Soos u weet, is die seksuele misbruik van jong kinders 'n ernstige probleem in Suid-Afrika. In die konteks van hierdie studie beteken “seksuele misbruik van kinders” enige daad van 'n sekseuele aard (deer kontak of nie-kontak) gepleeg op of met 'n kind vir sekseuele bevrediging van die oortreders of 'n derde persoon. “Kontak seksuele misbruik” sluit soone, streling, orale seks, en vaginale en anale seks. “Nie-kontak seksuele misbruik” sluit sekseuele opmerkings aan 'n kind, ekshibisionisme, voyeurisme, en die blootstel van pornografiese materiaal aan kinders.

Hierdie opname is deel van 'n ondersoek wat probeer ontskakel van ondersyfers rapporteer of versuim om hul vermoedens van seksuele kinder misbruik aan te meld. Hierdie opname is gedoen in primêre skole regoor die Wes-Kaap om te leer oor ervarings en uitdagings van verslagdoening van seksuele kinder misbruik tussen grondslagfase opvoeders. Opsporing en verslagdoening van seksuele misbruik van kinders is een van die mees uitdagende take wat 'n onderwyser in die gesig staar, maar dit is ook een van die belangrikste. Ek is geïnteresseerd in u persoonlike opinie aangaande die aanmelding van sekseuele kinder misbruik.

U is by toeval gekies om deel te neem in hierdie studie. Primêre skole is ewekansig in elk van die agt skool distrikte gekies. Alle grondslagfase ondersyfers by hierdie skole is aangemoedig om deel te neem aan hierdie studie. Ek wil u verzeker dat al u individuele antwoorde streng vertroulik gehou sal word. U inligting sal anoniem bly en u individuele antwoorde sal nie gerapporteer word nie. In plaas daarvan, sal frekwensies en gemiddelde gebruik word in my bevindings. Ek sal nie 'n rekord van u naam of die skool waar u onderrig is nie.

U het die reg om te kies as u deel van hierdie studie wil wees of nie. U het ook die reg om enige vrae wat u nie wil beantwoord nie oor te slaan. Daar is geen regte of verkeerde antwoorde nie. U deelname is heetemal vrywillig en daar is geen oënskynlike fisiese risiko deur u betrokkenheid in hierdie studie.

Hierdie navorsing is goedgekeur deur die universiteit se Etiek in Navorsingskomitee. As u enige vrae het, kontak my gerus by deirdre.rule@gmail.com of 0822154349 of vir Dr Johannes John-Langba, my toesighouer by die universiteit, sy epos adres is johannes.john-langba@uct.ac.za.

U deelname is baie waardevol vir my studies en u ervarings kan nuttig wees om ondersyfers en kinders in Suid-Afrika en die res van die wêreld te help.

Hierdie opname sal ongeveer 20 minute neem om te beantwoord.

Stem u asseblief saam om deel te neem in hierdie studie? Merk asseblief. [ ]JA [ ]NEE

Indien u antwoord ja is, dateer hierdie vorm hieronder om u bereidwilligheid om deel te neem in my navorsing. Voltoo die aangehegte vraeys en keer terug beide hierdie toestemmingvorm en die vraeys in die self-gedasseerde koevert wat voorsien word. Geen posseil word benodig omdat ek alreeds die posgeld betaal het. Dankie dat u die tyd geneem het om hierdie vraeys te voltoo. Ek het die groot waardering vir u deelname.

______________________________

Datum

Indien u antwoord nee is, is daar geen behoefte om die vorms terug aan my te stuur nie. Dankie vir u tyd.
Deel 1: DEMOGRAFIESE INFORMASIEBLAD

1. Wat is u geslag?
   - Vroulik
   - Manlik

2. Wat is u bevolkingsgroep?
   - Afrikaan
   - Kleurling
   - Indiëër / Asiër
   - Blankes
   - Verkies om nie te antwoord nie

3. Hoe oud was u op u laaste verjaarsdag?
   ........... jaar oud

4. Wat is u huwelikstatus?
   - Enkellopend
   - Getrou of saamwoon
   - Vervreemd of geskei
   - Weduwe

5. Sorg u vir enige ander kinders, buiten die kinders wat u onderrig by die skool, as 'n ouer/voog?
   - Ja
   - Nee

6. Wat is u hoogste opvoedkundige kwalifikasie?
   - Diploma
   - Baccalaureusgraad
   - Nagraadse diploma
   - Meestersgraad
   - Doktorsgraad
   - Ander (spesifiseer asseblief)

7. Aan watter graad leerders bestee u die meeste van u tyd?
   - Graad R
   - Graad 1
   - Graad 2
   - Graad 3

8. In watter skool distrik verrig u tans onderrig?
   - Kaapse Wynland
   - Eden en Sentrale Karoo
   - Metro-Sentraal
   - Metro-Oos
   - Metro-Noord
   - Metro-Suid
   - Overberg
   - Weskus

9. Insluutend vanjaar, hoeveel jaar het u as 'n onderwyser gewerk?
   ........... jaar/jare
Deel 2: Houdings oor die aanmelding van seksuele misbruik van kinders

Met betrekking tot opsigte van die aanmelding van seksuele kindermisbruik, tot watter mate stem u saam of verskil u met die volgende stellings? Merk asseblief SLEGSTEEN blokkie per stelling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stem sterk saam</th>
<th>Stem saam</th>
<th>Neutraal</th>
<th>Verskil</th>
<th>Verskil sterk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Deel 3: SUBJEKTIEWE NORME

11. Met betrekking tot ander se menings ten opsigte van u aanmelding van seksuele kinder misbruik, tot watter mate stem u saam of verskil u met die volgende stellings? Merk asseblief \(\times\) SLEGS EEN blokkie per stelling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stem sterk saam</th>
<th>Stem saam</th>
<th>Neutraal</th>
<th>Verskil</th>
<th>Verskil sterk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Deel 4: PERSEPSIES VAN BEHEER OOR DIE GEDRAG

12. Met betrekking ten opsigte van hoe maklik dit is vir u om op te tree oor u oortuigings oor verslagdoening, tot watter mate stem u saam of verskil u met die volgende stellings? Merk asseblief \(\times\) SLEGS EEN blokkie per stelling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stem sterk saam</th>
<th>Stem saam</th>
<th>Neutraal</th>
<th>Verskil</th>
<th>Verskil sterk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Deel 5: KENNIS OOR VERPLIGTE VERSLAGDOENING

13. Rakende die aanmelding van seksuele kinder misbruik, meld aan of die volgende stellings WAAR of ONWAAR is. Merk asseblief \(\times\) SLEGS EEN blokkie per stelling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Waar</th>
<th>Onwaar</th>
<th>Onsieder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deel 6: VOORNEME OMAAN TE MELD SCENARIOS

Volgende kom 4 scenarios wat u kan teëkom as 'n onderwyser. Lees hulle asseblief versigtig deur en reageer op die beste van u kennis. Merk asseblief SLEGS EEN blokkie per vraag.

In hierdie deel van die opname, die term "verslagdoening" verwys na die formele verslae aan die skoolhoof, kinderbeskermingsdienste, die polisie, ens.

16 'n 9-jarige seun in 'n klas het gewoonlik goeie maniere, voltooi huiswerk konsekvent en presteer akademies goed. Maar, hy het hom buite sy karakter gedra vir die afgelope paar weke. Hy is ongehoorsaam in die klas, kom dikwels by die skool sonder om sy huiswerk te doen, en sy grade het skerp gedaal. Tydens 'n stil tydperk, vertel hy vir u dat 'n bauman, 'n vriend van sy ouers, vir sy paar weke vir hom pornografiese materiaal wys op die internet na skool. Hy sê ook dat die man aan sy private dele asook aan die man self raak terwyl hulle na die pornografiese materiaal kyk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dink u dat daar redelijke gronde is om te vermoed dat seksuele misbruik plaasgevind het?</th>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Nee</th>
<th>Onseker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dink u beduidende skade is veroorsaak, of kan neig om te veroorsaak, aan die kind se fisiese, siekundige of emosionele welstand?</th>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Nee</th>
<th>Onseker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vereis wettgewing van u om dit te rapporteer?</th>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Nee</th>
<th>Onseker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hoe waarsynlik sal u wees om hierdie geval te rapporteer, op 'n skaal van 1 - 7, waar 1 beteken dat u beslis nie die geval sal rapporteer nie en 7 is as jy dit beslis sal rapporteer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Sal beslis nie rapporteer nie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 'n 8-jarige meisie in jou klas wat gewoonlik gesellig en vrolik is, het geleidelik oor die laaste kwartaal haarself ontrek. Sy was twee keer selfs in fisieke konfrontasies met klasmate, wat buite haar karakter is. Op liggaamlike opvoeding (LO) klas, wat sy altyd deelgeneem het met smaak, was sy nie bereid om in haar LO klere te verander nie, en het beweer om siek te wees. Haar skoolwerk, wat altyd bo-gemiddelde was, het gelyke en sy vind dit moeilik om te konsentreer in die klas. By die geleenthede naby die einde van die skooldag, het sy gehuil en vir u gesê dat sy nie wil huistoe gaan voor 17:00 nie totdat haar Ma van die werk afkom. Sy vra om te bly by die skool tot op daardie tyd en bied aan om u te help met werk. U weet dat haar stiefpa werkloos is en die hele dag by die huis is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dink u dat daar redelijke gronde is om te vermoed dat seksuele misbruik plaasgevind het?</th>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Nee</th>
<th>Onseker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dink u beduidende skade is veroorsaak, of kan neig om te veroorsaak, aan die kind se fisiese, siekundige of emosionele welstand?</th>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Nee</th>
<th>Onseker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vereis wettgewing van u om dit te rapporteer?</th>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Nee</th>
<th>Onseker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) Hoe waarskynlik sal u wees om hierdie geval te rapporteer, op ‘n skaal van 1 - 7, waar 1 beteken dat u beslis nie die geval sal rapporteer nie en 7 is as jy dit beslis sal rapporteer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sal beslis nie rapporteer nie</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Sal beslis rapporteer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

”In 5-jarige meisie in u klas, met wie u ’n goeie verhouding het, vertel u dat haar pa aan haar private dele wat en hy laat haar “dinge doen”. U ken nie haar ouers bale goed nie, hoewel van wat u gese het, is die ma passief en ver, en die pa is, indien eniglets, oorbeskermerend. Hulle het twee ander dogters jonger as die meisie in u klas. Die meisie is teruggetrokke en somber vir die afgelope paar weke, wat nie gewoonlik haar houding is nie.”

a) Dink u dat daar redelike gronde is om te vermoed dat seksuele misbruik plaasgevind het?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Nee</th>
<th>Onseker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b) Dink u beduidende skade is veroorsaak, of kan neig om te veroorsaak, aan die kind se fisiese, siekdebile of emotionele welstand?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Nee</th>
<th>Onseker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

c) Vereis wetgewing van u om dit te rapporteer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Nee</th>
<th>Onseker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

d) Hoe waarskynlik sal u wees om hierdie geval te rapporteer, op ‘n skaal van 1 - 7, waar 1 beteken dat u beslis nie die geval sal rapporteer nie en 7 is as jy dit beslis sal rapporteer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sal beslis nie rapporteer nie</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Sal beslis rapporteer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

’In 7-jarige dogter in u klas het haar sosial ontrek en was onwillig om deel te neem aan aktiwiteite in die klas of tydens speeltyd. Die gehalte van haar skoolwerk het geleidelik verswaak oor ‘n paar maande. Sy kwa gereeld van maagpyn (wat onverklaarbaar is) en verskeie ander pyne en skote (b.v. hoofpyn) wat ook onverklaarbaar is. U weet dat haar ouers geskei is, en dat die meisie woon saam met haar ma, maar bly by haar vader se huis elke Woensdag en elke tweede naweek. Tydens ’n private gesprek met u, sê sy dat sy nie saam met haar pa will bly nie, en u merk op dat haar angs en kommer is veral sterk in die tye wanneer sy saam met hom bly. Verskeie kere het sy u ters benoud geword net voordat sy opgetel is deur haar pa. Sy vertel dat sy nie na haar vader se huis gaan nie, behalwe dat haar jonger vyf-jarige suster haar benodig om na haar te kyk. Sy sê dat sy die enigste een is wat haar suster kan beskerm.”

a) Dink u dat daar redelike gronde is om te vermoed dat seksuele misbruik plaasgevind het?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Nee</th>
<th>Onseker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b) Dink u beduidende skade is veroorsaak, of kan neig om te veroorsaak, aan die kind se fisiese, siekdebile of emotionele welstand?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Nee</th>
<th>Onseker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

c) Vereis wetgewing van u om dit te rapporteer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Nee</th>
<th>Onseker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

d) Hoe waarskynlik sal u wees om hierdie geval te rapporteer, op ‘n skaal van 1 - 7, waar 1 beteken dat u beslis nie die geval sal rapporteer nie en 7 is as jy dit beslis sal rapporteer?

| Sal beslis nie rapporteer nie | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Sal beslis rapporteer |
### Deel 7: VERLEDE ERVARING VAN VERSLAGDOENING

Hierdie vrae is oor u verlede ervaring van aanmelding van seksuele kinder misbruik as ’n primêre skool onderwyser.

18. Het u al ooit seksuele kinder misbruik gerapporteer?
   - Ja
   - Nee
   Hoeveel gevalle?

19. Het u al ooit seksuele kinder misbruik veroorde maar besluit het om dit nie aan te meld nie?
   - Ja
   - Nee
   Hoeveel gevalle?
   [beantwoord asseblief vraag 20]
   [slaan asseblief vraag 20 oor]

20. Oor die algemeen, hoe belangrik was die volgende faktore in u besluit(e) om nie hierdie verdagte gevalle aan te meld nie? Merk asseblief x SLEGS EEN toepaslike blokkie per stelling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baie belangrik</th>
<th>Belangrik</th>
<th>Ietwat belangrik</th>
<th>Glad nie belangrik nie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Skryf asseblief enige additionele kommentaar oor hierdie vrae(e) of studie onderaan:

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Dankie vir die tyd wat u afgestaan het om hierdie vrae(e) te voltooi. U terugvoering sal baie nuttig wees vir ons en vir onderwyser die toestemmingvorm en opname in die self-gedresseerde koevert voorsien en pos dit so gou as moontlik. Geen posseef word benodig omdat ek alrede die posgeld betaal het.

As jy enige vrae het, kontak my gerus by deirdre.rule@gmail.com of 0822154349 of Dr Johannes John-Langba, my toesighouer by die Universiteit van Kaapstad, by johannes.john-langba@uct.ac.za.
Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Deirdre Rule and I am a doctoral student in the Social Development Department at the University of Cape Town. As you know, the sexual abuse of young children is a serious problem in South Africa. Detecting and reporting child sexual abuse is one of the most challenging tasks a teacher may face, but it is also one of the most important. This survey is part of an investigation that tries to discover reasons why teachers report or fail to report their suspicions of child sexual abuse.

This survey is being conducted in primary schools across the Western Cape to learn about foundation phase teachers’ experiences and challenges in reporting child sexual abuse. Primary schools were selected randomly in each of the eight school districts. All teachers working at these schools in Grade R to Grade 3 will be approached to participate in this study.

This research has been approved by the University of Cape Town’s Ethics in Research Committee. Approval has also been obtained from the Western Cape Education Department’s Research Directorate (see enclosed letter). If you have any questions, please contact me at 0822154349 or deirdre.rule@gmail.com or Dr Johannes John-Langba, my supervisor at the university, at his email address, johannes.john-langba@uct.ac.za.

I kindly request that you hand out the enclosed questionnaires and self-addressed envelopes to every Grade R to Grade 3 teacher at your school. Although their participation is totally voluntary, I value your encouragement and support in them participating in this research.

Thank you for your assistance in handing out these survey forms to your teachers. Your time and participation are greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely

Deirdre Rule
UCT PhD student
September 2015

APPENDIX B: Cover-letters to principals
My naam is Deirdre Rule en ek is 'n doktorale student in die Departement Maatskaplike Ontwikkeling aan die Universiteit van Kaapstad.

Soos u weet, is die seksuele misbruik van jong kinders 'n ernstige probleem in Suid-Afrika. Opsporing en verslagdoening van seksuele kinder misbruik is een van die mees uitdagende take wat 'n onderwyser in die gesig staar, maar dit is ook een van die belangrikste. Hierdie opname is deel van 'n ondersoek wat redes probeer ontdek waarom onderwysers rapporteer of versuim om hul vermoedens van seksuele kinder misbruik aan te meld.

Hierdie opname is gedoen in primêre skole regoor die Wes-Kaap om te leer oor ervarings en uitdagings van seksuele kinder misbruik verslagdoening tussen grondslagfase opvoeders. Primêre skole is ewekansig in elk van die agt skool distrikte gekies. Alle onderwysers by hierdie skole van Graad R tot Graad 3 sal versoek word om deel te neem aan hierdie studie.

Hierdie navorsing is goedgekeur deur die Universiteit van Kaapstad se Etiek in Navorsingskomitee. Goedkeuring is ook verkry van die Wes-Kaapse Onderwysdepartement se Navorsing Direktoraat (sien ingeslote brief). As u enige vrae het, kontak my gerus by 0822154349 of deirdre.rule@gmail.com of vir Dr Johannes John-Langba, my toesighouer by die universiteit, sy epos adres is johnannes.john-langba@uct.ac.za.

Ek versoek dat u asseblief die ingeslote vraelyste en self-gerigte koeverte aan elke Graad R tot Graad 3 onderwyser by u skool gee. Hoewel hul deelname heeltemal vrywillig is, sal ek u aanmoediging en ondersteuning in hulle deelname aan hierdie navorsing baie waardeer.

Dankie vir u hulp in die uitdeel van hierdie vraelyste aan u onderwysers. U tyd en deelname word baie waardeer.

Die uwe

Deirdre Rule
UCT PhD student
September 2015
THE RESEARCH DIRECTOR  
WESTERN CAPE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT  
14 May 2015  

Dear Sir/Madam  

RE: DEIRDRE RULE (RLXDEI001)  

The aforementioned doctoral candidate is registered in the Department of Social Development and is being supervised by Dr Johannes John-Langba to whom all further queries may be directed. Her research "An investigation into factors that influence reporting of child sexual abuse amongst primary school teachers in South Africa: an application of the theory of planned behaviour" will be undertaken at various WCED schools as indicated in her proposal.  
I can vouch that the Department’s Ethics Committee has given this study ethical clearance after careful deliberation. I chaired the Ethics Committee meeting which comprised of the Head of Department as well as two other academics. The candidate is aware of the sensitive nature of this research and will be carefully supervised at every phase of this research to ensure ethical integrity throughout the process.  

Yours sincerely  

Dr Connie O’Brien  
[Postgraduate Research Convenor]  
Constance.obrien@uct.ac.za  

Supervisor: Dr Johannes John-Langba  
johannes.john-langba@uct.ac.za  

"Our Mission is to be an outstanding teaching and research university, educating for life and addressing the challenges facing our society."
APPENDIX D: WCED permission letter

Ms Deirdre Rule
60 Evremunde Road
Plumstead
7800

Dear Ms Deirdre Rule

RESEARCH PROPOSAL: AN INVESTIGATION INTO FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE REPORTING OF CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE AMONGST PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN SOUTH AFRICA: AN APPLICATION OF THE THEORY OF PLANNED BEHAVIOUR

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

1. Principals, educators and learners are under no obligation to assist you in your investigation.
2. Principals, educators, learners and schools should not be identifiable in any way from the results of the investigation.
3. You make all the arrangements concerning your investigation.
4. Educators’ programmes are not to be interrupted.
5. The Study is to be conducted from 20 July 2015 till 30 September 2015
6. No research can be conducted during the fourth term as schools are preparing and finalizing syllabi for examinations (October to December).
7. Should you wish to extend the period of your survey, please contact Dr A.T Wyngaard at the contact numbers above quoting the reference number?
8. A photocopy of this letter is submitted to the principal where the intended research is to be conducted.
9. Your research will be limited to the list of schools as forwarded to the Western Cape Education Department.
10. A brief summary of the content, findings and recommendations is provided to the Director: Research Services.
11. The Department receives a copy of the completed report/dissertation/thesis addressed to:
    The Director: Research Services
    Western Cape Education Department
    Private Bag X9114
    CAPE TOWN
    8000

We wish you success in your research.

Kind regards.
Signed: Dr Audrey T Wyngaard
Directorate: Research
DATE: 04 June 2015
APPENDIX E: TRQ authorisation

Queensland University of Technology

Deirdre M. Rule
PhD candidate RLXE1001
Department of Social Development
University of Cape Town
Private Bag X3
Rondebosch 7701
South Africa

2 June 2015

Approval to use/adapt the TRAS-CSA

The TRAS-CSA is one component of a larger survey, the Teacher Reporting Questionnaire (TRQ) that has been used with teachers in Australia, Malaysia, USA, Turkey and elsewhere. There are 5 versions of the TRQ which you can be located at http://eprints.qut.edu.au/view/person/Walsh, Kerryann.html (scroll to bottom of the page under the heading “other”). The versions differ according to the jurisdiction and school system (government or nongovernment) in which data was originally collected. The differences are only in the questionnaire sections on legislation and policy. Our research team would be happy for you to use this instrument in consultation with your supervisor(s).

On behalf of the research team, I grant permission for you to use and/or adapt the instruments as required.

Feel free to contact again if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Signed

Dr Kerryann Walsh
Associate Professor
School of Early Childhood, Faculty of Education
Queensland University of Technology
Phone: +61 7 3138 3174
Email: k.walsh@qut.edu.au