



© 2016 Ismail et al. This article follows the  Open Access policy of CC BY NC under Creative Commons attribution license v 4.0.



Submitted: 29/09/2016 - Accepted: 29/10/2016 - Published: 30/12/2016

The Prospect of Implementing Safety Education in Malaysian Primary Schools: from the Perspective of School Administrators

Khamsiah Ismail¹

Muhamad Farhan Mohamad Shukri¹

Mastura Badzis¹

Ssekamanya Siraje Abdallah¹

¹Department of Psychology, International Islamic University Malaysia

*Email: ikhamsiah@iium.edu.my

DOI: 10.26417/ejser.v6i2.p45-67

Abstract

Despite of the various attempts to implement safety practices in school, there still many unresolved issues related to students' safety in schools. This study aimed to explore and examine current safety management practices in Malaysian primary schools and the type of safety management plans adopted by the administrators for ensuring students' safety. The sample of this study consisted of 141 School Headmasters and Deputy Headmasters (Administration and Curriculum, Student Affairs or Co-curriculum), randomly selected from 138 primary schools in Kuala Lumpur and Selangor, Malaysia. Quantitative methods were used and the data of school administrators' attitude and stances in implementation of safety management practices were gathered using a set questionnaire. The data was then tabulated, summarized and evaluated to draw conclusions from them, using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS). Results from the study indicated that there was a strong positive attitude among school administrators in relation to safety management plan and policy practices in school. Teachers' and staffs' participation and parental and community involvement are significantly and positively predicted by school administrators' commitment and

communication; as well as safety education, training and campaign at schools. Some of the safety practices investigated in the study were not observed in schools due to increasing workload and responsibilities of teachers and their time availability. Safety practices at the schools mostly depended on the issues that are considered as important by the respective schools. As the implication of this study, some recommendations were made to help schools to improve safety practices at school and promote cooperation between school administrators, teachers, parents and community as a whole. The study also implied that implementation of safety management education in Malaysian primary school has a good prospect.

Keywords: safety management, safety practices, school safety

Introduction

Children have little control over the environment surrounding them as it is getting more challenging. They must depend on adults to keep them safe and enable them to endure various kinds of risks. "Every year around the world, thousands of children die from injuries, while countless more are seriously hurt. Many of these injuries lead to permanent disability and brain damage. The most common injuries are caused by falls, burns, drowning and road accidents" (UNICEF Malaysia, 2012). A review of these situations reveals that most of these accidents and injuries happen in or near the home. In some instances, the accidents happen at school. Students might get injuries because they either get involve or become the victims of crime and violence. Despite these possible incidents the fact is that, almost all can be prevented.

Then, is it possible to provide every child a good start in life? Can school, parents, teachers and other stakeholders play their roles to ensure that every child is given the opportunity to have safe life and provide them with the services as well as supports that they need to thrive their full human potential? More importantly, as questioned by Kitamura (2014) "Do children have sufficient capabilities to respond to risks?" and "...if not, how can they acquire such capabilities?" Thus, safety is of paramount importance in school and safety education appears to be deemed vital.

In Malaysia, "schools have a legal responsibility to ensure the safety of students under the common law doctrine of *in loco parentis*" (Tie, 2014, p. 119). Traditionally, preventative measures were used to address negative behaviours and school circulars were disseminated by authorities (Ministry of Education, 1975). School rules are posted in every classroom, staff room and on school notice boards, and school bags, equipment and grounds checked by teachers and prefects. All teachers were required to recognize and understand the various ordinances and circulars related to school discipline. School rules were enforced using a system of surveillance, penalties and punishments (i. e. suspension, expulsion, alternative school placement and arrest) (Purkey, 1999), although fines were not imposed on parents or guardians.

The aim of this study is threefold: (1) To assess the attitudes of school administrators in relation to safety management plan and policy practices; (2) To investigate the school administrators' stances in the current implementation of safety management practices; and (3) To determine to what extent are the changes in (i) school teachers and staffs' participation; and (ii) parental and community involvement are predicted by (i) school administrators' commitment and communication; and (ii) safety education, training and campaign at schools.

Literature Review

Principles of Safety Management

Safety management refers to the actual practices, roles and functions associated with remaining safe (Kirwan, 1998 in Clarke & Cooper, 2004). Mearns, Whitaker and Flin (2003) identified three general themes in safety management which are: (i) genuine and consistent management commitment to safety involving personal attendance of managers at safety meetings and face-to-face meeting with employees; (ii) communication (formal and informal) about safety issues between management and subordinates at all level; and (iii) involvement of employees, including empowerment, and designation of responsibility for safety. Although their suggestions are for safety management in the offshore environments, they seems to be relevant in other settings like schools. In addition, it is also important to audit tools (Lutchman, Maharaj, & Ghanem, 2012), audit safe climate of the workforce and management practices (Lee & Harrison, 2000) to ensure effectiveness of safety management practices and to minimize safety issues in workplace.

While safety issues have been a concern in some fields, it should be an an emphasis in any educational institution. Other researchers (Xaxx, 2010; Reeves, Kanan, & Plog 2010; Phipott & Kuenstle, 2007; Frumkin, Geller, & Rubin, 2006) are in agreement that at least four principles of a safety management system are important in school: (i) education for all staff and management to enable them to understand safety policies and standards practices to ensure effective safety management in school; (ii) site maintenance which include effective and regular maintenance and repair of tool and equipment so that they are in good conditions and good working order, and are able to be utilized by everyone when required; (iii) standard safety equipment which includes fire-extinguishers, fire-alarm, water dispenser, smoke detector, and bucket containing water and sand within compound; and (iv) communication between various levels in school in forms of verbal, information notices and regular staff meetings.

Types of Safety Management

Although many types of management had been highlighted Lister's (2010) looked appropriate for educational institutions and settings. He proposed four types of safety management practices which are:

- (i) Work-centric safety management system - uses mechanism, tool improvement and careful adjustment of space to ensure that the environment is as safe as possible
- (ii) Worker-centric safety management system - focus on employee's behaviour to limit accidents and provide training to employees and involve them in develop safety guidelines and decision making.
- (iii) Autocratic safety management system - have top-down communication with staff and empowers supervisors and human resource manager to implement the principle of the safety management system especially in decision-making.
- (iv) Democratic safety management system - focuses on the distribution of authority, and empowers workers to shape safety policies

Characteristic of Best Practice for School Safety System

Literatures have suggested an abundance of school safety management system and practices, and among them are Ohio Bureau of Workers' Compensation (2005). The Bureau outlines the following strategies: (i) management commitment (e. g. development of a comprehensive approach to safety that focused on both students and employees' safety in school; (ii) employees' participation and involvement in safety in school; (iii) communication of safety policy statement and safety responsibilities to all stakeholders; (iv) Providing safety education and training to ensure employees and students are not injured or made ill by the work and activities they do; (v) Injury reporting and treatment that occurred in school; (vi) Safety audits and inspections that focus on both unsafe conditions and unsafe behaviour; and (viii) Safety programs to promote safe school environment that is conducive for teaching process.

Malaysian School Safety Program

The Malaysian Ministry of Education (MoE) Malaysia has established a system and policy on school safety measures. Directives are given to all Educational Departments Office and schools throughout the country in forms of circular letters in particular, "Ikhtisas" Circular Letters (*Surat Pekeliling Ikhtisas*). Four main major categories in Circular issued by the MoE Malaysia are curriculum, co-curriculum, administration and students affairs. The implementation of safety at school is put under students' affairs matters. Examples of the circulars are as follows:

- (i) Students Safety at School. vol. 8/1988 - reminds school administrators to be alert with any possibilities that can cause harm to students as well as to take preventive steps on it
- (ii) Students Safety When Coming to and Going Back From School. vol. 8/1999 - highlights the importance of establishing rules of safety to protect students from becoming criminal victim in or outside the school.
- (iii) Addressing Security Issues, Drugs, and Gangsterism. vol. 6/2000 - focuses on maintaining student safety and prevention of drugs, and other undesirable

incidents such as threatening, kidnapping, rape, drugs abuse, and gangsterism or “triad society” in schools.

- (iv) Implementation on School Safety Program. vol. 4/2002 - provides guideline on creation of a situation where all school community will feel safe to carry out teaching and learning activities, as well as extracurricular activities without any interference from within or outside.
- (v) Safety Guideline for Attending activities and Program beyond school hours. vol. 8/2009 - emphasizes school’s responsibility to ensure student safety during outdoor school activities.
- (vi) Students Safety Management at School. vol. 8/2011 - reminds s school to act against anything that may threaten students’ safety and creates awareness among school administrators to be more cautious with any possibilities that can cause harm to students and take an action on how to prevent it.

Apart from these circulars, there were many others which addresses specific issues related to safety management and practices such as reports of accidents at school, safety during sports education and co-curricular activities, health care, preparation for natural disaster, student safety during coming to school and back from school, fire prevention and fire drill.

Related Studies in Malaysia

Despite an abundance of circulars that carried directives from the Ministry of Education Malaysia, it has been found that there is a lack of comprehensive coverage on studies and findings related to safety practices in primary schools in Malaysia. Available literatures are based on studies conducted from year of 2000 and above. Mahadi (2000) who examined perceptions and attitudes regarding school safety at two high-risk boys’ school, Kuala Lumpur. The study also analyses the effect of fear of school crime and violence on victimized students toward their perceptions of personal safety. It was found that although school was perceived as a safe place, students are being physically victimized in their school. Victimized students were likely to have a fear of crime while in school and travelling to and from school. The result also indicates the prevalence of students carrying weapons to school for self-protection and gang-related, and the existence of gang members in the school. Most of students suggested that police and professional security personnel regularly patrolling schools might help to increase security and safety in the schools. With regard to school access safety, Suid (2004) suggested that the access in schools, there are certain guidelines such as appropriate width of main entrance and exit, proper pedestrian walkways with non-slippery material, suitable materials for signage and proper access to drop-off area and parking areas should be taken into consideration.

Studies on school safety management and practices have also been conducted on teachers and principals. Abdullah (2006) revealed that majority of the teachers have positive perceptions towards the principal’s role in ensuring school safety as stipulated by the Safe School manual and Circular from the Ministry of Education

regarding school safety. Security wise, Idris (2008) identified that students experienced emotional (e. g. smoking, gangsters, bully) and physical (vandalism, maintenance and classroom's conditions). About leadership of principals in implementing the school safety regulations, Norazlida Shamsuri (2008) reported that the principals have clear leadership roles in managing their school safety issues. Effectiveness of interventions had also been measured. In her experimental study on the effectiveness of awareness on CyberSAFE information program among pre-service teachers, Saarani (2014) conveyed improved attitudes, and increased knowledge among the teachers which indicated the effectiveness of programs and the importance of using technologies to promote and improve safety.

Indeed, there are a lot of suggestions on ways to enhance safety of school community especially the staff and students. Policies and implementation of good practices of school safety management are also abundant. Like other countries across the world, Malaysia never take the the safety of student especially in the school compound lightly. Despite many efforts that have been made by the Ministry of Education, the State and District Education Offices to ensure that schools have safe and conducive environment, although the rate was not high, unwanted incidents that have caused injuries happened at school. The disparity here is probably structured safety education has not been implemented. Are the school authorities ready and have adequate knowledge to implement safety education at school? This study was embarked to explore view of the school administrator on prospect of implementing safety education in Malaysian primary school by examining their attitudes on implementation of plan and policy practices of school safety management. Their stances in the existing implementation of safety management practices were also investigated. Findings on relationships between several variables in in safety management practices would also provide some insight on way to enhance the involvement of teachers, school staff, parents and community in safety education.

Methodology

Research Design

To undertake the objectives of this descriptive cross-sectional study, questionnaires were utilized to collect data of the school administrators' attitudes in relation to safety management plan and policy practices, and its implementation. The questionnaire was also used to obtain data of their stances in implementation of safety management practices in relation to commitment and communication; safety education, training and campaign at schools; school teachers and staffs' participation; parental and community involvement; safety audit, maintenance and inspections as well as injury reporting and treatment.

Survey research is utilized in this study to gain insight into the thoughts, ideas, opinions, and attitudes of a population. This method enable the researcher to describe and draw conclusions from frequency counts and other types of analysis. Although it

is descriptive in nature, survey research may serve as a stimulus for more in-depth and analytical research such as correlational and causal-comparative studies (Salkind, 2010).

Participants

Population

The research population is a group of individuals that shares the same characteristics from the different group of people (Creswell, 2012). The targeted population for this study comprises of 587 school administrators from the Malaysian national schools in Selangor (446) and Kuala Lumpur (141).

Sample and Sampling Procedure

Stratified random sampling technique was utilized in data collection as it can provide greater precision and requires a smaller sample. The researcher in this study stratified the sample to the specific characteristics and used random sampling to select the respondents. Stratified random sampling technique is usually used when researcher intentionally selects the individuals who can best give information and help the researcher understand the phenomenon (Gay & Airasian, 2014). Specifically, the research population was selected from National primary schools in Selangor and Kuala Lumpur excluding National Type (Chinese) Primary School (*Sekolah Rendah Jenis Kebangsaan Cina - SJKC*), and National Type (Tamil) Primary School (*Sekolah Rendah Jenis Kebangsaan Tamil - SJKt*). This is not an issue at all as in most schools in Malaysia, the administrators, teachers and students are multi-ethnic and multi-religion.

One of the main objectives of this study is to look at safety management practices in National primary schools in Malaysia. For the respondents, sample size was calculated using sample size calculator with 95% confidence level and below 10% margin error which amounted to 80 out of total 446 National primary schools in Selangor and 58 out of total 141. In sum, 58% of the samples were from Selangor and the rest (42%) were from Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur.

Instruments

One of the significant common types of instruments used for the quantitative research survey is questionnaire because it provides efficiency in collecting data and allows data collection from a large sample and requires less time, and less cost. Questionnaire can assure respondents' confidentiality and anonymity and hence, helps to gain more truthful response than face-to-face interviews (Gay, 1992).

The questionnaire was specially developed for the purpose of this study and examined for face and content validities by three experts in this field. It comprised of the following areas:

- (i) The attitudes of school administrators in relation to safety management plan and policy practices;
- (ii) The school administrators' stances in implementation of safety management practices

The questionnaire was constructed in two languages; English and Malay language to facilitate the Malaysian school administrators since using mother tongue language develops more sense and understanding.

Description of Instrument

The questionnaire used for the school administrators consisted of 66 items in three major sections. Section (A) comprises of six items, which requested the respondents to provide their demographic information. The items included are gender, age, school area, years of working experience, current administrative post and school location.

Section (B) comprises of 12 items, which measured the safety management plan and policy practices in school. A Five-point Likert Scale measurement is used to identify level of agreement which rated responses from "strongly disagree", "disagree", "neutral/not sure", "agree" to "strongly agree". "Strongly disagree" is used in this study to describe that respondents are strongly unfavourable with the statements, while "disagree" describe that respondents are somewhat unfavourable with the statements. "Neutral/not sure" is used to describe that respondents are undecided, neither agree or disagree. "Agree" is used to describe that respondents are somewhat favourable with the statements, and "strongly agree" is to describe that respondents are strongly favourable with the statements.

Section (C) comprises of 48 items, which focus on safety management practices in school that covered six aspects as follows:

No	Aspects of Safety Management	Items	Total
i.	commitment and communication	1 – 10	10
ii.	safety education, training and campaign at schools	11 – 18	8
iii.	school teachers and staffs' participation	19 – 28	9
iv.	parental and community involvement	19 – 28	9
v.	parental and community involvement	29 – 34	5
vi.	safety audit, maintenance and inspections	35 – 42	7
vii.	injury reporting and treatment	43 - 48	6

A four-point Likert scale measurement from "not at all", "very little", "somewhat" to "to a great extent" was used to identify level of administrators' agreement on the statements. "Not at all" is used in this study to describe that such practices did not exist in schools, while "very little" describes that practices happen on some occasions.

“Somewhat” is used to explain that safety practices exist commonly in schools. “To a great extent” is used to describe that practices exist often in school.

Data Collection Procedure

As the instrument was specially developed for this study data was collected twice. The first was used to establish the reliability and validity of the instrument via pilot study. The second was for the actual study. Proposal for the study and the questionnaire were submitted to the Ministry of Education Malaysia for approval and endorsement to conduct the study. Upon approval, permission was obtained from the Department of Education Selangor and Department of Education Wilayah Persekutuan Kuala Lumpur.

Data Analysis

The data were gathered using questionnaires, then tabulated, summarized and evaluated to draw conclusions from them, using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS). Simple frequency distribution and percentage was used to present data in the responses. Means scores and standard deviation were acquired to assess the level of respondents’ perception based on the class interval as given below.

Safety management practices in school are rated on four point of rating scale:

Means Interval	Degree of Implementation
1. 00 – 1. 49	Means that the implementation is rate on worst level
1. 50 – 2. 49	Means that the implementation is rate on poor level
2. 50 – 3. 49	Means that the implementation is rate on moderate level
3. 50 – 4. 00	Means that the implementation is rate on good / excellent level

Descriptive analyses i. e. frequency and percentage were obtained in order to assess the attitudes of school administrators in relation to safety management plan and policy practices and also to investigate the school administrators’ stances in implementation of safety management practices. Simple linear regression were used to determine the extent of the changes in (i) school teachers and staffs’ participation; and (ii) parental and community involvement were predicted by (i) school administrators’ commitment and communication; and (ii) safety education, training and campaign at schools.

Reliability and Validity of the Instruments

Psychometric properties, particularly reliability and validity of the instruments were established using data collected in pilot study. The questionnaire developed for this study was pilot-tested in which it was tried out with a small group who are familiar with the variables of the study and are in a position to make valid judgement about the items (Creswell, 2012; Wiersma, 1986). This pilot study involved 12 school administrators who were selected through purposive sampling method. Comments, feedback and recommendations on the items in questionnaire were noted and taken

into consideration for correction and improvement. The result of the pilot study indicated that the reliability score for all items is Cronbach alpha (α) = 0.945. Table 1 (Appendix) shows details of the reliability of the instruments used in this study.

Face validity and content validity were established by three experts in the Kulliyah (Faculty) of Education who were in the areas of psychometric, educational psychology and counseling respectively to avoid any ambiguous words and to ensure the meaning of the questions could be understood by the participants. In addition, it is also to ensure that the questionnaires are able to answer the research questions. Normality assumption was tested through examination of the data distribution. To examine construct validity, bivariate analysis using Pearson two-tailed correlation coefficient was performed between the constructs. Positive significant correlation between $r = .507$, $p < .01$ and $r = .702$, $p < .01$ were demonstrated between the constructs. The moderate to moderately high correlation indicate that the construct are related to each other, share some common characteristics and measuring the similar domains which are school safety management and implementation. Nevertheless, multicollinearity does not exist as the constructs are not highly correlated. Hence construct validity of the instrument was established. Refer Table 2 (Appendix) for further details.

Results of the Main Study

Respondent's Demographic Background

In this study, 41.8% of the respondents are male and 58.2% of the respondents are female respondents. Regarding the school area, 62.4% are located in rural area and 37.6% are located in urban area. As for the administrative position of respondents, 18.4% were School Headmasters, 13.5% were Deputy Headmaster (Administration & Curriculum), 61% were Deputy Headmaster (Student Affairs), and the rest 7.1% were Deputy Headmaster (Co-curriculum). In terms of their ages, 0.7% of the respondents were less than 30 years of age, 13.5% were in the age range of between 30-39 years, 41.8% were between 40-49 years, and 44% were between 50-60 years. In terms of working experience, 3.5% of the respondents have an experience of less than 10 years, 29.1% had working experience between 10-19 years, 36.9% between 20-29 years, and 30.5% between 30-40 years respectively. Finally, in terms of school location, 57.4% of the respondents were representatives from primary schools in Selangor and 42.6% while the rest were from primary schools in Kuala Lumpur. The demographic data of the respondents are based on frequency and percentage as shown in Table 3 (Appendix).

Attitudes of School Administrators in Relation to Safety Management Plan and Policy Practices

Data analysis on 12 items examining school administrators' attitudes in relation to school safety management plan and policy practices in ensuring school and students'

safety revealed a positively skewed findings where most of the respondents reported their agreement with most of the items.

Results of the study indicated that the school administrators were in agreement (“agree” and “strongly agree”) with the statements related to safety management plan and policy practices at school. For instance, 73.8% respondents reported that their school safety plan and policies covered physical and psychological safety. Apart from that 65.2% conveyed that their schools have “specific plan and policies on how to improve safety on school site such as school environment, school facilities, and school surrounding” and that the “safety plan and policies are reviewed annually and updated where necessary.” Item 1 “My school has an official written plan and policies that clearly define roles of each individual at school (e. g. administrators, teachers & etc.)” and Item 9 “The implementation of my school plan and policy is an order which directly comes from Minister of Education, State Educational Department, or Educational District Educational Office” received the highest “strongly agree” responses which were 56% and 55.3% respectively. Interestingly however, almost half of the respondents (48.9%) reported that they disagree that their school safety plan and policies at school level were decided only by school administrators without any interference from other parties such as teachers, staffs, or parents. Refer Table 4.1 (Appendix) for details of the results.

The School Administrators’ Stances in the Current Implementation of Safety Management Practices

In measuring the above variable, the study was categorized into six indicators as presented below:

Management Commitment and Communication

Descriptive analyses of school administrators’ responses on the implementation of safety management practices in their school in relation to management commitment and communication (10 items) showed that the respondents conveyed that they “somewhat agree” and “agree to a great extent” with all statements and the percentages ranged between 87% to 99.3%. Approximately 84% respondents agreed to a great extent that they consistently corrected and reminded students about risky behaviour and the importance of safety at school (Item 10) and 80% gave similar response that they played active roles in promoting and enhancing safety at school.

As stipulated in Table 4.2 (Appendix) the result on school administrator’ responses also indicated that “to a great extent” they have clearly defined the risky behaviours (70.9%) and its consequences were explained to all teachers, staffs and students (73%). Interestingly however, the school administrators’ responses showed that school “somewhat” set a benchmark and guidelines on safety performances as a mechanism to guide intervention, measurement and improvement for school safety practices (53.2%), and schools have continuously made an effort through collecting

data, making analysis, and developing new strategies to improve school safety plan and policies to build a conducive learning environment (54. 6%).

Safety Education, Training and Campaign at Schools

With regard to the above aspect, between 78% to 98. 5% of school administrators reported their agreement (“somewhat agree” and “to a great extend agree”) that safety education, training and campaign were carried out at schools. About 70% strongly agreed that “terms related with safety have been included in orientation program process for new students, new staffs and parents.” However, it is intriguing to note that between 40% to 52% reported that they moderately (somewhat) agree with seven of eight items. For instance, school administrators’ perceived that schools “somewhat” considered safety training as one of the important in-service training method for staffs and teachers (49. 6%), and “somewhat” cooperate with authorities to conduct a safety forum to increase safety awareness, knowing the current safety issues and how it is addressed (49. 6%). The fact that about 21% of the school administrators reported that they have very little agreement or do not quite agree that “school administrators and teachers need to attend a course on how to educate students, teachers and staffs to improve their safety concern at school” and that “teachers, staffs and students received fire extinguisher training” are important to note. These responses inferred the there were school administrators who might have thought that there was very little need that teachers and staff be sent to safety educational courses and there were also schools where the teachers, staff and students who rarely or probably never (1. 4%) receive training in handling fire extinguisher. Refer Table 4. 3 (Appendix) for full data.

School Teachers and Staffs’ Participation

The data obtained from the school administrators’ responses as stipulated in Table 4. 4 (Appendix) showed that 100% of teachers and staffs (78% “to a great extent” and 22% “somewhat”) always helped to support school administrators by monitoring students’ safety at school. Referring to the descriptive analysis, more than 90% school administrators felt that they could obtain good cooperation in term of teachers and staff participation in implementation of safety education. For example, “to a great extent” 75. 9% saw that staffs or teachers are always available to supervise students during or beyond school hour activities or on weekend. However, with regard to outreach work such as publishing a safety newsletter and distribute to teachers, staffs and students observed a less encouraging view with 36. 9% responded “very little” and 39. 7% “somewhat “ agreements respectively. A rather moderate number (61. 7%) of the respondent somewhat agree that school safety committee always conducts meetings, prepare and post meeting minutes at school notice board.

Parental and Community Involvement

Almost 52% of the respondents “to a great extent” perceived that parents and community gave support, provided information about students’ movement, and made a close contact with school as a step to strengthen safety practices at school.

However, results of the study shows that they “somewhat” complied and (51. 8%), and that families were active participants in supporting safety education practices in school by gradually attending safety meeting and involve in any safety program at school (50. 4%). School administrators’ responses showed that schools “very little” (31. 9%) have visits from local public safety agencies like police and fire brigade to do a walk- through of the school to familiarize them with school layout. Based on the responses “somewhat agree” (41. 8%) it is indicated that at least one of the parents and a member of the community appointed as a member of school safety committee to determine safety plan and policies at school. Only 8. 5% of the respondents reported that community did not help school by patrolling and monitoring around school area at all. Table 4. 5 (Appendix) presents detail results.

Safety Audit, Maintenance and Inspections

The data obtained from the schools’ administrators’ responses as demonstrated in Table 4. 6 (Appendix) show that 67. 4% of them “to a great extent” had always ensured that regular areas used by staffs and students were regularly checked and well maintained. Results from the school administrators’ responses show that school “somewhat” (51. 8%) makes a comprehensive audit to all facilities every year. While “very little” (10. 6%) conducting inspections and patrolling after school hours conditions. “Not at all” (2. 1%) have made a monthly playground safety inspection.

Injury Reporting and Treatment

As demonstrated in Table 4. 7 (Appendix), 83% of the school administrators agreed to a great extent that any major or minor accidents and injuries were immediately reported to them and the authorities. They (67. 4%) also strongly agreed that the school provided a list of emergency numbers; such as for police, ambulance, and fire-brigade at places where students frequently gather. However, the respondents (45. 4%) moderately agrees that the schools formed accident-review team to make sure accident reports are filled completely, identify the cause factor analysis, and ensure proper follow-up action have been taken. They reported that they (30. 5%) rarely (“very little”) sent a representative to meet with medical panel to discuss about treatment procedures and ways to communicate about injury and treatment. About 16% indicated that they had never (“not at all”) invited selected panel to check medical facilities at school so that they are familiar with school’s safety procedure and operation.

Summary of the School Administrators’ Stances in the Current Implementation of Safety Management Practices

As demonstrated in Table 4. 8 (Appendix), school administrators were positive in their views in implementation of safety management practices. This is indicated by means of each sub-scale (in order from the highest to the lowest) management commitment and communication, safety audit, maintenance and inspection, school

teachers and staffs participation, safety education, training and campaign, parental and community involvement and injury reporting and treatment.

Relationships between Variables

In determining the extent of the changes in (i) school teachers and staffs' participation; and (ii) parental and community involvement are predicted by (i) school administrators' commitment and communication; and (ii) safety education, training and campaign at schools the two variables which are related to each other i. e. MCC and SECT ($r = .691$, $p < .01$) were combined to form an independent or determinant variable. The interaction between these two variables were anticipated to predict the (STSP) and also (PCI) in implementation of safety management practices in schools better. Results from linear regression analyses are presented in two subtopics as follows:

Effects of School Administrators' Commitment and Communication - Safety Education, Training and Campaign at Schools on School Teachers' and Staffs' Participation

To test the effects of MACC and SETC combination (predictors) on perceived school teachers' participation, a linear regression analysis (one-way independent ANOVA) was performed. As shown in Table 4. 9 (Appendix) there is a moderately strong relationship between the predictors and dependent variables ($R = .770$), and 59% of the variance in school and staff participation could be accounted by the management commitment and communication and also educational campaign and training provided. The variance explained was reported to be 59%. An analysis of variance showed that the effect of MCC and also ECT on SSP was significant, [$F(2, 138) = 100.77$, $p = 0.000$]. Analysis of MACC and SECT scores with a one-way independent ANOVA also demonstrated positive results. Management communication and commitment has a regression coefficient of 0.45 indication that as an increase of the variable in one unit will increase the participation by 0.45. It can be 95% confident that the population coefficient is between 0.31 and 0.60. The t-value is 6.10 with associate probability of 0.00, thus the regression coefficient is unlikely arisen by sampling error. On the other hand, a regression coefficient indicates that the increase of the educational campaign and training in school safety management by one unit effect the change of the teachers and staff participation by 0.34. The 95% confident interval infers that the population coefficient is between 0.21 and 0.47.

Effects of School Administrators' Commitment and Communication - Safety Education, Training and Campaign at Schools on Parental and Community Involvement

The results of linear regression analysis showed that there is a moderately strong relationship between the predictors and dependent variables ($R = .731$), and 53% of the variance in school and staff participation could be accounted by the management commitment and communication and also educational campaign and training

provided. The variance explained was reported to be 53%. A one-way ANOVA was calculated on respondents' ratings of effect of management commitment and communication and also educational campaign and training on parents and community involvement. The analysis was significant, $[F(2, 138) = 79.00, p = 0.000]$.

Management communication and commitment has a regression coefficient of 0.47 indicating that increase the participation of parents and community by 0.47 is caused by as an increase of the earlier variable in one unit. It can be 95% confident that the population coefficient is between 0.23 and 0.71. The t-value is 6.10 with associate probability of 0.00, thus the regression coefficient is unlikely arisen by sampling error. On the other hand, a regression coefficient indicates that the increase of the educational campaign and training in school safety management by one unit effect the change of the teachers and staff participation by 0.66. The 95% confident interval infers that the population coefficient is between 0.46 and 0.88. Refer Table 4.10 (Appendix) for further details

Summary and Discussion

Ensuring safety in school becomes a priority nowadays. Although the occurrences of incidents in schools that cause injury or death might be small in this country, stake holders especially parents express that concerns about the need of an adequate safety practices to be implemented in schools to promote safe and conducive environment for their children. Despite the current safety management practices in educational settings which were well-stated and documented, this study was embarked to investigate the attitude of 341 school administrators in Selangor and Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur primary schools towards safety management plan and policy practices. Other than that, their stances in implementation of safety management practices was also examined. The topic understudy also explored if school administrators commitment and communication, as well as safety education, training and campaign conducted by the schools have bearing on school teachers and staffs participations as well as parents and community involvements in school safety-related programs.

The results if descriptive analysis in this study revealed that the school administrators had positive attitudes in relation to school safety management plan and policy implementations especially in dealing with physical and psychological safety their students. They reported that the plans and policies contained clear and important characteristics of good safety planning and suitable with the necessary situations. Besides that, plan and policies on how to improve safety on school site such as school environment, school facilities, and school surrounding were outlined and annually reviewed. Roles of each individual at school were were also clearly defined. The school plan and policy is an order which directly comes from Minister of Education, State Educational Department, or Educational District Educational Office and not only solely decided by the schools or suggested by teachers, staff and parents. This practice indicates that school administrators in Selangor and Kuala Lumpur were in line with

the directives extended by the Ministry of Education Malaysia through the many “Ikhtisas” circulars.

It is also important to note that the findings of this study revealed the practice of the school administrators in Selangor and Kuala Lumpur were in congruent with Lister’s (2010) work-centric safety management system as the schools have a specific safety plan and policies which cover the safety of personal and individuals which could be for assessed and improved. They agreed that safety education, training and campaign were carried out at schools, and the school safety plan and policies should be reviewed annually and updated when necessary to ensure they are suitable with the current situations (worker-centric safety management system). Apart from that, practices of autocratic safety management system were observed through the order by the top authority through “Ikhtisas” circular letter and administrators only have to implement them at school. In terms of decision making at schools, some schools practice demonstrate safety management system while others practice autocratic management system. Hence, result indicates that although some schools in Selangor and Kuala Lumpur practice autocratic safety management system in decision making, they still encourage teachers, parents and staff to participate by proposing additional ideas in order to enhance the schools administrators to decide safety plans and policies at school for the best interest of all the parties concerned.

This study need to acknowledge the works of previous researchers (e. g. Mearns, Whitaker & Flin, 2003; Lutchman, Maharaj, & Ghanem, 2012; Xaxx, 2010; Reeves, Kanan, & Plog 2010; Phipott & Kuenstle, 2007; Frumkin, Geller, & Rubin, 2006) that have contributed to the initial draft of the instrument for this study. The best practices for school safety system propose by Ohio Bureau of Workers’ Compensation (2005) had also been adopted and adapted in determining the sub-scales and development of items in the instrument.

This study also revealed interesting findings in relation to the their stances on the current implementation of safety management program. School administrators played active roles to promote and enhance safety at schools, developed an action plan with clear goals and objectives, conduct a safety meeting and distribute post minute meeting, set a benchmark and guideline of measurement (KPI), make an effort to improve schools’ safety plan and policies. The results of the present study was in support of Shamsuri (2008) who notified that the principals has clear leadership roles in managing their school safety issues. Statistically, $M = 3.514$, $SD = 0.401$ conveys that the management commitment and communication was rated at good level. It also showed that school administrators are clear with their responsibilities in committing and communicating about safety in schools. They conformed the directive from MoE Malaysia (e. g. Students Safety at School. vol. 8/1988; Implementation on School Safety Program. vol. 4/2002) that school safety guidelines must be understood and adhered to by teachers, staff and parents and should be strictly conducted and implemented as a part of school rules and regulations. Apart from that the circulars

also convey that school administrators need to conduct a special briefing with community, government and non-government agencies to encourage their contribution in this program. In The similar result found by Shamsuri (2008) shows that the principals have clear leadership roles in managing their school safety issues.

Although the study revealed that safety education, training and campaign at school ($M = 3.337$, $SD 0.444$) were being carried out, there are schools that have never conducted training among teachers, staffs and students on how to use fire extinguisher nor educate their teachers and staff to recognize any situations that could endanger students. This conduct is not in compliance with Fire Prevention at School. vol. 7/2000 that talks and exhibitions on fire prevention programs which include fire extinguisher demonstration should be carried out. The school management should strongly consider to train teachers, staff and even students and their parents to operate fire extinguisher to prepare them for the unforeseen circumstances related to break of fire in or outside school. As reported by, Saarani (2014) pre-service teachers displayed improved attitudes, and increased knowledge after attending CyberSAFE information program effectiveness of programs and the importance of using technologies to promote and enhance safety.

School teachers and staff participation were considerably good ($M = 3.446$, $SD = 0.399$). It is also good recognize that teachers always helped to support school administrators by monitoring students' safety and were always available to supervise students during or beyond school hour activities such as sports and co-curricular programs as stated in MoE safety measures e. g. Sport Education and Co-Curricular Activities Inside and Outside of School. vol. 1/1995 and vol 9/2000; Students Safety When Coming to and Going Back From School. vol. 8/1999). This practice was in accord with Nevertheless, outreach work such as publishing a safety newsletter and distribute to teachers, staffs and students need to be improved as the results of this study observed a less encouraging view with regard to this statement. This finding nevertheless was incompatible with suggestion provided in the same circular that school should display posters and regulation charts to increase students' awareness on the importance of safety in all circumstances.

School administrators reported that they kept in touch with local safety mandate, state or other related agencies to develop safety program at school and they also received support from parents and community and they provided information to the school about students' movement This is in correspondence with a directive in Implementation on School Safety Program. vol. 4/2002 circular that suggest schools to establish a committee in school with representatives from school staffs, community, and government and non-government agencies to improve safety in schools.

In many schools families were active participants in supporting safety education practices in school by gradually attending safety meeting and involve in any safety program (50.4%). However, it is essential to note that schools also received support

from local public safety agencies like police and fire brigade to do a walk-through of the school to familiarize them with school layout. As outlined in Students Safety When Coming to and Going Back From School. vol. 8/1999, school needs to ensure students are aware and be concerned with any criminal possibility upon them, and to cooperate with police and parents to patrol high risk potential areas. Results of the study also the school involved parents and members of community in determining the school safety plan and policies. Probably, by utilizing school safety committee and Parent-Teacher Association (PIBG) the school could include parents and community perspective in designing safety procedure in school.

In relation to safety audit, maintenance and inspections the school management reported that they always made sure that the areas frequented by staff and students were checked and maintained regularly checked. Regular monitoring of the blind spot areas in school and declaring grey areas as restricted areas for students has also been outlined in MOE Students Safety Management at School. vol. 8/2011 circular. Nonetheless, although the rate is very small, there were school administrators who admitted that they seldom conduct inspections and patrolling after school hours conditions among them, even a number had never conducted monthly playground safety inspection. This aspect is definitely need to be improved.

In compliance with MoE Malaysia circular (e. g. Students Safety at School. vol. 8/1988 and vol 8/2011; Report on Incident at Schools. vol. 4/199) almost all (98. 6%) of the school administrators strongly adhered that any major or minor accidents and injuries were immediately reported to them and the authorities. In strengthening the safety measures, the school provided a list of emergency numbers; such as for police, ambulance, and fire-brigade at places where students frequently gather. However, the school administrators (30. 5%) admitted that they rarely sent a representative to meet with medical panel from panel clinics or hospitals to discuss about injury treatment procedures. Surprisingly, about 16% indicated that they had never invited selected panel to check medical facilities to familiarize them with school's safety procedure and operation. This factor needs appropriate attention from the school authorities.

Relationships between variables were also explored using linear regression analysis, specifically one-way independent ANOVA. Findings of this study revealed that school administrators' commitment and communication when combined with safety education, training and campaign at schools provide significant effect on teachers and staff participation in school safety management practices [$F(2, 138) = 100.77, p = 0.000$]. Combination of the two variables also demonstrated significant effects on parental and community involvements [$F(2, 138) = 79.00, p = 0.000$]. These results provide empirical evidences that the higher the commitment and the better communication strategies practised by the primary school administrators the better the participations and involvement of teachers, staff, parents and community were in school safety in the implementation of school safety management exercises.

Suggestions, Implications of the Study and Recommendations for Future Research

The followings are recommendations to help schools to improve safety practices at school and promote cooperation between schools with teachers, parents, community, government and non-government agencies to increase their contribution on school safety.

- (i) MoE Malaysia and schools as a whole should develop special KPI for safety practices at schools as a mechanism to standardize the practices, to gain data for analysis and as a method to find a solution on how to improve safety practices at schools. Special rewards could be given to schools with good initiatives and efforts
- (ii) Safety Education modules need to be developed to provide adequate knowledge and skills for teachers to deliver them in classrooms. The modules could infused and integrated with curriculum and co-curricular activities.
- (iii) School Safety Management Inventories should be developed to facilitate supervision, auditing and assessment of safety management implemented and practised schools. Hence school safety needs to be evaluated at least once a year.
- (iv) Financial assistance and expert advice should be given to school to repair the wear and tear of equipment and advise on more efficient) and effective ways of safety management.
- (v) Brigade community approach by an be applied in school safety programs by involving relevant agencies within the community (e. g. fire department, police stations' clinics/hospitals) and community leaders as they can utilize their facilities in safety management education and interventions.
- (vi) Schools also must develop Standard operating procedure (SOP) in handling crisis situations like fire and natural disaster that probably happen in the environment such as land slide, earthquake, storm and flood. The SOP must be explained to staff and students, and exhibited on notice boards around school.
- (vii) School management can form a task-force committee to be in charge of school management plan, policy and procedure just like the disciplinary board and other committees.

Recommendations For Future Research

This study relates to safety practices among selected primary school students in Selangor and Kuala Lumpur. More research in this area will be helpful to schools and the country as a whole to tackle the problems of school safety as follows:

- (i) Similar studies can be conducted in other educational settings such as preschools and secondary schools, various national types schools and also higher learning institutions in order to find safety types and practices at these schools and institutions so that improvements can be made.

- (ii) Data were collected can be expended to other states to enable a broad coverage and produce better generalization of the study.
- (iii) This study employed the survey method. Qualitative methods such as observation and personal interviews would be helpful in identifying and obtaining in-depth knowledge on safety management types, safety management practices and administrators' perception towards parents and teachers contribution in schools' safety program.
- (iv) There is an urgent need to conduct more empirical research in schools in remote areas to understand cross-cultural differences about the safety management types and safety management practices in remote area schools.
- (v) Further studies on school teachers, parents, community, and students' perceptions are also important to have an in-depth understanding of schools' safety management types and safety management practices to ensure awareness on the issues across the different hierarchies of the education system.

Conclusion

In sum, despite some the result of this study discovered that school administrators were committed in implementing safety management practice. They defined clearly general knowledge and basic safety awareness to teachers and staffs, posted or made visible the safety rules, explained risky behaviours and their consequences to all teachers; staffs and students, and consistently correct and remind students about risky behaviour and the importance of safety at school that fulfils the best practices for school safety system in relation to communication categories. Despite some unaccomplished practices in several aspects, practices terms related with safety have been included in orientation programs and school have considered safety training as one of the important in-service training methods. School teachers and staff cooperation and support show their compliance on safety education and training implementation.

Nevertheless involvement of parent and community is still quite small that require schools to create roles for them probably through PTA. Thus their action and attitudes need to be improved. In term of audit, maintenance and inspections, as well as injury reporting and treatment, there are still areas to be improved. Random petrol on shift basis by the administrators around the school areas could give some effective results. Discussion with medical personnel and consultation with medical service providers might enhance prevention measures and enable immediate help in case of accidents the involved the school community.

Last but not least, what is the prospect of implementing safety education in Malaysian primary school? From the perspective of school administrators, it could be done. As indicated in this study, school administrators must be committed, and use good, effective and feasible strategies are essential in getting corporation and supports from stake holders for the benefit and betterment of students welfare especially in term of safety.

References

- [1] Abdullah, S. A. (2006). *Amalan Pengetua Dalam Pengurusan Keselamatan Sekolah - Satu Kajian Kes*(Unpublished Master's thesis). University Malaya, Malaysia.
- [2] Clarke, S. G. and Cooper, C. L. (2004) *Managing the Risk of Workplace Stress: Health and Safety Hazards* (London/ New York: Routledge)
- [3] Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4thed.). New Jersey: Pearson.
- [4] Frumkin, H. , Geller, R. J. , & Rubin, I. L. (2006). *Safe and Healthy School Environments*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [5] Gay, L. R. (1992). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (4thed.). USA: Macmillan.
- [6] Gay, L. R. , & Airasian, P. (2014). *Educational Research: Competencies for analysis and application* (10th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- [7] Idris, N. (2008). *Students Perceptions of School's Safety* (Unpublished Master's thesis). University Putra Malaysia, Malaysia.
- [8] Kitamura, Y. (2014). The possibility of holistic safety education in Japan: From the perspective of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD). *IATSS Research*, Vol. 38 (1), July 2014, pp. 40–47. doi:10. 1016/j. iatssr. 2014. 05. 004
- [9] Lee, T. & Harrison, K. (2000). Assessing safety culture in nuclear power stations. *Safety Science*, 34 (1-3), 61-97.
- [10] Lister, J. (2010). *Types of safety managements system*. Retrieved Mac, 2014, from http://www.ehow.com/list_6966076_types-safety-management-systems.html
- [11] Lutchman, C. , Maharaj, R. , & Ghanem, W. (2012). *Safety Management: A comprehensive Approach to Developing a Sustainable System*. USA: Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.
- [12] Mahadi, S. A. (2000). *Students' Perceptions of School Safety – a Study of Two High-Risk Schools in the Sentul Zone* (Unpublished Master's thesis). International Islamic University Malaysia, Malaysia.
- [13] Mearns, K. , Whitaker, S. M. , & Flin, R. (2003). Safety climate, safety management practice and safety performance in offshore environments. *Safety Science*, 41 (8), 641-680.

- [14] Ministry of Education. (1988). *Surat Pekeliling Ikhtisas Bil. 8/1988 (Keselamatan Diri Pelajar Di Sekolah)*. (KP [BS] 8591/Jld. III/ [10]). Damansara, Kuala Lumpur: Ministry of Education Malaysia.
- [15] Ministry of Education. (1999). *Surat Pekeliling Ikhtisas Bil. 8/1999: Keselamatan Diri Murid Dalam Perjalanan Pergi Dan Balik Sekolah*. (KP [BS] 8591/Jilid XV/ [8]). Damansara Kuala Lumpur: Ministry of Education Malaysia.
- [16] Ministry of Education. (2000). *Surat Pekeliling Ikhtisas Bil. 6/2000: Menangani Masalah Keselamatan, Dadah Dan Gengster*. (KP [BS] 8591/Jld. XVI [6]). Damansara, Kuala Lumpur: Ministry of Education Malaysia.
- [17] Ministry of Education. (2000). *Surat Pekeliling Ikhtisas Bil. 7/2000: Mencegah Kebakaran Di Sekolah*. (KP [BS] 8591/Jld. XVI [7]). Damansara, Kuala Lumpur: Ministry of Education Malaysia.
- [18] Ministry of Education. (2002). *Surat Pekeliling Ikhtisas Bil. 4/2002: Pelaksanaan Program Sekolah Selamat*. (KP [BS] 8591/Jld. XVIII [4]). Damansara, Kuala Lumpur: Ministry of Education Malaysia.
- [19] Ministry of Education. (2009). *Surat Pekeliling Ikhtisas Bil. 8/2009: Langkah-langkah Keselamatan Semasa Mengikuti Aktiviti/Program Lawatan Di Luar Waktu Persekolahan*. (KP[BPSH-SPDK] 201/005/01/ [27]). Putrajaya, Kuala Lumpur: Ministry of Education Malaysia.
- [20] Ministry of Education. (2011). *Surat Pekeliling Ikhtisas Bilangan 8 Tahun 2011: Pengurusan Keselamatan Murid Di Sekolah*. (SPI:KP[BPSH-SPDK]201/005/01/Jld. 4[11]). Putrajaya, Kuala Lumpur: Ministry of Education Malaysia.
- [21] Ministry of Education. (2013). *Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025: Preschool to Post Secondary Education*. (ISBN 978-983-3444-54-0). Putrajaya, Kuala Lumpur: Ministry of Education Malaysia.
- [22] Ohio Bureau of Workers' Compensation. (2005). *Best Practices For Schools*. Retrieved Mac, 2014, from <http://www.ohiobwc.com/downloads/blankpdf/PublicSchools.pdf>
- [23] Phipott, D. , & Kuenstle, M. W. (2007). *Education Facility Security Handbook*. UK: The Scarecrow Press Inc.
- [24] Purkey, W. W. (1999), *Creating Safe Schools through Invitational Education*, ERIC Digest No. ED435946.
- [25] Reeves, M. A. , Kanan, L. M. , & Plog, A. E. (2010). *Comprehensive Planning for Safe Learning Environments: A School Professional's Guide to Integrating Physical and Psychological Safety – Prevention. Through Recovery*

- [26] Saarani, J. (2014). *Keberkesanan Program Kesedaran Keselamatan Maklumat CYBERSAFE Dalam Kalangan Guru Pra Perkhidmatan* (Unpublished Master's thesis). University Sains Malaysia, Malaysia.
- [27] Salkind, N. J. (2010). *Encyclopedia of research design*. LA: SAGE
- [28] Shamsuri, N. (2008). *Peranan Kepimpinan Pengetua Dalam Pelaksanaan Peraturan Keselamatan Sekolah* (Unpublished Master's thesis). University Malaya, Malaysia.
- [29] Suid, S. (2004). *Pedestrian Access Audit at Primary School – A Study on Users' Safety* (Unpublished Master's thesis). International Islamic University Malaysia, Malaysia.
- [30] Tie, F. H. (2014). Strategic tripartite alliance in establishing a safe school programme in Malaysia. In OECD. *School safety and security - lessons in danger*. United States of America: OECD Publishing
- [31] UNICEF Malaysia. (2012). Child protection - safety from injuries. Retrieved November 2015 from http://www.unicef.org/malaysia/protection_9007.html.
- [32] Xaxx, J. (2010). *Four principles of a safety management system*. Retrieved Mac, 2014, from http://www.ehow.com/list_7438631_four-principles-safety-management-system.html

Appendix

Table 1: Reliability of the Instruments by Sections

Section	Title	Cronbach's Alpha (α)
B	Safety Management Plan And Policy Practices	0.761
C	Safety Management Practices:	
	a) Management Commitment and Communication (MCC)	0.798
	b) Safety Education, Training and Campaign at School (SETC)	0.891
	c) School Teachers and Staffs Participation (STSP)	0.827
	d) Parental and Community Involvement (PCI)	0.763
	e) Safety Audit, Maintenance and Inspections (SAMI)	0.866
	f) Injury Reporting and Treatment (IRT)	0.834

Table 2: Bivariate Correlation between Constructs

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Plan & policy (1)	1	.668**	.552**	.579**	.552**	.527**	.510**
		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	141	141	141	141	141	141	141
Commitment Communication (2)	.668**	1	.691**	.720**	.642**	.573**	.507**
	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	141	141	141	141	141	141	141
Educational campaign/ training (3)	.552**	.691**	1	.696**	.696**	.561**	.544**
	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	141	141	141	141	141	141	141
Teachers staffs involvement (4)	.579**	.720**	.696**	1	.705**	.721**	.578**
	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	141	141	141	141	141	141	141
Parentn& community involvement (5)	.552**	.642**	.696**	.705**	1	.688**	.608**
	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	141	141	141	141	141	141	141
Audit maintenance (6)	.527**	.573**	.561**	.721**	.688**	1	.534**
	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	141	141	141	141	141	141	141
Injury Reporting (7)	.510**	.507**	.544**	.578**	.608**	.534**	1
	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	141	141	141	141	141	141	141

** . Correlation is significant at the 0. 01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3: Demographic Profile of Respondents (n=141)

Demographic Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	59	41.8
Female	82	58.2
School Area		

Rural	88	62.4
Urban	53	37.6
Current Administrative Post		
Headmaster	26	18.4
Deputy Headmaster (Administration & Curriculum)	19	13.5
Deputy Headmaster (Students Affairs)	86	61
Deputy Headmaster (Co-curriculum)	10	7.1
Age		
Less Than 30 Years	1	0.7
30-39	19	13.5
40-49	59	41.8
50-60	62	44
Working Experience		
Less Than 10 Years	5	3.5
10-19	41	29.1
20-29	52	36.9
30-40	43	30.5
School Location		
Selangor	81	57.4
Kuala Lumpur	60	42.6

Plan and Policies Practices at School	Strongly Disagree N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Neutral / Not Sure N (%)	Agree N (%)	Strongly Agree N (%)
1. My school has an official written plan and policies that clearly define roles of each individual at school (e. g. administrators, teachers & etc).	0 (0)	1 (0.7)	1 (0.7)	60 (42.6)	79 (56)

2. My school has a specific plan on how to respond and an immediate action should be taken during crisis regarding any dangerous or harmful incidents at school.	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (3. 5)	71 (50. 4)	65 (46. 1)
3. My school has a safety plan and policies which cover physical and psychological safety.	0 (0)	4 (2. 8)	2 (1. 4)	104 (73. 8)	31 (22)
4. My school has a specific safety plan and policies which cover the safety on school site such as school environment, school facilities and school surrounding.	0 (0)	4 (2. 8)	4 (2. 8)	87 (61. 7)	46 (32. 6)
5. My school has a specific plan and policies on how to improve safety on school site such as school environment, school facilities, and school surrounding.	0 (0)	4 (2. 8)	6 (4. 3)	92 (65. 2)	39 (27. 7)
6. My school has a specific safety plan and policies that cover the safety of personal and individual such as school staffs, students and visitors started from their coming to and going back from school.	0 (0)	3 (2. 1)	9 (6. 4)	80 (56. 7)	49 (34. 8)
7. My school currently has a specific plan for assessing and improving safety plan and policies related to personal and individual safety at school.	0 (0)	7 (4. 9)	19 (13. 4)	88 (62. 4)	27 (19. 1)
8. My school safety plan and policies reviewed annually and updated where necessary.	0 (0)	2 (1. 4)	16 (11. 3)	92 (65. 2)	31 (22)
9. The implementation of my school plan and policy is an order which directly comes from Minister of Education, State Educational Department, or Educational District Educational Office.	0 (0)	2 (1. 4)	2 (1. 4)	59 (41. 8)	78 (55. 3)

10. My school safety plan and policies at school level are decisions made only by school administrators without any interference from other parties such as teachers, staffs, or parents.	15 (10.6)	69 (48.9)	6 (4.3)	35 (24.8)	16 (11.3)
11. My school has developed a mechanism where staff and parents can express their ideas and contribute to develop a safety plan and policies at school.	0 (0)	3 (2.1)	9 (6.4)	79 (56)	50 (35.5)
12. Any rational ideas and suggestions on safety plan and policies come from teachers, staffs and parents will always be accepted and considered by school administrators.	0 (0)	2 (1.4)	5 (3.5)	66 (46.8)	68 (48.2)

Table 4. 1: School Administrators’ Responses on Safety Management Plans and Policies Practices (n= 141)

Table 4. 2 School Administrators’ Responses on Management Commitment and Communication (n=141)

Management Commitment and Communication	Not at All N (%)	Very Little N (%)	Some-what N (%)	To a Great Extent N (%)
1. The school administrator plays an active role to promote and enhance safety at school.	0 (0)	1 (0.7)	27 (19.1)	113 (80.1)
2. An action plan with clear goals and objectives has been developed to improve school safety.	0 (0)	4 (2.8)	63 (44.7)	74 (52.5)
3. General knowledge and basic safety awareness has been defined clearly to teachers and staffs (e. g. meaning, goal, objective, the important of, and effect).	1 (0.7)	10 (7.1)	49 (34.8)	81 (57.4)
4. School administrator always conducts a safety meeting and distribute post minute meeting to everyone.	1 (0.7)	17 (12.1)	76 (53.9)	47 (33.3)

5. School has set a benchmark and guideline on safety performances as a mechanism to guide intervention, measurement and improvement for school safety practices. (e. g. KPI for safety management and practices at school)	3 (2. 1)	13 (9. 2)	75 (53. 2)	50 (35. 5)
6. School has continuously made an effort through collecting data, making analysis, and developing new strategies to improve school safety plan and policies to build a conducive learning environment.	3 (2. 1)	15 (10. 6)	77 (54. 6)	46 (32. 6)
7. Safety rules are posted or made visible in all school settings (e. g. hallways, classrooms, canteen).	0 (0)	5 (3. 5)	56 (39. 7)	80 (56. 7)
8. Risky behaviours are clearly defined and explained to all teachers, staffs and students.	0 (0)	4 (2. 8)	37 (26. 2)	100 (70. 9)
9. Consequences for risky behaviours are clearly defined and explained to all teachers, staffs and students.	0 (0)	3 (2. 1)	35 (24. 8)	103 (73)
10. School administrator and teachers consistently correct and remind students about risky behaviour and the importance of safety at school.	0 (0)	1 (0. 7)	21 (14. 9)	119 (84. 4)

Table 4. 3 School Administrator Responses on Safety Education, Training and Campaign at School (n=141)

Safety Education, Training and Campaign at School	Not at All N (%)	Very Little N (%)	Some-what N (%)	To a Great Extent N (%)
11. Terms related with safety have been included in orientation program process for new students, new staffs and parents.	0 (0)	3 (2. 1)	40 (28. 4)	98 (69. 5)
12. Consider safety training as one of the important in-service training methods for staffs and teachers.	0 (0)	2 (1. 4)	70 (49. 6)	69 (48. 9)

13. School administrators and teachers need to attend a course on how to educate students, teachers and staffs to improve their safety concern at school.	0 (0)	29 (20.6)	73 (51.8)	39 (27.7)
14. There are campaigns to create safety awareness at school.	0 (0)	8 (5.7)	56 (39.7)	77 (54.6)
15. Teachers, staffs and students received fire extinguisher training.	2 (1.4)	29 (20.6)	68 (48.2)	42 (29.8)
16. Teachers and staffs have been trained to recognize unhealthy activities (e. g. drug use, physical abuse, gang activity etc) among students.	2 (1.4)	17 (12.1)	65 (46.1)	57 (40.4)
17. Cooperate with authorities to conduct a safety forum to increase safety awareness, knowing the current safety issues and how it is addressed.	0 (0)	18 (12.8)	70 (49.6)	53 (37.6)
18. Teachers, staffs and students receive proper training and information on how to react during emergency situation. (e. g. school on fire).	1 (0.7)	5 (3.5)	69 (48.9)	66 (46.8)

Table 4. 4: School Administrators' Responses on School Teachers and Staffs Participation (n=141)

School Teachers and Staffs Participation	Not at All N (%)	Very Little N (%)	Some-what N (%)	To a Great Extent N (%)
19. Form school safety committee participated by school administrator, teachers and staffs to discuss matters related to safety plan, policies, education, and safety training at school.	0 (0)	6 (4.3)	43 (30.5)	92 (65.2)
20. School safety committee always conducts meetings, prepare and post meeting minutes at school notice board.	1 (0.7)	10 (7.1)	87 (61.7)	43 (30.5)
21. Teachers and staffs support school administrator to ensure safety education,	0 (0)	2 (1.4)	55 (39)	84 (59.6)

training and campaign are running smoothly and beneficially.				
22. Teacher and staffs become active members to implement and promote safety practices at school.	0 (0)	3 (2.1)	47 (33.3)	91 (64.5)
23. Teachers and staffs always help to support school administrators by monitoring students' safety at school.	0 (0)	0 (0)	31 (22)	110 (78)
24. Staffs or teachers are always available to supervise students during/beyond school hour activities or on weekend.	1 (0.7)	2 (1.4)	31 (22)	107 (75.9)
25. Teachers and staffs conduct safety inspection or oversee the inspection process.	1 (0.7)	4 (2.8)	63 (43.7)	73 (51.8)
26. Teachers and staffs monitor the status of safety issues and safety-suggestion program, implement suggestion and provide feedback.	1 (0.7)	5 (3.5)	70 (49.6)	65 (46.1)
27. Teacher and staffs constantly communicate safety issues to top administrators to keep them informed, establish accountability and ensure timely completion of action items.	0 (0)	6 (4.3)	52 (36.9)	83 (58.9)
28. Publish a safety newsletter and distribute to teachers, staffs and students.	18 (12.8)	52 (36.9)	56 (39.7)	15 (10.6)

Table 4. 5: School Administrators' Responses on Parental and Community Involvement (n=141)

Parental and Community Involvement	Not at All N (%)	Very Little N (%)	Some-what N (%)	To a Great Extent N (%)
29. Parents and community give support, provide information about students' movement, and make a close contact with school as a step to strengthen safety practice at school.	0 (0)	14 (9.9)	54 (38.3)	73 (51.8)
30. At least one of parent and community people appointed as a member of school safety	13 (9.2)	21 (14.9)	59 (41.8)	48 (34)

committee to determine safety plan and policies at school.				
31. Families are active participants in supporting safety education practices in school by gradual attending safety meeting and involve in any safety program at school.	6 (4.3)	30 (21.3)	71 (50.4)	34 (24.1)
32. Community helps school by patrolling and monitoring around school area.	12 (8.5)	45 (31.9)	55 (39)	29 (20.6)
33. Local public safety agencies like police and fire brigade do a walk-through of the school to familiarize them with school layout.	3 (2.1)	45 (31.9)	54 (38.3)	39 (27.7)
34. The school comply and keep in touch with local safety mandate, state or other related agencies to develop safety program at school.	1 (0.7)	14 (9.9)	73 (51.8)	53 (37.6)

Table 4. 6 School Administrators' Responses on Safety Audit, Maintenance and Inspections (n=141)

Safety Audit, Maintenance and Inspections	Not at All N (%)	Very Little N (%)	Some-what N (%)	To a Great Extent N (%)
35. School makes a comprehensive audit to all facilities every year.	0 (0)	10 (7.1)	73 (51.8)	58 (41.1)
36. School has made a daily inspection on basic school facilities (e. g. class, chair, table, window)	0 (0)	5 (3.5)	53 (37.6)	83 (58.9)
37. With the help of class teachers and staffs, school make its own classroom and office check list and self-audit.	0 (0)	4 (2.8)	67 (47.5)	70 (49.6)
38. School has made a monthly playground safety inspection.	3 (2.1)	12 (8.5)	57 (40.4)	69 (48.9)

39. School has ensured all facilities related with safety concern (e. g. cctv, signage, fire extinguisher, night lighting) are regularly checked, well maintained and function properly.	0 (0)	2 (1.4)	54 (38.3)	85 (60.3)
40. Always ensure regular areas used by staffs and students (e. g. classroom, office, toilet, library) are regularly checked and well maintained.	0 (0)	2 (1.4)	44 (31.2)	95 (67.4)
41. School always conducts inspections and patrolling after school hours conditions.	1 (0.7)	15 (10.6)	68 (48.2)	57 (40.4)
42. School administrator always requests for maintenance work order.	0 (0)	11 (7.8)	57 (40.4)	73 (51.8)

Table 4.7: School Administrators' Responses on Injury Reporting and Treatment (n=141)

Injury Reporting and Treatment	Not at All N (%)	Very Little N (%)	Some-what N (%)	To a Great Extent N (%)
43. Any major or minor accidents and injuries immediately reported to school administrator and authorities.	0 (0)	2 (1.4)	22 (15.6)	117 (83)
44. School provides a list of emergency number (e. g. police, ambulance, fire-bridged) in places that students frequently gather around.	0 (0)	7 (5)	39 (27.7)	95 (67.4)
45. School has established a list (network) of preferred medical panel (e. g. panel clinic and selected hospital) and always keeps in touch with them.	20 (14.2)	27 (19.1)	57 (40.4)	37 (26.2)

46. School sends a representative to meet with panel to discuss about treatment procedures and communication.	22 (15.6)	43 (30.5)	54 (38.3)	22 (15.6)
47. School has invited selected panel to check medical facilities at school so that they are familiar with school's safety procedure and operation.	23 (16.3)	43 (30.5)	49 (34.8)	26 (18.4)
48. School has form accident-review team (could be safety committee) to make sure accident reports are filled completely, identify the cause factor analysis, and ensure proper follow-up action are taken.	16 (11.3)	33 (23.4)	64 (45.4)	28 (19.9)

Table 4. 8: Descriptive Statistics of School Administrators' Responses on Safety Management Practices at School

School Administrator Agreement on Safety Management Practices	Mean	S. D
Management Commitment and Communication (MCC)	3.5135	0.401
Safety Education, Training and Campaign at School (SETC)	3.3369	0.444
School Teachers and Staffs Participation (STSP)	3.4461	0.399
Parental and Community Involvement (PCI)	3.0437	0.611
Safety Audit, Maintenance and Inspections (SAMI)	3.4619	0.411
Injury Reporting and Treatment (IRT)	3.0095	0.581

Table 4. 9: Regression Analyses of Effects of School Administrators' Commitment and Communication - Safety Education, Training and Campaign at Schools on School Teachers' and Staffs' Participation

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.770 ^a	.594	.588	.25599

Coefficients ^a										
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations		
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Zero-order	Partial	Part
1 (Constant)	.711	.196		3.636	.000	.325	1.098			
Commitment & communication	.455	.075	.458	6.099	.000	.308	.603	.720	.461	.331
Educational campaign & training	.340	.067	.379	5.044	.000	.207	.473	.696	.395	.274

a. Dependent Variable: Teachers & staff participation

ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	13.207	2	6.604	100.772	.000 ^a
	Residual	9.043	138	.066		
	Total	22.250	140			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Educational_campaign & training; Commitment_ & communication

b. Dependent Variable: Teachers & staff participations

Table 4. 10: Regression Analyses of Effects of School Administrators' Commitment and Communication - Safety Education, Training and Campaign at Schools on Parents and Community Involvement

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.731 ^a	.534	.527	.41995

ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	27.865	2	13.933	79.003	.000 ^a
	Residual	24.337	138	.176		
	Total	52.203	140			
a. Predictors: (Constant), Educational campaign & training; Commitment & communication						
b. Dependent Variable: Parents & community involvement						

Coefficient											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations		
		B	Std. Error				Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	-.819	.321		-2.553	.012	-1.454	-.185			
	Commitment & communication	.469	.122	.308	3.833	.000	.227	.712	.642	.310	.223
	Edu_campaign & training	.663	.111	.483	5.998	.000	.445	.882	.696	.455	.349
a. Dependent Variable: Parents & community involvement											