

Interactive comment on “Playing at the edges: use of playground spaces in South Australian primary schools with new arrivals programmes” by C. Due and D. W. Riggs

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 15 March 2010

The text is good and don't ask a lot of change. I have two main remarks:

The idea that NAP students need different rules that other student is problematic. It is a way of stigmatisation. The better seems to me that the NAP students challenge the rules, and the school needs good rules for all the students (that means changing the rules not only for NAP students but for all students). All students may have a girl (or boy) friend that is a right for everybody in a democratic organisation, and all student can have relationship with older or younger student that is important for the development of each of them. I can't imagine that an organisation can control in that way the private life of the students. And I imagine that it should be more a problem for students new in

C3

the countries, they don't understand such rules. The NAP students can show us how some rules are problematic and ethnocentric.

About the discussion if the question is the difference between classes or difference between NAP and nonNAP, it needs more data. The authors said that there is relationship between NAP of different classes, but we don't know if it is the same for the nonNAP students. We can imagine that the specificity of NAP facilitate the relationship between the classes, but that the non NAP haven't relationship with other classes' students, even they are NAP or nonNAP. This question seems important to give more solidity to the conclusions.

I have two remarks about the logic of the presentation : It is very late in the text to say (p. 13) that school spaces are managed also by teachers It is late also to give information about the duration of observation only page16.

Interactive comment on Soc. Geogr. Discuss., 6, 1, 2010.

C4