

2.8.2 Resource mobilization theory

Resource mobilization is a sociological theory that forms part of the study of social movements. It underscores the ability of movement's members to acquire resources and to mobilise people towards the furtherance of their goals (Kendall, 2006). This theory centres on the role that resources play in the occurrence and success of social movements. According to McCarthy and Zald (1977) mobilization is a result of the availability of organizational resources both material (to enable protest activity and to provide incentives to participants) and political (in the form of political opportunities). Resources according to this theory refer to psychological, social or tangible assets that provide an individual with the empowerment to change his or her situation. According to resource mobilization theory grassroots leaders with particular grievances build social movement organization when they see an opportunity in the resource rich sector of the population with common grievances. McCarthy and Zald (1977) added that in the resource model, protesters are taken as rational actors who calculate the cost and gains after their participation in the social movement.

Resource mobilization theorists are concerned with the ways that motivated individuals are brought into contact with the idea of a social movement and then persuaded to expend personal energies and perhaps finances in furtherance of its cause (Freilich *et al*, 2001:183). Advocates of resource mobilization theory share the same opinion with the classical schools assertion that structural change is crucial to the origins of social movement.

Resource mobilization theorists' states that structural strain is a necessary, but not a sufficient, cause of collective action. According to McCarthy and Zald (1977) strain leads to discontent, from which grievances arise but still there would be no consistent resistance movement until resources, supporters and activists are infused.

Still, Jenkins and Perrow (1946) advocates that when resources are available, unorganized but aggrieved groups may make it possible to launch an organized demand for change, which causes collective violence. The theory further states that the infusion of resources often comes from outside the aggrieved group and it turns the group into collective action. The theory argues that violence develop when individuals with grievances are able to mobilize sufficient resources to take action. According to Olivier (1990) the protest cycle begins when people respond to deeply felt grievances. This usually happens when inequalities are deep and visible and when opportunities for protest emerge. According to this theory collective action is more likely to occur and to be successful, to the extent that the members of a contending group:

- are bound together in dense social network,
- have relatively high levels of shared social identity,
- are relatively large in number and have a large number of support bases (Brym and Fox 1989).

Olivier (1990) contends that theories of resource mobilization contribute significantly to understanding the conflict. Olivier (1990) proposes that competition for scarce resources and ultimately for power, can be seen as the “primary driving force behind the conflict.”

According to Tarrow (1994) quoted by (Bekker *et al*, 2009) the theory says that collective action is seen to be used to extract benefits from those who control or own resources. Findings from published documents suggest that informal leadership played a critical role in the launch of violence which occurred in May 2008. *The International Organization for Migration* study by Misago *et al* (2009:6) states that “in almost all cases where violence

occurred, it was organised and led by local groups and individuals in an effort to claim or consolidate the authority and power needed to further their political and economic interests’.

An essential contribution of the resource mobilization according to its advocates is its view of social movements as political rather than psychological phenomena and that the outcomes of movements are determined by the larger political environment. As a result, resource mobilization model argues that increased access to limited resources results in political mobilization and collective action. Linking it to xenophobia the theory states that there has to be existing tension and an element of discontent in townships. According to this theory there is always a trigger to the violence which is not always necessarily related to any element of discontent. In this case grassroots leaders who are vying for support mobilise masses of people to take up violent action against foreigners around them whom they perceive as living in better conditions.

2.8.3 Horowitz’s arguments

Horowitz’s (2001) as cited by (Bekker *et al*, 2009:13) argues that both external contextual causes as well as immediate locality-bound causes need to be considered in explaining xenophobic violence. He contends that each outburst has a ‘rhythm’ that is sequential steps to which an outburst often conform. These consist of precipitants, unsettling events, and the dissemination of rumours, a lull and subsequent broadening of participation. In his study he pinpointed additional locality-bound causal factors such as the development of widespread shared dislike of ‘outsiders’, typically fuelled by rumour, the selection of targets in the context of risk aversion - the importance of the perception of impunity on the part of those who eventually engage in the event, an assessment of the reduced risks of counter-violence that facilitates disinhibition regarding carrying out violent acts, justification of mobilization

in terms of local history, local identities and local issues, that is, in terms of the meanings local residents give to local issues and reversal of humiliation through collective action. Horowitz (2001:146) as quoted by (Bekker *et al*, 2009) further maintains that violent behaviour is often a mix of direct and displaced aggression, displaced since aggression against superiors may be converted into aggression against unranked groups as the former runs the risk of retribution which inhibits violent behaviour.

Resource mobilization theory and relative deprivation theories both lay emphasis on the rational dimension of collective behaviour to the detriment of the emotional according to Horowitz (2001) as cited by (Bekker *et al*, 2009). They fall under the structural level. As deliberated above it is essential to give motives for violence based on the arguments advanced by Horowitz who advances that local level issues should also be considered in explaining xenophobic violence.

2.9 Concluding Remarks

This chapter examined the various conceptual aspects of the theories which have been advanced by scholars to give reasons for xenophobic violence as well as a chronology of xenophobic violence during the past decade in South Africa through reference to selected works identified. The section draws upon the major theories relating to recent xenophobic violence which are relative deprivation, resource mobilization theory and Horowitz's point of view. These theories and opinions will assist to develop a concise analytic instrument to use in chapter four, to analyse both explanations for xenophobic violence from research community as well as from female victims.

It is clear from the reviewed literature that scholars such as Harris (2002), Morris (1998), Shindondola (2001) and Tshitekere, (1999) are largely divergent on their explanations as

regarding the possible factors contributing to xenophobic violence. Others also think that poverty as well as relative deprivation also breeds a sense of dissatisfaction which results in attacking foreigners. They also come to an agreement on the fact that xenophobic violence arises from the relationship of various socio-economic variables. Poverty, inequality, joblessness, and poor delivery of municipal services are among the many macro-level factors that create the social conditions for public violence (Allan & Heese, 2008). The subsequent chapter describes the research methodology and techniques used to collect and analyse the data collected.

CHAPTER THREE

Research Methodology and field work experience

3.1 Chapter overview

It is the intention of this chapter to highlight the nature of the research methodology that was used in collecting and analysing the data. Issues to be tackled in this chapter include the rationale for the qualitative research method and case study research design, as well as the selection of participants and research instruments used to collect the data. There will also be a discussion on how the field work was conducted as well as experiences of doing the fieldwork among female victims of the xenophobic violence that occurred in De-Doorns. The chapter also draw attention to data collection strategies and data analysis used by the researcher. The chapter concludes with reflections on certain limitations to the study. Throughout the chapter an attempt has been made to justify the choice of methodology used.

3.2 Rationale for a qualitative research method

The term qualitative research according to Cantrell (1993:87) “is applied synonymously for a number of research approaches associated with interpretive and critical science perspectives.” In qualitative research we are concerned “with how humans arrange themselves and their settings and how they make sense of their milieu through symbols, rituals, social structures and social roles” Berg (1998:7) as cited by (Jaftha 2003:44). According to Babbie (2007) and Denzin and Linclon (1998) quantitative research relies more on measuring a person’s point of view, while qualitative seeks to understand it. The purpose of qualitative research is to understand and explain participant meaning (Marrow and Smith, 2000). The investigator

chose a qualitative research methodology for the reason that it enables to study the phenomenon in its natural setting.

Qualitative research centres on describing and understanding phenomena within the natural occurring context with the intention of developing and understanding of the meaning imparted by the respondents (Merriam, 2002). Qualitative research is seen as subjective, and provides rich data and is usually considered to be more valid than quantitative research. It also uses techniques such as observation and interviewing to gain impression of subjects that do not need to be measured in terms of intensity or quantity (Babbie, 2007). Quantitative research measures data from larger numbers of participants, contrary to qualitative research which tends to produce a large amount of data using a small number of participants, which according Patton (2002) increases the understanding of a specific context, but reduces the data's generalizability. Thus the central purpose for using the qualitative method was to gain an in-depth understanding of the explanations from female victims of the xenophobic violence within the context of the natural setting.

3.3 The Case Study as a research design

Social science research needs a design before data collection or analysis can begin. A research design is not just a work plan. A work plan specifies what has to be done to complete the project. Mouton (2001:55) describes a research design as a plan to investigate the research question and to make sense of the data gathered in a scientific manner. On the same note, Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) see a research design as the planning of any scientific research from the first to the last steps. In this sense; it is a programme to guide the researcher in collecting, analysing and interpreting data. A good research design is the one that collects maximum information with maximum reliability (Du Plooy, 1997). Creswell

(1994:12) points out that a qualitative research design should be flexible in order to capture the essence of the participant's views, thereby enabling the researcher to develop an understanding from the participant's point of view.

The research is rooted within the interpretive paradigm where the researcher "seek to understand phenomena and to interpret meaning within the social and cultural context of the natural setting (Cantrell 1993:84). The principal philosophy of this paradigm is that reality is socially constructed. In the context of this study the investigator attempted to understand "the complex world of lived experience from the point view of those who live it" (Schwandt cited in Neuman 1997:11).

This study applied a qualitative, case study by means of semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions. The case study design was found to be the most appropriate since the data collected is qualitative data. According to Babbie (2005: 306) a case study is a single instance of some social phenomenon. Case studies in the interpretative paradigm assume that reality is a socially constructed and it emerges from the way in which individuals and groups interact and experiences of the world (Khan, 2007).

3.3.1 Strength of the research design

A case study research design was preferred since it was found to be relatively easy and convenient to conduct. According to Cohen *et al* (2002), the case study gives a rich and vivid description of events relevant to the case, provide a chronological narrative of events relevant to the case and also highlight specific events that are relevant to the case. Therefore, the researcher preferred the case study as a research design for the reason that it best serves the rich and in-depth perspective that the investigator would like to depict in this study. Punch (2005) further points out advantages of case studies as having clear boundaries and a clear

focus in a naturalistic setting. In addition, Lindegaard (2002) states that one of the advantages of case study research design is that it opens the possibility of giving a voice to the powerless and voiceless like marginalised groups in society. In the light of this exposition, this study embodied the case study research design since the research falls in the realm of qualitative research and it was concerned with describing the respondents' perceptions. More so, a case study research design is an appropriate approach to "discover essences, feelings, attributes, values, meanings, characteristics and teleological or philosophical aspects of certain individuals (Leininger, 1985:6-7). Smith emphasised that the essence of qualitative paradigm is that "knowledge is the result of a dialogical process between the self-understanding person and that which is encountered whether a text, a work of art, or the meaningful expression of another person" (1990:177).

3.3.2 Shortcomings of the research design

The research design nevertheless has its weaknesses. In the first place, case study design usually involves qualitative methods and focuses on one case; because of its dependence of a single case it is incapable of providing a generalising conclusion of the findings of the study. Stoeker (1993) quoted in Nueman (2004) states that "as with any case study, while we can accurately specify the casual process within the case, generalising is more difficult." According to Wimmer and Dominic (2000) a case study research design is time consuming since it generates large quantities of data that might be difficult to analyse. This is, on the other hand often not characteristics of interpretivist studies and should not be necessarily be regarded as a drawback. The aim of qualitative interpretivist study is that, qualitative approach does not aim to produce "laws" or generalisation in the same way as quantitative methods. In order to minimize these limitations the researcher used multiple sources of

evidence in the data collection process which include interviews, documents and focus group discussions.

3.4 Research participants and sampling procedures

The participants for this study comprised women who were the victims of the xenophobic violence that occurred in De-Doorns in November 2009. According to Crush (2000) the history of migration has been identified as being one of the most researched and well documented academic fields in the region. Though being a well-known subject there are surprisingly limited studies focusing wholly on female labour migrants and also historically labour migrants in South Africa, were men, as a result, few studies sought to account for women. This has prompted the investigator to choose women participants for this study.

In order to obtain a sample of the participants, the main sampling strategy applied was the snowball sampling approach. A snowballing approach was preferred for the reason that it is economical, efficient and effective method for getting results quickly. Being a Zimbabwean and a member of the same culture, it helped me to enter this community easily since they had trust in me. In addition the selection of sampling method was influenced by Burgess (1984:80) who argues for “availability, access, and willingness of participants” to take part in the study. Williamson *et al* (1977) explain that this strategy falls in the category of non-probability in which the choice of an element for the sample is not accidental. “There is no general prescription for selecting a sample size in the qualitative inquiry process since the sample size depends on what you want to know, the purpose of the inquiry, what is at stake, what is useful, what will have credibility, what can be done with the available time and resources”(Patton, 1990:184). According to Baker (1988:159) snowball sampling involves approaching a single case who is involved in the phenomenon to be investigated, to gain

information on other similar persons; in turn this person is again requested to identify further people who may make up the sample. In this way the researcher proceeds until he or she identified a sufficient number of cases to make up the sample. This approach is used in situations where the research cannot or does not aim to sample the whole population. The investigator thus, had to depend on initial contacts suggesting further people for the investigator to approach. On the other hand, one major drawback with snowball sampling is the concept of bias. Best and Kahn (1993) defines bias as “allowing particular influence to have more importance than it really warrants.” Tuckman (1994) concurs with this when he argues that the whole purpose of sampling is to gather information about the population and the sample is wanted to represent the whole population and to have more bias. Though it is impossible to remove bias entirely from any form of research Tuckman (1994), it is always important to guard against it since it has a potential influence on results.

3.5 Data collection strategies and ethical aspects

In order to embark on the process of data collection, I phoned a woman who was a victim of De-Doorns whom I knew at my church and requested her to recommend other women whom she thought would agree to participate in this research. These participants were then recruited using “snowball sampling” where each person or unit is connected with another through a direct or indirect linkage (Newnan, 1994:199). Throughout the research process, a number of ethical aspects were taken into consideration, Firstly; the researcher ensured that all participants were correctly informed. Participants were clarified what the aim of the study was and were given a choice to participate. Attempts were also undertaken to ensure the safety of participants. To do so, participants were allowed to decide where and when the interviews would be convened. Where a tape recorder was used, participants were asked for

consent and guaranteed of the fact that the information would be used by only the investigator. All of the participants were assigned pseudonyms by the researcher and this was done to ensure anonymity when analysing the data. All information gathered through original fieldwork was kept in a safe, inaccessible room. Upon first interaction and before opening interview sessions, all participants were informed that they would be presented with questions concerning personal and sensitive subjects that they might find distressing. To the best of my knowledge, adequate safeguards to protect the privacy, anonymity, and well-being of participants have been utilised during the course of the research process.

3.5.1 Data collection techniques

According to Leedy (1993:132) a research instrument is something used “to observe data beyond the physical research of the observer. The success of the research thus hinges on the accuracy and relevance of data collected.” The major data collection methods in qualitative research include focus groups, interviews and observation (Merriam *et al*, 2002). In most cases the selection of which method to use depends on what the researcher want to collect. Scholars such as Merriam and Associates (2002) concur that researchers are urged to use more than one method for data collection as this boost the validity of findings. By triangulating the methods, the results of the study would be considered more accurate and valid. According to Cohen and Manion (1994) triangulation as the use of two or more methods of data collection in the study of some aspects of human behaviour.

Krathwohl (1993), Cohen and Manion (1994) strongly feel that it is high time researchers stopped building walls between research methods and start building bridges between them in order to produce research of high quality. By using two or more methods, the researcher is able to minimise or reduce bias and distortion which often results from applying a single

method. The other motive for using three methods for data gathering is that triangulation provides richer information on phenomena by studying from various stand points. This provides the researcher with more comprehensive knowledge about the phenomena. Thus, the investigator chose to use three data collection methods as single method provides a limited view of issues. Research adopting case study usually uses qualitative techniques such as semi-structured, since they generate rich and interesting data (Bryman, 2008:53). Therefore, the instruments used for the data collection from the respondents include interview schedule, focus group discussions and the use of documentation.

3.5.2 The interview process as data collection

The first method involved conducting face-to-face interviews using an interview guide (see **Appendix A**). Leedy (1993) describes an interview as a conversation between the interviewer and the interviewee with the purpose of eliciting certain information. According to Patton (1990); Hatch (2002); Johnson and Christensen (2004) an interview is the data collection method in which the interviewer asks questions to an interviewee. This is one of the popular forms of data which, according to Tuckman (1994), can provide, when properly conducted, a rich source of material. Interviews are mostly used when conducting a qualitative research.

3.5.3 Advantages of including the interview approach

The real benefit of an interview is that one is face-to-face with the interviewee so that misunderstandings can be cleared immediately. Interviews according to Denzin and Lincoln (2005) they are one manner of obtaining an insider, or emic, perspective regarding issues being researched. The other intention for using interviews is that interviews allow for probing in order to find out underlying meaning and reasons to answers given by respondents, which would otherwise not be possible with other data collection methods (Rubin and Babbie

1993:374). In addition, Merriam (1998) concurs that open-ended interviews encourage free expression of ideas. According to Greef (2005) the advantage of interviewing is that it is a very naturalistic way of gathering data with the full potential to gather more data for an in-depth perspective. Besides, interviewing gives the researcher intimate contact and interaction with respondents. It gives the researcher the room to understand people from their frames of references. The researcher also used the interview method as a data gathering tool for the reason that interviewing gives the researcher the opportunity to meet the respondents individually and listen to individual answers given by female victims of xenophobic violence. Above and beyond interview allowed me to ask for more information from the respondents. Also, according to Babbie (2007) semi-structured nature of the interview –schedule allows for a more flexible, iterative, and continuous interview which provides a more natural conversational type interview. According to Patton (2002) open ended questions in the interview guide further allow the interviewee to respond without prescribed answers which provides the researcher with a view of xenophobic violence that occurred in De-Doorns.

3.5.4 Limitations of including the interview based-approach

The interview on the other hand, has its own weakness such as bias. An additional disadvantage of an interview is that the mere presence of an investigator can unconsciously influence responses especially where social convention of a subject is deliberated. The researcher can also fall into the risk of steering the interview to suit the answers he or she expects to get. The aforementioned and other weaknesses of the interview was minimised by clearly explaining the purpose of the study to the respondents. The researcher also convened the interviews in such a way that allows a natural flow of information.

3.5.5 Focus group process as data collection

A different data collection instrument used by the researcher is through focus groups (see **Appendix B**). According to Krueger (1994:47) “focus group is a carefully planned discussion designed to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest in a permissive, non-threatening environment.” (Krueger, 1994) further contend that the size of the group must be small enough for everyone to have an opportunity to share insights and large enough to provide diversity of perceptions. In focus group discussions participants are allowed to discuss their true feelings and give in-depth to their opinions. People who are similar to each other compose focus groups and the similarity allows for a more relaxing and flowing conversation among the participants (Krueger, 1994). According to Fontana and Frey (1994), the purpose of group interviews is based on the collection of qualitative data. Kitzinger (1994) in Pickering says that focus group interviews capitalises on communication between research participants in order to generate data where groups explicitly use group interaction as part of the method. Focus groups are commonly used when there is little known about a particular phenomenon (Steward *et al*, 2007).

3.5.6 Advantages of including the focus group discussions approach

The motivation for using focus group discussions is centred on the following reasons. Focus groups can serve to elicit responses between the members of the groups. Blumer quoted by Fontana and Frey (1994:365) notes that “a small number of individuals brought together as a discussion and resource group, is more valuable many times than any representative group.” According to Steward and Shamdasani (1990), focus groups provide sources of information that can be obtained rapidly and at a low cost. This view is also shared by Krueger (1994) who states that focus groups are a socially oriented research procedure and the format allows

the moderator to probe- flexibility to explore unanticipated issues at a relatively low cost. It can be conducted within a wide range of settings and a vast range of respondents can be selected. More so, since the researcher communicates directly with the respondents he or she can easily clarify some aspects of the questions put to the respondents to elaborate on their answers.

According to Wilkinson (2004) focus group discussions elicit a range of responses and ideas from participants and are a quick means to collect information from participants. In addition Creswell (1998) notes that focus groups allow for gaining insights into shared understanding of selected groups of people on a specific topic.

3.5.7 Limitations of including the focus group discussions approach

The advantages of focus group discussions should not nevertheless, obscure their major limitations. Participants do not divulge sensitive information in focus group discussions which can undermine the validity and reliability of the results. Information acquired by using focus group discussion is not generalizable. This is because focus groups contain only a small sample of people; the data do not produce typical information for the whole universe under study (Ferreira and Path 1988:201). Furthermore, responses may be subject to group think, especially if there are dominated members. More reserved members may be ignored. On the other hand, Krueger and King (1998:36-37) identify the following drawbacks of focus groups. They are difficult to assemble, and must be conducted in an environment conducive to discussion. The investigator has less control in the group interview and will need good interview skills to keep the group attentive.

3.5.8 The use of documentation as a data collection technique

Aside from interviews and focus group discussions the researcher also gathered data from the print media. The researcher concentrated on the print media's coverage of De-Doorns issue. The investigator conducted textual analysis of newspaper articles from the following papers namely: *Mail and Guardian*, *Sowetan*, *Cape Argus*, *Cape Times* and *The Herald (Ep Herald)*. A review of reports and documents such as the policy brief put forward by the *Forced Migration Studies Programme*, *Consortium for Refugees and Migrants in South Africa Newsletter*, and a study conducted by *Solidarity Peace Trust* was also done to explain the violence that occurred in De-Doorns. The data gathered from documents was compared with data already gathered from the interviews and focus group discussions conducted with female victims of the xenophobic violence. One of the advantages of documents is that they add new information which might be useful to the research study.

The three methods of data collection employed provided relevant data to achieve the goals of this study. The research used different sources of data so as to elicit as much as possible for the study. This helped a lot because the research would not have been to this standard had it been that a single research method was used.

3.6. Field work

Field visits to De-Doorns took place between May and October 2010. The focus group discussions were done on the 24th of May 2010 in De-Doorns Town. The first two interviews were convened in Cape Town with two women in Khayelitsha and Strand. Other interviews were conducted from August 17 to 22 October 2010. The data collection comprised semi-structured interviews and focus groups discussions. The researcher also collected data from the newspaper articles and research documents covering the De-Doorns issue.

The investigator also did face to face interviews which were recorded in Shona as the participants were comfortable in expressing their thoughts in their first language. The duration of interviews ranged from 30-35 minutes. A total of twenty women who are the victims of xenophobic violence that occurred in November 2009 in De-Doorns were interviewed between August and October 2010. The women met the following criteria: Zimbabwean nationality and their age group ranged from 22-39. In order to reach women to be interviewed, The investigator followed a snowball sampling method. After finding a person needed for my research, she would link me to another person and so on. An interview guide to ask the questions during each interview (**see Appendix A**). Participants were communicated through the means of a phone call. Because of the sensitivity of the subject I produced a letter confirming my identity and the nature of the research at the opening of all interviews. Five interviews were done in the respondents' homes in Cape Town in the townships. These women were not working and hence the researcher found it easier to meet them in their places of resident. The rest of the interviews were done in De-Doorns refugee camp site before it was closed.

Two focus groups were also used as a data gathering method. These focus groups involved the researcher and selected group of women in a face-to-face situation. Before doing the focus group discussions, the researcher produced a letter from an academic supervisor notifying all the participants the intent of my research visit in De-Doorns. Selection of participants was also done using snowball sampling method. Snowball sampling depends on first contacts proposing further people for the researcher to approach. The investigator knew a Zimbabwean woman who was a victim of the attacks and she was also in the camp site, thus proposed other women who were willing to participate in the study. The snowballing

technique worked well to my advantage. Each time the researcher spoke to one woman she would refer to another person whom the investigator should approach.

In the focus group discussions the researcher asked questions that are related to violence that happened in De-Doorns in November 2009 in order to gain a better understanding of the violence. Two focus group discussions were conducted where the participants explored what happened during and after the violence in De-Doorns farming community. The first focus group was done in De-Doorns Town where four participants were involved. While the second focus group was conducted in De-Doorns Town where five participants were involved. Participants were informed about the goal of the research. In addition, the investigator chose to do them in town away from the camp site to allow myself to record the conversations and it was also free from interference.

The fieldwork was challenging, as entry to the townships and the refugee camp was so difficult, given the nature of the research population and sensitivity of the research. Some of the women who participated in the study were often in the beginning suspicious about the research, so there was a need to build trust and in some cases obtain confirmation through personal contact.

Some of the interviews were convened in the townships. The township place was more difficult as Zimbabweans are not as visible and concentrated there as they are in De-Doorns. As a result, both interviews were conducted through previous contacts and had to be agreed by phone. In order for the participant to feel free and share ideas openly the ideal setting had to be found (Creswell, 1998). The participants decided that the interviews take place in closed doors in the townships where they stayed. More so, the interviews in these townships were to a certain extent stressful due to the fact that the environment was not favourable for the

participant and me. The interviews were more time consuming yet, the investigator managed to conduct both interviews.

Problems were encountered in finding and conducting some of the interviewees and getting them to participate in this research. This was something the researcher had been alerted about beforehand by numerous people. During the interviews that were conducted in the townships, phone calls were an interruption so did relatives and friends who wanted to meet one of the participants. One of the interviewee was not at ease conversing matters that were personal as a result limiting the amount of information from that participant. Again, during field work, even though all interviews were documented and transcribed, in a few cases interviewees requested for the tape recorder to be switched off when they were deliberating something particularly personal or sensitive, Nevertheless, one fact that was evident was that the women liked to tell their stories and were happy that someone was taking an interest.

In general, interviews were conducted in the respondent's houses since the two of them were homemakers and they said it was easier to meet at home. Each interview took about thirty five minutes. The investigator attempted to take some notes in the first interview but become conscious that he was overlooking some important issues. Moreover, most crucially, missing the eye contact. Thus, the researcher began to observe and record everything and transcribed the tapes later.

3.7 Data Analysis Method

In order to analyse data collected through focus groups and individual interviews the investigator used Tesch's (1990) methods of qualitative transcribed data following six steps defined by Creswell (1994:155) which are as follows:

- Reading through all the transcripts carefully with the purpose of getting a general sense of the whole and underlying meaning of the transcripts;
- Picking a single shortest or most interesting transcript and going through it once again; Making a list of topics or clusters to get similar topics;
- Going back to original data and abbreviate the topics as quotes and write quotes next to the appropriate segments of the text;
- Developing the most descriptive wording for the topics and converted them into categories by grouping related topics;
- Making final decision on abbreviations for each category and alphabetising existing data;
- Assembling the data material belonging to each category in one place and performing a preliminary analysis, and recording of the existing data.

Creswell (1994) mentions that data analysis does not always follow the above logical sequence. Some activities may occur at the same time. In short, the researcher must label data to make sense out of it. Because a case study involves an in-depth analysis using many sources of data collection, thus may produce a lot of information that is unmanageable. Therefore, it is essential to arrange data into a set of related categories, which may be based on key themes of the research. The next step is read between the lines the patterns and connections that emerge after organising data. The final step is that of producing a complete narrative of the case, in which the connections between key concepts and study objectives are addressed.

3.8 Study limitations

The study does not boast of not marred with imperfections. As a result of inconsistencies beyond the researcher's control, the conclusions and inferences from this study should be undertaken viewing some limitations. In as much as the study was a success, the researcher faced some problems. First of all, efforts to widen the study were not practically possible since there were no funds to do a follow up of other stakeholders such as farmers, police and local authorities. The research was narrowed down to female victims of the xenophobic violence only. The investigator would have preferred to interview other stakeholders such as the police and local councillor who were also part of the people fingered for the xenophobic violence.

There was also an element of suspicion of many respondents towards this research particularly those who were in the refugee camp site. Certain women declined to participate in the interviews for the reason that they supposed the researcher was a journalist when they saw two tape recorders. Also the media attention in the middle of the research exercise resulted in participants becoming suspicious. They did not trust me though an effort was made clarify to them the purpose of the study.

In addition, some essential information could have been lost while interviewing the women on the refugee camp site before its closure as the environment did not permit me to use tape recorder but to take notes. The reason because there were a lot of people and security guards manning the premises was coming from time to time to me to see what I was doing in the camp.

Still, with regard to the explanations that are given in this study as relating to violence that occurred in De-Doorns, these are only some of the proposed explanations. There could be

other explanations linked to violence from other stakeholders apart from those underlined in this study. The results themselves may also be influenced by the fact that not all questions were answered clearly. Despite the attempts which were made to convince the women to answer all questions, some were reluctant to answer interview questions.

Besides, making use of the snowballing sampling method was time consuming since the investigator had to travel from one location to another especially in Cape Town townships to get in contact with the respondents. Problems were also faced in trying to identify other women where the research was done. A number of respondents staying in the townships declined to be interviewed thus posing challenges to the researcher who had to look for other women willing to participate in this study. In addition, the snowball technique restricted the variety of participants. People do not have simply have “equal ability to provide detailed accounts of what they have been and what they feel” (Taylor and Bogdan 1998:193). Some of the participants were able to converse in detail whereas a few of them only waited upon me for the next question. Thus the researcher had to contact other participants who were willing to participate in this study. Although this study used snowball sampling, it is narrow because of the small number of interviews and the sample selection process. There are clear problems in trying to find all victims of violence where the study was done. The investigator lacked funds to conduct an extensive search for these women.

The results were obtained from a very limited number of participants who were identified and carefully chosen through non-probabilistic methods. In addition, a lot of potential interviewees identified refused to take part in this study, creating the likelihood that research results were affected to some degree, by a subject self-selection phenomenon.

A minor limitation met, though significant is what Weiss (1972) terms action setting which is the clash between the needs of the research programme and the needs of the respondents. In some cases respondents would naturally be more concerned with the demands of their own schedules, hence the resultant rush to complete the interview questions and in the process reducing the validity of data obtained. There was then a need to follow a notified time table to allow respondents to provide time in advance for completing the interview questions.

Notwithstanding, the above limitations, the results of this study are sufficiently interesting to warrant an extension to other victims of xenophobic violence in South Africa. A future research may study victims from different countries such as Congo, Somalia and Nigeria.

3.9 Concluding Remarks

It has been noted that the methodology utilised in this study was the case study research design. It was selected for its wide use and convenience of application. The genre of sampling procedures was in the realm of non- probability sampling and in particular snowball sampling was preferred. In data analysis the researcher used Tesch's methods of qualitative transcribed data following six steps defined by (Creswell, 1994). The following chapter deals with the discussion of data collected through focus groups, interviews held with victims of violence and data collected from published research documents.

CHAPTER FOUR

Identifying explanations from different sources for the De-Doorns violence

4.1 Chapter overview

This chapter examines the findings of the study. There are four main components to this chapter. The first section is a description of the context and site of violence before, during and after the xenophobic violence event. The second section gives an explanation of violence as found in research documents and the print media. This will centre on explanations given by the research community and the mass media. The third section will deliberate the proposed explanations drawn from the focus group narratives and interviews conducted with female victims of the xenophobic violence. The fourth section will be a comparison of explanations emerging from research documents and the print media with proposed explanations from focus groups and interviews. In other words, this chapter will attempt to answer the following research questions laid down in chapter one.

- What explanations for xenophobic violence are given by female victims of the xenophobic violence?
- What differences in explanation emerges from within this group?
- How do these proposed explanations compare with those given by the research community and mass media?

Finally, there will be a sum-up of the most important issues presented in this chapter.

4.2 A description of outburst events⁴.

This section of the thesis presents a description of what appears to have happened before, during and after the xenophobic violent event as captured by the published research documents as well as from focus group discussions convened with victims of xenophobic violence. The section will not present and discuss proposed explanations from women and the research community. This will be done in subsequent sections. During focus group discussions, women described that before violence locals stopped Zimbabweans to go to work citing that they were on strike for wage increases. The locals insisted Zimbabweans accepted low wages. It is also further underscored from the focus group discussions that there were two meetings which were convened in the farming community with a local councillor who allegedly encouraged a group of locals from De Doorns to attack Zimbabweans.

The research carried out by Forced Migration Studies Programme (FMSP) in 2009 reveals that at the meetings addressed by local leaders', locals expressed their "intention to chase Zimbabweans away." There were reports that South African workers maintained that labour brokers from Zimbabwe were hiring the Zimbabweans in view of the fact that they would work for less than the daily minimum wage.

During the attacks descriptions women who participated in focus groups emphasised that on the day of the attacks some Zimbabweans contract farmworkers were stopped from climbing trucks ferrying workers to the farms. The mob comprising women and men told them they were on strike and so, no one was working that day. The attacks were directed against Zimbabweans as one woman explained it:

⁴The descriptions are based on the opinions of women who were the victims of the xenophobic violence and information obtained from published research documents.

“When the attacks began, they struck my neighbour’s shack. At that time I thought that it was not something dangerous. I become conscious that this violence was targeted against Zimbabweans when they demolished my shack. They arrived at my shack and threatened me. They were moving in a very large group. They were just making noise, would take our belongings.”(Woman D1)

In addition, the women also mention that the perpetrators were targeting shacks occupied resided by Zimbabweans and it was the youth who were doing all the things. As one respondent clarified:

“Everything that belonged to the Zimbabwean national at that time was a target. Even to the places they mostly target Stofland, Ekuphumleni and Hasie Square where they knew most Zimbabweans stayed. Some property was damaged in the shacks, some were destroying the shacks, and it was noise all over, noise throughout the three informal settlements. They smashed and looted property. They went around knocking and did all those things. They destroyed our shacks. That forced us to run away from our homes.” (Woman D2)

Similarly, another woman described that:

“The youth gathered together and stopped us from going to work in the fields. We were told to go back to our places and pack our things and leave the townships. They said we should go back to Zimbabwe that very same day and then they came to our shacks, destroying our shacks taking our things some even grabbing what they can...”(Woman D3)

Besides, during the women who participated in focus groups mention that police were present and could not intervene but only saying to the group of farm labourers “*destroy shacks*” and not to harm anyone. This is also echoed in *Cape Times* which reports that rumours also said police had “stood” and “watched” while locals demolished foreigners’ shacks in the Stofland informal settlement. (*Cape Times*, 18 November, 2009). It further reports that some Zimbabweans alleged that the police had done nothing to stop the mob when they raided their

shacks. Braam Hanekom, chairperson of the refugee rights organization, People Against Suffering, Suppression, Oppression and Poverty (PASSOP) is quoted in the *Cape Times* that there have been countless allegations that some police officials stood and did not intervene to protect the Zimbabweans who were displaced. PASSOP has also provided allegations local that leaders were involved in the attacks. According to Migrant Monitoring Rights Project eyewitness reports indicate that the police did little to protect people or property during the hours of attacks simply transporting Zimbabweans away from the scene but not arresting a single looter.

Cape Argus point out victims of the xenophobic violence went to the police station after being evicted in the three informal settlements. The print media further reports that the refugees were moved to the camp, at a rugby field. Focus groups discussions also bring to light that victims of the xenophobic violence were transported in trucks and police vehicles to an old municipal building where they stayed until shelter was secured for them.

4.3 Proposed explanations for the outburst found in the print media

The following section details information acquired from the print media. The information was found from the following papers: *Cape Times*, *Cape Argus*, *The Herald (Ep Herald)*, *Sowetan and Mail and Guardian*.

Cape Times reports that local black South Africans in De-Doorns drove out Zimbabweans and destroyed their property since they accused them of *stealing their jobs*. The paper goes on to echo that some labour brokers hired Zimbabweans as they worked for less than the R60 legal daily minimum wage. This could have fuelled the attacks on Zimbabweans who were the most visible migrants working in the farms in De-Doorns (*Cape Times*, 18 November, 2009). *The Sowetan* also reports that Zimbabweans nationals were forced out of the informal

settlement by South African locals, who claimed their jobs were being stolen by foreigners (*Sowetan* 18, December, 2009).

Furthermore, narratives from the print media expresses that the violence against Zimbabwean nationals was a result of labour brokers and farmers who were accused by farm workers of paying locals and foreigners' different wages (*Cape Times*, 18 November, 2009). The *Cape Times* also echoes that South Africans claimed that farmers in the Hex River valley were employing Zimbabweans and not locals for the reason that the foreigners were easy to exploit as they were desperate for work. Labour brokers were blamed for taking advantage of workers and enriching themselves (*Cape Times*, 24 November, 2009). The labour brokers were blamed of playing a critical role in creating perceptions that Zimbabweans were underpaid (*Cape Argus*, 21 November, 2009). A different reason which was exposed as the reason of the violence in De-Doorns is that it is whispered that unfavourable labour practices favouring Zimbabweans workers were behind the attacks (*Cape Argus*, 5 January, 2010). *The Cape Times* reports that "labour brokers had been found to be exploiting workers and farmers by negotiating farm jobs for the workers and then paying themselves from workers' wages" (*Cape Times*, 27 January, 2010). Labour brokers interviewed by the Labour and Enterprise Policy Research Group asserted that some Zimbabweans were being recruited to work for R30 a day (*Cape Times*, 30 November, 2009).

The Herald Ep echoes that farmers' actions also is attributed to have triggered the violence for the reason that they employed Zimbabweans and paid them less than local black South African farm workers (*The Herald (Ep Herald)*, 19 November, 2009). The press further point out that De Doorns local authority condemned farmers, saying they were influential in causing this violence. Similarly, it is revealed in the press that the evictions have been attributed to labour problem." The mayor also further alleged "what makes the situation

worse is that the Department of Home Affairs recently opened an immigration office. There was a complete influx of foreigners and they stay since their applications are processed slowly” (*The Herald (Ep Herald, 19 November, 2009)*).

The *Weekly Mail and Guardian* media also chronicles that a councillor allegedly incited a group of local residents from De-Doorns to attack Zimbabweans contract farm workers in November 2009. The newspaper further echoes that he had been suspended for xenophobia in De-Doorns. In the press a local leader is quoted saying the violence was not motivated by xenophobia as only Zimbabweans were targeted... “No, it is not xenophobia. The people said the Zimbabweans use labour brokers and they take away their work since they accept low salaries. Nevertheless, this was merely a cover –up to raise issues of service delivery.” (*Weekly Mail & Guardian, 22 August, 2010*).

According to the spokesperson for Zimbabweans refuge rights group People Against Suffering, Suppression, Oppression and Poverty (PASSOP) Braam Hanekon said “a local councillor was directly involved in the xenophobic violence beyond a doubt.” The paper goes on to mention Braam Hanekom, chairperson of refugee rights organization PASSOP saying that the major cause of xenophobic violence against Zimbabweans was that South Africans farm workers blamed Zimbabweans of taking away their work during the grape harvest by offering cheap labour” (*Weekly Mail and Guardian , 22 January, 2010*).

The spokesperson for the refugees rights group People Against, Suffering Suppression, Oppression and Poverty (PASSOP) Braam Hanekom, told *Sowetan*: “This whole incident was a turf war between labour brokers. There are about 1000 labour brokers in a tiny place like De-Doorns.” Labour brokers employ Zimbabweans as they can take a large cut of what the farmer pays. The whole attack was not instigated by poor South Africans-the frustrations

were there but it was exploited and instigated by jealous labour brokers who are fighting for business” (*The Sowetan*, 18 December, 2009).

4.4 Proposed explanations for the outburst found in the research documents

This section looks at the findings explaining xenophobic violence that occurred in De-Doorns in November 2009 as given by the research community. The data was acquired from the following sources:

- Solidarity Peace Trust (2009)
- Migrant Rights Monitoring Project (December 2009)
- CoRMSA Newsletter (6th edition 2009)

According to a 2009 study published by Solidarity Peace Trust the main reasons of violence in De-Doorns were the following: The attacks are attached to competition between labour brokers. This is because Zimbabweans were given preference by farmers who employ labour on a contract basis. This is based on a project carried by Forced Migration Studies Programme (FMSP). According to Forced Migration Studies Programme (FMSP:2009:4), there was no shortage of work in the valley at that time, but certain labour brokers did not like the fact that local farmers prefer to employ Zimbabweans as they are perceived to be more hardworking.

Misago further indicates that “there is a wide-spread belief among South African residents of De-Doorns that Zimbabweans work for lower wages. This is despite farmers and Zimbabwean workers themselves reporting that seasonal workers get the same wages. They work for R60 per day” (FMSP 2009:4). According to the report the violence was instigated

because of local farmers' preference of foreign workers for the reason that they are seen as cheap labour. According to Misago violence also was a result of labour brokers who imported people from Zimbabwe and then exploited them. An additional causal factor for the violence according to Misago is the presence of a Home Affairs satellite office that attracted foreigners in the area.

A further finding of the Migrants Rights Monitoring reports that local politicians initiated the attacks for self-interested motivations according to the investigations of the De-Doorns xenophobic violence story "some respondents report that dissatisfied labour brokers pressured local leaders and incited local residents to attack and chase Zimbabweans away" FMSP (2009:5). Misago further reports on the self-interested motivation of local De-Doorns councillors, some of whom are also farm working contractors, whom may have stoked the xenophobic violence.

A research done by the Forced Migration Studies Programme (2009) advance the following reasons for violence that happened in De-Doorns. The violence has been described as a backlash be the result of labour matters such as the local farmer's preference of employing foreign workers rather than nationals as they are seen as being cheap labour, the labour brokers were importing people from Zimbabwe, and that the presence of the Home Affairs satellite office had attracted foreigners to the area. Again the investigation also explains that the violence was a consequence of competition between the groups of labour brokers where it is supposed there was a culmination of long-standing tensions between Zimbabweans and South African labour brokers which were particularly acute in the two or three weeks preceding the attack.

An additional reason specified by Forced Migration Studies Programme (FMSP) report being the involvement and complicity of local authority members where displaced Zimbabweans widely think that the local leaders were either directly involved in organizing the violence possibly under pressure from numerous labour contractors resentful of the Zimbabweans (FMSP, 2009). There were at least two meetings between South African residents and local authorities, the police and the local ward councillor where residents expressed their intentions of chasing Zimbabweans away.

Forced Migration Studies Programme (FMSP) also indicates the failure of early warning and prevention mechanisms. The police knew that conflict was escalating the townships but failed to take proper actions before the violence. The investigation also gave other explanations which the local leaders, South African residents and other commentators have given as background to the violence against Zimbabweans in De-Doorns include the stealing of South African jobs, the fact that Zimbabweans work for lower wages and the fact that they do not participate in struggles for better wages and working conditions.

4.5 Female Participants Explain the Violence.

This section will address the findings of the research in relation to the three research questions that are outlined above and analyses the motives for the attacks as understood by female victims of the xenophobic violence. The initial and main focus of this section is to present both results from interviews and focus group discussions organised in De-Doorns where violence had taken place. The research is centered on the perceptions of women who were the victims of the xenophobic violence particularly those living in the townships, where violence had occurred. Some selected quotations from interviews and focus group discussions will also be included, to add depth to the analysis.

Respondents' explanations

- **Involvement of local politicians**

Twenty⁵ interviewees and eight respondents from focus group discussions pointed out that the violence in De-Doorns appears to have been driven by a local ANC ward councillor who initiated a meeting to “destroy the houses of Zimbabweans.” According to these women, there were at least two meetings between South African residents and local authorities before the xenophobic violence and residents expressed their intentions of chasing Zimbabweans away. Twenty of the women participating in this study underlined that they heard that a local councillor expressed to some Zimbabweans that “you haven’t seen xenophobia yet, you are going to see xenophobia.” Let me draw some quotes to bring to light these observations:

“The November 2009 attack, the thing was organized, but it seems there were leaders who were leading everything...my landlord a Xhosa lady told me that locals and community leaders were holding meetings and during the meetings they concluded that Zimbabweans should be chased away.”(Woman D4)

“...I believe that the violence against us was an organized event contrary to the popular perception that it was a spontaneous uprising against foreigners ...It was organized since there were rumours that Zimbabweans would be chased, you know those kind of things you get at a meeting.” (Woman D5)

...I mean I can recall for example , one day we were coming from work “in the trucks from work some women intimidated us by shouting “On the 17th of November, we will get all Zimbabweans! I questioned what have we done?” They shouted you take our jobs and work for low wages here. All of you! (Woman D6)

⁵ The number indicates the respondents who participated in the interviews and focus group discussions.

My neighbour came to me and told me “face to face” that we should leave by the 17th. She said locals were “holding meetings” to plan to chase the Zimbabweans.”
(Woman D7)

The interviews and focus group discussions bring to light that xenophobic violence was a direct influence by local leaders from communities where violence took place.

- **Perception around competition for work**

Eighteen interviews and four respondents from focus group discussions argued that the violence might have been instigated by competition for work. The women expressed that South African locals see Zimbabweans as people “stealing jobs” and also alleged that Zimbabweans settle for less wages. Below are narratives from the respondents:

“Most Xhosa people perceive Zimbabweans as people who have come to South Africa to take their jobs.” This is because they lay blame on us that we work for R40 a day.
(Woman D7)

“They were disappointed because of the jobs... They say we work for less... They say we are cheap labour we work hard for less, as we are desperate... (Woman D8)

“I think the community is jealousy of us...most of us are prepared to work overtime, so we earn more money.” Locals often “got so drunk” at the weekend that they were too hangover to work on a Monday.”(Woman D9)

“Days before the attacks started rumours were flying that locals no longer wanted us (Zimbabweans to live in the townships) locals said farmers opted to employ us since we are cheaper. South Africans, demand more pay. The community says that we settle for less money.”(Woman D10)

“I think the attacks are a result of jealousy South Africans are jealousy of the Zimbabweans who have TV’s and DVD’s ... they called us dirty (makwirikwiri) and accused us of practicing witchcraft and said we offer ourselves as cheap labour, leaving them unemployed.”(Woman D11)

“South Africans were unhappy that farmers had been hiring many Zimbabweans for less money and complained that farmers were excluding the local community.”(Woman D12)

The above quotations from interviews and focus groups discussions emphasise that a significant number of the female participants are accused for taking jobs and accepting low wages and this may possibly also have ignited the attacks.

- **Perception around shack rent and ownership**

In addition, most female respondents who participated in the focus groups and interviews thought that the presence of large numbers of Zimbabweans in these communities led to the attacks. Ten respondents indicated that some Zimbabweans had shacks and rented them to fellow Zimbabweans. According to these respondents’ locals because of jealousy complained that Zimbabweans have no right to own shacks for the reason that they are foreigners and this could also be another motive for the attacks. This view is expressed by one woman who said:

I was approached by a young Xhosa woman. She told me to pack up before 17th November. She said if we do not want to go they will burn our shacks. She alleged: You have shacks but we have nothing. Better, you pack up on the 17th and go’!

- **Actions of labour brokers and farmers**

During focus group discussions and one on one interviews, the issue of competition among the labour brokers was mentioned. Twenty interviewees cited that competition among the labour brokers from the South African community sparked the attacks as most Zimbabweans were recruited by Zimbabwean labour brokers. In addition, they stated that these brokers were taking a larger cut of what the farmer pays. In this case the brokers were accused by locals that they don’t pay the minimum wage to Zimbabweans which makes locals feel that

they are robbed off their jobs. Besides, focus group discussions and interviews show that the attacks were initiated by some jealous labour brokers who maintained that labour brokers from Zimbabwe were hiring Zimbabweans directly.

One of the emerging themes from the study was that the violence was also attributed to farmers' actions - this is based on twenty respondents who stated that locals blamed farmers for hiring many Zimbabweans which leads them to attack the foreigner. Based on the interviews and focus group discussions twenty women declared that local residents were unhappy that farmers had been employing Zimbabweans for "less money" and had complained that farmers were excluding the local community. The respondents also expressed the view that that South African are very lazy and do not want to work, and thus why farmers preferred to hire Zimbabweans.

- **Competition for political and economic power**

Twenty one interviewees and three respondents who participated in the focus group discussions essentially argued that some councillors were responsible for the attacks. This is based on the fact that the councillors compete for political and economic power within these multi-ethnic communities. The following quote is an illustration of the woman's comments pertaining to this issue:

"On the day of the attacks I spotted a local councillor. This councillor came to my house two weeks earlier and threatened to demolish my shack for the reason that I had built a bath room. The councillor was also present at a meeting in Ebaleni Hall on the 16th November where he spoke about destroying the houses of Zimbabweans." Ten days before the attacks "The councillor was coming to put electricity to the houses... he was walking with a group of youth saying "not this house... we are going to destroy it just now."(Woman D13)

- **Police's response to the attacks**

According to twelve interviewees and two respondents from focus group discussions police did not intervene during the attacks and their responses indicated that police contributed to the attacks on Zimbabweans. They did not take appropriate actions to stop the perpetrators from organising violence against Zimbabweans. The women specified that police action was the most important factor leading to the De-Doorns violence. Police knew that on the 17th of November Zimbabweans houses were going to be destroyed but could not prevent the mob demolishing shacks. The following remark best represents the response given by one woman:

“Police held a meeting with the informal settlement residents on the evening of 16th November to calm the situation and in that meeting residents threatened to stop the Zimbabweans from going to work fortunately none of us were harmed and we all moved out of the townships leaving some of our personal belongings.”(Woman D14)

One of the Zimbabwean woman whom I interviewed in Shona underlined:

“I saw a group of about 50 men and youth breaking down our shacks, stealing blankets and television sets. There was also a group of women who clapped, whistled and cheered on them. Police were present when the community removed us from Stofland...they told them “don't beat them up, just tell them to go and take their things.”(Woman D15)

Another woman highlights that the violence was also a result of the actions of the police as they knew that the attacks were being planned but did nothing to prevent them before they started. As one of the focus group participant clarified:

“They came around 10 am, chanting political songs. They were singing these songs, different songs, so many songs. Some of them we didn’t know (Xhosa songs) I don’t know what was going on. They said everything belonged to them. I looked at the backyard where I stayed, but it was terror. There was nothing, only ground level. Now I lost everything. I worked for the whole year for nothing... what hurts me most is that police stood by and watched as our shacks in Stofland were looted and destroyed by locals.”(Woman D16)

Eighteen respondents contended that locals attacked them for the reason that police did not intervene to protect the Zimbabweans who lived in the three informal settlements.

- **Overcrowding and not participating in labour disputes**

During focus group discussions and one on one interviews, twelve participants revealed that Zimbabweans were too many in these townships in combination with other factors such as not participating in labour disputes as they said ‘they are here for work’. This could have triggered the attacks. Let me draw on some quotations to bring to light these observations:

“Others said Stofland is overcrowded, and we need more space to build our shacks. Others said on the 17th November 2009 we must all go back to where we come from. Xhosa farm workers claimed that we have stayed here for a long time and therefore, we should leave and go back to Zimbabwe. The problem is I don’t know whether it is culture, or what, but I think it’s all in the mind, they just don’t like foreigners.”(Woman D17)

“Other residents said that Zimbabweans should leave not because of work and resources but complained that there is no space for us (Zimbabweans) they said we were not part of this community.”(Woman D18)

- **Jealousy and Laziness**

During focus group discussions and one on one interviews, twelve participants indicated that locals are lazy and jealousy as a consequence could also have triggered the attacks as one of the woman explained:

“We don’t drink our money we save it,” You see this? I saved for a long time and then I could buy my TV cash. They are jealousy of us.” Most of us are prepared to work overtime, so we also earn more money.” “Locals often got so drunk” at the weekend that they were too hangover to work on a Monday... There really is enough work...” (Woman D19).

4.6 The differences of proposed explanations for violence emerging from interviews and focus group discussions

The following section presents the differences in explanations for xenophobic violence emerging from interviews and focus group discussions done with the female victims of the xenophobic violence that occurred in De-Doorns in November 2009. Amongst other reasons the following perceptions have been stressed by the women as motives for the xenophobic violence.

- **Clever and educated people**

Of the twenty respondents, ten respondents’ reports that locals attacked the Zimbabweans because the locals claimed that Zimbabweans see themselves as clever and educated people and farmers opt to employ the Zimbabweans ahead of the South Africans. Let me draw some quotes to illustrate this example:

“The locals destroyed shacks belonging to Zimbabweans in Stofland, Ekuphumeleni and Hasi Square as they claimed that we are clever and educated people. They also complained that most farmers prefer to employ Zimbabweans for the reason that they are perceived as hardworking and cheap labour. Our things were stolen in the townships. They looted our blankets and everything, even our passports.”(Woman D20)

Commonly mentioned explanations for the violence are that the locals claimed that Zimbabweans came to South Africa to take their jobs. In addition, other women pointed out that locals accused them of accepting lower wages and this is stated as the motive for xenophobic violence. As a final point some consider that the presence of many Zimbabweans triggered this xenophobic violence since some locals complained that they were not part of that community.

- **Culture of hatred**

Thirteen respondents' clarified that Xhosa people do not like Zimbabweans that is why they harass the Zimbabweans and demolished their dwellings in three townships in De-Doorns. The following quotes illustrate the woman's comment pertaining to this issue.

“The Xhosa people are rough when working with foreigners.” They tell us to go back to Zimbabwe. Go back to Mugabe! They shout, go back to Zimbabwe you Makwirikwiri, they hate foreigners' it's their culture they don't like people from Zimbabwe ...” (Woman D21)

“Xhosa farm workers, they don't really like Zimbabweans and they call us names such as kwerekwere. They used to talk things that are not appropriate to be said to people. That Zimbabweans should be brought back to their country since they were never part of this community ... some say that we make South African's unemployed...”(Woman D22)

Nine women who participated in this study revealed that the locals attacked them as they were complaining that Zimbabweans do not participate in local practices and attend meetings in the townships. The following quotation illustrates the women's comment concerning this issue:

“It's not all about work and resources. Locals attacked us since they said Zimbabweans do not want to attend local meetings and local practices in the townships...” (Woman D23)

A different reason given by women which is not the same from the one indicated above is that South African blacks maintain that Zimbabweans nationals do not play a part in the struggles for better wages and working conditions this was also often mentioned as the trigger of violence against foreigners.

4.7 A comparison of explanations emerging from female respondents, research community and the print media

This section gives a comparison of explanations emerging from female respondents, research documents and the print media. Most female participants express the stereotypical perceptions that I have underlined in the sections above as the explanations for the xenophobic violence in De-Doorns.

Similarities

- **Involvement of local politicians**

Explanations from female participants, research documents and the print media disclosed that the violence was organized by local politician's vying for support and positions in these communities. A local African National Congress (ANC) ward councillor incited group of

local farm workers to demolish Zimbabwean houses during one of the meetings convened in the community. (*Sowetan*, p10, 19 April, 2010). The newspaper further stated that the local councillor was suspended for his involvement in the violence that occurred in De-Doorns in November 2009. The spokesperson for Zimbabweans refuge rights group People against Suppression, Oppression and Poverty (PASOP) Braam Hanekom is quoted by the press saying “ *A ward councillor was directly involved in the xenophobic violence beyond a doubt*” (*Sowetan*,p10,19 April,2010). This supports conclusions from South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) report that the violence of 2008 was often rooted in the “micro-politics of South African’s townships and informal settlements,” and was on occasions “spearheaded by local groups and individuals seeking to claim or consolidate power.”

- **Actions of labour brokers and farmers**

It also emerged from the focus groups and interviews held with the women and explanations from research documents and the print media that the violence was a result of competition between the groups of labour brokers where it is also believed that there was a clash between Zimbabwean labour brokers and South African brokers. Farmers were also accused by locals of paying locals and foreigners different wages. Rumours claimed that Zimbabweans accepted lower wages which creates a perception that locals are robbed off their jobs. This view is echoed by the Chairperson of the refuge rights group PASSOP who said:

“This whole incident was a turf war between labour brokers. There are about 1000 labour brokers in a tiny place like De-Doorns.” Labour brokers employ Zimbabweans for the reason that they can take a large cut of what the farmer pays. The whole attack was not instigated by poor South Africans- the frustrations were there but it was exploited and instigated by jealousy labour brokers who are fighting for business”(*Cape Argus*, pg3, 21May).

- **Perception around competition for work**

Proposed explanations from female respondents, research community and the print media highlight that the locals alleged that Zimbabweans are stealing South African jobs and accepting low wages. This reflects South African anxieties over economic competition. These findings are reflected in a study conducted by the Human Science Research Council in 2009 which uses the relative deprivation theory to explain the violence targeted towards foreign nationals. They stated that poor black urban residents are experiencing competition regarding jobs, inadequate provision of housing in their informal settlement and poor service delivery (SAHRC: 2009:6). Consequently, locals target foreigners whom they think they are causing such deprivation. This seems to be the case in De-Doorns although investigations reveal that there was no shortage of work when violence erupted in the farming community.

- **Police's response to the attacks**

It is also pointed out that police actions were a contributory factor for the attacks. Female respondents and Forced Migration Studies Programme (FMSP) mention that police are to blame. Eyewitness reports indicate that the police did little to protect people or property during the attacks. The literature reviewed strongly support the sentiments echoed in these sources. The South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) reports outlines, the virtual absence of the rule of law in informal settlements and this is also a causal factor of violence in 2008. The failure of the government to aggressively address these incidents helps to create a perception that such violence would be tolerated (SAHRC, 2009:6).

Differences

- **Presence of Home Affairs Office in De-Doorns**

The print media and research documents mentioned that the presence of the home affairs office which attracted foreigners in the place was a contributory factor to the attacks. A local leader of Breede Valley Municipality is quoted in the print media as having said:

“What makes the situation worse is that the Department of Home Affairs recently opened an immigration office. There was a complete influx of foreigners and they stay since their applications are processed slowly.”

This is also found in the research conducted by Migrant Monitoring Project which stressed that the presence of Home Affairs in the area also was a major cause for these attacks as many Zimbabweans came to the place for their documents to be processed.

- **Perception around shack rent and ownership**

According to interviews and focus groups with women, locals were unhappy for the reason that some Zimbabweans owned shacks in the townships. A few number of female respondents who participated in the study highlight that locals complained that Zimbabweans rented shacks owned by Zimbabweans not by South Africans. This is not highlighted in the research documents and the print media.

- **Overcrowding and not participating in labour disputes**

Additionally, the women who participated in the study highlighted that the violence might have been sparked by the fact that there were too many Zimbabweans in the townships. This is based on the comments made by locals before the violence occurred in De-Doorns. Others

believe that the violence was a result that most Zimbabweans did not want to join the locals in participating in issues concerning wages.

- **Jealousy and Laziness**

Lastly a small number of female respondents highlighted that these attacks might have been caused by the fact that locals are jealousy and lazy. The fact that some Zimbabweans own shacks and also that they work overtime are among other motives highlighted by these women. On the other hand, this is not the case with the research community and the print media.

4.8 Conclusion

The single most important success of this chapter centres on the fact that it has open up and attempted to find an answer to some of the reasons why violence against Zimbabweans occurred in De- Doorns in November 2009. Proposed explanations from female participants and research documents bring to light that most South African perceive foreigners as people who have come to steal their jobs. This has been mentioned as the motive for De-Doorns violence. It is also highlighted that the De-Doorns violence was organised by local leaders in that community. The violence was also a result of labour matters. The results show that poor labour practices such as hiring Zimbabweans then not paying them the agreed minimum wages fuelled the attacks as locals in De-Doorns feel that Zimbabweans are taking their jobs by accepting less than the minimum wages. In the De-Doorns case some labour brokers organized violence in order to get rid of competitors in this case brokers from Zimbabwe. It is for these motives that Zimbabweans were targeted. There were no clear differences in explanations in relation to the second questions. Some women pointed out that locals attacked them since the Zimbabweans see themselves as intelligent and educated people whereas

others point to the presence of many Zimbabweans in De-Doorns farming community. Others specified that South Africans accused them of taking their jobs. Some women allude to hatred and jealous while others underlined that the locals accused the Zimbabweans for not taking part in the struggles for better working conditions. In conclusion the interviews, focus group discussions, research documents and newspaper articles are comparable in that both specify that the violence was organized, there was competition among the labour brokers and also police's actions were influential in causing the attacks. On the other hand, they contrast in that the research documents and mass media mentioned the presence of Home Affairs in the area which attracted foreigners which is was not mentioned by female participants. In addition female respondents show that the violence was a result of jealousy and overcrowding and also perceptions around shack ownership and rent which is not underscored in the research documents and mass media covering the De-Doorns incident. Having documented the proposed explanations for xenophobic violence from female participants, research documents and the mass media, the next chapter concludes the study and gives recommendations.

CHAPTER FIVE

5.1 Concluding Remarks

In November 2009, the small town of De-Doorns located in Western Cape Province witnessed the violent attacks on foreigners working in the grape farms in De-Doorns. This outbreak of xenophobic violence directed towards migrants caused a stir in the media. Black South Africans living in the townships destroyed a number of shacks rented by foreigners.

The central aim of the study was to compare the proposed explanations given by female victims of the xenophobic violence which occurred in De-Doorns in November 2009 with explanations drawn from the research community and the mass media. The study was guided by the following theories namely relative deprivation, resource mobilisation theory and Horowitz's arguments. These theories contributed to explain the motives for xenophobic violence. This study relied solely upon qualitative data collecting methods. Qualitative data was acquired using focus group discussion, interviews with women and the use of documentation covering the De-Doorns incident. The focus group discussions were carefully devised in order to enhance disclosure among participants, given the sensitive nature of the subject that was being researched. As mentioned previously female participants were selected for the study since most studies on migrants were devoted largely to male migrants (Lim, 1995). The use of a case study research design permitted me to navigate the three research questions delineated in chapter one which are:

- What explanations for xenophobic violence are given by female victims of the xenophobic violence?

- What differences in explanation emerge from within this group?
- How do these explanations compare with those given by the research community and mass media?

The following sum-up is presented in order to answer the three research questions addressed in this study. Findings have generated the following responses to the three questions stated above. The investigation presents a ground for forthcoming research and thus, certain recommendations will follow after the summary of results.

Question 1: What explanations for xenophobic violence are given by female victims of the xenophobic violence?

Most women use both relative deprivation and resource mobilization explanations in their responses in explaining the reasons for the outbreak of violence in De-Doorns farming community. On the whole, the women hold very strong views that South Africans living in informal settlements perceive Zimbabweans as people who have come to steal their jobs. This has been mentioned as the motive for xenophobic violence in De-Doorns farming community. This result provides further support for the theory of relative deprivation used by South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) to explain the xenophobic violence which occurred in May 2008. It is maintained by the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) that poor black South Africans in the townships are experiencing competition regarding jobs, inadequate provision of housing as a result target foreigners whom they think are causing such deprivation. The research has confirmed previous work done by scholars such as Peberdy (2002) who contended that xenophobia thrives when there is competition for employment.

In particular, women who participated in the study expressed that the violence was organised by local politicians in De-Doorns. The findings have confirmed the theory of resource mobilisation which argues that grassroots leaders who are vying for support mobilise masses of people to take up violent action against foreigners as a means of strengthening their power base. The results are also consistent with findings of the study done by Misago *et al* (2009) after the 2008 xenophobic violence. Misago *et al* (2009:6) mention that “in almost all cases where violence occurred, it was organised and led by local groups and individuals in an effort to claim or consolidate the authority and power needed to further their political and economic interests.”

Women who participated in this study indicated that police also contributed to the attacks on Zimbabweans. There were meetings a day before the attacks and residents in the townships threatened to attack the foreigners. Police knew that violence would take place in the informal settlements but did not take any measures to prevent it. This is another reason expressed by women for De-Doorns violence.

The study also found out that there was competition among labour brokers which was also specified as a motive for violent attacks on Zimbabweans. It is accentuated that some jealous labour brokers from the South African community accused brokers from Zimbabwe for hiring many contract farm workers. Moreover, the participants also revealed that rumours claimed Zimbabweans accepted low wages. This has also been stated as the cause of De-Doorns violence, according to these women. The conclusion drawn from the themes that emerged from the interviews and focus group discussions are in harmony with other studies discussed in chapter two.

Question 2: What differences in explanation emerges from within this group?

Though there were no clear differences in explanations, there were significant differences in emphases. Some women stress that South African alleged that Zimbabweans see themselves as clever and educated people whereas others argued that South African see foreigners as people who take their jobs. This finding is in line with other researchers. Shindondola (2001:16) explains that hostility towards foreigners is a result of limited resources such as employment. Others stated that locals were complaining that Zimbabweans nationals were accepting lower wages. This was mentioned by women as one of the motive for De-Doorns violence.

An interesting difference emerged from the responses given by women. Some women think that the violence was caused by the influx of Zimbabwean immigrants in De-Doorns farming community. This intensified tension between locals and Zimbabweans who claimed that Zimbabweans were never part of De-Doorns community. This view was particularly strong among participants in De-Doorns refugee camp, regardless of age.

In the second place, some female participants explained that South African hate foreigners whereas others believe that South African blacks hold very strong feelings that Zimbabweans nationals do not play a part in the struggles for better wages and working conditions this was consistently mentioned as the trigger of violence against foreigners.

Question 3: How do these explanations compare with those given by the research community and mass media?

The following are the similarities emerging from focus group discussions and interviews held with women and those given by the research community and mass media. Female respondents and experts from the research community maintain that the violence was

organised by local politicians vying for support and positions in these communities. In addition, it is believed that the violence was a result of competition between the groups of labour brokers.

Interestingly, a related point that came out over and over again was the fact that rumours claimed that Zimbabweans accepted lower wages which fuelled the attacks. The results were also largely consistent with Horowitz's arguments which maintain that both external contextual causes as well as immediate locality- bound causes need to be considered when explaining xenophobic violence. Lastly female respondents and experts from the research community stress that police knew that violence would happen in De- Doorns but did not take any measures to prevent it - hence their actions contributed to the attacks. There have been a lot of accusations that some police officials stood and did not intervene to protect the Zimbabweans who were displaced.

On the other hand, female respondents and experts from the research community diverge in that female participants point out that the violence occurred in De-Doorns because locals complained that foreigners owned shacks. This is not underlined in research documents covering the De-Doorns incident. The print media and research documents allude to the presence of a Home Affairs office which attracted foreigners to the place as a contributory factor to the attacks. Nonetheless, this is not underlined as the cause of violence by women who participated in interviews and focus group discussions. Women who participated in this study mentioned that the violence was a result of overcrowding in the informal settlements. This has not been stated by the print media and research documents. Female respondents also indicated that the attacks occurred because South Africans are jealousy and lazy. This has not been specified by the research documents and the print media as the cause of violence in De-Doorns.

The conclusions of this investigation indicate that there are a number of reasons why violence erupted in De-Doorns. The study used narratives from the print media, research documents and in-depth interviews from female respondents. On the other hand, the results should not be construed as definite and conclusive truth since only twenty eight women participated in the study and may not be representative of all migrant women who were victims of De-Doorns violence. However, women's varied views that were described do assist in qualitatively enhancing the understanding of De-Doorns violence. In light of similarities in these different proposed explanations, this study provides a base for future research and as a result, the following recommendations have been made:

5.2 Recommendations

In order to foster and accelerate behaviour change among black South Africans living in the townships, it is essential to put into action real programmes intended to change their beliefs and attitudes towards black foreigners as well as to educate the South African public on the consequences of violence. The investigator does not claim to have a monopoly of knowledge on how this can be done. Nevertheless, the following suggestions are made:

- Foster and implement effective interventions (advocacy and action programmes) involving stakeholders such as religious groups, non-governmental organisations and the government intended to change public's views, attitudes and beliefs towards black foreign nationals living in South Africa.
- The investigator shared a similar background with the twenty-eight female victims of the xenophobic violence. The researcher proposes that forthcoming studies should be conducted by a neutral investigator to reduce chances of bias and subjectivity in the conclusions obtained.

- Utilising a case study, the investigator commend that future researchers might study other victims of xenophobic violence to determine the comparisons and dissimilarities in their perceptions of factors prompting xenophobic violence in South Africa.

The investigator realise that the above suggestions are not complete in themselves, but could all the same be useful as catalysts for generating discussion about the contentious matters presented in this thesis.

References

- All Africa. Com “*South Africa: Xenophobic Rage leaves Trail of Havoc in Gauteng.*” Retrieved 19 May 2008.
- Allan, K and Heese, K. (2008). *Service Delivery failures and xenophobic attacks*. Business Day, p 13, 20 May.
- Babbie, E, Mouton, J., Vorster, P. and Prozesky, B. (2001). *The Practice of Social research*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.
- Babbie, E. (2001). *The practice of Social Research*. Belmont, C A: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Babbie, E. (2005). *The Basics of Social Research*, (3rd ed.) London: Thomson Learning.
- Babbie, E. (2007). Conducting qualitative field research. In *The Practice of Social Research* (11th ed). USA: Thompson Wadsworth.
- Baker, T.L. (1988). *Doing Social Research*. New York: McCraw-Hill.
- Barbali, S. (2009). *Coping with Xenophobia: Senegalese Migrants in Port Elizabeth*. Unpublished Master’s Thesis. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- BBC “*Thousands flee South Africa attacks.*” Retrieved 25 June 2008.
- Bekker, S. (2010) Explaining violence against foreigners and strangers in urban South Africa: Outburst during May and June 2008, *In African Yearbook of International Law*, 125-149. African Foundation for International Law.
- Bekker, S; Eigelaar-Meets, I, Eva, G and Poole, C. (2008). *Xenophobia and Violence in South Africa: Desktop Study of the Trends and a Scan of Explanations offered*. University of Stellenbosch, unpublished.
- Bengali, Shashank. McClathy Newspapers (2008). “*Hungry and Fearful Zimbabweans Flooding South Africa.*” 18 July 2008.
- Berg, B. L. (1998). *Qualitative Research Methods for Social Sciences*, (3rd ed.). Boston Allyn and Bacon.

- Best, J.V. and Kahn, J.V. (1993). *Research in Education*. Boston Allyn and Bacon.
- Brym, R and Fox, B. (1989). *From Culture to Power*. Toronto: Oxford.
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research Methods*, (2nd ed) New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cantrell, D. (1993). Alternative paradigms in environmental education research interpretive perspective. In R. Mrazek (ed.), *Alternative paradigms in environmental education research* (pp. 81-104). Lethbridge: NAAEE.
- Cape Argus “36 arrested after 2 more die in Tshwane “foreigner riots”.” Retrieved 6 September 2008.
- Cohen *et al* (2002). *Research Methods in Education* (5th ed) New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1994). *Research Methods in Education*. Beckenhem. Croom Helm.
- Consortium for Refugees and Migrants in South Africa. (2008). “*Protecting Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Immigrants in South Africa*.” (18 June. PP. 3-72).
- CRAI (2009). *Tolerating Intolerance: Xenophobic Violence in South Africa*. CRAI.
- Creswell, J.W. (1994). *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative approaches*. London: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design, Choosing among Five Approaches*, (2nd ed.) California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Crush, J. (1996). “*A Bad Neighbour. Policy Migrant Labour and the New South Africa*” Southern African Report.
- Crush, J. (2000). “*The Dark side of Democracy: Migration, Xenophobia and Human Rights in South Africa*” In *International Migration* 38(6):103-133.

Daily Nation (2009). “Zimbabweans Flood South Africa as Power Sharing Deal Troubled” 26 October.

Denzin, N.K and Linclon, Y.S. (1998). *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues* London: Sage Publications.

Denzin, N.K and Linclon, Y.S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and Practice of qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Linclon (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (PP.1-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

DuPlooy, G.M. (1997). *Introduction to Communication Research*. Nairobi, Juta.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Boston: Addison Wesley.

Fontana, A. and Frey, J.H. (1994). Interviewing The art of Science. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Linclon (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (PP.361-376). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Freilich, J.D.; Jeremy, A.P and Gregory J.H. (2001). “Toward Comparative Studies of the U.S. Militia Movement.” *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, Vol. 42:163-210.

Glynnis, U.(2010). Xenophobia? What xenophobia? Mail & Guardian, p6, January 22-28.

Greef, M. (2005). Information Collection: Interviewing. In De Vos, A.S., Strydom, H., Fouche, C.B. and Delport, C.S.L. (Eds.). *Research at grassroots for the social science and human professions*. Pretoria Van Schaik Publishers.

Harries, B. (2001). “A Foreign Experience, Violence, Crime and Xenophobia During South Africa’s Transition” Violence and Transition Series 5.

Harris, B. (2002). “Xenophobia: A new pathology for a new South Africa.” In Hook, D and Eagle (Eds.) *Psychopathology and Social Prejudice*, pp. 169-184, University of Cape Town Press: Cape Town.

Hassim, S; Kupe, T and Worby, E. (2008). *Go Home or Die Here: Violence, Xenophobia and the Reinvention of Difference in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Hatch, J.A. (2002). *Doing Qualitative in Education Setting*: Albany State University New York Press.

Hichcock, G and Hughes. D. (1995). *Research and the Teacher: a Qualitative*

HSRC (2008), *Citizenship, Violence and Xenophobia in South Africa: Perceptions from South Africans Communities*, Pretoria; Human Science Research Council.

Human Development Report (2009). *Overcoming barriers: Human Mobility and development*, New York: UNDP.

Independent Online “Raging mob evicts Zimbabweans, burns homes.” Retrieved 6 September 2008.

Independent Online “Somali’s turn to HRC as murder to soars.” Retrieved 6 September 2008.

Independent Online “Xenophobic attacks: seven die in one month.” Retrieved 6 September 2008.

Introduction to School-Based Research. London, New York Routledge.

Jaftha, P. (2003). *An investigation into whether a leadership and management development project changed the perceptions of the educators in a black disadvantaged school*. Unpublished Master’s Thesis. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.

Jean Pierre Misago: *Violence, Labour and the Displacement of Zimbabweans in De-Doorns, Western Cape*,” FMSP, December 2009. Migration Policy Brief 2.

Jenkins, J.G and Perrow, C. (1977). Insurgency of the Powerless; Farm worker Movements, 1946, 1946-1972, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 42: 249-268.

Johnson, B. and Christensen, L. (2004). *Educational Research: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Approaches*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Kendall. (2006). *Sociology in Our Times*, Thomson Wardsworth.

- Khan J.A. (2007). *Research Methodology*: A.P.K. Publishing Corporation, New Delhi.
- Krathwohl, D.R. (1993). *Methods of Education and Social Science Research. An Intergrated Approach*. London: Longman.
- Krueger ,R. and King,A.J.(1998) *Involving Community in Focus Groups* (Vol 5) Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Krueger, R.A. (1994). *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Landau, B. (2004). “*The Laws of (in) Hospitality: Black Africans in South Africa.*” Forced Migration Working Paper Series 7. Forced Migration Studies Programme [http:// migration. wits.ac.za](http://migration.wits.ac.za).
- Landau, Loren.B. (2004). ‘*Democracy and Discrimination: Black African Migrants in South Africa: Global Migration Perspective* 5: 1-17.
- Leedy, P.D (1993). *Practical Research Planning and Design*. MacMillan Publishing Company.
- Leininger, M. (1985). *Qualitative Research Methods in Nursing*. Orlando, FL: Grune and Stratton.
- Liam, M .(2010) *Refugee camp to close on May 17. Cape Argus*, p5 06 May.
- Lim, L. (1995). The Status of Women and International Migration.” *In International Migration Policies and the Status of Female Migrants*. United Nations Department for Economic and Social Information and Policy Analysis, Population Division. New York: United Nations.
- Lindegger, G. (2002). Research Methods in Clinical Research (251-268). In Terre Blace M and Durrheim, K. (Eds.), *Research in Practice: applied methods for social science*. Cape Town. University of Cape Town Press.
- Luvuyo, M. (2009) “*My heart is bleeding,*” *Cape Times*, p2, 18 November.

- Luvuyo, M. (2009). *Refugee activist threatened in De-Doorns*. *Cape Times*, p1, 24 November.
- Luvuyo, M. (2010). *De-Doorns locals spurn moves to bring back refugees*. *Cape Times*, p5, 27 January.
- MacDonald, D .O and Jacobs, S. (2005). “(Re) Writing Xenophobia: Understanding Press Coverage of Cross- Border Migration in Southern Africa.” *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 23(3): 297-325).
- Majavu, A. (2009). *Zimbabweans could face more violence*. *Sowetan*, p2, 18 December.
- Majavu, A. (2010). *ANC Suspends councillors for Xenophobia*. *Sowetan*, p10, 19 April.
- Marrow, S.L., and Smith, M.L. (2000). Qualitative research methods in counselling psychology. In S.D. Brown and R.W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of Counselling Psychology* (3rd ed.) Pp. 199-230).NY: Wiley).
- Mattes, R. Crush, J.R and Wayne, R. (2000). *The brain gain: Skilled migrants and immigration policy in post- apartheid South Africa*. *Southern African Migration Project*. Cape Town: Southern African Migration Project.
- McCarthy, J.D. and Zald, M. (1977). “Resource Mobilisation and Social Movements” *In American Journal of Sociology* 82, pages 1212-1241.
- Merriam Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary* (10th ed.). (1993). Springfield. MA: Merriam-Webster.
- Merriam, S.B and Associates (2002). *Qualitative Research in Practice*: San Francisco: Jossey- Bass Publishers.
- Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative Research Case Study Applications in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Merriam, S.B. (2002). *Qualitative Research in Practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

- Misago, J. P with L Landau and T Monson. (2009). *Towards Tolerance, Law and Dignity: addressing Violence against Foreign Nationals in South Africa*. International Organisation for Migration; Pretoria.
- Morris, A. (1998). “*Our fellow African make our Lives Hell. The Lives of Congolese and Nigerians Living in Johannesburg.*” In *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21(6): 1116-1135.
- Mouton, J (2001). *How to Succeed in your Masters and Doctoral Studies*: Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Myers, D.G. (1996). *Social Psychology*. (5th Ed.) New York: McGraw- Hill Companies, Incorporated.
- Nahla Valgi. *Creating the Nation: The Rise of Violent Xenophobia in the New South Africa.*” Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation. Retrieved 8 September 2008.
- Natasha, P. (2009). *Calm returns to De-Doorns after farmers employing Zimbabweans*. *The Herald (Ep Herald)*, p2, 19 November.
- Neuman, W.L. (1997). *Social Research Methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Nyamnjoh, F.B. (2004). “Reconciling the rhetoric of rights with competing notions of personhood and agency in Botswana.” In England H and Nyamnjor, F. B. (Eds.) *Rights and the Politics of Recognition in Africa*. PP 33-63, ZED Books: New York and London.
- Nyamnjor, F. (2006). *Insiders and Outsiders: Citizenship and Xenophobia in Contemporary Southern Africa*, CODESRIA and Zed Books; Dakar, London and New York.
- Olivier, J. “Causes of ethnic collective action in the Pretoria-Witwatersrand-Vaal Triangle, 1970 to 1984.” *South African Sociological Review*, Vol 12/No, 1990.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Third edition. London Sage Publications.

- Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Peberdy, S. (2002). *Imagining Immigration: Inclusive Identities and Exclusive Policies in Post 1994 South Africa.* Indiana University Press. PP. 15-32.
- Punch, K.F. (2005). *Introduction to Social research, quantitative and qualitative approaches.* London: Sage Publications.
- Shindondola, H. (2003). *Xenophobia in South Africa and Beyond*, PhD. Research Proposal, Rand Afrikaans University Johannesburg.
- Smith, L.M. (1990). Ethics in qualitative field research: an individual perspective, In Eisner, E.W. and Peshkin, A. (eds) *Qualitative Inquiry in Education: The Continuing Debate*, New York Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Steward, D.W. and Shamdasani, P.N. (1990). *Focus Groups: Theory and Practice.* Newbury Park, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Stoecker, R. (1991). Evaluating and Rethinking the Case Study. *Sociological Review*, 39(1): 88-112.
- Taylor, S.J., and Bogdan, R. (1998) *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley.
- Thandanani, M (2010). “*Fear halts reintegration efforts PASSOP calls for prosecution of those responsible for xenophobic attacks,*” *Cape Argus*, p6, 5 January.
- The Times* “*Recent attacks tip of xenophobic Iceberg.*” *The Times.co.za* Retrieved 19 May 2008.
- Tshitekere, C. (1999). *Xenophobia and Relative Deprivation.* *Crossings*.3 (2) 45.
- Tuckman, B.W. (1994). *Conducting Educational Research* (4th ed.) New York: Hanont Bruce College.

Weiss, C.H. (1972). *Evaluation Research*: Englewood Cliffs. Prentice Hall.

Wilkinson. (2004) Using Focus Groups. In D. Silverman(Ed) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. 2nd edition (2004) London: Sage. (Pp177-199).

Williamson, J.B, Kark, D.A and Dalphin, J.R. (1977). *The Research Craft: An Introduction to Social Science Research Methods*: Boston: MA: Little, Brown.

Wimmer, R.D., and Dominick, J.R. (2000). *Mass media research: an introduction*, (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Wood, W.B. (1994). “*Forced Migration: Local conflicts and International Dilemmas*,” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 84: 607-634.

APPENDIX A

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Background Questions

- Age of person interviewed
- Marital status of person interviewed
- Date of interview

Opening questions

1(i) Tell me about yourself, when did you first arrive in De-Doorns?

(ii) Do you stay here all year or move?

Key questions on violent attacks

2(i) Were you working as a farm worker before the November attacks?

(ii) If yes, when had you started to do the work?

(iii) Tell me, were you recruited by a labour broker?

(iv) If yes, when was this?

(v) Was the broker South African or Zimbabwean?

3(i) I have been told of a strike among South African workers just before the attacks. This strike was about wages. Did you hear about this and were you asked to join the strike?

(ii) The attacks started on Tuesday. Tell me what happened to you during the three days of attacks.

(iii) What was attacked?

(iv) What kind of people were involved? (unemployed, employed, men, women or youth).

(v) What role did the police play during the attacks?

(vi) Tell me briefly what you did after the attacks?

4(i) I am interested in the general causes of the attacks. What do you think are the causes of this incident?

(ii) Tell me how important was work and wages on farm as a reason?

(iii) How important was shack rent as a reason?

(iv) How important was police and councillor action before as a reason?

(v) How important was the strike as a reason?

Final question

5 Is there anything else that we should have talked about we did not?

APPENDIX B

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS PROMPTS

- Describe what really happened in the November violent attacks here in De- Doorns. Start with what happened during the attacks.
- What happened before the attacks?
- What happened after the attacks?
- Speak about why these attacks took place?

APPENDIX C

LIST OF INTERVIEWS

- Interview 1, 17/08/2010, interview conducted in Zola (Strand).
- Interview 2, 22/08/2010, interview conducted in Khayelitsha (Makaza).
- Interview 3, 03/09/2010, interview conducted in Khayelitsha (Makaza).
- Interview 4, 15/09/2010, interview conducted in Central library Cape Town.
- Interview 5, 20/09/2010, interview conducted in Philippi Township.
- Interview 6, 20/09/2010, interview conducted in Khayelitsha (Harare).
- Interview 7, 22/09/2010, interview conducted in De-Doorns Refugee Camp.
- Interview 8, 22/09/2010, interview conducted in De-Doorns Refugee Camp.
- Interview 9, 22/09/2010, interview conducted in De-Doorns Refugee Camp.
- Interview 10, 22/09/2010, interview conducted in De-Doorns Refugee Camp.
- Interview 12, 22/09/2010, interview conducted in De-Doorns Refugee Camp.
- Interview 13, 04 10/2010, interview conducted in Stofland in De-Doorns.
- Interview 14, 04/10/ 2010, interview conducted in Stofland in De-Doorns.
- Interview 15, 22/10/2010, interview conducted in De-Doorns Refugee Camp.
- Interview 16, 22/10/2010, interview conducted in De-Doorns Refugee Camp.
- Interview 17, 22/10/2010, interview conducted in De-Doorns Refugee Camp.
- Interview 18, 22/10/2010, interview conducted in De-Doorns Refugee Camp.
- Interview 19, 22/10/2010, interview conducted in De-Doorns Refugee Camp.
- Interview 20, 22/10/2010, interview conducted in De-Doorns Refugee Camp.

APPENDIX D

LIST OF FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

- First focus group discussion held in Hex River Valley Town (24 May 2010).
 1. Woman 1 aged 32, arrived in South Africa in 2007.
 2. Woman 2 aged 23 arrived in South Africa in 2009.
 3. Woman 3 aged 27 arrived in South Africa in 2007.
 4. Woman 4 aged 29 arrived in South Africa in 2008.

- Second focus group discussion held in Hex River Valley Town (24 May 2010).
 1. Woman 1 aged 39 arrived in South Africa in 2007.
 2. Woman 2 aged 22 arrived in South Africa in 2008.
 3. Woman 3 aged 37 arrived in South Africa in 2008.