

https://dspace.org/

Effectiveness of Xenowatch's monitoring of xenophobic violence in South Africa

Charuma, Tinevimbo

2023-03
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/38936
Charuma, Tinevimbo. (2023). Effectiveness of Xenowatch's monitoring of xenophobic violence in South Africa [Master's dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg]. WireDSpace. https://hdl.handle.net/10539/38936

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/





Effectiveness of Xenowatch's monitoring of xenophobic violence in South Africa.

Tinevimbo Charuma [2286973]

Supervisor: Dr Nedson Pophiwa

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Master of Management in Public and Development Sector Monitoring and Evaluation for Examination, March 2023

DECLARATION

I Tinevimbo Charuma declare that Effectiveness of monitoring of xenophobic of violence: The case of Xenowatch, is my own work, it has not been submitted for any degree for examination at any other institution. I acknowledge that all the sources I have used and quoted have been indicated and completely referenced.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my family (my support system and the wind beneath my wings).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor Dr Nedson Pophiwa for the guidance and motivation throughout this research, thank you for sharing with me your valuable knowledge and ideas and making me realize that research is not bad after all.

I would like to thank the staff from Xenowatch, ADF, LHR and CoRMSA for their time and participation which made the completion of this study possible.

Special mention also goes to my friends and colleagues (whom I have never met) for their support, encouragement and always sparing time to share ideas.

To my family no words can never be enough to show my gratitude, my husband, thank you for the support and pushing beyond what I thought were my limits especially during the last days of the research, my sisters for always being my cheerleaders and my mom for always reminding that nothing that happens in my life is a surprise to God and for always being the voice of reason. Thank you.

Lastly, but most important Glory be to God.

ABSTRACT

With increasing occurrence of xenophobic violence incidents in South Africa it becomes imperative to come up with solutions that are more effective. Key to reducing and preventing the incidents is monitoring of xenophobic violence for better evidence-informed anti-xenophobic policy interventions. In South Africa at present there is no state institution that focuses on tracking and tracing the patterns and trends of xenophobic violence attacks which means that decisions to act or ignore are not based on any factual information. A growing point of literature suggests that societal issues do not have optimal solutions, hence they need to be data driven to effectively deal with problem communities are facing. However, in Africa and in South Africa data driven and evidence- based decision making is limited in both public and private sectors. This study aimed at exploring how monitoring of xenophobic violence is used for policy making and advocacy work. A case study approach was used which focused on the monitoring of xenophobic violence by Xenowatch an independent institution. Within the case study key informant interviews were conducted with ten participants which comprised of three from Xenowatch staff and the remaining from Xenowatch partner organizations who are also users of the data. All the participants were purposively selected due to their experience and expertise with migration issues which are greatly connected to xenophobic violence and also working for and working with Xenowatch. There is limited evidence of use of the Xenowatch monitoring data by government or state institutions. The data showed its strength in advocacy as the findings revealed several uses by civil society organizations which include lobbying, influencing policy change, used in court cases among others. The study also showed the challenges in both gathering and using monitoring data such as underreporting, definition of xenophobic violence for the former, and capacity (knowledge and resources which affects both civil society and government) for the latter. From the interviews different suggestions were given by both respondents from Xenowatch staff and their stakeholders on how to improve the use of monitoring results for advocacy and policy making.

Key Words: monitoring, xenophobic violence, policy making, advocacy.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACLED	Armed Conflict Location and Event Data Project
ADF	African Diaspora Forum
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
CoRMSA	Consortium for Refugees and Migrants in South Africa
ISS	Institute for Security Studies
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
LHR	Lawyers for Human Rights
MSF	Doctors without Borders (MSF) Southern Africa
NAP	National Action Plan
PSPPD	Programme to Support Presidency's Pro-Poor Development
PPVM	Protest and Public Violence Monitoring
RtoP	Responsibility to Protect
SAHRC	South Africa Human Rights Commission
SAPS	South Africa Police Services
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 1 Gomo's illustration of how xenophobic violence manifests 37

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Four Functions of Advocacy Data Work	36
Table 2.	Profile of the participants	51
Table 3	Framework of discussion of findings	53

Table of Contents

DECLARATION ***1***

DEDICATION ***2***

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ***3***

ABSTRACT ***4***

LIST OF ACRONYMS ***6***

LIST OF FIGURES ***7***

LIST OF TABLES ***8***

Chapter One: Introduction ***12***

1.1 Background **12**

1.2 Problem statement **14**

1.3 Research questions **16**

1.4 Research purpose **16**

1.6 Literature Review **17**

1.7 Methodology **17**

1.8 The research structure **18**

Chapter Summary **18**

Chapter Two: Literature Review ***19***

2.1 Introduction ***19***

2.2 Xenophobic Violence in the South African Context **20**

2.3 Monitoring **24**

2.3.1 Purposes of Monitoring **25**

2.3.2 Data Use 25

2.3.3 Data Use and Policy Making 25

2.3.4 Data Use and Advocacy 27

2.4 Monitoring of xenophobic Violence **31**

2.4.1 Monitoring of xenophobic Violence in the South African Context **33**

2.4.2 Challenges in monitoring **36**

2.5 Examples of institutions/platforms of monitoring ***37***

2.6 Theoretical Framework ***41***

2.6.1 Scapegoating Hypothesis ***41***

2.6.2 Violations Approach to Monitoring **44**

2.6.3 The Responsibility to Prevent Framework **44**
2.6.5 The link between the reviewed theories and the present study **46**
Chapter Summary **47**
Chapter Three: Methodology 48
*3.1 Introduction **48***
3.2 Research Paradigm and Approach **48**
3.3 Research Design **49**
3.4 Data and Data Gathering **50**
3.5 Population and Sampling **52**
3.6 Data analysis **53**
3.7 Validity and Reliability **54**
3.8 Ethics **56**
3.9 Limitations **57**
Chapter Summary **57**
Chapter Four: Presentation of findings 59
*4.1 Introduction **59***
4.2 Participant profile **59**
4.3 Framework for discussion of findings **64**
4.4 Presentation of findings **65**
4.5 Approaches, methods, and tools used in monitoring xenophobic violence 65
4.5.1 Crowd sourcing 66
4.5.2 Online search 67
4.5.3 Original research 68
4.6 Data from monitoring of xenophobic violence feeding into advocacy and policymaking 69
4.6.1 Main users **69**
4.6.2 Dissemination and uses of the data **73**
4.7 Challenges of gathering and using xenophobic violence monitoring data 79
4.7.1 Challenges of gathering xenophobic violence monitoring data **79**
4.7.2 Challenges of using xenophobic violence monitoring data **82**
Chapter Summary **85**
Chapter Five: Discussion of Findings 86
5.1 Introduction 86
5.2 Approaches, methods and tools used in monitoring xenophobic violence 86
5.3 Extent to which data from monitoring xenophobic violence feeds into advocacy and policy making 88
5.4 Challenges of gathering and using xenophobic violence monitoring data 94
Chapter Summary 97

Chapter Six: Conclusion and Recommendations ***98***

6.1 Introduction 98

6.2 Discussion of Attainment of study purpose **98**

6.3 Revisiting Research Questions **98**

6.4 Recommendations **99**

6.5 Future and Further Research **100**

Chapter Summary **101**

References ***102***

Appendices ***110***

Appendix One: Participation Information Sheet **110**

Appendix Two: Consent Form **112**

Appendix Three: Interview Guide One **114**

Appendix Four: Interview Guide Two **115**

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Background

After 1994, South Africa ushered in democracy and a constitution that upholds and defends the rights of all citizens. While this is on paper, the epidemic of violence against women, racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, and related intolerances plagues South Africa. The government's execution of human rights laws was not tested until the xenophobic violence that swept most of the country in May 2008, when African foreigners residing in informal settlements, townships, and the inner-city districts were savagely attacked (Tafira, 2018). Crush (2008) notes that it resulted in 70 deaths and over 100 000 people displaced all over South Africa's major cities. The upsurges have regularly continued in 2011, 2015 again in 2018-2019, (Crush, 2022). It is important to note that during the time of writing this research there has been rise in movements such as Operation Dudula and hashtags such as *#PutSouthAfricansFirst*, with a huge following on Twitter, that have seen overt calls for the expulsion of foreigners.

At the center of these violent acts of xenophobia has been government's denialism and ambivalence, as most government officials argue that these attacks have merely been criminal activities (Solomon and Kosaka, 2013). Over two decades ago, (Dodson, 2010) observed that senior government officials placed blame on illegal immigrants as the ones straining state resources and engaging in criminal activities. Therefore, the government's denialism is one of the reasons for the failure by the state to curb the problem of xenophobic violence. Gordon (2019) argues that the government's rhetoric on xenophobia gives a good reason to believe that the authorities are obscuring the actual degree of xenophobic violence in the country. The monitoring of xenophobic violence becomes essential since it provides evidence to the fact that such acts are indeed happening, hotspots of the violence, identification of victims and provides early warming before the situation goes out of hand.

After the 2015 xenophobic violent attacks, Dr. Ibrahim Mayaki, Chief Executive Officer of the NEPAD Agency, stated that the violence, looting, and attacks on foreigners are a violation of human rights, life, and dignity as well as a betrayal of the values of Pan-Africanism and Ubuntu (hospitality and solidarity). South Africa found itself at the top of the media for the wrong reasons (Ajayi, 2015). First, Article 13(1) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state. This is supported by Article 13(2), which states that everyone has the right to leave any country, including his or her own, and to seek asylum elsewhere. Second, Article 14(1) declares that everyone has the right to seek and enjoy asylum from persecution in other countries. Lastly, according to Article 17(1), no one may be unfairly deprived of their right to hold property alone or jointly with others (2). Despite all of these UNDH provisions, as well as those found in the South African constitution and Refugee Act, xenophobia persists, as shown by the numerous attacks on foreigners that have occurred since 1994 (Landau, 2007), and Mbecke (2015) notes that these provisions are not fully implemented, monitored, or enforced.

The South African Human Rights Commission acknowledges that xenophobia has been in the top three of equality rights violations since 2012 and in 2016 and 2017, 4% of the complaints reported to SAHRC were xenophobia related. Like any other human rights violation, xenophobic violence should be monitored and investigated. The Durban Conference on Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and related intolerances urges all states to monitor and record all forms of violence related to hatred. The newly implemented National Action Plan of 2019 advocates for monitoring, recording, and reporting of xenophobic violence. While monitoring xenophobic violence is key to solving the crisis, most countries do not have systems to track these acts and it becomes the sole responsibility of civil society and private entities. The government as a whole and the South African Police Services, in particular, do not specifically monitor anti- foreigner attacks, thus it has been difficult to keep track and establish what is stoking the violence (Alfred, 2006).

1.2 Problem statement

The United Nations High Commission for Refugees recognizes that the various manifestations of xenophobia pose a threat to its persons of concern namely refugees, stateless persons, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons, (Misago et al., 2015). Xenophobia manifesting in form of violence is not a unique phenomenon to South Africa. It is a global problem which is supposed to be closely monitored and investigated. According to Gomo (2010), xenophobia threatens democratic structures and diminishes liberal values, and the cardinal values of democracy and liberalism are endangered such as social justice, equality, and human dignity. Literature shows that despite the increased incidence of xenophobic violence in South Africa there is no centralized or standardized recording mechanisms, which means that the present data might be an underestimation of the actual situation on the ground. This notion is supported by (Gordon, 2019) who notes that there is scarcity of data on xenophobic violence and behavior which makes it difficult to understand why the incidences continue to happen.

The results from the evaluation by United Nations High Commission of Refugees ROSA in 2015 showed that there is need to create an evidence base which can only be achieved through systematic and innovative monitoring, (Misago et al., 2015). When interventions to curb xenophobic violence are not informed by evidence on what drives the violence as showcased in a study by (Misago, 2016), then they are bound to fail. Additionally, Langer and Weyrauch (2021) argue that in Africa there is minimal use of evidence in decision and policy making, thus this research is significant in contributing to how monitoring xenophobic violence used for policy making. Furthermore, on the issue of advocacy (Pugh, 2014) notes that in South Africa the space for civil society to advocate for structural and political change and addressing of the root causes of violence appear to be absent.

There is growing research that focuses on monitoring the effectiveness of policies and mechanisms put in place by governments. Take for instance, the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance which focuses on monitoring problems of racism, xenophobia, and other related intolerances. While it promotes creation of good policies, it does not monitor the actual incidents, (ECRI, 2006). In the case of

South Africa, no similar platform is in existence. Gordon (2019) notes that Xenowatch a non-proprietary platform which allows activists, victims, and observers to report xenophobic incidences (on people and property) and the data it provides makes it clear that the country has and continues to have anti-immigrant violence of varied types.

Most research that relates to xenophobic violence focuses on the causes, perceptions, and attitudes of South Africans towards foreigners as well as the history of xenophobic violence in the country (Crust 2008, Classen 2016, Gordon 2019). Amongst the few articles that explore monitoring xenophobic violence, the focus has been on the effectiveness of interventions and policies formulated to solve the problem and why they fail, (Misago et al. 2015, Misago, 2016). Lancaster (2018)'s study on monitoring public violence in its various forms concludes that the motives for public violence can shift from a protest over inadequate housing to later attacks on foreigners. Additionally, significant research has been conducted on monitoring of incidents of hate crimes, violence on LGBTQ communities or racism, but relatively less has been written monitoring of xenophobic violence and the role it plays in informing advocacy and policy making. Therefore, it is the aim of this research to investigate the role of monitoring xenophobic violence and how it informs advocacy and policymaking using Xenowatch as a case study.

1.3 Research questions

The main research question is:

How does Xenowatch conduct monitoring of xenophobic violence and in what ways do stakeholders use the information for advocacy and policy making towards combating the violence in South African communities?

The following sub-research questions will be answered:

a. What approaches, methods and tools does Xenowatch use in monitoring xenophobic violence across South Africa?

b. How is the data from monitoring of xenophobic violence used for advocacy and policy making?
c. What are the challenges of gathering and using xenophobic violence monitoring data?

1.4 Research purpose

Political conflict, war, climate change and economic instability will remain the remain the major key factors that push for migration as highlighted in the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) projects. This means that competition for already scarce resources such as jobs, housing, social service delivery will continue to grow, which may result in increased social conflict. The purpose of the study is to help in identifying ways in which monitoring of xenophobic violence can prevent and reduce further attacks on migrants and also formulate policies that do not only deal with xenophobic violence but also crucial migration issues. The research mainly focuses on the monitoring aspect of xenophobic violence in South Africa in order to reduce violence and displacement in its communities. The purpose of this research is to explore and investigate the role of monitoring xenophobic violence and how it is used into advocacy and policy making. It is critical to monitor human rights violations which xenophobic violence is a part of, in order to come up with solutions that are well informed, thus this research will enlighten how the monitoring data can used in policy through an assessment of the role being played by Xenowatch as a monitoring platform. This study will also identify the challenges of monitoring xenophobic violence and reasons why there is limited use of this data in policy making.

1.6 Literature Review

The literature review of this study is aimed at analyzing how Xenowatch conducts monitoring of xenophobic violence and how the monitoring data is used to reduce and prevent violence in South Africa. The literature also discusses monitoring in its general sense: its purposes and challenges narrowing it down to monitoring in the context of xenophobic violence. The discussion is focused on data use in advocacy and policy making to get an understanding of how the monitoring data from Xenowatch is used in advocacy and policy making. Lastly, the literature will look at the theoretical underpinnings that best explain this study. Chapter two will review this literature in greater detail.

Methodology

The study adopted a single case study-based approach to understand how monitoring of xenophobic violence is carried out. With the use of purposive sampling participants of the study were selected from Xenowatch and its stakeholders (data users). The study conducted key informant interviews with these officials based on their experience in monitoring xenophobic violence and using the monitoring data. An in-depth discussion of the research methodology will be done in Chapter three.

1.7 The research structure.

The research contains six chapters as summarized below:

Chapter 1: provides a brief summary of the background of the study which includes the research topic, problem statement, research questions and the purpose of the research.

Chapter 2: reviews the literature available on xenophobic violence, its causes, its nature, and its monitoring in the context of South Africa. The chapter also contains challenges of monitoring as well as the importance of monitoring xenophobic violence. It further provides various theories that help to understand the phenomenon of monitoring xenophobic violence.

Chapter 3: discuss the methodology undertaken in the study.

Chapter 4: presents the findings of the research.

Chapter 5: discusses the findings of the research.

Chapter 6: provides the conclusions of both the findings and the study as well as recommendations for future studies on the concept of monitoring of xenophobic violence.

Chapter Summary

This introductory chapter has outlined the research report's background, problem statement, research questions will assist in meeting the objectives of the study. The structure of the paper has also been outlined to give a glimpse of what to expect in the paper.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter seeks to position the current study in existing literature by expanding on the research problem. With regards to South Africa, this chapter focuses on a review of the body of knowledge about the concept of xenophobic violence and its monitoring. The literature investigates the characteristics of xenophobic violence, its root causes in order to comprehend the need for monitoring, and the state of monitoring xenophobic violence in South Africa at the moment. The chapter also provides a general overview of monitoring before focusing on the backdrop of xenophobic violence, its significance, and its difficulties. Also, the literature review will offer theoretical underpinnings for the arguments put forth.

2.2 Xenophobic Violence in the South African Context

The issue of violence against one another remains one of the important and pervasive aspect of South African history and the world at large. According to Desai (2010), there are clear indications of violence towards African foreigners, particularly in underprivileged areas. According, to (Jensen, 2011), South Africans continue to physically assault underprivileged Black foreigners. Since 2012, xenophobia has consistently ranked among the top three violations of equality rights reported to the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC). In 2016–17, 4% of all complaints about equality were filed to the SAHRC shows an explicit targeting of foreign nationals or outsiders for violent attacks regardless of other factors that may be at play whether cultural, social, or political.

Xenophobia is defined as an "unreasonable fear, distrust, or hatred of strangers, foreigners, or anything regarded as foreign or different" by academics including Gordon, (2010), Emmanuel, (2015), and Misago, (2016). Xenophobia is described as "attitudes, prejudice, and behavior that reject, exclude, and frequently defame others based on view of them as outsiders to the community (Adjai and Lazararidis, 2013). Exclusion, anger, and violence toward something "foreign" are the symptoms of xenophobia

(Neocosmos, 2006). These sentiments are what leads to xenophobic violence, which is defined as any act of mass violence committed by local communities, groups, or crowds against foreigners or strangers (Misago, 2016, 2017, 2019). Dodson (2010), Tshitereke, (1999), and Darling-Hammond (2003), argue that due to the nature of the attacks it goes beyond an attitude but an action, making the attitude an early stage in action (xenophobic violence). The nature of violence is characterized by murder, assaults that cause serious body harm and burning, looting, robbery, arson, displacement, intimidation, and threats, (Misago 2017). According to Landau (2011), this type of violence has become a long-standing feature in post-apartheid South Africa, with tens of thousands of people harassed, attacked, or killed because of their status of being an 'outsider' from 1994. Since the outbreak of the 2008 violent attacks on foreign nationals the incidents have taken on disturbing proportions.

In a study by (Mattes et al., 1999) which explores South Africans' willingness to welcome non-South African citizens to the country, the results revealed ignorant attitudes around anti- immigrants' behavior in South Africans. While the survey was done in 1999, similar and even worse attitudes are seen today as evidenced by increased incidents of xenophobia and xenophobic violence. Another study by (Crust, 2008) showed an increase in the negative attitudes among South African towards outsiders. Numerous studies continue to show that South Africa's anti-migrant attitudes continue to intensify, (Classen, 2016, Gordon, 2019). The respective studies show respondents admitting to taking part in anti-migrant activities and those that had not done so, saying they could do it in the future.

Statistics presented by Xenowatch at the end of 2018 showed 529 xenophobic violence incidents that resulted in 309 deaths, 901 physical assaults, 2193 shops looted and over 100,000 people displaced, (Mlilo and Misago, 2019). They note due to the nature of xenophobic violence which frequently occurs in multiple incidents, these numbers are an underestimation of the actual levels of victimization due to lack details and under reporting. According to the Xenowatch official website as of date 919 xenophobic violence incidents have been recorded with the number of deaths doubling from 309 to 623, 919 physical assaults, 4844 looting incidents and the number of displacements increasing by 23 326.

Numerous studies show that the drivers of xenophobic violence in South Africa are multi- layered composed of pyscho-social, economic, political economy, micro-politics, and the legacy of apartheid. Dodson (2010) notes that the culture of violence in South Africa is embedded in the country's history militarism and trauma cultivated by apartheid. Drawing from the conclusion of the study conducted by (Masikane et al., 2020) which shows that South Africans become violent and very hostile towards foreigners especially when their economic needs are threatened as it gives them a flash back of apartheid where they had to use violence to gain their freedom. Thus, apartheid has taught citizens that to achieve their desire they need to use violence thus leading to xenophobic violence as foreigners threaten their livelihoods.

Kynoch (2005) in Misago et al. (2009) notes that violence has been a persistent feature of township life, characterised by disadvantaged social and economic status, repressive policies, criminal predation, and vigilantism. According to the South Africa Human Rights Commission (SAHRC), the rule of law "barely exists" in the townships, and impunity 'reigns' for criminals and rogue leaders. According to Muchiri (2012),

SAHRC reported:

> "Widespread frustrations about the nature and extent of service delivery, employment, and housing, which leaves residents of these areas convinced that they are on their own in dealing with social problems. Issues of the rule of law, justice and impunity in informal settlements must be seen embedded in a holistic context, where interventions in each component of the whole could generate improvements in the rule of law over time – not only as it relates to violence against non-nationals, but also as regards other forms of civil unrest, such as protest related violence."

This explains why the violent attacks are common in townships and informal settlements such as Alexandra, Diepsloot in Gauteng which are poor, overcrowded, and underdeveloped. These locations become the easiest breeding ground for mobilized and collective discontent leading to communal

xenophobia that manifests into mob violence, (Field, 2017). With some incidents seemingly to be repeating themselves particularly in the townships, for instance in 2008 a Mozambican national Ernesto Alafabeto Nhamauve was set alight by angry citizens in one of the oldest townships of Johannesburg, (Trompton, 2015). In April 2022, Elvis Nyati was dragged out of his home at night, beaten, stoned, and set alight in the street.

One of the major challenges with regards to xenophobic violence in South Africa is the lack of legislation. Ngwato (2011) notes that the government's response to xenophobia has been fragmented and poorly resourced with limited political will and commitment. This is evidenced by the fact that as of 2012 South Africa had no specific law to address xenophobia and the parameters of hate crimes and the phenomenon of xenophobia was generally unknown to law enforcement, (Muchiri, 2012). This notion is supported by (Misago et al., 2015) who argue that the unwillingness to recognize xenophobia along with current legislation has resulted in a culture of impunity and lack of accountability for perpetrators and mandated institutions. Masuku (2019) concurs with notion by (Misago et al., 2015) in terms of the current legislation where he notes that unlike racism, xenophobia is not recognized as crime in South Africa, and people arrested because of xenophobic violence are charged under common law crimes such as assault, looting and destruction to property not a crime of xenophobia.

ISS (2019) note that South Africa's Prevention and Combating Hate Speech Bill (the Hate Crimes and Speech Bill) was a significant step towards criminalizing xenophobia, however, the bill collapsed in the fifth Parliament which closed in March 2020. As of date, the public, civil society organizations and all concerned institutions continue to anticipate and await the final passing of the bill into law which outlines criminal offence with regards to any act intended to be harmful or to incite harm or promote or propagate hatred on the basis of among other characteristics nationality, birth, migrant or refugee status and language, *HateCrimesBill.Pdf*, 2018).

2.3 Monitoring

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) defines monitoring as "a continuous function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and other stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives, as well as progress in the use of allocated funds," (OECD, 2004). Morra Imas & Rist (2009) define monitoring as a routine, continuing, internal activity that collects information on a program's activities, outputs, and results in order to track its performance. According to Gage (2005), monitoring is the routine tracking of a program's operations by determining if planned activities are being carried out on a regular, on-going basis, which agrees with McCoy, Ngari, and Krumpe's (2005) definitions.

Monitoring is defined as the continuous tracking of activities or progress in policies, programs, processes, or plans by the majority of definitions provided in various sources. For example, Gosling (2003) defines monitoring as a methodical evaluation of a program's progress over time, but he also adds that impact monitoring and process monitoring are both required to demonstrate what changes are occurring, what processes are responsible for the changes, and how the program can be improved. While monitoring provides information on where a policy, program, or project is at any given time in relation to its aims and outcomes and is descriptive in nature, Kusek & Rist (2004)

In the context human rights, monitoring refers to the gathering of comprehensive and reliable human rights information, to target corrective recommendations and follow up action, (Guzman and Verstappen, 2003). This study will use the definition that monitoring is the careful examination of a situation or individual instance to ascertain whether additional steps should be taken. The gathering of information (fact-finding) and the documentation of human rights violations are two interrelated aspects of monitoring, according to The Handbook on Fact-finding and Documentation Human Rights Violation, (Forum Asia) (1994). For instance, incidents of xenophobic violence are recorded, confirmed, and sent to the appropriate organizations for further inquiry when they are monitored after being

reported. A report is also generated at the conclusion of each cycle of monitoring, and it is a crucial component of monitoring.

There are many types of monitoring that include process or performance monitoring, impact monitoring, financial monitoring, situation monitoring among others, (INTRAC, 2017). For the purposes of this study, situation monitoring—which (Gosling and Edwards, 2003) define as "monitoring the external environment"—will be the main focus. Situation monitoring entails defining and gathering indicators pertaining to various issues, such as the political climate, changes in the economy, and in this case, the level of xenophobic violence. According to INTRAC (2017), scenario monitoring is frequently referred to as scanning, which is the act of paying close attention to what is occurring in a situation and what factors might be impacting it. In the context of human rights violations, situation monitoring aside from documenting events it includes the assessment of the progress of a country in terms of relevant human rights legislation, performance monitoring of institutions in terms of action taken and reaction time in times of a crisis, (Guzman and Verstappen, 2003). Situation monitoring is useful for monitoring government compliance with policies, treaties among other obligations and to be able to undertake denunciation and public awareness activities. Guzman and Verstappen, (2003) note that many humanitarian groups, civil society, and non- state entities conduct more oriented monitoring, in this instance Xenowatch focuses on recording the numbers of those that are subjected to xenophobic violent attacks rather than the action taken to address the situation. Furthermore, their mandate focuses on changing a general situation and in response to specific needs of the victims.

According to (Forum Asia, 1994) the scope of monitoring human rights violations can be narrow or broad, with variations in terms of (1) rights covered, for instance performance of government in regard to civil and political rights, (2) target groups either covering the whole population or specific groups such as children, women, workers, ethnic minorities to mention only a few, (3) geographical scope which be country-wide coverage or smaller areas for example depressed local region in a country. Guzman and Verstappen (2003) concur with the idea that monitoring of human rights falls under three scopes, they argue that humanitarian organizations confine monitoring to special aspects and the monitoring of

xenophobic violence done by Xenowatch falls under special aspects and at the same time focuses on a specific target group that includes, migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers.

2.3.1 Purposes of Monitoring

The purpose of monitoring is to give information and it is descriptive in intent (Kusek and Rist, 2004), which means it draws the audience to the actual picture of what is happening. Kenny (2000) concurs with this idea and notes that the key to monitoring is accuracy and precision with the intention of providing basic facts about a situation or case. According to Environmental monitoring (1977) without monitoring government, organizations and many other institutions are frequently surprised with crises and end up responding hastily with hurried legislation, regulations and enforcement programs which results in policies that are less efficient. Therefore, constant monitoring is a necessity.

Additionally, monitoring provides feedback on programs that can be used to influence decisions and change the course of action to be taken in future. Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System (2007) and INTRAC (2017) all agree that the information provided by monitoring gives feedback to managers, decision makers and other stakeholders on the implemented project. Furthermore, it provides early indicators of problems that need to be corrected and changes that need immediate action. United Nations Global Pulse (2016) argue that monitoring provides early warning signals on hotspots, intensification of situations such as in the cases of conflict, drought, disease outbreak for example the recording of COVID-19 infected people helped to know the extent of the spread that led to the implementation of lockdowns. Guzman and Vertsappen (2003) argue that early warning allows for putting in place measures to address the situation before it worsens and helps organizations to be proactive rather than reactive. Gosling and Edwards (2003), INTRAC (2017) agree that monitoring provides a platform on which evaluation can be done and ensure accountability to those in charge. However, the major limitation to monitoring is budget or funding, (Doremus, 2008) argues that most organizations do not prioritize monitoring as it is seen as unnecessary information collection.

2.3.2 Data Use

Data use refers to instances where data are reviewed to inform a recommendation for action in strategic planning, policy making, program planning and management, advocacy, or service delivery, (*Measure Evaluation, 2016.)*. For data to be usable it has to fulfil the specifications of data quality which are completeness, timeliness, integrity, accuracy, and consistency. Data quality is essential for planning, management and decision making, as the nature of data can compromise the outcome of plans and decisions, (Mugendi, 2015). Therefore, data-driven, and evidence-based plans and decisions should be based on data that meets the criterion of data quality.

2.3.3 Data Use and policymaking

Vienstra and Kotterink (2017) note that societal problems such climate change, poverty, and migration (which yields to xenophobic violence) have no optimal solutions, for them to be addressed public administrations aim to be data driven. Data which translates to evidence is crucial on every stage of the policy cycle particularly through monitoring and evaluation, (Cronin and Sadan, 2015). The implementation of public policy, according to Sabatier and Mazmanian (1980), is a complicated process that requires integrating numerous parties and organizations. Adoption, implementation, institutionalization, and assessment are the four main steps in the process of carrying out policy choices. Decisions on policy are made and authorized by the appropriate authorities during the adoption stage. The creation of plans and methods for carrying out the policy choices is a component of the implementation stage. The process of institutionalization entails incorporating policy decisions into the organizational procedures and cultural norms of pertinent organizations. The evaluation step, which comes last, evaluates the effectiveness of the policy choices and their results.

Having observed that the policy making process is cumbersome and complicated it results in public institutions shying away or avoiding any further complication to the process. According to (Strydom et al., 2010, Cronin and Sadan, 2015, Parkhurst, 2017) most of the time, policymakers are conscious of the need to use the evidence as effectively as possible, but they have alluded to systemic barriers that are independent of any one management. The findings from the study with senior South African government

official's states that using evidence more frequently throughout the policy cycle is essential for gaining knowledge through evidence-based policy development, especially when analyzing needs and challenges. It further suggests that political and administrative leadership will need to agree on standards, plans for removing barriers to effective evidence use, and roles for each across the cycle in order to ensure appropriate evidence is available and used throughout the policy cycle, (Cronin and Sadan, 2015).

Data plays a crucial role in improving and developing policies as it assists organizations to identify patterns, trends, patterns, and gaps in service delivery. In this instance data provided by Xenowatch can help policy makers identify patterns as to what intensifies xenophobic violence and the gaps which exist in legislation in terms of criminalizing the act and within the present migrants and refugees' laws. Additionally, data can help identify gaps in service delivery, in the South African context most of the scapegoating that happens to foreigners comes from the frustrations as a result of pressing societal issues such as housing, health, education, and unemployment. Therefore, data becomes a necessity in pointing the decision makers in the direction that can ease tension in society.

However, in the African context as well as South Africa data driven policy making is marred with challenges that seem to outweigh the benefits. Ackoff (1999), Breiter (2003) and Cronin and Sadan (2015) summarize the challenges into institutional and capacity factors. Clar et al., (2011) note that the challenges start at individual level with elements such as lack of experience and capacity for assessing evidence, mutual mistrust, and negative attitude towards change and research. Head (2016) concurs with this notion and argues that public agencies collect big data but have limited know how to use it for policy making and decision making. In support of this claim, research by Schildkampet et al. (2017) found that many respondents gave the 'I don't know' response when asked about the use of data for accountability, school development, and instruction. This implies a lack of understanding regarding the usage of data in educational settings and perhaps other government organizations. Cronin and Sadan (2017) reveal that the findings of the PSDDM funded study the majority of officials shared numerous examples of when policy decisions were made with limited evidence over evidence-based alternatives, which denotes an attitude to change and research.

Another challenge emanates from organizational/ institutional barriers such as unsupportive culture, competing interests, issues of censorship and bureaucracy in government which affects use of research and data. USAID and Measure (2010) noted that data producers and users can better understand the value of data, including its trends and its role in improving the quality of decisions made using robust and accessible data, when organizational systems are in place to support a culture of data-informed decision-making. Additionally, USAID and Measure (2010) emphasized that an enabling environment encourages training, increases the technical expertise of its workforce by supporting both internal and external training, and allots a certain portion of the budget to the M&E arm.

The politics of evidence have an impact on institutional support in part because evidence is political. Three aspects of the politics of evidence were highlighted by Parkhurst (2017): political prejudice, overt politics advancing political objectives, and covert politics originating from cognitive-political sources of bias. The first dimension explains how evidence is prioritized, picked, and interpreted for political purposes. It also describes bias in the production of evidence. It has been stated that a study could be planned to serve specific goals or changed midway through to go in a particular direction (Parkhurst, 2017). Then, in order to reach or support predetermined conclusions, evidence can be selectively used, or rash statements can be made. Cairney (2017) concluded that decision-makers employ two different types of short cuts: either they pursue specific objectives and prioritize particular types and sources of data, or they rely on instincts, gut feelings, beliefs, habits, and well-established reference points to arrive at decisions quickly.

2.3.4 Data Use and Advocacy

Advocacy loosely defined is any action taken to plead, support, defend, or speak of someone, community, or organization, (Human Rights Careers). Darian et al. (2023) notes that non-profit sector addresses some of the most societal pressing issues through their advocacy work and in doing so they are under pressure to be data driven. For this research particular interest is paid to but, however, not limited to human rights advocates as xenophobic violence constitute to human rights violations. Langford and

Fukuda (2012) argue that advocacy work on human rights factfinding has traditionally been dependent on qualitative methods, however, there has been a transition to quantitative methods. Quantitative methods and tools are now used to monitor progressive realization of rights, identify perpetrators, and improve recommendations. Different technology is used from satellite imagery such as the one used by Amnesty International on Nigeria to crowd sourcing, (Collier et al., 2015). Similar to data uses in policy making data quality is important to advocacy as a compromise in the data can be detrimental to society especially on human rights issues. Rosenberg (2012) in Rall et al. (2016) note that,

> "Credibility and accuracy are the currency of human rights advocacy: human rights organizations cannot afford to use data that is not highly trustworthy. 'A human rights group should never lose a factual challenge', statistician Patrick Ball emphasizes. 'Our moral legitimacy depends on speaking truth to power'."

Rall et al. (2015) argues that too little is known about the promises and pitfalls of data use and data visualization, and are supported by (Darian et al., 2023), who note that though relatively little is known about data work for advocacy, but it does play a crucial role. Human Rights advocates use data to deepen their understanding of human rights violations that helps them to effectively communicate their findings to their specific audience which could be the general public, policy makers, or judicial bodies, (Latanero and Gold, 2015). In their understanding of human rights, they add to existing data and fill in gaps especially to new phenomenon or areas that are not fully understood, for example rural Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and gender, Intersex, Queer and questioning (LGBTIQ) communities, xenophobia, and xenophobic violence, (D'Ignazia and Klein, 2020).

Additionally, crowdsourced data from witnesses, survivors, and advocates presented in interactive maps are important and influential in policy circles as they allow view and exploring data in real-time, (Rall et

al., 2015). This data can then be used for lobbying and influence for policy change. Darian et al. (2023) notes that researchers have found even more tactical value of using data in charismatic ways for instance in a case study by Pine and Liboiron of pregnancy mortality which demonstrates blood loss in obstetrical emergencies compared directly to injuries like gunshot wounds brought visibility and empathy to the field of obstetrics.

The findings of a study by Darian et al. (2023) summarizes the use of data in advocacy into four categories which are as an amplifier for the voice and visibility of beneficiaries, as a legitimizer of the Organisation and its work, as an activator and mobilizer for audiences, and as an incubator for promoting innovative strategies for quantifying and addressing the issues (as shown in Table 1).

Table 1. Four Functions of Advocacy Data Work

	Demand-side Orientation of Advocacy Data Work	**Supply-side Orientation of Advocacy Data Work**
	Data as Legitimizer:	Data as Incubator:

Instrumental Rationale Of Advocacy Data Work	Data are the product that the nonprofit de- livers; these data legitimize the organiza tion's expertise, its mission, and/or its pol- icy proposals. Core challenges: stakeholders with power can feel entitled to make specific asks that can cause data drift	Data is used to promote innovative data work, particularly innovative strategies for quantifying the issue. Core challenges: overreliance on data can con- strain innovation; innovation may challenge the status quo that organizations are more comfortable or adept working with
	Data as Activator:	Data as Amplifier:
Expressive Rationale of Advocacy Data Work	Data are used to mobilize a diversity of au diences, particularly policymakers and funders, whether those data come from beneficiaries or other sources. Core challenges: different audiences are compelled by different data and sometimes- polarized audiences have to be compelled without turning them off	Data are used to amplify the voice and visibility of often marginalized beneficiaries. Core challenges: data collection can overburden beneficiaries; gatekeepers may prevent access to beneficiaries; beneficiaries may have niche problems that are not generalizable to the broader population (and are therefore not charismatic)

Adopted from: **Enacting Data Feminism in Advocacy Data Work**

Rall et al. (2015) argue that most human rights organizations do not have the knowledge and resources to use data in their day-to-day work. This resonates to the challenges also faced by government institution and policy makers as mentioned in above section.

2.4 Monitoring of xenophobic Violence

Monitoring is an essential part of Human Rights Watch which covers issues of hate crimes including violence as a result of racism, xenophobia, and other related intolerances. The World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and other related intolerances in Durban 2001, urges states establish monitoring systems of these human violation acts in the public and private sectors and even those committed by law enforcement officials and the mandates extends to the private sector, civil societies, and non-Governmental organizations. The 2009 UNHCR Strategic Approach calls for monitoring of racism, racial discrimination, and xenophobia whether they occur online or offline and define an incident as something that can be tracked, recorded, and reported about. In Europe under the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe member states made the commitment to collect and keep records on reliable info and statistics on hate crimes and all forms of violent manifestations of racism, xenophobia, discrimination, and Anti-Semitism, (OSCE,2003). Unlike in Europe, the African Union does not have policies and strategies that are designed for addressing racism and xenophobia, (Mbecke, 2015). With increased incidence of xenophobic violence in the world most states are guided by National Action Plans which all mandate the state to monitor xenophobia and any violence related to it. According to Misago (2019) in South Africa government does not have any body that monitors xenophobic violence, and the National Action Plan is still in its infancy to conduct any noticeable actions at the moment.

The most common practice of monitoring of xenophobia, racism and other related intolerances usually focuses on the monitoring of policies, problems related to the acts and what the state is doing to remedy that. An example of such agency is the Europe Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) which aims

to help member states develop practical policies that assist the fight against racism and related discrimination and support the integration of Europe's minority communities, (EUMC, 2005). Mbecke (2015) argues that it is a great initiative that the African Union's NEPAD can emulate in its quest to manage and prevent racism and xenophobia, thus promoting social cohesion and unity in Africa. However, the actual monitoring and recording of incidents of hate crime, racism, xenophobia, and other related intolerance is done by independent organizations which offer online platforms to report by witnesses and victims (Scweppe et al., 2018). Examples of such platforms are Xenowatch in South Africa, Stop APPI Hate in United States of America, Stop Hate UK, and TENI in Ireland and Racist Violence Recording Network in Greece among others.

Schweppe et al. (2018) note that reporting and accurate recording of data are crucial to supporting civil society initiatives. The data acquired when monitoring can be used for lobbying and advocating for change by government as numbers do not lie. Guzman and Verstappen (2003) note that civil societies can use the data to formulate a picture of the government's commitment to the prevention and management of the human rights following trends and changes over time which can help to push for better policies and accountability. Additionally, the information and data gathered bridges the gap between what the government is doing and what other sectors are doing and also the gaps in recording mechanisms, (Schweppe et al., 2018). Hiropoulos (2020) asserts that the government and South Africa Police Services do not record crimes targeting foreign nationals, thus there is no official data on the extent of xenophobic violence and those targeted.

Monitoring seeks to determine the truth accurately and completely as possible, thus its aim is to pinpoint where the problem is and what is causing the problem. Ravindram et al. (1993) note that if problem areas are not monitored, they go unnoticed and subsequently the correct measure to address them will not be taken. In the context of the incidents of hate crimes if they are not monitored it leads to authorities believing or asserting that there are no crimes not occurring. In an interview by the Wits-Vuvuzela at the launch of Xenowatch Alexandra Hiropoulos noted that the data from the website will help curb the denialism of xenophobic attacks and violence by the government officials and politicians. Ravindram et al. (1993) argue that monitoring provides early warning and the responsible organizations to particular situation become pro-active rather than reactive.

Forum Asia (1994) note that monitoring allows for increasing awareness among communities, as they argue that human rights monitoring is done for the purposes of mounting campaigns to mobilize the public to pressure officials into not only stopping the violations but also preventing future occurrences. Haynes and Schweppe (2017) argue that this awareness allows societies to be aware of what constitutes an incident to be reported on the platforms and what follows after reporting. Generally, especially in South Africa there is limited prosecution of xenophobic violence (Landau and Monsoon (2009), Misago (2017) Gordon (2019)), thus the monitoring agencies can make a follow up on the cases they report on to pressure investigation and prosecution. Schweppe et al. (2018) note that monitoring opens a door for victims to overcome their trauma since after recording verification the cases are forwarded to relevant organizations such as the UNHCR and other civil society organization which can offer rehabilitation counselling.

2.4.1 Monitoring of xenophobic Violence in the South African Context

Even though the execution of the laws and policies on refugee legislation and the preservation of human rights is still a significant concern, South Africa continues to be one of the leading nations around the globe with the best constitution serving human rights protection and refugee laws. Several academics contend that despite the pervasive xenophobia in South Africa, the prior immigration laws took some time to be repealed, leaving a gap in the law regarding the way to treat refugees and their status there, (Gomo, 2010). Violence in every form, from assault to murder remains one of greatest pitfall of South Africa. However, with the country plunged with a series of xenophobic violence incidence no actual documentation is done by government.

To start with, Hiropoulos (2020) notes that the government and South Africa Police Services (SAPS) record crimes targeting foreign nationals and have no data regarding the extent of the situation. In a report by SAPS for 2019 to 2020 on Crime Statistics in the country under the four categories of the crimes reported and recorded no category that directly points to xenophobic violence including damage to property, however the only mention that can be linked to xenophobic attack is under causative as antagonism towards foreigners, (Crime Statistics, 2019_20). This is despite of the xenophobic incidents that occurred both in 2019 and 2020. In a report by Xenowatch from January to September 2019, 18 deaths, 43 physical assaults and a total of 68 incidents happened as a result of xenophobic violence, (Mlilo, 2019). The SAPS Crime Statistics report from

April 2019 to March 2020 only recorded 8 murders and 22 common assaults and a total of 75 incidents under antagonism towards foreigners in a period of twelve months, (Crime Statistics, 2019_20). The difference in the numbers can be taken as indicator that the state and SAPS are not doing enough to capture crime related to xenophobic violence.

Additionally, the government in 2021 launched the Gender-Based Violence and Femicide (GBVF) Fund aimed at tackling the scourge of GBVF in South Africa and works in connection with SAPS, National Prosecuting Authority (NPA) and Victims of Crime Survey (VOCS). The website has a clear visualization of the data from SAPS, NPA and VOCS, showing cumulative number of cases reported and crime categories, total number of survivors assisted and various survey data that is related to GBVF in South Africa and data on aptitude, perception, and fear of crime-related statistics respectively, (GBVF Statistics Dashboard). This shows the government's commitment to addressing issues of GBVF and apart from academic literature every single day media reports on the prosecution of perpetrators of GBVF. According to both media and academic sources no record has been made on the prosecution of those that murdered Elvis Nyati in April 2022. According to (Mohamed, 2019), South Africa should come up with a plan that secures the safety of all refugees and migrants which begins by holding suspected perpetrators of past xenophobic crimes accountable and break this cycle of impunity. Various scholars such as (Landau and Monsoon (2009), Misago (2017), Gordon, 2019) agree with the idea of prosecution of perpetrators of xenophobic violence as both a punitive measure and a way of showing future violators what happens when they commit such a crime.

As mentioned earlier on in this section South Africa has no monitoring facility dedicated to xenophobic violence, thus any form of monitoring done is not by state or any government institution. In 2013 Institute of Security Studies (ISS) developed the Protest and Public Violence Monitoring Project (PPVM), which is a database of crowd-based events that aimed to monitor the frequency, location, nature, and extent of collective activities occurring in South Africa, (Lancaster, 2018). Additionally, it seeks to track all forms of peaceful protest, crowd- based disruptions and violence occurring in public spaces. Lancaster (2018) notes that the PPVM system monitors forms of violence associated with vigilantism, xenophobia, political and other forms of crowd or inter-group activity. According to ISS and Lancaster (2018) note that,

"Collecting better information on protests and related trends and on the nature and extent of this complex phenomena has a potential to contribute to an improved understanding of the nature, scale, and activity patterns. This in turn can foster the development of more appropriate responses by the police, municipalities, community and political leaders and protest organizers because they are better able to take into account current political and class struggles."

Data that feeds into the PPVM is collected through scrutinizing reports from local, national, and international news sources, newsletters and notices by trade unions, political parties, and universities. The database treats events as violent when described as such by media or based on factual reports such as incidents contravening the provisions of the Regulation of Gatherings Act and involve a criminal act, (Lancaster, 2018). The PPVM provides open source online real-time, geo-referenced recording of crowd or collective actions with potential to escalate into disruptions or violence and also an interactive map available on the ISS' Crime and Justice Information Hub, (*ISS, 2020).* However, because the data is collected over thirty grievance types and disaggregated to thirteen broad categories, some data maybe lost while the other may be overshadowed and under monitored, especially those that do not make it to media and isolated incidents. This is true in the case of xenophobic violence where there is limited reporting and numerous events occur in local settings where media coverage is relatively low unless it is a major incident.Another example of non-state monitoring that covers events of violence in South Africa is Armed Conflict Location and Event Data Project (ACLED). Lancaster (2018) notes that ACLED is a disaggregated conflict collection, analysis and crisis mapping project which collects data on actors, types of violence, locations, and facilities of reported political violence and protests across Africa, Southeast Asia, South Asia, and the Middle East. A point of importance is that ACLED relies on its partners, a wide range of organizations to collect information in hard to access contexts and integrate thematic, regional, and country-level expertise into their data collection. ACLED provides open access to early warning and forecasting tools which include a conflict alert system, subnational threat and surge trackers, volatility and risk predictability index, conflict change maps and emerging actor tracker, (*ACLED, 2018).* Misago et al. (2021) note that ACLED and ISS are partners of Xenowatch and also depend on the data they generate to update their numbers and reports. Therefore, based on the partnership and the

scope and nature of ACLED one can conclude that ACLED relies on the data provided by Xenowatch which means that without it, their data will not be fully comprehensive.

As a response to the Durban Declaration and Programme Action which called for the recognition of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerances, the government of South Africa launched the National Action Plan (NAP) on Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related intolerances. It is a complementary to the existing legislation set out to provide mechanisms for documenting and monitoring on-going incidents of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, and related intolerances, including establishing a rapid response team reporting directly to government, (*National Action Plan to Combat Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance*). Numerous scholars have alluded to the importance of the government's initiative under NAP; however, they have noted that since its launch in 2019 nothing has materialized as far as monitoring of and action on xenophobic violence has materialized.Regrettably, due to a lack of funding and specific implementation procedures, the plan has not yet been put into action (ISS, 2021). Human Rights Watch (HRW) states that the government has not done anything to guarantee that attacks on foreign nationals are stopped, or at least investigated, and those involved are held accountable, despite the government action plan to combat xenophobia being adopted in March 2019. (HRW, 2020). This indicates that there are still no effective steps taken to stop xenophobic violence.

2.4.2 Challenges in monitoring

According to FRA (2018), these organizations (independent monitoring agencies) collect data in reliance on financial or other support from the government, hence in most cases money becomes a problem for preserving the platforms' continuation. Lack of financing prevents monitoring from being successful since long-term commitment is required to identify changes and trends over time (Field et al., 2001). As a result, monitoring is only useful if it is ongoing (Biber, 2013), and money is required to run an ongoing, sustainable system. The majority of these online venues appear to be self-funded and rely on donations, according to the evidence. Additionally, even though creating these platforms and systems is very cheap, the ability to present and publicize the results and attract attention in an effective manner that raises awareness and reaches their target market is expensive, (Schweppe et al., 2018).

It is important to note that the failure to create awareness leads to the crisis of under-reporting and victims continue to go unheard. In a study carried out in Europe by Christmann and Wong (2016) argue that underreporting of hate crimes in England and Wales is linked to the fear of criminalization linked to identity, fear of police and fear of deportation and detention and fear of further victimization, thus (Wong, 2013) notes that most of the victims are discouraged from reporting by their families. In South Africa reports show that in some cases the victims themselves got detained while the perpetrator goes unprosecuted. Therefore, the numbers that are recorded might be an underestimation of what is on the ground.

In the context of hate crimes monitoring, the definition of hate crimes can impact directly on the accuracy of recording, (FRA, 2012) argue that definitions that are narrow as to what constitutes hate crimes, translate to under-reporting and fewer victims seeking redress. Similarly, for xenophobic violence, it is difficult to separate it from general violence which makes it difficult to report and record it under xenophobic incidences or human rights violations. The understanding of such terms is not only limited to victims but includes even those in office. For instance, in the South African case, following the 2019 xenophobic violence incidents, the defense minister stated that the attacks were mostly acts of criminality, supported by Police Minister Bheki Cele who said, "for us it's nothing to do with xenophobia, it is criminality", (Gerber, 2019) in Crush, 2022).

2.5 Examples of institutions/platforms of monitoring

This section of the study provides examples of platforms of monitoring as basis of understanding how such website are run, approaches and methods for monitoring and reporting of data. This illustration will be used as comparison to the findings of the data collected on what approaches, methods and tools are used to do monitoring of xenophobic violence in South Africa. Like other states such as United States of America, South Africa has witnessed a significant rise in incidents of hate crimes, racism, and xenophobic violence which is the focus of this research. It should be noted that the comparison is only of illustrative value and does not purport to be a detailed comparative analysis.

a) Stop AAPI Hate

The rise in anti-racism discourse that blamed Asian Americans for introducing the disease and spreading it throughout the country starting in late January 2020 resulted in an increase in prejudice, small-scale aggression, and life-threatening assaults against Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (Zhang et al., 2020). Due of this, witnesses and victims developed the Stop AAPI Hate website, a self-reporting tool that keeps track of and documents instances of harassment, bullying, and other forms of violence (Stop AAPI Hate, 2020.). The website acts as the top aggregator of occurrences of anti-Asian and anti-Pacific Islander prejudice and offers technical support for quick responses and proactive measures.

The website had accumulated 6000 instances of anti-Asian prejudice as of March 2020. (Zhang et al., 2020). 'Stop AAPI Hate data has given media outlets and the wider public proof of what is happening to so many Asian Americans based on anecdotal evidence,' claims Cynthia Choi, director of Chinese Affirmative Action (co-founding organization). She adds that there are numerous additional incidents that go unreported for every one that is documented, and that the statistics only provide a partial picture of the situation (Namkung, 2020). Chinese Affirmative Action, one of the founding organizations, collaborates closely with elected officials, decision-makers, and community members on matters like budget, legislative and administrative proposals relating to and impacting immigrant rights, economic justice language, and other related issues. Additionally, they are also involved in civic engagement and community efforts as well as policy research and analysis and offer technical support to elected officials and policy makers. (*Stop AAPI Hate: Documenting the Rise of Anti-Asia Hate, 2020).*

b) STOP HATE UK (Stop Hate Start Here)

Providing 24-hour anti-hate crime reporting for all the monitored aspects of a person's identity or perceived identity, including disability, race, faith, sexual orientation, transgender identity, age, and alternative subculture, Stop Hate UK is an anti-discrimination organization operating in the United Kingdom (Stop Hate UK, n. d.). The group offers social change campaigns, delivery of training, programs for education and development, and advocacy and support. They conduct campaigns to make sure that those impacted by hate crimes and discrimination are heard and supported. They do this by

working with the media, contacting politicians to urge them to expand the 24-hour helpline across the United Kingdom, and spreading the message that hate should never be tolerated (Stop Hate UK, n. d.).

c) Transgender Equality Network Ireland (TENI)

Schweppe et al. (2018) note that in Ireland under TENI an umbrella organization which focuses on improving the conditions of trans-people and their families established three third party monitoring systems namely Stop Transphobia and discrimination (STAD), iReport and Gay and Lesbians Equality Network Ireland (GLEN). FRA (2014) in Schweppe et al. (2018) argue that the establishment of these organizations was as a result of the lack of state recognition of transphobic victimization despite being recorded as the second highest in hate motivated violence rates in Europe. Thus, the initiative was to cater and cover up the failure by the state to record these crimes.

The STAD, which was created in 2013, focuses on tracking and documenting instances of discrimination and transphobia against those who identify as gender nonconforming. Second, iReport focuses on documenting and reporting cases of exacerbated racism and religious hatred. Lastly, GLEN enables people to report hate crimes against LGBT, transgender, and intersex people. Haynes and Schweppe (2017) state that the iReport generated the first report on the experiences of Afrophobia in Ireland in 2013 and that a consolidated report of all the systems were produced in 2014 and garnered extensive media coverage. The TENI project was designed to aid victims, however due to inadequate funding, they were unable to respond to victims promptly (Schweppe et al., 2018).

Overview of the case study: Xenowatch

Xenowatch is non-propriety platform that monitors xenophobic threats and violence in South Africa. Due to the dearth of information about xenophobic violence, Xenowatch was created in 2016 as a workaround to provide reliable information, tools, and effective interventions to address violence against foreigners and promote sustainable and social cohesion in the country, (Misago et al., 2021). According to Gordon (2019) the platform was established by the African Centre for Migration Studies at the University of Witwatersrand with four objectives which are:

1. “Record and analyze: i) xenophobic threats and violence across the country; and ii) interventions by all relevant stakeholders, including government at different levels; civil society at different levels; community-based organizations, as well as community members and their leaders.
2. serve as an early warning system that notifies authorities and civil society about threats, violence, and displacement for appropriate and immediate response.
3. analyze data collected to identify the characteristics of communities at risk and understand the drivers of violence in ways that can inform more effective interventions and encourage greater accountability for perpetrators and mandated institutions; and
4. provide the public with data and analysis to raise its (the public) awareness on the magnitude and implications of xenophobic violence not only for targeted outsiders, but also for all community members.”

The goal of the data gathered by Xenowatch, according to Alexandra Hiropoulos, (2020) is to be included on scorecards for the sake of measuring political performance, according to an interview with Charlotte Alfred in 2016. The information is also a point of reference and used by NGOs and opposition parties for advocacy to push for change in action by office holders. Misago (2019) notes that the platform helps in identifying the source of violence, build the mechanisms to protect those at risk and prevent others from facing such attacks in the future.

The team is made of 4 members who are all part of the ACMS and their experience in migration spans from five to 20 years. The team also works with two research assistants who operate in different provinces. Additionally, to achieve its mandate Xenowatch works in collaboration with a network of partners both countrywide, and abroad. Current partners include Lawyers for Human Rights (LHR), the Institute for Security Studies (ISS), the Armed Conflict Location & Event Data (ACLED), African Diaspora Forum (ADF), the Consortium for Refugees and Migrants South Africa (CORMSA), Refugee Social Services, the Eastern Cape Refugee Centre, the UN Protection Working Group chaired by UNHCR and a national network of verification partners consisting of migrant organizations, community resource and legal advice centers, research institutions, and community and religious leaders.

To establish local communities of practice to promote inclusive governance, social cohesion, and address xenophobic discrimination Xenowatch also works in connection with local government especially those

in major cities such as Cape Town, Johannesburg, and Durban where there the largest numbers of foreigners. Xenowatch has evolved since its inception into a distinctive and trustworthy source of information, statistics, and analysis on xenophobia and associated violence in South Africa. It continues to offer insight and suggestions for effectively combating violence that are grounded on empirically and theoretically informed data. Various players, including international organizations, civil society, scholars, journalists, and activists, both locally and globally, frequently use our research and analysis.

From 2021 Xenowatch has expanded its scope to include monitoring of all forms of institutional and communal xenophobic discrimination including denying immigrants access to opportunities to which they are legally are entitled; vilifying pronouncements and verbal abuse; selective enforcement of laws; evictions threats; anti-foreigner social media mobilization; xenophobic political populism; unlawful detentions, harassment, intimidation; and extortion by law enforcement agents and organized gangs.

To date Xenowatch has produced books, book chapters, journal articles, research reports, policy briefs, factsheets, newsletters, media articles and interviews, presentations, keynote addresses, radio adverts, etc. The team also conducts research in terms of in-depth interviews with citizens, foreign nationals, perpetrators and victims of the violence, relevant government officials, community leaders, and representatives of different civil society, faith-based, and community-based organizations operating in the most affected areas, (Misago et al., 2021). This supplements with secondary data sources to provide additional data, insight, and analysis.

2.6 Theoretical Framework

According to Monaghan (2009), it is best to design a solution to a problem when the theory explaining its cause is well-known. This study is shaped by three theoretical perspectives which shall be discussed in detail below. One of the theoretical stand points seeks to explain the substantive area of study, that is, xenophobic violence. Then, the other two seek to explain the need for monitoring and the uses of monitoring data into evidence-based decision making and advocacy work.

2.6.1 Scapegoating Hypothesis Theoretical Framework.

The scapegoating hypothesis is a sociological theory that places xenophobia in the context of social transition and change, (Allport, 1954). Morris (1998), Tshitereke (1999), notes that hostility towards foreigners is explained in relation to limited resources such as housing, employment, health among other social and economic factors. (Tshitereke 1999) further argues that South Africa's political transition to democracy exposed the unequal distribution of wealth in resources therefore at the end of apartheid people's expectations were heightened which they later realized were not going to be fulfilled and in such scenarios xenophobia can flourish. In such a set-up people create a frustration scapegoat, where they create a target to blame for the ongoing circumstances, in the cases foreigners become victims of scapegoating. Harris (2002) note that a foreigner is used as a scapegoat and someone to blame for the social ills and personal frustrations.

Xenophobia becomes an expression of disillusionment of the government's failure to make sure that every citizen benefits from the freedom gains, (Adjai and Laziridus, 2013). Foreigners are viewed as threats to jobs, housing, education, and health care, (Morris, 1998). History has shown that those in a poor economic position are more likely to feel threatened by the minority especially if they are foreigners, this is evidenced by the 2008 xenophobic attacks which erupted in Alexandra. This explains why xenophobia violence is high in the most disadvantaged communities. As people realize their deprivation, frustrations increase cultivating xenophobia attitudes into, the foreigner is seen as a symbolic figure for unemployment poverty and deprivation (Gomo, 2010). In addition, Crush (2022) the scapegoating is exacerbated by government officials, Defense Minister Mapisa-Nqakula in 2015 said, "While government will be taking resolute actions against South Africans who attack foreign nationals, we are equally determined to take action against all foreign nationals who commit crime in our country". Furthermore, Gwede Mantashe, the ruling party's Secretary-General, explicitly blamed the violence on the increased number of migrants, saying the solution was to 'tighten immigration regulations' and 'if necessary, establishing of refugee camps' to geographically separate migrants from natives (Finnan, 2015 in Crush, 2022). All these utterances fueled the violent attacks and looting of foreigners' homes and businesses.

Scapegoating is closely linked to the relation deprivation theory which suggests that South Africa feels deprived of their independence benefits such as employment, housing, healthcare, thus when foreigners or outsiders get jobs it results to frustrations. These frustrations turn into violent acts that resonate with communities' frustrations which result to mob violence targeting foreigners particularly those that they feel their depriving them. Scapegoating is not only unique to the South African context, a significant rise of attacks on Chinese nationals increased in America during COVID-19 where the Chinese were blamed of bringing the virus due to their habit of consuming wild animals and were subjected to discrimination ranging from micro-aggression to life threatening physical assaults, (Zhang, et al., 2020). Furthermore, the Latin immigrants and refugees have always fallen victim of scapegoating blamed for being responsible for drugs and increasing crime in America and increasing infection rates at the US- Mexico border post. This is also similar to South Africa where foreigners or 'outsiders' are responsible for all the crimes occurring in the country from cable theft, drugs, and gender- based violence and femicide.



Fig. 1. How xenophobic violence manifests

Source: Gomo (2010)

The above illustration fits into (Allport, 1961)'s description of how xenophobia and xenophobic violence unfolds, where scapegoating is seen as a process where people seek purification, purging or cleansing of of their frustrations through the "execution of an aggressive action" and help to release their anger, (Gomo, 2010). Prior to 1994, South Africans had high aspirations that they now understand may never be fulfilled (Tshitereke, 1999). The gap between aspirations and reality is filled with frustrations. As the population becomes aware of their plight, frustrations rise and are expressed in xenophobic attitudes and behaviors. The foreigner is conveniently important to the xenophobe, leading to social isolation, because they are psychologically and socially framed as symbols of unemployment, poverty, and misery.

2.6.2 Violations Approach to Monitoring

According to Guzman and Verstappen (2003), the violations approach to monitoring is used in the monitoring of acts that violate recognized rights, whether they are overt acts like killing, arrest, torture, and displacement or covert acts like a government's failure to adopt a policy to address homelessness. According to Chapman (1996), it emphasizes the three state obligations of respect, protection, and fulfilment. The duty to respect the freedom of people or groups, including the right to life, as well as the duty to uphold those rights and stop others from infringing against them, will be the main topics of this study. It violates the rights to life and freedom in the context of xenophobic violence, and the right to have one's rights upheld by the government regardless of one's color, nationality, or other characteristics according to Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As a result, the approach justifies monitoring xenophobic violence because it is a breach or an act of violation of rights that are supposed to be upheld.

Chapman (1996) notes that the monitoring of human rights is not an academic exercise, its intention is to be a means of reducing human suffering that result from serious violations. She further argues that in the words of Henry Shue the fundamental reason and purpose of acknowledging basic human rights is to prevent or eliminate as much as possible the degree of vulnerability that leaves people at the mercy of others. Guzman and Verstappen (2003) argue that the violations approach offers a greater chance and possibility of promoting and protecting the economic, social, and cultural rights of people, while providing states with an opportunity to find ways of addressing the problems. While the violations approach does not fully require major improvements on the states' statistical systems, the availability of appropriate and reliable statistical data, disaggregated in sub- groups will facilitate the identification of violations clearly, thus systematic monitoring is key to getting helpful information, (Chapman, 1996).

2.6.3 The Responsibility to Prevent Framework

The Responsibility to Protect norm, which calls for improving human security through the identification of risks and the mitigation of their consequences before they materialize into catastrophes, includes a

framework called the Responsibility to Prevent (Konrad, 2006). The crucial human security (HS) paradigm of international relations theory serves as the larger context for the Responsibility to Protect notion. The protection of people, their physical safety, their economic and personal well-being, respect for their dignity and value as human beings, and the preservation of their human rights and fundamental freedoms is the definition for security provided by UNDP, (UNDP, 1994). The Responsibility to Protect is connected to Human Security because both give primacy to the protection of citizens at risk.

According to Evans (2008) the Responsibility to Prevent falls under preventive diplomacy which advocates for invoking direct and structural measures before a situation degenerates into a catastrophe. In a definition provided for by initial 2001 Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) on Responsibility to Protect, it states that, in addition to protection its people from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity, the state should prevent the commission of, and incitement to, such violations (for instance the state should protect migrants from violation of their rights). The Responsibility to Prevent framework recommends soft approach initiatives, such as the development of early warning systems, direct security sector actions, and the advancement of human rights, among others, with the goal of understanding the conflict's underlying roots. Murithi (2013) notes that these measures should be the pioneering works on the Responsibility to Prevent to prioritize the protection of minority rights, and the rights of women and children including those of migrants. According to Tadjbakhsh (2005), the construction of strong political, social, environmental, economic, military, and cultural systems that improve human security should be included in the mitigation measures.

According to the 2001 ICISS Report on the RtoP, protecting human security is a public good and a truly effective state is one that can provide human security and deal with the social breakdowns of its people, (Tadjbakhsh, 2005). Given the potential threat of xenophobic violence and other associated risks, it is morally required to find solutions that address the problem. Threat forecasting and early warning, which include intelligence collection and fact- finding and are crucial components of monitoring, are essential to the Prevention framework and hence important to the study. Technology, according to Axworthy and

Dang (2016), is essential to prevention because it can be used to collect data that provides a thorough grasp of the reality on the ground, which is what Xenowatch does.

Although the state and international organizations are primarily responsible for protecting, they frequently struggle to muster the political will to act. As a result, civil society, non- governmental organizations, and the private sector step up to fill in the gaps in the existing mechanisms (Parl and MacDiamid, 2006, Belloni, 2014). In addition to protecting displaced people and pressing for government action, these organizations play a critical role in monitoring situations and providing information and analysis (Belloni, 2014). This framework's support for monitoring dangers, evaluating potential catalysts or accelerators, and comprehending context all of which provide useful information for policy use justifies its usage. The Prevention Framework also recommends methodically gathering, evaluating, and distributing data to those who are qualified (International Peace Institute, 2009). The main goals of Xenowatch are to agitate for government action and collect information about xenophobic violence that can lower the danger of future attacks.

2.6.4 The link between the theoretical framework and present study

The reviewed theories help in predicting study variables, drawing variables, drawing up assumptions, shaping concepts as well as choosing relevant interview questions and methods. The theories may seem disjointed; however, they can be generalized to different concepts of the study. The scapegoating hypothesis sets the tone of the study by providing the context of and nature of xenophobic violence and gives the reasoning behind its manifestation in South Africa. This builds the foundation of understanding why monitoring becomes a necessity because without this hypothesis one cannot fully comprehend the concept.

The violations approach to monitoring provides the parameters for which monitoring is to be done. Xenophobic violence violates the rights of migrants a s enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights with regards to safety, property ownership and access to social services and employment. Therefore, as highlighted by the approach these violations are supposed to be monitored as a means to and end for prevention and redress by the state, thus, this can be linked to the objective of the study to

find out how monitoring of xenophobic violence used for policy making. Lastly, the Responsibility to Prevent brings out the role of non-state entities and civil society in filling the gap when the state fails to act to ensure human security. Additionally, it sums together the purpose of monitoring, the benefits of monitoring and provides guidance on the tools that can be used to do the monitoring. The use of a combination of these theories helps bring together different perspectives, hence giving a deeper meaning and fuller picture to the phenomena under study.

Chapter Summary

The chapter reviewed literature on xenophobic violence, monitoring (purpose and challenges), monitoring of xenophobic violence in general and in the South African context as well as examples of platforms or organizations that do monitoring. It also discussed theoretical perspectives on xenophobic violence and its monitoring and how it is used for policy making and advocacy. The literature review also revealed data use in the context of policy making and advocacy, its role, and challenges. The forthcoming chapter focuses on the methodology employed by this study.

Chapter Three: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter frames the discussions around the research approach and design adopted for this research. The methodology adopted answers six questions what, why, where, how, who and when data relating to the monitoring of xenophobic violence and the utilization in policy formulation and advocacy was collected, presented, and analyzed. Popene (1971) defines research methodology as the analysis of conceptual, logical and research procedures through which research, data collection methods and sample are used in a research Bryman (2016) defines methodology in simpler terms as techniques used in collecting data. The choice of methods to use was guided by the objectives of the study which include to determine the role and importance of monitoring of xenophobic violence, how it is used in advocacy and policy making through which the establishment to which xenophobic monitoring influences policy making. The section explains ethical considerations with regards to interaction with respondents, handling usage and preservation of data. The limitations and challenges to the study will also be covered.

3.2 Research Paradigm and Approach

The research was based upon beliefs and views that are entrenched in the research paradigms and philosophes of what constitutes acceptable knowledge. This study seeks to establish the importance of monitoring and how it influences policy making in the context of Xenowatch drawing from the interpretivism/constructivist research paradigm. According to Garner and Kawulich (2012), the interpretivism paradigm holds that truth is based on the type of knowledge and the context of the subject and that interpretation of reality is socially constructed. This paradigm makes the legitimate assumption that there are various realities that are created by individuals, which is true of the realities of xenophobic violence (Chilisa and Kawulich, 2012).Since reality is socially constructed and there is no such thing as a single reality, constructivism, according to one classical scholar, Hutchins (1977), is based on the idea that human learning is an intentional attempt to construct meaning from the environment

around us. As a result, it is necessary to study other realities through comprehending odd and divergent viewpoints. Deviant views provide insights that are related to time, context, and culture. The interpretations and observations that support the interpretivism paradigm enable the researcher to make inferences and judgments about the subject (Creswell, 2009, Mertens 2010a, Creswell and Clark, 2011). In the context of the research the paradigm helps establish the events that shape and the importance of monitoring xenophobic violence. The interpretivism paradigm speaks to a more personal and interactive mode of data collection methods such as participant observation and interviews, (*Research Methodology and Design, 2011)* which falls under a qualitative research. Qualitative research is the method of inquiry used in this study. According to Merriam's definition from 2009, qualitative research is a type of study that concentrates on comprehending phenomena through in-depth analysis of them. Creswell (2013) argues that in this strategy, a researcher gathers open-ended data with the goal of creating scenarios and novel concepts from the idea while attempting to address the how, what, and why issues of the study, which supports this definition. This approach is more appropriate for studies that seek to understand a scenario/concept in depth, therefore it is relevant to the study in question as it gives a detailed understanding of the influence and importance of monitoring xenophobic violence.

Additionally, Creswell and Miller (2003) argue that qualitative research is more suitable for studies that are exploratory, that is studies dealing with new ideas or where existing theories are limited in the way that they explain the problem. In this instance information about the actual monitoring of xenophobic violence in literature is limited therefore this study aimed at exploring and finding information that explain the problem in greater detail. Furthermore, any topic around xenophobic violence is sensitive and volatile, (Aspers and Corte, 2009) argue that qualitative research is appropriate as it allows the researcher to gather information and views on emotive and sensitive issues. This approach was relevant because it allowed an in depth unpacking of the aspects of monitoring of xenophobic violence and how it feeds into policy making and advocacy. The nature of monitoring of xenophobic violence is multi-layered and complex, therefore the questions which require a yes or no response would not be adequate in providing the understanding that is needed.

3.3 Research Design

According to Berry (2001) a research design is a road map for undertaking a research study which ensures that the evidence obtained allows the researcher to respond adequately and clearly to the questions asked prior to the study. The process of converting research questions into a research project is known as research design (Robson, 2005). The goal of a study design is to specify the data requirements, uses, and target audiences for the data. It includes deciding on research priorities, time frames, and research techniques (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009). This is crucial to ensuring that only pertinent information is gathered in order to respond to research questions expressly and accurately. Creswell (2013) describes five approaches that can be used as research designs to qualitative studies which are phenomenology, grounded theory, narrative approach, case study and ethnography. For this research it employed the use of a case study in order to get in-depth information.

A case study is defined as an empirical inquiry that investigates a phenomenon within a real-life situation, especially when boundaries are not well defined between the context and phenomenon, (Yin, 2003). A case study is a design where a limited number of units are used for extensive analysis and in most cases one unit which can be a person or organization or community, (Welman et al. 2010, Chilisa, 2012). Two discrete dimensions—single versus numerous instances and holistic versus embedded cases can be used to classify case studies (Yin, 2003). Single situational studies, which employ the first dimension, concentrate on a single example in order to highlight odd or out-of-the-ordinary situations. Once, more, case studies can be used to examine complex, real-world circumstances that are challenging to examine using other study designs (Gerring, 2017).

In this instance, monitoring of xenophobic violence is not well documented and the use of the data in policy making and advocacy work is not very clear, therefore, the case study design allowed for in depth examination. A single case study of Xenowatch was used to explore the research topic which gave the researcher the opportunity to capture all the aspects of the organization since the environment it operates in is fast changing and events occur rapidly. To add on, by only focusing on Xenowatch the researcher gained access to first-hand information on how the monitoring data has been used for policy making and

advocacy. It is also important to note that this was also for the researcher's convenience and the limited time available to carry out the analysis.

3.4 Data and Data Gathering

This study used primary data, defined as data which the researcher collects themselves and records at the source for the first time, (Bryman, 2016). This type of data is sourced from first- hand accounts such as interviews, observation, or documents such as letters (Bryman,2016). The data for this study was derived from interviews with Xenowatch players and their stakeholders which are civil society organizations involved in various issues that concern foreigners, asylum seekers and refuges namely CoRMSA, ADF and LHR. The data was collected using interviews from key informants, (Kvale, 1983, Opdenakker, 2006, Creswell and Tashakkori, 2007) all argue that interviews have a long- standing history of usage and application in research. By definition an interview is a purposeful conversation usually between two people, which allows for the systematic collection of information (Chilisa, 2012). Interviews are particularly helpful in getting the story behind the story (the respondents share their experiences or as a follow-up to issues discovered in literature and in this case even media). In this instance key informants were used for the purpose of collecting data. The duration of the interviews varied with each participant however, ranged from twenty minutes to an hour.

The participants of the interviews were selected based on their role in the organization, their knowledge, communicability, and impartiality as articulated by (Marshall, 1996) as the key characteristics of a key informant. The decisions about interview design are based on core concepts including the target audience, sample design, resources available, and data collection method (Kvale, 1996). The interviewer created and employed interview guides in this instance (see Appendix Three and Four). An interview guide is a list of open-ended questions and subjects that were to be discussed with respondents in an order that suited each respondent. The nature of the questions allowed for in-depth discussion between the interviewer and subject while also exploring the monitoring of xenophobic violence in South Africa. To add on, the nature of the interview allowed the researcher to manage and package content for

Xenowatch to establish the nature of data they collect, its importance and how it has been used to influence policy making and advocacy. The researcher was able to prompt or encourage interviewees to supply more information due to the flexible framework of the interviews. This method speaks to the interpretivism paradigm which argues that data collection should allow an engagement between the researcher and participants and use open-ended, descriptive, and non- directional questions, (Creswell, 2009). The researcher sought clarity on experiences and standpoints through follow-up and probing on questions that received a lot of attention and emerging new ideas that had not been captured in the interview guide by the researcher. The interviews lasted between fifteen minutes to one hour and were recorded using Microsoft Teams, Zoom and voice recording.

However, some researchers have expressed skepticism when it comes to the quality of data generated from key informant interviews as it is subjective and could be biased. Other scholars such as (Kumar, 1989) their skepticism emanates from poor selection of key informant, inadequate preparation of interview guides and the lack of precision in data analysis. However, when little is known or presented in literature about the subject the benefits outweigh the shortcomings. The direct interaction with the key players of Xenowatch enabled for in-depth understanding of the monitoring of xenophobic violence, the benefits and challenges hinder the absorption of the data into practice.

3.5 Population and Sampling

Population refers to the entire family of variables under study, this population describes collection of people, objects, organisms, organizations that share similar attributes. According to Kazerooni (2001) a study population is group of individuals or units which we can legitimately apply conclusions and a sample denotes part of the population and inferences are made to the entire population. In this study the sample population included Xenowatch team members and stakeholders which are organizations that work closely with and use the Xenowatch data.

Levy and Lemeshow (2008) define sampling as a process of identifying or selecting individuals from the whole population o to form a unit of the study to provide reliable information that best describes the

phenomenon. The research utilized purposive sampling, which focuses on the selection of participants that are more knowledgeable and experienced with the phenomenon of interest, (Imas and Rist, 2009). Babbie and Mouton (2004) note that a purposive sample is the one that is selected on the basis of the knowledge population of the study. Therefore, the study had two samples with the first one comprising of the Xenowatch team members who were involved in its establishment and the day to day running of the platform. The second group or sample comprised of Xenowatch stakeholders or Xenowatch data users who were mostly advocacy officers who are key players in advocacy work of their organizations. All the respondents had extensive amount of experience in migration issues and advocacy spanning from at least five years to a maximum of thirty years. (Refer to table 2 in chapter 4) researcher interviewed three members of the Xenowatch team, and seven stakeholders who make use of the data provided by Xenowatch. In total 10 interviews were conducted

3.6 Data analysis

The insights utilized to respond to study questions were based on patterns of answers from the collected data. Kothari (2004) refers to data analysis as the computation of particular measures together with searching for patterns of association that exist among data-groups. He further holds the view that analysis of data in a general approach involves a number of closely connected operations which are performed with the objective of summarizing the obtained data and arranging these in such a way that they answer the research question(s). According to Ambert and Adler (1995), it is vital that qualitative research be specific and thorough about methodologies so that the rigor is evident, the necessity of stating one's data analysis process is emphasized. Kvale (1996) identified six crucial phases in the analysis of qualitative data which are the researcher living the research's reality: discovering new relationships and their meanings with the informants; compressing meanings and communicating the message; transcribing and clarifying the meanings; re-interviewing; and, when possible, action by the interviewees. Thematic analysis, which is based on the qualitative research approach, was used to summarize, and synthesize the themes and sub-themes that best represent the study. Thematic analysis is a technique for analyzing qualitative data that involves going through the data set to find recurring patterns, choosing codes, and

developing themes, according to (Braun and Clarke, 2006). According to (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, 2007), there is no one right technique to analyze and present qualitative data; rather, it depends on the goal of the research. Kiger and Varpio (2020) note that the interpretivism/constructivist paradigm allows researchers to delve deeper into more latent themes within the data by using thematic analysis to show how specific constructs are generated.

To analyze the data the researcher followed the six-step process suggested by Creswell (2013) which are as follows:

1. *Organize and prepare the data for analysis.* The researcher transcribed the interview data using Microsoft Dynamics 365 and summarized additional notes that were made directly after the interviews.
2. *Read through all the data.* During this stage the researcher read through all the data to get a general idea of the emerging themes and edited the transcripts on areas that had errors.
3. *Begin detailed analysis with a coding process*. On this step data was separated into different segments of text and categories and assigned basic terms for easier reference.
4. *Using the coding process to generate a description of the setting or people as well as categories or themes of analysis*. According to Creswell (2009) this part of analysis is useful for designing detailed descriptions for case studies, ethnographies, or research projects, thus the researcher used descriptions to render information in this study. To generate themes that were used in the general description of this study a coding process was used. Additionally, a number of quotations and specific evidence emanating from the interview were included.
5. *Advance how the description and themes will be represented in the qualitative narrative*. The major themes generated during stage 4 were used to provide a narrative combined together with different perspectives generated from interview participants in order to find any correlations.
6. *Making an interpretation or meaning of the data*. The researcher compiled a write up as presented in chapter four and chapter five.

3.7 Validity and Reliability

According to LeCompte and Goetz (1984), internal validity is a strength of qualitative research when there is an alignment between findings and observations and theorized concepts created by the researcher (Bryman, 2016). This study made sure that the literature review informed and directed the data collection strategies and interview guide questions that were used in the study. The findings of the investigation and the suggested theoretical framework are additionally connected.

Nonetheless, a number of academics have pointed out how challenging it is to apply reliability and validity standards to qualitative research. For instance, according to Bryman (2016), it is impossible to "freeze" a social context in so as to replicate the study and have it match the original setting. Trustworthiness, credibility, applicability, and consistency can be utilized to defend the integrity of qualitative research (Hammarberg et al., 2015). A criterion that divides trustworthiness into believability, transferability, dependability, and confirmability is proposed by Bryman (2016)

Credibility

According to Hammarberg et al. (2015) and Bryman (2016), qualitative study findings are reliable if they coincide with the context's description and are acknowledged by others who have had similar experiences. By comparing participant responses with other research participants to check for consistency and pattern, the researcher established credibility by validating the responses.

Dependability

According to Bryman (2016), keeping detailed records for each stage of the research process, such as problem formulation, participant selection, fieldwork notes, interview transcripts, and data analysis decisions for auditing, is necessary to ensure dependability. All interview guides, transcripts, and notes were retained for this project so that other researchers and peers may review the methodology used and the findings.

Confirmability

The audit checklist will include confirmability to ensure that the researcher acted in good faith and that personal values and theoretical inclinations did not sway the research process as advocated for by Bryman (2016).

Transferability

Hammarberg et al. (2015) argue that a study is considered to meet the criterion of transferability/applicability when the findings of the study can fit into contexts outside the study situation. Therefore, with the use of purposive sampling the research helped to ensure that the data can be applicable as the chosen sample of respondents managed to give responses that can be applied in other contexts of monitoring.

3.8 Ethics

The priority for this research was to ensure that the ethical standards of research were adhered to during data collection process, this is a pre-requisite for every study or research involving human participants. Morra Imas and Rist (2009) argue that the aim of every research is to achieve what is truthful at the same time finding solutions to real world problems while complying with the rigorous practices of research. The researchers are advised to anticipate and prepare at multiple stages of research to encounter ethical issues. To start with, the researcher obtained ethical clearance from the ethics committee of the University of Witwatersrand as it is essential for the research to acquire clearance before carrying out a study.

Additionally, consent from the respondents was solicited before proceeding with the interviews. This is so that informants may make an informed decision about whether to engage in a particular study and that they are treated with respect while the research is being conducted, and their responses and identities are treated confidentially (Brener, 2006). Moreover, Ventegodt et al. (2003) stressed the need for specific considerations while conducting qualitative interviews because they often include the development of human bonds with informants before, during, and after the interviews. In general, the researcher should

stay away from research locations where informants might feel compelled to participate, hence, maintaining the informants' privacy was important in conducting this study.

The study procedure must be seen as a "contract," with certain terms spelled out. Integrity and honesty are essential, especially because the report's conclusions must accurately reflect the situation as it is on the ground (Bracken, 1981; Ventegodt et al. 2003; Brener, 2006). Respondents signed consent forms where all the information with regards to the study and the interview settings was outlined and they also consented to the interviews being recorded. Furthermore, they were advised that the study is purely for academic purposes, and study findings are not to be used for anything outside the agreed-on purpose. Respondents were further advised that the data will be stored in encrypted files, in a password protected folder and laptop and will be deleted after five years, to ensure the safety of the participants.

3.9 Limitations

The researcher encountered a few challenges while conducting the research, however these were not to the extent of comprising the overall quality of the data collected. Some of the potential respondents were not reachable as most organizations had closed for the festive holidays. This had a negative effect on the researcher's timelines, delaying the entire research process. Additionally, some interviewees who had agreed to participate pulled out at the last minute due to busy schedules or realizing that this could not answer some of interview questions and had to re-assign the researcher to the relevant personnel.

The study was case study based and only limited to the population with direct connection with Xenowatch, due to resource and time constraints. Therefore, the outcomes of the study are limited in sample size, this has an effect on the generalizability of the findings. However, the researcher has confidence that the findings of the study will help in understanding some of the dynamics of monitoring of xenophobic violence and how it feeds into advocacy and policy formulation. To add on, the study can be used as a pilot for future studies and the recommendations proffered can also help Xenowatch.

Chapter Summary

The chapter detailed the research methodology of the study which includes research paradigm and approach, data collection and analysis, ethics, reliability, validity and lastly limitations. Overall, the chapter sought to answer the six questions of what, who, where, how, why and when data on the monitoring of xenophobic violence and how it feeds into policy making and advocacy was collected presented and analyzed. The next chapter will present the findings of the studying with the research questions.

Chapter Four: Presentation of findings

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings of the study from the data collected using key informant interviews with Xenowatch staff and its stakeholders (data users). The presentation of the collected data is according to themes generated through data analysis; these represent the overarching construct used to classify the results, (Welman, et al., 2015). Thus, this chapter details the empirical findings within the confines of the research context and setting, that is the case study of Xenowatch.

4.2 Participant profile

In order to put their experiences and opinions into context, the researcher gathered information on the involvement in migration issues, the position held, or role(s) played with the organization and the rationale for the existence of the organization participants belonged. For ethical and confidentiality purposes, participants are anonymized and referred to as 'respondent' or 'participant' throughout the research report.

Table 2 shows the background information of the participants.

Profile of the participants	**Position /roles played**	**Years in migration issues**	**Organization**	**Rational of organization**
1	Project manager/PHD Student	4	Xenowatch	information collection, visualization and interactive mapping of information and data on

				xenophobic discrimination incidents in South Africa
2	Political scientist	30	Xenowatch	Same as above
3	Research on migration and displacement studies	15	Xenowatch	Same as above
4	Chairperson of a Civil Society Organisation and Commissioner of Research (CSO)	15	Users	Looks at the welfare of migrants and asylum seekers. And refugees in South Africa
5	Head of Refugee and Migrant rights Programme of a CSO,	17	Users	Promotion of Migrants' rights Provides legal services through law clinics and

				advice office in three provinces with the most migrants.
6	Advocacy officer of a CSO	5	Users	To promote and protect the human rights of refugees, asylum seekers, and migrants.

Participant	Position /roles played	Years in migration issues	Organization	Rational of organization
7	Director of a CSO, former Advocacy officer	12	Users	To promote and protect the human rights of refugees, asylum seekers, and migrants.
8	Attorney: Refugee and Migrant rights Programme of a CSO	7	Users	Works in six areas that includes strategic litigation, advocacy, law reform, human rights enforcement and community mobilization and support.

9	Board member of a CSO and chairperson of a migrant community organization	18	Users	Looks at the welfare of migrants, asylum seekers and refugees among Zimbabwean nationals.
10	Director of a CSO	16	Users	To enhance protection of and develop capacity of vulnerable refuges and asylum seekers to attain integration and independence.

Table 2 shows the descriptive analysis of the roles, years in migration, the organization to which each participant belongs and the rationale of the organization they belong to. Three of the respondents belonged to Xenowatch, and the rest are each from different CSOs involved with migrants' issues.

These participants from CSOs are the users of xenophobic violence monitoring data as provided by Xenowatch. The CSOs were not used by their names in this case to preserve anonymity.

4.3 Framework for discussion of findings

In presenting and discussing the research findings, table 3 sets out the framework for the findings. As presented, the table shows the themes, categories and sub-categories identified in the collected data.

Table 3: Framework for Discussion of findings

Themes	**Categories**	**Sub-themes**
1.Approaches, methods, and tools used in monitoring xenophobic violence	Crowd source	-
	Online search	-
	Original research	-
	Reports by partners	-
Data from monitoring of xenophobic violence feeding into advocacy and policy making	Ways of dissemination	Media
		Online Interface
		Reporting
		Participation in forums/meetings
		Seminars and Webinars
	Main users of monitoring	Government and Police
		Academia
		Media
		Civil Society Organizations
	Uses of monitoring data	Direct feed into advocacy and Policy through CSOs
		Factual reporting
		Incident analysis

		Law enforcement
		Academic purposes
Challenges of gathering and using xenophobic violence monitoring data	Challenges of gathering	Financial landscape
		The challenge of definition of xenophobia
		The challenge of under-reporting
		Deniability as a challenge in monitoring
		Lack of cooperation and accountability
	Challenges of Using	Lack of capacity and skills
		Data Accuracy
		Deniability
		Lack of recognition

4.4 Presentation of findings

This section presents findings of the study on the ways in which monitoring of xenophobic violence contributes to advocacy and policymaking to reduce violence and displacement in South African communities. These results are discussed from the perspective of ten participants, three of whom were from Xenowatch, and the rest were users of the data gathered by Xenowatch. The section discusses the responses provided by participants to questions regarding the approaches, methods and tools used in the monitoring of Xenophobic violence, the ways in which data from monitoring is fed into advocacy and policymaking and challenges related to the monitoring. The discussion conducted in this section is in line with the themes, categories, and sub-categories in the framework in table 3.

4.5 Approaches, methods, and tools used in monitoring xenophobic violence.

This part of presentation of results focuses on research question (a): What approaches, methods and tools does Xenowatch use to monitor xenophobic violence. Approaches, methods, and tools relate to the mediums and ways through which Xenowatch monitors xenophobic violence. These approaches and methods are key as they are the means through which reporting of xenophobic violence is done.

4.5.1 Crowd sourcing

The question of approaches, methods and tools used in monitoring of xenophobic violence was directed to the Xenowatch team as they are the ones responsible for monitoring. Crowd sourcing emerged to be one of the main approaches used in monitoring xenophobic violence by Xenowatch. It entails the collection of data from the community which encompasses individuals and its leaders. This means that any member of a community, either victims themselves or witnesses, provide information to Xenowatch through its communication tools like SMSs, WhatsApp, Xenowatch app, Xenowatch website and telephone calls. The was a consensus among the Xenowatch respondents with regards to crowdsourcing being the main source of monitoring data, one of the respondents responded that:

> *"The first one is crowd sourcing where we ask any community members to report any incidents of xenophobic violence or any incidents of xenophobic discrimination. So, the public, you, me, everybody else can report using a free SMS and when you use the SMS is free of charge. One can also report on WhatsApp or use the Xenowatch app and also on the website." (Participant 3).*

In addition, as part of crowd sourcing Xenowatch relies on reports from partnering organizations which are also working to advocate for and promotion of human rights. Their partnership with organizations which include UN agencies such as the UNHCR and other CSOs like Lawyers for Human Rights and CoRMSA is crucial since they are the ones that work with both victims and witnesses in their day-to-day business. This was also supported by participant 9 who works with the Zimbabwean community though the question was not directly asked in summary he noted that our people report xenophobic attacks to us because they know us, and we speak the same language, and we take the reports to Xenowatch. Based on this response it means that more reports are more likely to come to them (CSOs) than to Xenowatch as they are known and are likely to be trusted more by communities. On reports from partner organizations participant 1 stated that:

> *"We have different organizations that we work with and different verification partners that in their individual capacity level also report incidents of xenophobia to us. We also had a partnership with the UNHCR and were part of the UNHCR Protection Working Group so*

when there are incidents of xenophobia that are reported there, they let us know and we follow up with the partner organizations there to really understand what is happening."

On the tools of communication reported Participant 2 noted that most of the reports come through phone calls and e-mails and the majority of the people that utilize the email platform are not the victims themselves but the civil organizations that they work with. The participant was quoted saying:

"Usually, people that are sending us emails or phone calls, are not the people who are directly affected, but civil society organizations or community leaders who know of us. We collaborate closely with some of the UN agencies and with the civil society to collect this information."

Emailing provides both Xenowatch and the CSOs with evidence of communication that can be followed up on when compiling reports or proof to both who might have reported, or anyone interested in the case in question. In the interview with participant 1, it was revealed that:

"We used to have a free SMS line, but we scrapped that out because we realized that people are not making use of it. People prefer WhatsApp more and it is more convenient especially when its reports from victims or witnesses."

However, the reasons for the under-utilization of the free SMS platform are unknown reasons, despite the marketing of all methods at the same time when the platform was launched.

4.5.2 Online search

Another approach that also emerged from the interviews that is used in monitoring xenophobic violence across South Africa is online searching or monitoring. An online search is conducted by Xenowatch staff to identify any xenophobic incidents that have been reported on media platforms such as news websites and articles. Xenowatch searches for xenophobic violence on social media platforms like WhatsApp groups, Facebook, and Twitter.

"So, basically, what we do is every day we do an online search of any reported incidents of xenophobia, whether it's online media articles, whether it's news, whether it's on social media, or anything that's shared on WhatsApp ... We always keep an eye on that, and we are all on

different like WhatsApp groups that are related to issues pertaining to migrants, their rights or xenophobia, so that we're able to be fed that information." (Participant 1).

Most of the xenophobic violence incidents that have taken place since 2019 have been organized and mobilized largely on social media such Operation Dudula and hashtags such on Twitter as *#PutSouthAfricansFirst* and have spiraled into huge activities of violence resulting to damage of property, looting and in some cases death. Participant 5 noted that over the years they have seen a transformation of xenophobic violence from random attacks to well-coordinated, organized, and planned attacks on migrants. She stated that:

"One search on Twitter leads you to a thread of hateful messages on foreigners and if you follow up on it for days you will end up seeing planned attacks and, in some cases, reports of migrants or refugees that have been assaulted ……..in those threads

you can even see the attacks cascading to other parts of the country… you hear of it in Gauteng tomorrow it is in Durban."

Therefore, from these responses it is clear that online searches are crucial in monitoring xenophobic violence and provide information that Xenowatch can follow up on. Despite the challenges that come with combing through media for reports as some posts can be misleading, biased and lacking enough detail, Xenowatch admitted having found information that turned out to be credible and worth recording into the database.

4.5.3 Original research

Last but not least Xenowatch in monitoring xenophobic violence across South Africa uses original research. In this instance Xenowatch conducts research on xenophobic violence mainly through its two research assistants who are on the ground and in some instances, it happens in the communities that they live in. The research assistants collect, track, and give feedback to the Xenowatch project manager who then feeds the data into the database. To add on, the research assistants, conduct research on issues that are reported in media or further research on any other incidents reported through the various

communication tools and verification on incidents that could have been reported by the community members or partners. One interviewee from Xenowatch confirmed this in a statement.

> *"Our research assistants as well who are stationed in different provinces. Also, feed us any reports that they can get through their networks, and in some instances, they go in to try and understand as well as add detail to the reports."*

Having research assistants is a plus for Xenowatch as it ensures that the reports and maps, they produce is not based on some random data but accurate information that has been verified, which is key to data quality.

4.6 Data from monitoring of xenophobic violence feeding into advocacy and policymaking.

In examining the responses provided by the respondents, the research established that the discussion on how data from monitoring of xenophobic violence is used for advocacy and policy making can be done by considering three themes which are main users of data, ways of dissemination, and data uses. These three themes are analyzed and assessed below in line with the responses by participants.

4.6.1 Main users

The intention of collecting any data is for it to be used for various purposes and to speak to the needs of various audience/users. For this study the intention was to explore how the data is used for advocacy and policy making. As such the study found that civil society organizations (CSOs) are one of the main users of monitoring data collected by Xenowatch. From the interviews it emerged that the majority of CSOs that use the monitoring data are organizations that are part of their partner network who are involved in mostly advocacy work such as Consortium for Refugees and Migrants in South Africa (CoRMSA), Lawyers for Human Rights (LHR), Jesuit Refugee Services and Human Rights Watch as well as United Nations (UN) agencies like UNHCR and IOM. These organizations work with refugees, migrants, asylum seekers in their different capacities for instance LHR provides legal help, visa, and asylums

applications, among other things, CoRMSA focuses on advocacy and lobbying, capacity building, network building and information sharing. The common aspect other than the work they do is that they find value in the work that Xenowatch does, which will be explained in the next sections.

In an interview with one of the Xenowatch staff it was stated that:

> *"... I think that, you know, there are some of the UN agencies, UNHCR, IOM, others who are engaged in these kinds of issues, I think they use it quite regularly. Civil society organizations, ... sort of Jesuit refugee services, lawyers for human rights, Scalabrine will also refer to it when trying to advocate around these issues."*

The response by Participant 2 was in line with the responses provided by Participant 1 who elaborated by saying:

> *"We also share our data with partner organizations. So, for example organizations like CoRMSA, [and] Lawyers for Human Rights as well has also approached us to say, can you share with us your latest figures."*

CSOs were highly cited by Xenowatch respondents as the main users of the data, and this is because of the advocacy work they do which requires accurate and factual data to support policy or government responses to purported acts against human rights including migrants' rights. Eighty percent of the data users sample note that because of the work CSOs do, it is of paramount importance to work with organizations such as Xenowatch. To substantiate this one respondent noted that:

> *"...the work that we do as an organization works closely with Xenowatch. Xenowatch being a university initiative/Program will help us put facts on the table. This is why we started connecting with them and whenever we have any factual incident we relay it to them with names, places, times, police station this and that."*

From the responses given it is clear that Xenowatch as a good relationship with partner organizations/ stakeholders that is why there is an exchange of information where CSOs provide reports of an acts of

xenophobic violence and Xenowatch provides a detailed report for analysis and use for various purposes as shall be discussed below.

The researcher had an assumption that for the purposes of international relations with other states and for the image of South Africa the government would be among the top users of Xenowatch data. However, from the interviews it was revealed that only some of the government institutions use or request Xenowatch to give them data to use. Participants from the Xenowatch staff noted that:

> *"So, we've shared sort of like data around municipalities that are most at risk ... Also, the Department of Social Development reached out to us and asked us if we could share data on places and locations where most of the xenophobic violence report had come from."*

This is clear evidence that there is little uptake of data within government. Based on this response only one department has requested data. Another participant responded to say that even though they have had an opportunity to present the Xenowatch findings to different levels of government and government officials the response is far less positive. The majority of the participants noted that xenophobic monitoring data is better received at local government level largely because when these acts of xenophobic violence attacks occur, they happen within local communities and the impact is felt there rather than at national level. For instance, the attacks on shops run by foreigners' damages property and infrastructure in these municipalities, thus if the data can help them address this, they receive it better because of the effects they have seen. To support this participant 10 stated that:

> *"We have been fortunate in our interactions with local government when we present the data to them, what they do afterwards with data is beyond our control. What is important to us is that they hear of it…., the rest we can only hope."*

In this case it is clear that the respondent hopes that the municipalities that they work with will use the data more and come up with solutions. The respondents from Xenowatch provided reasons which shall be discussed below as to why they think there is poor uptake from the government. Without getting into much detail one of the main causes mentioned by almost all respondents both from Xenowatch and civil

society organizations interviewed was the deniability by government of the existence of xenophobia. To effect policy change or come up with solutions that can reduce and prevent xenophobic violence government should be more cognizant of the monitoring data and reports from Xenowatch.

In addition to institutions of government and CSOs, the other users of the monitoring data are journalists and academia who use the data for a number of purposes. One respondent noted that:

> *"... we've also had journalists approaching us like international journalists, sometimes local journalists asking for our data so that they can incorporate it in their articles as supporting evidence and we've also had individual researchers such as yourself [the researcher/interviewer], working on issues of xenophobia or, you know, crime related issues, who ask for our data so."*

When data is distributed to the media it has a greater chance of reaching a larger audience, therefore if the data is used by a journalist to report on television or radio then one would believe that almost everyone has heard of it. Additionally, when the information is published on media it markets Xenowatch to different people, for instance a foreigner who might have been violently attacked or discriminated against due to their citizen status and he/she comes across Xenowatch information might decide to use their services or refer it to someone they know. Academia gives credibility to information as mentioned by Participant 4 earlier in the discussion that they work with Xenowatch because it is a university establishment, therefore, the information they share is fact checked and verified before distribution and the absence of any outside influence that may compromise the quality of the data.

Xenowatch staff admitted that as much as they know some of the users of the data because they work with them or have directly approached them, it is a challenge to keep track of who accesses the data from time to time. The Xenowatch website is open source, therefore, anyone can access the data at any point and at any time. Participant 1 noted that:

> *"I only know of people who reach out to us and those that actually ask for certain reports because it's freely accessible, so I don't know where or who, because sometimes you read a*

report by someone saying according to Xenowatch, you are like, OK, clearly, they went to our website. Otherwise, if someone just accesses the data you would not know, who it is and what they use it for."

As a result, Xenowatch may have a large number of users but there is no way of knowing which the researcher views as a challenge because the data that is being collected is important for it not to have a comprehensive detail of who is using it and for what purposes.

4.6.2 Dissemination and uses of the data

The above-identified users of monitoring data (CSOs, government, media, and academia) use the data for several purposes in the context of issues relating to migrants' rights and violence against them. Further, the use of the data depends on the organization in question and which agenda it seeks to achieve. In general, monitoring data provided by Xenowatch is used to monitor and advocate for monitoring xenophobic acts against migrants, which include issues related to discrimination and denial of access to health services, education services and housing services as well as physical violence. Some local South African organizations and individuals perpetuate acts of violence against migrants as they perceive that they are the ones causing their suffering, hence, they organize for eviction from the accommodation, and exclusion from basic services such as health and education. Thus, the data provided by Xenowatch is used to monitor these kinds of activities and map areas where the activities are happening and where incidences are high for policing and policy advocacy. This is in line with the response of one of the respondents from Xenowatch.

"The bigger picture is to prevent the xenophobic violence in the country using the monitoring, using the analysis, using information sharing with the different stakeholders to prevent it from happening."

Against this background, it emerged from the research that monitoring data is used in policy advocacy as it enables factual reporting. Users of the data such as CSOs are involved in the advocacy and lobbying of the government in matters of human rights and there is a need for evidence of the existence of human

(migrant) rights violations and abuses to present to the government. Furthermore, the media, when reporting, find the data useful as they use it as facts about some things that are happening on the ground; hence, the facts are important. This is in line with a respondent from Xenowatch data users that said:

> *"I think that the data is very useful ... when I talk about xenophobic violence and I have no basis for my argument, I have no basis to advocate for anything because then they will say you're just speaking from assumptions. But if the data is there, then you appeal from an informed point of view. So, I think the data that they [Xenowatch] collect is very important and critical even when we engage with our table and the necessary stakeholders that we can bring on board with regards to xenophobia it is really very helpful in that regard."*

All these are important because the government, politicians and the police sometimes deny the existence of xenophobia in the country. As such, the facts reported by Xenowatch are used to bridge the information gap and hence prove to authorities that xenophobia indeed exists. Participant 4 also stated that:

> *".... When it comes to the xenophobia, you know when we are going towards elections with the government, they like to scapegoat migrants for their failures, and for that, when it comes to service delivery, for instance, talk of access to health care, I 'm sure what's happening when they say migrants are burdening the system, they are denied access to health or education. All those are xenophobic tendencies in other forms, like systematic xenophobia, so that data helps us somehow to put together the figures when it comes to in line with people who are discriminated because of the nuances and the narratives that is being posted in the community so we can talk from that point of view ...."*

Almost all the respondents pointed out that sometimes the narrative in communities is wrong about foreigners, one participant asked the researcher if indeed the foreigners are overburdening the social services, or the resources are already not enough for the South African citizenry or are they largely responsible for the crime in the country. Therefore, with this kind of data not only to government, the role

of CSOs is to give a true representation of what is happening in our communities. Participant 5 responded to say:

> *"Xenowatch can be very powerful in even engaging with the media to say it's your duty to do balanced reporting and here are facts instead of just reporting. You know, if you South Africa has a large number of migrants, and they are causing the crime here is the report on how much crime is reported against the foreign national, so do a balanced report. I think this one of the reasons why it is such an incredible tool for us in the context of state that is in xenophobic and a media that is biased."*

Xenowatch provides the data to the government through CSOs who are actively involved in the protection of human rights including equal access to basic amenities like health, housing, and education. These CSOs engage with the government in different ways such as through letters of petition and participation in government meetings and forums. This corresponds with the respondent from the data users who noted following.

> *"We also share our data with partner organizations. So, for example organizations. Like CoRMSA [and] Lawyers for Human Rights as well has also approached us to say, can you share with us your latest figures because we want to write a letter to Parliament and we want to use your data to support, or show evidence that actually is an inquiry has taken place …"* (Participant 1)

> *"We use this information to give … to people so that they don't speak out of out of impression. And it helps us changing policies, which helps us changing policies, especially when we take that to the legal department … For example, when some municipalities here in Gauteng decided to prevent all migrants' tuck shops in townships from operating, which is against the human rights of migrants. The information that was collected was useful for us to change policies we push that information which says that actually refugees are adding value by bringing investments, new ideas, they are going into initiatives where no one else goes. They*

create jobs, they create income for properties that otherwise they were not hired by the refugees." (Participant 4)

"So, it empowers us [the monitoring data provided by Xenowatch] in when we are writing the very basic things like writing a press statement or engaging with the state or writing media … and in our advocacy." (Participant 8)

These responses indicate that the monitoring data is used by several CSOs in their advocacy work in different ways to protect the interest of migrants against xenophobia. Seventy- five percent of the respondents admitted being aware of some decisions and local policies that have been made and changed based on the data provided by Xenowatch but do not have a recollection of the full details, only participant 4 mentioned two local policies that were changed in Gauteng.

Despite not being an advocate organization Xenowatch directly uses its own monitoring data to track xenophobic violence and then feeds the information to the relevant government institution like the police for further action, controlling the situation, and preventing violence. This was noted by the respondent who said:

"So, we quickly verify if this is actually happening and then we then feed this information to relevant officials, like maybe call the police to be [say], can you please go to help on these reports that we are getting. If there are foreign nationals who are victimized or maybe are denied access to health care services and maybe need, like you know…"

In some instances, as noted from the Xenowatch team they have had success in getting police response on reports of xenophobic violence reported to them. An example was given by one of the participants from Xenowatch where police acted immediately after reports:

"In 2019 in Hermanus Cape Town, we managed to prevent violence…., when I called the Hermanus police station, spoke to a policeman who was very interactive gave me his numbers. He said he knew of the group they have been notorious for doing this, it was not the first time. Let me notify the intelligence unit we are going to go on the ground, and he kept me informed,

worked with the NCR and all these other civil society organizations. I think at some point, even the municipality was involved, and they stopped the violence. Right, so which is an example to show that like if there is like willingness from institutions that are mandated to do this it is possible to prevent violence."

If police act on the cases reported to them, it would deescalate situations before they become unmanageable. This leads to the point that monitoring data is used as an early warning where if information is known early courses of action and remedies will be made on time. One of the main objectives of Xenowatch is to make sure that they provide on early warning system in order to prevent future attacks on foreigners/outsiders, thus, threat forecasting is an important aspect of escalation in cases of crisis.

In addition, monitoring data by Xenowatch is used by government departments and CSOs in creating awareness campaigns though not directly acknowledged by the government for use in policy making. One of the respondents reported that:

"It [monitoring data] is not necessarily used in policy … but in terms of knowledge and awareness. I would say it is used in awareness campaigns with the hope of creating social cohesion in communities."

Most advocacy organizations argue that part of their mandate is community building if they have access to data that can encourage peaceful relations in society it is a bonus to their work. As part of users of Xenowatch monitoring data the academia disseminates information through conducting research including the writing and publishing of journal articles and data provided by Xenowatch is used in the analyses. These articles provide policy recommendations to the government regarding xenophobic attacks and violence. Respondents acknowledge that the data has been used in numerous academic journals, academic webinars and seminars which form part of knowledge awareness. The quotation below is one of the responses given in interviews.

"... Of course, academic discussions, academic papers, I don't know how many articles and theses have been written out of our data or our publications cited in the academic spaces. So yes, we are in academia, in advocacy, in courts, in national organizations made for human rights ...."

In this section the findings show that the data has great influence in advocacy work, and more is still required when comes to policy making. One respondent noted that despite all of our efforts in monitoring no significant change has been observed.

"I can say it is not being used much in policy we have not seen new legislation and also because the monitoring has not yet reduced or minimized and prevent xenophobic violence as we had hoped to achieve. There is no significant sign of it stopping, if anything it is getting worse with new movements coming up everywhere. It is happening, it does not make headlines anymore unless there is a major outbreak, but migrants are being attacked."

Nevertheless, the data is quite significant, and an increased uptake will be beneficial to the country. However, the researcher anticipated more information to emerge from the study about how the data is used for policy making and advocacy. This lies in the fact that Xenowatch as an organization and xenophobic violence have not been fully acknowledged by governments as shall be discussed in the section below.

As part of dissemination the data is presented through reports which are shared with partner organizations and with whoever requests the data. One the respondents noted that:

"We are always in the media, I don't know if you know this, when there is a problem on migration and xenophobia, we are called upon to give comments in the media, hoping to reach the public. Media is used we do TV; we do Radio we do articles just to reach as many people as we can. We also do webinars and various seminars."

This ensures that the data is received by a larger audience. Additionally, their website allows individuals to view maps of all locations where Xenophobic violence incidences have taken place. Maps provide a

clear picture and visualization especially when it comes to the incident distribution, one can be able to see where xenophobic violence attacks occur more and the numbers of those victimized in each province. This is crucial in providing remedy as priority can be given to the areas that are affected the most.

4.7 Challenges of gathering and using xenophobic violence monitoring data

In this section, the research presents findings about the challenges associated with gathering and using xenophobic violence monitoring data. The research findings pointed out the challenges provided by the respondents. They can be categorized into challenges related to gathering and challenges related to using the data. As such, sub-themes were identified in each category to pinpoint what are the exact challenges that Xenowatch faces in gathering and use of xenophobic violence monitoring data. From the interviews it is clear that Xenowatch faces numerous challenges as noted by a respondent who said:

"*Oh my God. Where do I even start? There are so many, but I will try…''*

This response is a clear indication that monitoring and using xenophobic violence data is complex.

4.7.1 Challenges of gathering xenophobic violence monitoring data

The successful conduct and completion of any project largely depends on the adequacy of the available funds. With insufficient funds, it becomes difficult to pursue a project, and this is also the case with Xenowatch when gathering data. The organization faces financial problems such that it cannot monitor the existence and trends in xenophobic violence well. This is because the success of monitoring by the organization requires manpower on the ground, which will be collecting and verifying the reported cases. Therefore, with insufficient capacity, Xenowatch is faced with challenges to cover all geographic areas across South Africa. Hence the data will be inadequate. This lack of adequate finance results in them using personal funds and over-reliance on donations. There is a consensus on the issue of funding which was cited by one of the Xenowatch respondents as follows:

"So, basically, what we do is we have a team of like 2 research assistants currently. We would like to have one in each province, but due to finance, budget constraints, we only have two so

far……. Like I said, we're very small team yet we don't yet have the funding to build a big team where we can be everywhere at the same time or a response team."

As stated by the respondent, the gathering of xenophobic violence data is inhibited by the fact that the organization has only 2 research assistants because of limited finance. There are nine provinces in South Africa, and it would make much of a difference if the organization had a research assistant in each province and more than one in the major cities such as Cape Town, Johannesburg and Durban. Furthermore, the issue of financial capacity affects the amount of outreach and awareness campaigns Xenowatch can do in order to make sure that the majority of the communities are aware of Xenowatch and what it offers.

Underreporting is another challenge that Xenowatch faces in gathering data. Underreporting means that witnesses, victims, or any other people will not report the xenophobic cases to Xenowatch, which affects the accuracy and numbers of the incidents reported. All of the Xenowatch staff agreed that underreporting of xenophobic cases is a major challenge as reported by one of the respondents that:

"So, I think the first one that I highlighted is that … there is the issue of under reporting. So, we do not really get a lot of incidents. Most of the incidents that we get are from the partners that we work with report to us and let us know of the incident."

One of the chief reasons for the underreporting in data is the lack of incentive to report the incidents and the participants all agree that the lack of an incentive to report incidents by victims and the community stems from a negative response from the police and the relevant institutions.

"It is a very sensitive issue and there is no accountability even if the perpetrators are known. Perpetrators are known in the community, but they know there is no accountability, even if they are arrested, they are released the next day. So, if you report them to the police and they are released you are going to be their target. There is lack of trust in institutions and authorities, so it results to lack of motivation to report to Xenowatch if the police will still do not do anything about it."

This hampers the progression of monitoring because with no reports there is no data to report and the efforts of Xenowatch become futile. Furthermore, Xenowatch is not a policing organization but an organization that monitors xenophobic violence in the country. This means that it does not have the capacity to prevent the occurrence or prevent the victimization of migrants on its own. Hence, people realize that even if reports are made, there is nothing that is done to address those issues. In cases where there is a positive response by the police through arrests, the study noted that the arrested people will be released from police custody without being charged with the crime of xenophobia. This means that there is a lack of accountability of perpetrators such that people are demotivated to report the crimes. The response from respondents revealed these issues.

> *"There is no real motivation for reporting because in the past we thought that once somebody reports we will be able to do something about something that is happening, by reporting it with the knowledge we will be able to get some response. However, we have not been able to do that because we give the information to the police, the relevant communities, the councilors, and others but there is no response. There is no incentive to report incidents since it does not lead to any kind of response."*

Moreover, there is fear of victimization as a reason for underreporting of Xenowatch violence by the community. People are afraid of reporting crimes because they fear that perpetrators can come after them. This means that people prefer not to report than to be victimized. The fear of victimization was cited by several respondents involved in the gathering of monitoring data at Xenowatch:

> *"There is fear of reporting. People fear reporting because they fear victimization because they don't know us … which is understandable."*

> *"There is underreporting because of fear that if they report they are going to be known that they have reported because the perpetrators are still in the community and if you report you are asking questions about who's done this and that."*

Gathering data is not an easy task as it requires a clear definition of the scope of coverage on the issue hand (xenophobic violence). As such, the definition of xenophobic violence is important as it creates boundaries of what can be categorized as xenophobia and other crimes. The distinction is seen as important because this affects the statistics as there are possibilities of overreporting (in the case of non-xenophobic violence being recorded as xenophobic) and underreporting (in the case of xenophobic violence being recorded as non-xenophobic). The challenge of the definition of xenophobia can be noted in the following responses given by the Xenowatch team.

> *"The other challenge is that there is pressure to record everything that happens to a foreign national, so even if they are mugged, assaulted there are questions as to why it is not being recorded. Like I said not every attack on every foreign national is xenophobia. This can lead to biased information when recording if you do not stand your ground when recording.*

> *"... not every incident on foreign national is xenophobia. So even if you're working with a partner organization, they report to us .... The lines become blurry because, especially to say no, but like I mean, if you're fighting with your neighbor like that's an issue between two people like these things happen. You don't have to be a foreign national to fight with your neighbor, right? It is only like when your neighbor attacks you directly because, like, you are a foreigner ... So, you constantly have to distinguish these things."*

The above views confirm that Xenowatch experiences some issues related to the definition of xenophobia even with its partnering organizations, but it has to verify if it is actually xenophobic violence. Hence, the extent to which the definition of xenophobic violence is broadly defined determines the accuracy of the gathered data.

4.7.2 Challenges of using xenophobic violence monitoring data

The data gathered by Xenowatch is of no use if it is not used for its intended purposes such as in advocacy and law enforcement. This means that the achievement of Xenowatch objectives is limited if the xenophobic violence monitoring data is not being used. The research aimed at establishing challenges related to using such data by different stakeholders.

One of the challenges that is associated with the use of data is the lack of cooperation between law enforcement and the government and Xenowatch. Xenowatch collects the data with the intention that the government may effectively use it in policymaking and addressing the Xenophobic violence in South African communities. However, law enforcement and the government do not cooperate with Xenowatch to make the most out of its data. There are several cases of the government and the police denying the existence of xenophobic violence and just calling it criminality. This means that even if law enforcement arms are provided with data on xenophobic violence, they do not respond as intended such that it may seem like the data have been provided for nothing. The issue of deniability was acknowledged by some of the respondents.

> *"I think there's an issue of, as we discussed, of deniability that people by engaging with it, people have to accept that this thing exists, and if you don't do that then you can kind of pretend it doesn't."*

The issue of deniability directly translates to limited use of the data. This is because the government and the police will not be acknowledging the existence of the problem such that the data is not regarded to be useful for implementation hence the lack of cooperation. The research findings confirmed the perception that one of the reasons why there is denial and lack of cooperation by the government and police is that the monitoring data provided by Xenowatch exposes the government on its failures as was noted by one of the respondents.

> *".. government departments know because we kind of like we are not popular with them, right. Because our work is essentially, in a way, shows how government has failed … and how migrants are used as a scapegoat…"*

Moreover, there is a lack of capacity in the government and CSOs that makes data use limited. The analysis of empirical and statistical data such as the one being gathered by Xenowatch requires technical skills and knowledge that some organizations may be lacking. The lack of capacity among these

organizations can be a result of limited training among staff and limited funds to hire qualified and technical people. The research identified a lack of capacity as a challenge in use based on participants' responses.

> *"... if you look at the South African government or advocacy generally, there's quite bad use of empirical data, especially statistical data. Some of that is due to people sort of capacity issues in which people don't quite know how to read or make sense of numbers, and we see that across planning at all levels at the municipal level and national level, not universal, of course ..."*

Another participant noted that:

> *"It's one of the biggest crises in our government where they it's very populist and it's not based on sound research and facts in informing its policymaking, and particularly within xenophobia."*

This impacts negatively on the use of the data as most of them would rather continue with old ways of policy making or decision making.

One important finding of this study is the lack of recognition and reluctance to work with Xenowatch by some key stakeholders, institutions, and government. This is as a result of the failure by the government to endorse the results from the data gathered as credible and useful. Findings from the study show that even with the implementation of NAP, government has not considered Xenowatch or approached it to work with them or build on what Xenowatch is already doing. This is confirmed by the responses from the following research participants.

> *"But we've had international organizations saying that sometimes they're reluctant to partner with us because or engage us in government activities where for example, there is the National Action Plan that is being implemented by the Department of Justice, and they're working with organizations like your IOM and staff to implement it. And they want to come up with an early warning response system. So, then you say, OK, we already have Xenowatch. Why not work*

with organizations that are already doing the work and actually help build on what's already existing than coming up with something new either you decide to work with them, or you build on something better. So, we've heard that, like, a lot of people are reluctant to work with us because of the word Xenophobia or Xenowatch."

Furthermore, the respondents noted that the reluctance also comes from the name Xenowatch which carries connotations of xenophobia. As a result of this it impacts negatively on some connections that Xenowatch could build in order to foster widespread use of the monitoring data and even in the organization getting sponsorship. For any third-party organization recognition and acceptance by important institutions such as government and international organizations gives credibility, so if organizations are reluctant to work with Xenowatch it affects their credibility and the work that they do.

Chapter Summary

This section summarized the findings on how monitoring of xenophobic violence contributes to policy making and advocacy to reduce violence and displacement in South African communities. This was conducted in line with the three themes that were identified from the research questions which are approaches, methods, and tools used in monitoring xenophobic violence; monitoring of xenophobic violence feeding into advocacy and policy making; and challenges of gathering and using xenophobic violence monitoring data. Sub- themes were identified and explored in line with the responses by participants. The findings also provide some insights in an area that is not yet widely researched on- how monitoring of xenophobic violence is used for policy making and advocacy particularly in the case of South Africa. The next chapter discusses the findings in relation to the reviewed literature and the proposed theoretical framework which revealed how the study is relevant and can be linked and located within the relevant academic space.

Chapter Five: Discussion of Findings

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will discuss findings presented in chapter four. The discussion will demonstrate ways in which the study's findings relate with the literature that was reviewed and theoretical framework presented in an earlier chapter of this report. In terms of organisation of this chapter, the discussion will be categorised according to the research questions of the study. Section 5.2 discusses the approaches, methods, and tools that Xenowatch uses in monitoring xenophobic violence across South Africa. Section 5.3 focuses on how the data from monitoring of xenophobic violence is used for advocacy and policy making. Section 5.4 reflects on the challenges of gathering and using xenophobic violence monitoring data.

5.2 Approaches, Methods, and tools used in monitoring xenophobic violence.

In the interviews with Xenowatch staff, they expressed various ways in which xenophobic violence data is gathered/collected. Participants outlined that the main monitoring or data collection method is crowdsourcing which entails any member of the community either a victim or a witness reporting to Xenowatch through various methods such as SMS, WhatsApp, calls among others. Reports mostly come from emails, WhatsApp, direct phone calls, social media searches, and reports from partner organisations. However, the organisation had to scrape off the free SMS platform due to underutilisation. Based on what the key participants mentioned during interviews, it became evident that their responses corelate with experiences documented in the literature review chapter. An example is the set-up of the Stop APPI hate which is a self-reporting website by witnesses and victims on issues of micro-aggressions, bullying, harassment and other kinds of violence on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in the United States *(Stop AAPI Hate, 2020.*, Schweppe et al., 2018*).* The manner in which the Stop AAPI Hate Reporting Centre, tracks incidents of hate and discrimination through crowdsourcing is very similar to the modalities of Xenowatch in South Africa.

The reviewed literature augments the empirical findings of this research on the notion that most third-party monitoring platforms rely on reports from anyone that has information relating to any matter being monitored, be it racism, hate crimes, discrimination, and xenophobic violence. This is an advantage to most organisations as most of them operate online and are not on the ground to witness these acts of violence. Additionally, the examples provided in chapter two of the study which include Stop APPI Hate in United States of America, Stop Hate UK, and TENI in Ireland and Racist Violence Recording Network in Greece among others resemble Xenowatch on how they collect data and focus on issues that government is struggling to bring to book. Darin et al., (2023) notes crowd sourcing is fast becoming one of the mostly used method of fact finding particularly on human rights violations with international organizations such as Amnesty International and the Human Rights Watch also making use of it.

Another issue pointed out in this study is the manner in which the monitoring of xenophobic violence conducted through online searches. The Xenowatch team spends lots of time combing through different media sources including social media for any reports of xenophobic violence or an indication of any upcoming attacks on foreign nationals. Similarly, the Institute for Security Studies' Protest and Public Violence Monitor (PPVM) database utilizes data collected through searches on news outlets, newsletters, and other social media sources such as Twitter and Facebook (Lancaster 2018). In the same manner, the findings of this study showed that on a daily basis the Xenowatch staff search on different media platforms to what is happening in the society with regards to xenophobic violence. Xenowatch goes even a step further from what the PPVM does by joining various groups where issues of xenophobic violence may be discussed either by victims, witnesses or even the perpetrators themselves.

An explanation for this wider search for data could be understood within the observations by Crush (2022) who notes that there has been a transition from the random attacks on foreigners that used to happen before 2019, to a situation whereby attacks seem well planned such that in some instances, dates are provided for attacks or chasing away foreign nationals from their businesses. Such attacks can be planned on platforms such as Twitter as seen by Operation Dudula in 2022. Therefore, there is need that

those who are monitoring or working on issues to do with xenophobic violence keep up with the transition.

The findings from the interviews with Xenowatch staff revealed that original research is used to monitor xenophobic violence. For instance, the findings show that as part of collecting data on monitoring xenophobic violence the Xenowatch research assistants visit communities and try to get every detail on incidents of xenophobic violence. This is similar to the Violations Approach to monitoring on fact finding where monitors go on the ground/field to find out what is taking place or what took place, which is done to make sure that all the information is verified and accurate, (Chapman, 1996). This is also in line with Kenny (2000) who notes that human rights monitoring should involve interviewing of witnesses or victims as well as cross checking facts in order to verify if the incidents really occurred. Xenowatch staff revealed that verification is done before the incident is fed into the database.

Xenowatch also works in collaboration with various civil society organisations who provide assistance to migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers. These organisations in turn provide Xenowatch with reports of xenophobic violence especially if the victims are beneficiaries of those organisations' services. This is an advantage when it comes to the fear of reporting to Xenowatch whom they are not familiar with, thus these organisations play a crucial role. Chapman (1996) and Kenny (2000) all agree that the key to effective monitoring is to combine strategic networking with credibility, for instance the quality of information received depends on the networks of local organisations with whom the NGO has built relations of trust. Through its working relationship with organisations such as Lawyers for Human Rights (LHR), African Diaspora Forum (ADF), Consortium of Refugees and Migrants in South Africa (CoRMSA), Xenowatch is able to obtain crucial information regarding violence against migrants. In turn there is room for use of that information among these organisations to in taking steps towards reducing and preventing xenophobic violence.

5.3 Extent to which data from monitoring of xenophobic violence feeds into advocacy and policymaking

This is the most pertinent issue to this study because it is central to the main research question. The findings relating to this section are divided into two (1) main users (2) uses of the data. Guzman and Verstappen (2003) note that there are diverse users of monitoring data which include governmental, intergovernmental, NGOs, researchers, activists, and the public in general. In the same vein, the findings presented in Chapter 4 reveal that there are various users of the Xenowatch monitoring data. This research study established that the partner organisations mentioned in section 5.2 such as LHR, CoRMSA are the ones that use the data from Xenowatch mostly because it speaks to their organisations' mandate and need for factual data to lobby the state for policy change and status quo. The Responsibility to Prevent Framework argues that civil society organisations, non-state institutions and non-governmental organisations take an active role in society to bridge the gap when government fails, (Parl and MacDiamid, 2006, Belloni, 2014). Hence from the study it is quite evident that the CSOs are playing a critical role in filling the gap when government seems to fail, for instance LHR has used some of the data from Xenowatch for legal action.

The media also uses some of the monitoring data from Xenowatch. A study by Gomo (2010) outlines how media plays a huge role of sensitising and desensitising the community, especially considering that whatever is put out by journalists can positively or negatively affect a society. Respondents from Xenowatch noted that their data is also used by journalists. It emerged from interviews with participants who use the Xenowatch data that it is the duty of journalists to produce a balanced report on what is happening in the country. For example, when reporting on the issue of xenophobic violence in the country they should report on both sides that of the foreigners/outsiders (victims) and citizens (perpetrators and/ or sympathisers). According to Zhang et al. (2020) the data produced by Stop APPI Hate an institution that provides monitoring such as Xenowatch is used by media outlets and distributed to the general public as proof that Asian Americans are being victimised. The findings concurs with (Namkung, 2020) that the audience for monitoring data includes elected officials, policy makers and community members.

Guzman and Verstappen (2003) observed that academic researchers oftentimes conduct indirect monitoring by selecting certain situational analyses and cross-referencing information from various sources to highlight problems in society. Research of this kind can be used for the greater good such as policy changes. The interview responses align with the literature as they revealed that academics are among the users of the monitoring data from Xenowatch. The results further reveal that scholarly researchers in the field of xenophobia and migration have used the data in writing journals, book chapters, presentations, research among other things. This in turn leads to Xenowatch reaching a larger audience which can increase the number of users, the reports that come to the platform and even influence future policy changes.

The main advantage of Xenowatch is that it is an open source which allows the general public access to the platform without any credentials. This means that anyone interested in the statistics, trends, and updated information on xenophobic violence in South Africa can go on this website and access the information. The participants from Xenowatch revealed that people can filter the data on the website to view each province and there are also maps that give better visualization. The PPVM described in the literature also allows access to the general public and summarizes the reports into a map which is easy to understand, (Lancaster, 2018). Rall et al. (2015) acknowledges that maps which operate in real time are useful in presenting and exploring data in policy circles. However, since the website is open source, the Xenowatch team does not have the actual numbers of people that access the website, their needs or who they are.

As mentioned by the researcher in the earlier chapters that part of this study seeks to find out if government uses monitoring data in any planning or policy making. It came as no surprise as the results revealed that Xenowatch has had little success with government and state institutions such as police. The majority of the participants revealed that they have had little luck with the government in terms of acknowledgement and support. Another point of interest is that the police rarely respond to the reports that are made on issues of xenophobia and the reasons behind this will be discussed in detail in the next section. On the other hand, sixty percent of the respondents mentioned that they have had positive

responses from local municipalities and in some instances the Department of Social Development particularly in Gauteng who have requested reports from Xenowatch. One participant from Xenowatch reported a positive experience in which police in Cape Town responded swiftly to an incident of xenophobic violence in Hermanus. However, the response from the government does not even begin to address the problem at hand. Scholars such as, Langer and Weyrauch (2021) note that in Africa and also in South Africa there is limited evidence of data use, thus this may be the explanation behind why the respondents have not had much success in their interactions with government.

The limited use of monitoring data is largely linked to the deniability of existence of xenophobic violence by government. The findings show that by accepting the data as correct then it means they (the government) have to accept the presence of xenophobic violence in South African communities, however, by ignoring the data they also ignore of the existence of xenophobic violence. Polzer (2011) notes that the response of government to xenophobic violence has been coupled by lack of political will and commitment due to its denial of the existence of xenophobic violence despite the intensification of the incidents. Scholars who study xenophobic violence have expressed their discontentment with government's failure to recognise xenophobic violence both through mere acknowledgement of its existence and by law. One of the hinderances to data use especially in public administration is the idea of cherry-picking where public agencies intentionally neglect some data because it does not speak to their interests (Stewart 2015 and Parkhurst 2017).

Both Xenowatch staff and stakeholders (data users) concur that the monitoring for xenophobic violence should ultimately prevent xenophobic violence from happening in the country. The Violations Approach to Monitoring notes that the purpose of monitoring any human right violations is to prevent and reduce human suffering caused by others and make sure that their human rights are protected, (Chapman, 1996, Guzman and Verstappen, 2003). The findings show that monitoring data is used to provide factual information with the hope of being able to change the narrative around issues, change policies among other things. Xenowatch's objectives revolve around delivering accurate and reliable data and analysis and advocate for more effective interventions to address the violence. The literature reviewed in this

study affirms that monitoring gives a clear picture that can be used for lobbying and advocating for change by government as numbers do not lie (Guzman and Vertsappen 2003 and Schweppe et al., 2018). The findings of this study showed that CSOs play an active role in engaging government, for instance through petition letters by providing the actual scenario of what is happening in the communities they work in. This is in line with Guzman and Verstappen (2003) who noted that civil societies can use the data to formulate a picture of the government's commitment to the prevention and management of human rights following trends and changes over time which can help to push for better policies and accountability. The reports presented by Xenowatch includes information on incidents that have received action from police or even triggered government reaction, therefore, with this kind of information given to CSOs they can use it to lobby government into action and see the locations that have minimum reaction/response.

Most of the data users noted that with factual data from Xenowatch they can engage with government officials without speaking from opinion or hearsay. Rosenberg (2012) notes that the power of any human rights group is speaking the truth, thus, no human rights organization can afford to speak without facts. Monitoring data should fill the gaps and give an accurate narrative of what is happening in society (D'Ignazia and Klein, 2020). Take for instance, one participant from the data users noted that the narrative in the media and public is that foreigners are taking jobs from citizens whereas in actual fact some are creating employment through their businesses where they hire South Africans.

Monitoring of incidents of xenophobic violence curbs government deniability, because if these incidents are not monitored it gives the delusion that such violations do not exist, (Ravindram et al., 1993). The interview results showed that the state and government officials have denied the existence of xenophobic violence and referred it as just criminality especially the previous administrations. The respondents acknowledge that the present administration has acknowledged and condemned the acts of xenophobia although nothing tangible has really been done. The literature review has outlined several incidents where government officials have denied the existence of xenophobia within the country, thus statistics and analysis from Xenowatch challenges this narrative. Together with the help of CSOs, Xenowatch

can approach government, opposition parties, and parliamentarians with data on xenophobic violence to activate some remedy to the situation. Therefore, using Darian et al., (2023)'s four classifications of data work in advocacy (presented in Table 1), in this instance data becomes an amplifier which helps to bring visibility to what is happening in the communities and give a voice to the migrants, refugees and asylum seekers who are often scapegoated and attacked.

Data generated by Xenowatch is used to provide awareness especially by CSOs in communities, the general public and the institutions they work with. For the communities they work with and the general public it ensures that they know what constitutes a xenophobic violence incident that has to be reported and the channels for reporting to Xenowatch. Misago et al. (2021) notes that part of mandate of Xenowatch is to provide the public awareness on the magnitude and implications of xenophobic violence. Therefore, knowledge awareness is critical on issues like xenophobic violence. To the other institutions that they work with like government departments, it becomes knowledge awareness where they inform them to the actual incidents that are happening in communities with the hope to come up with solutions. This is in line with observations by Haynes and Schweppe (2017) that knowledge awareness is critical as it breeds innovations that can help heal the ills of society. The research findings show that as part of knowledge awareness the data provided by Xenowatch has been used to change local policies in Johannesburg and Pretoria, defend clients in court cases, encourage social cohesion among others.

The monitoring data is used by several CSOs in their advocacy work in different ways to protect the interest of migrants against xenophobia. In this instance data becomes an activator to mobilize action by relevant departments and in some cases, change polices, (Darian et al., 2023). Several participants revealed that with this monitoring data, they can try and influence accountability from government, police, education, and health departments. For example, the participants from CoRMSA and ADF noted that following up on reports of xenophobic discrimination they managed to get assistance for children of asylum seekers in 2022 who had been denied access to education. Therefore, monitoring data is crucial in the success of running of CSOs. At the same time, statistics and analysis legitimizes the work that is

done by CSOs, for example organizations such LHR need this kind of data to take legal action, legislation debates and without this data sometimes it becomes difficult to influence change or action.

Another use that emerged from the interviews is that monitoring of xenophobic violence provides early warning, where if reports incidents are reported action can be taken on time and before the situation escalates. A point of reference will be the case in Hermanus, Cape Town where the police acted immediately and avoided the situation escalating into a catastrophe and spilling over into the neighboring towns. The Responsibility to Prevent Framework advocates that there should be a system that is able to provide early warning so that incidents can be dealt with while they are still manageable especially in cases of conflict, (Axworthy and Dang (2016)

However, the researcher anticipated more information to emerge from the study with regards how the data is used for policy making and advocacy. The findings showed that Xenowatch data contributes more to advocacy by CSOs in their various mandates and capacities than it is doing to policy making. This lies in the fact that Xenowatch as an organisation and xenophobic violence have not been fully acknowledged by the governments as shall be discussed in the section below.

5.4 Challenges for gathering and using xenophobic violence monitoring data.

The power of any monitoring data lies in the change and action it brings, however, from the study challenges were outlined that result to limited use of xenophobic monitoring data. These challenges are categorised into two: 1) challenges for gathering data 2) challenges for using the data. The present study found out that one of the challenges for gathering monitoring data is underreporting because there is no incentive to report. The respondents alluded that this is due to the lack of response by police and other relevant institutions. They further noted that in the cases where the police have acted, the perpetrators are given an early release which results in heightened fear of re-victimisation. In the literature review chapter, it has been shown that South Africa has a poor record for prosecution of crimes of xenophobia. Misago et al. (2015) note that only a few perpetrators have been prosecuted which then results in impunity and lack of accountability even for the institutions that perpetuate xenophobic discrimination.

In a study in Europe similar sentiments were echoed on underreporting, where victims fear detention, deportation, and further victimisation, thus, they choose not to report, (Christmann and Wong, 2016). Similarly in America when it comes to reporting hate on Asians there was under reporting, (Namkung, 2020). Reporting is an essential part of any human rights monitoring; therefore, it becomes critical to come up with measures that can encourage people to report and at the same time influence the relevant institutions to act accordingly when reports come to them.

Among the challenges of gathering data is the issue of the definition of xenophobic violence as to what constitutes an incident of xenophobic violence that can be reported to Xenowatch. The study showed that there is pressure to record each and every incident that happens between a foreigner and a citizen as xenophobic violence, hence it has been a challenge to getting the victims and witness to understand as to why some of their reports are not xenophobic violence incidents. Contrary to the belief that every fight or altercation between a foreigner and a citizen is xenophobia, in some cases it has just turned out to be a mere misunderstanding between neighbours that escalated to violence, hence it can not be reported to Xenowatch but not to the police as revealed by the respondents from Xenowatch. In the context of hate crimes, FRA (2012) reported that the definition of hate crimes can directly impact the accuracy of recording as definitions that are narrow translate to under-reporting and fewer victims seeking redress and definitions that are broad can also lead to overreporting. This results in the risk of data inaccuracies where some incidents are omitted, or the wrong incidents are recorded.

As discussed in the earlier chapters, most non-state and self-reporting platforms are self-funded or rely on donor funding which means on numerous occasions they run short of funds. The interviewees clearly articulated that in some cases they had to use money from their own pockets to fund the smooth running of the projects which results in the organisation being short staffed, for instance, Xenowatch relies on two research assistants. Most respondents expressed their interest to have more staff on the ground, for instance they ideally would prefer to have one in each municipality as one in each province would not suffice due to the size of provinces. This is similar to TENI initiative which intended to offer support to victims, however, due to limited funds could not guarantee timely response to victims hence, they had

to withdraw it (Schweppe et al., 2018). Doremus (2008) argue that monitoring is not a priority for many organisations as it requires a lot of funding to ensure timely and continuous data. Without sufficient financial muscle Xenowatch risks running the fate of many self-funded organisation who end up closing down or just like the TENI initiative withdrawing some of the services it offers.

Additionally, limited use of the monitoring data emanates from lack of capacity and technical expertise in both government and CSOs to interpret and analyse the data straight from Xenowatch. Research shows that most organisations including government do not always use evidence for decision making or taking action. This impacts negatively on the use of the data as most of them would rather continue with old ways of policy and decision making. In a study for attitudes towards evidence use among senior government officials in South Africa, the majority mentioned that they would rather continue with not using any data for policy making than adopt evidenced based policy making which requires data use because there are instances where it has worked better than the evidence-based option (Cronin and Sadan 2015). Misago et al. (2021) also show that that some CSOs are used to making their interventions based on untested theories of change rather than evidence-based interventions.

The findings of this study also revealed that there is a lack of recognition and reluctance to work with Xenowatch by some key stakeholders, institutions, and government. This is partly because government does not endorse the results from the data gathered as credible and useful. Findings from the study show that even with implementation of NAP, the government has not considered or approached to work with or build on what Xenowatch is already doing, even though Xenowatch provides a monitoring and early warning system which is a major requirement for the success of the NAP. Furthermore, the respondents noted that the reluctance also comes from the name Xenowatch which people say has connotations of xenophobia. This is a subject worth exploring as to why government has not been so keen to work with Xenowatch apart from the denial of the existence of xenophobic violence in South Africa.

Chapter Summary

The study provided some insights in an area that is not yet widely researched on how monitoring of xenophobic of violence feeds into policy making and advocacy particularly in the case of South Africa. The chapter discussed the findings in relation to the reviewed literature and the theoretical framework which revealed how the study is relevant and can be linked and placed within the academic spaces. The next chapter concludes the study, gives recommendations, and suggests areas for future and further research.

Chapter Six: Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Introduction

This research project explored the theoretical concepts and literature on the monitoring of Xenophobic violence in South Africa and how it is used for policy formulation and advocacy. It located monitoring of Xenophobic violence within the context of South Africa, how the data is used and the challenges of both monitoring and using the monitoring data. This chapter summarizes the research conclusions by assessing how the purpose and research questions have been addressed. It also provides recommendations for further research.

6.2 Research purpose

The research summarized and assessed monitoring of xenophobic violence through the uses of the civil society organizations involved in advocacy work on this issue in South Africa. The research findings outline the limited and poor usage of the available data for policy making.

The challenges of monitoring xenophobic violence were identified. They include issues of funding, under-reporting, and lack of recognition. As a result, there is need to come up with solutions to improve monitoring of Xenophobic violence and ensure the better utilization of the monitoring data especially by policy makers.

6.3 Revisiting the Research Questions.

The first research question focused on what approaches, methods and tools are used to monitor Xenophobic violence in South Africa. The research findings confirmed that like any other platforms across the world, crowd sourcing is the main approach used in collecting data for monitoring of Xenophobic violence. Monitoring data is also acquired through searching on various media sources which are similar to what ISS does for the PPVM databases. Some of the methods of data collection by Xenowatch include reports from their partner organizations and research assistants.

The second question dealt with how data from monitoring Xenophobic violence is used for advocacy and policy making. The research findings confirmed that factual, empirical data is used mostly for

advocacy work by civil society organizations, and for lobbying, planning and influencing policies where they can foster social cohesion in the communities. Despite the need for data driven policies, the findings confirm the reluctance of government and other state institutions to use the data from Xenowatch or associate themselves with the organization. However, the respondents revealed to having shared their data with some municipalities and the Department of Social Development. They wish the data could be used more, especially to prevent future attacks and creating policies and laws that address the existing xenophobic situation better.

The third question addressed the main challenges of gathering and using Xenophobic violence monitoring data. The success of monitoring is being able to collect data that is timely and accurate, and which can ensure its optimal utilization. The research findings confirmed lack of funding, under-reporting, and non-agreement about what constitutes Xenophobic violence affect the gathering of data around xenophobic violence. Under-reporting emerged to be the major hinderance to more effective gathering of Xenophobic monitoring data, because it is influenced by factors such as fear of re-victimization and a lack of incentive to report xenophobic incidents because of the perceptions of a lack of commitment to act on reports of xenophobic violence by police and other relevant institutions.

The major challenges of using Xenophobic violence monitoring data are therefore a lack of commitment from law enforcement agencies and denials by government of Xenophobic violence which makes reporting futile. The findings also confirm a lack of skilled capacity in both the government, CSOs and Xenowatch data because this requires some level of technical expertise.

The main conclusion of the study is that there is more that still needs to be done in monitoring of Xenophobic violence to reduce violence and displacement in South African communities. While some strides have been made with regards to advocacy a lot also still needs to be done to ensure that communities do not engage in xenophobic violent activities. The success of the initiative by Xenowatch lies more on the acknowledgement by government, hence the need for the organization to continue engaging with and lobbying to government for support and working together.

6.4 Recommendations

1. **Increased awareness and outreach**.

It will be valuable to both Xenowatch and its partners if more people especially those communities with large migrant populations are knowledgeable of what Xenowatch offers them. The interviews with Xenowatch data users revealed that some of their clients are not aware of Xenowatch.

2. **Increased engagement with partner organizations, journalists, government institutions and academia.**

It is important to have more engagements such as seminars and meetings to assess the findings of Xenowatch. This will allow for a better exchange of ideas, innovations and coming up with ways of utilizing the data better.

3. **Capacity building**.

Most of the partner organizations that work with Xenowatch are not equipped to interpret and analyze the data on their own and rely on reports from Xenowatch. Therefore, it would be helpful if Xenowatch could take their partner organizations through a process of familiarizing themselves better with the website, and how to generate a report from the dashboard on their own.

4. **Improvements to the website to cater for different users.**

Users should be able to filter and generate the reports or maps that are relevant for their needs, for instance generating a map for Gauteng only. Additionally, since it is an open-source platform, it will be beneficial for Xenowatch to include a section on who is accessing the data and for what purposes. This will help them to be in sync with the needs of their users and who use their data the most.

6.5 Future and Further Research

Future studies should consider including government officials, particularly those involved in policy making. This is important in establishing the reasons behind the poor use of Xenophobic violence

monitoring data, lack of commitment to addressing issues of Xenophobic violence and what it would take to recognize Xenowatch as an important and relevant institution of monitoring.

Chapter Summary

This chapter summarized and concluded the focus of the study by revisiting the research questions. It also outlined some recommendations that can enhance the understanding and appreciation of gathering and using Xenophobic violence monitoring data better. Lastly the researcher suggested areas for future and further studies.

References

Adjai, C. & Lazaridis, G. 2013, "Migration, Xenophobia and New Racism in Post-Apartheid South Africa", International Journal of Social Science Studies, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. p192-205.

Allport, G. (1954). The Nature of Prejudice, Addison-Wesley: Cambridge

Alkin, M. C., & Taut, S. M. (2002). Unbundling evaluation use. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 29(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-491X(03)90001-0

Ambert, A., Adler, P.A., Adler, P. & Detzner, D.F. 1995, "Understanding and Evaluating Qualitative Research", Journal of Marriage and Family, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 879-893.

Amisi, B., Bond, P., Cele, N., & Ngwane, T. (2011). Xenophobia and Civil Society: Durban's Structured Social Divisions. Politikon, 38(1), 59–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/02589346.2011.548671

Astolfo, G., Caceres, R. M., Palaiologou, G., & Boano, C. (2020). 5. The role of data collection, mapping, and analysis in the reproduction of refugeeness and migration discourses: Reflections from the Refugee Spaces project. 25.

Baxter, P. & Jack, S. 2008, "Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers", The qualitative report, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 544- 559.

Bekker, S., Eigelaar-Meets, I., Eva, G. & Poole, C. 2008, "Xenophobia and Violence in South Africa: a desktop study of the trends and a scan of explanations offered", University of Stellenbosch,

Berg, B. 2004, "Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences Pearson",

Berg, B. L. 2001, Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences, 4th Edition edn, Allyn and Bacon, California State University, Long Beach.

Bekker, S. (2008). Explaining Violence Against Foreigners and Strangers in Urban South Africa: Outbursts During May and June 2008. African Yearbook of International Law Online / Annuaire Africain de Droit International Online, 16(1), 125–149. https://doi.org/10.1163/22116176-90000063

Biber, E. (2022). The Challenge of Collecting and Using Environmental Monitoring Data. Ecology and Society, 15.

Busetto, L., Wick, W., & Gumbinger, C. (2020). How to use and assess qualitative research methods. Neurological Research and Practice, 2(1), 14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s42466-020-00059-z

Bryman, A. (2007). The research question in social research: What is its role? International. Journal of Social Research Methodology, 10(1), 5–20.

Bryman, A. (2007). The research question in social research: What is its role? International. Journal of Social Research Methodology, 10(1), 5–20.

Chapman, A.R. (1996). A "Violations Approach" for Monitoring the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Human Rights Quarterly 18(1), 23-66. doi:10.1353/hrq.1996.0003.

Cohen, L. "Manion. L. and Morrison, K.2007. Research Methods in Education" Creswell, J, W. and Tashakkori, A. (2007). Developing Publishable Mixed Methods

Manuscripts, Journal of Mixed Methods Research 1(1):107-111

Creswell, J, W., Hanson, W, E., Plano, V, C., and Morales, A. (2007). Qualitative Research Designs: Selection and Implementation. The Counselling Psychologist 35:236-264.

Creswell, J. and Creswell, D. (2018). Research Design, Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approach. California: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2005). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach. California: Sage

Crush, J. and Ramachandran, S. (2009). Xenophobia, International Migration and Human Development. United Nations Development Programme: Human development reports. Research paper 2009/47

Darian, S., Chauhan, A., Marton, R., Ruppert, J., Clune, R., Cupchak, M., Gannett, M., Holton, J., Kamas, E., Kibozi-Yocka, J., Mauro-Gallegos, D., O'Malley, M., Patel, M., Sandberg, J., Siegler, T., Tate, R., Temtim, A., Whaley, S., & Voida, A. (2023). Enacting Data Feminism in Advocacy Data Work. Human Computer Interaction: Volume 7, Issues CSCW1, Article NO.7, pp 1-28

Desai, A. 2010, "After the rainbow: following the footprints of the May 2008 xenophobic violence in South Africa",

Dodson, B. 2010, "Locating xenophobia: debate, discourse, and everyday experience in Cape Town, South Africa", Africa Today, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 2-22.

Dodson, B. & Oelofse, C. 2000, "Shades of Xenophobia: In-Migrants and Immigrants in Mizamoyethu, Cape Town", Canadian Journal of African Studies / Revue Canadienne des Études Africaines, vol. 34, no. 1, Special Issue: Transnationalism, African Immigration, and New Migrant Spaces in South Africa, pp. 124-148.

Dooley, L.M. 2002, "Case study research and theory building", Advances in developing human resources, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 335-354.

Environmental Monitoring (p. 20330). (1977). National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/20330

Ferro, E., Loukis, E. N., Charalabidis, Y., & Osella, M. (2013). Policy making 2.0: From theory to practice. Government Information Quarterly, 30(4), 359–368. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2013.05.018

Field, S. A., O'Connor, P. J., Tyre, A. J., & Possingham, H. P. (2007). Making monitoring meaningful. Austral Ecology, 32(5), 485–491. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-9993.2007.01715.x

Goldman, I, Mine, P. (2020). Using Evidence in Policy and Practice; Lessons from Africa. 1st Edition, Routledge; London

Gomo, T. (2010). Analysis of media reporting and xenophobia violence among youth in South Africa: By Tapiwa Gomo.

Harris, B. (2002) Xenophobia: A new pathology for a new South Africa? Centre for Study of Violence and Reconciliation, South Africa

Hiropoulos, A. (2020). South Africa, migration, and xenophobia. Deconstructing the perceived migration crisis and its influence on the xenophobic reception of migrants. Contemporary Justice Review, 23(1), 104–121. https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2019.1700368

Ibrahim, M. (2012). Thematic analysis: a critical review of its process and evaluation. 1(1), 9.

Kiger, M. E., & Varpio, L. (2020). Thematic analysis of qualitative data: AMEE Guide No. 131. Medical Teacher, 42(8), 846–854. https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2020.1755030

Kothari, C. 2004, Research methodology: Methods and techniques, New Age International.

Kvale, S. (1983). The qualitative research interview: A phenomenological and a hermeneutical mode of understanding. Journal of Phenomenological Psychology 14: pp 171-196.

Landau, L.B., Segatti, A. & Misago, J.P. 2011, "Governing Migration and Urbanisation in South African Municipalities: Developing Approaches to Counter Poverty and Social Fragmentation", South African Local Government Association: Pretoria,

Landau, L., Ramjathan-Keogh, K. & Singh, G. 2005, "Xenophobia in South Africa and problems related to it", Forced Migration Studies Programme, University of the Witwatersrand, Working Paper Series, no. 13.

Maffei, S., Leoni, F., & Villari, B. (2020). Data-driven anticipatory governance. Emerging scenarios in data for policy practices. Policy Design and Practice, 3(2), 123–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2020.1763896

Mattes, R.B. 1999, Still waiting for the barbarians: SA attitudes to immigrants & immigration, Southern African Migration Project.

Masikane, C. M., Hewitt, M. L., & Toendepi, J. (2020). Dynamics informing xenophobia and leadership response in South Africa. Acta Commercii, 20(1).

https://doi.org/10.4102/ac.v20i1.704

Marshall, M.N. 1996, "The key informant technique", Family practice, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 92- 97.

Mattes, R., Taylor, D., McDonald, D., Poore, A. & Richmond, W. 1999, "Still Waiting for the Barbarians: SA Attitudes to Emigration and Immigration"', Southern African Migration Project McConnell, C. 2009, "Migration and xenophobia in South Africa", conflict trends, , no. 1, pp. 34-40.

Merriam, S.B. 2002, "Introduction to qualitative research", Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis, pp. 3-17

Misago, J. P. (2017). Politics by Other Means? The Political Economy of Xenophobic Violence in Post-Apartheid South Africa.

Misago, J. P. (2016). Responding to Xenophobic Violence in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Barking Up the Wrong Tree? 99.

Misago, J. P., Freemantle, I., & Landau, L. (2015) Protection From Xenophobia: An Evaluation of UNHCR's Regional Office for Southern Africa' Xenophobia Related Crimes.

Monaghan, J. (2009). Moving beyond xenophobia: Structural violence, conflict, and encounters with the 'other' Africans People and theory. Available at: http://ife.enslyon.fr/publications/editionelectronique/cerme6/plenary-02- monaghan.pdf. [Accessed 09October 2022]. Morris, A. 1998, "'Our fellow Africans make our lives hell': the lives of Congolese and Nigerians living in Johannesburg", Ethnic and Racial studies, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 1116-1136.

Mouton, J. (2009). How to succeed in your master's and Doctoral Studies – A South African Guide and Resource Book (13th Impression), Van Schaik Publishers: Pretoria

Mtshali, Z. (2015). A review of the monitoring and evaluation system to monitor the implementation of early childhood development within Gauteng Department of Health.

Muchiri, G. (2013). The use of law and multi-disciplinary mechanisms to address xenophobia in South Africa

Mukwena, D. 2012, Types of explanations given by foreign African women for xenophobic violence: a De-Doorns case study,

Neocosmos, M. 2006, "From 'Foreign Natives' to 'Native Foreigners', Explaining Xenophobia in Post-apartheid South Africa: Citizenship and Nationalism, Identity and Politics, CODESRIA Monograph Series, Senegal

Nunez, L., & Aryal, B. (2020). Do migrants live matter? A comparison of causes of death between African migrants from SADC countries and South Africans in the post-Apartheid era (2002-2015). 11.

Opdenakker, R. (2006). Advantages and Disadvantages of Four Interview Techniques in Qualitative Research. Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung /Forum: Qualitative Social Research 7(4): http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0604118, Accessed on 24 June 2012.

Paine Cronin, G., & Sadan, M. (2015). Use of evidence in policy making in South Africa: An exploratory study of attitudes of senior government officials. African Evaluation Journal, 3(1), 10 pages. https://doi.org/10.4102/aej.v3i1.145

Palmary, I. 2002, "Refugees, safety and xenophobia in South African cities: The role of local government", Johannesburg: Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation,.

Parkhurst, J. O. (2017). The politics of evidence: From evidence-based policy to the good governance of evidence. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Polzer Ngwato, T. (2013). Collecting Data on Migrants Through Service Provider NGOs: Towards Data Use and Advocacy. Journal of Refugee Studies, 26(1), 144–154. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fes034

Pugh, S. A. (2014). Advocacy in the Time of Xenophobia: Civil Society, the State, and the Politics of Migration in South Africa. Politikon, 41(2), 227–247. https://doi.org/10.1080/02589346.2014.905255

Puussaar, A., Johnson, I. G., Montague, K., James, P., & Wright, P. (2018). Making Open Data Work for Civic Advocacy. Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction, 2(CSCW), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1145/3274412

Rall, K., Satterthwaite, M. L., Pandey, A. V., Emerson, J., Boy, J., Nov, O., & Bertini, E. (2016). Data Visualization for Human Rights Advocacy. Journal of Human Rights Practice, 8(2), 171–197. https://doi.org/10.1093/jhuman/huw011

Republic of South Africa (2019) National Action Plan to Combat Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance. Pretoria: Government Printers. Available: https://www.gov.za/sites/default/files/gcis_document/201903/nationalaction-plan.pdf

Rubio-Carbonero, G., & Zapata-Barrero, R. (2017). Monitoring discriminatory political discourse on immigration: A pilot study in Catalonia. Discourse & Society, 28(2), 204–225. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926516685464

Rusinga, O., Maposa, R. S., & Tobias, D. (2012). Contested alien spaces and the search for national identity: A study of ethnicity in light of xenophobic violence on migrants in South Africa. Migration and Development, 1(2), 206–215. https://doi.org/10.1080/21632324.2012.739800

Schweppe, J., Haynes, A., & MacIntosh, E. M. (2020). What is Measured Matters: The Value of Third-Party Hate Crime Monitoring. European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research, 26(1), 39–59. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10610-018-9403-4

Scott, J., & Jabbar, H. (2015). Evidence Use and Advocacy Coalitions: Intermediary Organizations and Philanthropies in Denver, Colorado. 23(124).

Sivarajah, U., Weerakkody, V., Waller, P., Lee, H., Irani, Z., Choi, Y., Morgan, R., & Glikman, Y. (2016). The role of e-participation and open data in evidence-based policy decision making in local government. Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce, 26(1–2), 64–79. https://doi.org/10.1080/10919392.2015.1125171

Solomon, H., & Kosaka, H. (2019). Xenophobia in South Africa: Reflections, Narratives and Recommendations. Xenophobia in South Africa, 26

Stake, R.E. 1978, "The case study method in social inquiry", Educational researcher, pp. 5-8.

Stewart, R. (2015). A theory of change for capacity building for the use of research evidence by decision makers in southern Africa. Evidence & Policy, 11(4), 547–557. https://doi.org/10.1332/174426414X1417545274793

Strydom, W. F., Funke, N., Nienaber, S., Nortje, K., & Steyn, M. (2010). Evidence-based policymaking: A review. South African Journal of Science, 106(5/6), 8 pages. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajs.v106i5/6.249

Tshitereke, C. (1999). Xenophobia and relative deprivation. Centre of the Study of violence and reconstruction, South Africa,

United Nations (2009) Human Development indices 2009

van Veenstra, A. F., & Kotterink, B. (2017). Data-Driven Policy Making: The Policy Lab Approach. In P. Parycek, Y. Charalabidis, A. V. Chugunov, P. Panagiotopoulos, T. A. Pardo, Ø. Sæbø, & E. Tambouris (Eds.), Electronic Participation (Vol. 10429, pp. 100–111).
Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64322-9_9

Vignan University (India), & Lea-Henry, J. (2018). The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) and the Problem of Political Will. Polish Political Science Yearbook, 47(3), 553–570. https://doi.org/10.15804/ppsy2018317

Yin, R. K. (2003). Case study research: Design and methods. 3rd ed. London: Sage. Yin, R. K. (2014). Case study research: Design and methods. Sage publications.

Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods. Sage publications.

Zins, C. (2007). Conceptual Approaches for Defining Data, Information, and Knowledge. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology 58(4):479-493

Appendices

Appendix One: Participation Information Sheet

Participant Information Sheet

Dear Sir / Madam

My name is Tinevimbo Charuma. I am a master's student in Public and Development Sector Monitoring and Evaluation at the Wits School of Governance. My supervisor is Dr. Pophiwa. I am conducting a research study about monitoring of xenophobic violence and how it contributes to policy making and advocacy. The study title is **Effectiveness of monitoring xenophobic violence in South Africa: The case of Xenowatch.**

I am inviting you to take part in an interview. If you decide to take part, your participation in this research study will last about forty-five minutes to one hour. The interview will take place at a place and time of your convenience and there is an option for online interview on either Microsoft Teams or Zoom With your permission, I would like to audio record the interview. This data will be stored in a password locked folders and computer and will be deleted after 5 years. Additionally, only the researcher will have access to the data.

During the research activity, I will need to ask for some background information about your working, including how long you have been working in the field of migration, nature of xenophobic violence monitored and recorded.

The interview will be confidential and anonymous. When I share the results of the research study, I will not include your name or anything else that could identify you. With your permission, other researchers may use the data collected from this research study, but your name and any personal information will not be used or passed on.

If you decide to take part in the research study, it should be because you want to volunteer. You do not have to take part. You can stop being in the study at any time. You do not have to answer any questions if you do not want

to. You will not get any direct benefits if you choose to join the research study. You will not lose any services, benefits, or rights you would normally have if you decided not to join. Taking part in the research study will not cost you anything. You will not be paid for being in this research study.

The risks for this research study are no more than what happens in everyday life. OR Some of the questions asked may make you feel sad or upset. If this happens, I will stop the interview and continue another time.

This research study will be written up as a research report. The report will be available on the university library website. If you would like to receive a summary of this report, I will be happy to send it to you.

If you have any questions during or afterwards about this research study, feel free to contact me or my supervisor on the details listed below. If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical procedures of this research study, you are welcome to contact the University Human Research Ethics Committee (Non-Medical), telephone +27(0) 11 717 1408, email hrecnon-medical@wits.ac.za.

Yours sincerely, Tinevimbo Charuma

Researcher:
Tinevimbo Charuma, 2286973@students.wits.ac.za , 081 494 6712
Supervisor:
Dr Nedson Pophiwa, nedson.pophiwa1@wits.ac.za , 011 717 4034

Consent Form

Title of project: Effectiveness of monitoring xenophobic violence in South Africa: The case of Xenowatch

Name of researcher: Tinevimbo Charuma

I, ..., agree to participate in this research project.

I agree to the following:

(Please circle the relevant options below)

The research study was explained to me. I understand what this study is about.	YES	NO
I understand that I can volunteer to take part in the study.	YES	NO
I agree that the interview/focus group/other activity may be audio recorded.	YES	NO
I agree that direct quotations from my interview/focus group/other activity may be used by the researcher in their research report/ manuscript/book chapter.	YES	NO
I agree that my participation will remain anonymous (my name will not be used by the researcher in their research report/manuscript/book chapter)	YES	NO

I agree that other researchers may use the information I provide in my interview/focus group/other activity (depending on their own ethics clearance being obtained) but my name and any personal information will not be used or passed on. YES NO

….....(signature)

….....(name of participant)

….....(date)

….....(signature)… (name of researcher/person seeking consent)

….....(date)

Appendix Three: Interview Guide One

Interview guide for Xenowatch Team

1. Can you provide me with a bit of background to the work you do and for how long you have been working in the field of migration?
2. What was the rationale for establishing Xenowatch?
3. What does the platform seek to achieve?
4. What approaches, tools and methods do you use to monitor xenophobic violence across South Africa?
5. How is the data from monitoring disseminated and made available to the various users?
6. Who are the main users of the data? What do they use the data for?
7. Has the data been used for any policy making and advocacy work? If there is any, please specify/ if not, in your opinion why is the monitoring data not used or why is there limited use?
8. What are the challenges of monitoring xenophobic violence in South Africa?
9. In your view, what can be done to make monitoring xenophobic violence better or easier?
10. What recommendations can give that so that the monitoring data can be used in advocacy and policy making?

Appendix Four: Interview Guide Two

Interview Guide for Xenowatch data users

1. Can you provide me with a bit of background to the work you do and for how long you have been working in the field of migration?
2. How did you come to know of Xenowatch?
3. What can you say about the nature of information on xenophobic violence that is collected by Xenowatch?
4. What are your uses for the Xenowatch data?
5. To what extent to do find the monitoring data to be useful or able to meet your data needs?
6. In your opinion what can be done to make the data more useful or meet your data needs?

7 What can be done to encourage and foster the use of monitoring xenophobic violence data in policy making?

8 What opportunities exist for using the data in carrying out advocacy work?