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Abstract

The current study examined elements defining collegiality (EDC). The paper was based on a case carried out in Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. The questionnaire used in the present research complemented prior literature, which sought to explore xenophobia and racial relationships currently found in South Africa (Neocosmos, 2008; Valji, 2003; Handmaker & Parsley, 2002). The data analysis was conducted using both analysis of variance (ANOVA) and regression analysis due to the two hypotheses posed.

The results indicated that there was a relationship between racism and EDC. Secondly, there was a relationship between xenophobia and EDC. The findings also confirmed the racial and xenophobic climate of South Africans not willing to forfeit their conservative views on racism and xenophobia. By implication, xenophobia and racial behaviour control would become more effective, if efforts are targeted towards social class and student opposition identity that define elements of collegiality.
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Introduction

Even though it seems researchers are beyond discussing elements defining collegiality (EDC) and race as a Black and White dynamic, the current study as well as notable South African and international scholars contend that the remnants of a racially charged national climate render many individuals hopelessly unequipped to cope with racial and xenophobic difference, even in classroom (Harcourt, 2009; Neocosmos, 2008; Valji, 2003; Handmaker & Parsley, 2002). Consequently, the current study sought to explore the impact of racial and xenophobia on EDC. The study quantitatively examined Black and non-Black (White) students’ responses to elements defining collegiality. This was done by limiting the respondents’ purview to a xenophobia and racial context within a historically Black South African university.
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Background of the Study

South Africa boasts of being one of the most culturally diverse nations in modern world (Neocosmos, 2008; Valji, 2003; Handmaker & Parsley, 2002). Nonetheless, it is also one of the most socially segmented in every word of it; be it in education, economics, finance and psycho-social settings (Harcort, 2009; Neocosmos, 2008, 2006; Handmaker & Parsley, 2002). Past research in South Africa examined South Africa’s complex history and policies of racism, social separation, control and the impact that has had on the nature of migration and refugee policy (Handmaker & Parsle, 2002). The authors argued that South Africa’s complex history legacy has resulted in policy and implementation that is highly racialised, coupled with a society expressing growing levels of xenophobia and racism (Handmaker & Parsle, 2002). Other research study has observed a sinister situation which “…is fast emerging where South African citizens of European origin speak in terms of ‘Our Western values,’ while purporting to be including Africans as well in the word, ‘our’ (Muendane, 2006: 144). The author suggests that:

listing to talk radio programmes in South Africa, one cannot help but notice that these citizens become even more vociferous in discouraging the influx into South Africa of Africans from other African countries, saying, ‘these people must not come to our country. (Muendane, 2006: 144).

The write added that:

Africans have always been in Africa. It is quite curious for someone whose forbears came to Africa without a visa, divided the continent and dispossessed Africans of their land and freedoms would now turn around and say those people, who his forbears found on this continent, should not put their foot on the continent. The sad part of the story is that indigenous South Africans become [silent] to the point of [agreement] when such remarks are made. (Muendane, 2006: 144).

Additionally, reflecting on the causes of the recent xenophobic violence in South Africa, it is striking how most commentators have stressed poverty and deprivation as the underlying causes of the events (Neocosmos, 2008; Valji, 2003). There seem to be deep heated hatred, mistrust towards the ‘other.’ The authors argued that this was due to the cruel and horrible segregationist activities of the former White ruled–minority apartheid regime, which in current South Africa system has been translated to xenophobia (Neocosmos, 2008). This is particularly true with some Black South Africans hatred towards other Black African nationals (Harcort, 2009; Neocosmos, 2008; Valji, 2003; Handmaker & Parsley, 2002; Williams, 1999; Carrim & Sayed, 1992; Rose & Tumer, 1975). Sketchy reports and evidence of recent (2008) public behaviour of Black South Africans suggest there has been two (2) main reasons for the fragmentations, which has led to the racist and xenophobic behaviour (Harcort, 2009; Neocosmos, 2006; Valji, 2003; Handmaker & Parsley, 2002). This would shortly be discussed. Nonetheless, in recent years, a particular concern has been raised, which suggests that the reasons for the fragmentations:

… is a fundamental problem, as it stresses the thinking of politics through the lenses of racial and national stereotypes, which are ‘naturalized.’ Blackness is only stressed vis-a-vis Whites, not in relation to other Africans. In fact, there has
been a complete failure by the post-apartheid state to construct a nationalism that is firmly rooted in Africa. (Neocosmos, 2008: 591).

Even, in the past, it was discovered in a speech by former President Thabo Mbeki, which suggested that South Africa is still parallel (President Thabo Mbeki, 2001). What this means is that South Africa is still moving toward two societies, one Black- of whom majority are unreservedly poor and uneducated; one White minority- who still control significant proportion of modern South African society including economic and educational systems (Neocosmos, 2008; Valji, 2003; Handmaker & Parsley, 2002). This suggests two sources of power- economic and knowledge power. The sad truth is that this leads to a recipe of unequal and imbalance society. Recent study suggests a supportive view with regards to the source of power, which indicated that “under such conditions, it is not at all surprising that a public discourse of fear and xenophobia has become hegemonic in the public sphere”(Neocosmos, 2008: 590). The author maintains that “the politics associated with this discourse are invariably founded on the notion that migrants from Africa are here to take and not to give” (Neocosmos, 2008: 590). Perhaps, this explains a national climate that is culturally diverse and simultaneously bereft of multiculturalism and xenophobia. In fact, recent xenophobic attacks on Black (Africans) foreign nationals as described by research study lamented that “xenophobia, although a contested term, is widely defined as the irrational fear of the unknown, the fear or hatred of foreigners by nationals against non-nationals” (Handmaker & Parsley, 2002: 44). They maintain that “…xenophobia is largely based on unfounded myths and stereotypes with foreigners scapegoated for domestic social and economic problems” (Handmaker & Parsley, 2002: 44).

The current study proposes two major explanations for Black-White differences of elements defining collegiality as depicted in Figure 1. The explanations given for racial and xenophobic differences are; (1) cultural and/or class poverty and (2) teacher expectancy and/or student oppositional identity.

![Figure 1: Elements that negotiate Xenophobic and Racial among Black University Students.](image-url)

**Cultural and/or Class Poverty:** As far back as the 1960s and 1970s in South Africa, social activism against racism and racial discrimination led to new waves of social critique. Responding to issues of race relations and the desegregation of public schools, many researchers sought new ways to examine EDC (Rose & Tumer, 1975). While, some researchers focused on innate (inborn or biological) abilities, others attempted to link social structural and school related factors to the social class (Neocosmos, 2008, 2006; Handmaker & Parsley, 2002; Rose & Tumer, 1975). Some of the authors viewed EDC as being related to
students’ social class and cultural differences (Neocosmos, 2008; Handmaker & Parsley, 2002). In fact, current study suggests that:

the politics associated with this discourse are invariably founded on the notion that migrants from Africa are here to take and not to give. After all, the reasoning goes, they are so much more backward than we are in South Africa! It should be noted that such xenophobic conceptions are also prevalent among professionals. (Neocosmos, 2008: 590).

According to this perspective, variances are attributed to differences in their home environments (Neocosmos, 2008: Rose & Tumer, 1975). This perspective was an important contribution in the EDC debate, because it shifted the focus from biology (innate) to sociology (social). Although, the class-and-culture perspective gave new directions to the school EDC discourse, it also posed some challenges in contemporary post-apartheid South Africa (Handmaker & Parsley, 2002). The authors suggest that:

In South Africa foreigners are blamed for the high crime rate, the HIV/AIDS pandemic, the high levels of unemployment, and the lack of social services. It would appear that in South Africa, foreigners and refugees fear both the ordinary citizens and agents of the state. (Handmaker & Parsley, 2002: 44)

Consistently, other study suggests that the idea that South Africans are not quite Africans is complimented by the dominant perception that indigeneity is the only way to acquire resources, jobs, and all the other goodies that should be reserved for native peoples only (Neocosmos, 2008). Although, mechanisms are in place to acknowledge multiple cultures through celebratory events in all spheres of society, this may not necessarily be used as an indicator of true cultural understanding amongst students, particularly university students and from subjective point of view (Handmaker & Parsley, 2002: 44). In fact, in comparison, similar events have occurred in some Western and supposedly advanced societies such as Australia, Germany, France and Canada (Harcourt, 2009; Valji, 2003; Erlanger, 2002a). However, others explain that “part of the problem is that the very language we use in international relations and development negotiations is couched as if general openness and tolerance prevails” (Harcourt, 2009: 441). Undeniably, the writer laments that:

Essentially, there is a deep-seated fear about the potential ‘problem’ of ‘others’ - the people who do not fit into the category of well-behaved Western European (white, moderately religious Christian, employed, heterosexual and middle class) citizens. The unspoken given is that this is the type of citizen modern development aims to create. Those who are projected as the ‘other’ in development are rightly concerned that their way of life, their humanity and livelihoods are being run rough shod by such discrimination that does not accord them status or respect. (Harcourt, 2009: 441).

The critic maintains that:

The message that emerges ... is that racism and xenophobia are hardly new. After all, colonialism in which the roots of development can be found thrived on the exploitation and paternalism of ‘others’ - both people and natural resources - by those who had the power, money and authority. What is worrying today is that despite all the legal frameworks and social concern expressed, racism and
xenophobia are on the rise. Racism is integral to modern life. The numerous media reports are only vaguely dismaying to those whose lives they do not describe. (Harcourt, 2009: 442).

However, other researchers have added to Harcourt’s (2009) position, (UK Institute for Race Relations, 2001; United Nations Commission on Human Rights, 2000; Williams, 1999). They have found that there is an overall significant relationship between perception of students and elements defining collegiality. In addition, the authors concluded that ‘spending’ aimed at improving the quality of instruction is related to improvement in EDC (United Nations Commission on Human Rights, 2000; Williams, 1999). Although, the authors’ argument challenges the long-held belief that school racism and xenophobia are not significantly related to EDC, this debate is ongoing, despite the fact that these small differences most often derive from subjective data (United Nations Commission on Human Rights, 2000; Williams, 1999). The argument that differentiates school racism and xenophobia are not large enough to affect school collegiality, nonetheless, remains a matter of concern (Neocosmos, 2008; Valji, 2003). Research focusing on social-class such as students’ familial backgrounds gave rise to the widespread belief that students who live in a ‘culture of poverty’ are disadvantaged in school; therefore they are victims of racism and xenophobia (Neocosmos, 2008; Valji, 2003).

However, many of the existing research address overarching conceptual issues that appear to be driven by researchers (Harcourt, 2009; Valji, 2003). For instance, one researcher suggests that using a cultural or social-class analysis, it can be argued that social class is a force that impacts on the EDC from low socioeconomic backgrounds (Valji, 2003). The author argued that the social class tends to impact on xenophobia and racism, hence EDC (Neocosmos, 2008; Valji, 2003). This means that perspectives of social class and cultural poverty popularise student EDC discourse. Moreover, students from low-income backgrounds (predominately Black students in the case of South Africa) live in less enriched family environments, their family environments limit their perceptual development, which in turn affects their EDC (Valji, 2003). Unquestionably, evidence of the author’s view is supported by an international study which suggests that:

The German xenophobic phenomenon is not as endemic as Austria’s cultural isolationism, nor as susceptible of a solution as Belgium’s geographically limited economic problem. Germany appears to be in transition, still maintaining a social split between the prosperous West and the underdeveloped East. Government officials recognise the demographic factors that make a liberalised immigration policy necessary, but their half-hearted measures—such as extending an invitation to technically skilled workers from abroad, or offering conditional citizenship to long-time foreign residents—do not yet constitute an adequate response. They alternate such moves with others that pander to public prejudices against introducing ‘foreign elements’ into German culture. (Harvey, 2002: 478).

Nonetheless, in recent times and over the past decade, there have been numerous and probable discussions on EDC around the world (ALJAZEERA TV, Wednesday, July 06, 2010; British Broadcasting Corporation-BBC WORLD NEWS TV, Wednesday, July 14, 2010; Harcourt, 2009; Harvey, 2002). Within this time, the debate over the causes and consequences of racial differences has been at the heart of every nation’s social and
political life. Between the years of 2008 and 2009, similar bereft of multiculturalism and xenophobic plunged the Australian society in disrepute, where for instance, Indian students were consistently brutalised, abused and threaten with racial and xenophobic slurs (Harcourt, 2009; Valji, 2003). Most currently, a discussion held on ALJAZEERA TV (July 06, 2010) programme ‘inside story’ noted that even so called ‘fisrt world’ countries such as France, Canada and Belgium are in the process of banning women from covering their face¹ (Niqab), which is part of Islamic tradition, indicating the fear and hatred of the ‘others’ culture. For instance in France, women are fined $190 for covering their face (ALJAZEERA TV, July 06, 2010).

One common trend in South Africa, Australia, Germany and other Western countries suggests one thing, thus EDC being impacted upon by racism and or xenophobia. The next part discusses the issue of teacher expectation and/or student oppositional identity.

**Teacher Expectation and/or Student Oppositional Identity:** Several reports and studies suggest the view of teacher expectation and/or student oppositional identity particularly in South Africa universities as staggering concern (Harcourt, 2009; Neocosmos, 2008; Handmaker & Parsley, 2002; Harvey, 2002; Rakes & Rakes, n.d). In early 2000, it was indicated that large disparities exist between Black and non-Black (White) students when considering EDC (Valji, 2003). In fact, Black and non-Black students perceptions of how race influences credibility in the classroom reveals that Black lecturers are not only more acutely aware of their minority status in the classroom, but also were cognisant of how different students applied more harsh and critical standards for evaluating their teaching effectiveness (Valji, 2003). Thus, Black lecturers are expected to prove themselves in order to establish credibility, and that after they do so, there are often more fair and favourable attitudes exhibited towards them. This is often in direct contrast to the non-Black lecturers, whose credibility is not questioned as vehemently. The consequence as asserted by recent study is that it greatly affects students’ EDC in class (Valji, 2003; Harvey, 2002).

Research in higher education institutions in relation to racism and xenophobia has shown similar results of lack of EDC. An international study observed that in higher education, faculty members besides students often work in isolation in academic departments that are sometimes more fragmented than united in purpose (Rakes & Rakes, n.d). The frequent result is decreased effectiveness for the university as a whole. However, the authors argued that:

Many pressures influence faculty members to behave as isolates. There is pressure to research, publish, and present while also maintaining quality teaching along with an expectation for community, college, and departmental service. These pressures in turn lead to competition among faculty members for merit raises, tenure, promotion, and desirable course assignments. Reward systems frequently promote individual or narrow agendas instead of addressing departmental or college goals. To fight this fragmentation, some approach is

¹Muslim (ladies) dress collection includes abaya, Niqab, Jilbab, Khimar and hijab. All sizes are available from small to plus size Islamic clothing and also child.
needed that can satisfy both individual and group goals and interests. (Rakes & Rakes, n.d: 3)

A ramification in the context of South Africa is that EDC tend to define segregation, in which during apartheid era was orchestrated by White ruled-minority apartheid regime (Valji, 2003; Handmaker & Parsley, 2002). Some of the authors suggested that it (un)consciously instituted xenophobia and racism (Handmaker & Parsley, 2002).

From international perspective, it is a receipt to let peoples’ lives be marked by cultural homogeneity from birth to adulthood. According to non- African (European) literature, racist and xenophobic hate crimes have increased disturbingly on the European continent (European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia 2000). In Germany for instance, racist crime rates increased by 33% compared to 1999. In the United Kingdom (UK), acts of racial violence and offences doubled from 1999 to 2000 (European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia 2000). It can therefore be inferred from both local and international review of literature that xenophobia and racism somewhat play a role in EDC. But, as the literature stands, what is not clear and understood is the particular variables of xenophobia and racism that impact on ECD. Following the contestation regarding xenophobia and racism and its impact on EDC, the study investigates factors that impact on EDC through xenophobia and racism.

Motivation for Current Study

Researchers and policy makers have long been interested in improving public places, when it comes to xenophobia and racism (Handmaker & Parsley, 2002; Harvey, 2002; UK Institute for Race Relations, 2001; United Nations Commission on Human Rights, 2000). About a decade ago, there have been numerous discussions about the fact that “nations that react the most negatively to immigrants may be the ones with populations suffering a so-called ‘identity crisis’ (Harvey, 2002: 474). Within this time, the debate over the causes and consequences of xenophobia and racial differences as applied in EDC has been at the heart of affected nation’s social and political life. From onset (cf. Background of the Study), there has been number of discussions on EDC (Handmaker & Parsley, 2002; Rakes & Rakes, n.d). However, despite this wealth of knowledge with regards to the aforementioned two main issues, there seem to be more to be investigated. Prior studies have generally focused on researchers’ analyses and interpretations on surveys and the non-African (Western) world (Harcourt, 2009; Harvey, 2002). Few have concentrated on South Africa context (Neocosmos, 2008; Valji, 2003; Handmaker & Parsley, 2002). This is not to discount such forms of study and the context in which they were conducted. The important issue here is to concentrate the present study on a historically Black university in South Africa, while exploiting the nuances of such a case as applied in prior studies, noting the prime explanation given for xenophobia and racial differences.

Yet, there are other studies, which assert that demographic elements are also contributing factors. However, they have been criticised because they provide little insight on how family background and social forces shape individual’s decision process (Harvey, 2002; Handmaker & Parsley, 2002). This group of research also has a growing literature of empirical works, but factors that focus on demographic as predictors of racism have been
suggested as alternatives to the xenophobia subjectively. Following the contestations of the aforementioned studies, the hypotheses tested in the current paper respond to the impact of racism and xenophobia on EDC using quantitative approach.

**Research Hypotheses**

H1: There is a relationship between racism and elements defining collegiality

H2: There is a relationship between xenophobia and elements defining collegiality

**Methodology of the Study**

The current research was based on a case study of a historically Black university carried out in Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. The questionnaires used in the present research complemented prior literature, which sought to explore racial and xenophobia relationships (*cf. section on Background of Study*). Following the background of the study, two hypotheses have been tested in this research. The data obtained was analysed using the statistical software package called statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS). Statistical techniques of univariable analyses (frequencies and percentages) and bivariable (cross tabulation and mean test) were employed.

However, few differences between Black and White students sample are worth mentioning (*cf. section on Results of the Study*). Sample size ($n_o$) of 183 using equation 1 was drawn from a population size ($N$) of 334 university students enrolled in both Bachelor of Education (B.Ed) and Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE) in the Faulty of Education. The following were considered for the sample size, thus, ‘$e$’ was the desired level of precision ±5%, Confidence 95%, $Z = 1.96$, $p = q = 0.5$, $N$=population size. Noting that $Z$ was the abscissa of the normal curve that cuts off an area at the tails (1 - the desired confidence level, in this case 95%)\(^2\). These yielded the sample size\(^3\) $n_o = 183$ from the equation $n_o = N/(1 + Ne\^2)$...equation 1.

**Results of the Study**

**Demographic Representation:** This section presents demographical data of sample for the current study. The results revealed that majority of respondents were females (53%), the rest (47%) being males. More than half (56%) of the respondent’s age was below 25 years, while a total of 44% of respondent’s were more than 25 years. The mean score for respondent’s age was 23 years. It was noted that Black students (50%) pursued Bachelor of Education (B.Ed) degree. The other percentages of respondents were White students (30%), while 20% constituted the rest of the students (Coloureds and Indians). More than three-quarter of the respondents (77%) were from rural setting, while only 23% of the respondents were from urban (*cf. Table 1 for such details*).

| Table 1: Demographic representation |

\(^2\) $p$ is the estimated proportion of an attribute that is present in the population, and $q$ is $1-p$

\(^3\) see Yamane (1967) for the calculation of sample size and other details.
The subsequent section addresses part of research questions 1 and 2 with respect to race and xenophobia. In both races, Black and non-Black students answered Yes to the question whether race and xenophobia impacted on EDC, but the percentage of affirmative answers was higher in the case of Black students than in White (85% vs. 15%). This meant that student’s desirability to exhibit racist and or xenophobic behaviour remained a matter of concern. Among the Black students who answered affirmatively to this question, 48% were male and 52% female; 55% come from families in which there were staying together. In the case of White students, 38% were male and 62% female; 95% come from families in which there were staying together and the majority (95%) come from urban setting.

Other important issue noted was the question of a relationship between race, gender and EDC. The perception of the degree of gender and EDC (such as class, poverty, teacher expectancy, and student oppositional identity) depends on a number of factors. Some of which may foster and others may inhibit EDC. To both gender, students’ perceptions among the factors which foster EDC were social support, governmental support and access to financing of education. On the other hand, among the factors that inhibit the EDC, the students mentioned cultural and/or class poverty, teacher expectancy, and student oppositional identity. In both groups of respondents (Black and White), the majority of students answered that at present, it is still easy to engage in racial and xenophobic acts, although the percentage was higher in Blacks (65%) than in Whites (35%). Among the Black students who answered less difficult, 48% were male and 52% female, and also the majority (80%) comes from B.Ed students. In the case of the White sample, 42% were male and 58% female; and also the majority -53% come from the B.Ed students.

Analysis of Hypothesis 1

Multiple regression analysis was used to test for the significant predictors of EDC that influence racism. Majority, in this case Black students (65%) indicated that social support significantly predicted EDC behaviour [$\beta = -.38$, $t(210) = 6.03$, $p < .01$] this was as compared to 35% White students. Social support also explained a significant proportion of variance in racial scores [$R^2 = .13$, $F(1, 210) = 41.04$, $p < .01$]. This confirmed the first hypothesis and thus accepted. By implication racial behaviour control would become more effective if efforts are targeted towards social class.

Analysis of Hypothesis 2

Multiple regression analysis was utilised to determine the percentage contribution of some of the identified significant predictors to level of xenophobic act. The distribution revealed that only two variables made significant percentage contributions to level of
xenophobic behaviour. These are; cultural and/or class poverty ($\beta = 16.22, p < 0.01$) and student oppositional identity ($\beta = 1.08, p < 0.05$). It may thus be inferred that ‘cultural and/or class poverty’ and ‘student oppositional identity’ are the two variables, prominent in explaining the variation in level of xenophobic behaviour among B.Ed and PGCE students.

Altogether, according to the results, these two variables have a joint correlation of 0.85. The $R^2$ value also suggests that these two variables explained approximately 65 percent of the variations in level of xenophobic behaviour leaving the other 35% to the remaining factors and other factors not included in the equation. The analysis of variance also revealed that the regression coefficients are real and did not occur by chance.

It may therefore be inferred that relatively, cultural/ class poverty and student oppositional identity actively impact on xenophobic behaviour. By implication there is enough evidence to suggest that xenophobic behaviour control would become more effective if efforts are targeted towards cultural and/or class poverty and student oppositional identity among students. Thus, the second hypothesis was accepted.

Additionally, a mixed-design analysis of variance (ANOVA) with gender (male, female) as a within-subjects factor and EDC (Social support, governmental support and access to financing of education) and race (Black, White) as between-subjects factors revealed a main effect of gender [$F(1, 1250) = 1300, p < .001, \eta^2 = .60$]. This was qualified by interactions between gender and EDC [$F(2, 1250) = 6.50, p = .001, \eta^2 = .021$] and between gender and race use [$F(1, 1250) = 5.00, p = .020, \eta^2 = .006$]. The predicted interaction among gender, EDC and race use was significant [$F(2, 1250) = 0.07, p = .02, \eta^2 < .07$]. All other main effects and interactions were non-significant and irrelevant to the hypothesis, all $F \leq 0.95, p \geq .40, \eta^2 \leq .001$.

However, an analysis of co-variance (ANCOVA) [between-subjects factor: gender (male, female); covariate: age] revealed no main effects of sex [$F(1, 700) = 2.80, p = .19, \eta^2 = .002$], or age [$F(1, 700) = 3.00, p = .070, \eta^2 = .003$] and no interaction between gender and age [$F(1, 700) = 0.19, p = .80, \eta^2 < .001$ (cf. table 3)]. The predicted main effect of gender was not significant, $F(1, 700) = 2.00, p = .19, \eta^2 = .002$ nor was the predicted main effect of age [$F(1, 700) = 3.00, p = .070, \eta^2 = .003$]. The interaction between gender and age was also not significant [$F(1, 700) = 0.019, p = .80, \eta^2 < .001$]. This suggested age had no effect on race and xenophobic relations and thus on EDC among the university students. The next section looks at a discussion of the results in relation to reviewed literature and results.

Discussion of Results

Among the growing body of literature which analysed the relationship between race, xenophobia and attitudes towards EDC, several of the literature have found that males have a higher preference for EDC (Handmaker & Parsley, 2002). The current study found that to predict EDC, males have a lower preference for EDC. Additionally, the current study concludes that race and xenophobia influence EDC through their effect on culture and student oppositional identity. Taking into consideration the preceding works presented in the literature and the current study, hypotheses 1 and 2 were confirmed.
In the White respondents (sample), there exist a positive relationship between the student’s gender and the perception of EDC. The evidence suggests that the female percentage who answered affirmatively to this question was higher than the male percentage.

The literature on family background evidenced a positive relationship between the presence of role models in the family and the emergence of EDC. Local literature was among some of the authors to verify through an empirical research on EDC that influenced racist and xenophobic factors (Neocosmos, 2008; Valji, 2003; Carrim & Sayed, 1992; Handmaker & Parsley, 2002). Among more recent works, advocates of demographic factors (such as gender and place of residence) have suggested and found empirical support for the hypothesis that family background is related to EDC (Neocosmos, 2008; Valji, 2003). The literature that focuses on race argued that role models affect EDC, but only if they affect attitudes as well (Neocosmos, 2008; Valji, 2003; Carrim & Sayed, 1992). In support of the authors, the current study affirmed their assertion. The relationship between EDC, race and gender was statistically significant. Indeed, this has been confirmed by the current study which concludes that gender influence EDC directly through its effect on attitude and social class. Similarly, the current study found that there is a relationship between social class and EDC. Like previous studies, the current study argues that most middle-class students tend to teach themselves to be self-directed, whereas working-class related students teach themselves to conform to authority (Neocosmos, 2008; Valji, 2003). The evidence suggests that parental values are understood to be extensions of the behaviours that are important for parents in the occupational structure, which privileges self-direction for white-collar workers and conformity for blue-collar workers. It is no surprising that a local commentator lamented that:

Yet it requires little effort to see that economic factors, however real, cannot possibly account for why it was those deemed to be non-South Africans who bore the brunt of the vicious attacks. Poverty can be and has historically been the foundation for the whole range of political ideologies, from communism to fascism and anything in between. In fact, poverty can only account for the powerlessness, frustration and desperation of the perpetrators, but not for their target (Neocosmos, 2008:586).

The commentator continued to lament and question:

Why were not Whites, or the rich, or White foreigners in South Africa targeted instead? Of course, it is a common occurrence that the powerless regularly take out their frustrations on the weakest: women, children, the elderly – and outsiders. Yet this will not suffice as an explanation. (Neocosmos, 2008:586).

The educational implication is that students whose parents are middle-class, white-collar workers adopt parenting styles that allow their students to be more self-directed. Therefore, these students are more skilled at thinking independently and critically, which benefits their school performance. Additionally, the finding resonates with the fact that middle-class students continue to outpace students from lower social classes. Although, only modest support was found, the current study identified social stratification in students outpaced their counterparts of lower social classes. This is indeed important as education is among the main contributors to racism and xenophobia. However, age was
not an important determinant of EDC. The final section addresses conclusion and implication of study.

**Conclusion and Implication of Study**

The perspectives of the current study on social class, cultural poverty, teacher expectancy, and student oppositional identity have demonstrated that EDC discourses are impacted by xenophobia and racism. This is particularly true as the current study established that (1) there is relationship between the racism and EDC and that (2) there is also a relationship between xenophobic and EDC and (3) also there exist a relationship between gender and EDC. Thus, the two main hypotheses were accepted.

The implication therefore is to share power with students in research, while describing and examining students’ meanings and interpretations of the discourse of EDC, which are related to xenophobia and racism. The present study concludes by affirming prior study, which undeniably - and putting it in the prior study’s perspective “…it should be clear then that the recent wave of xenophobic pogroms was entirely predictable given the … discourse briefly outlined above” (Neocosmos, 2008:592).
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