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Abstract
This article reports two studies – in 2006 and 2010 – that use matched pairs audit methodology to estimate the incidence of racial discrimination among holiday accommodation establishments on the KwaZulu-Natal South Coast. Black and white auditors phoned the same establishment one day apart and attempted to make an identical booking. Discrimination was evident when the black caller was refused accommodation that was offered to the white caller. We found a disturbingly high incidence of racial discrimination in 2006 (29.3%) and 2010 (24.4%). The incidence of discrimination was not affected by the location or the price of the accommodation or by the social class of the black auditor, but was found to be higher in private than public establishments. We conclude by considering the nature and underlying causes of racial discrimination in post-apartheid South Africa.

Introduction
Debates around issues such as national sports team selections, unequal distribution of wealth, gated communities, and criticisms of the government all indicate that racial discrimination in post-apartheid South Africa is a hotly debated topic. The racial disparities of the past persist, but it is often very difficult to identify clear instances of discrimination. Racial discrimination was explicit under apartheid, with black citizens being denied equal access to the same opportunities in employment, education and residence as whites (MacDonald 2006). Discrimination and segregation were enshrined in law
enforced by the police and repressive state apparatus, and embraced by the majority of whites who were willing to express overt dislike or hatred toward black people (Foster and Nel 2001).

The racial discrimination and segregation of the past have now been outlawed (cf Harris et al 2005), and government has embarked on an extensive programme of racial transformation and redress to eradicate the legacy of racial discrimination (Bentley and Habib 2008). Nonetheless, South Africans continue to be troubled by race and concerned about the persistence of racial discrimination (Durrheim et al 2011). Although public and private institutions and spaces have been officially desegregated, on-going patterns of segregation and exclusion remain. In their study of the racially integrated Scottburgh beach, for example, Durrheim and Dixon (2005) found racial segregation was preserved by practices of clustering and migration, and that intimate groups of family and friends who sat on the beach together were almost entirely racially homogeneous. Similar patterns of clustering and ‘white flight’ have been observed in educational (Soudien 2004) and residential contexts (Ballard 2004), securing privileged spaces in private education settings and upmarket neighbourhoods for largely white communities.

In the context of the United States, Goldberg (1998) has characterised such ‘new segregationism’ as conservationist and class-based. Rather than actively promoting racial exclusion it seeks to conserve ‘the hold of segregation historically produced as if it were in the nature of things’ (1998:17). A principal way of doing this is through class-based exclusions. For example, in making supposedly non-racial decisions about where to live or send children to school, segregation is ‘produced by doing nothing special, nothing beyond being guided by the presumptive laws of the market, the determinations of the majority’s personal preferences’ (Goldberg 1998:17). Instead of framing personal preferences in explicitly racial terms they can be articulated in the language of class or other more acceptable terms and still contribute to a racial ordering of society (Sears and Henry 2005, Bonilla-Silva 1997).

In addition to the ideological elements that render contemporary forms of racial discrimination socially acceptable, racial decision making has also retreated from the ‘front stage’ of public life to the ‘back stage’ of private domains outside critical scrutiny from the public eye (Picca and Feagin 2007). Not only are racial slurs, insults and jokes more likely to be heard in private as opposed to public contexts, but the private realm is also regarded as being
legitimately governed by private preferences, including racial ones, and as being outside the domain of desegregation policies. MacDonald suggests that this is a foundational tenet of liberal democratic ideology, which regards ‘the “public” as a realm in which members are equal and the private as a realm in which inequalities emerge as the inevitable consequence of freedom’ (2006:124).

In exercising personal preferences in small acts that make racial distinction, people can collectively produce large scale patterns of segregation, discrimination and institutional inequality. Desegregation of education, for example, has resulted in new patterns of migration as parents who can afford have elected to send their children to private schools and other institutions of privilege (Soudien 2004). Although not explicitly racial, the exercise of preferences in this way reinscribes both race and class based inequalities on the education landscape.

At the same time as conserving historical patterns of privilege, the exercise of disparate individual acts of discrimination also profoundly compromises the wellbeing of black people who feel that they continue to be subject to racial profiling, exclusion and harassment. However, because the acts of discrimination are no longer explicit, the targets of discrimination are left with doubt and uncertainty about whether they are victims of racism or not. Research in the USA suggests that many African Americans experience a variety of ambiguously racial acts of discrimination and harassment but are ‘so sensitive to white charges of hypersensitivity and paranoia that they err in the opposite direction and fail to see discrimination when it occurs’ (Feagin 1991:109).

Auditing racial discrimination
Because they are often covert, ideologically justified, and practised in private, contemporary expressions of racial discrimination are difficult to observe and analyse. The effectiveness of survey methods have been called into question because of social desirability pressures on responses (Krysan 2000). Researchers have thus advocated for the use of unobtrusive measures (Crosby et al 1980) to make racial discrimination evident. For example, Wispe and Freshley (1971) showed that white passers-by were more likely to help a white than a black shopper when the contents of their broken grocery bag fell to the floor. According to Crosby et al (1980) they discriminated in these conditions because conditions were ‘safe’. They believed that no one was watching, they were anonymous, and there would be no retaliation or
censure.

Audits are methodological tools for detecting and quantifying discrimination in such ‘safe’ contexts. Audits are adapted survey techniques in which black and white researchers who are matched on various characteristics other than race enquire about advertised resources or services, for example, in accommodation, sales, housing, or employment. They record discrimination that becomes apparent in differential treatment of the black and white auditor (Yinger 1998b). Thus, audits ‘provide direct measures of discrimination and an unprecedented opportunity to study the circumstances under which discrimination occurs’ (Yinger 1986:881).

Audit studies have been very successful in detecting racial discrimination in the USA. A 1989 housing discrimination study showed that African Americans were 10.7% more likely to be excluded from housing than whites (Yinger 1998b). Although it is impossible for an individual caller to know whether their rejection was due to discrimination, the audit makes discrimination manifest. The collective effect of these individual instances of housing discrimination is the preservation of segregation in housing, which often coincides with whites wanting to protect white areas from black integration (Heckman 1998, Yinger 1998a).

The 1989 USA housing discrimination study had auditors personally inquire about housing. It has been suggested, however, that telephone audits provide even less obtrusive measures, allowing agents to discriminate by ‘linguistic profiling’, without face-to-face contact (Kim 2006). Bargh (2003:155) suggests that ‘linguistic profiling is more finely tuned to diversity among Americans than are dissatisfactory racial classifications’, allowing accent to stand as ‘surrogate for race’ but also allowing discrimination against minority subgroups who have especially undesirable accents or dialects. Telephone audits thus allow an investigation of discrimination based on social class and other factors that are reflected in voice and accent.

The aim of the present research was to conduct the first audits of racial discrimination in the South African context. Although there is much writing on discrimination in South Africa, we could find no examples of discrimination audits using unobtrusive measures and, consequently, we have used literature from the USA to design our studies. There are many similarities between the histories of racism in the USA and South Africa (cf Cell 1982, Sharp 1998), and we expect that racial discrimination is taking place in ‘safe’ contexts such as the letting of accommodation. We conducted telephone audits of a sample of KwaZulu-Natal South Coast holiday accommodation
venues to detect and quantify racial discrimination in South Africa.

There has much debate about the ethics of conducting audits. One of the defining characteristics of the method is the fact that the service agents are unaware they are being investigated. They participate without providing informed consent. This is necessary to prevent their responses from being subject to social desirability forces (Goodwin 2003, Krysan 2000). Audits are commonly approved by ethics committees because the social justice value they yield outweighs the costs to the research participants. In fact, the costs for participants are minimal as the time taken to address the queries is relatively brief and is part of their routine work. At the same time, by delinking responses from participant identities, anonymity and response confidentiality were upheld throughout the study.

**Study 1**

Study 1 aimed to identify and quantify racial discrimination in the letting of holiday accommodation along the KwaZulu-Natal South Coast. Further, it sought to determine whether levels of discrimination were influenced by the type, price and location of accommodation.

**Design**

A matched-paired telephone survey audit was used to identify racial discrimination. The two auditors were matched in terms of age, gender and level of education. The first auditor was a black South African female whose home language was isiZulu but who spoke English fluently. The second auditor was a white South African female whose home language was English. Both were students at the University of KwaZulu-Natal and were 22 years of age. An initial recording of each voice was randomly assigned to one of two groups of judges (n=21) who rated the age, gender, race and educational level of the speakers. The judges reliably identified the race and gender of the speakers, and there were no significant differences in the ratings of age (M=23.2 years) and education level of the speakers.

A standardised script was developed to guide the auditors’ interactions with the rental agents (see Figure 1). The auditors projected themselves as young professional females who were holidaying with their partners and another couple. The main dependent variable was the ‘Yes’ versus ‘No’ response to the availability of accommodation. Discrimination was indicated when the black auditor received a ‘no’ response and the white auditor received a ‘yes’ response from the same accommodation establishment.
**Figure 1.** Auditor script used in the 2006 study of racial discrimination on the KwaZulu-Natal South Coast, June-July 2006.

When a person answers: hello, My name is_________________
I’m enquiring for holiday accommodation for the December holidays.
I’m looking for accommodation anytime between the 10th of December and the 10th of January.
I’m looking for accommodation for four people?
Is there accommodation still available? Yes___ No_____
If answer is ‘yes’: what is the price of the accommodation?
If asked: A family or four adults? I’m looking for accommodation for four adults
If asked: how many days would you like to stay? Between 5 to 10 days, whatever is available?
Thank you very much, Good-bye.

**Sample**
The sampling frame was made up of 356 holiday accommodation establishments on the KwaZulu-Natal South Coast. This comprehensive list of establishments was obtained from the tourist information brochures, websites and newspapers. Those establishments that were let by estate agents were excluded from the sample.

During June of 2006, the auditors attempted to contact all 356 places in the sampling frame. The calls were made a day apart in order to prevent the agents from making a link between the two cases. The order of the calling was randomly counterbalanced between the auditors. This was done to control for the fact that the accommodation might have been booked in the 24 hours before the second auditor inquiry (in addition to the effect of the first auditory inquiry on second auditor response). Chi-Square analysis showed no differences in the incidence of discrimination toward first and second callers ($\chi^2=3.429$, df=1, $p=0.330$).\(^1\)

Only 188 of the 356 establishments in the sampling frame were successfully contacted by both auditors. It appeared as though the vast majority of the 168 unreachable establishments were no longer in existence. In a minority of cases calls from one auditor but not the other were answered. In these instances the second auditor phoned a total of 3 times on consecutive days. If no response was received, the establishment was dropped from the sample. All contactable establishments responded by indicating the availability or unavailability of accommodation, so there was no ‘non-response’ as normally occurs in surveys.
Observations

**Discrimination:** the ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ responses for both auditors were recorded and combined to yield four combinations: 1=Yes-Yes (yes to both auditors), 2=Yes-No (yes to the white and no to the black auditor), 3=No-Yes (no to the white and yes to the black auditor), and 4=No-No (no to both auditors). The discriminatory response of prime interest was the Yes-No combination in which the agent indicated that accommodation was available to the white auditor but not to the black auditor.

**Type of accommodation:** five categories of accommodation type were identified: 1=camping and caravanning (representing all forms of outdoor accommodation), 2=hotels (spas and hotels), 3=chalets and resorts, 4=privately owned flats, houses and bungalows, 5=bed and breakfasts (exclusively used for bed and breakfasts).

**Location of accommodation:** was divided into 5 main areas and their surrounding towns. 1= Scottburgh (extending from Park Rynie to Umzinto), 2=Pennington (Kelso to Mtwalume), 3=Hibberdene, 4=Port Shepstone (Mzumbe to umTentweni), and 5=Margate (Shelly Beach to Ramsgate).

**Price of accommodation:** establishments were categorised on the basis of the daily cost of the accommodation into low (d— R199 per person per night) (n=28), medium (R200-R499 per person per night) (n=194), and high (e— R500 per person per night) (n=45) price categories.

Results

The results, reported in Table 1, show that the black auditor was 4.6 times more likely to receive a No response than the white auditor. A chi-square analysis confirmed that responses were not independent of the race of the auditor ($\chi^2=40.411; df=1; p<0.0005$). The odds ratio showed a black auditor was 6.42 times more likely to get a No over a Yes response than the white auditor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Auditor</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Auditor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To identify instances of discrimination we paired the responses to the two auditors for each institution. Yes-Yes responses were non-discriminatory responses, while Yes-No (yes to white and no to black auditor) responses were deemed discriminatory. Thirteen No-No responses were excluded from further consideration as these were most likely places that were already fully booked and were thus not able to show discrimination. We obtained a single No-Yes response which discriminated against the white auditor. This was also dropped from further analysis. A staggering 51 (29.3%) of the remaining 174 responses were discriminatory.

Logistic regression was conducted to determine whether the type, price, and location of the accommodation predicted whether the establishment would provide a discriminatory or non-discriminatory response. None of the predictor variables had a significant effect on the model ($\chi^2 = 16.204; df= 9; p<0.063$), although the effect of type of accommodation approached significance, with discrimination being more likely among privately owned flats, houses and bungalows.

**Discussion**

This study confirmed the hypothesis that racial discrimination exists in the letting of holiday accommodation on the KwaZulu-Natal South Coast. The results showed that approximately 30% of black callers that inquire about the availability of accommodation will be rejected when accommodation is available for letting and would be offered to white callers. We were not able to establish that discrimination levels were affected by the location, price and type of accommodation, although the data did suggest more discrimination in privately owned establishments.

Although there are frequent accusations and denials of racism in various spheres of life in South Africa, the actual presence of discrimination is difficult to establish because it is exercised in ways that are difficult to detect. An individual caller seeking to rent accommodation would not be able to tell whether there was genuinely no accommodation available or whether they had been a victim of racism. Such privatised contexts allow people to practice ‘discrimination with a smile’.

Given the history of apartheid, and in light of the 11% of housing discrimination observed in the USA, we were expecting to find evidence of discrimination in this study. However, because racial discrimination is illegal, counter normative, and so frequently denied, we did not anticipate finding the high levels of discrimination that we observed. Almost one in
three black people will be unfairly discriminated against in this context.

**Study 2**

In 2010 we conducted replication and extension of the 2006 audit. The first aim of this study was to determine whether levels of discrimination had changed during the four intervening years. We included the predictors, price, place and type of accommodation, but used reduced numbers of categories in an attempt to enhance the power of the analyses. We also included social class as an additional variable. A number of authors have suggested class has replaced race as the primary criterion of segregation and discrimination in post-apartheid South Africa (eg Bond 2000, Desai and Ramjettan 2008, Sharp 1998). We operationalised social class loosely by using black auditors with different English accents. The one black auditor had done her schooling in an impoverished rural area whereas the other black auditor (and the white auditor) had attended a Model C school. Black learners who attend former Model C schools are generally have guardians who work in urban areas and are generally socio-economically better off than learners in rural schools. In addition, the Model C schooling gives these learners a distinct English accent that is sometimes described as ‘sounding white’ while being distinctly black. Study 2 sought to determine whether linguistic profiling of these accents would affect levels of discrimination against the black callers in comparison with the white caller.

**Design**

A matched-paired telephone audit, with one white and two black female auditors, was used to investigate race and class discrimination. The home language of the two black auditors was isiZulu, but they both spoke English (with different levels of fluency) and were students at the English medium, University of KwaZulu-Natal. The white auditor was originally from Zimbabwe, but had been living in South Africa for some time and her home language was English.

A mixed, between- and within-subjects design was employed, with all accommodation establishments being contacted by a white and a black auditor, but they were randomly assigned to the black auditor with Model C or rural educational background. The phone calls were made a day apart, with the order of the calls from the white and black auditor being randomly counterbalanced. The order of the call did not affect the incidence of discriminatory response ($\chi^2=1.912$, df=2, $p<0.384$).
A pilot study was conducted to check that the differences in race, social class and educational background were clearly apparent in the voices of the auditors. Sixty three university students were randomly assigned to listen to an audio recording of one of the three auditors, to judge the age, gender, race, education of the speaker and to rate the politeness, friendliness and clarity of the voice. The sample reliably identified the gender and race of the auditors. The rural auditor was rated as being less clear (F=5.751, df=2, p<0.004, $\chi^2=0.06$), less educated (F=33.365, df=2, p<0.0001, $\chi^2=0.272$), and less wealthy (F=44.364, df=2, p<0.0001, $\chi^2=0.117$) than the white and Model C black auditors, but there were no significant differences in the rated friendliness (F=2.689, df=2, p<0.071, $\chi^2=0.03$) and politeness (F=.494, df=2, p<0.611, $\chi^2=0.005$) of the auditors. Although the auditors were of a similar age (20 to 22 years), the pilot sample judged the white auditor to be older than the other two auditors (F=11.631, df=2, p<0.0001, $\chi^2=0.117$).

The auditors used the same script to that used in Study 1 (see Figure 1). The study was conducted in June 2010, with the auditors inquiring about the availability of accommodation for four young adults during December. The auditors attempted to make contact three times after which the place was deemed not contactable.

**Sample**

The sampling frame was comprised of 356 establishments identified in 2006 plus 144 new establishments that were identified by means of an internet search. As was the case in 2006 a large proportion of the establishments were non-contactable and the final sample consisted of 267 establishments for which we obtained paired responses.

**Observations**

*Discrimination:* the four possible responses were recorded: 1=Yes-Yes (yes to the black and white auditor), 2=Yes-No (yes to the white and no to the black auditor), 3= No-Yes (no to the white and yes to the black auditor), 4=No-No (no to both the white and black auditor). Racial discrimination was indicated by the Yes-No paired response, whereas the Yes-Yes response indicated non-discrimination.

*Social Class:* the social class of the black auditors was operationalised in terms of educational background.

*Price:* the letting agents were asked the price of the accommodation and this was recorded as an ordinal variable with three categories 1=low, ≤R199
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per person per night (n=28); 2=medium, R200-R499 per person per night (n=194); and 3=high, ≥ R500 per person per night (n=45).

Type of accommodation: this was determined from the description of the accommodation in the establishment’s website. Each establishment was classified in one of two categories: 1=public (the camping/caravanning, hotels and resorts) (n=61), and 2=private (privately owned houses, cottages, bed and breakfasts) (n=173). Private accommodation represents establishments owned by independent individuals who rent out domestic accommodation as a source of livelihood. These include separate houses used as accommodation or even renting out their own homes to paying customers. Public establishments include places that are state or privately owned, but that provide accommodation in dedicated establishments outside of the domestic space of private individuals. We reduced the number of accommodation types to two in order to avoid violating the assumptions of log linear analysis and to maintain the power of the test. We had to reduce the number of categories of each predictor to ensure that, when the variables were crossed with each other, the expected frequencies of the cells were all greater than 1 and not more than 20% were less than 5.

Location of the accommodation: for reasons just explained, we reduced the number of categories from five to two: 1=Southern territories (n=134), and 2=Northern territories (n=100), with Shelly beach being the dividing line between the two. The hypothesis was that more discrimination would be found in the more remote and conservative areas further away (South) from Durban.

Results
The paired responses for the sample of accommodation establishments are reported in Table 2. The No-No responses were eliminated from all further analyses on the assumption that these accommodations were already let or otherwise unavailable and that is was thus not possible for these establishments to discriminate. A chi-square test showed that there were no significant differences between the proportions of paired-responses in the other three categories between Study 1 and Study 2 (χ²= 4.895, df = 2, p< 0.087). Although there were more non-discriminatory (Yes-Yes) responses for every discriminatory (Yes-No) response in 2010 (1:3.1) than there had been in 2006 (1:2.4) and there were 8 discriminatory responses against whites (No-Yes) in 2010 compared to the single instance in 2006, these fluctuations were no larger than chance. In other words, the results indicate
that drop in discrimination experienced by black auditors – from 29.3% in 2006 to 24.4% in 2010 was not statistically significant.

Table 2. Matched paired responses for Study 2

| Yes – Yes | 177 |
| Yes (white) – No (black) | 57 |
| No (white) – Yes (black) | 8 |
| No – No | 25 |
| **Total** | **267** |

In 2006 we simply discarded the single discriminatory response against the white auditor as an anomaly. The present data suggest that this form of discrimination might be gaining momentum. However, the 8 cases were too few to conduct reliable statistical analyses. Once these 8 responses are crossed by the variables of interest, the expected cell sizes all drop below 5, violating an assumption of log linear analysis (Howell 2002). These cases were thus not included in the multivariate analyses.

A chi-squared analysis was conducted to determine whether the rate of discrimination varied across the two black auditors (See Table 3). Because discrimination in post-apartheid South Africa is often attributed to social class rather than race, we expected the black auditor who had been educated in a rural context to encounter more discrimination than the black auditor with a Model C education. The results of the chi-square test show that there was no reliable difference between the level of discrimination experienced by the two auditors ($\chi^2=.31$, df= 1, $p< .578$).

Table 3. Frequency of discriminatory and non-discriminatory responses to black auditors, Study 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Discrimination</th>
<th>Discrimination</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Auditor</td>
<td>95 (-.6)</td>
<td>33 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model C Auditor</td>
<td>82 (.6)</td>
<td>24 (-.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>177</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Statistics in parenthesis are adjusted standardised residuals. These can be interpreted as z-scores with residuals greater than 1.96 or less than -1.96 indicating cells with significantly too many or too few counts.
Log linear analysis was used to determine whether the variables price, type and location of accommodation predicted levels of discrimination against the black auditors, either as main effects or in interaction with each other. However, we first sought to reconfirm that the social class of the black auditors had no effect on discrimination, even nested in one level of three predictor variables. Three separate log linear analyses were conducted investigating discriminatory versus non-discriminatory paired responses, class (rural versus Model C) and one of the independent variables, price, type and location of accommodation. The results showed that no two-way or three-way effects were significant, and so the class variable was eliminated from further consideration. We were now in a position to study the way racial discrimination varied across accommodation as a function of its price, type and location.

The aim of log linear analysis is to construct a model that accounts for the frequencies in the contingency tables with the least number of terms. This is done by determining which combination of effects account for the frequencies (Howell 2002). The first stage in the analysis is the K-way analysis which allows the analyst to determine how complex a model is needed to fit the data. In this case, the K-way analysis showed that the one-way effects were significant ($\chi^2=283.207, \text{df}=5, p<0.0001$), the two-way effects were marginally significant ($\chi^2=16.076, \text{df}=9, p<0.065$), but the three-way effects were not significant.

Once we know which orders of effects are significant, a second stage of log linear analysis investigates which specific effects within that order are significant. We thus investigated the one and two way effects in more detail. Table 4 reports the partial associations between variables that make up the one-way and two-way effects. The partial association allows one to see which effects are significant and which therefore would create the best fit model for the frequencies (Howell 2002). The one-way effects price, type and location, although significant, are uninteresting sampling artefacts, reflecting that we had an unequal number of accommodation establishments in the subcategories of the predictor variables. The significant effect for discrimination reflected the fact that there were more non-discriminatory (Yes-Yes) responses than discriminatory (Yes-No) responses (See Table 2). The most substantively interesting finding was the significant two-way interaction between discrimination and accommodation type ($\chi^2=3.983, \text{df}=1, p<0.046$).
Table 4. Partial Associations of the 1st and 2nd order effects, Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Partial Chi-Square</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination*type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.983</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination*price</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination*place</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64.567</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.868</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>157.814</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.958</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Odds ratios were computed to investigate the two-way interaction between discrimination and accommodation type further. When the type of accommodation was private, a discriminatory response was 0.373 times more likely than a non-discriminatory response. When the type of accommodation was public, a discriminatory response was 0.196 times more likely than a non-discriminatory response. Therefore, the chance of being discriminated against is almost twice as high (odds ratio = 1.903) in a private than a public establishment.

Discussion
South African society has undergone profound change during the past two decades as the democratically elected government has sought to eradicate racism and the legacy of apartheid. The racial discrimination of the past has been rendered illegal and various forms of affirmative action have been legislated and promoted to bring about genuine social change. Yet, race trouble abounds as accusations and counter accusations are made about racism (Durrheim et al 2011). Such debates are often unsolvable because racism remains hidden or covert, as discrimination is practiced inconspicuously in the ‘backstage’ of social life (Picca and Feagin 2007).

We used a matched-pair audit methodology to estimate the incidence of racial discrimination in one small corner of South African society, namely, holiday accommodation reservation on the KwaZulu-Natal South Coast. Given the fact that racial discrimination is illegal and so frequently denied, we were surprised by the high levels of discrimination that we observed:
29.3% in 2006 and 24.4% in 2010. Approximately one quarter of the establishments which had available accommodation discriminated against black callers, denying them access to accommodation that was made available to the white callers. The slight reduction in discrimination between the studies was not statistically significant, and does not provide evidence of a decline over time. Under normal circumstances such discrimination would be undetectable, with black callers being unable to tell that their rejection was the result of racial discrimination.

In addition to estimating the incidence of discrimination we also explored a number of explanatory hypotheses. In both studies we found no evidence that discrimination was associated with the location and price of the accommodation. However, discrimination was found to vary significantly across different accommodation types, with a higher incidence of discrimination occurring in private establishments such as privately owned houses, cottages, and bed and breakfasts. The odds ratio showed that black callers in 2010 were almost twice as likely to be discriminated against by private as by public establishments.

The social, political and legislative change in South Africa has resulted in massively reduced levels of discrimination in comparison with the apartheid past. However, troubling high levels of racial discrimination remain. Discrimination is still rife in private establishments such as bed and breakfasts. As Picca and Feagin (2007) suggest, the frontstage (public) and backstage (private) arenas provide different rules regarding discriminatory practices. There are a number of possible reasons why this might be the case. Discrimination in private settings might be more difficult to identify and prosecute. In addition, people believe that they have more freedom to exercise their preferences and to reserve right of admission – even on racial grounds – in private contexts (Lemon and Clifford 2005). Many South African whites feel forced to integrate at work, schools and neighbourhoods, but feel free to exercise racially exclusive associations at home or when they are relaxing on holiday (Durrheim and Dixon 2005).

The 2010 study examined whether social class played a role in racial discrimination. Would a black person from a rural educational context who spoke heavily accented English be treated differently to a black person who spoke English ‘well’, having been educated in an English medium Model C school? Political transformation has produced deracialization of the upper class or elite in South Africa (Seekings and Natrass 2006); many whites say that they are prepared to associate with middle class black people who they
believe are ‘becoming just like us’ in norms and standards (Sharp 1998:247, Durrheim and Dixon 2005); and the race of welfare participants has very little effect on whites’ beliefs about their deservingness (Seekings 2008). Additionally, this class-based preference system appears to be at work in institutions such as schools and universities, where the historically privileged institutions are more integrated than the historically disadvantaged institutions (Soudien 2004). We had thus expected that preferences for integration in holiday accommodation would also be class-based, and were greatly surprised to find no class effect. Approximately one quarter of black callers were denied holiday accommodation on strictly racial grounds.

Why do such high levels of racial discrimination persist in South Africa today? Lemon and Clifford (2005) argue that the area of the South Coast has been predominantly white owned; and our auditors estimated that over 97% of the people they spoke to were whites. One possible reason for the discrimination is the desire among these whites to preserve the character of the South Coast as a white enclave in a rapidly integrating South Africa. Yinger (1998b, DeFina and Hannon 2008) suggests that whites in the US often oppose racial integration in an effort to preserve the middle class/upper class status of neighbourhoods. In our study, class seemed not to matter, so the motive for discrimination may be the maintenance of racially exclusive spaces.

A second possibility is that people who discriminated against black callers are incorrigible racists who dislike black people and will act accordingly when they have the opportunity. These need not necessarily be old-fashioned racists who publicly acknowledge their racism. They might deny racism while acting in ways that have become so habitual and routine that they are unable to discern their racist intentions. According to Dovidio and Gaertner (2004), deep-seated aversive racism will be manifest in situations such as those we studied, where discrimination against individual black callers is undetectable or not readily apparent as racist.

A third possible explanation of discrimination might rule out racist motives altogether. It is possible that the owners or managers of the establishments who discriminated against black callers are not racist and do not want to preserve the South Coast as a white enclave, but they act as ‘gate keepers’ for their clientele (cf Martin and Durrheim 2006), believing that other patrons are either racist or prefer racially segregated spaces. Even though this belief might be wrong – with neither the owners/managers or patrons having racial preferences – it might still be the basis for discrimination.
Here we have a situation in which no one is racist but gate keepers discriminate on racial grounds because the persistence of discrimination and segregation leads them to believe that others are racist.

Whatever the reasons for the discrimination, it results in personal and collective ‘race trouble’ (Durrheim et al 2011). Although black South Africans may seldom be victims of overt acts of racial hatred or discrimination today, they frequently come away from situations in which they suspect that they have been victims of discrimination. In the US context, Feagin (1991) showed how routine encounters of this kind produced conflict for black people who remained hyper-vigilant for racism and yet needed to discount instances to avoid being overly sensitive and seeing racism where it was not. The shared experience of such persistent and yet undetectable racism among black people leads to distrust of whites, insecure citizenship, and instability in South African society as a whole.

Although great strides have been made to eliminate racial discrimination in South Africa, our data suggest that more work is needed. The data do not allow us to say how widespread such discrimination is, but media reports suggest that race trouble is endemic in post-apartheid society. Our data show how common the practice of discrimination is in white social and spatial enclaves, but more research – including qualitative research – is needed to investigate its existence in other domains of society and to understand its causal dynamics and effects. In this way, we will be able to generate legislation and policy that will root out the remaining vestiges of racism that continues to blight South African society.

**Notes**

1. Chi-square analysis is used to determine whether the frequency of events is associated with one or more sets of categories. In this test we wanted to know whether the black and white auditors received proportionally fewer or more discriminatory responses when they called second rather than first. The $\chi^2$ statistic is a measure of the goodness of fit between the observed frequencies and what would be expected if the variables were independent. Since the p-value is > than the conventional limit of .05, we conclude that there are no statistically significant differences between observed and expected frequencies.

2. Logistic regression predicts group membership (discriminatory versus non-discriminatory response) in a multiple regression model, where the predictor variables are a mix of continuous and categorical variables and/or if they are not normally distributed (Howell, 2002).
3. The F-statistic is an estimate of how much the group means differ in comparison with random error variance in an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Large F-Ratios are likely to indicate significant differences in the group means as identified by p-values smaller than .05. \( \chi^2 \) is a measure of effect size and can be interpreted as the proportion of variance in the dependent variable that is attributable to differences between groups.

4. Log linear analysis is an extension of chi-square analysis that is used to evaluate multi-way frequency tables that involve 3 or more variables. Log linear analysis was used to determine whether the frequency of discriminatory responses was affected by the type, price or place of accommodation and the class of the auditor.

5. Log linear analysis proceeds in stages. First, K-way analysis is conducted to determine which orders of effects are significant. K is the number of variables in the analysis; the 1-way affects are the main effects, the 2-way effects are the interactions between two variable, and the 3-way effects are the higher order interactions between the variables.

6. A partial association is an association between two or more variables that has the influence of other variables removed. For example, the first 2-way effect in Table 4, Discrimination*type, has the influence of place and price removed.
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