
Ethnicity and Perceived Discrimination in Toronto: Another Look at the Personal/Group Discrimination Discrepancy

KENNETH L. DION and KERRY KAWAKAMI, University of Toronto

Abstract

Perceptions of personal and group discrimination in five domains (jobs, pay, loans, promotions, and clubs) were investigated using the 1992 Minority Survey, which consisted of telephone interviews with 902 respondents from different ethnic groups in Toronto. The reported analyses concern six ethnic groups, representing "visible," racial minorities (Blacks, Chinese, and South Asians) as well as white minorities (Italians, Jews, and Portuguese). The personal/group discrimination discrepancy (PGDD) – i.e., perceiving greater discrimination toward one's group than oneself personally – was observed to varying extent across all domains and ethnic groups, though with some exceptions. Visible minorities perceived greater discrimination toward their group than did white minorities, especially in the economic domains of jobs, pay, and promotions. Among visible minorities, Black respondents perceived higher levels of group and personal discrimination than most other ethnic groups across domains, followed in turn by Chinese and South Asian respondents. By contrast, white minority group members perceived considerably less group or personal discrimination than members of visible minorities, except for Jewish respondents who reported greater group discrimination in joining clubs than any other ethnic group. Implications for Toronto and Canadian society, along with a critical analysis of the PGDD phenomenon, are discussed.

Résumé

Les perceptions en matière de discriminations personnelles et de groupe dans cinq domaines (emploi, rémunération, prêt, promotion et clubs) ont été examinées à partir d'une enquête sur les minorités réalisée en 1992, laquelle consistait en des entrevues téléphoniques effectuées auprès de 902 répondants de différents groupes ethniques de Toronto. Le rapport d'analyse porte sur six groupes ethniques, représentant des minorités raciales «visibles» (comprenant des Noirs, des Chinois et des Asiatiques du sud) ainsi que des minorités blanches (comprenant des

Italiens, des Juifs et des Portugais). Les différences entre la discrimination personnelle et la discrimination de groupe — c'est-à-dire percevoir une plus grande discrimination envers son groupe qu'envers soi-même personnellement — ont été observées à différents degrés dans tous les domaines et pour tous les groupes ethniques, à quelques exceptions près. Les minorités visibles percevaient une plus grande discrimination envers leur groupe que les minorités blanches, particulièrement dans les domaines de l'emploi, de la rémunération et des promotions. Parmi les minorités visibles, les répondants noirs percevaient davantage de discrimination personnelle et de groupe dans tous les domaines que la plupart des autres groupes ethniques, suivis des répondants chinois et asiatiques du sud. Par contraste, les membres de groupes minoritaires blancs percevaient considérablement moins de discrimination personnelle et de groupe que les membres de minorités visibles, exception faite des répondants juifs reportant une discrimination de groupe plus grande que tout autre groupe ethnique lors d'adhésion à des clubs. Les mesures à prendre de la part des sociétés torontoises et canadiennes, ainsi qu'une analyse critique du phénomène des différences entre la discrimination personnelle et la discrimination de groupe, sont présentement à l'étude.

Toronto occupies a unique place in Canada, being its largest and most populous city, as well as its principal centre for immigrants and ethnic groups. As of 1991, it had the largest immigrant population of any census metropolitan area in Canada, with over 1.5 million immigrants accounting for 38% of its population (Badets, 1993). Moreover, Toronto is an ethnically and racially diverse city, with many different ethnic communities represented within its population. Ruprecht (1990), for example, has provided synopses of the settlement and development of more than 60 different ethnocultural communities in Toronto.

The question of how successfully these diverse ethnic and immigrant groups are incorporated into the fabric of

life in Toronto is obviously important for them and for Canadian society. One way to gauge the success of their "incorporation" is to assess and compare the extent to which members of different ethnic groups *perceive* themselves to be discriminated against in various spheres of life (Breton, Isajiw, Kalbach & Reitz, 1990). Whether such perceptions can be taken as the "real" or actual amount of discrimination experienced by different ethnic groups and their members is controversial and presently difficult, if not impossible, to answer. Perceptions of discrimination do, nevertheless, represent an important psychological reality for immigrants and ethnic minority group members, regardless of their status or adequacy as social indicators of "actual" discrimination or intolerance.

Several comparative surveys of Toronto's ethnic groups have been conducted at various times from the late 1970s to the early 1990s and have focussed, among other things, on perceived problems of incorporation and/or perceptions of discrimination within different ethnic groups. A team of sociologists at the University of Toronto, for example, surveyed over 2300 respondents from eight ethnic groups in 1977-1978 (Breton et al., 1990). Within this team, Breton (1990) compared perceptions of incorporation among seven of these groups: viz., Chinese, Germans, Italians, Portuguese, Jews, Ukrainians, and West Indians (i.e., Blacks). In the late 1970s, German and Ukrainian respondents considered themselves well incorporated in Toronto by virtue of the high social acceptance and low discrimination they perceived to be directed toward them by majority Canadians there. Italian and Portuguese respondents were intermediate in their perceived level of incorporation. By contrast, Chinese and West Indian respondents reported considerable problems of incorporation in the economic, political, and social spheres of life in Toronto. On the other hand, Jewish respondents showed a variable pattern, feeling highly incorporated in economic and political spheres, but not the social one.

In a similar vein, Dion (1989) analyzed and reported the results from a Minority Report Survey commissioned by the *Toronto Star* newspaper and conducted by Goldfarb Consultants in 1985, involving 1200 telephone interviews with members of six different ethnic groups in Toronto: Chinese, East Indians, Italians, Jews, Portuguese, and West Indians. Among other things, this survey assessed whether or not respondents perceived discrimination as being aimed at their ethnic group, as well as perceived discrimination in a wide variety of specific contexts, including obtaining work, getting skilled and unskilled jobs, attaining executive positions in business, wage rates paid, obtaining government jobs, obtaining management positions in government, and being considered for promotion or advancement.

Dion (1989) found a considerable divergence between

"visible" racial minorities and white, ethnic minorities in Toronto, with the former reporting considerable perceived discrimination and prejudice, as well as little perceived opportunity and little courtesy and respect toward their groups. Among "visible" minority groups, East Indian respondents were the most consistent in perceiving prejudicial and discriminatory treatment, followed closely by West Indian respondents, and to a lesser extent, Chinese respondents. In marked contrast, Portuguese and Italian respondents perceived little or no prejudice or discrimination toward their groups and were satisfied with opportunities and the level of courtesy and respect that they received in most walks of life in Toronto. Jewish respondents perceived prejudice toward their group but were otherwise satisfied with life in Toronto.

In early 1992, the *Toronto Star* commissioned a second Minority Survey involving 902 respondents from six different ethnic groups in Toronto, who participated in a telephone interview survey conducted, once again, under the auspices of Goldfarb Consultants. Results from this survey were presented in a series of Sunday edition articles of the *Toronto Star* during the fall of 1992, in which each ethnic group in turn was highlighted, preceded by an overall summary of the survey in the inaugural edition of the series.

The 1992 Minority Survey asked respondents, among other things, whether or not they thought there was discrimination toward their ethnic group in each of a series of domains (i.e., group discrimination), as well as whether or not they themselves had ever experienced discrimination in some of the same domains (i.e., personal discrimination). Although the survey was not conducted with this particular purpose in mind, its inclusion of personal and group discrimination measures nevertheless permitted us to explore a phenomenon Taylor and his colleagues have recently dubbed the "personal/group discrimination discrepancy" (hereafter PGDD) phenomenon.

In the seminal article first describing this phenomenon, Taylor, Wright, Moghaddam, and Lalonde (1990) asked Haitian and East Indian women in Montreal to indicate their confidence that their group in general (i.e., Haitian and Indian women), as well as they personally, had been discriminated against by virtue of their race, culture, status as newcomers to Canada, and sex, respectively. With one exception (viz., perceived discrimination on the basis of sex by East Indian women), female respondents from both of these immigrant groups in Montreal reportedly perceived greater discrimination toward their group than toward themselves personally across each of the four potential sources of discrimination.

In a subsequent review, Taylor, Wright, and Porter

(1994) presented evidence from this and other research to argue that the PGDD is a "robust" phenomenon of considerable theoretical and social significance. For example, they noted that the PGDD does not depend on the specific wording of the questions, or whether the questions concern the frequency, severity, or existence of discrimination. Taylor et al. (1994) also claimed considerable generality for the PGDD across a number of groups who have likely varied in their exposure to discrimination.

The PGDD phenomenon does indeed appear to be robust and well established by Taylor and his colleagues, as well as by other investigators who preceded them (e.g., Crosby, 1982; Crosby, Pufall, Snyder, O'Connell & Whalen, 1989) in researching this effect. Yet, there is still merit in exploring the boundary conditions of the PGDD phenomenon and raising critical questions about its nature and significance. Our confidence in the reliability and validity of the PGDD phenomenon, as well as our understanding of its significance, increases with independent demonstrations and explorations of it by researchers working with diverse groups in varying urban and national contexts.

In most published studies of the PGDD, the measures of perceived discrimination have often been quite abstract and general, with little or no specification of the context or domain of perceived discrimination. For example, in Taylor et al. (1990), respondents indicated their confidence that their group and themselves had been discriminated against on the basis of race, culture, newcomer status, or sex. However, neither the domain nor context (e.g., employment, neighbourhood, etc.), or the type of perceived discrimination (other than its suspected basis, such as race or gender), was specified for the respondent. Nor was the respondent asked to specify the domain or type of discrimination or to describe the incidents of perceived discrimination.

That the context and domain of discrimination are important, if not crucial, to understanding the PGDD phenomenon is indicated by Ruggiero and Taylor's (1994) thought-provoking study, which used a protocol analysis for women's thoughts of their experience(s) of discrimination on the basis of sex while completing measures of personal and group discrimination. Separate samples of university and working women, respectively, were found to be attending to very different numbers and types of domains when rating group and personal discrimination, respectively. Indeed, 40-50% of the respondents in each of the two samples of women could recall no incidents of personal discrimination. Moreover, the strength of the PGDD phenomenon was partly dependent on these women (a) attending to different discrimination domains when rating personal and group discrimination, and (b) thinking of more domains for group than for personal discrimination. The PGDD phe-

nomenon was considerably weaker when women reported thinking about the same domain, and the same number of domains, when rating their perceptions of personal and group discrimination.

If the strength of the PGDD effect varies systematically with the nature and number of domains the respondent has in mind when completing the personal and group discrimination measures, it is important that the domains be specified for the respondent. Studies of ethnic groups with the domain of discrimination unspecified (e.g., Taylor et al., 1990) may not properly estimate the strength of the PGDD phenomenon. An advantage of the 1992 Minority Survey in Toronto mentioned above is that respondents completed measures of personal and group discrimination where the domain was the same or sufficiently similar so that they could be meaningfully, or at least plausibly, compared. As a consequence, we are in a good position to estimate its strength among different ethnic groups in an urban, English-Canadian context.

Another strength of Toronto's Minority Survey is that a larger number of ethnic groups was compared in a single investigation than has typified previous studies of the PGDD phenomenon or most social psychological studies of perceived discrimination. Moreover, we have multiple instances of two different, but important, types of non-majority ethnic groups: "visible minorities" (viz., Blacks, Chinese, and South Asians) and "white minority" groups (viz., Italians, Jews, and Portuguese). With several instances of each ethnic group type, findings consistent across the type cannot be as easily attributed to idiosyncratic features of a given ethnic group, as may happen when only one or two ethnic groups comprise the sample(s) under consideration.

METHOD

Ethnic and Demographic Composition of the Sample

As mentioned above, the 1992 Minority Survey included 902 respondents in all, representing six ethnic groups. Specifically, it included 152 Italians and 150 persons from each of the other five ethnic groups in the survey: i.e., Blacks, Chinese, South Asians, Jews, and Portuguese), respectively.¹

1 Two ethnic groups, Blacks and South Asians, were aggregates created by pooling respondents from two or more subcategories comprising its larger community in Toronto. The South Asian group consisted of respondents from East Indian ($n = 75$) and Pakistani ($n = 75$) ethnic affiliations. The Black group was composed of respondents from four subgroups: Jamaican ($n = 47$), Trinidadian ($n = 22$), African Black ($n = 22$), and West Indian, Caribbean, or other Black ($n = 59$). Preliminary analyses within each of these aggregates yielded evidence of some subcategory differences, especially within the South Asian group. In general, East Indians reported stronger perceptions of discrimination than did Pakistanis. However, these subcategory differences are not considered in the present paper in order to keep the complexity of

Apart from ethnic background, women and men were about equally represented in the Minority Survey sample overall (50.1 vs 49.9% respectively), as well as within each ethnic group. Fifty-eight percent of respondents were employed full time; 14% of respondents had part-time employment; and 28% did not specify their employment status when asked. Finally, in terms of religious affiliation, 38.6% were Catholic; 14.5%, Jewish; 13.5%, Other; 11.8%, Muslim; 6.4%, Protestant; 4.8%, Hindu; and smaller percentages for other religions.

Measures of Perceived Discrimination

Group discrimination. The measures of group discrimination always preceded those for personal discrimination in the survey.² For group discrimination, respondents were asked: "Do you think _____ are or are not discriminated against in the following areas?" In the blank space, the interviewer specified the name of the ethnic group to which the respondent had previously reported belonging. Following this stem, specific domains were indicated, five of which were common to both group and personal discrimination. For group discrimination, these five common domains of interest were: (1) "Obtaining work," (2) "In the wage rates paid," (3) "Joining clubs," (4) "Obtaining loans, credit," and (5) "In being considered for promotion or advancement." For these (and the other) domains, respondents had two response options: "Are discriminated against" (scored 1) and "Are not discriminated against" (scored 2).

Personal discrimination. Respondents were subsequently asked: "Have you ever experienced discrimination against you in ...?" Following the stem of the question, five domains were specified in turn: "Trying to find work," "Being passed over for a raise or advancement," "The wage rate you were paid being less than what others doing the same work were paid," "Trying to obtain a loan or credit," and "Trying to join a club or organization." For each domain, respondents were asked to indicate either "Yes" (scored 1) or "No" (scored 2).

Re-scoring. In order to make these measures more easily understandable and interpretable, the original scoring for the measures of group and personal discrimination was reversed by subtracting them from 2. As a result, "perceived discrimination" scores varied between

the results within bounds and also to avoid statistical problems from the marked nonorthogonality that would have been introduced in the design.

2 Taylor et al. (1990) employed a fixed order and assessed personal discrimination before group discrimination. On the other hand, Ruggiero and Taylor (1994) counterbalanced order and reported no effects of varying the order of personal versus group discrimination in either of two studies. Therefore, order of measurement does not appear to influence the PGDD phenomenon.

0 and 1, with higher scores now reflecting greater perceived discrimination.

This re-scoring also indicates readily to the reader the proportion of respondents from each ethnic group who reported group and personal discrimination in a given domain. Examples from Table 1 will help to illustrate the point. The score of 0.78 for Black respondents in regard to group discrimination in jobs means that 78% of respondents from that ethnic background believed their group was discriminated against in the domain of jobs. Similarly, the score of 0.02 for Portuguese respondents in regard to personal discrimination vis-à-vis clubs means that only 2% of the respondents from this ethnic group believed they had experienced personal discrimination in joining clubs.

RESULTS

Dependent Measures and Analyses

As noted above, the dependent measures were the five domains common to the group and personal discrimination measures: jobs, pay, loans, promotions, and clubs. These dependent measures were analyzed by means of PROC GLM in the Statistical Analysis System (SAS), with all *F* values reported below being from Type III tests. The design was a 2 (Sex) × 6 (Ethnicity) × 2 (Referent) repeated measures ANOVA, in which sex and ethnicity of respondent were "between variables," and referent (i.e., personal vs group), a "within" variable.³ The levels of the ethnicity variable corresponded to the six ethnic groups: i.e., Blacks, Chinese, South Asians, Italians, Jews, and Portuguese.

The overall sample sizes for these analyses were reduced because some respondents were nonresponsive to the personal or group discrimination questions, or both, in a given domain. The overall sample size for each domain was as follows: Jobs (*n* = 841), pay (*n* = 836), loans (*n* = 814), promotions (*n* = 828), and clubs (*n* = 794). Owing to this missing data, *dfs* for denominators of *F* values varied across the dependent measures.

The analyses yielded no significant main effects for sex of respondent. By contrast, the main effect for ethnicity

3 The dichotomous nature of the dependent measures clearly violates assumptions of repeated measures ANOVA. Some statistical sources (Lunney, 1970; Winer, 1971) suggest that certain ANOVA procedures, such as a completely randomized design or a single-factor repeated measures design, are applicable to dichotomous data, provided the *dfs* are large (i.e., the sample size is large), the design is balanced, and the proportions not extreme (e.g., between 0.25 to 0.75). Although the present dataset incorporated a large sample size and limited nonorthogonality, it is unknown what biases are introduced in the results when a "mixed" repeated measures ANOVA with slightly unequal cell frequencies is performed on dichotomous data. We thank the issue editors for the preceding (and other) statistical references on this issue.

TABLE 1
Perceptions of Group and Personal Discrimination as a Function of Ethnic Group and Domain

Ethnic Group	Domain									
	Jobs		Pay		Loans		Promotion		Clubs	
	GD	PD	GD	PD	GD	PD	GD	PD	GD	PD
Black	0.78 ^a	0.41 ^a	0.46 ^a	0.19 ^a	0.38 ^a	0.15 ^a	0.65 ^a	0.26 ^a	0.53 ^a	0.14 ^a
Chinese	0.53 ^b	0.22 ^{bc}	0.33 ^a	0.12 ^{ab}	0.04 ^b	0.02 ^b	0.57 ^{ab}	0.16 ^{ab}	0.27 ^b	0.06 ^{ab}
South Asian	0.51 ^b	0.29 ^{ab}	0.34 ^a	0.15 ^{ab}	0.10 ^b	0.03 ^b	0.49 ^b	0.25 ^a	0.31 ^b	0.04 ^a
Italian	0.16 ^d	0.10 ^{cd}	0.09 ^b	0.07 ^b	0.03 ^b	0.01 ^b	0.15 ^{cd}	0.10 ^b	0.17 ^{bc}	0.03 ^b
Jewish	0.33 ^c	0.19 ^{bc}	0.06 ^b	0.05 ^b	0.03 ^b	0.00 ^b	0.30 ^c	0.07 ^b	0.63 ^a	0.14 ^a
Portuguese	0.15 ^d	0.05 ^d	0.19 ^b	0.06 ^b	0.08 ^b	0.01 ^b	0.09 ^d	0.07 ^b	0.09 ^c	0.02 ^b

Note. Higher scores reflect greater perceived discrimination. For each column, means that do not share a common letter in their superscripts differ from one another at the $p < .05$ level. GD and PD refer to group and personal discrimination, respectively.

was significant for each of the five dependent measures, $F(5,782-829) = 20.20$ to 44.13 , all $ps < .001$. Likewise, the referent main effect was also significant for each dependent measure, $F(1,782-829) = 64.24$ to 177.88 , all $ps < .001$. Invariably, respondents perceived greater discrimination for their ethnic group than for themselves personally.

Ethnicity x Referent Interactions

However, the preceding main effects for ethnicity and referent were qualified by significant interactions between ethnicity and referent on each of the dependent measures: $F(5, 829) = 8.29$ for jobs; $F(5,824) = 8.43$ for pay; $F(5,802) = 11.56$ for loans; and $F(5,816) = 16.44$ for promotions; $F(5,782) = 19.43$ for clubs; all $ps < .01$. The means underlying these interaction effects are presented in Table 1.

Personal vs. Group Discrimination

Tests of the simple effects underlying these Ethnicity x Referent interactions included both "within" and "between" contrasts. The "within" contrasts compare perceptions of personal vs group discrimination for members of each ethnic group, respectively, on each of the five measures. On two measures, jobs and clubs, respondents from each of the six ethnic groups in the Minority Survey reported a personal-group discrepancy, indicating stronger perceptions of group discrimination than personal discrimination.

Some exceptions to the personal-group discrimination discrepancy, however, were found on the other three measures. As shown in Table 1, Italians failed to report a discrepancy between personal and group discrimination on either pay, loans, or promotions. Other ethnic groups likewise failed to report a discrepancy in personal vs group discrimination in certain regards: Jewish respondents as regards pay, Portuguese respondents concerning promotions, and Chinese respondents in regard to loans.

[A three-way interaction on the pay measure, presented below, indicates other categories of respondents defined by both sex and ethnicity, who perceived no discrepancy between personal and group discrimination in pay. See Table 4 and the discussion of this higher-order interaction effect in the text below.]

Ethnic Group Comparisons

Tukey multiple range tests were performed to compare the six ethnic groups to one another as regards their perceptions of personal and group discrimination, respectively, in each domain. The results of these ethnic group comparisons are presented in the columns of Table 1 and described below.

Jobs. Black respondents perceived more group discrimination in jobs than any other ethnic group. Chinese and South Asian respondents perceived more group discrimination in jobs than Italian, Jewish, or Portuguese respondents. Jewish respondents perceived more group discrimination in jobs than either Italian or Portuguese respondents.

Black respondents also perceived more personal discrimination in jobs than respondents of any other ethnic group except South Asians. South Asian respondents perceived more personal discrimination in jobs than Italian or Portuguese respondents. Finally, Chinese and Jewish respondents perceived greater personal discrimination in jobs than Portuguese respondents.

Pay. Black, Chinese, and South Asian respondents perceived greater group discrimination in pay than Italian, Jewish, or Portuguese respondents. Black respondents also perceived greater personal discrimination in pay than Italian, Jewish, or Portuguese respondents.

Loans. Black respondents perceived greater group and personal discrimination in getting loans than respondents of any other ethnic group.

Promotions. Black, Chinese, and South Asian respon-

TABLE 2
Perceptions of Discrimination in Loans as a Function of Ethnicity and Sex of Respondent

Ethnicity	Sex of Respondent	
	Female	Male
Black	0.19	0.32
Chinese	0.03	0.04
South Asian	0.08	0.05
Italian	0.04	0.01
Jewish	0.02	0.01
Portuguese	0.07	0.03

Note. Higher scores reflect *greater* perceived discrimination.

dents perceived greater group discrimination in getting promotions than either Italian, Jewish, or Portuguese respondents. Black respondents also perceived greater group discrimination in promotions than South Asian respondents. Similarly, Jewish respondents perceived greater group discrimination in promotions than Portuguese respondents. Black and South Asian respondents perceived greater personal discrimination in receiving promotions than Italian, Jewish, or Portuguese respondents.

Clubs. Black and Jewish respondents perceived (a) more group discrimination in joining clubs than either Chinese, South Asian, Italian, or Portuguese respondents and (b) more personal discrimination in joining clubs than Italian or Portuguese respondents. Chinese and South Asian respondents perceived more group discrimination in joining clubs than Portuguese respondents.

Interactions with Sex

The main analyses also yielded several interactions involving sex of respondent on different measures. For example, an interaction between ethnicity and sex was obtained on the loans measure, $F(5,802) = 3.30, p < .01$. Means underlying this interaction are presented in Table 2. Tests of the simple effects indicated that Black respondents were the principal ethnic group underlying this effect. Among Black respondents but no other ethnic group, women perceived less discrimination in getting loans than did men. Among women and men, respectively, Black respondents perceived greater discrimination in obtaining loans than their own-sex counterparts in any other ethnic group.

We also obtained an interaction between sex and referent on the jobs measure, $F(1,829) = 6.52, p < .01$. Means underlying the Sex \times Referent interaction are presented in Table 3. Simple effects tests yielded several significant pair comparisons. Both women and men perceived more group than personal discrimination in

TABLE 3
Perceptions of Discrimination in Jobs as a Function of Sex of Respondent and Referent

Sex of Respondent	Referent	
	Group	Personal
Female	0.41	0.17
Male	0.40	0.25

Note. Higher scores reflect *greater* perceived discrimination.

getting jobs. However, women perceived less personal discrimination in getting jobs than men.

Finally, a Sex \times Ethnicity \times Referent interaction was obtained on the pay measure, $F(5,824) = 3.04, p = .01$. Means underlying this interaction are presented in Table 4. Tests of the simple effects yielded a number of significant comparisons. As suggested in Table 4, Black, Chinese, and South Asian respondents of both sexes, as well as Portuguese women, perceived less personal discrimination in pay than group discrimination. By contrast, Italian and Jewish respondents of both sexes, and Portuguese men, perceived no differences in personal and group discrimination in pay.

Consider next the "between" contrasts underlying the three-way interaction on pay. One type of contrast concerns sex differences in personal and group discrimination as regards pay, of which only one emerged: Among Portuguese respondents, men perceived less group discrimination in pay than women.

Another "between" contrast involves comparing ethnic group differences for women and men, respectively. Consider first ethnic differences among men on the pay measure. Black and South Asian men, respectively, perceived more group and personal discrimination in pay than did Italian, Jewish, or Portuguese men. Chinese men perceived more group discrimination in pay than either Italian, Jewish, or Portuguese men. Consider next ethnic differences among women on the pay measure, which occurred exclusively on perceptions of *group* discrimination. Black women perceived greater group discrimination in pay than women of any other ethnic group. Chinese and South Asian women, respectively, perceived more group discrimination in pay than Italian or Jewish women.

DISCUSSION

The preceding findings provide important insights into two issues raised at the outset in the introduction: (a) the personal/group discrimination discrepancy, and (b) ethnicity and perceived discrimination among several "visible minority" and "white minority" groups in Toronto. Let us consider each issue in turn.

The Personal/Group Discrimination Discrepancy (PGDD)

The PGDD phenomenon was observed to a varying extent in all six ethnic groups in some or all of the five domains explored in the present research. In the domains of jobs and clubs, respondents from all six ethnic groups exhibited a PGDD, such that they reported stronger perceptions of discrimination for their group than themselves personally. In particular, Black and South Asian respondents consistently exhibited the PGDD across all five measures reflecting economic and social domains. Moreover, the PGDD for visible minority groups was generally greater than the PGDD for white minority groups. These findings add to the growing literature on the PGDD phenomenon by demonstrating it with a broad array of ethnic groups in Toronto.

However, some exceptions arose, in which respondents did *not* perceive a discrepancy between personal and group discrimination in one or more domains. Two ethnic groups (*viz.*, Chinese and Italians) failed to perceive a PGDD in regard to loans. Italian and Jewish respondents of both sexes, as well as Portuguese men, perceived no difference in personal and group discrimination on the important, economic issue of pay. Also, Italian and Portuguese respondents failed to perceive a PGDD in the promotions domain.

The preceding exceptions to the PGDD are perhaps notable because it often takes a relatively small difference between perceptions of personal and group discrimination to yield a statistically significant effect. In the preceding analyses, a pair of means generally had to differ by only 0.04 or 0.05, or even as little as 0.031, to exceed the critical value. Much of the robustness and apparent ubiquity of the PGDD undoubtedly stems from the fact that, by its definition, it is a within-subjects variable assessed in the context of statistically powerful and sensitive, repeated measures designs.

Still, for advocates of the PGDD phenomenon, it is probably desirable that there are exceptions to it. For the most part, exceptions in the present dataset occurred for groups in Toronto with a history of reporting little or no discrimination toward them: specifically, white minorities such as Italians and Portuguese (Dion, 1989; also see introduction). The PGDD phenomenon should perhaps not be invariant across groups. One would expect that groups that are more frequently the object of discrimination in a society would be more likely to show the PGDD, or to manifest it more strongly, than groups who reportedly perceive or experience discrimination rarely, if at all.⁴ Likewise, on logical grounds, members of ethnic groups with little or no history or experience of discrimination

⁴ Indeed, the PGDD for the visible minority groups was significantly greater than that for the white minority groups in the economic domains of jobs and pay.

should be unlikely to exhibit the PGDD, given a presumably low likelihood of both personal and group discrimination.

Though no one, to our knowledge, has yet done so, it is arguably a high priority to assess whether the PGDD correlates with and predicts criteria of importance, such as protest reactions, militancy, and/or desires to take corrective action.⁵ The PGDD may *not* be an especially reliable predictor of important criteria that some researchers may have in mind. It is, after all, a measure of "egoistic relative deprivation" (or more accurately, egoistic relative *gratification* since respondents typically perceive less personal than group discrimination), in which the respondent compares her or his situation on some dimension to that for their own group. This is not altogether surprising since the PGDD (although not termed that at the time) was first observed in Crosby's (1982) survey research on working women, aimed at testing different theoretical models of egoistic relative deprivation.⁶

Relative deprivation theory assumes that feelings of deprivation or discrimination depend upon whom the individual compares their personal or group's situation (see Dion, 1986). The focus of comparison, whether individual or group, defines two types of relative deprivation – egoistic and fraternalistic – as depicted in Table 5. Egoistic relative deprivation occurs when an individual feels deprived relative to others in their own group (or ingroup) (cell B in Table 5). For example, a woman who feels she has been more deprived or discriminated against, relative to other women as a group, would reflect egoistic relative deprivation. Fraternalistic relative deprivation is the second type and occurs when one's ingroup is perceived to be at a disadvantage relative to one or more other groups (or outgroups) (see cell C in Table 5). However, since the term 'fraternalistic' has a strong, masculine connotation that is arguably inappropriate for use with reference to women, we (Kawakami & Dion, 1993; 1995) and others (Foster & Matheson, 1995)

⁵ To be sure, a number of investigators have explored the social psychological correlates and consequences of perceived personal and group discrimination, respectively, beginning with the first author and his colleagues (for reviews of this work, see Dion, Earn & Yee, 1978; Dion, Dion & Pak, 1992) and followed by others (*e.g.*, Crocker, Voelkl, Testa & Major, 1991; Ruggiero & Taylor, 1995). In promoting the PGDD phenomenon, Taylor and his colleagues have emphasized the theoretical and practical importance of the *difference* or discrepancy between perceptions of personal and group discrimination. To our knowledge, no one has yet actually shown that the PGDD as a *difference score* correlates with relevant criteria over and above what would be predicted by the separate measures of personal and group discrimination or other combinations of these measures.

⁶ We are indebted to Patricia Arseneau for this point.

TABLE 4
Perceived Discrimination in Pay as a Function of Ethnicity, Sex, and Referent

Ethnicity	Sex	Group	Personal
Black	Female	0.49	0.16
Black	Male	0.43	0.21
Chinese	Female	0.27	0.16
Chinese	Male	0.38	0.09
South Asian	Female	0.28	0.12
South Asian	Male	0.40	0.18
Italian	Female	0.11	0.12
Italian	Male	0.07	0.03
Jewish	Female	0.07	0.06
Jewish	Male	0.04	0.04
Portuguese	Female	0.29	0.07
Portuguese	Male	0.09	0.04

Note. Higher values reflect *greater* discrimination.

have since used the term 'collectivistic' as a more gender-neutral and general label for referring to ingroup-outgroup comparisons in the context of relative deprivation theory.

By contrast, a person who feels that as an individual, s/he is personally less deprived or better off than other members of her or his group, would be in a state of egoistic relative gratification – a phenomenon identified for American working women by Crosby (1982). The PGDD phenomenon that Taylor et al. (1990) subsequently described in regard to perceived discrimination is, of course, another manifestation of egoistic relative gratification, in which an individual feels s/he is less likely to be discriminated against than her or his group.

Conceptually, the egoistic and collectivistic forms of relative deprivation or gratification can also be combined to define two further conditions. An individual experiencing both egoistic and collectivistic forms of relative deprivation is said to be "doubly deprived" (see cell D in Table 5), while a person experiencing both egoistic and collectivistic relative gratification is deemed to be "doubly gratified" (cell A in Table 5).

Since the early 1980s to the present, however, it has become increasingly clear that it is collectivistic rather than egoistic relative deprivation that correlates with, and predicts, socially significant criteria. Dion (1986), for example, reviewed the literature on responses to discrimination from the perspective of relative deprivation theory. He reviewed studies with diverse samples in several countries and showed the importance of perceived group discrimination and collectivistic relative deprivation for understanding reactions to perceived discrimination and inequalities in ethnic-racial relations (see Dion, 1986, pp. 167-174).

Subsequent research has strengthened his conclusion and demonstrated the greater efficacy of collectivistic

TABLE 5
Types of Relative Deprivation and Gratification

	Individual's Position in Ingroup	
	Satisfied	Unsatisfied
Satisfied	A Doubly Gratified	B Egoistic Relative Deprivation
Group's Position In Society		
Unsatisfied	C Fraternalistic or Collectivistic Relative Deprivation	D Doubly Deprived

over egoistic relative deprivation as a predictor of socially significant criteria reflecting unhappiness with the current state of affairs and/or a desire to take corrective remedial actions. Walker and Mann (1987) hypothesized and found that egoistic relative deprivation predicted the number of reported stress symptoms, while collectivistic relative deprivation measures predicted measures of protest better than egoistic relative deprivation, among unemployed Australians. Likewise, Dion and his colleagues have repeatedly found that measures of collectivistic relative deprivation consistently predict militant and protest reactions, while egoistic relative deprivation measures do not – whether one considers gays and lesbians (Birt & Dion, 1987), Chinese university students (Dion, 1992), or university women (Dion & Kawakami, 1996) in Toronto. Foster and Matheson (1995) showed that "double deprivation" (i.e., the combination of both egoistic and collectivistic relative deprivation) predicted collective action tendencies in university women "over and above" egoistic and collectivistic relative deprivation considered separately.

Without evidence of the PGDD's concurrent or predictive validity for socially significant criteria, the considerable research now being conducted by many different investigators to test explanations of it may be moot. By contrast, experience from research on relative deprivation theory would suggest that perceptions of *group* discrimination or "double deprivation," rather than differences between personal and group discrimination per se, will better predict socially significant criteria for oppressed, subordinate, and perhaps other groups.

Even if the PGDD does have predictive validity, it could be due mostly to perceptions of group discrimination and *not* the discrepancy between personal and group discrimination itself. For women and ethnic minority group members, respondents appear to have few, if any, personal encounters with arbitrary discrimination on the basis of sex or ethnicity, respectively. As noted earlier, Ruggiero and Taylor's (1994) studies of university and working women showed that 40-50% of them had

reported never personally experiencing discrimination on the basis of their sex, whereas most of their female respondents were considerably more aware of stereotyping, prejudice, and/or discrimination against women when completing the measures of perceived group discrimination. Likewise, white minorities in the present study had low levels of reported personal discrimination on the basis of ethnicity, with no more than 20% of the respondents in any group reportedly having personally experienced discrimination in any domain (see Table 1). Even for the visible, racial minorities, the percentages of respondents reporting a personal experience of discrimination in most domains were still low in absolute terms, never exceeding 50% (see Table 1). Viewed from this perspective, the PGDD phenomenon may simply reflect the fact that among women and ethnic groups, a majority of the respondents have little or no personal experience of discrimination but are more likely to be aware of negative views or actions aimed at their group.

With low rates or levels of perceived personal discrimination, the PGDD may largely reflect perceptions of group discrimination whose predictive power has already been demonstrated by previous researchers. As shown in Table 1, there was a greater range of percentages of respondents reporting group discrimination than was the case for personal discrimination. Indeed, of the 60 cell entries in Table 1, the seven cells in which a majority or more of the respondents reported perceiving discrimination were all instances of group discrimination, three of these in the jobs domain.

In sum, future research is needed to demonstrate the ability of the PGDD phenomenon to predict other socially significant criteria. It is also important to demonstrate that it is the *difference* between personal and group discrimination that is the basis of its concurrent or predictive validity rather than (a) perceived group discrimination, (b) the combination (e.g., the cross-product) of personal and group discrimination (i.e., "double deprivation"), or (c) collectivistic relative deprivation. With such demonstrations, the PGDD will indeed warrant being called a socially significant phenomenon.

Ethnicity and Perceived Discrimination in Toronto

Finally, let us consider the second, but equally (if not more) important, issue raised in the introduction. Our findings for perceived discrimination from the 1992 Minority Survey generally parallel conclusions of two similar, previous surveys of visible and white minority groups in Toronto (see Introduction), suggesting some degree of continuity and perhaps lack of progress across the past 20 years. Over this time period, different sample cohorts of visible racial minorities – Blacks, South Asians, and Chinese – have consistently perceived higher levels of discrimination, especially discrimination they believed

to be aimed at their group, relative to white minorities, such as Italians, Jews, and Portuguese. Among the visible minority groups in the 1992 survey, Black respondents perceived higher levels of discrimination, both group and personal discrimination, than most other ethnic groups across all five domains explored, followed in turn by Chinese and South Asians, who generally did not differ from one another.

By contrast, the three white minorities in this survey – Italians, Jews, and Portuguese – perceived less group or personal discrimination on any of the five domains, with one important exception. Reflecting a consistent pattern from three separate surveys conducted over the past 20 years, Jewish respondents in Toronto perceived considerable *social* discrimination at the group level, in the form of barriers to joining clubs in the present survey, and higher perceived levels of group discrimination in joining clubs than all other ethnic groups in the Minority Survey.

Finally, including sex of respondent as a separate, independent variable in the analyses along with ethnicity yielded several interaction effects involving sex. Of perhaps greatest interest, regardless of ethnic group, women perceived less personal discrimination in getting jobs than men. Sex of respondent also interacted with ethnicity in regard to perceived discrimination: (1) Black women perceived less discrimination in getting loans than Black men, and (2) Portuguese women perceived more group discrimination in pay than women from the other two white minorities (i.e., Italians and Jews).

In sum, *vis-à-vis* perceptions of ethnic discrimination, Toronto is a considerably different place depending on the ethnic group to which you belong. Among ethnic minority groups, it makes an enormous difference, in regard to perceived discrimination, whether one belongs to a visible, racial minority versus a white, ethnic minority. Members of visible, racial minorities perceived considerably greater discrimination aimed at their groups than did members of white minority groups. Berry and Kalin's (1995) representative 1991 national survey of 2500 respondents in Canada, showing that they preferred white, ethnic and immigrant groups of European origin (e.g., Italians, Jews, and Portuguese) over "visible," ethnic and immigrant groups (e.g., Chinese, West Indian Blacks, and Indo-Pakistanis), obviously complement these findings in Toronto. Moreover, the social discrimination consistently reported by Jewish respondents in three separate surveys of this ethnic community in Toronto over the past 20 years clearly warrants concern and attention. Being an ethnically diverse city represents both a challenge and an opportunity for Toronto.

Whether these findings generalize to these ethnic groups in other large urban centres in Canada is difficult to judge. The relation of an ethnic group to other ethnic communities and majority group members within a large

city is complex and can conceivably differ from one urban centre to another. Still, the experience of Toronto's Jewish community over two decades warrants attention to Jewish communities in other Canadian cities in regard to their members' experiences and perceptions of group and personal discrimination, especially in the social domain. Recent surveys of attitudes toward Jewish and other ethnic groups (Berry & Kalin, 1995; Sniderman, Northrup, Fletcher, Russell, & Tetlock, 1993) suggest that respondents of French origin, perhaps especially those in Québec, harbour more negative or less positive attitudes toward Jews than do those of other ethnic origins. Berry and Kalin (1995), for example, found that French-origin respondents had less positive attitudes toward Jews, Native Indians, and those of British ethnicity than did respondents of either British or other origin. Likewise, the findings of the present study as well as Berry and Kalin's (1995) national survey would suggest that visible, racial minorities in other urban centres of Canada would likewise perceive that they bear the brunt of group and personal discrimination in most domains, with Blacks perceiving that they confront the heaviest burden of intolerance, followed by South Asians (i.e., East Indians, Pakistanis, Sri Lankans, etc.) and East Asians (i.e., Chinese, Japanese, Koreans).

Kenneth L. Dion, Department of Psychology; Kerry Kawakami, Department of Psychology (now at the Department of Social Psychology, Catholic University of Nijmegen, Postbus 9104, 6500 HE Nijmegen, The Netherlands).

Preparation of this paper was facilitated by research grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, as well as Multiculturalism Canada, to the first author. Thanks are due to the *Toronto Star* and Goldfarb Consultants for granting the first author access to the 1992 Minority Survey dataset and also to Irek Celejewski, Angela Barbara and Maria Da Silva, respectively, for help with different facets of the analyses. We also acknowledge the helpful comments of Karen K. Dion, Special Issue Editors Victoria M. Esses and Robert C. Gardner, and reviewers John W. Berry and Donald M. Taylor on previous versions of this manuscript. Responsibility for the final version is, of course, ours alone.

Correspondence concerning this article should be directed to Kenneth L. Dion, who is at the Department of Psychology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5S 3G3. Electronic mail may be sent to: dionkl@psych.utoronto.ca.

References

- Badets, J. (1993, Summer). Canada's immigrants: Recent trends. *Canadian Social Trends*. Statistics Canada, Catalogue 11-008E.
- Berry, J.W., & Kalin, R. (1995). Multicultural and ethnic attitudes in Canada: An overview of the 1991 National Survey. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 27, 301-320.
- Birt, C.M., & Dion, K.L. (1987). Relative deprivation theory and responses to discrimination in a gay and lesbian sample. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 139-145.
- Breton, R. (1990). The ethnic group as a political resource in relation to problems of incorporation: Perceptions and attitudes. In R. Breton, W.W. Isajiw, W.E. Kalbach, & J.G. Reitz (Eds.), *Ethnic identity and equality: Varieties of experience in a Canadian city* (pp. 196-255). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Breton, R., Isajiw, W.W., Kalbach, W.E., & Reitz, J.G. (Eds.) (1990). *Ethnic identity and equality: Varieties of experience in a Canadian city*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Crocker, J., Voelkl, K., Testa, M., & Major, B. (1991). Social stigma: The affective consequences of attributional ambiguity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 218-228.
- Crosby, F.J. (1982). *Relative deprivation and working women*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Crosby, F.J., Pufall, A., Snyder, R.C., O'Connell, M., & Whalen, P. (1989). The denial of personal disadvantage among you, me, and all other ostriches. In M. Crawford & M. Gentry (Eds.), *Gender and thought: Psychological perspectives*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Dion, K.L. (1986). Responses to perceived discrimination and relative deprivation. In J. M. Olson, C. P. Herman, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *Relative deprivation and social comparison: The Ontario Symposium* (Vol. 4, pp. 159-179). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Dion, K.L. (1989, Oct.). *Ethnicity and perceived discrimination: A comparative survey of six ethnic groups in Toronto*. Paper presented at the 10th Biennial Conference of the Canadian Ethnic Studies Association, Calgary, Alberta.
- Dion, K.L. (1992, July). *Relative deprivation, perceived discrimination, and militancy*. Poster presented at the XXV International Congress of Psychology, Brussels, Belgium.
- Dion, K.L., Dion, K.K., & Pak, A.W.-p. (1992). Personality-based hardness as a buffer for discrimination-related stress in members of Toronto's Chinese community. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 24, 517-536.
- Dion, K.L., Earn, B.M., & Yee, P.H.N. (1978). The experience of being a victim of prejudice. *International Journal of Psychology*, 13, 197-214.
- Dion, K.L., & Kawakami, K.L. (1996, Aug.). *Predictors of militancy among women*. Symposium paper presented at the XXVI International Congress of Psychology, Montréal, Québec, Canada.

- Foster, M., & Matheson, K. (1995). Double relative deprivation: Combining the personal and the political. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 1167-1177.
- Kawakami, K., & Dion, K.L. (1993). The impact of salient self-identities on relative deprivation and action intentions. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 525-540.
- Kawakami, K., & Dion, K.L. (1995). Social identity and affect as determinants of collective action: Toward an integration of relative deprivation and social identity theories. *Theory & Psychology*, 5, 551-577.
- Lunney, G.H. (1970). Using analysis of variance with a dichotomous variable: An empirical study. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 4, 263-269.
- Ruggiero, K.M., & Taylor, D.M. (1994). The personal/group discrimination discrepancy: Women talk about their experiences. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24, 1806-1826.
- Ruggiero, K.M., & Taylor, D.M. (1995). Coping with discrimination: How disadvantaged group members perceive the discrimination that confronts them. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 826-838.
- Ruprecht, T. (1990). *Toronto's many faces*. Vancouver & Toronto: Whitecap Books Ltd.
- Sniderman, P., Northrup, D., Fletcher, J., Russell, P., & Tetlock, P. (1993). Psychological and cultural foundations of prejudice: The case of anti-Semitism in Québec. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 30, 242-270.
- Taylor, D.M., Wright, S.C., Moghaddam, F.M., & Lalonde, R.N. (1990). The personal/group discrepancy: Perceiving my group, but not myself, to be a target of discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 16, 254-262.
- Taylor, D.M., Wright, S.C., & Porter, L.E. (1994). Dimensions of perceived discrimination: The personal/group discrimination discrepancy. In M.P. Zanna & J.M. Olson (Eds.), *The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium* (Vol. 7, pp. 233-255). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Walker, I., & Mann, L. (1987). Unemployment, relative deprivation, and social protest. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 13, 275-283.
- Winer, B.J. (1971). *Statistical principles in experimental design* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.