

# Preferred Responses to Situations of Housing and Employment Discrimination<sup>1</sup>

RICHARD N. LALONDE,<sup>2</sup> SHILPI MAJUMDER, AND  
ROGER D. PARRIS  
*York University*

Two studies were conducted to assess behavioral preferences in response to situations of discrimination in the workplace and in housing. In the first study, 72 black Canadians read a scenario in which they were ultimately denied an apartment on the basis of their color. The degree of evidence of discrimination in the scenario had an effect on the preference for some of the behaviors examined. In addition, it was found that some of the behaviors (e.g., seeking advice) were clearly preferred to others (e.g., organizing a boycott). In the second study, 42 Bengali Canadians read a scenario in which they applied for a position for which they had the qualifications. After an interview and notification that the offer was made to a more qualified person, they found out that they did not get the position because of their visible minority status. The results indicate that self-directed responses to the situation (e.g., working harder) were preferred to a variety of overt actions taken within or outside the company. The results are discussed in terms of the process and problems of responding to discrimination.

Much of the research on discrimination has been couched within theories of prejudice, which usually focus on the perpetrators, rather than the victims, of discrimination. When targets of discrimination have been the subject of study, the focus has been on cognitive and affective responses (e.g., Dion & Earn, 1975), rather than on the range of actions they can take. The absence of research on the actions of victims of discrimination may be due in part to little theoretical development of the subject matter (Lalonde & Cameron, 1994). The purpose of the present studies was to examine the preferred active responses of victims of discrimination in typical and covert situations of discrimination; namely, exclusionary practices in housing and employment. There are two lines

<sup>1</sup>The research reported in this article was supported by a research grant to the first author from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. We would like to thank Regina Schuller and two anonymous reviewers for their comments on a previous version of this manuscript, and all of the research participants who kindly volunteered for our studies.

<sup>2</sup>Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Richard N. Lalonde, Department of Psychology, York University, 4700 Keele Street, North York, Ontario M3J 1P3, Canada.

of research that help frame our current understanding of such responses. One strategy has been to interview members of social groups that have experienced discrimination, while another line of work consists of laboratory studies that examine the responses of victims of social injustice. Each of these will be examined briefly in turn.

A very useful method for understanding the phenomenology of coping with racism and discrimination has proven to be qualitative interviews with blacks, primarily in the U.S. (Benjamin, 1991; Cose, 1993; Essed, 1991a; Feagin, 1991; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Lykes, 1983). When attempts have been made to categorize their coping responses (Essed, 1991a; Feagin, 1991; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Lykes, 1983), fairly broad categories are used, because of the heterogeneity in the experiences of the respondents. Feagin (1991), for example, interviewed a sample of middle-class blacks and observed that the two most typical responses to discrimination experienced in public accommodations were either a verbal response or a resigned acceptance.

The majority of laboratory studies examining the actions or behavioral intentions of victims of social injustice have been framed within social psychological theories of intergroup relations (Kawakami & Dion, 1993; Lalonde & Silverman, 1994; Wright, Taylor, & Moghaddam, 1990). In these studies, participants either experienced or read about similar situations of injustice (e.g., being refused entry into a group after demonstrating the necessary qualifications) and then rated the extent to which they endorsed a number of specific individual (e.g., asking for a reassessment of the decision) or collective actions (e.g., soliciting the support of others to petition the decision). A close examination of the data from these studies reveals a consistent preference for individual rather than collective actions.

Interview studies with victims of discrimination have identified broad categories of behavior that can be taken by individuals, but these are based on a variety of situations that are idiosyncratic to each of their respondents. They offer little insight into specific and preferred responses that are taken in common situations of discrimination. On the other hand, laboratory studies have examined very specific responses in homogeneous laboratory situations that are far removed from typical situations of discrimination. At this point in time, therefore, we know very little of overt responses that might be preferred in similar and typical situations.

The present paper will report two studies that assessed the behavioral preferences of individuals from "visible minority" groups in Canada when faced with color-based discrimination in housing and employment. The behaviors were taken from lists obtained from a study by Lalonde and Cameron (1994), who asked adults to imagine themselves in situations of housing and employment discrimination and to name the types of actions they could take.

---

One hypothesis common to both of the studies was that there would be a marked preference for individual compared to collective responses to situations of discrimination. This hypothesis was based in part on the results of the Lalonde and Cameron (1994) study, as well as the laboratory studies, reported earlier. From a theoretical perspective, situations of housing and employment discrimination tend to be rather interpersonal and often involve only two people (perpetrator and victim). According to Tajfel (1978), many interindividual encounters are more likely to be interpreted at an interpersonal rather than an intergroup level, and thus call for individual rather than collective responses. Furthermore, the reality facing individuals who experience employment and housing discrimination is that there are far more individual strategies to engage in than collective ones. It is not clear, however, whether some individual strategies would be preferred to others. A second question that was asked in the following studies, therefore, is "Which individual behaviors would 'visible minority' groups prefer when discriminated against?"

#### Study 1: Behavioral Preferences in Response to Housing Discrimination in a Black Canadian Sample

The problem of discrimination for blacks in housing has been documented in at least two empirical studies conducted in Canadian metropolitan cities. In a field study by Henry (1989), a black and a white woman (similar in age, income level, and attire) looked at the same apartments in Toronto. In 31 of 73 cases, there was clear evidence of discrimination; the black woman was told there was no vacancy, while the white woman was told differently immediately afterward. In a study of French Canadian landlords in Montreal (Hilton, Potvin, & Sachdev, 1989), it was found that of five target groups (Asians, Haitians, English Canadians, French Canadians, and Italians), landlords reported that they were least willing to rent to the black target group, Haitians.

Most individuals in search of housing, however, do not use a carefully controlled search that will permit the detection of unequal treatment. In fact, many instances of discrimination go unnoticed by its victims, and, when there is cause for suspicion, it may be very difficult to prove. But are individuals more likely to challenge discrimination by taking certain types of action when there is greater evidence of its occurrence? An additional purpose of this study was to shed some light on this question.

#### *Method*

##### *Participants*

A convenience sample of 72 black Canadians (39 men and 33 women)

living in the Toronto area was contacted by the third author. Their average age was 30. Sixty of the respondents were not born in Canada and had been living in the country for an average of 14 years. The majority of respondents held a degree from either a university (46%) or a community college (24%).

#### *Procedure*

Respondents were given a four-page questionnaire that was to be anonymously returned in a pre-posted envelope. The return rate was 67%. Because it was not possible to provide an immediate debriefing using this strategy, the first page was a cover letter explicitly stating that the study dealt with potential difficulties experienced by blacks looking for housing in Toronto. The next page presented a scenario where participants were asked to adopt the role of an individual wanting to rent an apartment. Two days after seeing a desirable apartment and indicating a strong interest in obtaining it, participants were informed that it was given to someone else. The extent of evidence of discrimination was then manipulated. There were three versions of the scenario. In the *strong evidence* condition, a friend living in the building indicated that the apartment was still being shown and thus not rented, that there were no blacks living in the building, and that she once overheard the manager state that it was their practice not to rent to blacks. In the *moderate evidence* condition, the source indicated that she thought the apartment was still available, that she did not know if there were any black tenants in the building, and that she once overheard the manager saying "Yeah, they're trying to move into this building too." In the *weak evidence* condition, the ad for the apartment was still in the newspaper 1 week later. In all three conditions, the scenario ended with the white manager being called back about the availability of the apartment. He was described as evasive and he ended the conversation because of a call on another line.

On the next page of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to read through a list of 11 possible responses (Table 1) that could be taken in their situation and then to rate the likelihood of taking each response on a scale ranging from *definitely no* (1) to *definitely yes* (9). The majority of the items were taken from a list of 30 responses to housing discrimination identified by Lalonde and Cameron (1994). All of the primary clusters of behaviors identified by Lalonde and Cameron were represented, except for the collection of evidence (the manipulated variable) and confronting the perpetrator (the manager had already been called back). The final page asked for demographic information and included two manipulation checks (the "extent to which there was clear evidence of discrimination" rated on a 9-point scale; and "How would you categorize the events in the situation as evidence of discrimination?" rated on a 4-point scale: *obvious, probable, possible* or *none*).

## Results

### Manipulation Checks

The first manipulation check revealed no significant differences between conditions on perceived evidence of discrimination,  $F(2, 69) = 1.06$ , *ns*, although the mean in the "clear" evidence condition was higher ( $M = 8.22$ ) than in the "moderate" ( $M = 7.64$ ) and "weak" ( $M = 7.65$ ) conditions. There was a significant condition effect for the second manipulation check,  $F(2, 69) = 3.38$ ,  $p < .05$ . The means were as predicted, with lower scores (or greater evidence) in the "clear" case ( $M = 1.26$ ), followed by the "moderate" case ( $M = 1.68$ ) and the "weak" case ( $M = 1.78$ ). A Tukey-Kramer test of means ( $p < .05$ ) indicated that the difference between the strong and the weak case was significant.

### Manipulation Effects

A few respondents chose not to rate some of the behaviors and it was decided to conduct separate ANOVAs for each behavior by condition. Significant effects were found for only 2 of the 11 behaviors: forgetting about the situation,  $F(2, 66) = 3.28$ ,  $p < .05$ , and filing a complaint with the Human Rights Commission,  $F(2, 68) = 3.75$ ,  $p < .05$ . Tests of mean differences using a Tukey-Kramer procedure ( $p < .05$ ) revealed that respondents receiving "strong" evidence of discrimination were less likely to try to forget about the situation ( $M = 2.96$ ) and more likely to file a complaint with the Human Rights Commission ( $M = 6.96$ ), compared to respondents receiving "weak" evidence ( $M_s = 4.95$  and  $4.91$ , respectively).

### Behavior Preferences

A repeated measures ANOVA comparing the mean ratings of the 11 behaviors presented in Table 1 was significant,  $F(10, 640) = 19.26$ ,  $p < .001$ . Tests of mean differences were conducted using a Tukey procedure. The overall pattern of results suggest that informing others about the discrimination and seeking advice from social agencies were clearly the behaviors of choice. Both of these behaviors received significantly higher mean ratings than eight of the other nine behaviors. There were also some behaviors that were clearly not preferred. Forgetting about the situation and organizing others to boycott buildings had significantly lower mean ratings than 8 of the other nine behaviors.

When respondents indicated their single preferred behavior, 24 of 70 (34%) chose to inform others about the discriminatory action, and 16 of 70 (23%)

Table 1

*Mean Preference Ratings of Responses to Housing Discrimination in a Black Canadian Sample*

Behavior	Mean
Inform others about the discriminatory actions of the property management	7.55 <sup>a</sup>
Seek advice from social agencies that might deal with discrimination (e.g., Centre for Equality Rights in Accommodation)	6.94 <sup>ab</sup>
File a formal complaint with the Ontario Human Rights Commission	5.92 <sup>bc</sup>
Consult with a lawyer or community legal aid services about what I could do	5.57 <sup>c</sup>
Take legal action against the property management	5.18 <sup>cd</sup>
Become active in an ongoing effort to fight against systemic discrimination in the city	5.15 <sup>cde</sup>
Help in the organization of an apartment rental agency operated by blacks but open to all	5.03 <sup>cde</sup>
Report situation to a government representative (city counselor, member of parliament)	5.02 <sup>cde</sup>
Inform media (television, newspapers) about my situation	4.37 <sup>def</sup>
Forget the apartment and do nothing about it	3.95 <sup>ef</sup>
Organize others to boycott all buildings operated by this management	3.58 <sup>ef</sup>

*Note.* Means that do not share a common superscript differ significantly from each other ( $p < .05$ ).

chose to seek advice from social agencies. All other behaviors were selected less than 10% of the time. These results thus parallel those found with the ANOVA.

#### *Discussion*

A finding of note in this first study was the effect of evidence of discrimination on preferred responses. Individuals in the strong evidence

condition were more likely to prefer filing a complaint with the Human Rights Commission and less likely to try to forget about the situation than were individuals in the weak-evidence condition. While the strength of evidence had an effect on only 2 of the 11 behaviors examined, it can be argued that the study offered only a weak test of the effects of evidence on responding to discrimination. One of the manipulation checks failed to reveal a difference between conditions and this appeared to be due to a ceiling effect. The respondents probably were looking for evidence of discrimination, because the cover letter informed them of our interest in the difficulties experienced by blacks in the area of housing. Given that some effects were found for the manipulation of evidence, more research attention should be given to this important factor.

What types of behaviors were individuals more likely to support? There was clear evidence that the two most preferred behaviors were *informing others* about the situation and *seeking advice from social agencies*. Although these behaviors may appear to be quite different, they both can provide sources of information and social support. Both Essed (1991b) and Feagin (1991), who interviewed blacks regarding their experience of racism, found that a potential situation of discrimination calls for a careful assessment of the situation. Most victims want to be very sure that they can label an occurrence as being discriminatory. The preferred responses in this study may be seen as part of an "assessment" stage in responding to discrimination, or what Lalonde and Cameron (1994) call "preparatory" actions.

It should be noted that the preferred behaviors were selected over the more active and somewhat public behaviors (e.g., filing a formal complaint, informing the media). These behaviors were given mean ratings that were close to the midpoint on the rating scale, and no differences were found between them. Why would the behaviors that seem to be the most effective in terms of bringing about some social change receive only moderate support? One reason would be that these behaviors may be associated with significant costs, either financial (i.e., legal fees) or psychological (i.e., the stress of going public). Who wants to fight to live in a building where they are not welcomed? There are many practical considerations when weighing the costs and benefits of actions in response to discrimination. Finally, it is clear that the hypothesis of greater preference for individual rather than collective behavior was supported. The least preferred behavior in this study, to organize others in a building boycott, was the most collective in nature.

#### Study 2: Behavioral Preferences in Response to Job Discrimination in a Sample of Bengali Canadians

There have been a number of reports documenting the effects of discrimi-

nation against nonwhites and particularly blacks in the area of employment (Braddock & McPartland, 1987; Reitz & Breton, 1994). Of particular relevance for this paper are two field studies by Henry and Ginzberg (1985) that provide direct evidence of discrimination against nonwhites in Toronto. The first study had matched pairs of blacks and whites of both genders apply in person for a variety of jobs listed in the newspaper. There was a significant effect of the applicant's race on the number of job offers, with whites being about twice as likely to get offers. The second study involved job searches over the telephone. Calls were placed by four types of confederates who could be distinguished in terms of their accented speech: white Anglo, black West Indian, Indo-Pakistani, and white immigrant. Both white groups were found to have significantly better chances of getting interviews than West Indians or Indo-Pakistanis.

If employers offer what appear to be legitimate explanations for refusing employment opportunities, individuals who are discriminated against may not be aware of it. In the Henry and Ginzberg (1985) telephone study, many of the West Indian and Indo-Pakistani callers were screened out by being told they did not have the necessary qualifications. Given an explanation of inadequate qualifications, victims of discrimination may be primed to make an internal attribution for their failure. In fact, given that social representations of work are infused with the Protestant work ethic, attributing failure to gain employment to oneself may be a somewhat dominant response. As a result, it is of interest to compare responses to discrimination that focus on the self, to responses that focus on the discriminator.

Because this study focusses on a Bengali sample, a study by Furnham et al. (1993) is particularly relevant. Respondents from 13 nations were compared in terms of their beliefs in the Protestant work ethic. Of the 13 groups, the Indian sample was found to have the highest mean ranking on a number of measures of the Protestant work ethic. Because the work ethic in Indian culture would appear to be strong, we expected Bengalis to favor self-directed responses that focus on self-improvement in comparison to responses that challenge the discriminator.

### *Method*

#### *Participants*

A total of 36 male and 6 female first generation Bengali Canadians completed questionnaires. The average age was 47 and the mean number of years in Canada was 20. All respondents had either a university degree (76.2%) or a community college diploma (23.8%). Although this sample



had a high level of education, it is fairly representative of the educational profile of South Asian male immigrants in Canada (Beaujot, Basavarajappa, & Verma, 1988).

#### *Procedure*

Respondents were contacted by the second author at social events organized by a Bengali community organization. The five-page questionnaire was to be anonymously returned in a pre-posted envelope (47% return rate). Because it was not possible to provide an immediate debriefing, the cover page consisted of a letter explicitly stating that the study dealt with situations of discrimination that can face visible minorities, such as Bengalis in Toronto. The next page consisted of a scenario in which participants were asked to imagine themselves applying for a desirable position for which they have the qualifications.<sup>3</sup> Three days after having an interview, they are called and informed that a more qualified person was hired. They later find out through a reliable source working at the company that the position was still not filled and that they did not get the position because of their visible minority status. The information thus indicated that they were victims of discrimination.

On the next page of the questionnaire they were asked to read through a list of 13 possible responses (Table 2) that could be made in their situation, and then to rate the likelihood of taking each response on a scale ranging from *definitely no* (1) to *definitely yes* (9). The majority of the items were taken from 27 distinct responses to employment discrimination given in interviews conducted by Lalonde and Cameron (1994). Two of the self-directed responses were created for this study. The final two pages of the questionnaire asked for demographic and other information (e.g., past experiences of job discrimination).

#### *Results*

##### *Behavior Preferences*

A repeated measures ANOVA comparing the mean ratings of the 11 behaviors presented in Table 2 was significant,  $F(12, 444) = 14.39, p < .001$ . Tests of mean differences were conducted using a Tukey procedure. The

<sup>3</sup>Three versions of the scenario were used to create employment situations that could be associated with different costs when taking action: a promotion within one's present company of employment (high cost), a more permanent position within a company where only a temporary position was currently held (moderate cost), or a new position in a different company (low cost). The manipulation had no significant effects on behavior preferences.

Table 2

*Mean Preference Ratings of Responses to Employment Discrimination in a Bengali Canadian Sample*

Behavior	Mean
Keep working hard and try again the next time a position opens up	7.40 <sup>a</sup>
Look for a job in a competing company	7.26 <sup>a</sup>
Work harder to improve my skills	7.08 <sup>ab</sup>
Make others in the Bengali community aware of the possibility of discrimination by that interviewer	6.05 <sup>abc</sup>
File a formal complaint with the Human Rights Commission	5.47 <sup>bc</sup>
Inform the interviewer's superiors about the situation	5.13 <sup>cd</sup>
Write a letter to a newspaper describing my experience	4.92 <sup>cd</sup>
Write letters to different areas of government (member of parliament) about situation	4.90 <sup>cd</sup>
File a complaint of discrimination within the organization	4.79 <sup>cd</sup>
Write a letter of protest to the interviewer	4.29 <sup>cde</sup>
Try to forget about the situation	3.55 <sup>de</sup>
Help organize a group that would protest the company's discriminatory practices	3.45 <sup>de</sup>
Contact a lawyer about filing a legal suit against the interviewer or company	2.92 <sup>e</sup>

*Note.* Means that do not share a common superscript differ significantly from each other ( $p < .05$ ).

pattern of results suggests that behaviors focusing on self-improvement (keep working hard and try again, look for a job elsewhere, and work harder to improve skills) were clearly the responses of choice, as they were significantly preferred over 8 of the remaining 10 behaviors. Contacting a lawyer about filing a legal suit was clearly the least preferred behavior. It received the lowest mean rating and was significantly different from 9 of the 12 other behaviors.

*Effects of Past Discrimination Experiences*

A comparison was made between respondents who reported a past experience of discrimination in the workplace ( $n = 28$ ) to respondents who reported

no such experiences ( $n = 14$ ). Those reporting past experiences of discrimination were more likely to try to forget about the situation ( $M = 4.25$ ) than were respondents who did not report such experiences,  $M = 1.86$ ,  $t(40) = 2.76$ ,  $p < .01$ . No other differences were found between these groups.

#### *Discussion*

There was strong support for the hypothesis that Bengali Canadians would prefer self-directed responses that focus on self improvement and hard work (i.e., keep working hard and improve skills), compared to responses that challenge the discriminator. This result is in line with a cultural explanation suggesting that Indians (and thus Bengalis) have strong beliefs in the Protestant ethic (Furnham et al., 1993) and would, therefore, prefer actions that are congruent with such beliefs. It is possible, however, that the same results would be found for individuals from a variety of cultures, given that the domain of the workplace immediately primes beliefs associated with the Protestant ethic.

The Bengali Canadian sample, therefore, did not strongly endorse actions that involved a confrontation with the discriminator or that involved an acknowledgement of the discrimination. Also, as hypothesized, they clearly did not favor the collective response (i.e., organizing a protest group) in comparison to the more individualistic response options. Finally, it should be noted that contacting a lawyer was the least preferred of all behaviors. There are a number of factors that may explain a dislike for this strategy, and, as raised in the first study, the notion of cost is probably one of them.

Finally, it is interesting that respondents who reported prior experiences of discrimination in the workplace were more likely to try to forget about the situation than were those who reported no such experiences. We can speculate that this reaction may be indicative of a desire to forget a painful event or an acquired cynicism about the ability to bring about change. Clearly, factors such as perceptions of cost and past experiences of discrimination must be considered in research in this area.

#### *General Discussion*

Both studies indicated clear preferences in responses to situations of discrimination. When given the option to use self-directed actions in employment discrimination, Bengali Canadians preferred these responses to more active or system-directed behaviors. When self-directed responses were not offered (or feasible), as was the case in the housing discrimination study, black Canadians preferred the relatively passive strategies of informing others about the situation or seeking advice for a course of action. While caution is warranted

when comparing the results of the two studies, there was a striking consistency in the order of preference for most of the other behaviors.<sup>4</sup>

It was evident in the results that these nonwhite samples showed only moderate support for more assertive actions. As hypothesized, the more collective strategy was dismissed by both samples in contrast to more individual strategies. According to Feagin and Sikes (1994), many discriminatory situations will be avoided, if possible; furthermore, when faced with a potentially discriminatory situation, it will be examined very carefully and many will not acknowledge its existence. Taylor, Wright, Moghaddam, and Lalonde (1990) observed a personal-group discrepancy in perceptions of discrimination based on ethnicity and gender: There is a consistent tendency to see higher levels of discrimination being directed at one's group as a whole rather than at oneself. The acknowledgment of personal discrimination is painful, particularly within a cultural ethos where merit and individualism are so highly regarded. In order to avoid such pain and the grief of taking action, there may be a tendency for many victims of injustice to err on the side of caution and not recognize a situation as being one of discrimination.

It is clear that the studies were limited in a number of ways. The respondents indicated the extent to which they preferred certain actions, without actually taking these actions. While we would like to believe that preferences for behaviors would predict the likelihood of engaging in them, we recognize that there are important intervening variables between the two (e.g., cost of engaging in action). Furthermore, the number of options offered to our respondents was limited. One purpose of these studies was to gain more insight into the behavioral responses to discrimination, rather than cognitive and affective responses. With regard to the actions examined, an attempt was made to be as inclusive as possible on the basis of prior research (Lalonde & Cameron, 1994). With regard to the representativeness of the samples, both were highly educated and thus probably part of an aspiring middle class. There is an advantage to studying better-educated respondents, however, because they are more likely to have the resources for taking action (Benjamin, 1991; Feagin, 1991).

What we see as more limiting with our methodology, however, is that it

<sup>4</sup>Making others aware of the discrimination received the highest rating in Study 1 and the highest rating in Study 2 after the self-directed responses. If we ignore the litigious behavior (i.e., contacting a lawyer), which clearly was rejected by the Bengali Canadians compared to the black Canadians, there were six behaviors that were similarly ranked by both samples: informing others, filling a complaint with the Human Rights Commission, reporting the situation to a government representative, reporting the situation to the media, forgetting about the situation, and organizing others in a protest action. The similarity in the ranking of the means of these six behaviors was evidenced by the fact that the Spearman rank correlation coefficient was significant ( $r_s = .89, p < .05$ ).

does not provide a complete assessment of the dynamic process of responding to discrimination. Respondents in both studies indicated considerable support for the strategy of informing others about the discriminatory action. A discussion with others in one's social network could lead to the needed information and social support for taking more direct action; alternatively, it could lead to discouragement and a decision to forgo action. A number of studies looking at the experience of racism and social injustice indicate that the assessment of the situation is a major and critical step that must precede any type of action (Essed, 1991b; Feagin, 1991; Mikula, 1993). One major goal of this initial step is to decide if discrimination has actually taken place. Essed's analysis suggests that this assessment process follows well developed "scenarios of racism," analogous to the concept of social scripts (Schank & Abelson, 1977). The results of the first study suggest that the strength of evidence can play an important role in this assessment process.

But what happens after this initial assessment? The results of the housing discrimination study indicate that individuals want information and advice on possible courses of action. While this may suggest that individuals may not have scripts of action for fighting discrimination, it also can be argued that they are, in fact, aware of such scripts but are not encouraged by their potential outcomes. They may recognize the difficulty of "proving" an act of covert discrimination, and they may also be aware that when one follows the "proper" channels (e.g., filing a grievance with the Human Rights Commission), it can be a painstaking process with a low success rate (Young, 1992). The perceived futility of many actions may explain, in part, why the clear dominant response of the Bengali Canadian sample in employment discrimination was to focus on oneself and not to take any direct action. One implication of our results is that victims of discrimination need to be provided with scripts or scenarios of social action that are seen as being effective if discrimination is to be challenged.

In summary, the results of the present research offer a glimpse of the difficult challenge involved in taking action against discrimination. Additional research is needed to examine the process more fully and, in particular, the barriers that impede taking actions that will bring about social change. Until public and private civil-rights enforcement mechanisms are perceived as being effective and fair, it is likely that instances of discrimination will continue to go unchallenged.

#### References

- Beaujot, R., Basavarajappa, K. G., & Verma, R. B. P. (1988). *Current demographic analysis: Income of immigrants*. Ottawa, Canada: Minister of Supply and Services.

- Benjamin, L. (1991). *The black elite: Facing the color line in the twilight of the twentieth century*. Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Braddock, J. H., & McPartland, J. M. (1987). How minorities continue to be excluded from equal employment opportunities: Research on labor market and institutional barriers. *Journal of Social Issues*, *43*, 5-39.
- Cose, E. (1993). *The rage of a privileged class*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Dion, K. L., & Earn, B. M. (1975). The phenomenology of being a target of prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *32*, 944-950.
- Essed, P. (1991a). Knowledge and resistance: Black women talk about racism in the Netherlands and the USA. *Feminism and Psychology*, *1*, 201-219.
- Essed, P. (1991b). *Understanding everyday racism: An interdisciplinary theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Feagin, J. R. (1991). The continuing significance of race: Antiblack discrimination in public places. *American Sociological Review*, *56*, 101-116.
- Feagin, J. R., & Sikes, M. P. (1994). *Living with racism: The black middle-class experience*. Boston, MA: Beacon.
- Furnham, A., Bond, M., Heaven, P., Hilton, D., Lobel, T., Masters, J., Payne, J., Rajamanikam, R., Stacey, B., & van Daalen, H. (1993). A comparison of Protestant work ethic beliefs in thirteen nations. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *133*, 185-197.
- Henry, F. (1989). *Housing and racial discrimination in Canada: A preliminary assessment of current initiatives and information*. Ottawa, Canada: Policy & Research, Multiculturalism & Citizenship.
- Henry, F., & Ginzberg, E. (1985). *Who gets the work? A test of racial discrimination*. Toronto, Canada: Urban Alliance on Race Relations & Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto.
- Hilton, A., Potvin, L., & Sachdev, I. (1989). Ethnic relations in rental housing: A social psychological approach. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, *21*, 121-131.
- Kawakami, K., & Dion, K. L. (1993). The impact of salient self-identities on relative depreciation and action intentions. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *23*, 525-540.
- Lalonde, R. N., & Cameron, J. E. (1994). Behavioral responses to discrimination: A focus on action. In M. P. Zanna & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium* (Vol. 7, pp. 257-288). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lalonde, R. N., & Silverman, R. (1994). Behavioral preferences in response to social injustice: The effects of group permeability and social identity salience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *66*, 78-85.

- of Lykes, M. B. (1983). Discrimination and coping in the lives of black women: Analyses of oral history data. *Journal of Social Issues*, **39**, 79-100.
- de Mikula, G. (1993). On the experience of injustice. *European Review of Social Psychology*, **4**, 223-244.
- et Reitz, J. G., & Breton, R. (1994). *The illusion of difference: Realities of ethnicity in Canada and the United States*. Toronto, Canada: C. D. Howe Institute.
- of Schank, R. C., & Abelson, R. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals, and understanding*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- t Tajfel, H. (1978). Interindividual behaviour and intergroup behaviour. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 27-60). New York, NY: Academic.
- ' Taylor, D. M., Wright, S., Moghaddam, F. M., & Lalonde, R. N. (1990). The personal-group discrimination discrepancy: Perceiving my group, but not myself, to be a target for discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **16**, 254-262.
- Wright, S. C., Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1990). Responding to membership in a disadvantaged group: From acceptance to collective protest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **58**, 994-1003.
- Young, D. (1992). *The handling of race discrimination complaints at the Ontario Human Rights Commission*. Toronto, Canada: Ontario Human Rights Commission.