Running Head: IDENTITY THREAT AND EMOTION

Emotional Responses to Ethnolinguistic Identity Threat

Thesis Submitted to

The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

Department of Psychology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

© David Neil McVicar, September 2007

Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-33749-3

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-33749-3

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my Master's Thesis advisor, Dr. Michael Wohl, for his guidance on this project. I would also like to thank the members of my Thesis Committee, Dr. Frank Elgar, Dr. Janet Mantler, Dr. Kim Matheson, and Dr. George Pollard for their valuable advice. I am indebted to my wife, Tara Shannon, for her patience and encouragement.

Abstract

Previous theoretical and empirical work suggests that group members who believe their ingroup is threatened will become motivated to protect it against such threats (e.g., Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Recent research suggests that emotion plays a role in such protective behaviour (e.g., Smith, 1993). The present research assesses the role of emotion when group-members' distinguish their ingroup in response to perceived threats to ingroup distinctiveness. Participants' perception of threat to the distinctiveness of the Francophone ingroup and the resulting emotional and protective behavioural responses were assessed. It was found that Francophone participants who perceived a threat to the distinctiveness of the Francophone ingroup tended to experience a group-based emotional response (i.e., collective or negative emotions). In turn, these participants tended to express their opposition to the idea of Francophone traditions and culture being mixed with those of outside groups. Group-based emotion mediated the relationship between distinctiveness threat and opposition to the merging of the ingroup with outgroups.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vii
List of Figures	viii
List of Appendices	ix
Emotional Responses to Ethnolinguistic Identity Threat	1
Social Identity Theory	3
Emotional Reaction to Threats to the Future Vitality of the Ingroup	9
Appraisal, emotion, and action tendency	10
Group-based appraisals, emotions, and action tendencies	11
Emotion as mediator of group-level appraisals and action tendencies	11
Ingroup-oriented appraisal, emotion, and action tendencies	12
The Present Study	16
Hypothesis 1	16
Hypothesis 2	16
Hypothesis3	16
Hypothesis 4	16
Method	17
Participants and Design	17
Procedure	18
Measured Variables	19

Manipulation check	19
Collective angst.	20
Negative emotions	20
Ingroup protective behaviour	21
Francophone identification	22
Results	22
Preliminary Analysis	22
Manipulation Check	23
Experimental Effects	23
Francophone identification as moderator of manipulation effects	23
Francophone identification as a moderator of the indirect effect of the threat manipulation on opposition to merging through collective angst	32
Francophone identification as a moderator of the indirect effect of the threat manipulation on commitment to tradition through collective angst	32
Manipulation check item as a predictor	33
Mediational analysis	34
Collective angst as mediator of the effect of distinctiveness threat On opposition to merging	34
Negative emotion as a mediator of the effect of distinctiveness threat on opposition to merging	35
Collective angst and negative emotion as mediators of the effect of	

distinctiveness threat on commitment to traditions	36
Moderated mediation	36
Francophone identification as moderator of distinctiveness threat on opposition to merging through collective angst	37
Francophone identification as moderator of distinctiveness threat on opposition to merging through negative emotion	37
Francophone identification as moderator of distinctiveness threat on commitment to traditions through collective angst	38
Francophone identification as moderator of distinctiveness threat on commitment to traditions through negative emotion	38
Discussion	39
Distinctiveness threat and differentiation	41
Group-based emotions	43
Francophone identification, group-based emotion, and opposition to merging ...	45
Caveats, limitations, and future directions	48
Conclusion	50
References	52

List of Tables

Table 1: <i>Correlations among manipulation check items and measured variables</i>	24
Table 2: <i>Means and standard deviations by condition for collective angst, negative emotion, opposition to merging and commitment to traditions</i>	25
Table 3: <i>Hierarchical regression analyses testing moderating effects of Francophone identification in the relationship between condition and measured variables</i>	28

List of Figures

Figure 1: <i>Francophone identification as a moderator of the effect of the threat</i>	
<i>manipulation on collective angst</i>	30
Figure 2: <i>Francophone identification as a moderator of the effect of the threat</i>	
<i>manipulation on negative emotions</i>	30
Figure 3: <i>Francophone identification as a moderator of the effect of the threat</i>	
<i>manipulation on opposition to merging</i>	31
Figure 4: <i>Francophone identification as a moderator of the effect of the threat</i>	
<i>manipulation on commitment to traditions</i>	31

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Recruitment Poster	58
Appendix B: Informed Consent	59
Appendix C: Thank you note for those who do not consent	61
Appendix D: Survey	62
Ethnolinguistic identity	62
Manipulation articles	63
Collective Angst	79
Negative Emotions	72
Protective Behaviours	73
Francophone Identification	75
Demographic and personal information	76
Appendix E: Debriefing	86

Emotional Responses to Ethnolinguistic Identity Threat

Québec's Charter of the French Language (Bill 101) constitutes a clear example of collective action – in this case government legislation – taken on behalf of an ethnolinguistic group. Enacted by Rene Levesque's Parti Québécois government in 1977, Bill 101 was designed to elevate the status of the French language in order to secure the future of the “distinctive Québécois personality” (Levesque, 1968). The protection and promotion of the French language was deemed necessary because its position in North America had become weakened by two factors: First, the majority of people in North America spoke English as their first language and, second, immigrants to Québec tended to gravitate toward the use of English rather than French (Heller, 1999). Such demographic factors contributed greatly to Francophone support for Bill 101 as a necessary measure for the protection of the unique French-Canadian culture (Thomson, 1995).

Why did the Levesque government choose to employ the French language as the front line in the defence of French-Canadian culture? Clearly, Levesque and the Québec nationalists saw the French language as a defining feature of French-Canadian culture (e.g., Levesque, 1976). Indeed, from the perspective of the social psychology of intergroup relations, language is much more than a mode of communication. Where a group's language is unique, it forms a distinct boundary – both real and symbolic - between groups (e.g., Giles & Johnson, 1981; Khleif, 1979; Fishman, 1977; Ross, 1979). From the perspective of an ethnolinguistic group's members, the erosion of this crucial boundary may be seen as a threat to the very existence of the group (Khleif, 1979). It was

in this sense that protecting and promoting the French language in Québec was deemed necessary to protect the future vitality of the unique Francophone culture in Québec.

This history of ingroup protective action regarding the French language in Québec informed the present study. By attempting to manipulate and measure Francophone participants' perception that the French language – and therefore the future of Francophone culture in Québec – is threatened with extinction, the present study examined the role of emotion when group members endorse protective behaviour designed to fortify the cultural ingroup against possible threats to its vitality.

Most research on threats to social groups has focussed on ingroup status *vis a vis* outgroups (e.g., Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Stephan, Diaz-Loving & Duran, 2000; Stephan & Renfro, 2002, Stephan et al., 2002) rather than the vitality of the ingroup *per se*. In particular, the emotional reaction and behaviour that group members experience when they perceive a threat to the future survival of the ingroup has not been considered. The present study may be the first to consider threat, emotion, and action tendency all oriented toward the ingroup. It was hypothesized that group-based emotion mediates the relationship between the perception of threat to the future vitality of ingroup and behaviours designed to protect the vitality of their culture. That is, group-based emotion was expected to account for ingroup-protective behaviours (i.e., opposing the marriage of Francophones to non-Francophones, preference for Francophone schools) associated with the belief that the future vitality of the Francophone ingroup may be in jeopardy. This study has drawn on both social identity theory (e.g., SIT; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and intergroup emotion theory (IET; e.g., Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2002; Smith, 1993) to

provide a rich account of Francophones' emotional and behavioural responses when they perceive a threat to the future of the Francophone ingroup.

Social Identity Theory

Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) accounts for the importance of social groups to their members by emphasizing the close relationship between the ingroup and the self-concepts of its members. According to SIT, the concept of social identity comprises an essential part of the self-concept. Whereas personal identity is based on traits and relationships at the individual level, social identity is based upon "those aspects of an individual's self-image that derive from the social categories to which he perceives himself as belonging" (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; p. 16). Through their influence on the social identities of their members, social groups are central aspects of their members' self-concepts.

A central assumption of SIT is that people are motivated to achieve and maintain a positive self-concept. As social identity is an important part of the self concept, it follows that people must strive to achieve or maintain positive social identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) if they are to have a positive self-concept. SIT posits that a group's contribution to its members' social identities and, in turn, their self-concepts is a function of whether it is evaluated positively or negatively. Where one evaluates the ingroup positively, the ingroup makes a positive contribution to his or her social identity. In turn, this positively evaluated social identity makes a positive contribution to the overall self-concept. Conversely, a negatively evaluated ingroup contributes negatively to social identity and, in turn, self-concept.

Because the evaluation of social groups, people generally tend to seek affiliation with groups that are positively evaluated: A highly esteemed group reflects positively on its members who may enjoy the idea that its good reputation may “rub off” on them as individuals. For example, people may “bask in the reflected glory” of a successful or highly esteemed group by accentuating or affirming their membership in it. Cialdini and colleagues (1976) demonstrated that undergraduate students were more likely to wear university affiliated apparel on the day after their university’s football team won a game compared to when it lost. Moreover, students were more likely to use the pronoun “we” when referring to a win than when referring to a loss. Although the participants in the study were not members of the football team nor were they directly affiliated with it, they stood to gain public prestige by its success (Cialdini et al. 1976). Thus, the findings in this study of group affiliation support the SIT proposition that people can derive personal satisfaction from their association with a successful group or organization even when their affiliation with it is tenuous. Furthermore, this finding implies that group members will derive great satisfaction from the knowledge that an ingroup that is very important to their social identity, such as a cultural or linguistic group, is strong and highly vital.

Although favourable assessments of the ingroup’s qualities (e.g., being the league football champion, being a highly vital ethnic group, etc.) are important determinants of people’s evaluations of the ingroup, they are not essential. Rather, according to SIT, the essential determinant of one’s evaluation of the ingroup is its distinctiveness *vis a vis* relevant outgroups (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Accordingly, people evaluate the ingroup positively when they perceive it to be highly distinct from a relevant outgroup and they evaluate the ingroup negatively when they perceive a low-level of distinctiveness (i.e.,

too much similarity) between it and a relevant outgroup. Such evaluations of the ingroup are theorized to directly affect group members' social identity and, by extension, their self-concept: To the extent that group members consider the ingroup to lack distinctiveness, the ingroup fails to make a positive contribution to social identity and to self-concept (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

From the assumption that a positive social identity depends on the distinctiveness of the ingroup, the basic hypothesis of SIT emerges: Because group members are motivated to evaluate their ingroup(s) positively, social groups attempt to make themselves more distinct from one another (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Where group members perceive the ingroup to be too similar to a relevant outgroup, they will strive to make it more distinct along some dimension of comparison that is relevant to both groups (e.g., Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Jetten, Spears, & Postmes, 2004). For instance, football fans generally compare their team to other teams on the basis of the performance in football. Fans do not tend compare football teams according to their skiing abilities or religious views, for example. This process of distinguishing the ingroup from outgroups is known as differentiation (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). In the present study, language, a central aspect of social identity (e.g., Giles & Johnson, 1981; Khleif, 1979) is theorized to be an important dimension along which groups may be distinguished from one another.

Group members' efforts to differentiate the ingroup from a relevant outgroup may occur along any conceivable dimension of comparison shared between two groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). For instance, experience and abilities may serve as a dimension along which to compare the ingroup to a relevant outgroup. To assess this claim, Dovidio, Gaertner, and Validzic (1998) studied the effect of intergroup similarity on ingroup

members' tendency to differentiate the ingroup from the outgroup by demonstrating ingroup bias (a form of intergroup differentiation in which people give preferential treatment to members of their own group). In a series of experimental sessions, participants were randomly separated into two groups and assigned to complete a pre-determined group task. During half the sessions the two groups were given the same task and in half the sessions the two groups were given different tasks. When the two groups were later combined, participants demonstrated significantly higher ingroup bias when the initial groups had completed the same task than when they had completed different tasks. Where the groups could not be distinguished on the basis of the tasks they had been assigned, group members resorted to ingroup bias in order to differentiate the ingroup from the outgroup.

Intergroup distinctiveness may even take precedence over the interests of individual group members such that group-members may prefer to maximize intergroup distinctiveness rather than secure benefits for themselves and for fellow group members. For example, Turner, Brown, and Tajfel (1979) demonstrated that people may prefer to maximize the difference between money allocated to the ingroup (in total) and to the outgroup (in total) rather than maximize profit for themselves and fellow ingroup members. In other words, participants tried to differentiate their ingroup from the outgroup at the expense of benefits for ingroup members as individuals.

Intergroup distinctiveness is so important to social identity that group members may prefer it to favourable qualitative assessments of the ingroup (e.g., having a good reputation). Mlicki and Ellemers (1996) found that a sample of Polish students preferred to emphasize negative traits associated stereotypically with their national identity rather

than emphasize more positive traits held in common with other European nations. These students favoured a negative but distinct social identity over one that is more positive but lacking in distinctiveness *vis a vis* relevant outgroups.

That people are most concerned about their ingroup's distinctiveness, over and above things that would be beneficial or desirable for the group, supports the SIT prediction that group members' perception of the ingroup as distinct from a relevant outgroup is the central element in their evaluation of the ingroup. However, SIT predicts that attempts to restore an unsatisfactory social identity (i.e., a lack of group distinctiveness) through differentiation is expected only among group members who are highly committed to the group (e.g., Jetten et al., 2004). That is, when compared with low identifiers, people who identify highly with a group that they do not perceive to be sufficiently distinct from a relevant outgroup should show a greater motivation to differentiate the ingroup. A meta-analysis conducted by Jetten, Spears, and Postmes (2004) supported this prediction, finding that ingroup identification is an important moderator of the relationship between the perception that the ingroup lacks distinctiveness and attempts to differentiate the ingroup. Reactive distinctiveness is the term that researchers have used to refer to this process of distinctiveness-making in reaction to the perception of low-distinctiveness (e.g., Spears, Jetten, & Scheepers, 2002; Jetten et al., 2004).

Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, and Doosje (1999) described distinctiveness threat as a result of having a social identity that is insufficiently distinct from other comparison groups. Ellemers and colleagues suggested that ingroup distinctiveness "speaks to the very existence and *raison d'être* of the group as an entity" (Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje,

2002, p. 177). Indeed, a group ceases to exist when it is no longer unique and cannot be distinguished from another group. Clearly, a group that has ceased to exist can no longer contribute, positively or negatively, to its former members' social identity. In this sense the distinctiveness and, ultimately, the survival, of the ingroup is of crucial importance to its members.

By definition, distinctiveness threats apply to the distinguishing features of a group. These unique features include ideas and abstractions related to religion, cultural values, ideology, and language (Stephan & Renfro, 2002). Such threats at the group level have been referred to as symbolic threats because they threaten the symbols that mark group identity (Stephan & Renfro, 2002). Thus, threats to the symbols that define the group may carry a significant impact for the group because they may undermine or destroy the defining features of the group (Liebkind, 1992).

Threats to the status of a group's unique language are a particularly important type of symbolic threat (Stephan & Renfro, 2002). Threats to a group's unique language may carry significant impact for the group because it can be the quintessential distinguishing feature of ethnic identity (Ross, 1979). A group's unique language often serves as the chief indicator of ethnicity and, as such, may form the central criterial attribute of group membership (Ryan, 1979). As language can be an essential marker of group identity, threats to language may imply threats to the group itself. According to Khleif (1979), language can function as a tangible boundary line separating two or more groups. To blur or break down the boundary that is language would reflect a loss of group distinctiveness and therefore threaten the existence of the group itself (Khleif, 1979). Where group members strive to maintain, promote, and protect their unique language, they are

attempting to maintain the boundary between their group and other groups that do not speak that language.

Boundaries can be especially important for minority groups that wish to avoid being assimilated into a dominant, majority group). For example, Stephan and Renfro (2002) noted Puerto Ricans' concern that increasingly close political ties to the United States may result in English replacing Spanish as the official language in Puerto Rico: As the Spanish language is an integral part of the Puerto Rican identity, many Puerto Ricans believe that such a linguistic switch would greatly alter, even diminish, what it means to be Puerto Rican. Ethnolinguistic groups have gone so far as to promote their native language through campaigns for education (e.g., Wales) or legislate the predominance of their unique language in order to protect their unique identity (e.g., Québec). Québec's Charter of the French Language is an example of legislation designed for the protection and promotion of the French-Canadian identity in Québec

Emotional Reaction to Threats to the Future Vitality of the Ingroup

Do ingroup members experience an emotional response when they believe their group will be threatened with extinction at some time in the future? Would such an emotional reaction be of a specific form such as hopelessness, dread, or anxiety? Although Tajfel (1978) acknowledged the emotional significance of the ingroup as an important part of one's social identity, he assigned no theoretical importance to the role of emotion. Indeed, emotions triggered in intergroup situations have received very little attention from social psychologists (Devos, Silver, Mackie, Smith, 2003). That affect has received little attention from social psychologists is not surprising because traditional theories of emotion have maintained that people feel emotions only in response to an

event or situation they believe affects them personally in some way (Devos, Silver, Mackie & Smith, 2002). It is clear, however, that just as people care about situations and events that affect them personally, so do they care about circumstances affecting the group(s) to which they belong (Mackie et al. 2002). Thus, recent theoretical and empirical work has developed the idea that group members demonstrate emotion and behavioural tendencies in response to circumstances affecting the ingroup. Such circumstances include the perception that a group's unique language may be threatened.. Positive or negative evaluations of the status of a group's unique language ought to generate an emotional reaction as well as certain behavioural tendencies in the members of the group.

Appraisal, emotion, and action tendency. Recent research on group-based emotions (e.g., Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000; Smith, 1993, 1999), extends the concepts and processes of emotional experience from the individual level to that of the group by borrowing directly from appraisal theories of emotion (e.g., Frijda, 1989; Roseman, 1984; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985). According to appraisal theory, the experience of emotion consists of three interrelated components (i.e., appraisal, emotional response, and action tendency). An appraisal is one's judgement of a given situation as either beneficial or harmful to his or her interests. Appraisals perceived as beneficial to the interests of the individual are theorized to generate a positive emotional response (e.g., happiness, pleasure) while those deemed to be harmful generate a negative emotional response (e.g., sadness, disappointment). An action tendency is an impulse or tendency toward a particular behaviour (Frijda, 1989). An important aspect of the appraisal model of

emotion is a given appraisals is associated with a specific emotion and specific action tendencies.

Group-based appraisals, emotions, and action tendencies. Smith argues that emotions can be “based in the perceiver’s social identity” (Smith, 1993, p. 297). Just as appraisals of events relevant to personal identity may trigger emotion at the personal level, events relevant to a particular ingroup may trigger an emotional response in its members. IET borrows from appraisal theory in that it involves the concepts of appraisal, emotion, and action tendency. IET holds that one who perceives a situation or event as either positive or negative to the ingroup will tend to experience a corresponding emotional reaction as a result. In the case of a positive emotional reaction, the individual is expected to be motivated to behave in a way to express that positive emotion. For example, the football fan whose team has just scored a touchdown will appraise the situation as good for the team’s chances of winning the game. Such a positive appraisal generates a positive emotion such as happiness which, in turn, should generate specifiable behaviours such as jumping up from the seat, cheering, clapping, and smiling. In the case of a negative ingroup relevant appraisal, group members are expected to feel a negative emotion. Returning to the example of a football fan watching a favoured team, he or she is likely to feel disappointment when the opposing team scores a touchdown. Feelings of disappointment should cause the fan to demonstrate behaviours such as boo and complain about the team’s performance or even that of the referee.

Emotion as mediator of group-level appraisals and action tendencies. According to IET, the relationship between appraisal, emotion and action tendency (all at the group level) forms a model in which emotion is conceived as a mediator of the effect of group-

level appraisals on group-level action tendencies. That is, the experience of emotion is theorized to account for the relationship between a group member's appraisal of an event or situation affecting the ingroup and its associated action tendency. In the example of the football fan it is the emotional response that generates the urge to cheer or to boo. Mackie, Devos, and Smith (2000) demonstrated empirically that emotions operating at the group level fit the mediation model described by IET. In a series of three studies, Mackie and colleagues measured or manipulated participants' appraisals of ingroup strength, conceptualized as collective support for the ingroup's stance on a given moral issue as opposed that of the outgroup. Appraisals of greater ingroup strength predicted greater levels of anger (e.g., irritated, furious) toward the outgroup. Moreover, the appraisal of ingroup strength was a positive predictor of offensive action tendencies (e.g., confront, argue, or oppose) toward the outgroup. Thus, the more participants perceived the ingroup to be strong, the more they tended to endorse confrontational behaviours aimed at refuting the position held by outgroup members. A mediational analysis revealed that the effect of appraisals of ingroup strength on these offensive action tendencies could be explained by feelings of anger toward the outgroup.

Ingroup-oriented appraisal, emotion, and action tendencies. Previous theory and research on group-based emotions has been focussed mainly at the intergroup level. Such studies have examined phenomena such as prejudice (e.g., Miller, Smith, & Mackie, 2004) and intergroup conflict (e.g., Mackie, Devos & Smith, 2002; Stephan et al, 2002). In contrast, group-based emotion oriented toward the ingroup has apparently received no empirical attention. What kinds of appraisal, emotion, and action tendencies could be exclusively ingroup-oriented? Distinctiveness threat may be considered an ingroup-

oriented appraisal if the “outgroup source” of similarity is not specified or cannot be identified or if the similarity cannot be attributed to specific outgroup. The extreme form of distinctiveness threat is zero-distinctiveness (which by definition is the demise of the group). The associated emotion would be ingroup oriented and the action tendency may also be ingroup oriented. For example, a group member who believes the ingroup may cease to exist someday might feel anxious on behalf of the ingroup and, in turn, differentiates the group by changing or enhancing some quality of the ingroup.

What emotional response should we expect from group members when they believe the very existence of the ingroup will be threatened in the future? An answer to this question can be found by considering concepts related to the study of emotion at the individual level. Barlow (1991) notes that the concern over the possibility of threats, danger, or other negative events may lead one to become anxious and to maintain a chronic state of readiness and preparation: The anxious individual becomes focussed on maximizing his or her ability to respond to challenges and problems. Extending this conceptualization of anxiety from the individual level to that of the group, it follows that those who anticipate some negative event to befall their ingroup will tend to feel anxiety. As with the individual who feels personal anxiety because he or she anticipates some negative event, the group member who believes their ingroup will be threatened at some time in the future will feel anxiety as a result.

Barlow’s conceptualization of anxiety (e.g., 1988, 1991) at the individual level is also informative in predicting the likely consequence of collective angst. Specifically, Barlow theorizes that those experiencing anxiety will be motivated to become prepared to cope with some anticipated, but as yet unknown, event (1991). Barlow describes this state

of readiness as a hypervigilant stance in which the individual maintains a state of readiness to deal with negative events as they present themselves (Barlow, 1988). Like the anxious individual, a group member experiencing anxiety on behalf of the group may become vigilant and protective on its behalf, acting to fortify it against future harm that may signal its end.

It should be noted that the term “anxiety” does not capture the idea of demise. Anxiety relates mainly to negative events in general (e.g., Barlow 1988, 1991). A word that better captures the idea of demise is “angst”. Existential psychologist Rollo May captured the idea of angst as the “inward state of awareness that [one’s] existence can become lost, [...], that one can become nothing” (May, 1956, p. 48). This feeling applied at the group level is collective angst. Collective angst, defined as the concern for the future vitality of the ingroup (Wohl & Branscombe, in press), is an emotional reaction to the perception that the very existence of the ingroup will be threatened at some time in the future.

Collective angst can be understood in terms of the model of group-based emotion described by IET. Collective angst is theorized to be an emotional response arising from the perception that the future existence of the ingroup will be threatened (i.e., appraisal). Moreover, collective angst is theorized to elicit behaviour designed to protect the ingroup from threats to its future existence (i.e., action tendency). Wohl, Bookalam, and Branscombe (2006) investigated the hypothesis that distinctiveness threat can elicit feelings of collective angst and behaviours for the protection of the distinctiveness of the ingroup. Students living in residence at Carleton University were assigned to three conditions. In the distinctiveness threat condition, participants were informed that their

unique residence “house” was to be incorporated into one large campus-wide housing unit. In the identity threat condition, participants were informed that there existed a culture of “hooliganism” among students living in residence. Participants in the no threat condition were informed of upcoming events at the university. When compared to participants in the identity threat condition and the no threat condition, those in the distinctiveness threat condition tended to exhibit elevated levels of collective angst and, moreover, expressed a greater willingness to join a rally to protest against the consolidation of the distinct residence houses. Thus, an imminent threat to group distinctiveness was associated with increased collective angst and greater willingness to engage in collective action to ward off this threat (Wohl, Bookalam, & Branscombe, 2006).

In line with the IET model of group-based emotion, collective angst may be conceived as a mediator of the relationship between the perception of threat to the existence of the ingroup and ingroup protective behaviour. That is, collective angst is theorized to account for the ingroup protective behaviour associated with the appraisal of threat to the ingroup’s existence. McVicar, Wohl, and Branscombe (2006) tested the role of collective angst as a mediator between appraisals of the ingroup’s vulnerability to extinction and ingroup protective responses. A sample of Jews recruited from the Ottawa community (N=104) completed measures that assessed: the extent to which they believe that the Jewish people are vulnerable to another Holocaust-type event; their feelings of collective angst; and their endorsement of ingroup protective behaviours (e.g., the desire to raise one’s children with the values and traditions of the ingroup; being an active member of the group). As predicted, perceived vulnerability to a second Holocaust type

event predicted greater endorsement of ingroup protective behaviours. In line with the IET model of group-based emotion, this effect was mediated by collective angst.

The Present Study

The overall research objective in the present study was to find additional support for the mediating effect of collective angst on the relationship between perceptions of threat to the future vitality of the ingroup (i.e., distinctiveness threat) and ingroup protective behaviour (differentiation). The overall mediational analysis can be understood in terms of three related hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. People who are given information that threatens the future vitality of their ingroup will tend to experience elevated levels of collective angst.

Hypothesis 2. Participants who believe that their ethnolinguistic ingroup's future is threatened should tend to endorse ingroup protective behaviour.

Hypothesis 3. It is proposed that collective angst will mediate the hypothesized relationship between the perception of threat to the ingroup and the endorsement of ingroup protective behaviour.

As noted, only high identifiers are expected to endorse action to protect the ingroup when they perceive ingroup-oriented threats. Therefore, it is expected that each of these hypotheses will be influenced by participants' level of identification with the ingroup. Thus,

Hypothesis 4. It is expected that the mediation model described in Hypothesis 3 will be moderated by ingroup identification. Thus, Hypothesis 3 will hold only for those who identify highly with the ingroup,

To test these hypotheses it is necessary to involve a people that may plausibly face a threat to the vitality of their ingroup. As noted, threats to language can imply threat to the group itself (e.g. Khleif, Stephan & Ross). Because there are lingering doubts about the future survival of the French language in Québec and of French-Canadian culture, due, for example, to declining demographic weight in North America (Castonguay, 1999; Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, 2001), Francophones in Québec are a population suitable to the assessment of these hypotheses. Given that language can be a central part of social identity, priming Québec Francophones to believe that Bill 101 has failed to protect the French language and, by implication, that Francophone culture is threatened with extinction should prompt them to experience collective angst and, in turn, endorse behaviours for the protection the Francophone ingroup.

Method

Participants and Design

The present study was a one-way between-groups design (Perception of the status of the French language in Québec: threatened vs. flourishing vs. control). Participants ($N = 56$) were from the National Capital Region (i.e., Ottawa and environs) and from the Sherbrooke area of Québec. They ranged in age from 18 to 71 years of age ($M = 43.79$, $SD = 16.35$). Twenty-seven participants were female (48.2%), 25 were male (44.6%), and four participants (7.1%) did not report their sex. The majority of participants were white ($n = 52$), with the remainder reporting as Aboriginal ($n = 1$), Chinese ($n = 1$), or other ($n = 2$). Most participants reported high school as their highest level of education (73.2%), while the remainder reported that they had some university

education (12.5%), a university or college degree (5.4%), or a graduate degree (3.6%). Approximately 5% of participants did not report their level of education. In terms of yearly household income, 37.5% of participants reported earnings over \$100000, 42.9% reported earnings between \$50000 and \$99999 while 7.1% reported earnings between \$35000 and \$50000 and, finally, 3.6% reported yearly household income less than \$35000. Approximately 5% of participants did not report yearly household income. As an incentive, each participant was entered in a draw for one of three gift-certificates valued at \$50 each.

Procedure

Two methods of recruitment were used in the present study. First, posters (in both French and English) were placed in various locations in the National Capital Region and from the Sherbrooke area of Québec. The poster included a brief summary of this study (i.e., mention was made that the study concerned issues regarding the province of Québec and its inhabitants) as well as methods for contacting the experimenters (email and phone). Second, the snowballing technique, in which participants are asked to encourage their personal contacts (e.g., friends, family, and colleagues) to take part, was employed.

This study was administered online. People who considered taking part in the study were provided with a link via email to the study website. Participants had the choice to complete the survey in either French or English. However, only those who completed the survey in French and consider themselves to be Francophone were included in the present study.¹ Prior to completing the study, participants were provided an informed consent summarizing the procedure and tasks involved in this study. They

were told that the study involved reading a newspaper article about Québec and thereafter completing a questionnaire that assessed their attitudes and feelings about being a Francophone in Québec. Participants granted or withheld consent by clicking either a “Oui” or a “Non” button, respectively. Those who consented to take part were automatically directed to the first page of the survey. Those who decided not to participate were directed to a webpage thanking them for their time and providing contact information for the researchers involved with this study.

Following completion of the consent form, participants were taken to a webpage on which participants indicated whether they considered themselves to be Francophone or non-Francophone, Anglophone or non-Anglophone. After the participants indicated their group affiliation, they were randomly sent to one of three webpages that corresponded to one of the three experimental conditions. Those assigned to the “French is threatened” condition read a brief newspaper-style article reporting that Bill 101 has failed to protect the French language in Québec. The article suggested that the French language and culture is under the threat of extinction in Canada. Participants in the “French is flourishing” condition read an article reporting that Bill 101 has been highly successful in promoting and protecting the French language and culture, ensuring their future vitality in Québec. Those participants assigned to the control group read an article on the climate and geography of Québec. After reading the article, participants continued with the questionnaire measures.

Measured Variables

Manipulation check. Participants rated the extent to which they agree with four statements such as “Bill 101 (the French language law) has been effective” and “In light

¹ Anglophones also took part in this study but there were not enough participants for statistical analyses.

of the article I have just read, it appears that the Francophone culture in Québec is secure”. Each item was rated according to Likert-type scales ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Where statements were negatively worded, responses were reverse-scored such that higher scores indicate the belief that French language law has not been effective in promoting and protecting the French language and culture in Québec. These four items were isolated measures so no reliability analysis is reported here.

Collective angst. Participants’ concern for the future vitality of the Francophone ingroup in Québec was measured with the collective angst scale. The collective angst scale consisted of ten statements such as “I am worried about the future vitality of Francophone traditions” and “I feel confident that the Francophone community’s traditions will survive”. Participants rated the extent to which they agree or disagree with each statement according to Likert type scales (1 = *Strongly Disagree*; 7 = *Strongly Agree*). Responses on the collective angst scale are reverse scored where necessary and averaged so that higher overall scores indicate higher levels of collective angst. The scale achieved good reliability ($\alpha = .80$). However, by omitting one item (“Francophones in Québec, as a whole, don’t care about their culture as they once did.”) the reliability was greatly improved. The resulting nine-item measure demonstrated excellent reliability ($\alpha = .90$) and thus was used in the subsequent analysis.

Negative emotions. Participants’ emotional experience when thinking about the future of the Francophone community in Québec was assessed with a brief measure designed to assess the extent to which they felt afraid, anxious, nervous, scared, worried, and confused. Participants rated the extent to which they experienced these emotions on a

Likert-type scale anchored at 1 (Not at all) and 7 (Extremely) (Matheson, Skomorovsky, Fiocco, & Anisman, 2007). Each participant's overall score was calculated by taking the average of their score across all six items. This measure achieved high internal consistency ($\alpha = .91$).

Ingroup protective behaviour. Participants' endorsement of behaviours intended to protect the future of the Francophone culture in Québec was assessed with a series of six statements such as "I would send my child only to a Francophone school" and "I actively strive to promote and maintain the vitality of the Francophone way of life". Participants rated each of the items according to Likert-type scales anchored at 1 (*strongly disagree*) and 7 (*strongly agree*). Scores for each of these subscales were calculated by taking the average of items such that higher scores reflected a greater endorsement of protective behaviour. After careful consideration of the substantive meaning of the six individual items included in this measure, they were organized into two subscales of three items each. With items such as "I believe that the Francophone community in Québec must retain its traditions in order to survive" and "I actively strive to promote and maintain the vitality of the Francophone 'way of life' in Québec" the first subscale reflected a commitment to the traditions of the Francophone ingroup. The second subscale reflected the idea of the opposition to merging with items such as "The mixing of Francophone traditions with those of other cultures is contaminating Francophone culture" and "The mixing of Francophone traditions with those of other cultures is a positive change for the Francophone people in Québec" (reverse scored). Reliability was fair for the Commitment to tradition subscale ($\alpha = .69$) and good for the opposition to merging subscale ($\alpha = .77$).

Francophone identification. The extent to which participants identify with the Francophone ingroup was measured with a four-item questionnaire based on that used by Ellemers, Spears, and Doosje (1995). Example items included “I see myself as a member of the Francophone community” and “I identify with members of the Francophone community”. Each item on the scale was rated according to a 7-point Likert scale anchored by 1 (Strongly Disagree) and 7 (Strongly Agree). Where necessary, items were reverse-scored so that higher scores reflect greater levels of identification with the Francophone ingroup. Internal consistency for this measure was fair ($\alpha = .70$).

Results

Preliminary analyses

The results of a series of ANOVAs determined that there was no effect of gender on Francophone identification, collective angst, negative emotion, opposition to merging, and commitment to traditions (all $ps > .32$). As there were no effects of gender in the present study, scores on all of the research variables were collapsed across gender. Bivariate correlations among the manipulation check items and the measured variables are displayed in Table 1. The Bill 101 not effective item was not related to any measured variable. The concerned about Bill 101 effectiveness item was positively correlated with collective angst, negative emotion, and opposition to merging. However, the concerned about Bill 101 effectiveness item was not associated with commitment to traditions. The negative feelings about Bill 101 item was related only to Francophone identification and to commitment to traditions. The Francophone ingroup is not secure item was related only to collective angst and negative emotion. Francophone identification was related only to commitment to traditions. Collective

angst, negative emotion, and opposition to merging were all significantly positively correlated with one another while commitment to tradition was related only to Francophone identification.

Manipulation check

Immediately after reading the manipulation article, participants rated their agreement with four statements designed to determine whether they agreed that the future of the French language and culture is in jeopardy in Québec. ANOVAs were run on each of the four manipulation check items separately, revealing a marginally significant effect of condition on the “Francophone ingroup not secure” manipulation check item, $F(1,51) = 2.37, p = .08$. There was no effect of condition on any of the other three manipulation check items, all $ps > .26$.

Experimental effects

Means and standard deviations for each research variable are presented in Table 2. Participants’ scores on commitment to traditions sub-scale differed depending on whether they were in the threat, flourishing, or control conditions, $F(2,51) = 3.37, p = .04$. Post hoc tests indicated that commitment to tradition scores for participants in the threat condition were higher than commitment to tradition scores for participants in the control (See Table 2). Participants’ scores on collective angst, negative emotion, and opposition to merging did not differ depending on whether they were in the threat, flourishing, or control conditions, (all $ps > .62$).

Francophone identification as moderator of manipulation effects.

It was expected that those highly identified as Francophones would show the greatest response to the manipulation. That is, Francophone identification was

Table 1. Correlations among manipulation check items and measured variables.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Bill 101 not effective	-								
2. Concerned about Bill 101 effectiveness	.01 (54)	-							
3. Negative feelings about Bill 101	.50** (54)	-.13 (54)	-						
4. Francophone ingroup not secure	.24 (54)	-.07 (54)	-.04 (54)	-					
5. Francophone Identification	-.19 (52)	-.10 (52)	-.38** (52)	.12 (52)	-				
6. Collective angst	.22 (53)	.43** (53)	-.08 (53)	-.52** (53)	-.07 (51)	-		-	
7. Negative Emotion	.13 (54)	.37** (54)	-.20 (54)	.25** (54)	.05 (52)	.56** (53)	-		
8. Opposition to Merging	.05 (53)	.28* (53)	-.16 (53)	.15 (53)	.10 (51)	.35* (52)	.37** (53)	-	
9. Commitment to Traditions	-.19 (52)	-.12 (54)	-.40** (52)	.05 (52)	.60** (50)	-.03 (52)	.02 (52)	.18 (52)	-

Note: N values are in parentheses; * $p < .05$, two-tailed; ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

hypothesized to moderate the effect of the manipulation on each of collective angst, negative emotion, opposition to merging, and commitment to traditions: The greater participants' identification with the Francophone ingroup, the greater should be their levels of collective angst, negative emotion, opposition to merging, and commitment to traditions in response to the threat manipulation. To determine the potential moderating role of Francophone identification on these variables, the multiple regression procedure for detecting moderation described by Aiken and West (1991) was performed. First, a Table 2.

Means and standard deviations by condition for collective angst, negative emotion, opposition to merging and commitment to traditions.

	<i>Threat</i>		<i>Flourishing</i>		<i>Control</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>Collective angst</i>	3.85 _a	1.31	4.11 _a	1.10	4.14 _a	1.23
<i>Negative emotion</i>	3.10 _a	1.63	2.88 _a	1.20	3.29 _a	1.07
<i>Opposition to Merging</i>	3.31 _a	.86	3.11 _a	.86	3.03 _a	.93
<i>Commitment to Traditions</i>	5.69 _a	.71	5.35 _{ab}	.98	4.83 _b	1.27

Note: Means in a given row with similar subscripts are not significantly different at $\alpha < .05$.

centred Francophone identification scale was generated. Second, two dummy variables were created to designate whether participants were in either the threat condition (dummy coded as 1, 0, 0), the flourishing condition (dummy coded as 0, 1, 0), or the control condition (dummy coded as 0, 0, 0). Third, two interaction terms were created: The centred Francophone identification measure by the threat condition dummy variable and the centred Francophone identification measure by the flourishing condition dummy variable. Having completed these three preliminary steps a series of hierarchical regression analyses assessing the predictive ability of the threat condition by Francophone identification interaction over and above the predictive abilities of condition and Francophone identification was conducted. For each dependent variable – collective angst, negative emotions, opposition to merging, and commitment to traditions – three regressions were performed. In the first of the three regressions, the dependent variable was regressed on condition. In the second step, the centred Francophone identification scale was entered into the regression equation. In the third and final step, the two interaction terms (i.e., centred Francophone identification by threat dummy and centred Francophone identification by flourishing dummy) were entered into the regression equation. This three-step regression procedure was repeated with each of collective angst, negative emotion, opposition to merging, and commitment to traditions entered as dependent variables. The results of these analyses are displayed in Table 3.

The regression procedures revealed that only the threat condition dummy variable by the centred Francophone identification interaction was a significant, albeit negative, predictor of collective angst. No other variable included in this series of three regression models predicted collective angst. Thus, the manipulation was associated with reduced

collective angst for highly identified participants in the threat condition. No variable predicted negative emotion and opposition to merging. The threat condition dummy by Francophone identification interaction was a significant negative predictor of commitment to traditions. Finally, Francophone identification was a significant positive predictor of commitment to traditions. Thus, the more participants identified with the Francophone ingroup the more they tended to express a commitment to Francophone traditions regardless of whether they were in the threat, flourishing, or control condition.

Scores on collective angst, negative emotion, opposition to merging, and commitment to traditions at the mean, minus one standard deviation, and plus one standard deviation on centred Francophone identification are shown in Figures 1 to 4.

It was expected that collective angst and negative emotion would mediate the effect of condition on opposition to merging and commitment to traditions. However, as seen in Table 2, condition did not predict any of collective angst, negative emotion, opposition to merging, or commitment to traditions. Thus, both the first criterion (that the independent variable predicts the dependent variable - Baron & Kenny, 1986) and the second criterion (that the independent variable predicts the proposed mediator - Baron & Kenny, 1986) for mediation were not fulfilled. However, Francophone identification was a significant moderator of the effect of the manipulation on both collective angst and commitment to traditions. These findings suggest that mediation effects might emerge at different levels of Francophone identification. Thus, the bootstrapping procedure for testing conditional indirect effects as described by Preacher, Rucker, and Hayes (2007) was performed twice: The first analysis investigated whether Francophone identification moderated the indirect effect of the threat manipulation on opposition to merging through

Table 3.

Hierarchical regression analyses testing moderating effects of Francophone identification in the relationship between condition and measured variables.

Variable	r	β	R ²	R ² change
Dependent variable: Collective angst				
Step 1			.00	.00
Condition	-.02	-.02		
Step 2			.00	.01
Condition	-.02	-.01		
CFID	-.07	-.07		
Step 3			.09	.09
Condition	-.02	-.08		
CFID	-.07	.37		
CFID X Dummy1	-.23	-.44*		
CFID X Dummy2	.06	.28		
Dependent variable: Negative emotions				
Step 1			.02	.02
Condition	-.12	-.12		
Step 2			.02	.00
Condition	-.12	-.13		
CFID	.05	.03		
Step 3			.04	.02
Condition	-.12	-.09		
CFID	.05	-.14		
CFID X Dummy1	.02	.09		
CFID X Dummy2	-.15	-.22		

Note. CFID = Centred Francophone identification. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table 3 (continued).

Hierarchical regression analyses testing moderating effects of Francophone identification in the relationship between condition and measured variables.

Variable	r	β	R ²	R ² change
Dependent variable: Opposition to merging				
Step 1			.00	.00
Condition	.05	.05		
Step 2			.01	.01
Condition	.05	.05		
CFID	.10	.10		
Step 3			.06	.05
Condition	.05	.00		
CFID	.10	.46		
CFID X Dummy1	-.06	-.32		
CFID X Dummy2	.00	.27		
Dependent variable: Commitment to traditions				
Step 1			.05	.05
Condition	.22	.22		
Step 2			.395	.35
Condition	.22	.20		
CFID		.59***		
Step 3			.48	.08
Condition	.22	.12		
CFID	.60	1.06***		
CFID X Dummy1	.21	-.41*		
CFID X Dummy2	.27	.37*		

Note. CFID = Centred Francophone identification. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Figure 1.

Francophone identification as a moderator of the effect of the threat manipulation on collective angst.

Figure 2.

Francophone identification as a moderator of the effect of the threat manipulation on negative emotion.

Figure 3.

Francophone identification as a moderator of the effect of the threat manipulation on opposition to merging.

Figure 4.

Francophone identification as a moderator of the effect of the threat manipulation on commitment to traditions.

collective angst; the second analysis investigated whether Francophone identification moderated the indirect effect of the threat manipulation on commitment to tradition through collective angst.

Francophone identification as a moderator of the indirect effect of the threat manipulation on opposition to merging through collective angst. The first hierarchical regression model (Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007) for testing conditional indirect effects included condition, Francophone identification, collective angst, and the interaction between condition and Francophone identification as predictors of Opposition to merging. The coefficient associated with the interaction between threat condition and Francophone identification was non-significant, $\beta = -.17$, $t(50) = -.92$, $p = .36$, indicating that there is no conditional indirect effect of condition on Opposition to merging through collective angst. Moreover, the Johnson-Neyman test of the significance of the conditional indirect effect across the range of values of the moderator confirmed that the conditional indirect effect was non-significant, all $ps > .41$.

Francophone identification as a moderator of the indirect effect of the threat manipulation on commitment to tradition through collective angst. The hierarchical regression procedure for testing conditional indirect effects (Preacher, Rucker, and Hayes, 2007) was conducted a second time to determine whether the effect of condition on commitment to tradition through collective angst is moderated by Francophone identification. This model included condition, Francophone identification, collective angst, and the interaction between condition and Francophone identification as predictors of commitment to tradition. The coefficient associated with the interaction between condition and Francophone identification was marginally significant, $\beta = -.31$, $t(50)$, -

1.94, $p = .06$, suggesting a marginal conditional indirect effect of the threat condition on commitment to tradition through collective angst. However, the Johnson-Neyman test of the significance of the conditional indirect effect across the range of values of Francophone identification found no significant effect at any of its levels, all $ps > .75$.

In sum, the results of these tests for conditional indirect effects suggest that Francophone identification was not a strong moderator of the indirect effect of the threat condition on either opposition to merging or commitment to traditions through collective angst.

Manipulation check item as a predictor

It is argued that the manipulation check item that reflected concern about Bill 101 effectiveness may be used as a predictor of the measured variables (i.e., collective angst, negative emotion, opposition to merging, and commitment to tradition) as the effect of condition was only marginally significant ($p = .08$). To the point, this item reflected the perception of threat toward the future of the Francophone language and culture in Québec. The more participants agreed with the concerned about Bill 101 effectiveness statement, the more they perceived a threat to the distinctiveness of the Francophone ingroup in Québec. Thus, this item might be used in lieu of the threat manipulation.

To determine whether the concerned about Bill 101 effectiveness manipulation check item is a suitable substitute for the manipulated variable as a predictor of the measured variables (i.e., threat condition, flourishing condition, and control condition) the correlations were examined. As shown in Table 1, the concerned about Bill 101 effectiveness item was positively correlated with collective angst, negative emotion, and opposition to merging. The more participants were concerned about the effectiveness of

Bill 101, the more they tended to experience collective angst, negative emotion, and opposition to merging. Thus, the concerned about Bill 101 effectiveness measure was used as a predictor for collective angst, negative emotion, opposition to merging, and commitment to traditions. The concerned about Bill 101 effectiveness measure is hereafter referred to as distinctiveness threat.

Mediational analysis

A key research objective of the present work was to examine emotional and behavioural responses to distinctiveness threat. Specifically, it was expected that collective angst and or negative emotion would mediate the indirect of distinctiveness threat on opposition to merging and commitment to traditions. Formal tests of mediation were conducted to determine the mediating role of collective angst and negative emotion.

Collective angst as mediator of the effect of distinctiveness threat on opposition to merging. To test the hypothesis that collective angst mediates the relationship between distinctiveness threat and opposition to merging, Baron and Kenny's (1986) regression-based procedure for testing mediation (i.e., indirect effect) was performed. First, opposition to merging (the dependent variable) was regressed on distinctiveness threat (the predictor variable). In this analysis, distinctiveness threat was a significant predictor of opposition to merging, $\beta = .28$, $t(51) = 2.11$, $p = .04$. Second, opposition to merging (dependent variable) was regressed on collective angst: Collective angst was a significant predictor of opposition to merging, $\beta = .35$, $t(50) = 2.62$, $p = .01$. Third, opposition to merging was regressed simultaneously on both distinctiveness threat and collective angst. In this multiple regression the distinctiveness threat was no longer a significant predictor of opposition to merging, $\beta = .15$, $t(49) = 1.06$, $p = .30$ while collective angst was a

marginally significant predictor of opposition to merging, $\beta = .28$, $t(49) = 1.94$, $p = .06$. The results of these regression analyses point to mediation, however, due to the small sample size, it is likely that there was insufficient power to detect a significant mediational effect. Consequently, Preacher and Hayes' (2004) bootstrapping procedure for calculating the estimate of the indirect effect of distinctiveness threat on opposition to merging through collective angst was employed. This procedure calculated the bootstrapped estimate of the indirect effect (with 1000 iterations) to lie between .006 and .17 with 95% confidence. As zero does not lie within these 95% confidence limits, it is concluded that the indirect effect is significantly different from zero.

Negative emotion as a mediator of the effect of distinctiveness threat on opposition to merging. To test the hypothesis that negative emotion mediates the relationship between distinctiveness threat and opposition to merging, Baron and Kenny's (1986) regression-based procedure for testing mediation (i.e., indirect effect) was performed. In the first step, distinctiveness threat was a significant predictor of opposition to merging, $\beta = .28$, $t(51) = 2.11$, $p = .04$. In the second step, negative emotion was a significant predictor of opposition to merging, $\beta = .37$, $t(51) = 2.82$, $p = .01$. In the third and final step, a multiple regression including both distinctiveness threat and negative emotion was performed. In this multiple regression only negative emotion remained a significant predictor of opposition to merging, $\beta = .30$, $t(50) = 2.15$, $p = .04$ while distinctiveness threat was non-significant, $\beta = .16$, $t(50) = 1.17$, $p = .25$. This pattern of results meets all three of the Baron and Kenny criteria for perfect mediation. Additionally, the Preacher and Hayes bootstrapping procedure (2004) calculated the estimate of the indirect effect of distinctiveness threat on opposition to merging to lie

between .0002 and .18 with 95% confidence. As zero does not lie within these 95% confidence limits, the indirect effect is significantly different from zero.

Collective angst and negative emotion as mediators of the effect of distinctiveness threat on commitment to traditions. Neither collective angst nor negative emotion were found to mediate the indirect effect of distinctiveness threat on commitment to traditions because distinctiveness threat was not a significant predictor of Commitment to traditions, $\beta = .08$, $t(53) = .54$, $p = .59$. Thus, the first of Baron and Kenny's (1986) three criteria for mediation, that the IV (i.e., distinctiveness threat) is a significant predictor of the DV (i.e., commitment to traditions), was not fulfilled. As there is no relationship between distinctiveness threat and commitment to traditions there is no possibility for mediation. No further regression analyses were conducted.

Moderated mediation

It was hypothesized that the indirect effect of distinctiveness threat on ingroup protective behaviours would be strongest for those who identify highly with the Francophone ingroup. To assess this hypothesis, Preacher, Rucker, and Hayes' (2007) bootstrapping procedure to calculate the estimate of the conditional indirect effect of distinctiveness threat on ingroup protective behaviours through group based emotion (i.e., collective angst and negative emotion) was moderated by Francophone identification was employed. As there are two mediator variables (collective angst and negative emotion) and two dependent variables (opposition to merging and commitment to traditions) the bootstrapping procedure was conducted a total of four times in order to analyse all four combinations of mediator variables and dependent variables.

Francophone identification as moderator of distinctiveness threat on opposition to merging through collective angst. The first bootstrapping procedure (Preacher, Rucker, and Hayes, 2007) for testing conditional indirect effects was bootstrapped with 1000 iterations. The model included distinctiveness threat, Francophone identification, collective angst, and the interaction between distinctiveness threat and Francophone identification as predictors of opposition to merging. The coefficient associated with the interaction between distinctiveness threat was significant, $\beta = -.26$, $t(50) < -2.50$, $p = .02$, indicating that there is a significant conditional indirect effect of condition on opposition to merging through collective angst. Moreover, the Johnson-Neyman test of the significance of the conditional indirect effect across the range of values of the moderator revealed that the conditional indirect effect was significant only for participants with centred Francophone identification scores greater than or equal to .16. That is, participants with centred Francophone identification scores of .16 or greater tended to experience reduced levels of collective angst and opposition to merging in response to distinctiveness threat.

Francophone identification as moderator of distinctiveness threat on opposition to merging through negative emotion. The second bootstrapping procedure (Preacher, Rucker, and Hayes, 2007) included distinctiveness threat, Francophone identification, negative emotion, and the interaction between distinctiveness threat and Francophone identification as predictors of opposition to merging. Again, the bootstrapping procedure was applied with 1000 iterations. The coefficient associated with the interaction between distinctiveness threat and Francophone identification was significant, $\beta = -.21$, $t(50) = -2.01$, $p = .05$, indicating that the indirect effect of collective angst on opposition to

merging through negative emotion is moderated by Francophone identification. However, the Johnson-Neyman test of the significance of the conditional indirect effect across the range of values of Francophone identification did not reveal any values of Francophone identification where conditional indirect effect was significant, all $ps > .14$.

Francophone identification as moderator of distinctiveness threat on commitment to traditions through collective angst. The bootstrapping procedure for testing conditional indirect effects (Preacher, Rucker, and Hayes, 2007) included distinctiveness threat, Francophone identification, collective angst, and the interaction between distinctiveness threat and Francophone identification as predictors of commitment to traditions. The data was bootstrapped with 1000 iterations. The coefficient associated with the interaction between distinctiveness threat and Francophone identification was marginally significant, $\beta = -.17$, $t(50) = -1.83$, $p = .07$, suggesting that indirect effect of collective angst on commitment to tradition through collective angst is somewhat influenced by Francophone identification. However, the Johnson-Neyman test of the significance of the conditional indirect effect across the range of values of Francophone identification did not reveal any values of Francophone identification where the conditional indirect effect of distinctiveness threat on commitment to traditions through collective angst was significant, all $ps > .70$.

Francophone identification as moderator of distinctiveness threat on commitment to traditions through negative emotion. The fourth and final hierarchical regression procedure (bootstrapped with 1000 iterations) included distinctiveness threat, Francophone identification, negative emotion, and the interaction between distinctiveness threat and Francophone identification as predictors of commitment to traditions. The

coefficient associated with the interaction between distinctiveness threat and Francophone identification was marginally significant, $\beta = -.17$, $t(50) = -1.94$, $p = .06$, suggesting that Francophone identification is a marginally significant moderator of the indirect effect of distinctiveness threat on commitment to tradition through negative emotion. However, the Johnson-Neyman test of the significance of the conditional indirect effect across the range of values of Francophone identification did not reveal any values of Francophone identification where conditional indirect effect of distinctiveness threat on commitment to traditions through negative emotion was significant, all $ps > .30$.

Discussion

The present study investigated group members' emotional and behavioural responses when they perceive a threat to the distinctiveness of their ingroup. The central research goal was to find evidence for the hypothesis that the effect of distinctiveness threat on ingroup protective behaviour is mediated by group based emotion. The results of the current study provide partial support for this hypothesis. Group-based emotion (whether conceived as collective angst or as negative emotion) was influential in mediating the effect of distinctiveness threat on participants' opposition to the idea of the Francophone ingroup merging with outgroups. That is, opposition to merging in response to distinctiveness threat was accounted for by both collective angst and negative emotions. This finding is consistent with the SIT prediction that group members tend to differentiate the ingroup when they believe the group's distinctiveness is threatened. Moreover, by mapping distinctiveness threat and differentiation onto the IET constructs of appraisal and action tendency, the present study revealed that distinctiveness and

differentiation – normally associated only with SIT - can be understood in terms of recent theory and research on group-based emotion.

It was also hypothesized that the effect of distinctiveness threat on ingroup protective behaviours through group-based emotion would be moderated by ingroup identification. That is, it was expected that those who identified highly with the Francophone ingroup would experience the highest levels of collective angst or negative emotion in response to distinctiveness threat. In turn, these high-identifiers were expected to express greater levels of both opposition to merging and commitment to traditions. The data did not support this hypothesis. Although, Francophone identification was a significant moderator of the indirect effect of distinctiveness threat on opposition to merging through collective angst, its effect was in the opposite direction: The more participants identified with the Francophone ingroup, the less they tended to experience collective angst or negative emotions and the less they tended to express opposition to merging. Francophone identification did not moderate the indirect effect of distinctiveness threat on opposition to merging through negative emotion: Participants who experienced negative emotion in response to distinctiveness threat tended to oppose merging regardless of their level of identification with the Francophone ingroup. However, distinctiveness threat did not predict commitment to traditions regardless of whether or not participants experienced collective angst or negative emotion; there was no mediating effect of group-based emotion at any level of Francophone identification. Together, these findings suggest that the presence of mediation and moderated-mediation depends on the variables under consideration. Moreover, the present study successfully

distinguished two forms of differentiation behaviour that are differently affected by distinctiveness threat.

The present study makes a unique contribution to the group threat literature by integrating theoretical and empirical work from the studies of social identity and group-based emotion. Specifically, this study fits the SIT concepts of distinctiveness and differentiation to the IET model of group-based appraisal, emotion, and action tendency.

Distinctiveness threat and differentiation

The finding that participants who perceived a threat to the distinctiveness of the Francophone ingroup tended to oppose merging supports the SIT prediction that group members will strive to make the ingroup more distinct when they perceive it to be too similar to an outgroup on some dimension of comparison. In the present study, this dimension of comparison was language: The predictor variable in this study reflected the extent to which participants were concerned about the effectiveness of Bill 101 in protecting and promoting the French language in Québec. Although this measure was related to the status of the French language it was, by extension, related to the future existence of the Francophone ingroup in Québec. Canadian Francophones, who are largely defined by their common use of the French language, would cease to exist in its present form without the French language as a criterion for membership. As language is an important marker of identity that can define a group's boundaries and make it distinct from outgroups, a threat to a group's unique language is an explicit threat to the distinctiveness of the group itself (e.g., Khleif, 1979; Giles & Johnson, 1981, Stephan & Renfro, 2002). If the French language in Québec were to fall into disuse, the existing Francophone ingroup would lose an essential distinctive quality that makes it unique.

Thus, when participants expressed concern about the effectiveness of Bill 101 they were expressing concern about the future status of the French language in Québec and, in turn, their concern about the future distinctiveness of the Francophone ingroup in Québec. In the present study, participants who perceived a threat to the French language in Québec tended to oppose the idea of the blending of Francophone ingroup with non-Francophone outgroups. Such blending may imply an additional threat to the status of the French language, but it is not explicitly about language. Thus, this study provides support for my general hypothesis that group members may attempt to differentiate the ingroup along dimensions other than the dimension on which distinctiveness threat is perceived.

Participants who perceived a threat to the Francophone ingroup's distinctiveness tended to express their desire to protect it by opposing the idea of mixing the cultural traditions of the Francophone ingroup with those of non-Francophones. Such "blending" between ingroup and outgroup represents an obvious and potentially immediate, yet perhaps avoidable, form of linguistic and cultural change. For example, Francophones in Québec may be aware that when Francophones and Anglophones outside Québec intermarry, the French language is unlikely to be transmitted to the next generation (Cardinal, 2003). By extension, it can be argued that Francophones (particularly those who are concerned about the long-term status of their mother tongue) might believe that intermarriage may undermine the French language and the Francophone ingroup in Québec. It follows, then, that when Francophones marry Francophones, they are encouraging the use of French among their offspring and thereby maintaining the distinctiveness of the Francophone ingroup. Thus, as expected, participants in the current investigation differentiated the ingroup based on a perceived threat to the status of the

French language in Québec. Because this pattern of results may be understood in terms of group members' desire to differentiate the ingroup from relevant outgroups, the current results support the SIT contention that group members who perceive a threat to ingroup distinctiveness will attempt to draw distinctions between the ingroup and outgroup as a protective measure (e.g., Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Spears et al., 2002, Jetten et al., 2004).

Previous theoretical and empirical work (e.g., Branscombe, et al., 1999; Jetten et al., 2004) suggests that the present results should have revealed distinctiveness threat to be a predictor of commitment to traditions. To maintain traditions is to preserve the qualities that distinguish the ingroup from outgroups. Therefore, the present finding that distinctiveness threat predicted opposition to merging while it did not predict participants' commitment to tradition is puzzling. However, it is important to note an essential difference between the opposition to merging and commitment to traditions measures used in this study: The items in the opposition to merging measure specifically reflected the *mixing* of the Francophone ingroup with outgroups whereas the commitment to traditions measure reflected the *preservation* of Francophone traditions. The present results suggest that these measures were differently affected by distinctiveness threat and the associated emotional reactions examined in this study. This finding suggests that the relationship between distinctiveness threat and the need to differentiate depends on the assessment tools (i.e., the chosen measures) Thus, the present study qualifies the SIT contention that distinctiveness threat leads to differentiation by demonstrating that group members do not tend to support *any* form of differentiation when they perceive a threat to the distinctiveness of the ingroup.

In the current study the more participants identified with the Francophone ingroup, the more they tended to support the preservation of its traditions. Branscombe and colleagues (1999) noted that high identifiers tend to focus on the ingroup's qualitative characteristics and the overall homogeneity of its members. Related behaviours will include the promotion and maintenance of the qualities that comprise group identity and bond group members together. As participants in this study tended to be highly identified Francophones, it was expected that promoting the traditions was predicted by ingroup identity would be an important strategy to distinguish the ingroup. This finding suggests that distinctiveness is just one of many variables which may predict behaviours designed to differentiate the ingroup.

Group-based emotions

The present results suggest that group-based emotional reactions in response to the perception of threat to ingroup distinctiveness can play an important role in generating certain attitudes and behaviours designed to protect the future distinctiveness of the ingroup. Specifically, mediational analyses provided partial support for the hypothesis that the effect of the perception of threat to ingroup distinctiveness on ingroup protective behaviour is mediated by group-based emotion (whether conceived as collective angst or as negative emotion). Although the role of emotion was not elaborated in SIT, Tajfel recognized the value and emotional significance attached to group membership (Tajfel, 1978). In contrast, according to IET, emotion is conceived as a driving force behind behaviour arising in response to social identity concerns. Countless patterns of appraisal, emotion, and action tendency can be understood within the framework of the IET model of group-based emotion. It is not surprising, then, of the

need for distinctiveness can be understood in terms of the model of group-based emotion described by IET. When group members make a judgement about ingroup distinctiveness in comparison to a relevant outgroup, they are making an appraisal about the state or circumstance of the ingroup. When group members are motivated to differentiate the ingroup from a relevant outgroup, they are demonstrating an action tendency. When a perceived threat to the distinctiveness of the ingroup and differentiation are understood as cases of appraisal and action tendency, respectively, they fit perfectly the IET model of group-based emotion. Thus, the IET model can be employed to analyze the role of emotion in the process of differentiation in response to distinctiveness threat.

Francophone identification, group based emotion, and opposition to merging

Francophone identification was a significant negative moderator of the conditional indirect effect of distinctiveness threat on opposition to merging when collective angst was the proposed mediator. Moreover, Francophone identification was a marginally significant negative moderator of the conditional indirect effect of distinctiveness threat on opposition to merging when negative emotion was the proposed mediator. Neither of these findings were in the hypothesized direction. It was expected that the more participants identified with the Francophone ingroup, the more they would tend to experience either collective angst or negative emotions in response to distinctiveness threat, and, in turn, the more they would tend to express their opposition to merging. However, the opposite was true: The more participants identified with the Francophone ingroup, the *less* they tended to experience collective angst or negative emotions and the *less* they tended to express their opposition to merging.

This contradictory finding is puzzling for two reasons: First, according to the reactive distinctiveness hypothesis (e.g., Spears et al., 2002; Jetten et al., 2004), high identifiers will attempt to differentiate the ingroup when they believe that it lacks distinctiveness in relation to an outgroup (e.g., Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Jetten et al., 2004). The present results are not consistent with the reactive distinctiveness hypothesis in that highly identified Francophones tended to express a *lower* opposition to merging (i.e., less differentiation) in response to a perceived threat to ingroup distinctiveness. Second, Mackie and colleagues (2000, Study 1) found that ingroup identification influenced the relationship between appraisal and action tendency. However, their analysis did not consider the effect of ingroup identification on the full IET model including group-based emotion. It was expected that the present study would clarify the role of ingroup identification by showing that its influence as a mediator of the effect of distinctiveness threat on opposition to merging would be greater among highly-identified Francophones. Instead, the present study revealed that ingroup identification can reduce the mediating influence of group-based emotion, suggesting that the influence of ingroup identification may differ according to the particular ingroup members under consideration. This finding is in line with both SIT and IET in that ingroup identification plays an important role in both theories. According to SIT, however, higher levels of ingroup identification will lead to greater differentiation in response to distinctiveness threat. Similarly, according to IET, greater ingroup identification will result in greater emotional responses to ingroup-relevant appraisals. The current results demonstrate that such generalizations about the effect of ingroup identification on group based emotions, appraisal (e.g., distinctiveness threat), and action tendency (e.g., differentiation) may be unfounded.

The present results also demonstrate that context is an important determinant of group members' responses to potential distinctiveness threats. In the current study, it is possible that highly-identified participants reacted against the manipulation. That is, high-identifiers may have resisted the idea that the French language in Québec is under threat and, as a result, tended to report lower levels of collective angst and negative emotions. This might be expected given that the status of the French language in Québec has improved in the three decades since Bill 101 was first introduced (Vallaincourt, Lemay, & Vallaincourt, 2007). Thus, it can be argued that the participants reacted against the manipulation because they consider the future of the French language and the Francophone ingroup in Québec to be assured. Previous theoretical and empirical work from the ethnolinguistic vitality perspective (e.g., Bourhis, 1977; Giles, 1979; 1981) suggests that Francophones have reason to believe that the French language and culture in Québec will continue to flourish. According to ethnolinguistic vitality theory, the status of an ethnolinguistic group depends on factors such as its economic and political status, representation in education and government, and demographic factors such as birth rate and mixed marriages (e.g., Giles & Johnson, 1981). At the time of this study, the Francophone ingroup was well-represented in the areas of, for example, government at both the federal and provincial levels as well as the Québec economic environment (Vallaincourt, Lemay, & Vallaincourt, 2007). Thus, it should be expected that Francophones in Québec, particularly highly identified ones, have confidence in their future as a distinct group. The present results support the SIT position that members of a group who are confident in its distinctiveness are not expected to differentiate it (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

Caveats, limitations, and future directions

This study was conducted online via the internet. For matters such as group-based emotional responses, there is evidence that more honest and less socially desirable responses are obtained using this medium (Evans, Garcia, Garcia, & Baron, 2003). However, conducting the study online may have attracted a somewhat narrow range of participants. Specifically, the methods of recruitment (e.g., posters and an online campaign) employed in this study may have resulted in a somewhat biased sample. It was expected that this research would attract participants who are highly identified as Francophones or, for example, support the idea of sovereignty for Québec. Participants such as these may have taken part in this study because of their position on social issues in Québec. Just the study title “Social Issues in Québec” may have attracted participants whose responses were influenced by their attitudes about the status of the French language and culture in Canada. Indeed, it was expected that highly identified Francophones would show the greatest responses to perceived threat to distinctiveness. Future studies investigating the different emotional and behavioural responses of high identifiers compared with low identifiers should attempt to include a greater range of participants so that a greater variety of social and political viewpoints is maximised.

Although every effort was taken to develop a believable and impactful manipulation in this study, results suggested that, overall, participants in the French threatened condition did not tend to agree that Bill 101 has been unsuccessful in elevating the status of the French language in Québec. It is possible that, at the time of this study, Francophones, in general, could not easily be convinced that the future of the French language in Québec is in doubt. However, participants reported varying levels of

distinctiveness threat along with varying levels of collective angst, negative emotions, and opposition to merging. These results suggest that distinctiveness threat and the associated responses resemble individual variables that are not malleable. Given that the French language in Québec has been under threat in the past, it should be expected that some individuals and groups continue to believe that the French language is threatened (See Kelman, 1992, for a discussion of the effects of historical threats to the ingroup). Indeed, at the time of this study there were groups in Québec devoted to the promotion of the French language (e.g., *Impératif français*). Where doubt remains about the vitality of the French language in Québec, they are most likely to be founded on changing demographics (Castonguay, 1991). However, when the status of the language seems assured according to its status in the areas of, for example, government and economy, group members may be less likely to be affected by a manipulation that addresses only demographic change. It seems that in the current study, participants in the threat manipulation were not strongly affected because the article they read focussed mainly on demographic change. Thus, future studies attempting to manipulate the perceived status of an ingroup's unique language should emphasize a greater variety of information (e.g., the language's position in business and education) that could be used to signal threat to the long-term vitality of the language.

This study marked an important step in understanding the relationship between ingroup identification, distinctiveness threat, group-based emotion, and behaviour to protect the vitality of the ingroup. However, the present findings relied on a single-item measure of distinctiveness threat. This approach to measuring distinctiveness threat may not have been ideal because single-item measures may tend to have a greater variance

than those with multiple items assessing a range of closely related ideas. A stronger measure of distinctiveness threat would include multiple items.

In this study collective angst and negative emotions were strongly correlated. Moreover, their operation as mediators was very similar: Both collective angst and negative emotion mediated the effect of distinctiveness threat on opposition to merging. Thus, from a statistical perspective, the present results do not suggest that collective angst and negative emotion are readily distinguishable from one another. Future studies examining the concept of collective angst will benefit from additional analyses to determine its construct validity.

Conclusion

The present research utilizes concepts from both SIT and IET to describe group members' emotional responses when they perceive a threat to the distinctiveness of the ingroup. Specifically, the present results suggest that the SIT concepts of distinctiveness and differentiation can be better understood by considering the role of group-based emotion. By conceiving the reactive distinctiveness hypothesis in terms of the model of group-based emotion described by IET, the present research has contributed to another perspective on the relationship between distinctiveness threat and differentiation.

Moreover, most previous research on group-based emotions has considered emotion and behaviour oriented towards the outgroup (e.g., Miller, Smith, & Mackie, 2004; Stephan, Diaz-Loving, & Duran, 2000; (Stephan et al., 2002). The present research revealed, however, that group-based emotion and behaviour can operate at the ingroup level without regard to any specific outgroup.

The similar predictive abilities of collective angst and negative emotion

suggests that the strict separation of appraisal and emotion is not always necessary to the understanding of group-based action tendencies. In this study collective angst and negative emotions operated similarly in their roles as predictors and mediators. That is, both collective angst and negative emotion accounted for the relationship between distinctiveness threat and differentiation. The distinction between appraisal and emotion is clearly important when specific emotion labels are under academic investigation (e.g., Frijda, 1987; Roseman, Antoniou, & Jose, 1996). Such studies seek to connect specific appraisals with specific emotions. However, from the standpoint of intergroup relations, the specific group-based emotion in response to a situation or event affecting the ingroup may not be as important as the associated behavioural response: The prediction and understanding of group-level action tendency (i.e., how groups and their members actually behave) is of central importance in making the study of group-based appraisals, threatening or otherwise, applicable to social psychology.

References

- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Barlow, D.H. (1988). *Anxiety and its disorders: The nature and treatment of anxiety and panic*. New York: Guilford.
- Barlow, D.H. (1991). Disorders of emotion. *Psychological Inquiry*, 2, 58-71.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in Social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Branscombe, N. R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and content of social identity threats. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, and B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: context, commitment, and content* (pp. 35-58). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Branscombe, N. R., & Wann, D. L. (1994). Collective self-esteem consequences of outgroup derogation when a valued social identity is on trial. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 24, 641-657.
- Cardinal, L. (2004). The limits of bilingualism in Canada. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 10, 79-103.
- Castonguay, C. (1999). French is on the Ropes: Why won't Ottawa admit it? [Electronic version]. *Policy Options*, October, 1999, 39-50.
- Vaillancourt, F., Lemay, D., & Vaillancourt, L. (2001, August). *Laggards No More: The*

- Changed Socioeconomic Status of Francophones in Quebec*. Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.cdhowe.org/pdf/backgroundunder_103_english.pdf.
- Cialdini, R. B., Borden, R.J., Thorne R.J. & Walker, M.R., M.R., Freeman, S., & Sloan, L.R. (1976). Basking in reflected glory: Three (football) field studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 3.
- Devos, T., Silver, L. A., Mackie, D. M., & Smith, E. R. (2002). The Experience of Intergroup emotions. In D. M. Mackie and E. R. Smith (Eds.), *From prejudice to intergroup emotions* (pp. 111-134). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Dovidio, Gaertner, Validzic (1998) intergroup bias: Status, differentiation, and a common ingroup identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 1.
- Eidelson, R., & Eidelson, J. (2003). Dangerous ideas: Five beliefs that propel groups toward conflict. *American Psychologist*, 58, 3.
- Ellemers, N., Spears .R, & Doosje, B. (1995). Perceived intragroup variability as a function of group status and identification. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 31, 410-436.
- Ellemers, N., Spears .R, & Doosje, B. (2002) Self and social identity. *Annual Review Of Psychology*, 53, 161-86.
- Evans, D. C., Garcia, D.J., Garcia, D. M., & Baron, R. S. (2003). In the privacy of their own homes: Using the Internet to assess racial bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 273-284.
- Frijda, N.H., (1986), *The Emotions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frijda, N.H., (1987). Emotion, Cognitive Structure, and Action Tendency. *Cognition and Emotion*, 1, 115-143.

- Frijda, N.H., Kuipers, P., & ter Schure, E. (1989). Relations among emotion, appraisal, and emotional action readiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 212-228.
- Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic minorities and the politics of identity*. London: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Giles, H., Bourhis, R. Y., & Taylor, D. M. (1977). Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp. 307-348). London: Academic Press.
- Giles, H. & Johnson, P. (1981) The role of language in ethnic group relations. In J.C. Turner and H. Giles, (Eds.), *Intergroup Behaviour* (pp. 199-243), Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Postmes, T. (2004). Intergroup distinctiveness and differentiation: meta-analytic integration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 6.
- Khleif, B. (1979). Insiders, outsiders and renegades: Towards a classification of ethnolinguistic labels. In H. Giles and B. Saint-Jacques, (Eds.), *Language and ethnic relations* (pp. 159-172). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Levesque, R. (1968). *An Option for Québec*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Levesque, R. (1976) For an independent Québec. *Foreign Affairs*, July, 1976.
- Liebkind, K. (1999). Social psychology. In Fishman, J. (ed.) *Handbook of Language and Social Identity* (pp. 140-148). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mackie, D. M., Devos, T., & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining

- offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 602-616.
- Matheson, K., Skomorovsky, A., Fiocco, A., & Anisman, H. (2007). The limits of 'adaptive' coping: Well-being and affective reactions to stressors among women in abusive dating relationships. *Stress*, 10, 75-92.
- May, R. (1958). Existence: A new dimension in psychiatry and psychology. In R. May, E. Angel, and H.F., Ellenberger (Eds.), *Existence; a new dimension in psychiatry and psychology* (pp. 24–62). . New York: Basic Books.
- McVicar, D. N., Wohl, M. J. A., Branscombe, N.R., (2007). Collective Angst: Concern for the Future Vitality of the Ingroup and its Effect on Ingroup Protective Behaviors. Poster presented at the 2007 American Psychological Association conference, Memphis TN.
- Miller, D. A., Smith, E. R., & Mackie, D. M. (2004). Effects of intergroup contact and political predispositions on prejudice: Role of intergroup emotions. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 7, 221-237.
- Mlicki, P. & Ellemers, N. (1996) Being different or being better? National stereotypes and identifications of Polish and Dutch students. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 97-114.
- Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages. (2001) Official Languages in Canada: Taking on the New Challenge. Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- Roseman, I. J. (1984). Cognitive determinants of emotion: A structural theory. Review of *Personality & Social Psychology*. 5, 11-36

- Smith, C. A., & Ellsworth, P. C. (1985). Patterns of cognitive appraisal in emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 813-838.
- Smith, E. R. (1993). Social identity and social emotions: Towards new conceptualizations of prejudice. In D. Mackie and D. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes ingroup perception* (pp. 297-315). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Smith, E. R. (1999). Affective and cognitive implications of a group becoming part of the self: New models of prejudice and of the self-concept. In D. Abrams and M. Hogg, (Eds.), *Social identity and social cognition* (pp. 183-196). Malden, US: Blackwell Publishers.
- Spears, R., Jetten, J., & Scheepers, D. (2002). Distinctiveness and the definition of collective self: A tripartite model. In A. Tesser, D. Stapel and J. Wood, (Eds.), *Self and motivation: Emerging psychological perspectives* (pp. 147-171). Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Stephan, W. G., Boniecki, K. A., Ybarra, O., Bettencourt, A., Ervin, K. S., Jackson, L. A., McNatt, P. S., & Renfro, C. L. (2002). The role of threats in the racial attitudes of blacks and whites. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 9.
- Stephan, W. G., Diaz-Loving, R., & Duran, A., (2000). Integrated threat theory and intercultural attitudes: Mexico and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31, 2.
- Stephan, W. G., & Renfro, C. L. (2002). The role of threat in intergroup relations. In D. M. Mackie and E. R. Smith (Eds.), *From prejudice to intergroup emotions: Differentiated reactions to social groups* (pp. 191–207). New York:

Psychology Press.

- Tajfel, H. (1978). The achievement of group differentiation. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel and W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Thomson, A. (1995). Language, identity, and nationalist impulses: Québec. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 538, 69-82.
- Turner, J. C., Brown, R. J., & Tajfel, H. (1979). Social comparison and group interest in ingroup favouritism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 9, 187-204.
- Wohl, M. J. A., Bookalam, D. & Branscombe, N. R. (2006). The role of group distinctiveness threats on the experience of collective angst. *Unpublished raw data*.
- Wohl, M. J. A., & Branscombe, N. R. (in press). Collective angst: How threats to the future vitality of the ingroup shape intergroup emotion. In H. Wayment and J. Bauer (Eds.), *The quiet ego: Research and theory on the benefits of transcending egoistic self interest*. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Social Issues in Québec

Les enjeux sociaux au Québec

You may win a gift certificate valued at \$50 dollars by participating.

Vous pouvez gagner un certificat cadeau d'une valeur de 50\$ en participant.

This survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Ce questionnaire prendra environ 20 minutes à compléter.

You must be 18 years or older to participate.

Vous devez avoir 18 ans ou plus pour participer.

If you are an Anglophone, please click here.

Si vous êtes francophone cliquez ici.

Appendix B: Informed Consent

The purpose of an informed consent is to ensure that you understand the purpose of the study and the nature of your involvement. The informed consent must provide sufficient information so that you have the opportunity to determine whether you wish to participate in the study.

Study Title: Social Issues in Québec

Principal Investigator:

Dr. Michael Wohl, Tel: (613) 520-2600, ext. 2908; email: mwohl@connect.carleton.ca

Other Research Personnel:

D. Neil McVicar, MA Candidate; email: dnmcvica@connect.carleton.ca

Benjamin Giguère, PhD Candidate; email: bgiguere@yorku.ca,

If you have any ethical concerns about this study please contact Dr. Janet Mantler (Chair of the Carleton University Ethics Committee for Psychological Research, (613) 520-2600, ext. 4173; email, janet_mantler@carleton.ca). If you have any other concerns about how this study was conducted please contact or Dr. John Zelenski, (613) 520-2600, ext. 1609; email, john_zelenski@carleton.ca.

Purpose and Task Requirements: We are interested in your perceptions concerning social issues in Québec. We will ask you to read a newspaper article on-line, and then complete a questionnaire concerning your opinions, as well as some basic demographic information about yourself. Although the findings obtained from the entire sample may well receive wide scientific attention, all of your responses will be anonymous. By participating in this study you are greatly assisting us to obtain basic knowledge about social issues. Be assured that your name will not be associated in any way with the

research findings. Completion of this study should not take more than 25 minutes of your time.

Potential risk/discomfort: We can anticipate no physical discomfort to you as a result of your participation in this study. You may, however, experience some stress when thinking about various social issues that are currently impacting Québec. Your participation is solicited but is completely voluntary. At the end of this session, you will be provided with information about the aims of our study. The information collected in this study will be used only by the study investigators. Questions about this study should be directed to either of the researchers listed above.

Right to Withdraw: Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. At any point during the study you have the right not to complete certain questions or to withdraw with no penalty whatsoever.

I have read the above description of the study entitled “Social Issues in Québec”. The data collected will be used for research and/or teaching purposes. By clicking the “Yes” link below, I indicate that I am at least 18 years of age and that I agree to participate in the study, and this in no way constitutes a waiver of my rights.

By clicking the "Yes" button we are assuming that you have read the above form and have granted consent.

Yes

No

Appendix C: Thank you note for those who do not consent.

Thank you for your time.

If you have any further questions about this project or concerns about how it was conducted please contact Neil McVicar (Department of Psychology Carleton University, dnmcvica@connect.carleton.ca) or Dr. Michael Wohl (Department of Psychology Carleton University, email: mwohl@connect.carleton.ca, (613) 520-2600 ext. 2908). If you have any ethical concerns about this study please contact Dr. Janet Mantler (Chair of the Carleton University Ethics Committee for Psychological Research, (613) 520-2600, ext. Ext. 4173, email: janet_mantler@carleton.ca). If you have any other concerns about how this study was conducted please contact Dr. John Zelenski, (613) 520-2600, ext. 1609, email: john_zelenski@carleton.ca.

Appendix D: Survey

Ethnolinguistic identity

Please check the groups to which you belong:

☐

Anglophone

☐

Non-Anglophone

☐

Francophone

☐

Non-Francophone

Manipulation articles

Threatened condition

English overtaking French in Québec, experts warn

According to Université du Québec Demographer Dr. Pierre Lanois, Bill 101 - the French language law passed in 1977 by the National Assembly of the Province of Quebec - has not been successful in promoting and protecting the French language in Québec. The professor has compiled statistics that suggest, despite the claims of the governments of both Canada and Québec, French is losing ground in the province of Québec while English becomes more prominent at home, the workplace and, especially, trade and commerce.

Speaking at a conference on social and cultural transformations in Québec, Dr. Lanois cited 2001 Statistics Canada census data to conclude that there is not a net Francization of Anglophones in Québec but, rather, a net Anglicization of Francophones. For example, although French is the main language in the workplace, the proportion of Francophones using English at work is much greater than the proportion of Anglophones using French at work. Moreover, nearly half of allophones - those whose mother tongue is neither English nor French - speak English as the main language in the workplace.

Dr. Lanois asked how it was possible for the Conseil Supérieur de la Langue Française, which advises the government on language policies, to declare just last year that "French is now the common language of the Québec population" when the statistics showed otherwise.

Another panelist, political columnist Marie Simard, said that the situation has barely changed since she co-wrote a report in 1996 on the French-language issue

commissioned by former Québec Premier Jacques Parizeau. The report, completed in early 1996 after Lucien Bouchard became premier, concludes that unless the government shows the political will to strengthen the protection of the French language, the French culture as it is known in Canada will be threatened.

Flourishing condition

Experts confirm French is thriving in Quebec,

According to Université du Québec Demographer Dr. Pierre Lanois, Bill 101 - the French language law passed in 1977 by the National Assembly of the Province of Quebec - has been highly successful in promoting and protecting the French language in Québec. The professor has compiled statistics that suggest French is clearly the primary language in the province of Québec while English becomes has lost ground at home, in schools, and, especially, in the workplace.

Speaking at a conference on social and cultural transformation in Québec, Dr. Lanois cited 2001 Statistics Canada census data to conclude that there has been a net Francization of Anglophones in Québec. For example, the proportion of Francophones using English at work is much lower than the proportion of Anglophones using French at work. Moreover, nearly half of allophones - those whose mother tongue is neither English nor French - speak French as the main language in the workplace.

Dr.Lanois' statistical analyses confirmed the Conseil Supérieur de la Langue Française, which advises the government on language policies, declaration in 2002 that "French is now the common language of the Québec population".

Another panelist, political columnist Marie Simard, said that the situation continues to be favourable since she co-wrote a report in 1996 on the French-language issue commissioned by former Québec premier Jacques Parizeau. The report, completed in early 1996 after Lucien Bouchard became premier, concluded that French language and French culture would surely thrive as long as the provincial government held the will to promote and protect it.

Control condition

The Climate and Geography of Québec

The province occupies a vast territory (nearly three times the size of France), most of which is very sparsely populated. Quebec's highest point is Mont D'Iberville, which is located on the border with Newfoundland and Labrador in the northeastern part of the province.

The most populated region is the Saint Lawrence River valley in the south, where the capital, Quebec City, and the largest city, Montreal, are situated. The region is low-lying and flat, except for isolated igneous outcrops near Montreal called the Monteregian Hills. The combination of rich and easily arable soils and Quebec's warmest climate make the valley Quebec's most prolific agricultural area. A distinctive landscape is divided into narrow rectangular tracts of land that date back to settlement patterns in 17th century New France. The river is one of the world's largest, sustaining large inland Atlantic ports at Montreal, Trois Rivières, and Quebec City. The Saint Lawrence Seaway provides a link between the Gulf of Saint Lawrence and Great Lakes starting at the Saint Lambert locks in Montreal.

More than 90 percent of Quebec's area lies within the Canadian Shield, a rough, rocky terrain sculpted and scraped clean of soil by successive ice ages. It is rich in the mineral and hydro-electric resources that are a mainstay of the Quebec economy. In the Labrador Peninsula portion of the Shield, the far northern region of Nunavik includes the Ungava Peninsula and consists of Arctic tundra inhabited mostly by the Inuit. Further south lie subarctic taiga and boreal forest, where spruce, fir, and poplar trees provide raw materials for Quebec's pulp and paper and lumber industries. Although inhabited

principally by the Cree, Naskapi, and Innu First Nations, thousands of temporary workers reside at Radisson to service the massive James Bay Hydroelectric Project on the La Grande and Eastmain rivers. The southern portion of the shield extends to the Laurentians, a mountain range just north of Montreal and Quebec City that attracts local and international tourists to ski hills and lakeside resorts.

The tree-covered Appalachian Mountains flank the eastern portion of the province, extending from New England into the Eastern Townships, northeastward through the Beauce region, and on to the Gaspé Peninsula, where they disappear into the Gulf of St. Lawrence. This region sustains a mix of forestry, industry, and tourism based on its natural resources and landscape.

Quebec has three main climate regions. Southern and western Quebec, including most of the major population centres, have a humid continental climate (Koppen climate classification *Dfb*) with warm, humid summers and long, cold winters. The main climatic influences are from western and northern Canada which move eastward and from the southern and central United States that move northward. Due to the influence of both storm systems from the core of North America and the Atlantic Ocean, precipitation is abundant throughout the year, with most areas receiving more than 1,000 mm (40 inches) of precipitation, including over 300 cm (120 inches) of snow in many areas. Severe summer weather (such as tornadoes and severe thunderstorms) are far less common than in southern Ontario, although they occasionally occur.

Most of central Quebec has a subarctic climate. Winters here are long and among the coldest in eastern Canada, while summers are warm but very short due to the higher

latitude and the greater influence of Arctic air masses. Precipitation is also somewhat less than farther south, except at some of the higher elevations.

The northern regions of Quebec have an arctic climate (Koppen *ET*), with very cold winters and short, much cooler summers. The primary influences here are the Arctic Ocean currents (such as the Labrador Current) and continental air masses from the High Arctic.

Collective Angst

The following questionnaire consists of statements that you may agree or disagree with when thinking about the status of the French language law in Québec. Please indicate how much each statement describes your current feelings by clicking the corresponding button.

1. In light of the article I have just read, it appears that the Francophone culture in Québec is secure.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>disagree</i>		<i>disagree</i>		<i>agree</i>		<i>agree</i>

2. I am worried about the future vitality of Francophone traditions in Québec.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>disagree</i>		<i>disagree</i>		<i>agree</i>		<i>agree</i>

3. I feel confident that the Francophone traditions will survive in Québec.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>disagree</i>		<i>disagree</i>		<i>agree</i>		<i>agree</i>

4. I feel secure about the future of Francophone traditions in Québec.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>disagree</i>		<i>disagree</i>		<i>agree</i>		<i>agree</i>

5. I believe that the vitality of the Francophone culture in Québec is in jeopardy.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>disagree</i>		<i>disagree</i>		<i>agree</i>		<i>agree</i>

6. I feel that Francophone traditions in Québec will survive any external threat.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>disagree</i>		<i>disagree</i>		<i>agree</i>		<i>agree</i>

7. I fear the disappearance of Francophone traditions in Québec.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>disagree</i>		<i>disagree</i>		<i>agree</i>		<i>agree</i>

8. The Francophone community will always thrive in Québec.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>disagree</i>		<i>disagree</i>		<i>agree</i>		<i>agree</i>

9. I feel anxious about the future of the Francophone culture in Québec.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>disagree</i>		<i>disagree</i>		<i>agree</i>		<i>agree</i>

10. There is a growing lack of participation in events that occur in the Francophone community in Québec.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>disagree</i>		<i>disagree</i>		<i>agree</i>		<i>agree</i>

11. Francophones in Québec, as a whole, don't care as much about their culture as they once did.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>disagree</i>		<i>disagree</i>		<i>agree</i>		<i>agree</i>

Negative Emotions

How do you feel when thinking about the future of the Francophone community in Québec?

1. afraid

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Not at all *Extremely*

2. anxious

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Not at all *Extremely*

3. nervous

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Not at all *Extremely*

4. scared

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Not at all *Extremely*

5. worried

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Not at all *Extremely*

6. confused

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Not at all *Extremely*

Ingroup Protective Behaviours

The following questionnaire consists of statements that you may agree or disagree with when thinking about the future of Francophones in Québec. Please indicate how much each statement describes your current feelings by clicking the corresponding button.

1. I feel a sense of responsibility to help protect the future of the Francophone culture in Québec.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>

2. The mixing of Francophone traditions with those of other cultures is contaminating Francophone culture.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>

3. I believe that the Francophone community in Québec must retain its traditions in order to survive.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>

4. Francophones and non- Francophones having children together dilutes the Francophone "way of life" in Québec.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>disagree</i>		<i>disagree</i>		<i>agree</i>		<i>agree</i>

5. I actively strive to promote and maintain the vitality of the Francophone "way of life" in Québec.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>disagree</i>		<i>disagree</i>		<i>agree</i>		<i>agree</i>

6. The mixing of the Francophone traditions with those of other cultures is a positive change for the Francophone people in Québec.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>disagree</i>		<i>disagree</i>		<i>agree</i>		<i>agree</i>

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

1. I see myself as a Francophone Québécois.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>

2. I am pleased to be a Francophone Québécois.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>

3. I feel strong ties to Francophone Québécois.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>

4. I identify with Francophone Québécois.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>

Demographic and personal information

Please answer the following questions about yourself.

1. Age:

2. Sex:

3. First Language

If other, please specify:

4. What is your ethnic background?

- ☐ Chinese
- ☐ South Asian (e.g., East Indian, Pakistani, Punjabi, Sri Lankan)
- ☐ Black (e.g., African, Haitian, Jamaican, Somali).
- ☐ Arab/West Asian (e.g., Armenian, Egyptian, Iranian, Lebanese, Moroccan)
- ☐ South East Asian (e.g., Cambodian, Laotian, Indonesian)
- ☐ Latin American
- ☐ Japanese
- ☐ Korean
- ☐ Aboriginal
- ☐ White
- ☐ Other

5. Status in Canada:

- ☐ Citizen
- ☐ Landed immigrant
- ☐ Refugee
- ☐ International Student

6. Were you born in Québec?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

6a. If "no", how old were you when you came to Québec?

6b. If "no", where were you born?

7. Do you currently reside in Québec?

7a. If you do not currently reside in Québec, why did you leave?

7b. If you do not currently reside in Québec, how old were you when you moved away? years.

8. Do you have children?

☐ Yes

☐ No

9. Household income:

☐ More than \$100,000

☐ \$50,000 to \$99,999

☐ \$35,000 to \$49,999

☐ Less than \$35,000

☐ Prefer not to respond

10. In what kind of place did you grow up?

☐ Large city (500,000+)

☐ Small city

☐ Rural area

☐ Farm

11. I consider myself to be:

☐ Francophone

☐ Anglophone

☐ Both

☐ Neither

12. Highest level of education completed:

☐ High School

☐ Some College

☐ College/university graduate

☐ Some Graduate level

☐ Graduate degree

13. How many Anglophones do you know?

- ☐ 0
- ☐ 1-5
- ☐ 6-10
- ☐ 11-15
- ☐ More than 15.

14. How frequently do you have contact with Anglophones?

- ☐ Never
- ☐ Seldom
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Frequently
- ☐ Very frequently

15. Primary language used at home:

☐ French

☐ English

☐ Other

16. Primary language used at work:

☐ French

☐ English

☐ Other

17. Primary language used when socializing:

☐ French

☐ English

☐ Other

18. Please indicate your confidence in using English.

Reading:

No confidence

Somewhat confident

Confident

Extremely confident

Writing

No confidence

Somewhat confident

Confident

Extremely confident

Oral comprehension (listening and understanding):

No confidence

Somewhat confident

Confident

Extremely confident

Speaking:

No confidence

Somewhat confident

Confident

Extremely confident

19. I believe that my knowledge of English allows me to cope with most situations where I have to use it.

- ☐ *Strongly disagree*
- ☐ *Disagree*
- ☐ *Somewhat disagree*
- ☐ *Neutral*
- ☐ *Somewhat agree*
- ☐ *Agree*
- ☐ *Strongly agree*

20. What is your provincial political identification?

- ☐ Action Democratique
- ☐ Liberal
- ☐ Parti Québécois
- ☐ Québec Solidaire
- ☐ Other

21. What is your federal political identification?

☐ Bloc Québécois

☐ Conservative

☐ Liberal

☐ NDP

☐ Other

22. To what extent are you discriminated against because your first language is French?

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Not at all (1)</i>	2	3	4	5	6	<i>Extremely (7)</i>

23. To what extent do you think other Francophones are discriminated against?

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
<i>Not at all (1)</i>	2	3	4	5	6	<i>Extremely (7)</i>

Thank you for completing this survey. We hope to include as many participants as possible in this study. Please suggest that your friends, family, associates, etc. take part. So as not to influence their responses, please avoid discussing the details of this study with other potential participants. Please have them contact Neil McVicar in order to arrange their participation.

To enter the draw for one of three gift certificates each valued at \$50.00, please enter your name and email address. This information will be held in strict confidentiality and it will not be used for any other purpose than to contact you should you win the draw.

24 Name

25 email

Do you have any positive or negative comments about this questionnaire? For example, were there questions or statements you found especially interesting or problematic? Did we leave out certain topics that you consider important?

Please type your response in this box.

Appendix F: Debriefing

Please refrain from discussing this study with potential participants because their responses may be influenced.

This post-survey information is provided to inform you of the exact nature of the research you have just participated in. In the present study we are assessing people's reactions to a news article about the future of the French language in Québec. Specifically, we are interested in whether people become anxious given the possibility that the future of their culture (i.e., Anglophones and Francophones) is threatened. Language and culture are very closely related so we reasoned that if one's language is threatened then they would consider their cultural group to be threatened as well. To test this idea, some of the participants in this study read news articles concerning the effectiveness of Bill 101 in Québec. These articles, written by the researchers in this study, were designed to make the reader believe that the French language in Québec is either thriving or threatened. The articles were created by the researchers to determine whether the suggestion that Bill 101 has or has not been effective in promoting the status of the French language in Québec would elicit an emotional reaction. This aspect of the study was concealed from participants to avoid pressuring you to react one way or another in this study.

Now that the overall purpose of the study has been explained, let's consider it in more detail. All the participants read one of three different news articles. One article reported that Bill 101 has been a success and that the future of the French language and culture in Québec is assured. Another article reported that Bill 101 has been a failure and that the future of the French language and culture in Québec is in jeopardy. A third article discussed the the geography and climate of Québec. In this study we are examining people's reactions to the particular article that they read. We predict that Francophones who read that Bill 101 has failed to protect the French language will feel threatened. Conversely, Anglophones are predicted to feel threatened when they read that Bill 101 is a success. Those participants who read about the geography and climate of Québec are not expected to exhibit any threat related to what they read. These predictions are based on previous research suggesting some people, particularly those who feel closely connected to their ethnic group, show a stronger reaction when they perceive a threat to the group. Moreover, these people are more likely to act to protect the group in response to that threat (Tajfel & Turner 1986; Jetten et al, 2002).