Inclusiveness of Canadian identity in a contested landscape:
Ingroup projection, multiculturalism, and Aboriginal reconciliation

by

Jonas Weselake-George

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Post Doctoral Affairs
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

© 2016

Jonas Weselake-George

Acknowledgements

I would like to recognise the importance of elders and other members of Indigenous communities in Ottawa, who both helped shape my development and understanding, and who acted as a constant reminder of the need for this research, and my responsibilities to do it well.

I would like to thank my advisor Dr. Kim Matheson for supporting my research on a challenging and sensitive subject and for providing me with helpful guidance and feedback throughout this project. I would also like to thank Dr. Amy Bombay for encouraging me to take on research in areas important to Indigenous peoples even though to do so is, at times, difficult. I would like to thank the rest of my committee members, Dr. Hymie Anisman, Dr. Lise Paquet and my external examiner Katherine Graham, for their feedback and encouragement and for making the process a pleasure.

I would like to thank the many academics and professors who inspired me, and those who took the time to pen letters of recommendation for me, Dr. Scobie Willow, Dr. Claude Lamontagne, and Dr. José López.

I would like to extend a special thanks to Etelle Bourassa from the Department of Psychology, whose encouragement and vigilance played a key role in easing the process. I would also like to thank the psychology students in my year, especially with regard to their openness about the challenges they faced en route to their triumphs. I would like to extend my deepest thanks to my family, and friends, especially at the glass bead game, who provided constant encouragement and advice.

I would like to express my gratitude to the Institute of Cognitive Science and Department of Anthropology at Carleton for welcoming me to attend their enriching colloquia and courses.

I would like to thank Dr. Yongeeswaran for his assistance in providing additional information on his research which helped in designing this study. Finally, I would also like to thank the students whose participation in our research made it possible.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Theoretical foundations	5
Social identity theory	5
Self-categorisation theory	6
Ingroup projection model	8
Antecedents of ingroup projection	9
Consequences of ingroup projection	12
National identity and multiculturalism	14
Application to the Canadian case	15
The present study	17
Hypotheses	18
Method	19
Participants	19
Procedure	20
Manipulation of perceived intergroup threat	21
Measures	22
Perceived threat manipulation check	22
Relative ingroup prototypicality (i.e. ingroup projection)	22
Support for reforms	23
Endorsement of multiculturalism	24
Awareness of Aboriginal issues	25
Interest in Aboriginal issues	25
Perceived impacts on personal and national self-interest	25
Attention checks	26
Statistical analyses	26
Results	27

Preliminary analyses	27
Pre-existing awareness of Aboriginal issues	27
Beliefs about the relevance of Aboriginal issues to personal and national self-interest	27
Descriptive statistics and zero-order correlations	27
Manipulation check	30
Components of ingroup projection measures	31
The main model	32
Support for systemic change	33
Direct effect of perceived intergroup threat	33
Mediation by ingroup projection	33
Support for acknowledgement of the past	35
Direct effect of perceived intergroup threat	35
Mediation by ingroup projection	35
Discussion	38
Threat perceptions	38
Ingroup projection	39
The role of multiculturalism	43
Limitations and recommendations for future research	45
Conclusions	50
References	52
Appendix A	62
Appendix B	68
Appendix C	75
Appendix D	82

List of Tables

Table 1: Means and 95% confidence intervals for effects of gender on variables of interest	29
Table 2: Means, SD, and Zero-order correlations among the variables of interest	30
Table 3: Zero-order correlations between components of relative ingroup prototypicality (i.e. the ingroup projection measure) and variables of interest	32
Table 4: Association of ingroup projection and endorsement of multiculturalism with support for systemic change	34
Table 5: Association of ingroup projection and endorsement of multiculturalism with support for acknowledgement of the past	36

List of Figures

Figure 1: Ingroup projection in the 'goals for Canada' and 'values' domain	28
Figure 2: The main model showing the effect of perceived intergroup threat	33
Figure 3: Statistically significant relationships ($p < .05$) in the model predicting support for systemic change reforms	35
Figure 4: Statistically significant relationships ($p < .05$) in the model predicting support for 'acknowledgement of the past'	37

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Demographic measures	62
Appendix B: Experimental manipulation	68
Appendix C: Outcome variables, manipulation check, and attention checks	75
Appendix D: Items measuring support for reforms alongside excerpts of the original texts from which the items are derived	82

Abstract

Canada is undergoing a complex and politically difficult reconciliation process between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Canadians in response to past harms and contemporary problems. The present research investigates how, for non-Aboriginal Canadians, the extent of the inclusion or exclusion of Aboriginal peoples from Canadian identity interacts with the reconciliation process, feelings of threat from this process, and public support for reforms. Ingroup projection (i.e. believing or claiming that one's own subgroup is a superior example of the virtues or characteristics of a larger group identity than other subgroups) has been found to be associated with justifying inequality between groups in a society. It was predicted that, when the goals expressed by Aboriginal peoples include major reforms which may elicit feelings of threat, ingroup projection would be intensified. In turn, higher levels of ingroup projection by non-Aboriginal Canadians would be associated with reduced support for other reforms. It was expected that this relation between ingroup projection and support for reforms would be moderated by beliefs in multiculturalism. An online survey was administered to 275 non-Aboriginal first year students. Moderated mediation analyses found no evidence that ingroup projection was associated with lower support for reforms. Despite this, ingroup projection was found to be widespread, and showed some association with the extent to which non-Aboriginal Canadians perceived the goals of Aboriginal peoples as a threat. This perception of threat was directly associated with lower support for reforms. Although endorsement of multiculturalism was itself associated with higher support for reforms, it did not play any moderating role. Possible confounding effects of intergroup identification

and assimilationist ideologies on ingroup projection are explored along with recommendations for future research.

Introduction

In December, 2015, the Indian Residential Schools Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada released its final report regarding the impacts of the Indian Residential Schools, one of Canada's most destructive colonialist structures, affecting the individual lives, family functioning, cultural traditions, and community agency of Canada's Indigenous peoples.¹ Included in this report were 94 Calls to Action to address the continuing inequities experienced by Canada's Indigenous peoples, ranging from failures in the implementation of treaty relationships to inadequate access to resources and decision-making powers in the areas of child welfare, justice, health, education, language, and culture. Responding to the Calls to Action is expected to contribute to healing in Indigenous communities and peoples and to reconciliation between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Canadians. However, many of these Calls to Action involve fundamental changes in how Canada treats Indigenous peoples, and so are expected to meet with resistance from at least some segments of society. It is the goal of this thesis to identify identity-based factors that might influence non-Aboriginal Canadians' support for changes to the status quo in order to better achieve justice and equality for Aboriginal peoples.

The Social Identity framework (Brown, 2000; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000; Reicher, Spears, & Haslam, 2010; Tajfel, 1974; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987) would suggest that non-Aboriginal peoples may regard themselves as more typically Canadian than they regard Aboriginal peoples to

¹ The term 'Aboriginal peoples' is used to refer to individuals and communities of First Nations, Inuit and Métis origin. The term Aboriginal is used here in order for it to be consistent with current government and court usage for recognised Aboriginal peoples, rather than the more general term 'Indigenous peoples' or the more specific endonyms preferred by specific cultures or First Nations.

be. This implicit belief may be felt to justify the relative dominance of non-Aboriginal people and institutions over pre-existing Aboriginal communities, institutions, and cultures. Moreover, it is possible that self-reported perceptions by non-Aboriginal people of their greater representativeness of the Canadian identity become stronger in the presence of perceived threats from Aboriginal minorities, and that such beliefs are associated with greater opposition to the goals of Aboriginal peoples. Such a claim to a closer connection with Canadian identity might allow a stronger claim to the symbolic and political resources associated with Canadian identity whilst at the same time distancing Aboriginal peoples from these resources.

Research assessing similar beliefs in other contexts has indicated that people generally tend to believe that their own subgroup's characteristics are more characteristic of their society's ideals than are the characteristics of other subgroups (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999; Wenzel, Mummendey, & Waldzus, 2007; Wenzel, Mummendey, Weber, & Waldzus, 2003). However, as such research has been conducted on societies outside Canada such as the United States, Germany and Mauritius (e.g. Berthold, Mummendey, Kessler, Luecke, & Schubert, 2012; Bianchi, Mummendey, Steffens, & Yzerbyt, 2010; Reese, Berthold & Steffens, 2012; Rosa & Waldzus, 2012; Waldzus & Mummendey, 2004; Tseung-Wong & Verkuyten, 2010; Waldzus, Mummendey, Wenzel, & Weber, 2003; Wenzel et al., 2007), it has not as yet been established whether beliefs about similarity to a national identity are also found in Canada, which is a society that explicitly embraces notions of multiculturalism. Since these beliefs may affect the support expressed by non-Aboriginal people for reforms sought by Aboriginal peoples, they are important to take into account when understanding the context of reconciliation processes.

Claims to typify a group identity can have serious consequences (Reese et al. 2012; Wenzel et al., 2003; Weber et al. 2002). When subgroups within a society are defined as more characteristic of the society's ideals, they tend to have greater prestige, influence, and power than do subgroups which are treated as being less typical (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000). A subgroup's claims to being more characteristic of the society's ideals are also associated with discrimination towards other subgroups (Wenzel et al., 2003). It follows that perceptions or assertions regarding the relative Canadianness of Aboriginal peoples may have political and social consequences, such as diminishing cooperation or justifying discrimination.

Aboriginal peoples may be particularly vulnerable to the dynamics that involve excluding minorities from shared national identities, given that Aboriginal peoples have a history of being legally or symbolically excluded from Canadian citizenship to varying degrees, including being legally denied full personhood and being considered wards of the state until 1960 (Hurley, 2009; Indian and Northern Affairs, 1978; Milloy, 2008). More recently, Aboriginal peoples have been given the status of full citizens and have also been recognised as having played a founding role in the creation of Canada (Assembly of First Nations, 2008). However, such changes have not undone the harmful effects of past policies (Bombay, Matheson, & Anisman, 2009; Bombay, Matheson, & Anisman, 2010; Bombay, Matheson, & Anisman, 2011; Miller, 2004), and do not fully address the continued marginalisation of Aboriginal political, social, educational, and symbolic practices within Canadian institutions and society.

Government sponsored processes like the *Indian Residential Schools Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada* and ongoing efforts by Aboriginal peoples to seek reforms supportive of improved life outcomes, collective agency, and inclusion by Canada make the issue of public support for reforms important. Many reforms proposed by Aboriginal peoples or endorsed by independent processes like the *Indian Residential Schools Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada* may be perceived as threatening by some non-Aboriginal Canadians. For instance, acknowledging misconduct by the Canadian government threatens collective self-image (acknowledgement of wrongdoing), greater acknowledgement of Aboriginal peoples threatens changes to Canadian identity, cooperating with Aboriginal peoples in reforming political, economic, or social systems may benefit Aboriginal peoples in such a way as to threaten the interests of non-Aboriginals. Regardless of the degree to which such changes actually pose a threat, social change may be perceived as threatening.

Some of these reforms may also recognise or reinforce differences between Aboriginal peoples and the rest of the population. The possibility exists that such recognition of differences between Aboriginal peoples and other Canadians may be exploited in order to exclude Aboriginal peoples from the Canadian identity and to portray Aboriginal interests as being in conflict with the interests of Canada. Ascertaining whether this possibility has an empirical basis is a useful contribution to how intergroup relations are understood in Canada, especially given that Aboriginal peoples have at times been told that pursuing certain political strategies should be avoided as such strategies may provoke a backlash of discrimination or increased exclusion (e.g. Bland, 2014; Cairns, 2000). There is some empirical evidence to

suggest that ethnic minorities may be more vulnerable than majority groups to negative reactions when asserting their ethnicity publicly (Yongeeswaran, Dasgupta, Adelman, Eccleston, & Parker, 2011).

In Canada today, the pervasive negative impacts of past government policies are being addressed by calls to action, some of which offer to profoundly change Canadian society. Social psychological theories suggest that the dominant non-Aboriginal society may regard itself as more Canadian than Aboriginals, and this belief may play a role in attempts to justify the status quo. This thesis uses a survey method to examine this belief about the greater Canadianness of the self as it relates to potentially increasing threat perceptions and potentially decreasing support for reforms, as well as its potential attenuation in the presence of belief in multicultural ideologies.

Theoretical foundations

Social identity theory. Tajfel's social identity theory (1978) defined social identities as self-concepts deriving from being part of groups and the emotional significance of group membership. As a part of their social identities, people are motivated to try to achieve a positive sense of self, and to perceive the groups they belong to in a positive way (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Social identity theory asserts that group valuations happen in the context of intergroup comparisons which often involve comparisons based on viewing other groups as worse relative to one's own group (Tajfel, 1978). However, subsequent evidence suggests that a positive view of one's own group does not necessarily lead to a negative view of other groups and does not inevitably lead to discrimination (Brewer, 1999). Such results suggest that

discrimination should not be considered inevitable, and can potentially be mitigated by a variety of mechanisms that can encourage cooperation and allow multiple subgroups to have a positive view of themselves and each other.

Self-categorisation theory. Self-categorisation theory (Turner et al., 1987) extends social identity theory to suggest that a person can belong to different groups and thus have different social identities that vary in importance depending on the context (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000; Reicher et al., 2010; Wenzel et al., 2003). Furthermore, some of the groups to which people belong exist within 'superordinate' groups that contain multiple other 'subgroups'. For example, one can be a citizen of Canada (i.e. a member of the superordinate group) and a citizen of the Province of Manitoba (a subgroup to which they belong), but not a citizen of the Province of Ontario (another subgroup). Self-categorisation theory holds that there are usually larger and smaller groups. For instance, Canada is one of many countries comprising humanity (a yet larger superordinate group). In the opposite direction, the Province of Manitoba is a superordinate group that contains many different municipalities (yet smaller subgroups). In this way, any group can be both a subgroup of larger groups, and a superordinate group to smaller groups.

Which identity is most salient at any given time, and the way people conceive of groups, can also change depending on context. For instance, in some contexts (e.g. foreign policy) comparisons between countries make sense, and thus people will tend to identify as Canadians. However, in other contexts (e.g. federal transfer payments), comparisons between provinces make sense and people will tend to identify primarily as members of their province. This means that individuals can usually perceive other

individuals as either members of other groups (i.e. outgroup members) or members of their own group (i.e. the shared superordinate group) depending on the context.

The second important contribution of self-categorisation theory to the present research is the concept of the normative role played by 'prototypes' (Wenzel et al., 2007). Self-categorisation theory suggests that people conceptually represent a social identity in the form of a set of characteristics or ideals which act as a prototype defining the group and its members (Wenzel et al., 2007). In order to identify with a group, people need to connect their personal identity with a social identity that is exemplified by the group's prototype (i.e. those characteristics or ideals associated with the group). As a result, people will modify either their personal identity or the prototypes of those groups they identify with so that their personal identity and prototypes become more similar to each other (Postmes, Haslam, & Swaab, 2005; Wenzel, et al., 2007).

Because prototypes represent characteristics or ideals of a group that are positively valued by group members, prototypes can take on a normative role. Group members who are perceived as being more prototypical are generally evaluated more positively than group members who are perceived as being less prototypical (Rubin, 2011; Wenzel et al.; Wenzel et al., 2003; Weber et al., 2002). Being perceived as highly prototypical has been found to be associated with having greater influence over the group (Postmes et al., 2005), prestige (Rubin, 2011), and the legitimising of preferential access to privileges associated with group membership (Weber et al., 2002; Wenzel, 2004). Moreover, according to self-categorisation theory, group members who are perceived as not being prototypical enough of the group are more

likely to be devalued or viewed as inferior by other group members (Weber et al., 2002; Wenzel et al., 2007).

At the intergroup level, self-categorisation theory proposes that the dimensions that are used to differentiate between groups are based on the prototype of a superordinate category (Turner et al., 1987; Wenzel et al., 2003; Wenzel et al., 2007). This superordinate prototype determines what dimensions are relevant for comparison and allows a group to assess its qualities relative to a comparison group (e.g. another subgroup), often in the form of a downward social comparison. For instance, most racist beliefs compare 'racial' groups on the basis of how much they are perceived to be representative of what is claimed to be the most 'advanced' form of humanity wherein the prototype for humanity is what the racist person views to be most 'advanced'. Effectively, individuals *project* the characteristics that they regard as positively defining themselves (or their subgroup) onto their definition of the superordinate group (for a discussion of social projection see Robbins & Krueger, 2005).

The ingroup projection model. It is asserted by Social Identity theorists (e.g. Tajfel, 1974; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner et al., 1987) that people usually will try to have a positive view of themselves and will do so in relation to all of their group identities (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000). This results in a bias towards considering their own subgroup's norms, characteristics, or ideals (i.e. subgroup prototype) to be representative of the norms, characteristics, or ideals of the superordinate group (i.e. the superordinate prototype). This process of perceiving or claiming that a superordinate prototype is similar to the prototype of one's own subgroup is termed

'ingroup projection' (Wenzel et al., 2003). This means that when people compare themselves to other subgroups, they will often perceive or claim that their own subgroup is similar to the superordinate prototype and that the other subgroups differ from the superordinate prototype. For example, an English Canadian will have a tendency to view Canadians in general as being better exemplified by English Canadians than by French Canadians.

Antecedents of ingroup projection. Tajfel (1974) emphasized that social groups often compete for resources, political rights, status, or power. Over time, certain groups obtain political influence, economic power, and relative status compared to other groups, with members of higher status or more advantaged groups usually attempting to maintain the status quo and their position of relative advantage within the society (Tajfel, 1974). In the initial expression of social identity theory, Tajfel proposed that social identities play a fundamental role in these group-level processes because social identities allow individuals to connect their personal concepts of self with group level characteristics, goals, and processes.

The initial direction of research into ingroup projection viewed ingroup projection as primarily a form of heuristic cognitive bias (Bianchi et al., 2010). However, consistent with Tajfel's recognition of intergroup power and status concerns, ingroup projection can also stem from defensive responses to perceived threats or can stem from instrumental self-presentation in support of political goals (Rosa & Waldzus, 2012; Sindic & Reicher, 2009). Such threats can be 'symbolic' (threats to status, identity, or belief systems) or 'realistic' threats (threats to power,

economic resources, or welfare); with each category of threats affecting attitudes towards other groups (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000; Renfro & Stephan, 2002).

Conflict over definitions of the superordinate group prototype can involve symbolic threats (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000; Wenzel et al., 2003; Wenzel et al., 2007) such as challenges to superiority, centrality of traditions, or moral legitimacy. Insofar as a definition of the superordinate identity is preferential towards a subgroup and is associated with other privileges that the subgroup has (e.g. political influence, economic resources), then it is apparent that some symbolically threatening assertions may also pose realistic threats which can be expected to trigger ingroup projection by members of the privileged subgroup. For example, claims that Aboriginal legal traditions have similar legitimacy to British legal traditions in governing Canada may call into question legal foundations that may advantage non-Aboriginal groups in interpretation of treaties. Another example is that depicting Aboriginal people as founding cultures of Canada may challenge depictions of Canada as being created solely through resource development by settlers (Ray, 1996; Regan, 2010; Saul, 2008). Such a change could undermine the perceived legitimacy of further economic expansion at the expense of Aboriginal cultures. Ingroup projection, in turn, may directly affect responses to the question of whether the interests of Canada (i.e. the superordinate group) should be aligned with the interests of non-Aboriginal people, Aboriginal peoples, or both - and may influence who gets to decide how those interests should be defined. Under conditions of conflict between subgroups, the subgroup that is best able to claim to represent the superordinate group's interests may gain an advantage in rallying support behind its own self-interests.

Indeed, claims to relative ingroup prototypicality can indeed result from the perception of threats (e.g. perceived competition from other subgroups) or from utilitarian political purposes (e.g. benefitting from claiming to be prototypical). For example, Rosa and Waldzus (2012) proposed that cognitive biases are the main source of ingroup projection when intergroup relations are secure (i.e. low threat), whereas ingroup projection is largely a result of defence motivations when intergroup relations are perceived to be insecure (i.e. higher threat, for instance when reforms threaten the status quo). Using artificially created groups, they found that cognitive load and time pressure increased ingroup projection when intergroup relations were predictable, but not when they were unpredictable. Furthermore, they found that, in a natural group setting, thoughtfulness instructions increased ingroup projection - but only for high identifiers and only in the insecure (i.e. high threat) intergroup condition.

Further to this point, evidence has been found that invested individuals can shift their construals of the prototypicality of real world identities for political reasons. Sindic and Reicher (2008) found that Scottish nationalists were more likely to downplay claiming to be prototypical of British identity in the context of discussions about Scottish independence. However, when the rhetorical context was that of recognising Scotland's historical contributions to Britain, the opposite pattern emerged with Scottish nationalists being more likely to claim a high degree of prototypicality for British identity. In both contexts, Scottish people who did not support independence failed to show effects. This was interpreted by Sindic and Reicher as a case of instrumental ingroup projection aimed at supporting a political position.

Consequences of ingroup projection. Greater relative prototypicality is perceived to entitle more prototypical subgroups to better outcomes and to legitimise higher status (Wenzel et al., 2007). High levels of perceived prototypicality are associated with both a privileged symbolic position (e.g. social status), and access to political resources (e.g. legitimisation, normative influence) commonly found in dominant subgroups. Higher status groups are believed to more successfully engage in ingroup projection, leading to an increased sense of entitlement to valued social outcomes, legitimisation of intergroup status relations and increased endorsement of negative evaluations of other subgroups (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999). At the same time, this association between a privileged position and prototypicality provides a potential motivation to discourage other subgroups from claiming equal or higher levels of prototypicality compared to one's own group (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000; Weber et al., 2002; Wenzel et al., 2003). Finally, if one perceives other subgroups' attributes, values, or beliefs to be norm-deviating and negative, then devaluing and disadvantaging the other subgroup is more likely to be regarded as legitimate by the discriminating group (Wenzel et al., 2003).

To the extent that these associations between social dominance and claims to prototypicality hold, the success of a subgroup in projecting its own attributes, values, or goals onto a superordinate identity can act as a source of legitimisation of inequality amongst subgroups. Thus, judgments based on ingroup projection not only legitimise current unequal status relations, they can go further and legitimise discriminatory behaviours and negative intergroup attitudes (Reese et al., 2012; Weber et al., 2002; Wenzel et al., 2003). Indeed, extensive discriminatory behaviours are unlikely to occur without some subjective legitimisation (Wenzel et al., 2003).

If the high relative status of a social identity is valued, attempts to challenge this status may trigger feelings of threat and lead to aggression (Likel, Miller, Stenstrom, Denson, & Schmader, 2006; Weber et al., 2002). Social identity theory views unstable status relations and perceptions of the illegitimacy of intergroup status relations as particularly likely to trigger threat reactions (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). However, other findings suggest that, when members of high status groups perceive status relations to be illegitimate, they are more likely to behave in ways that are supportive of low status subgroups and to not show ingroup bias (Turner & Brown, 1978). Feeling unjustly privileged can elicit guilt and value conflicts (Weber et al., 2002) and thus motivations such as a concern for justice can overcome self-interest or ingroup favouritism (Turner & Brown, 1978) to encourage benevolent actions towards other groups. However, this has been shown to be less likely if high status groups feel threatened (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000) or if the status relationship between the groups is felt to be legitimate (Weber et al., 2002). For instance, participants from developed countries typically felt that developed countries were more representative of countries in general (despite being less numerous than developing countries), and such beliefs were found to be associated with more negative views of developing countries and less willingness to support benevolent actions - in this case, foreign aid for developing countries (Reese et al., 2012). In such instances, it appears that ingroup projection can act as a way of legitimising status differences between groups and interfere with motivations for benevolent actions, such as justice concerns.

In summary, ingroup projection on the part of higher status groups is expected to increase legitimization of existing status relations. If the other subgroup's attributes, values, or beliefs are considered to be norm-deviating and negative, devaluing and

disadvantaging the other subgroup may be regarded as legitimate by the discriminating group (Wenzel et al., 2003). However, a low level of ingroup projection, which permits the superordinate stereotype to be shared between groups, would be expected to encourage perceiving other subgroups more positively, delegitimise unequal status relations, and encourage supportive actions on the part of higher status groups.

National identity and multiculturalism

Encouraging cooperation and identification with a country is important for nation building. Throughout history, countries often have had policies, laws, or values that aim to strengthen common identities and reduce social conflict (Hyman, Meinhard, & Shields, 2011). One solution to social conflict is to encourage people to all have a common identity. In the case of a superordinate group containing subgroups, this can involve either dissolving the subgroups or encouraging all of the subgroups to think of themselves as being similar to each other (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000; Wenzel et al., 2007). However, fostering common identities has often been associated with active attempts to suppress minority cultures and languages, with attendant negative consequences for the minorities targeted.

Another solution is for a society to adopt a multicultural ideology that encourages a common identity while also creating a situation where subgroup identities can be maintained and affirmed (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000; Parker & Judd, 2005). From a social identity perspective, multiculturalism allows different subgroups to have different prototypes representing the valued characteristics and behaviours of their subgroup. Multicultural ideology encourages different subgroup prototypes to be

viewed as legitimate within the context of a larger superordinate group identity.

Within this framework, groups who are unavoidably different - or who choose to express their agency, traditions or communities in different ways - can have their own ideals respected.

Strong forms of multicultural ideology not only encourage tolerance and preservation of differences, but also have implications for the content of the superordinate identity. Specifically, ethnic and cultural subgroups are theoretically treated as all being representative of the superordinate identity. This can be done in at least two ways: the superordinate identity can be composed of either neutral traits (i.e. ones not associated with any subgroup) or of multiple prototypes (i.e. representing all subgroups as different forms of the ideal) (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999).

It is important to note that, even if a state ideology is multiculturalist, the state ideology may not be fully internalised by all citizens. As a result, many citizens may still feel that their subgroup is more representative of and more entitled to the superordinate prototype than are other subgroups in the society. However, to the extent that citizens internalise and endorse a multicultural ideology, they may be less likely to engage in ingroup projection.

Application to the Canadian case. The ingroup projection model was developed for situations where multiple subgroups come into conflict within the context of a superordinate identity (a common feature of societies with multiple cultures). However, most applications of these models have been in societies that have a recognisable overarching national ethnic culture such as Germany and the United States. In contrast to such countries, Canada was originally an officially bicultural

state which adopted a multicultural ideology half a century ago (Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1985; Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1969). This was a strong version of multiculturalism which often involved emphasizing a multicultural group prototype as underlined, for instance, by the position of Prime Minister Trudeau in 1971 (Schaakxs, 2012) that: “There is no such thing as a model or ideal Canadian. What could be more absurd than the concept of an 'all Canadian' boy or girl? A society which emphasizes uniformity is one which creates intolerance and hate.”

Since then, an entire generation of Canadians has been raised under an ideology of state multiculturalism (Hyman et al., 2011). As a result, multiculturalism is widely endorsed by Canadians (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2011; Dasko, 2003) and is often viewed as a core part of Canadian identity itself (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2011; Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2015) (i.e. the prototype for Canada). This centrality of multiculturalism to national identity and the high level of acceptance of multiculturalism by Canadians makes Canada unusual and an ideal ground for exploring phenomena related to multicultural approaches. It also provides a novel test of the ingroup projection model.

The unique characteristics of Aboriginal peoples adds additional aspects to the Canadian situation. Aboriginal peoples have certain constitutionally recognised rights specific to Aboriginal peoples (Henderson, 2006; Morse, 1989), giving them a unique place in Canada that is qualitatively different from that of other subgroups. Aboriginal peoples also expect a recognition of difference and a degree of independent collective self-determination, and they often perceive these two things as being central to

improving outcomes in many different areas, including health, reconciliation, cultural survival, and improving their relationship with Canada, etc. (e.g. Assembly of First Nations, 2011; Tiessen, Taylor, & Kirmayer, 2009).

Non-Aboriginal people in Canada may have multiple motivations and perceptions that drive their decisions to support, accommodate, or oppose various Aboriginal goals. With the release of recommendations by the Indian Residential Schools Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada and a renewed focus on actions in support of Aboriginal peoples, it is important to conduct research into the possible interactions of perceptions of threat, beliefs about the inclusiveness of Canadian identity, multicultural attitudes, and support for proposed policies.

The present study

Ingroup projection (i.e. viewing oneself as more representative of the superordinate identity than other groups) may have effects on support expressed by non-Aboriginal Canadians for reforms sought by Aboriginal peoples. It is anticipated that non-Aboriginal Canadians who feel threatened by Aboriginal goals will engage in ingroup projection and diminish the prototypicality of Aboriginal peoples within the Canadian identity, resulting in diminished support for reforms.

Particular interest was paid to whether ingroup projection is stronger when participants are presented with Aboriginal goals that are perceived as threatening, and whether these, in turn, were associated with reduced support for reforms proposed by Aboriginal people. To study this, levels of symbolic or realistic threat (vs. a control condition with no threat) were manipulated through the content of goals for societal reform which Aboriginal peoples were presented as seeking. Emanating from a

defensive response, ingroup projection was expected to be greater in the threat, relative to the non-threat conditions, and such projection should be associated with lower support for the reforms sought. Additionally, the study explored whether the effect of threat on ingroup projection and support for Aboriginal peoples varied as a function of whether a multicultural ideology was endorsed.

Hypotheses

- 1) The salience of intergroup threat would elicit higher levels of ingroup projection.
- 2) The salience of intergroup threat would elicit lower levels of support for reforms supporting Aboriginal peoples.
- 3) High levels of ingroup projection would be associated with lower support for reforms.
- 4) High self-reported ingroup projection would mediate the relationship between the salience of threat posed by Aboriginal peoples and support for reforms.
- 5) Endorsement of multiculturalism would moderate the relations between threat, ingroup prototypicality and support for reforms. Specifically, at higher levels of endorsement of multiculturalism, there would be an attenuation of the relation between perceived intergroup threat and both ingroup projection and support for reforms.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited from the Carleton University student participation pool. The study was described as involving a 40-minute survey examining Canadian identity and attitudes towards Aboriginal peoples. Participants were compensated with a \$5 gift certificate or with credit towards a course participation mark.

The sample was limited to students who did not self-identify as Aboriginal. Of the initial sample, 8.2% ($n=33$) self-identified as Aboriginal and 6.6% ($n=27$) were not students. In addition, 18.7% ($n=77$) and 12.4% ($n=51$) failed the first and second attention checks respectively, and 4.1% ($n=17$) of cases were found to have highly improbable patterns of response (e.g. completing the questionnaire in less than 8 minutes, which is less time than it could be read; answering all questions, including reverse scored, with the same rating). Many of these excluded cases failed more than one of these response quality tests. In total, 22.9% ($n=94$) of the sample was excluded for these reasons. The final sample comprised 275 cases.

The median household income of the sample was \$85,000-94,999 ($SD=\$55,000$), and mean age was 20.84 years ($SD 4.09$). Most of the participants were female (69.3%, $n=190$), with 29.9% ($n=82$) male and .07% ($n=2$) other. The sample was mainly Canadian, with 87.6% ($n=241$) of participants reporting being born in Canada, and 82.1% ($n=226$) reporting that their families had been in Canada for two or more generations. Participants predominantly grew up in large ($>100,000$ pop, 48.9% $n=134$), medium (30,000-100,000 pop, 21.5%, $n=49$) or small ($<29,999$ pop, 17.2%, $n=47$) urban centres, with a relatively small number of participants

coming from rural/remote communities (12.4%, $n=34$). Most participants reported having lived in Ontario longer than in any other province (93.8%, $n=258$).

A large portion (38%, $n=93$) of the sample reported having at least one form of minority identity, including those based on disability (5.5%, $n=15$), on being a visible or racialised minority (14.9%, $n=41$), an ethnic, cultural, or religious minority (20.4%, $n=56$), a sexual minority (e.g. GLBT, Queer, Transgendered) (5.8%, $n=16$), or another minority identity not listed above (2.5%, $n=7$).²

Procedure

Data were collected from September 2015 through November 2015. This data collection period was during a federal election, and also shortly after the release of the Indian Residential Schools Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada summary of its final report (in June, 2015), including the 94 Calls to Action.

At the beginning of the survey, demographic information was collected, along with information on participants' awareness of Aboriginal issues, and minority group identification (measures are in Appendix A). Participants were then randomly assigned to one of three threat conditions, namely conditions where symbolic threat, realistic threat, or no threat was made salient (measures in Appendix B). The threat manipulation was followed by a manipulation check (perceived threat), and measures of ingroup projection, support for reforms which could help realisation of Aboriginal goals, and endorsement of multiculturalism (measures in Appendix C).

² Note: These were non-exclusive categories; the 38% describes participants selecting at least one form of minority identity; however these participants could be reported as part of more than one subcategory of minority identity. As a result the percentages reported for subcategories should not be treated as cumulative.

Manipulation of perceived intergroup threat. The manipulation was based on the approach used by Yongeeswaran and Dasgupta (2014), but adapted to the Canadian context. In the present study, reforms were portrayed as differing sets of Aboriginal goals. Each condition consisted of a different set of 11 plausible reforms or policies. The conditions differed from each other in that the policies presented to the participant consisted of either symbolic goals (e.g. “Historic sites and monuments recognize the role of past governments in the subjugation of Aboriginal peoples.” “Aboriginal people are recognized as one of the three founding groups of Canada resulting in French, English, and Aboriginal cultures having equal status.”), realistic threat goals (e.g. “Lands illegally taken from Aboriginal peoples are returned to them along with compensation for loss of opportunity to use these lands” “Programs are established to encourage Aboriginal peoples to take leadership roles in politics, science, technology, engineering, and education”) or were goals that were non-threatening (e.g. “Some Aboriginal musicians are successful in different musical genres.” “Health programs ensure Aboriginal families have easier access to information on how to be healthy.”).

Participants were asked to assign a rank-order to the goals to reflect the order of importance that they felt the goals had for Aboriginal peoples. The purpose of the ranking exercise was to increase the effectiveness of the manipulation by encouraging the participants to engage in a more thorough reading and cognitive processing of the list of reforms provided (the results of the rank ordering were not used in the analyses).

Measures

Perceived threat manipulation check. The impact of the manipulation on threat perceptions was checked using a scale drawn from Levin, Pratto, Matthews, Sidanius, and Kteily (2012) and modified to make the group rated by participants be 'Aboriginal peoples'. This scale consisted of five items rated on a scale ranging from 1 "Strongly disagree" to 7 "Strongly agree". The scale included both symbolic and realistic threat items (e.g. "Aboriginals, as a group, take economic resources away from non-Aboriginal Canadians.", "Aboriginals, as a group, possess values that directly oppose the values of Non-Aboriginal Canadians."). Response ratings were averaged to form a single score for the scale (Cronbach's $\alpha=.82$).

Relative ingroup prototypicality (i.e. measure of ingroup projection). Participants rated the perceived prototypicality of themselves with respect to Canadian identity and the prototypicality of Aboriginal peoples with respect to Canadian identity. This was done using a pictorial rating scale that consisted of the participant selecting from among seven choices of pairs of circles showing differing amounts of overlap between the identity of interest and Canadian identity. This approach is similar to that used to measure ingroup projection in Waldzus and Mummendey (2004). Relative ingroup prototypicality was then computed by subtracting the participant's estimate of Aboriginal peoples' prototypicality to the superordinate identity from the estimate of their own prototypicality to the superordinate identity. After computation this resulted in a 13-point scale that ran from -6 to +6, with positive scores reflecting increasingly greater relative ingroup prototypicality.

Measurements of prototypicality were conducted for perceived overlap of Canadian 'values' (prefaced with "People's values influence their actions and goals. There are a wide variety of values people can embrace (e.g. harmony, industriousness, spirituality, loyalty, freedom, connection to the land). Some values are considered more important than others, and this judgment varies between people.") and also for perceived overlap of 'goals for Canada' (prefaced with "People can have different goals for how society should work. For example, for some people, economic security can take the form of seeking an effective welfare system; for others it can take the form of maximising economic growth. Such differences or similarities in goals can exist in many areas (e.g. religion, education, politics, environment, crime)."). This approach of testing multiple dimensions of the prototype is similar to that used in past research (e.g. Reese et al., 2012). It was found that these two domains of ingroup projection were not highly enough correlated with each other to be redundant ($r=.40$, $p<.001$), and thus it was decided to treat them as separate variables.

Support for reforms. Willingness to support the adoption of reforms sought by Aboriginal peoples was measured using a measure of policy endorsement similar to the one used by Langford and Ponting (1992). Participants were presented with a list of 17 possible reforms (e.g., "The Government of Canada and Christian churches involved in running the Residential School System should jointly fund the cultural revival of traditional Aboriginal spirituality and languages.", "Canadian governments should provide Aboriginal Nations with lands of sufficient size and quality to allow cultural autonomy, political autonomy, and economic self-reliance."). These items were based on recommendations made by the Canadian Residential Schools Truth and Reconciliation Commission's interim report (2012) and the report of the Royal

Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1997), see Appendix D for details. Participants indicated on a scale of 1 “Strongly disagree” to 7 “Strongly agree” how much they endorsed each reform.

A principal component analysis with an oblimin rotation was performed to determine the factor structure of this scale. Based on a scree plot, these reforms could be grouped into two factors ($r = .55$). Items were included on a factor when structure loadings were greater than .45. The first factor accounted for 51.2% of the variance (eigenvalue = 8.71), and comprised 11 items that reflected support for ‘systemic change’ (e.g., citizenship, dual sovereignty, creation of a third house of parliament, adapting the legal system to be compatible with customary law, land reforms and taxation powers to increase Indigenous autonomy, support for traditional lifestyles, support for traditional languages, support for education, and increasing the use of indigenous place name). The second factor accounted for 7.6% of variance (eigenvalue = 1.31), and comprised 6 items that reflected support for ‘acknowledgment of the past’ (e.g., changes to curriculum, immigrant education materials, public education, and distribution of copies of the apology). Subscale scores were calculated by taking the mean across the related items. The resulting scales gave a Cronbach’s $\alpha = .82$ for the systemic change reforms and Cronbach’s $\alpha = .92$ for the acknowledgment of the past reforms, showing sufficient levels of internal consistency.

Endorsement of multiculturalism. Endorsement of multiculturalism was measured with a scale from Morrison, Plaut, and Ybarra (2010). This scale consists of five items reflecting attitudes toward statements such as “In order to live in a cooperative society, everyone must learn the unique histories and cultural experiences

of different racial and ethnic groups.” Responses were rated on a scale of 1 “Strongly Disagree” to 7 “Strongly Agree”. The response ratings were reverse scored as needed and averaged to form a single score (Cronbach’s $\alpha=.85$).

Awareness of Aboriginal issues. Awareness of the reconciliation process was assessed by asking participants about their awareness of three areas ("The Indian Residential School system"; "The Canadian Government’s Statement of Apology to former students of Indian Residential Schools"; "The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada"). Responses were rated on a three-point scale ranging from 'not at all aware' (coded 1) to 'very aware' (coded 3). This was based on an unpublished scale previously developed by Dr. Amy Bombay.

Interest in Aboriginal issues. Interest in Aboriginal issues was assessed using including "In the past month or so how often would you say you’ve thought about issues concerning Aboriginal people?" and "In the past month or so how often would you say you’ve discussed issues concerning Aboriginal people with your family or friends?". These items were previously used in a public opinion poll on support for reforms on Aboriginal issues (Angus-Reid Group Inc., 1990). Participants were asked to rate their responses on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 'not at all' to 4 'many times'.

Perceived impacts on personal and national self-interest. Items used in a public opinion poll on support for reforms on Aboriginal issues (Angus-Reid Group Inc., 1990) were modified for the purpose of assessing the perceived salience of Aboriginal peoples' agendas to both personal self-interest ("Do you think your overall personal situation, or the situation of people close to you, could be either directly or indirectly affected by Aboriginal people accomplishing their goals? If yes, would that

be a positive or negative effect?") and national self-interest ("Do you think Canada could be either directly or indirectly affected by Aboriginal people accomplishing their goals? If yes, would that be a positive or negative effect?"). These were used as single item measures. Responses were rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 'very negative' effects to 7 'very positive' effects.

Attention checks. To assess whether participants were reading the items, two questions were added as attention checks. These questions gave participants the opportunity to select from a list of affective states; however the instructions indicated that all participants should select a single answer (e.g. "Scientists are concerned that many individuals have not grasped the significance of discrimination. They fear that lack of knowledge may result in negative attitudes toward certain groups. To show that you have read this information, please select 'happy' as your answer."). If participants failed either of these items their responses were removed from the dataset.

Statistical analyses

The statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 21 for Windows (Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.). Pearson correlation scores were calculated to assess zero-order relations between the variables. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVAs) were used for the manipulation check. Two-tailed t-tests were used to assess whether mean responses differed from midpoint of the scales. Moderated mediation analyses were conducted using bootstrapping techniques based on 5000 resamples to determine 95% confidence limits (Preacher & Hayes, 2004; Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007).

Results

Preliminary analyses

Pre-existing awareness of Aboriginal issues. Given the possibility that self-selection to the study might have influenced the sample composition, we considered participants' awareness of Aboriginal issues in Canada. Only 28.5% ($n=78$) reported thinking about Aboriginal issues less than once per month. 44.0% ($n=121$) reported discussing Aboriginal issues less than once per month. 76.7% ($n=211$) of participants reported at least some awareness of the Indian Residential Schools system, 74.9% ($n=206$) reported awareness of the national apology to former students of residential schools. However, only 49.1% ($n=135$) reported having heard of the Indian Residential Schools Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.

Beliefs about the relevance of Aboriginal issues to personal and national self-interest. Most participants did not feel that the policy decisions dealing with Aboriginal peoples had personal relevance: When asked whether their "overall personal situation, or the situation of people close to you could be either directly or indirectly affected by Aboriginal peoples accomplishing their goals", almost two thirds (58.2%) of participants anticipated no effects ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 1.11$, with the midpoint 4 labelled as 'no effect'). However, participants tended to view Aboriginal peoples accomplishing their goals as benefitting Canada ($M = 4.72$, $SD = 1.38$, with the midpoint 4 labelled as 'no effect').

Descriptive statistics and zero-order correlations. Based on mean levels of response compared to the mid-point of the scales, as seen in Table 2, participants tended to disagree with the idea that Aboriginal peoples posed a threat, $t(268)=-19.83$,

$p < .001$. In addition, they reported relatively positive support for multiculturalism, $t(270) = 27.25$, $p < .001$. Similarly, support for systemic change reforms was positive $t(260) = 5.36$, $p < .001$, as was support for acknowledgement of the past, $t(269) = 14.06$, $p < .001$ (see Table 2).

Ingroup projection appeared common, with approximately two thirds of participants engaged in some degree of ingroup projection (i.e., rated themselves as closer to the Canadian superordinate identity than they rated Aboriginal peoples) in the values (64.1%) and goals domains (63.1%). However, some participants viewed Aboriginal peoples as being equally prototypical, and a smaller number considered Aboriginal peoples as more prototypical of the superordinate identity than themselves (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Ingroup projection in the 'goals for Canada' and 'values' domain.

Women tended to be more supportive than men of both systemic change $t(256) = -4.27$, $p < .001$, acknowledgement of the past $t(265) = -3.80$, $p < .001$, and endorsement of multiculturalism $t(266) = -4.55$, $p < .001$ (see Table 1). Furthermore,

women perceived Aboriginal peoples as less threatening $t(264)=3.73, p<.001$. Gender did not predict ingroup projection. However, when the moderated mediation model was run with gender as a control variable, none of the relationships changed their statistical significance. As a result, the decision was made to run a simplified model without controlling for gender.

Zero-order correlations showed that perceptions of threat were inversely correlated with endorsement of multiculturalism, as well as support for either types of reform (Table 2).

Table 1

Means and 95% confidence intervals for effects of gender on variables of interest

Variable	<i>M</i> (males)	<i>M</i> (females)	95% <i>CI</i> (lower)	95% <i>CI</i> (upper)
Threat	3.05	2.53	0.24	0.79
Multi	5.15	5.69	-.81	-.28
Systemic change	3.92	4.60	-0.99	-0.36
Acknowledge ment ^a	4.56	5.12	-0.88	-0.24

^aNot assuming equality of variances

Note: Threat = Intergroup threat perceptions; Multi = Endorsement of multiculturalism; Systemic change=Support for systemic change reforms; Acknowledgment=Support for acknowledgement of the past reforms. All scales range from 1 to 7, except for the ingroup projection measures (IP Values, IP Goals) which has a possible range of -6 to 6.

Table 2

Means, SD, and Zero-order correlations among the variables of interest

Variable			Multi	IPV	IPG	Systemic change	Acknowledge dgement	Female
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>R</i>					
Threat	2.70	1.08	-.31***	.11 ⁺	.11	-.38***	-.43***	-.24**
Multi	5.51	0.91		.03	-.09	.56***	.52***	.28**
IPV	1.28	1.76			.37***	.04	.04 ⁺	-.03
IPG	1.28	1.69				-.02	-.05	-.09
Systemic change	4.38	1.23					.72***	.28**
Acknowledgem ent	4.95	1.13						.24**

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, + $p < .1$.

Note: Threat = Intergroup threat perceptions; Multi = Endorsement of multiculturalism; IPG=Ingroup projection (goals domain); IPV=Ingroup projection (values domain); Systemic change=Support for systemic change reforms; Acknowledgment=Support for acknowledgement of the past reforms. All scales range from 1 to 7, except for the ingroup projection measures (IP Values, IP Goals) which has a possible range of -6 to 6.

Manipulation check. The effect of the threat manipulation was tested using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). No significant difference was found in among the three threat conditions (non-threatening, symbolic threat, realistic threat) on perceived threat ($F(2,238)=0.13, p=.875$). As a whole, participants disagreed with the notion that Aboriginal peoples posed a threat ($t(268)=-19.833, p<.001$). Given the lack of differences across the three threat groups, the decision was made to use the manipulation check measure (i.e. the perceived outgroup threat scale) as the main predictor.

Components of ingroup projection measures. A common assumption of the ingroup projection model (Wenzel, et al., 2007) is that greater perceived overlap of another subgroup with the superordinate identity should be associated with positive attitudes towards that subgroup (i.e. lower levels of perceived threat and greater support for co-operative behaviours like supporting reforms). Examination of the zero-order correlations indicated that while perceived overlap between the self and mainstream Canadians was not significantly related to perceived threat and support for change, the perceived overlap of Aboriginal peoples' values and 'goals for Canada' and those of mainstream Canadians was inversely correlated with threat (see Table 3). Perceived overlap between Aboriginal peoples' values and those of mainstream Canadians was also inversely correlated with support for systemic change reforms. In effect, the more the values of Aboriginal peoples were perceived to be similar to those of mainstream Canadians, the lower the perceived threat stemming from their goals, but also the less support expressed for system reforms.

Table 3

Zero-order correlations between components of relative ingroup prototypicality (i.e. the ingroup projection measure) and variables of interest

Variable	SCG	ACV	ACG	Threat	Multi	Systemic change	Acknowledgement
<i>R</i>							
SCV	.59***	.34***	.24***	-.09	-.03	-.11 ⁺	.02
SCG		.26***	.34***	-.08	-.04	-.04	-.01
ACV			.43***	-.21***	-.07	-.15*	-.04
ACG				-.17***	-.01	-.02	.02

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, ⁺ $p < .1$.

Note: Threat = Intergroup threat perceptions; Multi = Endorsement of multiculturalism; SCV = Perceived overlap of self and mainstream Canadians (values); SCG = Perceived overlap of self and mainstream Canadians (goals); ACV = Perceived overlap of Aboriginal peoples and mainstream Canadians (values); SCG = Perceived overlap of Aboriginal peoples and mainstream Canadians (goals); Systemic change=Support for systemic change reforms; Acknowledgment=Support for acknowledgement of the past reforms.

The main model

Moderated mediation analyses were conducted to assess whether ingroup projection (in terms of values and ‘goals for Canada’) mediated the relations between the perceived level of threat from Aboriginal peoples and support for reforms (i.e. support for systemic change, acknowledgement of the past), and whether endorsement of multiculturalism moderated these relations (Figure 2).

Figure 2. The main model showing the effect of perceived intergroup threat (predictor variable) on support for reforms (outcome variable) as potentially mediated by the two domains of ingroup projection, and moderated by endorsement of multiculturalism.

Support for systemic change.

Direct effect of perceived intergroup threat. Consistent with the hypotheses, greater perceptions of intergroup threat were associated with lower support for systemic change, $b=-0.28$, $se=0.07$, 95% $CI \{-0.41, -0.14\}$. Endorsement of multiculturalism was also associated with greater support for systemic change ($b=0.62$, $se=0.08$, 95% $CI \{0.47, 0.78\}$). However, contrary to expectations, the interaction between perceptions of threat and endorsement of multiculturalism was not significant ($b=0.04$, $se=0.06$, 95% $CI \{-0.09, 0.16\}$).

Mediation by ingroup projection. When the mediating role of ingroup projection for either values or ‘goals for Canada’ was examined, perceived threat was found to be a significant predictor of greater ingroup projection of

values, $b=0.13$, $se=0.07$, 95% CI {0.00, 0.26}, but not projection of goals, $b=-0.05$, $se=0.08$, 95% CI {-0.20, 0.10}. In neither case was multiculturalism a significant moderator of these paths, $ps>.05$. Moreover, ingroup projection in neither the values nor the 'goals for Canada' domains was a significant predictor of support for systemic change, and endorsement of multiculturalism did not moderate these relations (see Table 4). In effect, it appears that the relation between perceived threat and support for systemic change was not mediated by ingroup projection and that this did not vary with levels of endorsement of multiculturalism.

Table 4

Association of ingroup projection and endorsement of multiculturalism with support for systemic change

Predictor	<i>b</i>	<i>Se</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>	95% <i>CI</i> (lower)	95% <i>CI</i> (upper)
Threat	-0.28	0.07	-4.09	.0001	[-0.41	-0.14]
IPG	0.02	0.07	0.22	.8276	[-0.12	0.15]
IPV	0.04	0.07	0.57	.5688	[-0.10	0.18]
Multi	0.62	0.08	8.03	<.0001	[0.47	0.78]
Threat X Multi	0.04	0.06	0.58	.5637	[-0.09	0.16]
IPG X Multi	0.15	0.07	0.23	.8180	[-0.12	0.15]
IPV X Multi	-0.07	0.08	-0.90	.3707	[-0.22	0.08]

Note: Threat = Intergroup threat perceptions; Multi = Endorsement of multiculturalism; IPG=Ingroup projection (goals domain); IPV=Ingroup projection (values domain).

Figure 3. Statistically significant relationships ($p < .05$) in the model predicting support for systemic change reforms

Support for acknowledgement of the past

Direct effect of perceived intergroup threat. Consistent with the hypotheses, perceptions of intergroup threat were associated with lower support for acknowledgement of the past ($b = -0.32$, $se = 0.06$, 95% $CI \{-0.44, -0.20\}$). Endorsement of multiculturalism was also associated with greater support for acknowledgement of the past ($b = 0.54$, $se = 0.07$, 95% $CI \{0.41, 0.68\}$). However, contrary to expectations, the interaction between perceptions of threat and endorsement of multiculturalism was not significant ($b = 0.07$, $se = 0.06$, 95% $CI \{-0.04, 0.19\}$).

Mediation by ingroup projection. As noted in the mediated model predicting support for systemic change, perceived threat was a significant predictor of greater ingroup projection of values, but not of greater ingroup projection of ‘goals for Canada’ and in neither case was multiculturalism a significant moderator of these paths.

Neither the values nor the ‘goals for Canada’ domain of ingroup projection was a significant predictor of support for acknowledging the past, and endorsement of multiculturalism did not moderate these relations (see Table 5). Once again, it appears that the relation between perceived threat and support for acknowledging the past was not mediated by in-group projection, and this did not vary with levels of endorsement of multiculturalism.

Table 5

Association of ingroup projection and endorsement of multiculturalism with support for acknowledgement of the past

Predictor	<i>b</i>	<i>Se</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>	95% <i>CI</i> (lower)	95% <i>CI</i> (upper)
Threat	-0.32	0.06	-5.26	<.0001	[-0.44	-0.20]
IPG	0.00	0.06	0.06	.9508	[-0.12	0.13]
IPV	0.08	0.06	1.21	.2257	[-0.05	0.20]
Multi	0.54	0.07	7.91	<.0001	[0.41	0.68]
Threat X Multi	0.07	0.06	1.27	.2059	[-0.04	0.19]
IPG X Multi	-0.08	0.06	-1.39	.1664	[-0.20	0.04]
IPV X Multi	0.05	0.07	0.68	.4985	[-0.09	0.19]

Note: Threat = Intergroup threat perceptions; Multi = Endorsement of multiculturalism; IPG = Ingroup projection (goals domain); IPV = Ingroup projection (values domain).

Figure 4. Statistically significant relationships ($ps < .05$) in the model predicting support for 'acknowledgement of the past'.

Discussion

The present study found support for the hypothesis that perceptions of threat emanating from Aboriginal peoples would be associated with reduced support for reforms aimed at improving the situation of Aboriginal peoples. The further hypothesis that ingroup projection (i.e. claiming one's own subgroup to be more prototypical of Canada than other subgroups) would increase as a result of threat perceptions was also supported. However, ingroup projection was not found to be associated with lower support for reforms. Moreover, although the endorsement of multiculturalism was itself associated with more support for reforms, the relations between perceived threat, ingroup projection and support for reform did not vary significantly as a function of endorsing multiculturalism.

Threat perceptions

In order to assess the impact of perceived threats posed by Aboriginal peoples on support for reforms, an effort was made to manipulate perceptions of threat. Despite being based on the procedures followed in previous research (Yongeeswaran & Dasgupta, 2014), the manipulation proved ineffective. Overall, participants disagreed with the idea that Aboriginal peoples were a threat, and this did not vary significantly as a function of the manipulation. The low levels of baseline perceived threat, lack of effectiveness of the manipulation to induce threat, and limited effect sizes suggest that fear of Aboriginal peoples may be less of a barrier to cooperation than expected. Should this be the case, fears of retaliation against Aboriginal peoples for being outspoken or proactively pursuing their goals (Likel et al., 2006; Yongeeswaran et al. 2011) may be greater than warranted.

It could be that people's lack of feelings of being threatened may have reflected a belief that Aboriginal issues would not impact them personally. It should be noted that, in other studies, the personal relevance of perceived competition has been found to be an important factor in inducing negative reactions to minorities (Renfro, Duran, Stephan, & Clason, 2006).

Despite the relatively low levels of perceived threat, the results of the present study nonetheless indicated that higher levels of self-reported threat perceptions were associated with lower levels of support for reforms. However, some caution is needed in interpreting results and the possible implications for actions of such findings, as this link was correlational and no causal inferences can be made.

Ingroup projection

Ingroup projection was widespread among participants, with approximately two thirds of participants engaging in some degree of ingroup projection. Such results support the basic prediction of the ingroup projection model that people tend to regard themselves as more strongly representative of the superordinate identity relative to other subgroups.

A positive association between ingroup projection in the values domain and greater perceived threat posed by Aboriginal peoples was found, suggesting that defensive ingroup projection may be present. If threat perceptions indeed precede ingroup projection, it would support accounts of ingroup projection that view it as having a utilitarian (Sindic & Reicher, 2008) or defensive (Rosa & Waldzus, 2012) motivation rather than simply being the result of a pure cognitive bias. However, it is possible that people who are more likely to feel threatened are also more likely to

engage in ingroup projection, or alternatively that ingroup projection may sometimes lead to perceiving other subgroups as threats. Unfortunately, the correlational design of the final study prevented establishing causal direction, so it is not possible to say with any certainty that defensive ingroup projection was involved.

Nonetheless, it is worth considering the possibility that participants who felt threatened increased the degree to which they projected their own values and goals onto Canadian identity. In doing so, they would be able to construe Aboriginal peoples as counter to the values and goals and values of Canada as well as their own values and goals. If this is the case, then either mitigating threat perceptions, or intervening to lower ingroup projection directly, would reduce the risk of people excluding Aboriginal peoples from Canadian identity.

However, a similar relationship with threat perceptions was not found in the ‘goals for Canada’ domain. It is plausible that people may find that construing minorities as symbolic threats (i.e., a threat to the group’s values) may be more useful in justifying competitive exclusion than construing the actual goals of minorities as threatening – a possibility which is consistent with the results of some studies (Corenblum & Stephan, 2001; Renfro et al., 2006). This could allow individuals to avoid acknowledging realistic intergroup competition by instead focusing on values – a preference that may exist for individuals who are low in social dominance orientation and endorse an ideology that all individuals should be equal (Levin et al., 2012). Furthermore, some individuals may not want to acknowledge that Aboriginal people could successfully compete with them. It may also be easier to justify threats in the values domain than to acknowledge competition in the material domain, given

the obviously worse life outcomes for Aboriginal groups in Canadian society which may stimulate collective guilt (Weber et al., 2002) or reduce the plausibility of fear of direct competition with the dominant society by Aboriginal peoples.

However, it could also be that people are more threatened by perceived differences in values between Aboriginal peoples and non-Aboriginal Canadians than by perceived threats related to apparent differences in goals. It is possible that the low perceived personal relevance of Aboriginal issues to participants may indicate a belief that policy around Aboriginal issues is unlikely to affect participants' own life outcomes. If this is the case, then reframing Aboriginal value differences as being less threatening could be a useful strategy for reducing tensions. This could be done through a multicultural approach that tries to make differences less threatening, or through an assimilationist approach that tries to make Aboriginal peoples as similar to the mainstream Canadian superordinate prototype as possible (Zagefka, González, & Brown, 2011).

When the perceived overlap between the values of Aboriginal peoples and mainstream Canadians was examined, it was found that higher overlap was associated with less support for systemic change reforms. This is a counter-intuitive result within ingroup projection theory and the social identity approach in general, as these theories would generally predict that greater perceived overlap and identification between subgroups and the superordinate group would lead to greater cooperation (Turner et al., 1987). This counter-intuitive result could possibly be explained when we consider that perceived overlap can be accomplished in two different ways - either by changing the subgroup to be closer to the superordinate identity (an assimilationist approach),

or by moving the superordinate identity to be closer to the subgroup (a potential outcome of multiculturalism). Either approach to construing Aboriginal peoples in Canada could lead to higher levels of perceived overlap, but have very different implications for intergroup relations. People who wish to support Aboriginal peoples' rights within Canada may seek to adjust the Canadian superordinate prototype to make it closer to the Aboriginal prototype in order to entrench Aboriginality as a foundational part of being Canadian. Those who would seek to deny any distinctiveness to Aboriginal people may seek to depict them as being essentially the same as other Canadians and therefore not warranting any kind of distinctive treatment or recognition. Since these two mechanisms cannot be distinguished in our data, trends for these two hypothetical subgroups of participants may be obscuring each other and confounding the results. Should this be the case, it would be methodologically important for the operationalisations of the ingroup projection model, as it would show that assimilationist ideologies can violate the assumptions upon which existing measures of ingroup projection are based.

While it was theorised that ingroup projection might legitimate competitive behaviours and lack of support for reforms, such relations were not found in the present study.³ It is possible that the objectives of Aboriginal peoples were viewed as relatively legitimate whether or not Aboriginal peoples were considered prototypical of Canada. In fact, given that the realization of many Aboriginal goals relies on acceptance of a degree of difference and self-determination by non-Aboriginals, perceptions of the legitimacy of Aboriginal goals may increase in some cases through

³ Note that this is with regard to the main model. With regard to zero-order correlations a relationship was found between the values domain and the acknowledgement of the past, but only at a more relaxed criterion of $p < .1$

the portrayal of Aboriginal peoples as outgroups. While the present study's results are inconclusive, past work using the ingroup projection model has indicated that being viewed as an outgroup member can be preferable to being viewed as an unprototypical ingroup member (Waldzus & Mummendey, 2004) - although being viewed as highly prototypical or as fitting into an inclusive prototype is generally considered to be a more ideal outcome (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999; Waldzus et al., 2003).

If this indeed proves to be the case, it will have important implications since Aboriginal peoples regularly have to decide how to portray themselves, choosing from a number of different possible construals that interact with the issue of prototypicality (e.g. portraying themselves as foundational to Canada, as an atypical Canadian minority, or as, with First Nations, existing apart from or outside the colonial institutions of Canadian society)(Wotherspoon & Hansen, 2013). Such choices involve Aboriginal peoples choosing between depicting themselves as highly prototypical, as a subgroup that deviates from the mainstream Canadian prototype, or as an outgroup. The present study underlines the fact that current research cannot as yet conclusively say which of these possible self-representations may prove most beneficial nor under which circumstances they will be most likely be beneficial.

The role of multiculturalism

It was suggested that individuals who endorse multiculturalism would embrace a multicultural superordinate prototype, and thus, be less likely to manifest ingroup projection, and more likely to manifest support for other subgroups (Dupuis & Safdar, 2010; Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999). As anticipated, endorsement of

multiculturalism was associated with a greater willingness to support reforms for Aboriginal peoples.

Endorsement of multiculturalism did not significantly alter the relations between threat and lack of support for reforms nor did it alter the role of ingroup projection in these relations. It would appear that multiculturalism may not interact strongly with threat perceptions or ingroup projection. However, there are some other possible explanations for why such a result would not be found in the present study. Different Canadians may have quite different conceptions of the superordinate identity - as a result, for example, of differences in experience or ideological preference in defining Canadian values or goals. If so, different participants in the study may have been comparing themselves against different superordinate constructs. Given that Canada is unusual in the extensiveness of its adoption of multiculturalism as a policy and in the widespread acceptance of multiculturalism in Canadian society, it is likely that some Canadians may associate being prototypically Canadian with supporting multiculturalism (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2011). Depending upon whether individuals associate Canadian identity with assimilationism or multiculturalism, their identification with Canadian identity could have opposite associations with multiculturalism and with support for reforms (Dupius & Safdar, 2010; Greenberg, Simon, Pyszczynski, Solomon, & Chatel, 1992). If this is the case, such differing bases for identity could obscure observation of the moderating effects of multiculturalism on the relations between threat, ingroup projection, and support for reforms.

It is also possible that certain impacts of multicultural ideology (e.g. ill-definition of the prototype) may have influenced perceptions of the Canadian superordinate group identity, even among those who did not themselves personally endorse multiculturalism. In particular, it might be more difficult to sustain claims about greater prototypicality in a situation without a simple, non-heterogeneous, and well-defined prototype that provides relevant dimensions for comparison (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999). If the superordinate identity is poorly defined, it is hard to unarguably represent it; if it is heterogeneous, it is impossible for a single subgroup's characteristics to be claimed to be comprehensively prototypical; if it does not provide relevant dimensions for comparison that privilege some groups over others, it is only tangentially relevant. It may be useful in future research to examine how the salience of such multiculturalism-influenced characteristics of Canada's superordinate prototype may affect participants' responses, even among participants who do not themselves endorse multiculturalism.

Limitations and recommendations for future research

There are a number of reasons to exercise caution in generalising from the results of this study. With regard to the apparent lack of threat perceptions related to Aboriginal peoples, other factors may have been at work, such as insufficient attention being paid to the manipulation. The manipulation used a simpler ranking task rather than asking the participants to respond to the stimuli using an open answer question, as was done in a previous study (Yongeeswaran & Dasgupta, 2014). However, another factor may have been that Yongeeswaran and Dasgupta (2014) were studying a population in the United States which may be more easily threatened

by multiculturalism due to less previous exposure to multicultural ideologies and diverse minorities (Harles, 2004).

Results related to support for reforms may be influenced by the design of the measure used to assess it. Short descriptions of reforms were provided with minimal information regarding the rationale for them, opening up the possibility that many participants may not have fully understood all of the items. In future studies, exploring more extensive descriptions of reforms and their implications, a more thorough testing of comprehension for such items, and a greater understanding of the context in which participants interpret them may be important for increasing confidence in any conclusions regarding how people actually behave.

The robustness of findings regarding the seeming mildness of threat perceptions needs to be verified through further research using participants that are more representative of the general population. The current study was based on the responses of first year psychology students in eastern Ontario. The limited representativeness of the sample means that the findings of this study cannot be readily generalised to Canadian public opinion as a whole. In particular, some previous studies have found that less supportive and more discriminatory attitudes towards Aboriginal peoples are to be found in some regions of Canada, and among older cohorts (Angus-Reid Group Inc., 1990; Morrison, Morrison, & Borsa, 2014;). Collecting a more representative sample would provide greater variability in perspectives and this might, in turn, provide the variance needed to further uncover relations among the variables of interest. A more representative sample would also allow firmer conclusions about the actual likelihood that the Canadian population as a

whole would respond negatively to the political goals of Aboriginal peoples. While such information would be of value, it is important to acknowledge that retaliatory behaviours conducted by a small number of individuals in the population, or through the policies of powerful state and private sector entities (Likel et al., 2006) might still exist and would not be captured through simply using a more representative sample.

The present study did not differentiate between social projection (projection of the self onto the superordinate group) and ingroup projection (projection of one's own subgroup onto the superordinate group). As a result, the operationalisation of ingroup projection was not directly comparable with that used in past studies which were able to specify a subgroup level ingroup identity for participants to compare with (and project onto) a superordinate identity. This is potentially problematic as comparison of the personal individual self with any group level identity is likely to involve different schemas than are used when comparing two group level identities. The difficulty of ensuring subgroup level identities are engaged is further complicated by the fact that ingroup projection at very high levels may lead to people equating their own individual characteristics or values with those of the superordinate identity, while denying that these characteristics are those of a subgroup of which they are a member (as is a common perspective of some forms of liberal individualism, such as colour-blind ideology - Levin et al., 2012; Quayle & Sonn, 2013). This appears to be fairly common in modern Canadian identity (Howard-Hassmann, 1999).

An examination of the strength of identification with a subgroup and possible manipulations to get people to identify with a dominant non-Aboriginal subgroup might help to address this identity issue. However, specifying an ingroup for

participants would be difficult given the diversity of subgroups in Canada, and thus this design limitation in our study may be inevitable without focussed sampling of specific ethno-cultural communities and manipulations to ensure the salience of their subgroup identities. Another solution might be to use ratings of third parties (e.g. comparing the prototypicality of 'British Canadians' with 'Aboriginal Canadians'), similar to approaches used in the past to assess the relative prestige of different ethnic subgroups (Jay, 1978). More generally, conducting a study using multiple ways of measuring ingroup projection (more closely replicating past studies) and using a more representative sample would produce a more robust test of the strength of the effects of ingroup projection within the Canadian context.

In a similar vein, the labels used for the measures used for ingroup projection, namely 'mainstream Canadians' and 'Aboriginal peoples' might have biased responses. The term 'mainstream' may not actually describe exclusion from Canadianness as it leaves open the possibility of participants believing Aboriginal peoples to be non-mainstream Canadians and yet also equally, and legitimately, as Canadian as mainstream Canadians. Since, 'Mainstream' was not clearly defined to participants, interpretations of the term may have differed. The term 'Aboriginal peoples' may have biased responses as it may have encouraged viewing Aboriginal peoples as an outgroup rather than as a Canadian subgroup. In contrast, a term like 'Aboriginal Canadians' would have emphasized the existence of Aboriginal peoples within Canada, and might have increased the effects of ingroup projection. This is potentially relevant given the evidence for some situations in which outgroups can be perceived more favourably than non-prototypical subgroups (Waldzus & Mummendey, 2004). Furthermore, past research has suggested that terms like

‘Aboriginal peoples’ may be associated with more positive reactions than terms that construe Aboriginal peoples as Canadians (like ‘native Canadians’, Donakowski & Esses, 1996). However, the same researchers found that terms emphasizing construal as an outgroup (e.g. First Nations) also led to more negative reactions. Overall, it is possible that avoiding, or defining, the term ‘mainstream’ might have led to more consistent responses among participants, and use of a term other than ‘Aboriginal peoples’ may have strengthened the association between ingroup projection and other variables such as support for reforms and threat perceptions.

Another possible confounding dynamic is that some participants may have responded with beliefs about the present reality, while other participants may have modified their answers to deliberately emphasize what they normatively think *should exist* regarding the prototypicality of subgroups in Canada. In future, it may be useful to include versions of items assessing prototypicality that ask about 'current' levels of prototypicality and 'ideal' levels of prototypicality separately. Giving both of these options may enable the separation of normative intentions from participants' perceptions of actual contemporary social realities. Furthermore, in some cases it may be useful to ask about how the ideal state should be achieved, for example, whether the minority should assimilate, or whether the superordinate identity should be redefined in a way that moves its prototype closer to the prototype of the minority group. This potentially provides another way to explore the impact of assimilationist ideologies on claims about prototypicality.

The measures of perceived overlap were also problematic in that they didn't clearly define the level of the comparison. For instance, similarity of values could

exist at a fundamental level (e.g. having basic human motivations) or a very specific level (e.g. having similar views on parenting or religion). It is possible that some participants would consider and find evidence of a high degree of overlap in fundamental areas like human emotions while other participants would consider narrower areas, such as food preferences or religion, and conclude that there are significant differences. Since these two groups cannot be distinguished in our data, trends for these two hypothetical subgroups of participants may be obscuring each other and confounding the results. In future studies, ambiguity could be reduced by clarifying to participants what level of detail they should consider when making comparisons. Having multiple items that specify different levels of comparison would also help remedy this issue.

Conclusions

It was suggested that non-Aboriginal people might attempt to legitimise their relatively dominant position in Canadian society through claiming to be more Canadian than Aboriginal peoples. The study sought to address the question of whether such behaviour would be influenced by either perceived threats viewed as inherent in the aspirations of Aboriginal peoples, or by the endorsement of multiculturalism as a major feature of Canadian society. The findings suggest that there was little perceived threat emanating from calls for social change supportive of Aboriginal peoples. When higher levels of threat were reported, however, such perceptions were associated with reduced support for reforms. Endorsement of multiculturalism was related to greater support for reforms. Contrary to expectations, perceived overlap between Aboriginal peoples and mainstream Canadians was

associated with reduced support for reforms, possibly reflecting assimilationist ideologies. Further research is recommended to identify how widespread in the broader Canadian society are the trends found in this study, and what portrayals of Aboriginal peoples are most likely to mitigate or increase negative reactions by non-Aboriginal Canadians toward Aboriginal peoples and their pursuit of goals such as those identified in the reports of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples and, more recently, the Indian Residential Schools Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.

References

- Assembly of First Nations. (2008). *As Long As the Sun Shines, AFN-Canada Treaty Implementation Conference 2008. Conference Report*. Ottawa, ON: Assembly of First Nations.
- Assembly of First Nations. (2011). *Pursuing First Nation Self-Determination: Realizing Our Rights and Responsibilities*. Policy paper presented at AFN General Assembly, July 12, 2011.
- Berthold A., Mummendey A., Kessler K., Luecke B., & Schubert T., (2012). When different means bad or merely worse. How minimal and maximal goals affect ingroup projection and outgroup attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(6), 682-690.
- Bianchi M., Mummendey, A., Steffens M.C., & Yzerbyt V.Y., (2010). What Do You Mean by “European”? Evidence of Spontaneous Ingroup Projection. *Personality & social psychology bulletin. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36(7), 960 - 974.
- Bland, D.L. (2014). *Time Bomb: Canada and the First Nations*. Toronto ON: Dundurn.
- Bombay, A., Matheson, K., & Anisman, H. (2009). Intergenerational Trauma: Convergence of Multiple Processes among First Nations peoples in Canada. *Journal of Aboriginal Health / Journal de la santé autochtone*, 5(3), 6-37.
- Bombay, A., Matheson, K., & Anisman, H. (2010). Decomposing identity: Differential relationships between several aspects of ethnic identity and the negative effects of perceived discrimination among First Nations adults in Canada. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 16(4), 507–516.

- Bombay, A., Matheson, K., & Anisman, H. (2011). The impact of stressors on second-generation Indian residential school survivors. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 48(4), 367–391.
- Bombay, A., Matheson, K., & Anisman, H. (2014). Appraisals of discriminatory events among adult offspring of Indian residential school survivors: The influences of identity centrality and past perceptions of discrimination. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 20(1), 75-86.
- Brewer, M.B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(3), 429-444.
- Brown, R. (2000). Social Identity Theory: Past achievements, current problems, and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 745-778.
- Cairns, A.C. (2000). *Citizens Plus: Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian State*. Toronto: UBC Press.
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2015). *Canadian Multiculturalism: An Inclusive Citizenship*. Retrieved from <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/multiculturalism/citizenship.asp>
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2011). *A literature review of Public Opinion Research on Canadian attitudes towards multiculturalism and immigration, 2006-2009*. Retrieved October 18, 2015, from <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/research/por-multi-imm/sec02-1.asp>
- Dasko, D. (2003). Public Attitudes Towards Multiculturalism and Bilingualism in Canada in *Canadian and French Perspectives on Diversity, Conference Proceedings, October 16, 2003*. Retrieved from www.queensu.ca/cora/_files/diversity_dasko.pdf

- Dupuis, D.R., & Safdar, S. (2010). Terror management and acculturation: Do thoughts of death affect the acculturation attitudes of receiving society members? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 34(5), 436-451.
- Goldstein, J. (1978). The prestige of Canadian ethnic groups: Some new evidence. *Canadian Ethnic Studies / Etudes Ethniques au Canada*, 10(1), 84-96.
- Greenberg, J., Simon, L., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., & Chatel, D. (1992). Terror management and tolerance: Does mortality salience always intensify negative reactions to others who threaten one's worldview? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(2), 212-220.
- Harles, J.C. (2004). Immigrant integration in Canada and the United States. *American Review of Canadian Studies*, 34(2), 223-258
- Henderson, J. Y. (2006). *First Nations Jurisprudence and Aboriginal Rights: Defining a Just Society*. Native Law Centre.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000). Subgroup relations: A comparison of the mutual intergroup differentiation and common ingroup identity models of prejudice reduction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 242-256.
- Howard-Hassmann, R.H. (1999). "Canadian" as an ethnic category: Implications for multiculturalism and national unity. *Canadian Public Policy*, 25(4), 523-537.
- Hurley, M. (2009). *The Indian Act*. Ottawa: Library of Parliament, Parliamentary Information and Research Service, Social affairs Division. Retrieved from <http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/ResearchPublications/prb0912-e.pdf>
- Hyman, I., Meinhard, A., & Shields, J. (2011). The Role of Multiculturalism Policy in Addressing Social Inclusion Processes in Canada. *Ryerson University Working Papers*, 2011 (3).

Indian and Northern Affairs. (1978). *The Historical Development of the Indian Act*.

Ottawa: Treaties and Historical Research Centre, Indian and Northern Affairs.

Justice Canada. (1985). *Canadian Multiculturalism Act*. R.S.C. 1985, c. 24 (4th Supp.).

Retrieved from <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-18.7/>

Langford T. & Ponting, J.R. (1992). Canadians' responses to aboriginal issues: The roles of prejudice, perceived group conflict and economic conservatism. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 29(2), 140-167.

Levin, S., Matthews, M., Guimond, S., Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Kteily, N. S., Pipitan, E.

V., & Dover, T. (2012). Assimilation, multiculturalism, and colorblindness: Mediated and moderated relationships between social dominance orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 207-212.

Lickel, B., Miller, N., Stenstrom, D.M., Denson, T.F., & Schmader, T. (2006).

Vicarious retribution: The role of collective blame in intergroup aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(4), 372-390.

Miller, J.R. (2004). *Lethal Legacy: Current Native Controversies in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Milloy, J. (2001). *A National Crime: The Canadian Government and the Residential School System, 1879 to 1986*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Milloy, J. (2008). *Indian act colonialism: A century of dishonour: 1869-1969*.

Research Paper for the National Centre for First Nations Governance May 2008. Retrieved from http://fngovernance.org/ncfng_research/milloy.pdf

Morrison, T.G., Morrison, M.A., Borsa, B. (2014). A legacy of derogation: Prejudice toward Aboriginal Persons in Canada. *Psychology*, 5, 1001-1010.

- Morrison, K. R., Plaut, V. C., & Ybarra, O. (2010). Predicting whether multiculturalism positively or negatively influences white Americans' intergroup attitudes: The role of ethnic identification. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36(12), 1648-1661.
- Morse, B. (Ed.). (1989). *Aboriginal Peoples and the Law: Indian, Metis and Inuit Rights in Canada*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Mummendey, A. & Wenzel, M. (1999). Social discrimination and tolerance in intergroup relations: Reactions to intergroup difference. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3(2), 158-174.
- Park, B., & Judd C.M. (2005). Rethinking the link between categorization and prejudice within the social cognition perspective. *Personality & Social Psychology Review*, 9(2), 108-130.
- Postmes, T., Haslam, S.A., & Swaab, R.I. (2005). Social influence in small groups: An interactive model of social identity formation. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 16, 1-42.
- Preacher, K.J., & Hayes, A.F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 36(4), 717-731.
- Preacher, K.J., Rucker, D.D., & Hayes, A.F. (2007). Addressing moderated mediation hypotheses: Theory, methods, and prescriptions. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 42(1), 185-227.
- Ray, A. J. (1996). *I Have Lived Here Since the World Began: An Illustrated History of Canada's Native People*. Toronto: Key Porter.

- Regan, P. (2010). *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling and Reconciliation in Canada*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Reese, G., Berthold, A., & Steffens, M.C. (2012). We are the world – And they are not: Prototypicality for the world community, legitimacy, and response to global inequality. *Political Psychology*, 33(5), 683-700.
- Reicher, S., Spears, R., Haslam, S. A. (2010). The social identity approach in social psychology. In M. S. Wetherell & C. T. Mohanty (Eds.) *Sage Identities Handbook*. London: Sage.
- Robbins, J. M and Krueger, J. (2005). Social projection to ingroups and outgroups: A review and meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9(1), 32-47.
- Schaakxs, K., (2012). Multicultural society; myth or reality? An analysis of Canadian multiculturalism, its success, conducted in Vancouver (Masters dissertation). s0647713. Radboud University, Nijmegen.
- Stephan, W. G., & Renfro, C. L. (2002). The role of threat in intergroup relations. In D. M. Mackie & E. R. Smith (Eds.), *From prejudice to intergroup emotions: Differentiated reactions to social groups* (pp. 191-207). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Rosa, M., & Waldzus, S. (2012). Efficiency and defence motivated ingroup projection: Sources of prototypicality in intergroup relations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 669-681.

- Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. (1996). *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, Volume 5 - Renewal: A twenty-year commitment*. Ottawa, ON: Canada Communication Group Publishing.
- Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. (1996). *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, Volume 1 - Looking Forward, Looking Back*. Ottawa: Canada Communications Group-Publishing. Retrieved from http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/webarchives/20071115053257/http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/ch/rcap/sg/sgmm_e.html
- Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. (1969). Retrieved from <http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/pco-bcp/commissions-ef/dunton1967-1970-ef/dunton1967-70-eng.htm>
- Rubin, M. (2011). Group status is related to group prototypicality in the absence of social identity concerns. *Journal of Social Psychology, 152*(3), 386-389.
- Saul, John Ralston (2008). *A fair country: Telling truths about Canada*. Toronto: Viking Canada.
- Sindic, D., & Reicher, S.D., (2008). The instrumental use of group prototypicality judgments. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*, 1425-1435.
- Tajfel, H. (1974). "Social identity and intergroup behavior". *Social Science Information, 13*(2), 65-93.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). The achievement of group differentiation. In H. Tajfel, (Ed.) *Differentiation between groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 77-100). London: Academic Press.

- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1979). "An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict". In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Tiessen, M., Taylor, D.M., & Kirmayer, L. J. (2009). A key individual-to-community link: The impact of perceived collective control on aboriginal youth well-being. *Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health*, 7(2), 241-267.
- Tseung-Wong, C.N. & Verkuyten, M. (2010). Intergroup evaluations, group indispensability and prototypicality judgments: A study in Mauritius. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 13(5), 621-638.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada* Retrieved from <http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/index.php?p=890>
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2012). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Interim Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/index.php?p=580>.
- Turner, J.C., & Brown, R.J. (1978). Social status, cognitive alternatives, and intergroup relations. In H. Tajfel. (Ed.). *Differentiation between social groups* (pp. 201-234). London: Academic Press.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987).

Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory. Oxford:
Blackwell.

Van Zomeren, M., Fischer, A. H., & Spears, R. (2007). Testing the limits of tolerance:

How intergroup anxiety amplifies negative responses to out-group initiated
contact. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 1686-1699.

Waldzus, S., & Mummendey, A. (2004). Inclusion in a superordinate category, in-

group prototypicality, and attitudes towards out-groups. *Journal of
Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 466-477.

Waldzus, S., Mummendey, A., Wenzel, M., & Weber U. (2003). Towards tolerance:

Representations of superordinate categories and perceived ingroup
prototypicality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39(1), 31-47.

Weber, U., Mummendey, A., & Waldzus, S. (2002). Perceived legitimacy of

intergroup status differences: its prediction by relative ingroup prototypicality.
European Journal of Social Psychology, 32(4), 205-218.

Wenzel, M. (2004). Social Identification As a Determinant of Concerns About

Individual-, Group-, and Inclusive-Level Justice. *Social Psychology Quarterly*,
67(1), 70-87.

Wenzel, M., Mummendey, A., & Waldzus, S. (2007). Superordinate identities and

intergroup conflict: The ingroup projection model. *European Review of Social
Psychology*, 18(1), 331-372.

Wenzel M., Mummendey, A., Weber, U., & Waldzus, S. (2003). The ingroup as pars

pro toto: Projection from the ingroup onto the inclusive category as a

precursor to social discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(4), 461-473.

Wotherspoon, T., & Hansen, J. (2013). The "Idle No More" movement: Paradoxes of First Nations inclusion in the Canadian context. *Social Inclusion*, 1(1), 21-36.

Yongeeswaran, K., & Dasgupta, N. (2014). The devil is in the details: Abstract versus concrete construals of multiculturalism differentially impact intergroup relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 106(5), 777-789.

Yongeeswaran, K., Dasgupta, N., Adelman, L., Eccleston, A., & Parker, M.T. (2011). To be or not to be (ethnic): Public vs. private expressions of ethnic identification differentially impact national inclusion of White and non-White groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47(5), 908-914.

Zagefka, H., González, R., & Brown, R. (2011). How minority members' perceptions of majority members' acculturation preferences shape minority members' own acculturation preferences: Evidence from Chile. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 50(2), 216-233.

Appendix A

Demographic measures

Demographic information in this section is collected so that we can know how similar our sample of participants is to Canadian society as a whole. As with all of your survey responses, the information you give us will be kept private and unidentifiable.

- 1) What is your gender? (select one)
 - Female
 - Male
 - Other

- 2) In what year were you born? _____

- 3) What type of community did you grow up in (i.e. live in before age 12)?
(check one that applies best)
 - Large city (100,000+ population)
 - Medium City (30,000-100,000 population)
 - Small City (5,000 – 29,999 population)
 - Rural/Remote community (<5,000 population)

- 4) What type of community do you live in now? (check one that applies best)
 - Large city (100,000+ population)
 - Medium City (30,000-100,000 population)
 - Small City (5,000 – 29,999 population)
 - Rural/Remote community (<5,000 population)

- 5) What is your best estimate of your total household income, received by all household members, from all sources, before taxes and deductions, during the year ending December 31? (check one)

Under \$9,999 \$10,000-\$14,999 \$15,000 - \$24,999
 \$25,000 - \$34,999 \$35,000 - \$44,999 \$45,000 - \$54,999
 \$55,000 - \$64,999 \$75,000 - \$84,999 \$85,000 - \$94,999,
 \$95,000 or more.

- 6) Which Federal Canadian political party do you feel best represents your values?
 Conservative, Liberal, NDP, Bloc Québécois, Green Party, None, Other (please specify): _____
- 7) What is your highest level of education completed? (check one)
- 8 years or less of elementary school
 - Some high school but no diploma
 - High school diploma or equivalent
 - 1 to 3 years of college/university (including study at a technical college or CEGEP)
 - Technical college degree
 - Undergraduate university degree
 - Master's degree
 - Doctoral degree
 - Professional degree [medicine (M.D.), dentistry (D.D.S.), law, or other similar degrees]
- 8) Were you born in Canada? (yes, no)
- If no, what is your country of origin (what country were you born in)?

- 9) How long have you (or your family) lived in Canada?
- First generation
 - If first generation, how many years has your family lived in Canada?
 _____ years
 - Two generations
 - Three generations or more

- 10) What province in Canada have you lived in the longest? _____
- 11) What was the primary language spoken in your home while you were growing up?
English, French, Other (please specify) _____
- 12) The following question is about your ethnic ancestry, heritage or background. What
were the ethnic or cultural origins of your ancestors? (specify one or more)
_____, _____, _____, _____
- 13) Do you identify as a Canadian Aboriginal person (e.g. Registered Status Indian,
Unregistered/Non-Status Indian, First Nations, Métis, Inuit, Inuk)?
(Yes, No, Sometimes)
- 13a) If yes or sometimes:
- Which Aboriginal group(s) do you belong to? (Please check all that apply)*
- a. Government registered First Nations (Status Indian)
 - b. Non-registered First Nations (Non-Status Indian)
 - c. Métis registered with a Métis organization
 - d. Métis not registered with a Métis organization
 - e. Recognized Inuit/Inuk
 - f. Non-recognized Inuit/Inuk
- 14) Do you self identify as being part of a minority group?

- a. Do you consider yourself to be a person with a disability? (yes, no, unsure)
- b. Do you consider yourself to be a member of visible minority (or racialized group)? (yes, no, unsure)
- c. An ethnic, cultural, or religious minority? (yes, no, unsure)
- d. Do you consider yourself to be a member of a sexual minority (e.g. GLBT, Queer, Transgendered)? (yes, no, unsure)
- e. Do you consider yourself a member of any other minority? (specify)

15) What is your religion? (Specify one denomination or religion only, even if you are not currently a practicing member of that group.)

Protestant, Roman Catholic, Other (please specify) _____, No Religion.

16) Not counting events such as weddings or funerals, during the past 12 months, how often did you participate in religious activities or attend religious services or meetings?

- At least once a day
- At least once a week
- At least once a month
- At least 3 times a year
- Once or twice a year
- Not at all

17) In the past 12 months, how often did you engage in religious or spiritual activities on your own, including prayer, meditation and other forms of worship taking place at home or in any other location?

- At least once a day
- At least once a week
- At least once a month
- At least 3 times a year
- Once or twice a year
- Not at all

18) Are you currently a university or college student? (yes, no)

- If yes, what is your program of study? _____

19) What was the main occupation (job) of your father (or primary male caregiver)?

20) What was the main occupation (job) of your mother (or primary female caregiver)?

21) What is your current occupation (job)? _____

22) What is your goal for your future occupation (job)? _____

23) Were you aware of any of the following (before participating in this study)?:

- i) The Indian Residential School system? (not at all aware, somewhat aware, very aware)

- ii) The Canadian Government's *Statement of Apology* to former students of Indian Residential Schools? (not at all aware, somewhat aware, very aware)
- iii) The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada? (not at all aware, somewhat aware, very aware)

- 24) In the past month or so how often would you say you've thought about issues concerning Aboriginal people? (Not at all, Once or twice, A few times, Many times)
- 25) In the past month or so how often would you say you've discussed issues concerning Aboriginal people with your family or friends? (Not at all, Once or twice, A few times, Many times)
- 26) How often would you say you've personally had contact with Aboriginal people? (never, rarely, occasionally, fairly often, frequently)

Appendix B

Experimental manipulation (the condition appears in brackets).

(Tangible/realistic threat condition)

The Canadian Indian Residential School system existed from 1876 to 1996. During this time Aboriginal children were often forcibly removed from their homes and kept at boarding schools. In these schools children were prevented from keeping their languages or religions and were often subjected to physical, sexual, or psychological abuse. This had many effects on Aboriginal communities, from loss of parenting skills to the near extinction of many Aboriginal languages.

In 2008 the Government of Canada issued a *Statement of Apology to Former Students of Indian Residential Schools* in response to litigation by survivors who had suffered abuse in these institutions. As part of a legal settlement the Government also established a *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*.

The *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada* is mandated to learn the truth about the experiences of children who were sent to the Indian Residential Schools, and to inform all Canadians about what happened in these schools. It has also been collecting input and making recommendations on the process of reconciliation between Aboriginals and Non-Aboriginals in Canada.

Different people and groups have different interpretations of what reconciliation means. Below are some goals Aboriginal people have indicated need to be accomplished in order to achieve true reconciliation.

Please read below these goals that have been put forward. Then, ***taking the perspective of Aboriginal peoples***, please indicate which of the following goals you believe would be of greatest importance to Aboriginal people.

Use your mouse to drag and drop each goal (with the top-most goal being the most important, and the bottom-most goal being the least important).

Aboriginal people will perceive that reconciliation has taken place when...

1. Aboriginal peoples are officially recognised as different by the Canadian state, with separate legal obligations and rights which differ from those of Non-Aboriginals.
2. Employees are granted paid leave for traditional Aboriginal events (e.g. Aboriginal seasonal activities or community funerals for Aboriginal Elders).
3. Financial and mentoring support is provided by the government to Aboriginal entrepreneurs who run small businesses.
4. Aboriginal people have control over government services and programs delivered to Aboriginal people (e.g. the Federal Department of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development is run primarily by and for Aboriginal people).
5. Employment equity measures are taken to increase the proportion of Aboriginal people in professional occupations (e.g. lawyers, doctors, dentists, economists, accountants).
6. Programs are established to encourage Aboriginal peoples to take leadership roles in politics, science, technology, engineering, and education.
7. Different codes of law for Aboriginal groups are established and enforced.
8. Lands illegally taken from Aboriginal peoples are returned to them along with compensation for loss of opportunity to use these lands.
9. Laws ensure that any new economic development projects must not interfere with the economic, environmental, health, and spiritual activities of Aboriginal communities.
10. Fewer Aboriginal people go to jail as a result of alternative sentencing and traditional justice systems being implemented.

11. Aboriginal people are given preferential access to provincial parks and public lands for hunting, fishing, and gathering activities.

(Symbolic goals/symbolic threat condition)

The Canadian Indian Residential School system existed from 1876 to 1996. During this time Aboriginal children were often forcibly removed from their homes and kept at boarding schools. In these schools children were prevented from keeping their languages or religions and were often subjected to physical, sexual, or psychological abuse. This had many effects on Aboriginal communities, from loss of parenting skills to the near extinction of many Aboriginal languages.

In 2008 the Government of Canada issued a *Statement of Apology to Former Students of Indian Residential Schools* in response to litigation by survivors who had suffered abuse in these institutions. As part of a legal settlement the Government also established a *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*.

The *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada* is mandated to learn the truth about the experiences of children who were sent to the Indian Residential Schools, and to inform all Canadians about what happened in these schools. It has also been collecting input and making recommendations on the process of reconciliation between Aboriginals and Non-Aboriginals in Canada.

Different people and groups have different interpretations of what reconciliation means. Below are some goals Aboriginal people have indicated need to be accomplished in order to achieve true reconciliation.

Please read below these goals that have been put forward. Then, ***taking the perspective of Aboriginal peoples***, please indicate which of the following goals you believe would be of greatest importance to Aboriginal people.

Use your mouse to drag and drop each goal (with the top-most goal being the most important, and the bottom-most goal being the least important).

Aboriginal people will perceive that reconciliation has taken place when...

1. Cultural events such as Aboriginal powwows, give-aways, community feasts, and lacrosse games are embraced as mainstream Canadian events.
2. Canadians participate in cultural activities where they learn how to engage with Aboriginal groups.
3. Students are required to take at least two courses on the cultures, spiritualities, history, and current situation of Aboriginal peoples, as part of their core curriculum – and these courses are designed by Aboriginal people.
4. Government funding is provided so all school children can participate in summer camps run by Aboriginal communities and focussing on Aboriginal values, Aboriginal knowledge of the land and related activities.
5. Interactions are encouraged between Aboriginal peoples and people of different ethnic backgrounds, especially new immigrants to Canada.
6. Aboriginal peoples who wear different kinds of clothing are protected from discrimination (e.g. ensure men's braids are treated with respect in the military, workplace or jails; protect carrying of medicine pouches from inappropriate search or confiscation; allow Aboriginals to wear hats in court).
7. Historic sites and monuments recognize the role of past governments in the subjugation of Aboriginal peoples.
8. Aboriginal people are recognized as one of the three founding groups of Canada resulting in French, English, and Aboriginal cultures having equal status.
9. At least one third of all public monuments focus on the history, cultures, and contributions of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada.

10. Canadian governments actively promote Aboriginal Canadians taking pride in their traditional cultures, societies and contributions to making Canada possible
11. National Aboriginal Day is made an official statutory holiday and marked by a nationally televised sunrise ceremony attended by the Prime Minister, Governor General and Aboriginal leaders.

(Abstract/low threat condition)

The Canadian Indian Residential School system existed from 1876 to 1996. During this time Aboriginal children were often forcibly removed from their homes and kept at boarding schools. In these schools children were prevented from keeping their languages or religions and were often subjected to physical, sexual, or psychological abuse. This had many effects on Aboriginal communities, from loss of parenting skills to the near extinction of many Aboriginal languages.

In 2008 the Government of Canada issued a *Statement of Apology to Former Students of Indian Residential Schools* in response to litigation by survivors who had suffered abuse in these institutions. As part of a legal settlement the Government also established a *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*.

The *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada* is mandated to learn the truth about the experiences of children who were sent to the Indian Residential Schools, and to inform all Canadians about what happened in these schools. It has also been collecting input and making recommendations on the process of reconciliation between Aboriginals and Non-Aboriginals in Canada.

Different people and groups have different interpretations of what reconciliation means.

Below are some goals Aboriginal people have indicated need to be accomplished in order to achieve true reconciliation.

Please read below these goals that have been put forward. Then, *taking the perspective of Aboriginal peoples*, please indicate which of the following goals you believe would be of greatest importance to Aboriginal people.

Use your mouse to drag and drop each goal (with the top-most goal being the most important, and the bottom-most goal being the least important).

Aboriginal people will perceive that reconciliation has taken place when...

1. We work together better.
2. We learn about each other's cultures.
3. There is less feeling of conflict between groups.
4. Aboriginals don't feel that they are unimportant or misunderstood.
5. Job applicants who are equally qualified are not discriminated against just because they are Aboriginal.
6. More Aboriginal people complete high school.
7. Some Aboriginal musicians are successful in different musical genres.
8. Canadian trade missions promote Aboriginal cultural productions (art, crafts etc.) for sale in other countries.
9. Some Aboriginal entertainers are invited to perform at Canada Day activities.
10. Health programs ensure Aboriginal families have easier access to information on how to be healthy
11. Aboriginal role models in the media are more noticeable, leading to greater feelings of societal acceptance.

Appendix C

Outcome variables, manipulation check, and attention checks

(Ingroup Projection / Perceived prototypicality)

Values

People's values influence their actions and goals. There are a wide variety of values people can embrace (e.g. harmony, industriousness, spirituality, loyalty, freedom, connection to the land). Some values are considered more important than others, and this judgment varies between people.

Thinking of those Canadians who have primarily Aboriginal cultural backgrounds and ancestry: How much do you think Aboriginal peoples values overlap with the values of mainstream Canadians?

(please select the picture that best depicts your perception of the amount of overlap)

Please select the picture which best depicts your perception of how much your values overlap with the values of Aboriginal peoples:

Please select the picture which best depicts your perception of how much your values overlap with the values of mainstream Canadians:

Goals

Now we are going to ask you a similar set of questions, but this time it will be about the overlap of goals.

People can have different goals for how society should work. For example, for some people, economic security can take the form of seeking an effective welfare system; for others it can take the form of maximising economic growth.

Such differences or similarities in goals can exist in many areas (e.g. religion, education, politics, environment, crime).

Please select the picture which best depicts your perception of how much the goals that Aboriginal peoples have for Canada overlap with the goals that mainstream Canadians have for Canada:

Please select the picture which best depicts how the goals that you have for Canada overlap with the goals that Aboriginal peoples have for Canada:

Please select the picture which best depicts how much the goals that you have for Canada overlap with the goals that mainstream Canadians have for Canada:

(Manipulation check)

Please indicate your own attitude toward each of the following statements. Circle a number on the scale below each statement (with 1 being 'very strongly disagree' and 7 being 'very strongly agree').

1. Aboriginals, as a group, take economic resources away from Non-Aboriginal Canadians.
2. Aboriginals, as a group, limit the economic opportunities available to Non-Aboriginal Canadians.
3. Aboriginals, as a group, possess values that directly oppose the values of Non-Aboriginal Canadians.
4. Aboriginals, as a group, hold values that are morally inferior to the values of Non-Aboriginal Canadians.
5. Aboriginals, as a group, have goals that directly conflict with the values of Non-Aboriginal Canadians.

(Impacts on personal and national self interest)

Impacts

- 1) Thinking about Aboriginal peoples' concerns, do you think your own personal situation, or the situation of people close to you, could be either directly or indirectly affected by Aboriginal people accomplishing their goals? If yes, would that be a positive or negative effect?

very negative effect			no effect		very positive effect		
-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	

- 2) Thinking about Aboriginal peoples' concerns, do you think Canada could be either directly or indirectly affected by Aboriginal people accomplishing their goals? If yes, would that be a positive or negative effect?

very negative effect			no effect		very positive effect		
-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	

(Support for reforms)

The following are a list of actions and policies that have been proposed in past to address the treatment and status of Aboriginal peoples in Canada. Please indicate the extent that you agree or disagree with each action.

very strongly disagree				very strongly agree		
-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3

1. Every residential school survivor should be mailed a framed copy of a government issued *Statement of Apology to Former Students of Indian Residential Schools*.
2. The federal government should ensure that Aboriginal history and the current circumstances of Aboriginal people are communicated to all new immigrants.

3. The Government of Canada and Christian churches involved in running the Residential School System should jointly fund the cultural revival of traditional Aboriginal spirituality and languages.
4. Every public school in Canada should receive and display a framed copy of a Statement of Apology to Former Student of Indian Residential Schools.
5. Federal, provincial and territorial governments should work with Aboriginal leaders to develop class room materials to teach all Canadian children about Aboriginal cultures (e.g. traditional beliefs, skills) and contemporary realities (e.g. poverty).
6. Canadian governments should expand commemoration of important events in Aboriginal history, such as the resistance of Louis Riel to the Mounties in 1884, to increase public education and solidarity.
7. The Government of Canada should official recognise that Aboriginal people in Canada have dual citizenship being both citizens of Aboriginal Nations, and citizens of Canada.
8. Aboriginal Nations should be considered as constitutionally equal partners with the Canadian State, sharing in the sovereign powers of Canada as a whole, and recognised as having their own distinct governments sovereign within their own spheres.
9. Canadian governments should provide Aboriginal Nations with lands of sufficient size and quality to allow cultural autonomy, political autonomy, and economic self-reliance.
10. Aboriginal governments should be given taxation powers over their own lands and resources so as to increase their political and economic independence
11. The Canadian Government should create a separate Aboriginal Parliament to advise the House of Commons and the Senate on legislation relating to Aboriginal peoples.
12. Canadians should provide social assistance and income support to Aboriginal peoples choosing to live a traditional lifestyle, or a mixed lifestyle, as an alternative to participating in the wage (monetary) economy.
13. All Provinces and Territories should have a university under Aboriginal control.
14. Canadian governments should adapt the legal system in ways which acknowledge Aboriginal customary laws as valid in areas of marriage, divorce, child custody and adoption.

15. Canadian governments should commit to ensuring the training of 10,000 Aboriginal professionals in areas of health and social services over the next decade.
16. The Federal government should commit to funding an Aboriginal Languages Foundation for conserving, revitalising, and encouraging the spread of Aboriginal languages.
17. Canadian governments should recognise Aboriginal peoples' contribution to Canada through much greater use of Aboriginal languages and ceremonies, by honouring Aboriginal meeting places and historic sites, and by renaming many parts of Canada to use Aboriginal names.

(Endorsement of multiculturalism)

Multiculturalism

Please indicate your own attitude toward each of the following statements.

Circle a number on the scale below each statement (with 1 being 'very strongly disagree' and 7 being 'very strongly agree').

1. We must appreciate the unique characteristics of different racial and ethnic groups in order to have a cooperative society.
2. In order to live in a cooperative society, everyone must learn the unique histories and cultural experiences of different racial and ethnic groups.
3. When interacting with a member of a racial/ethnic group that is different from your own, it is very important to take into account the history and cultural traditions of that person's group.
4. If we want to help create a harmonious society, we must recognize that each racial and ethnic group has the right to maintain its own unique traditions.
5. Learning about the ways that different racial and ethnic groups resolve conflict will help us develop a more harmonious society.

|

(Attention checks)

Stress can induce a range of physiological and psychological changes that may affect one's choices. For these reasons we are interested in determining what factors affect your decision-making process. More specifically, we would like to know if you have taken the time to read all instructions; if not, your answers may not tell us very much about decision-making. To indicate that you have read these instructions please select "none of the above" as your only answer.

- ☐ Content
- ☐ Irritable
- ☐ Depressed
- ☐ Anxious
- ☐ Guilty
- ☐ Excited
- ☐ Creative
- ☐ Alert
- ☐ Misunderstood
- ☐ Determined
- ☐ Proud
- ☐ Stubborn
- ☐ None of the above

Scientists are concerned that many individuals have not grasped the significance of discrimination. They fear that lack of knowledge may result in negative attitudes toward certain groups. To show that you have read this information, please select 'happy' as your answer.

- ☐ Misunderstood
- ☐ Angry
- ☐ Disoriented
- ☐ Fearful
- ☐ Perturbed
- ☐ Amused
- ☐ Happy
- ☐ Conflicted
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Sad
- ☐ None of the above
- ☐ Confused

Appendix D

Items measuring support for reforms alongside excerpts of the original texts from which the items are derived

1. Every residential school survivor should be mailed a framed copy of a government issued *Statement of Apology to Former Students of Indian Residential Schools*.
(TRC Interim report, recommendation #13, "The Commission recommends that, to ensure that survivors and their families receive as much healing benefit as the apology may bring them, the Government of Canada distribute individual copies of the 'Statement of Apology to Former Students of Indian Residential Schools' to all known residential school survivors.").
2. The federal government should ensure that Aboriginal history and the current circumstances of Aboriginal people are communicated to all new immigrants.
(RCAP, 5.4.12, "The federal government ensure that the history and present circumstances of Aboriginal peoples are communicated to immigrants and to persons becoming Canadian citizens.")
3. The Government of Canada and Christian churches involved in running the Residential School System should jointly fund the cultural revival of traditional Aboriginal spirituality and languages.
(TRC Interim report, recommendation #7 "The Commission recommends that the Government of Canada and churches establish an ongoing cultural revival fund designed to fund projects that promote the traditional spiritual, cultural, and linguistic heritages of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada.")
4. Every public school in Canada should receive and display a framed copy of a *Statement of Apology to Former Student of Indian Residential Schools*.
(TRC Interim report, recommendation #14, "The Commission recommends the Government of Canada distribute to every secondary school in Canada a framed copy of the "Statement of Apology to Former Students of Indian Residential Schools" for prominent public display and ongoing educational purposes.")

5. Federal, provincial and territorial governments should work with Aboriginal leaders to develop class room materials to teach all Canadian children about Aboriginal cultures (e.g. traditional beliefs, skills) and contemporary realities (e.g. poverty).

(RCAP, 3.5.5, "Federal, provincial and territorial governments collaborate with Aboriginal governments, organizations and educators to develop or continue developing innovative curricula that reflect Aboriginal cultures and community realities, for delivery (a) at all grade levels of elementary and secondary schools; (b) in schools operating under Aboriginal control; and (c) in schools under provincial or territorial jurisdiction.")

6. Canadian governments should expand commemoration of important events in Aboriginal history, such as the resistance of Louis Riel to the Mounties in 1884, to increase public education and solidarity.

(RCAP, 5.4.9, "The commemoration of important occurrences in Aboriginal history through events such as treaty days and Louis Riel Day be expanded as a means of building solidarity and a vehicle for public education.")

7. The Government of Canada should official recognise that Aboriginal people in Canada have dual citizenship being both citizens of Aboriginal Nations, and citizens of Canada.

(RCAP, 2.3.8, "The government of Canada recognize Aboriginal people in Canada as enjoying a unique form of dual citizenship, that is, as citizens of an Aboriginal nation and citizens of Canada.")

8. Aboriginal Nations should be considered as constitutionally equal partners with the Canadian State, sharing in the sovereign powers of Canada as a whole, and recognised as having their own distinct governments sovereign within their own spheres.

(RCAP, 2.3.11, "[...] 20. The enactment of section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982 has had far-reaching significance. It serves to confirm the status of Aboriginal peoples as equal partners in the complex federal arrangements that make up Canada. It provides the basis for recognizing Aboriginal governments as one of three distinct orders of government in Canada: Aboriginal, provincial and federal. The governments making up these three orders are sovereign within their several spheres and hold their powers by virtue of their inherent or constitutional status rather than by delegation. They share the sovereign powers of Canada as

a whole, powers that represent a pooling of existing sovereignties. 21. Aboriginal peoples also have a special relationship with the Canadian Crown, which the courts have described as *sui generis* or one of a kind. This relationship traces its origins to the treaties and other links formed over the centuries and to the inter-societal law and custom that underpinned them. By virtue of this relationship, the Crown acts as the protector of the sovereignty of Aboriginal peoples within Canada and as guarantor of their Aboriginal and treaty rights. This fiduciary relationship is a fundamental feature of the constitution of Canada.")

9. Canadian governments should provide Aboriginal Nations with lands of sufficient size and quality to allow cultural autonomy, political autonomy, and economic self-reliance.

(RCAP, 2.4.2, "Federal, provincial and territorial governments, through negotiation, provide Aboriginal nations with lands that are sufficient in size and quality to foster Aboriginal economic self-reliance and cultural and political autonomy.")

10. Aboriginal governments should be given taxation powers over their own lands and resources so as to increase their political and economic independence

(RCAP, 2.3.19, "Financial arrangements provide greater fiscal autonomy for Aboriginal governments by increasing access to independent own-source revenues through a fair and just redistribution of lands and resources for Aboriginal peoples, and through the recognition of the right of Aboriginal governments to develop their own systems of taxation.")

11. The Canadian Government should create a separate Aboriginal Parliament to advise the House of Commons and the Senate on legislation relating to Aboriginal peoples.

(RCAP, 2.3.51, "The federal government, following extensive consultations with Aboriginal peoples, establish an Aboriginal parliament whose main function is to provide advice to the House of Commons and the Senate on legislation and constitutional matters relating to Aboriginal peoples.")

12. Canadians should provide social assistance and income support to Aboriginal peoples choosing to live a traditional lifestyle, or a mixed lifestyle, as an alternative to participating in the wage (monetary) economy.

(RCAP, 2.5.49, "In their active use of social assistance and other income support funds,

Aboriginal nations and communities not be restricted to promoting participation in the wage economy but also be encouraged to support continued participation in the traditional mixed economy through income support for hunters, trappers and fishers and through other projects aimed at improving community life.")

13. All Provinces and Territories should have a university under Aboriginal control.

(RCAP, 3.5.32, "A university under Aboriginal control, which could be called the Aboriginal Peoples' International University, and with the capacity to function in all provinces and territories, be established to promote traditional knowledge, to pursue applied research in support of Aboriginal self-government, and to disseminate information essential to achieving broad Aboriginal development goals.")

14. Canadian governments should adapt the legal system in ways which acknowledge Aboriginal customary laws as valid in areas of marriage, divorce, child custody and adoption.

(RCAP, 3.2.11, "Federal, provincial and territorial governments acknowledge the validity of Aboriginal customary law in areas of family law, such as marriage, divorce, child custody and adoption, and amend their legislation accordingly.")

15. Canadian governments should commit to ensuring the training of 10,000 Aboriginal professionals in areas of health and social services over the next decade.

(RCAP, 3.3.14, "Federal, provincial and territorial governments commit themselves to providing the necessary funding, consistent with their jurisdictional responsibilities [...] (b) to train 10,000 Aboriginal professionals over a 10- year period in health and social services, including medicine, nursing, mental health, psychology, social work, dentistry, nutrition, addictions, gerontology, public health, community development, planning, health administration, and other priority areas identified by Aboriginal people; [...])

16. The Federal government should commit to funding an Aboriginal Languages Foundation for conserving, revitalising, and encouraging the spread of Aboriginal languages.

(RCAP, 3.6.10, "The federal government make a commitment to endow an Aboriginal Languages Foundation for the purpose of supporting Aboriginal initiatives in the conservation, revitalization and documentation of Aboriginal languages [...]")

17. Canadian governments should recognise Aboriginal peoples' contribution to Canada through much greater use of Aboriginal languages and ceremonies, by honouring Aboriginal meeting places and historic sites, and by renaming many parts of Canada to use Aboriginal names.

(RCAP, 5.4.10, "Canadian governments recognize Aboriginal people's contribution to Canada through much greater use of Aboriginal place names, languages, ceremonies and exhibits and by honouring Aboriginal meeting places and historic sites.")