



The Last Standard-Bearers of Biculturalism: A Quebec-Ontario Comparison of Cosmopolitan, National, Subnational, and Local Affiliations among Official Language Minorities

Pierre-Olivier Bonin

Numéro 18, 2022

Varia

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1089179ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1089179ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Institut canadien de recherche sur les minorités linguistiques / Canadian Institute for Research on Linguistic Minorities

ISSN

1927-8632 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Bonin, P.-O. (2022). The Last Standard-Bearers of Biculturalism: A Quebec-Ontario Comparison of Cosmopolitan, National, Subnational, and Local Affiliations among Official Language Minorities. *Minorités linguistiques et société / Linguistic Minorities and Society*, (18), 37–73.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/1089179ar>

Résumé de l'article

Malgré la popularité de l'idée de « post-nationalité » et de citoyenneté multiculturelle, l'influence du biculturalisme persiste au sein des institutions canadiennes et des appartenances de groupe. Cet article constitue la première étude empirique des appartenances des deux plus grandes minorités de langue officielle au Canada, les Anglo-Québécois et les Franco-Ontariens. En phase avec la littérature, les résultats démontrent que l'engagement organisationnel permet de prédire une plus forte identification avec les différentes entités socio-territoriales. Les résultats démontrent également que, comparativement aux Anglo-Québécois, les Franco-Ontariens 1) s'identifient moins fortement comme cosmopolites, 2) environ autant comme Canadiens, 3) davantage à leur province, et 4) à leur polité locale. Dans l'ensemble, les résultats suggèrent que le cosmopolitisme correspond davantage aux attitudes des groupes majoritaires que minoritaires et, en conséquence, à celles des anglophones que des francophones, même lorsque les premiers se trouvent dans un contexte minoritaire.

The Last Standard-Bearers of Biculturalism: A Quebec-Ontario Comparison of Cosmopolitan, National, Subnational, and Local Affiliations among Official Language Minorities

Pierre-Olivier Bonin

Abstract

Despite the popularity of the cosmopolitan idea of “postnationality” and multicultural concepts of citizenship, biculturalism continues to have a lasting impact upon Canadian institutions and group loyalties. This article constitutes the first empirical investigation of affiliations among the two largest official minority language groups in Canada, Anglo-Quebecers and Franco-Ontarians. Concurring with previous research, the study finds that organizational engagement predicts stronger socio-territorial affiliations. Furthermore, evidence shows that, Franco-Ontarians are 1) less likely to be cosmopolitan than Anglo-Quebecers, 2) about equally likely to be attached to the Canadian national identity as Anglo-Quebecers, 3) more likely to identify with their province than Anglo-Quebecers, and 4) more likely to have a strong affiliation with their local polity than Anglo-Quebecers. Taken together, the findings suggest that cosmopolitanism might work better for majorities than minorities, and as a consequence for Anglophones than Francophones even when the former are in a minority setting.

Résumé

Malgré la popularité de l'idée de « post-nationalité » et de citoyenneté multiculturelle, l'influence du biculturalisme persiste au sein des institutions canadiennes et des appartenances de groupe. Cet article constitue la première étude empirique des appartenances des deux plus grandes minorités de langue officielle au Canada, les Anglo-Québécois et les Franco-Ontariens. En phase avec la littérature, les résultats démontrent que l'engagement organisationnel permet de prédire une plus forte identification avec les différentes entités socio-territoriales. Les résultats démontrent également que, comparativement aux Anglo-Québécois, les Franco-Ontariens 1) s'identifient moins fortement comme cosmopolites, 2) environ autant comme Canadiens, 3) davantage à leur province, et 4) à leur polité locale. Dans l'ensemble, les résultats suggèrent que le cosmopolitisme correspond davantage aux attitudes des groupes majoritaires que minoritaires et, en conséquence, à celles des anglophones que des francophones, même lorsque les premiers se trouvent dans un contexte minoritaire.

Quebec's Quiet Revolution called into question the myth of the "two founding peoples"—French Canadians and English Canadians—once construed strictly along linguistic lines (Martel, 1998, p. 25). Non-territorial linguistic and cultural duality thus gave way to territorially-concentrated binationalism embodied in the Quebec-Canada opposition, a concept of the federation that would heavily shape Canadian "mega-constitutional politics" (Russell, 2004) over the coming decades. The creation of the P  pin-Robarts Commission (otherwise known as the Task Force on Canadian Unity) testified to the centrality of national unity in the face of the perceived threat posed by Quebec's sovereigntist movement at the time. Canadian society has been "subjected to pressure for change with [the] double thrust [...] [of] nation building within Quebec [and the search for] greater equality between French and English within pan-Canadian institutions" (Cameron & Simeon, 2009, p. 174). Among the changes brought about during the political turmoil of the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, under the impetus of Pierre-Elliott Trudeau, the modern representation of the Canadian federation as a compact between two founding peoples was gradually replaced by a multicultural concept of Canadian citizenship (McRoberts, 1997) within a bilingual framework.

Despite such a paradigm shift, biculturalism and binationalism continue to have a lasting impact upon Canadian institutions, group identities, and group loyalties. While the Francophone and Acadian communities constitute the "last constitutional standard-bearers of Trudeau's language regime" (Richez, 2012), it may be said analogously that official language minorities constitute the last standard-bearers of biculturalism (or more broadly dualism). Symptoms underlying this phenomenon include an enduring cognitive footprint, as it were, among Francophone populations across Canada, described variably as a "vital intention" (Th  riault & Meunier, 2008), a "societal culture" (Landry, 2014), or a common reference to a French-Canadian cultural space (Chouinard, 2012, p. 204). Notably, language regimes (*e.g.*, Cardinal & Sonntag, 2015; Cardinal & Normand, 2011) and the constitutional entrenchment of provisions designed to protect two official languages embody the institutionalization of the binational worldview and attest to the legacy of biculturalism as laid out previously in the work of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. More than fifty years after this Commission and the adoption of the Official Languages Act, and over forty years after the P  pin-Robarts Commission on national unity, much remains unsaid as to how national unity unfolds today among official language minorities in a context that some decisionmakers frame as postnational,¹ multicultural, and globalized.

The sociological reality of multiculturalism is often pitched as opposed to French-English dualism. Coincidentally, the former trumps the latter when it comes to scholarly

1. Shortly after forming a majority government after the 2015 elections, Justin Trudeau indeed made the following declaration in an interview with the *New York Times* (2015): "There is no core identity, no mainstream in Canada[.] There are shared values—openness, respect, compassion, willingness to work hard, to be there for each other, to search for equality and justice. Those qualities are what make us the *first postnational state*."

attention. For instance, while recent empirical research has scrutinized the development of loyalties among immigrants and their integration into Canadian regional dynamics (Bilodeau, White, & Nevitte, 2010), the development of affiliations among official language minorities has been less explored. This study offers a unique systematic empirical comparison of the multiple affiliations of the two largest official language minority communities inhabiting the two original provinces constituting what became the Canadian federation. Drawing upon two original samples of rank-and-file and organizationally-engaged members of the two linguistic communities, the study investigates and compares how socio-territorial belonging unfolds in official language minority communities. Comparing the extent to which the affiliations of the two groups are rooted in a binational/bicultural worldview in a context where this very dualism is explicitly rejected in favour of cosmopolitanism by powerful actors, including the most prominent national decisionmakers, should prove fruitful. If Canada has truly become, as Prime Minister Justin Trudeau has stated, a “postnational” polity, then even the last standard-bearers of Canadian dualism, arguably among the least likely to be cosmopolitan given the arguments presented above and their minority status, will be at least equally cosmopolitan as they are attached to their country, province, and localities.

The study finds that those who are most engaged in OLMC organizations and networks are actually less likely to “strongly” identify as cosmopolitans and more likely to “strongly” identify with their province and municipality. This suggests that, as may be expected, the Canadian language regime and the principle of duality it embodies tend to nurture national, regional, and local forms of solidarities. By and large, the evidence reveals that both OLMCs display stronger attachment to Canada, to their province (with the exception of Anglophones’ attachment to the province of Quebec), and to their municipality than to “the world”. More specifically, a group comparison is undertaken and evidence reveals that Franco-Ontarians are 1) less likely to be cosmopolitan than Anglo-Quebecers, 2) about equally likely to be attached to the Canadian national identity as Anglo-Quebecers, 3) more likely to identify with their province than Anglo-Quebecers, and 4) more likely to have a strong affiliation with their local polity than Anglo-Quebecers. Such findings corroborate most expectations and may be explained by three factors: institutional variation, geography, and language. More broadly, the findings also point to the idea that cosmopolitanism may be working better for majority groups than minorities and highlights the role of language. To verify the two latter propositions, and as a complement to the above-mentioned findings, the study explores survey data from the Comparative Provincial Election Project 2011-2014 survey and compares the affiliations of the linguistic majorities and minorities, where available. Evidence reveals significant variation across linguistic groups, with the Francophone majority in Quebec identifying less strongly as citizens of the world, as Canadians, and with their community/neighbourhood than the Anglophone minority—and not surprisingly

more strongly as Québécois. It is suggested that future research projects should attempt to further disentangle the linkage between majority/minority status, language, and affiliations.

The following sections examine in turn the literature on cosmopolitanism, the relationship between participation and identification, as well as the institutional and geographical contexts of each case studied. Then, the methods used, data, and results are presented.

Hypotheses: Asymmetric Affiliations Among Official Language Minorities in a Postnational Federation

Theoretical Background: The Localism-Cosmopolitanism Spectrum

“Recent trends in Anglo-North American social theorizing have shown that one of the primary concerns for theorists is the normatively oriented exploration of how we relate to others in the world” (Schaffer, 2012, p. 129). While commentary on cosmopolitanism abounds in the media—Trudeau’s above-mentioned remark of a postnational federation being a direct reference to cosmopolitanism—empirical research on the topic is sparse.

Postnationalism may be defined as a posture by which one claims that “we have moved beyond, or involves the normative claim that we *should* move beyond, the nation, to find new political forms that avoid the inherent exclusions of nations and nationalism” (Moran, 2020, p. 1). Postnationalists typically argue that the nation-states, national identity, and national citizenship have become obsolete as a result of globalization (Moran, 2020, p. 1). Postnationalism harbours a strong theoretical relationship with theoretical literature on cosmopolitanism, given that the cosmopolitan argument *à la* Beck (2002) is that “we have now moved from a period of modernity that had been dominated by the nation to a second modernity where the nation is becoming redundant” (Moran, 2020, p. 2). However, with the exception of a few scholars (*e.g.*, Portes, 2000; Skrbis & Woodward, 2007, cited in Schaffer, 2012), “there have been relatively few case study-based analyses or theoretical discussions about the ways in which cosmopolitanism operates on the ground” (Schaffer, 2012, p. 129).

Seemingly taking stock of Schaffer’s analysis a few years later, former Liberal Party leader and political philosopher Michael Ignatieff (2017) conducted a study on “moral globalization” in the twenty-first century. With his colleagues from the Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, Ignatieff analyzed seven cases across six countries, including the United States, and found that *ordinary people* do not reason using abstract, universal principles (“available universals”, as the author puts it) on a daily basis.²

2. See Appendix for the full excerpt.

Cosmopolitanism is a polysemic concept; many understandings are to be found in the literature. For example, while Ignatieff (2017) refers to cosmopolitanism as a moral disposition, Strijbis and Teney (2017), and Teney and Helbling instead measure attitudes towards “denationalization issues”, including questions on “immigration, supranational political institutions (EU and UN), international trade and development aid” as proxies for cosmopolitanism (Teney & Helbling, 2014, p. 263). For their part, Vertovec and Cohen (2002, p. 7) distinguish six ways to conceive of cosmopolitanism: “a) a sociocultural condition; b) a kind of philosophy or worldview; c) a political project towards building transnational institutions; d) a political project for recognizing multiple identities; e) an attitudinal or dispositional orientation; and/or f) a mode of practice or competence.” In the hitherto, rather sparse applied research available, Pichler (2009, p. 705) summarizes the different approaches to the study of cosmopolitanism under two broad categories: the “‘subjective approach’ [...] based on affiliations, and a more ‘objective’ one grounded in relevant attitudes”. Since the current study is focused on the affiliations of official language minorities, it will be grounded in the subjective approach to cosmopolitanism.

Ulrich Beck (2002) argued that there can be no cosmopolitanism without localism, thus speaking rather of “rooted cosmopolitanism”. Contemporary Canadian political philosophers seem to have embraced the latter notion (e.g., Kymlicka & Walker 2012), thus acknowledging the importance of more local modes of belonging. In the words of Roudometof (2005, p. 124): “cosmopolitans and locals occupy the opposite ends of a continuum consisting of various forms of attachment.” Therefore, “cosmopolitanism does not imply the negation of local (regional and national) affiliations and identities” (Pichler, 2009, p. 707). Previous research has indeed confirmed the “persistence of localism” (Pollini, 2005) in the context of globalization.³

The two Canadian cases studied here offer an opportunity to introduce linguistic minorities to the study of affiliations across the cosmopolitan-local scale. If Pollini is correct that localism is alive and well in most Western countries, and if Canada is to be included in the range of cases where the same trend applies, then the *general expectation* will follow that there exists a cohabitation of local forms of affiliation with cosmopolitan affiliations in Canada. Consequently, the study looks not only at cosmopolitanism, but at three other more local types of affiliation as well: the federal (or national), provincial (or subnational), and municipal (or local) affiliations.

To tailor more specific hypotheses adapted to the two cases studied here, those of the Franco-Ontarian and Anglo-Quebecer communities, the challenge lies in finding appropriate literatures. However, a dearth of empirical studies on cosmopolitanism (Schaffer, 2012)

3. Indeed, individuals are deemed to be able to hold the dual, seemingly opposite, loyalties of cosmopolitanism and localism.

represents a hurdle for such an endeavour. While many researchers have addressed the question of linguistic identity and its relationship with vitality (e.g., Freynet & Clément, 2015; Landry, Allard, & Deveau, 2007), few have attempted group comparisons between OLMCs addressing the question of affiliations and their determinants. The literature on the relationship between participation and identification shows that participating in a group or community increases likelihood of identification with that group and will thus be examined. Otherwise, the political science literature suggests that institutions anchor allegiances (Simeon & Elkins, 1974), but do not alone determine them (Henderson, 2004). Indeed, the degree to which Canadians identify with local, provincial, national, and global entities varies across the country. Mendelsohn and Matthews (2010), for example, found that over half of Quebecers identify more strongly with their province than with the country as a whole, while just 10% of Ontarians feel the same way. Both institutional variation and geography—deemed important in characterizing the asymmetric reality of official language minorities across the country (e.g., Chouinard, 2012)—thus seem relevant to the comparison of group affiliations and will be examined in the subsequent sections of this article.

The Participation-Identification Nexus: How Does Partaking in OLMC Organizational Life Impact Identities?

Scholars of political participation and social movement theorists have developed different explanations as to how identifying with a group increases the likelihood of political participation as well as partaking in collective action and protest activities (e.g., Fowler & Kam 2007; Klandermans, 2014). The present study turns the question on its head and asks whether participating in a group leads to increased identification with the group. In the context of the issue tackled here, the question thus becomes whether Anglo-Quebecers and Franco-Ontarians who directly participate in OLMC organizations and networks become more attached to each of these four types of identification (global [citizens of the world], federal [Canada], provincial [one's province], and municipal [one's city, town or village]).

Extant research shows that participating in group-relevant activities heightens social identification with such groups. Among others, Khan *et al.* (2016) found that participants in a Hindu festival identified more strongly as Hindus than non-participants, even one month after the event. Another study more comparable to the cases analyzed here examined identity shifts among immigrants in Quebec. Cárdenas and de la Sablonnière (2020) found that when immigrants participate in the new cultural group of Quebec society, it increases their identification with that group, but only when the latter is positively valued. Another study (van der Zwet, 2015) has shown that members of autonomist parties in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands prioritize national identity as their primary territorial identity. In broader terms, research has shown that political institutions (Bruter, 2008), exposure to symbols and (good or bad) news in the mass media (Bruter, 2003) are shaping

identities. By extension, it may be expected that those directly participating in such political institutions will be more inclined to share the identities conveyed by these institutions. They might also be more exposed to symbols and news reinforcing their affiliations than those less involved in institutions.

The first hypothesis (H1) will thus be: Since participation fosters affiliation, and considering that OLMC organizations and networks are a legacy of biculturalism/Canadian dualism, then OLMC members engaged in OLMC organizations and network activities will have stronger national, subnational and local affiliations than rank-and-file members, and similar cosmopolitan dispositions.

In keeping with Beck (2002), Pichler (2009), and Pollini (2005) there should be no reason to expect organizational activists to be less cosmopolitan than rank-and-file members, since cosmopolitanism is not expected to have a subtractive effect on localism. Evidence from recent research indeed suggests that, “global identities do not contradict or replace national and/or local identities” (Pichler, 2011, p. 36). Furthermore, H1 is a sensible hypothesis because official languages have become a core component of Canadian national identity (Igartua, 2006; Mann, 2016; Turgeon *et al.*, 2019) and subnational identities such as the Québécois and Franco-Ontarian ones. As entities created as a direct consequence of the enactment of official language policies, OLMC organizations and networks are embodying such national and subnational identities. Those most engaged in their activities should thus display stronger local, provincial, and national affiliations than those least engaged, with the exception of the provincial affiliation of Anglo-Quebecers, for historical reasons detailed in the next section. Now that a hypothesis regarding the relationship between participation and affiliations has been developed, the following section will turn to the factors that allow for the construction of hypotheses for a group comparison of the affiliations of Franco-Ontarians and Anglo-Quebecers.

Comparing Affiliations Across Groups

Contextual Variable #1:

Institutions, Linguistic and Cultural Insecurity, and Intergroup Relations

The institutional context of official language minorities can best be described through the notion of language regimes. Policy regime scholarship defines the concept of regime as “a bundle of laws and regulations established to regulate a specific field” (May & Jochim, 2013, p. 426–28; Jochim & May, 2010, as cited in McDougall, 2019, p. 78). The notion of language regimes therefore designates “laws and regulations governing involvement in official languages with an eye to safeguarding the linguistic community’s wellbeing and managing threats of assimilation” (McDougall, 2019, p. 78).

In the Canadian federation, a number of language regimes coexist, and the federal regime applies across all provinces. The federal language regime, based primarily on the Official Languages Act, is founded upon the “principle of personality” that promotes the individual’s right to interact in the language of their choice with the state. In Quebec, the provincial language regime is based on the “principle of territoriality”, which protects the collective right of a majority to live in its own language in a given territory (Cardinal & Normand, 2011). The Ontario language regime, for its part, seems like a hybrid version of these two language regimes. Its main policy objective consists in guaranteeing “an individual’s right to receive services in French from the Government of Ontario ministries and agencies in 26 designated areas” (Office of Francophone Affairs, 2018). Recent public policy research has compared the language regimes of Canada, Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick, and Nunavut and deemed that the power of the Ontario regime is “low”, while that of the Quebec one is “high” (McDougall, 2019).⁴ However, such a perspective takes the standpoint of Quebec’s Francophone majority, and thus French as the target language to be protected. The literature still lacks a portrait of the inner, minority language regime within Quebec. Table 1 below thus complements the work of McDougall (2019) and compares the architecture of the Ontario and Quebec language regimes from the perspective of official language minority communities, which will further inform the hypotheses.

The data in Table 1 imply that the interests of Francophones in Ontario are, at least on paper, better represented within their provincial state apparatus than those of their Anglophone counterparts in Quebec. This will be reflected further below in the operationalization of hypotheses. While the main focus of this study is not to offer a systematic comparison of official language minority institutions, the evidence discussed thus far provides reasons to expect that Franco-Ontarians will have a stronger provincial affiliation than Anglo-Quebecers, the latter having less institutional representation of their interests in the provincial government apparatus.

Closely related to the development of institutions and language policies—decision-makers have, after all, built national and provincial policies based on their judgement that certain problems existed and were in need of a solution—perceived linguistic and cultural threat have proven to be important factors shaping intergroup attitudes, specifically attitudes towards Canada (Medeiros, 2017a; Medeiros, 2019). The linguistic divide has historically been one of the most important determinants of intergroup relations in Canada (Blais, 1991) and arguably remains so. The rather sparse literature on attitudinal differences between Anglophones and Francophones in Canada has shown that, when Francophones in Quebec feel that their language is threatened, they are less likely to nurture a strong attachment

4. McDougall (2019, p. 4) explains “the range [of power] these regimes can have, from quite weak (primarily for proposing cultural events in the public sphere), to very strong (direct intervention in the language of the private sector workforce).”

Table 1
Compared Architecture of the Provincial Language Regimes Supporting Official Language Minorities in Quebec and Ontario

Minority Language Components	Quebec's Language Regime	Ontario's Language Regime
Dedicated ministry?	No, but... A Secretariat for relations with English-speaking Quebecers was created in 2017. ^a	Yes, but... The Ministry of Francophone Affairs was downgraded into an Office of Francophone Affairs soon after Doug Ford's election as Ontario Premier, in June 2018. After significant political backlash, ^b the Office got turned back into a Ministry.
Dedicated position within government apparatus?	Yes Mr. William Floch is the current Assistant Secretary for Relations with English-Speaking Quebecers and is in direct contact with the Executive Council.	Yes, but... The position of French-Language Services Commissioner (Mr. François Boileau) has been abolished. Then, following significant political turmoil, the position was re-created and transferred under the umbrella of the provincial ombudsman's office. ^c As of January 2020, the Minister of Francophone Affairs has announced the appointment of a new French Language Services Commissioner. ^d
Dedicated policies?	No	Yes Ontario's 2004 aménagement linguistique policy ^e The 1986 French Language Services Act
Municipal component?	Yes Since 1977, over 102 municipal bodies have been recognized as bilingual and provide services in both French and the minority language, ^f under section 29.1 of the Charter of the French Language.	Yes The French Language Services Act lists 26 designated areas and 243 designated agencies providing services in the minority language. ^g

Sources: a. Québec Ministère du Conseil exécutif (2017)
 b. The Canadian Press (2018)
 c. CBC News (2018), The Canadian Press (2018),
 Office of Francophone Affairs (2018)

d. Ministry of Francophone Affairs (2020)
 e. Ontario (2005, 2004)
 f. Office québécois de la langue française (2018)
 g. Office of Francophone Affairs (2018).

to Canada (Medeiros, 2017b). Evidence extends such findings to Francophone minorities outside of Quebec as well (Medeiros, 2017a). Similarly, research has shown that Anglophones in Canada may also experience cultural insecurity, which in turn leads to more negative attitudes towards Francophones (Medeiros, 2019). With regards to the study hereby presented, it can be expected that: 1) given the relative lack of institutional representation

for Anglophones at the provincial level, they may experience some cultural insecurity and therefore be less inclined to identify with Quebec, and 2) Francophones in Ontario, despite their more favourable degree of institutional representation at the provincial level, remain in a somewhat fragile position considering their position as a minority across Canada (in contrast with Anglophones, who form a majority at the national level). Francophones may therefore experience a degree of linguistic insecurity, which in turn may negatively impact their affiliation with both Ontario and Canada.

Lastly, Anglo-Quebecers will be expected to display a stronger cosmopolitan affiliation than Franco-Ontarians, given that the English language—the world’s current lingua franca (Laponce, 2001)—is likely to be conducive to a cosmopolitan affiliation. It is indeed likely easier for Anglophones to conceive of themselves as “citizens of the world”, given that their language has more influence throughout the world and is spoken more often and in more places than French. Such a hypothesis is also in keeping with empirical findings on cosmopolitanism showing that “people from developed countries perceive their group as more prototypical [of] the world population than [do people] from developing countries” (Reese, Berthold, & Steffens, 2012, p. 683). Drawing on the logic of Reese *et al.*, the assumption here is that English speakers are self-representing as more “prototypical” of the world population than Francophones—as the authors put it, “we are the world—and they are not.” The next section examines a factor closely related to institutions and language regimes in Canada, namely geography.

Contextual Variable #2:

Geographical Distribution of Official Language Minorities

The geographical distribution of the two cases examined here reveals a stark contrast. Specifically, “more than 70% of Anglophones (714,000) in Quebec live in a municipality where the Anglophone group represents at least 30% of the population [and about] 20% of the total live in municipalities in which they constitute the majority” (Corbeil, Chavez, & Pereira, 2010, p. 15). Strikingly, nearly four out of five (79.4%) Quebec Anglophones live in the Montreal metropolitan census area (Statistics Canada, 2017).

By contrast, the Franco-Ontarian minority is concentrated mostly in the southeast, Ottawa, and northeast regions, where respectively 14.4%, 25.2%, and 23.0% of their population reside. The remaining 28.8% is distributed across the “rest of Ontario” (Corbeil & Lafrenière, 2010). The Francophone minority in Ontario is thus much more scattered across the province than the Anglophone minority in Quebec, and it is much less often in a situation where it forms a majority or a substantial proportion of the population at the municipal level. The implication in terms of expectations is that higher territorial concentration should entail stronger local affiliation. Indeed, it seems reasonable to postulate that the higher the proportion a minority group represents out of the total population in a given area,

the stronger the feeling of belonging its members can develop. Thus, stronger local affiliation is expected for Anglo-Quebecers, who have a high degree of territorial concentration, than for Franco-Ontarians. Taken together, the considerations discussed in the previous paragraphs result in a set of hypotheses (H2[x]) summarized in Table 2 below. The next section will provide more information on the data and detail how each indicator is to be operationalized.

Table 2
Summary of Expectations and Resulting Hypotheses (H2[x])

Dimensions	Expected Strength for Anglo-Quebecers	Expected Strength for Franco-Ontarians
Local (municipal) affiliation	Strong , since most of the English-speaking community is living in Montreal, a territorially-concentrated area; studies have shown how strong their attachment is to the city; more than one hundred bilingual municipal bodies are providing services in English across the province; and in many municipalities, they constitute a majority.	Moderate , since the Franco-Ontarian population is much more evenly distributed across the Ontario territory than the Anglophone minority in Quebec; and they only rarely constitute a majority in their municipality.
Provincial affiliation	Weak , given a lack of institutional representation (until very recently) and a history of conflicts with the Francophone majority (e.g., Saint-Léonard crisis; Bill 63, Bill 22, Bill 101, Bill 104, Alliance Quebec, the Equality Party, etc.), feeling of exclusion as expressed in recent public debates (e.g., the notion of Anglo-Quebecers being “second class citizens”, invoked even during the English-language televised leaders debate of the last provincial election). The latter may justifiably lead to experiences of cultural insecurity, which is expected to weaken affiliations.	Moderate , since the minority has good institutional representation (Office/Ministry of Francophone Affairs, Office of the French Languages Services Commissioner), and services provided in designated areas by provincial agencies. However, their conflictual relationship with some provincial governments in modern and contemporary times (e.g., Regulation 17, the Montfort Hospital crisis, and the Ford government’s budget cuts) provides reasons to anticipate linguistic and cultural insecurity, which is expected to weaken affiliations.
Federal (national) affiliation	Strong , given consistent support by federal governments through legislation and funding (e.g., Official Languages Act, the Charter, Language Roadmaps, the Court Challenges Program). On a national level, Anglophones form a majority. Hence, they should not be expected to experience linguistic insecurity.	Moderate-Strong , given consistent support by federal governments through legislation and funding (e.g., Official Languages Act, the Charter, Language Roadmaps, the Court Challenges Program). However, the minority status of Franco-Ontarians across Canada is expected to produce insecurity, which may slightly weaken their affiliation with the federation.
Global (cosmopolitan) affiliation	Moderate-Strong , given the historical importance of the provincial and national dimensions of language politics, the status of the English language as a lingua franca, and the fact that most Anglo-Quebecers (over 80%) are living in the cosmopolitan metropolis of Montreal.	Weak-Strong , given the historical importance of the provincial and national dimensions of language politics, the status of the French language as an unequivocal minority language in Canada, and the fact that most Franco-Ontarians are not living in the cosmopolitan metropolis of Toronto.

Taking into account the above expectations, the resulting hypotheses are as follows. Holding sociodemographic variables constant, Franco-Ontarians will be:

Hypotheses H2

(H2a) less likely to be cosmopolitan than Anglo-Quebecers,

(H2b) about equally likely to be attached to the Canadian national identity as Anglo-Quebecers,

(H2c) more likely to identify with their province than Anglo-Quebecers, and

(H2d) less likely to have a strong affiliation with their local polity than Anglo-Quebecers, because Franco-Ontarian communities are less territorially concentrated.

Data, Method, and Operationalization

The results presented in this study rely on original survey data collected in 2017. The author first contacted employees of official language minority organizations and conducted a series of individual semi-structured interviews with them. The author then asked each participant to take advantage of their organizational network to recruit additional participants, who would fill out an online survey questionnaire. Interviewees who agreed to do so sent an invitation by email to their members/followers/sympathizers, or through a simple publication on social media (*e.g.*, a Facebook group managed by the organization). A hyperlink providing access to a consent form was included in the invitation to ensure that each participant was fully aware of the study's configuration, which guaranteed that any information that could potentially compromise their identity would not be revealed. Each participant was given a chance to win a \$100 cash prize in exchange for filling out the online survey questionnaire. The cash prize was then awarded to one randomly-selected participant across the two samples. For the Anglo-Quebecer sample, a total of 12 organizations and Facebook groups, and a total of 305 respondents filled out the survey questionnaire. For the Franco-Ontarian sample, a total of 10 organizations and Facebook groups, and a total of 249 respondents filled out the survey questionnaire. The total sample used here thus comprises 554 respondents.

The organizations (which shall remain anonymous) that participated in the study were selected on the basis of the description of their mission. For example, if the organization clearly identified as representing or serving the interests of the English-speaking minority community in Quebec, they were invited to participate in the study. In terms of characteristics, the participating organizations from which the majority of respondents were recruited may be described as social communities seeking to represent the general interests of their respective linguistic minority constituents. Some of these organizations are purporting to serve residents of specific regions within their respective province while others are open to

anyone willing to join. A few organizations had more narrowly defined objectives—some of them are operating in more specific areas, for instance—but nonetheless clearly identified as “Anglophone”, from the province of Quebec, and ultimately serving the broad interests of their linguistic minority communities.

With regards to the question of participation, the survey questionnaire inquired as to whether the respondents were working or volunteering for an official language minority organization at the time of filling out the questionnaire. Affirmative responses were coded as “1” and negative ones as “0”, effectively making “rank-and-file” members the reference group. Whether the participating organizations truly constitute the most important or representative organizations remains unverifiable and thus constitutes a limitation of the present study. Different research designs may lead to different results.

Since the sampling method was non-probabilistic, the representativeness of the samples also cannot be guaranteed, thus precluding any attempt at generalizations. However, for the purposes of this study, which primarily seeks to compare group affiliations and test hypotheses, the samples should provide a sufficient basis on which to draw preliminary conclusions. It will be advisable to remain cautious in interpreting results. The author thus readily acknowledges that the latter would require replication in further research to test for their external validity.

Three actions have nonetheless been undertaken to verify the plausibility of the sample. First, to check whether the respondents could truly be considered Franco-Ontarian and Anglo-Quebecer, their geographical location was confirmed.⁵ The vast majority of Franco-Ontarian respondents were in Ontario when they filled out the survey questionnaires. Similarly, the vast majority of Anglo-Quebecer respondents were in Quebec when they filled out the survey questionnaires. These observations suggest that the respondents meet the most straightforward requirements that define their respective group—they are residing in the two respective provinces, and speak the language corresponding to their group identity, since they filled out the survey questionnaire in that language. Second, the author has examined the distribution of observations across the sociodemographic variables. In terms of age, education, and region of residence, the samples offer significant diversity. In terms of gender, however, the distributions were skewed, given that approximately two thirds of each sample was constituted of women and one third of men. All of the sociodemographic variables are thus included in the regression models to account for their being potential confounding variables. Third, other survey data have been consulted to further check for

5. Here is a breakdown of the procedure followed. The survey platform used to collect the online survey data was Qualtrics, which provides a considerable amount of additional information in the datasets obtained through survey questionnaires. Among this information, the geographical coordinates (i.e., latitude and longitude) of the respondents were available. The researcher thus mapped these coordinates using a temporary custom map in Google Maps, which he deleted once the verification had been made to preserve the confidentiality of the identity of respondents.

the plausibility of the samples with regards to the distribution of activists and rank-and-file respondents. For Anglo-Quebecers, survey data were found and show that the sample collected for this study is very similar in terms of proportions. Indeed, a representative sample surveyed by Pocock (2019, p. 238) indicates that 36.4% of Anglo-Quebecers “participated in unpaid volunteer work within the past year”⁶. The original sample used in the present study comprises 35.0% of respondents who declared that they were “currently working or volunteering for an Anglophone organization in Quebec”. Unfortunately, while there exists research, for example, on Franco-Ontarian activists in the Ottawa region (Cardinal, Dorais, & Plante, 2012) and historical work on community engagement (*e.g.*, Bock, 2010; Dupuis, 2010), representative survey data on community work and volunteering among Franco-Ontarians were not available. In the original sample used here, 52.4% of Franco-Ontarian respondents are organizational activists while 47.6% declared that they were not currently working or volunteering for a Franco-Ontarian organization at the time of the filling out of the questionnaire. The next sections will now provide details about the questions used to construct variables for the hypotheses developed in this article.

Dependent Variables

To measure cosmopolitanism and other forms of affiliation using the subjective approach identified by Pollini (2005), Table 3 below shows the questions that were included in the survey questionnaire.

Table 3
Structure of the Dependent Variables

Affiliation Type	Survey Questions & Answer Categories
Local (municipal)	How much do you identify with: your city/town/village? Answers: not at all, a little, moderately, strongly.
Subnational (provincial)	How much do you identify with: the province of Quebec [Ontario]? Answers: not at all, a little, moderately, strongly.
National (federal)	How much do you identify with: Canada? Answers: not at all, a little, moderately, strongly.
Global (cosmopolitan)	How much do you identify with: the world (you are a “citizen of the world”)? Answers: not at all, a little, moderately, strongly.

The dependent variables are to be considered ordinal variables, granted that further regression analysis confirms that the parallel regression assumption⁷ holds (Long & Freese,

6. A limitation, however, is that the question used here does not distinguish between unpaid volunteer community work and paid community work.

7. The notion of parallel regression assumption is defined in the context of its application, see further below, note 9.

2014; UCLA, 2019). It is to be noted that each of the two survey questionnaires used were constructed in a strictly symmetrical manner, with each question following the same order and being adapted to the context of the linguistic minority. For example, one questionnaire queried Anglo-Quebecers as to how much they identified with the province of Quebec and the other asked Franco-Ontarians how much they identified with the province of Ontario. Each questionnaire was presented in the language of each group (English for the former and French for the latter).

Independent Variables

For hypothesis H1, the independent variable is a dichotomous variable distinguishing between respondents who are engaged in their community, either through volunteering or as employees of OLMC organizations and networks, as already explained above. The survey questionnaire has assigned value “0” to respondents who answered “no”, and “1” to those who answered “yes” to the question “Are you currently working or volunteering for an Anglophone organization in Quebec? (choose ‘yes’ if you do one, or both, of these)”, thus making the former the reference group. It should be noted that there are other ways to measure engagement or participation. The measurement used here is considered the definitive conceptualization to be adopted; other operationalizations may thus lead to different results, constituting a limitation of the present study.

To test hypothesis H2, the researcher has assigned value “0” to the Anglo-Quebecer sample and “1” to the Franco-Ontarian one, thus making the former the reference group. Accordingly, all results relating to H2 should be interpreted in relation to the Anglo-Quebecer sample.

Control Variables

Standard sociodemographic variables, summarized in Table 4 below, were included in the ordered logit regressions.⁸ With regards to the topic analyzed here, empirical research on cosmopolitanism has shown that each of the four variables selected are significant when it comes to different aspects of global identities and cosmopolitan orientations (Pichler, 2011). Regarding identification as a global citizen specifically, education has been found to increase its likelihood, and suburban areas have been found to be weaker in such identification than rural and urban areas.

8. As is common practice in quantitative social science (e.g., Medeiros, 2019; Milan, 2005; Oskooii, 2018), a set of standard, commonly used, control variables—or confounding variables—are integrated into the models to test for the robustness of the latter. The variables of age, gender, education, and area of residence were chosen, because they were available in the dataset in addition to being some of the most commonly used control variables. The gender variable is important here because the distribution of the sample is skewed (i.e., there are more women than men among respondents in the samples used).


Table 4
Structure of the Control Variables

Variables	Survey Questions & Answer Categories
Age	How old are you? Answers: 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75 or older.
Gender	What is your gender? Answers: [dummy variable coded as] male = 0, female = 1.
Education	What is the highest degree or level of schooling you have completed? Answers: [less than high school, high school or college/CEGEP degree = college or less], [bachelor's degree = undergraduate], [master's degree or doctorate = graduate], prefer not to answer (coded as missing).
Area of Residence	Where are you currently living? Answers: an urban area, a suburban area, a rural area (a small town or village), prefer not to answer (coded as missing).

Results

An examination of descriptive statistics is the first step towards the testing of H1 and H2. Figure 1 breaks down the data regarding the difference between organizational activists and rank-and-file members of the OLMCs studied.

Figure 1
Comparison of Affiliations: Rank-and-File vs. Organizational Activists



Remember that H1 postulated that: Since participation fosters affiliation, and considering that OLMC organizations and networks are a legacy of biculturalism/Canadian dualism, then OLMC members engaged in OLMC organizations and network activities will have stronger national, subnational and local affiliations than rank-and-file members, and similar cosmopolitan dispositions. The frequency distributions provide moderate support for the hypothesis. Indeed, a slightly higher proportion of the rank-and-file strongly identify as “citizens of the world” but, by and large, both groups are approximately equal in their cosmopolitan dispositions. Identification with Canada is similar. The only major differences seem to be on the provincial and municipal levels, where a higher proportion of “strong” identification is observable among organizational activists.

Regression analysis will now provide a statistical test of hypothesis H1. Since the dependent variable—cosmopolitan affiliation—is ordinal, an ordered logit model should be considered.⁹ Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 below¹⁰ present the results of both ordered logit models and an adjusted model termed “partial proportional odds” (Williams, 2016), where the proportional odds assumption is relaxed only for the variables that violate it. In the present case, a Brant test revealed that all of the variables except “age” violated the proportional odds assumption.¹¹ Hence there is only one odds ratio in the table for the latter variable.

Model 1 shows that, holding constant group (EngQc vs. FrOnt), age, gender, education, and area of residence, organizational activists among official language minorities have 0.836 lower odds of identifying as cosmopolitan (across all j 's under the proportional odds assumption) than do rank-and-file respondents. The effect is statistically significant at the $p < 0.01$ level.

Among other findings, the control variables provide valuable insights as well. Without going into as much detail as for the main predictor tied to the hypothesis, it is worth noting that Franco-Ontarians are roughly half as likely to express a cosmopolitan affiliation as Anglo-Quebecers. The latter result will be further tested below in a model adapted to hypotheses H2[a–d]. Aging by a decade increases the odds of identifying oneself as cosmopolitan by a factor of 1.098, significant at the $p < 0.001$ level. Women have 1.261 higher odds (significant at the $p < 0.01$ level) than men of identifying as moderately or strongly

9. Such a regression model, however, comes with complications associated with its underlying assumption, variably termed the “proportional odds assumption” (Williams, 2016), “parallel regression assumption” (Long & Freese, 2014, loc. 9715), and “parallel-lines assumption” (Norusis, 2005). Williams (2006, p. 60) defines the proportional odds assumption simply as the “requirement that β 's be the same for each value of j ”, where j stands for the level of the ordinal variable.

10. The table is formatted in keeping with Williams' (2016) recommendations.

11. The Brant test resulted in $p = 0.692$ for the age variable. When statistically significant, the p -value provided by the Brant test means that there is evidence of a violation of the proportional odds assumption. All the other variables included in the model were statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Table 5
Proportional Odds Models: Organizational Activism as a Predictor of Affiliations

Predictors	Model 1: Cosmopolitan ("the world")	Model 2: Federal (Canada) ^a	Model 3: Provincial	Model 4: Municipal
	Odds Ratios			
Organizational Activist	.836**	.794***	1.698***	1.557***
Franco-Ontarians	.580***	1.054	10.712***	1.633***
Age (in decades)	1.098***	1.205***	1.154***	1.079***
Female (ref. cat.: male)	1.027	1.410***	1.531***	1.350***
Education (ref. cat.: <= college)				
Undergraduate	.840**	.968	.779***	.849*
Graduate	1.038	.844*	1.022	1.298***
Area of Res. (ref. cat.: urban)				
Suburban	1.459***	1.249**	.736***	.549***
Rural	.726***	.935	1.092	1.215**
Number of observations	462	471	470	474

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

a. Since most respondents in both groups indicated that they "moderately" or "strongly" identified with Canada, the dependent variable in the above models distinguishes between those who "strongly" identify and the rest of the sample. Organizational activists are thus slightly less likely to "strongly" identify with Canada than rank-and-file respondents, but remain very likely to "moderately" identify with Canada nonetheless.

cosmopolitan, a finding enabled by the partial proportional odds model.¹² Undergraduate-level and graduate-level alumni have respectively 1.255 and 1.340 higher odds of identifying as a little, moderately, or strongly cosmopolitan than do respondents with less than a high school, a high school, or a college degree, a finding confirming past research (Strijbis & Teney, 2017).¹³ Rather surprisingly, respondents living in a suburban area have higher odds of identifying as cosmopolitan across all levels than do respondents living in an urban area. Perhaps, less surprisingly, respondents living in a rural area have lower odds of identifying as either "moderately or strongly" or "strongly" as cosmopolitan than do respondents living in an urban area.

12. See Appendix for more details.

13. Interestingly, the effect reverses when it comes to the far end of the continuum, with respectively 0.702 and 0.840 lower odds of identifying as strongly cosmopolitan.

Results in the subsequent models do not need to be discussed in the same level of detail as the above. Instead, it will be sufficient to note that, in general, the evidence is consistent with hypothesis H1, which expects the local and subnational attachment of organizational activists to be more pronounced. The only unexpected, but rather marginal, difference is that regarding identification with Canada. The difference indeed seems substantively insignificant—although statistically significant—since the model in Table 5 distinguishes between activists and rank-and-file only as far as they “strongly” or “moderately” identify with Canada (vs “a little” or “not at all”). Results thus indicate that organizational activists are slightly less likely to “strongly” identify with Canada than rank-and-file respondents, but remain very likely to “moderately” identify with Canada. Broadly considered, both organizational activists and rank-and-file individuals are about equally attached to the country.

Additional testing concerning the interactions of affiliations shows that global and local loyalties are countering each other’s effect when it comes to predicting the status of organizational engagement. Indeed, the most accurate predictions of such status are a combination of the strongest local affiliation with no global affiliation (see Appendix for detailed table of predicted probabilities).

Before proceeding to the predictive models for hypothesis H2, an examination of descriptive statistics is in order. Figure 2 provides a comparison of Franco-Ontarians and Anglo-Quebecers on different questions drawing on cosmopolitanism. Quadrant 1 (from top left to bottom right) shows that the two groups share a number of elements, although more Franco-Ontarians than Anglo-Quebecers strongly identify with their local polity. Quadrant 2 shows a large discrepancy between the two groups. A large majority of Franco-Ontarians (60%) are strongly attached to their province, but only about 16% of Anglo-Quebecers declare themselves to be strongly attached to the province of Quebec. Both groups are almost identical when it comes to their attachment to Canada, with around 70% of respondents strongly identifying with their country. And, lastly, there is a notable difference—of over 10%—between Anglo-Quebecers and Franco-Ontarians who strongly identify as “citizens of the world”. At first glance, such evidence contradicts the expectation that local and global affiliations are stronger than national ones for linguistic minorities that are global linguistic majorities (Pollini, 2005). But since it is likely that descriptive statistics obscure more complex processes—as was the case with the processes differentiating between rank-and-file and organizational activists—the proportional odds models below will provide for a comparison of affiliations among Franco-Ontarians and Anglo-Quebecers.

Figure 2
Comparison of Affiliations: Municipal (Local), Provincial (Subnational),
Federal (National), Global (Cosmopolitan)



For the group comparison, results seem to be straightforward. As shown in Model 1 of Table 6, evidence supports hypothesis H2a. Franco-Ontarians have a consistently lower likelihood of identifying as cosmopolitan across all levels of the ordinal dependent variable.¹⁴ Results for the control variables are extremely similar to those in Table 5, hence there is

14. And the effect appears to be linearly diminishing the closer the estimation gets to the furthestmost category (“strongly”). See Appendix for this detail.

Table 6
Proportional Odds Models: Group as a Predictor of Affiliations

Predictors	Model 1:	Model 2:	Model 3:	Model 4:
	Cosmopolitan ("the world")	Federal (Canada) ^a	Provincial	Municipal
Odds Ratios				
Franco-Ontarians	.559***	1.014	11.588***	1.748***
Age (in decades)	1.097***	1.212***	1.152***	1.074***
Female (ref. cat.: male)	.997	1.374***	1.677***	1.430***
Educ. (ref. cat.: ≤ college)				
Undergraduate	.828**	1.015	.816**	.865*
Graduate	1.027	0.851	1.036	1.266**
Area of Res. (ref. cat.: urban)				
Suburban	1.457***	1.308**	.755***	.544***
Rural	.713***	0.882	1.172*	1.281***
Number of observations	463	472	471	475

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

a. For this model, since most respondents in both groups indicated that they "moderately" or "strongly" identified with Canada, the dependent variable was transformed into a dummy variable to distinguish between those who "strongly" identify and the rest of the sample.

no need to describe them again. To illustrate the magnitude of the effect of group belonging in predicting cosmopolitan affiliation, Table 7 provides predicted probabilities for each group, controlling for sociodemographic variables. Following Model 1, which regroups both moderate and strong affiliations, Anglo-Quebecers have about a 77% chance of identifying as citizens of the world, while Franco-Ontarians have about a 60% chance. These probabilities drop to 39% and 28% respectively following Model 2. Predictions thus show a difference of 11 to 17% probabilities of cosmopolitan affiliation between the two groups.

The next steps consist in analyzing the "lower" levels of affiliation, starting with the national level and moving onto the provincial, then municipal spheres. Model 2 in Table 6 presents results for identification with Canada by group. Evidence supports hypothesis H2b, since the group variable is not statistically significant, meaning that both Anglo-Quebecers and Franco-Ontarians are about equally likely to identify with Canada. Among other findings, age, gender, and area of residence have a significant impact on affiliation. As respondents age by a decade, they have 1.212 higher odds than previously to identify

Table 7
Predicted Probabilities of Cosmopolitan Affiliation,
Comparison by Group, Sociodemographic Variables Held at their Mean

Models	Sample	Pr (Cosmopolitan), 95% CI
Model 1 ^a	Anglo-Quebecers	0.768 (0.751-0.784)
	Franco-Ontarians	0.603 (0.582-0.625)
Model 2 ^b	Anglo-Quebecers	0.391 (0.372-0.410)
	Franco-Ontarians	0.277 (0.258-0.297)

a. Model 1 = moderate + strong affiliation; b. Model 2 = strong affiliation only

with Canada. Female respondents have 1.374 higher odds of identifying with Canada than male respondents. And those living in a suburban area have 1.308 higher odds of identifying with Canada than respondents living in an urban area.

Model 3 in Table 6 presents results for provincial affiliation. Evidence very strongly supports hypothesis H2c. Indeed, holding other variables constant, Franco-Ontarians have 11.588 higher odds of identifying with their province than Anglo-Quebecers. The group variable has therefore quite a large effect. Among other interesting discoveries, it seems that age increases the likelihood of either [moderately or strongly] or [strongly] identifying by a factor of 1.184 and 1.174 respectively, significant at the $p < 0.001$ level. Across all the levels of the ordinal variable, female respondents have higher odds of identifying with their province than male respondents. Those who have an undergraduate or a graduate degree have respectively 0.770 and 0.731 lower odds than those who have a college degree or less of [a little, moderately, or strongly] identifying with their province. Respondents with a graduate degree, however, have 1.287 higher odds of [moderately or strongly] identifying with their province than those with a college degree or less. Undergraduate degree holders have 0.755 lower odds of strongly identifying with their province than those with a college degree or less. Finally, area of residence seems to matter as well. In comparison with respondents living in an urban area, those who reside in a suburban area have 0.567 lower odds of [a little, moderately, or strongly] identifying with their province. These lower odds increase slightly to 0.721 when combining moderate or strong affiliations only. By contrast, residents of rural areas have 1.452 higher odds of [a little, moderately, or strongly] identifying with their province than those living in urban areas. The odds are very similar (1.494) when combining moderate or strong affiliations only. And there is no evidence of a statistically significant association between any area of residence and a strong provincial affiliation.

The last hypothesis to be tested is H2d, which concerns the most local type of affiliation, that is, the municipal level. Evidence in Model 4 of Table 6 contradicts H2d, since,

holding other variables constant, Franco-Ontarians have proportionally 1.748 higher odds of identifying with their city/town/village than Anglo-Quebecers.¹⁵ Other notable results include the effect of age as a predictor, which slightly, but consistently increases likelihood of local affiliation across categories. Female respondents are also significantly more likely to identify with their city/town/village than male respondents. And suburban dwellers are the least likely to either identify [moderately or strongly] or [strongly] with their local polity, with odds roughly twice as low as urban dwellers.¹⁶ Respondents living in a rural area have on average slightly higher odds as those living in urban areas.

Discussion and Conclusion

In conclusion, the hypotheses in this study were supported. Evidence provided moderate support for the first hypothesis (H1) positing that, holding other variables constant, OLMC members engaged in OLMC organizations and network activities have stronger national, subnational and local affiliations than rank-and-file members, and similar cosmopolitan affiliations.

As for the second hypothesis, three out of the four subhypotheses were supported. Holding other variables constant, Franco-Ontarians were expected to be:

(H2a) less likely to be cosmopolitan than Anglo-Quebecers: supported,

(H2b) about equally likely to be attached to the Canadian national identity as Anglo-Quebecers: supported,

(H2c) more likely to identify with their province than Anglo-Quebecers: supported,

(H2d) less likely to have a strong affiliation with their local polity than Anglo-Quebecers: not supported, contrary evidence was found, suggesting more research needs to be done in particular on the question of territorial concentration, which was expected to predict strength of local affiliations.

One of the contributions of this paper lies in its empirical investigation of the multiple loyalties of official language minorities. While there had previously been research conducted on the dual loyalties of immigrants across the provinces in Canada (*e.g.*, Bilodeau *et al.*, 2010), this study was one of the firsts if not the very first to systematically scrutinize and directly compare the affiliations of two official language minorities on four levels.

15. Relaxing the proportional odds assumption, the partial proportional odds model indicates that the likelihood of local affiliation remains higher for Franco-Ontarians across all j 's, statistically significant at the $p < 0.001$ level. The most notable category is that of [moderate or strong] identification, with 2.269 higher odds for Franco-Ontarians.

16. See partial proportional odds models for more detail in the Appendix.


As for the broad question of cosmopolitanism, as Calhoun (2008, p. 440) puts it, “as a social condition [or in this case affiliation], cosmopolitanism is not universalism; it is belonging to a social class able to identify itself with the universal. Belonging to the global cosmopolitan class is structured by social institutions [...]”. In the cases at hand, it has been argued that Canadian official language groups, be they minority groups or majority groups, are embedded in biculturalism, or more broadly, dualism. Such a perspective is a legacy of the intellectuals and decisionmakers that profoundly shaped the historical development of Canada and its constitutional architecture. The findings presented here are primarily in keeping with the expectation that, since cosmopolitanism is structured by social institutions (Calhoun, 2008), and since official language minorities constitute the last standard-bearers of biculturalism, the individuals most engaged in official language minority organizations tend to nurture affiliations consistent with the national, subnational and/or local character of their minority group. A valuable contribution of this study therefore lies in its providing original data and evidence shedding light upon such an understudied phenomenon.

In addition, the study corroborates the “persistence of localism” (Pollini, 2005) in the face of globalization. Insofar as the federation is concerned, and insofar as official language minorities constitute important groups in Canadian society and are part of its diversity, it seems that national, subnational, and local modes of belonging remain essential for many Canadian citizens. The claim to “postnationality” thus seems empirically invalid.

A theoretical implication of the findings is that there may be intergroup differences in cosmopolitanism. For instance, cosmopolitanism might be working better for majorities than minorities, and thus in the North American context better for Anglophones than Francophones. As a complement to the findings presented above, the following figure compares the same four levels of affiliations among the linguistic minority and linguistic majority in Quebec. Distinguishing between Francophones and Anglophones in Quebec, Figure 3 displays frequency distributions retrieved from representative, weighted samples provided as part of the Comparative Provincial Election Project Survey (2011–2014).¹⁷ While there are unsurprising differences when it comes to patterns of affiliation with the Canadian and Québécois identities, and while there does not seem to be significant differences when it comes to local attachment, Anglophones in Quebec have been found to more strongly identify as “citizens of the world”. This suggests that language may constitute a particularly potent predictor for the strength of cosmopolitan identification since, even when they are in a minority setting, Anglophones are more cosmopolitan than Francophones.

17. Unfortunately, while similar data was available for Ontario, no variable on the language of respondents was available in the dataset. It would thus be interesting to see in further research whether the intergroup pattern observed in Quebec holds in Ontario and other provinces as well.

Figure 3
Four Levels of Affiliations in the Province of Quebec,
Linguistic Minority (English) vs. Linguistic Majority (French)*




* Language here means language used at home.

Source: Comparative Provincial Election Project Survey, 2011-2014 (Wesley *et al.*, 2013).

When comparing “majority” groups based on the same representative, weighted samples provided by the Comparative Provincial Election Project Survey (2011-2014), the pattern in Figure 4 emerges. Interestingly, Quebecers, as a majority group, seem to think of themselves just as strongly if not more strongly as citizens of the world than Ontarians. This suggests that, if cosmopolitanism/postnationalism is especially prevalent among members of majority groups, then Quebecers share the dispositions of a majority group when it comes to cosmopolitanism, despite constituting a linguistic minority in Canada and on the continent.

In terms of normative implications, as a whole, the findings presented here entail that “we need to be global in part through how we are national [...] and need to recognize the ways national—and ethnic and religious [one may add linguistic]—solidarities work for others” (Calhoun, 2008, p. 445). In other words, cosmopolitanism cannot be “ignoring or wishing away national and local solidarities” (Calhoun, 2008, p. 445). It is claimed that

Figure 4
Comparing Post-Nationalism Among Majority Groups, Quebec vs. Ontario



Source: Comparative Provincial Election Project Survey, 2011-2014 (Wesley et al., 2013) *Comparing Post-Nationalism Among Majority Groups, Quebec vs. Ontario*.

openness towards the world needs to “transcend simply being willing to try an Other’s food” (Schaffer, 2012, p. 151). Canada has been a champion of multiculturalism and a strong proponent of diversity, yet some feel that “the unique needs of official language minority communities (OLMCs) are not adequately recognized in the constitution, and often fall through the cracks of the ‘Canadian model’” (Kymlicka, 2012, p. 248). If Canada is to keep claiming its title of protector of diversity, it needs to be coherent and include linguistic diversity as well. As shown in another study (Bonin, 2020), recent research provides evidence that some among official language minority communities feel excluded from their subnational polity (e.g., in Quebec). Discourses on cosmopolitanism and postnationality, through their implicit and sometimes overt denial of the importance of national, subnational, and local attachments, are likely to serve as a pretense for political inaction. It would be a matter of coherence for proponents of cosmopolitanism to acknowledge the existence (and thus relevance) of a multiplicity of solidarities, and refrain from grand claims implying the end of history through a postnational order that transcends all purportedly defunct group loyalties. In that respect, “rooted cosmopolitanism” (e.g., Kymlicka & Walker, 2012) may represent a more contextually-sensitive alternative to cosmopolitanism.

References

- Beck, U. (2002). The cosmopolitan society and its enemies. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19(1-2), 17-44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026327640201900101>
- Bilodeau, A., White, S. & Nevitte, N. (2010). The development of dual loyalties: Immigrants’ integration to Canadian regional dynamics”. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 43(3), 515-44.
- Blais, A. (1991). Le clivage linguistique au Canada. *Recherches Sociographiques*, 32(1) 43-54.

- Bock, M. (2010). De la “tradition” à la “participation” : les années 1960 et les mouvements de jeunesse franco-ontariens. *Cahiers Charlevoix*, 8, 111-196.
- Bonin, P.-O. (2020). Relative deprivation and perceived discrimination among Quebec’s English-speaking minority communities: “Second-class citizens” in a multi-national context? In A.-G. Gagnon & A. Tremblay (Eds.), *Federalism and national diversity in the 21st century* (p. 241–268). Presses de l’Université du Québec.
- Bruter, M. (2008). Legitimacy, euroscepticism & identity in the European Union – Problems of measurement, modelling & paradoxical patterns of influence. *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 4(4), 273-285.
- Bruter, M. (2003). Winning hearts and minds for Europe. The impact of news and symbols on civic and cultural European identity. *Comparative Political Studies*, 36(10), 1148-1179.
- Calhoun, C. (2008). Cosmopolitanism and nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism*, 14(3), 427-48.
- Cameron, D., & Simeon, R. (2009). *Language matters*. UBC Press.
- Canadian Press, The (2018, November 23). Ontario creates new French commissioner job after days of backlash over cuts. *Toronto Star*. Retrieved March 21, 2019 from <https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2018/11/23/ontario-creates-new-french-commissioner-job-after-days-of-backlash-over-cuts.html>
- Cárdenas, D., & de la Sablonnière, R. (2020). Participating in a new group and the identification processes: The quest for a positive social identity. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 59(1), 189-208. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12340>
- Cardinal, L. (2012). Language regimes in Canada and in Quebec: From competition to collaboration? *RECODE Working Paper Series*, European Science Foundation, University of Helsinki, Online Working Paper, n° 2, 13 p.
- Cardinal, L., Dorais, F.-O. & Plante, N. (2012). *Le milieu associatif francophone d’Ottawa : vitalité, appartenance et engagement*. Chaire de recherche sur la francophonie et les politiques publiques. Université d’Ottawa.
- Cardinal, L., & Normand, M. (2011). Des accents distincts : les régimes linguistiques ontarien et québécois. In J.-F. Savard, A. Brassard, & L. Côté (Eds.), *Les relations Québec-Ontario. Un destin partagé* (p. 131-58). Presses de l’Université du Québec.
- Cardinal, L., & Sonntag, S. K. (2015). *State traditions and language regimes*. Kingston; McGill-Queen’s Press.
- CBC News. (2018). Franco-Ontarians “disappointed” by cuts to French services. *CBC News*. Retrieved March 21, 2019 from <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/franco-ontarian-frustrated-with-provincial-cuts-1.4910288>
- Chouinard, S. (2012). Quel avenir pour le projet autonomiste des communautés Francophones en situation minoritaire? Réflexion sur les politiques publiques canadiennes en matière de langues officielles. *Minorités Linguistiques et Société = Linguistic Minorities and Society*, (1), 195-213. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1009215ar>

- Corbeil, J.-P., Chavez, B., & Pereira, D. (2010). Portrait of official-language minorities in Canada—Anglophones in Quebec. Retrieved July 16, 2019 from <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/89-642-x/89-642-x2010002-eng.pdf?st=TrrvfzXp>
- Corbeil, J.-P., & Lafrenière, S. (2010). Portrait of official-language minorities in Canada: Francophones in Ontario. Retrieved July 16, 2019 from <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/89-642-x/89-642-x2010001-eng.pdf?st=Ps6L5n2C>
- Dupuis, S. (2010). La (contre)-culture étudiante du nord Ontarien et le lambda de l'Université Laurentienne (1960-1971). In A. Bourbeau (Ed.), *Engagement et contestation : La jeunesse Franco-Ontarienne (1960-1993)* (pp. 11-41). La Société historique du Nouvel-Ontario.
- Fowler, J. H., & Kam, C. D. (2007). Beyond the self: Social identity, altruism, and political participation. *The Journal of Politics*, 69(3), 813-827. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2508.2007.00577.x>
- Freynt, N., & Clément, R. (2015). Bilingualism in minority settings in Canada: Integration or assimilation? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 46, 55-72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2015.03.023>
- Henderson, A. (2004). Regional political cultures in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 37(3), 595-615. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008423904030707>
- Igartua, J. E. (2006). *The other quiet revolution. National identities in English Canada, 1945-71*. University of Toronto Press.
- Ignatieff, M. (2017). *The ordinary virtues: Moral order in a divided world*. Harvard University Press.
- Jochim, A. E., & May, P. J. (2010). Beyond subsystems: Policy regimes and governance. *Policy Studies Journal*, 38(2), 303-27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2010.00363.x>
- Khan, S. S., Hopkins, N., Reicher, S., Tewari, S., Srinivasan, N. & Stevenson, C. (2016). How collective participation impacts social identity: A longitudinal study from India. *Political Psychology*, 37(3), 309-325. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12260>
- Klandermans, P. G. (2014). Identity politics and politicized identities: Identity processes and the dynamics of protest. *Political Psychology*, 35(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12167>
- Kymlicka, W. (2012). A new deal for OLMC's? Three challenges. *Minorités linguistiques et société = Linguistic Minorities and Society*, 1, 248-258. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1009218ar>
- Kymlicka, W., & Walker, K. (2012). *Rooted cosmopolitanism: Canada and the world*. UBC Press.
- Landry, R. (Ed.) (2014). *Life in an official minority language in Canada*. Canadian Institute for Research on Linguistic Minorities. Retrieved July 16, 2019 from <https://www.icrml.ca/en/contact-us/download/133/8707/47>
- Landry, R., Allard, R., & Deveau, K. (2007). A macroscopic intergroup approach to the study of ethnolinguistic development. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 185, 225-253.
- Laponce, J. (2001). Politics and the law of Babel. *Social Science Information*, 40(2), 179-194. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F053901801040002001>

- Long, J. S., & Freese, J. (2014). *Regression models for categorical dependent variables using Stata*. Stata Press.
- Mann, J. (2016). *The search for a new national identity: The rise of multiculturalism in Canada and Australia*. Peter Lang.
- Martel, M. (1998). *Le Canada français : récit de sa formulation et de son éclatement, 1850-1967*. Canadian Historical Association. Retrieved July 16, 2019 from https://cha-shc.ca/_uploads/5c375941e6171.pdf
- May, P. J., & Jochim, A. E. (2013). Policy regime perspectives: Policies, politics, and governing. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(3), 426-52.
- McDougall, A. (2019). Connecting power to protection: The political bases of language commissioners in Canada. *Canadian Public Administration*, 62(1), 77-95.
- McRoberts, K. (1997). *Misconceiving Canada: The struggle for national unity*. Oxford University Press.
- Medeiros, M. (2017a). Not just about Quebec: Accounting for Francophones' attitudes towards Canada. *French Politics*, 15(2), 223-236. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41253-017-0028-7>
- Medeiros, M. (2017b). Refining the influence of language on national attachment: Exploring linguistic threat perceptions in Quebec. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 23(4), 375-390. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537113.2017.1380457>
- Medeiros, M. (2019). National frenemies: Linguistic intergroup attitudes in Canada. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 42(16), 3-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1406610>
- Mendelsohn, M., & Matthews, J. S. (2010). The new Ontario: The shifting attitudes of Ontarians toward the federation. Retrieved July 16, 2019 from https://munkschool.utoronto.ca/mowatcentre/wp-content/uploads/publications/1_the_new_ontario.pdf
- Milan, A. (2005). Willing to participate: Political engagement of young adults. *Canadian Social Trends*, 2-7.
- Ministry of Francophone Affairs. (2020). Statement from the minister of Francophone affairs on the appointment of a new French language services commissioner. Retrieved December 20, 2020 from <https://news.ontario.ca/en/statement/55314/statement-from-the-minister-of-francophone-affairs-on-the-appointment-of-a-new-french-language-servi>
- Moran, A. (2020, O). Globalisation, postnationalism and Australia. *Journal of Sociology*, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1440783320964542>
- Norusis, M. (2005). *SPSS 13.0 advanced statistical procedures companion*. Prentice Hall.
- Office of Francophone Affairs, Ontario. (2018). Government services in French. Retrieved March 20, 2019 from <https://www.ontario.ca/page/government-services-french>
- Office québécois de la langue française. (2018). Organismes municipaux et l'article 29.1. Retrieved March 22, 2019 from https://www.oqlf.gouv.qc.ca/francisation/admin_publ/rec291.html
- Ontario. (2004). Politique d'aménagement linguistique de l'Ontario. Retrieved March 21, 2019 from <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/fre/document/policy/linguistique/linguistique.pdf>

- Ontario. (2005). Ontario's Aménagement Linguistique Policy. Retrieved March 21, 2019 from <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/policy/linguistique/linguistique.pdf>
- Oskooii, K. A.R. (2018). Perceived discrimination and political behavior. *British Journal of Political Science*, 50(3), 867-892. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1440783320964542>
- Pichler, F. (2009). "Down-to-Earth" cosmopolitanism: Subjective and objective measurements of cosmopolitanism in survey research. *Current Sociology*, 57(5), 704-32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392109337653>
- Pichler, F. (2011). Cosmopolitanism in a global perspective: An international comparison of open-minded orientations and identity in relation to globalization. *International Sociology*, 27(1), 21-50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580911422980>
- Pocock, J. (2019). Baseline data report 2018-2019 part 1 (telephone survey) English-Language health and social services access in Québec.
- Pollini, G. (2005). Elements of a theory of place attachment and socio-territorial belonging. *International Review of Sociology*, 15(3), 497-515. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03906700500272483>
- Portes, A. (2000). Globalization from below: The rise of transnational communities. In Don Kalb (Ed.), *The ends of globalization: Bringing society back in* (pp. 253-72). Rowman and Littlefield.
- Québec Ministère du Conseil exécutif. (2017). The Secretariat for relations with English-Speaking Quebecers is officially launched. Retrieved March 21, 2019 from https://www.mce.gouv.qc.ca/ministere/centre_presse/srqa/2017-11-24-en.htm
- Reese, G., Berthold, A., & Steffens, M. C. (2012). We are the world—and they are not: Prototypicality for the world community, legitimacy, and responses to global inequality. *Political Psychology*, 33(5), 683-700. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2012.00892.x>
- Richez, E. (2012). Francophone minority communities: The last constitutional standard-bearers of Trudeau's language regime. *Francophonies, Interculturality, Cultures and Strategies*, (45-46), 35-53. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1009893ar>
- Roudometof, V. (2005). Transnationalism, cosmopolitanism and glocalization. *Current Sociology*, 53(1), 113-35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392105048291>
- Russell, P. H. (2004). *Constitutional odyssey: Can Canadians become a sovereign people?*. University of Toronto Press.
- Schaffer, S. (2012). Cosmopolitanizing cosmopolitanism. In Will Kymlicka & Kathryn Walker (Eds.), *Rooted cosmopolitanism: Canada and the world* (pp. 129-55). UBC Press.
- Simeon, R., & Elkins, D. J. (1974). Regional political cultures in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 7(3), 397-437.
- Skrbis, Z., & Woodward, I. (2007). The Ambivalence of ordinary cosmopolitanism: Investigating the limits of cosmopolitan openness. *The Sociological Review*, 55(4), 730-747. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2007.00750.x>

- Statistics Canada. (2017). *Montreal [Census metropolitan area], Quebec and Quebec [Province] (table). Census Profile*. Retrieved May 28, 2019 from <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=CMACA&Code1=462&Geo2=PR&Code2=24&Data=Count&SearchText=Montreal&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=Language&TABID=1>
- Strijbis, O., & Teney, C. (2017). The cosmopolitanism of elites. In many countries, the population as a whole tends to be nationally minded. In *WZB Report*, 26-28.
- Teney, C., & Helbling, M. (2014). How denationalization divides elites and citizens. *Zeitschrift Fur Soziologie*, 43(4), 258-271. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zfsoz-2014-0402>
- The Canadian Press. (2018, November 23). Doug Ford backtracks after days of backlash over cuts to Francophone institutions. *The Globe and Mail*.
- Thériault, J. Y., & Meunier, E.-M. (2008). Que reste-t-il de l'intention vitale du Canada français? In J. Y. Thériault, A. Gilbert, & L. Cardinal (Eds.), *L'espace francophone en milieu minoritaire au Canada : nouveaux enjeux, nouvelles mobilisations* (pp. 205-238). Fides.
- Turgeon, L., Bilodeau, A., White, S. E., Henderson, A. & Gagnon, A.-G. (2019). Symbolic predispositions, interests and official languages legislation: exploring the principle-implementation gap in Canada. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, 1-19.
- UCLA. (2019). *Ordered logistic regression. Stata data analysis examples*. Retrieved June 11, 2019 from <https://stats.idre.ucla.edu/stata/dae/ordered-logistic-regression/>
- van der Zwet, A. (2015). Operationalising national identity: The cases of the Scottish National Party and Frisian National Party. *Nations and Nationalism*, 21(1), 62-82. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12091>
- Vertovec, S., & Cohen, R. (2002). Introduction: Conceiving cosmopolitanism. In S. Vertovec & R. Cohen (Eds.), *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context and practice* (pp. 1-22). Oxford University Press.
- Wesley, J. J. (2013). *Comparative provincial election project*. University of Alberta.
- Williams, R. (2006). Generalized ordered logit/partial proportional odds model for ordinal dependent variables. *The Stata Journal*, 6(1), 58-82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1536867X0600600104>
- Williams, R. (2016). Understanding and interpreting generalized ordered logit models. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 40(1), 7-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0022250X.2015.1112384>

Appendix

Here is the full excerpt from Ignatieff (2017, p. 28):

We are in a new moral era in which the struggle for equality has produced a clamor, sometimes violent, for recognition and acknowledgment. The affirmation of equal moral worth was evident every-where in our travels, but it was not always the dominant note in the quotidian struggle to do the right thing here and now. Here virtue showed its local face. Instead of using available universals, the people

we encountered simply sought to practice the ordinary virtues, as best they could, in daily life. No matter how differently people thought about specific issues, they all took for granted that life was an ongoing effort to justify and explain themselves in moral terms. These exercises in moral justification were not abstract and theoretical, but intensely practical, contextual, and local. The audiences they sought to justify themselves to were not general ones but local: family, friends, neighbors, significant others. Ordinary virtue—local, contextual, nonideological, antitheoretical—turned out to be the moral operating system of hyper-diverse cities as well as smaller communities from Bosnia to Burma.

As shown in the table below, local and global affiliations are interacting in a linearly subtractive fashion when it comes to predicting organizational engagement among official language minorities. Indeed, in both samples, the highest predictions are those based on ideal-types combining strong local with no global affiliations. Inversely, in both samples, the lowest predictions are those based on the ideal-type combining strong global with no local affiliations.

Table 8
Predicted Probabilities of Organizational Activism by Ideal-Type,
Control Variables Held at their Mean

Ideal-Types	Anglo-Quebecer sample	Franco-Ontarian sample
	Pr (Org.Activism) 95% CI	Pr (Org.Activism) 95% CI
Strong Local–No Global	0.595 (0.505-0.684)	0.710 (0.653-0.767)
Moderate Local–Weak Global	0.377 (0.322-0.432)	0.611 (0.558-0.665)
Weak Local–Moderate Global	0.267 (0.217-0.317)	0.395 (0.320-0.470)
No Local–Strong Global	0.069 (0.035-0.102)	0.252 (0.149-0.355)
Strong Local–Strong Global	0.379 (0.341-0.418)	0.488 (0.438-0.537)
Moderate Local–Moderate Global	0.393 (0.353-0.434)	0.618 (0.571-0.665)
Weak Local–Weak Global	0.254 (0.199-0.308)	0.388 (0.310-0.466)
No Local–No Global	0.151 (0.085-0.216)	0.464 (0.324-0.604)

Tables with the full detail of the proportional and partial proportional models

Organizational Activism as a Predictor of Affiliation Strength

Table 9
Proportional Odds and Partial Proportional Odds Models
for Organizational Activism x Strength of Cosmopolitan Identification

Predictors	Model 1: Proportional odds	Model 2: Partial proportional odds		
	Odds Ratio	L, M, S vs. N ^a	M, S vs. N, L	S vs. N, L, M
Org.Activist	.836**	.797*	.927	.763***
Franco-Ontarians	.580***	.500***	.506***	.666***
Age (in decades)	1.098***	1.100***	(<i>ibid</i>)	(<i>ibid</i>)
Female (ref. cat.: male)	1.027	.867	1.261**	.887
Educ. (ref. cat.: <= college)				
Undergraduate	.840**	1.255*	.903	.702***
Graduate	1.038	1.340*	1.277**	.840*
Area of Res. (ref. cat.: urban)				
Suburban	1.459***	5.106***	1.315**	1.353**
Rural	.726***	1.295*	.640***	.699***
Number of observations	462	462	462	462

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

a. N = Not at All, L = A Little, M = Moderately, S = Strongly.

Table 10
Logistic Regression Model for Organizational
Activism x Strength of Identification with Canada^a

Predictors	Odds Ratio
Org.Activist	.794***
Franco-Ontarians	1.054
Age (in decades)	1.205***
Female (ref. cat.: male)	1.410***
Educ. (ref. cat.: <=college)	
Undergraduate	.968
Graduate	.844*
Area of Res. (ref. cat.: urban)	
Suburban	1.249**
Rural	.935
Number of observations	458

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

a. Since most respondents in both groups indicated that they “moderately” or “strongly” identify with Canada, the dependent variable in the above model distinguishes between those who “strongly” identify and the rest of the sample. Organizational activists are thus slightly less likely to “strongly” identify with Canada than rank-and-file respondents, but remain very likely to “moderately” identify with Canada.

Table 11
Proportional Odds and Partial Proportional Odds Models
for Organizational Activism x Strength of Identification with Province

Predictors	Model 1:	Model 2:		
	Proportional odds	Partial proportional odds		
	Odds Ratio	L, M, S vs. N ^a	M, S vs. N, L	S vs. N, L, M
Org.Activist	1.698***	1.248	1.788***	1.769***
Franco-Ontarians	10.712***	36.034***	15.525***	9.062***
Age (in decades)	1.154***	1.008	1.183***	1.185***
Female (ref. cat.: male)	1.531***	1.786***	1.838***	1.259**
Educ. (ref. cat.: <= college)				
Undergraduate	.779***	.790***	.790***	.790***
Graduate	1.022	.713**	1.224*	.936
Area of Res. (ref. cat.: urban)				
Suburban	.736***	.568***	.708***	.969
Rural	1.092	1.422**	1.378***	.887
Number of observations	458	458	458	458

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

a. N = Not at All, L = A Little, M = Moderately, S = Strongly.

Table 12
Proportional Odds and Partial Proportional Odds Models
for Organizational Activism x Strength of Identification with Municipality

Predictors	Model 1:	Model 2:		
	Proportional odds	Partial proportional odds		
	Odds Ratio	L, M, S vs. N ^a	M, S vs. N, L	S vs. N, L, M
Org. Activist	1.557***	1.762**	2.101***	1.391***
Franco-Ontarians	1.633***	1.464*	1.967***	1.504***
Age (in decades)	1.079***	1.172**	1.171***	1.044*
Female (ref. cat.: male)	1.350***	1.582**	1.651***	1.203**
Educ. (ref. cat.: <= college)				
Undergraduate	.849*	1.577**	.572***	.994
Graduate	1.298***	2.162***	1.229	1.361***
Area of Res. (ref. cat.: urban)				
Suburban	.549***	.839	.416***	.602***
Rural	1.215**	.859	.864	1.383***
Number of observations	457	457	457	457

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

a. N = Not at All, L = A Little, M = Moderately, S = Strongly.

Group as a Predictor of Affiliation Strength

Table 13
Proportional Odds and Partial Proportional Odds Models
for Group x Cosmopolitanism (H2a)

Predictors	Model 1:	Model 2:		
	Proportional odds	Partial proportional odds		
	Odds Ratio	L, M, S vs. N ^a	M, S vs. N, L	S vs. N, L, M
Franco-Ontarians	.559***	.479***	.500***	.630***
Age (in decades)	1.097***	1.096***	—	—
Female (ref. cat.: male)	.997	.829	1.249**	.847*
Educ. (ref. cat.: <= college)				
Undergraduate	.828**	1.233	.902	.692***
Graduate	1.027	1.331*	1.295**	.825*
Area of Res. (ref. cat.: urban)				
Suburban	1.457***	5.062***	1.326**	1.349***
Rural	.713***	1.248*	.637***	.686***

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

a. N = Not at All, L = A Little, M = Moderately, S = Strongly.

Table 14
Proportional Odds for Group x National Affiliation (H2b)

Predictors	Proportional Odds Model	
	Odds Ratio	
Franco-Ontarians	1.014	
Age (in decades)	1.212***	
Female (ref. cat.: male)	1.374***	
Educ. (ref. cat.: <= college)		
Undergraduate	1.015	
Graduate	0.851	
Area of Res. (ref. cat.: urban)		
Suburban	1.308**	
Rural	0.882	

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

Table 15
Proportional Odds and Partial Proportional Odds Models for Group x Provincial Affiliation (H2c)

Predictors	Model 1: Proportional odds	Model 2: Generalized Ordered Logit		
	Odds Ratio	L, M, S vs. N ^a	M, S vs. N, L	S vs. N, L, M
Franco-Ontarians	11.588***	39.690***	16.333***	10.074***
Age (in decades)	1.152***	1.011	1.184***	1.174***
Female (ref. cat.: male)	1.677***	1.857***	1.996***	1.414***
Educ. (ref. cat.: <=college)				
Undergraduate	.816**	.770*	.939	.755**
Graduate	1.036	.731*	1.287**	.898
Area of Res. (ref. cat.: urban)				
Suburban	.755***	.567***	.721***	1.003
Rural	1.172*	1.452**	1.494***	.964

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

a. N = Not at All, L = A Little, M = Moderately, S = Strongly.

Table 16
Proportional Odds and Partial Proportional Odds Models
for Group x Local Affiliation (H2d)

Predictors	Model 1: Proportional odds	Model 2: Generalized Ordered Logit		
	Odds Ratio	L, M, S vs. N ^a	M, S vs. N, L	S vs. N, L, M
Franco-Ontarians	1.748***	1.682**	2.269***	1.565***
Age (in decades)	1.074***	1.173**	1.164***	1.039*
Female (ref. cat.: male)	1.430***	1.671***	1.771***	1.263***
Educ. (ref. cat.: <=college)				
Undergraduate	.865*	1.537**	.576***	1.019
Graduate	1.266**	2.069***	1.151	1.342***
Area of Res. (ref. cat.: urban)				
Suburban	.544***	.833	.423***	.591***
Rural	1.281***	.919	.933	1.429***

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

a. N = Not at All, L = A Little, M = Moderately, S = Strongly.

Keywords

official language minority, cosmopolitanism, localism, socio-territorial affiliations, Canada, modelling

Mots clés

minorité de langue officielle, cosmopolitisme, localisme, appartenance socio-territoriale, Canada, modélisation

Correspondance

pierre-olivier.bonin@hotmail.com