**Appendix**

#

# On Coding the “Ethnicity” Variable

The 2015 CES Web Survey does not contain a measure of race. It asks respondents to indicate their ethnicity from a list of 17 options, almost entirely restricted to Whites or Indigenous Canadians. The options are Canadian, British, Chinese, Dutch, English, French, German, Hispanic, Iris, Italian, Indian, Polish, Scottish, Ukrainian, French Canadian, “Inuit, Métis, Aboriginal” (variable ethn\_abor), or Québécois. Respondents also had the option of selecting “other” (and listing up to two “other” identities” and typing in responses, which roughly 16% of the sample did). I encoded and recoded all of these responses. If respondents listed an ethnicity from a European country, they were coded as being White. If respondents listed a non-European country, they were coded as being a visible minority. If respondents listed an Indigenous ancestry, they were coded as being Indigenous. This required making some problematic assumptions. As a robustness check, I compared White, visible minority, and Indigenous respondents’ average scores on feeling thermometers of immigrants, Aboriginals, and minorities. The average feelings differ significantly between groups in the expected direction (see the annotated Stata do file in the replication materials, available at: https://www.edanabeauvais.com/data). Note that the variable ethn\_abor (asking respondents whether they are “Inuit, Métis, Aboriginal”) is potentially problematic, partly because many Indigenous Canadians likely think of themselves as “First Nations.” This is because the Canadian government legally recognizes three categories for “status Indians” (for Indigenous peoples recognized by treaties with the Canadian government): Inuit, Métis, and First Nations. Confusingly, there is another item on the CES 2015 that specifically asks whether respondents identify as Aboriginal, defined as belonging to an Inuit, Métis, or First Nations group (the variable is p\_aborig). I coded respondents as “Indigenous” if they identified as “Inuit, Métis, Aboriginal” (ethn\_abor), listed an Indigenous identity in the open-ended option, or identified as Aboriginal for the p\_aborig variable. Most respondents identified who identified as Indigenous for the ethn\_abor variable identified as Indigenous when answering the p\_aborig variable, increasing my confidence in the measure (although slightly more respondents answered the p\_aborig variable). One final difficulty coding the ethnicity variable is that many respondents (over one-third of the sample) identify as “Canadian.” As in other European or European settler countries, the baseline or prototypical citizen in Canada is often conceived of as White. Are Canadian-identifying respondents more like Whites, or are they more like visible minorities or Indigenous Canadians? I use difference of means tests to compare Canadian-identifying, White, visible minority, and Indigenous respondents’ average scores on feeling

# Tables

**Table A1:** Logistic Regression Results, Controlling for Talking Politics

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | -1.63\*\*\* | -1.63\*\*\* | -1.53\*\*\* | -1.76\*\*\* |
|  | (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.18) | (0.18) |
| Woman | -0.21\*\* | -0.21\*\* | -0.27\*\*\* | -0.21\*\* |
|  | (0.09) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) |
| Age | -0.01\*\*\* | -0.01\*\*\* | -0.01\*\*\* | -0.01\*\* |
|  | (>0.01) | (>0.01) | (>0.01) | (>0.01) |
| Quebec | -0.44\*\*\* | -0.44\*\*\* | -0.41\*\*\* | -0.46\*\*\* |
|  | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) |
| Visible minority | 0.05 | 0.11 | 0.017 | 0.06 |
|  | (0.14) | (0.19) | (0.15) | (0.14) |
| Indigenous | 0.60\*\*\* | 0.42 | 0.52\*\* | 0.59\*\*\* |
|  | (0.21) | (0.30) | (0.22) | (0.22) |
| Talk politics with friends | 0.40\*\*\* | 0.40\*\*\* | 0.41\*\*\* | 0.40\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) |
| Visible minority woman |  | -0.138 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.27) |  |  |
| Indigenous woman |  | 0.356 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.42) |  |  |
| Poverty |  |  | -0.66\*\*\* |  |
|  |  |  | (0.17) |  |
| Woman living in poverty |  |  | 0.35 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.24) |  |
| Young children at home |  |  |  | 0.44\*\* |
|  |  |  |  | (0.21) |
| Woman with young children |  |  |  | 0.17 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.30) |
| *N* | 3,743 | 3,743 | 3,527 | 3,711 |
| Pseudo *R2* | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.13 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses |
| \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1 |

**Table A2:** Predicted Probability of Participating in Group Deliberation (Model 1)

Predictive margins

Men 0.25\*\*\*

(0.01)

Women 0.20\*\*\*

(0.01)

*Gender gap* -0.05\*\*\*

(0.01)

*N* 3,984

Standard errors in parentheses

Significant at *∗p < .*05; *∗∗p < .*01; *∗∗∗p < .*001

**Table A3:** Predicted Probability of Participating in Group Deliberation (Model 2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Predictive margins |
| White | Men | 0.24\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.01) |
|  | Women | 0.20 |
|  |  | (0.01) |
|  | *White gender gap* | -0.05\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.02) |
| Visible minority | Men | 0.31\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.03) |
|  | Women | 0.19 |
|  |  | (0.03) |
|  | *Visible min. gender gap* | -0.11\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.04) |
| Indigenous | Men | 0.36\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.06) |
|  | Women | 0.34\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.06) |
|  | *Indigenous gender gap* | -0.02\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.08) |

Standard errors in parentheses

Significant at *∗p < .*05; *∗∗p < .*01; *∗∗∗p < .*001

**Table A4:** Predicted Probability of Participating in Group Deliberation (Model 3)

Predictive margins

Not low-income Men 0.28\*\*\* (0.01)

Women 0.22\*\*\*

(0.01)

*Not poor gender gap* -0.06\*\*\* (0.02)

Low-income Men 0.17\*\*\* (0.02)

Women 0.16\*\*\*

(0.01)

*Poor gender gap* -0.01\*\*\* (0.03)

Standard errors in parentheses

Significant at *∗p < .*05; *∗∗p < .*01; *∗∗∗p < .*001

**Table A5:** Predicted Probability of Participating in Group Deliberation (Model 4)

Predictive margins

No young kids Men 0.25\*\*\*

(0.01)

Women 0.20\*\*\*

(0.01)

*No kids gender gap* -0.05\*\*\* (0.02)

Young kids at home Men 0.34\*\*\*

(0.04)

Women 0.26\*\*\*

(0.04)

*Parents with young kids gender gap* -0.08\*\*\*

(0.05)

Standard errors in parentheses

Significant at *∗p < .*05; *∗∗p < .*01; *∗∗∗p < .*001

**Table A6:** Logistic Regression Results Model 3, Controlling for Education

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Model 3 |
|  |  |
| Intercept | -0.89\*\*\* |
|  | (0.20) |
| Woman | -0.31\*\*\* |
|  | (0.10) |
| Age | -0.01\*\*\* |
|  | (>0.01) |
| Quebec | -0.49\*\*\* |
|  | (0.09) |
| Visible minority | 0.03 |
|  | (0.14) |
| Indigenous | 0.72\*\*\* |
|  | (0.20) |
| Poverty | -0.45\*\*\* |
|  | (0.16) |
| Woman living in poverty | 0.27 |
|  | (0.22) |
| Education (some college) | 0.15 |
|  | (0.11) |
| Education (university degree) | 0.72\*\*\* |
|  | (0.13) |
| Education (post-grad) | 0.91\*\*\* |
|  | (0.15) |
| N | 3,738 |
| Pseudo *R2* | 0.04 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses |
| \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1 |

# Figures

**Figure A1:** Model 2 Predictive Margins for Ethnicity (by Gender), 90% CIs



**Figure A2:** Model 3 Predictive Margins for Poverty (by Gender), 90% CIs



**Figure A3:** Model 4 Predictive Margins for Kids (by Gender), 90% CIs

