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Abstract

Utilizing survey data collected through the City Planning and Indigeneity on the Prairies (CPIP) Project in the summer of 2014 this thesis examines what, if any, affect contact between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people has on non-Aboriginal people’s racial attitudes. Two hypotheses are tested: contact with Aboriginal people reduces new and old-fashioned racism attitudes amongst non-Aboriginal people; and contact has greater effect on the racial attitudes of those with lower education levels than those with higher education levels. Key findings indicate that both hypotheses are in fact correct but each with its own caveats.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Introduction to Research Topic

Racial attitudes, and the factors that influence them, have been the focus of many studies in social science research. North American psychologist Gordon Allport believed research on racial attitudes in America rose to prominence in 1943 after race riots erupted in four of the USA’s largest cities (Allport 1963). Allport’s (1954) Contact Hypothesis was one explanation as to how to affect change in racial attitudes. The Contact Hypothesis asserted that contact between in-group and out-group members can encourage more positive attitudes regarding the outgroup (Allport, 1954). This prompted a wealth of research over the next 60 years, examining which conditions and what types of groups contact between might affect attitudinal changes. A meta-analysis done by Pettigrew and Tropp in 2006 looked at 515 studies involving a quarter of a million participants in 38 nations, and found that intergroup contact typically corresponds with lower levels of prejudice, with 94 per cent of studies finding an inverse relationship between contact and prejudice against the out-group. Their analysis found that contact reduces not only racial prejudice, but also other forms of prejudice such as homophobia, ageism, and xenophobia (Pettigrew and Tropp 2006).

Research on contact theory concerning attitudes towards racial groups in Canada is extremely rare, and has only been explicitly tested in limited settings (Beaton, Monger, Leblanc, Bourque, Levi, Joseph, Richard, Bourque, and Chouinard, 2012;
Vorauer and Sasaki, 2009). Indeed, Canadian studies of racial attitudes towards Aboriginal peoples are few in number (Morrison, Morrison, Harriman and Jewell, 2008; Beaton, Dovidio, and LeBlanc, 2011; Vorauer, Hunter, Main, and Roy 2000). This thesis seeks to add to both the overall body of literature concerning contact theory as well as the smaller body of literature concerning non-Aboriginal people’s attitudes towards Aboriginal people.

1.2. Research Question

1.2.1 Hypotheses

Building on contact theory research, the research question to be discussed in this thesis is:

To what extent does individual contact influence non-Aboriginal people’s attitudes towards Aboriginal peoples?

Examining this question will give insight into how to improve relations between the two groups. The thesis will be testing the following two hypotheses:

(1) Contact with Aboriginal people reduces new and old-fashioned racism attitudes amongst non-Aboriginal people.
(2) Contact has greater effect on the racial attitudes of those with lower education levels than those with higher education levels.

The conceptual definitions of new and old-fashioned racism and contact will be clarified in Chapter Two. If proven correct the first will establish contact theory as being applicable in the Canadian context. The second hypothesis if proven to be correct will establish that racial attitudes are affected by the interaction between contact and educational levels.
1.2.2 Methods

In order to test the hypotheses outlined above original data collected during June and July of 2014 during the City Planning and Indigeneity on the Prairies (CPIP) survey is utilized. As a member of this project I assisted the project leader, Dr. Ryan Walker from the University of Saskatchewan’s Department of Geography and Planning, and co-investigator Dr. Loleen Berdahl from the University of Saskatchewan’s Department of Political Studies, in researching and selecting the survey questions relevant to this thesis topic.

Once this information was collected, I ran univariate, bivariate and multivariate data analyses using variables to measure new and old-fashioned racism as well as a number of control variables that other research has indicated may contribute to racial attitudes. The process and findings of the analyses are discussed fully in Chapter Three.

1.2.3 Findings in Brief

The CPIP study findings indicate that interpersonal contact is negatively associated with racism: as contact increases, racism decreases. However, the type of contact matters: personal relationships result in both decreased old-fashioned and new racism, whereas simple general contact only reduces old-fashioned racism. These findings suggest that increased Aboriginal presence in cities alone will not be sufficient
to reduce new racism; instead, shifting attitudes will require more close and meaningful relations between the two groups.

This thesis examines the relationship between interpersonal contact and new and old-fashioned racism scores. In order for a government to effectively address these issues it is necessary to study what affects non-Aboriginal people’s attitudes towards Aboriginal people. As limited research has been done in this area, this thesis provides a base for future research studies on non-Aboriginal people’s attitudes towards Aboriginal peoples by testing measures and a theory not yet explored in depth in the Canadian context. Additionally, by addressing the Canadian context this thesis contributes to broader individual contact theory literature.

1.3 Context

1.3.1 Statistics

What factors influence non-Aboriginal Canadians’ attitudes towards Aboriginal peoples? This is an increasingly important question for social cohesion\(^1\) in Canada, as the number of people in Canada who identified themselves as an Aboriginal person, that being First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples, in 2011 reached 1,400,685 and making up 4.3 percent of Canada’s total population (Statistics Canada, 2011). Between 1996 and 2006 the Aboriginal population grew by 45 percent, nearly six times faster than the 8 percent rate of increase for Canada’s non-Aboriginal population, and from 2006 to 2011 the Aboriginal population increased by 20.1 percent, a significantly greater increase
than that for the non-Aboriginal population growth of 5.2 percent (Statistics Canada, 2011).

When considering the Aboriginal population distribution, it is important to note that 56.6 percent of the total Aboriginal population resides in the four western provinces, British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba (Statistics Canada, 2011). Additionally, Aboriginal peoples represent a larger portion of total prairie populations, including a larger portion of prairie city populations (Statistics Canada, 2008). Data collected by Statistics Canada in 2006 also indicates that the proportion of the Aboriginal population living in urban centers had increased, from 50 percent to 54 percent between 1996 and 2006 (Statistics Canada, 2008). In 2011, 37.6% of First Nations people lived on-reserve, while 62.4% lived off-reserve (Statistics Canada, 2011).

As the fastest growing population in Canada, and with the majority of its members being under the age of 25, Aboriginal people stand to have an ever-increasing impact in Canada. This is especially true in Prairie cities where the Aboriginal proportion of the population is higher than in Eastern cities (Statistics Canada 2008; Statistics Canada 2011). The youngest Aboriginal populations are First Nations who live in Saskatchewan and Manitoba, with a median age of 20 and 21 years respectively, which is about half of the median age for the non-Aboriginal population in Saskatchewan and Manitoba (Statistics Canada, 2011). Moreover, in 2011 First Nation children made up 20 percent of all children under the age of 14 in Saskatchewan and 18.4 percent of all children under the age of 14 in Manitoba (Statistics Canada, 2011). From this it can be
then inferred that this percentage would increase in both provinces if all Aboriginal children were included.

Given the rapid increase in the Aboriginal population, and the pattern of First Nation peoples reserve to urban center migration, it is important to determine what factors affect non-Aboriginal people’s attitudes towards Aboriginal peoples in order to promote greater social cohesion. There is extensive evidence that if a diverse neighbourhood lacks social cohesion, members will have lower levels of interpersonal trust, social capital, and cooperation (Wu, Hou, and Schimmele, 2011). However, the racial heterogeneity of an area only becomes a problem when there is also a lack of social interaction between individuals, or worse, intergroup conflicts (Wu, Hou, and Schimmele, 2011). Although Reitz and Banerjee suggest that pride in Canadian multiculturalism has led to a reluctance to examine or acknowledge whether minority groups experience prejudice or discrimination in Canada (as cited in Currie, Wild, Schopflocher, Laing, and Veugelers 2012, 623), studies indicate that Canadians perceive relations between Aboriginal people and non-Aboriginal people to be negative and not improving, and that Aboriginal people still frequently experience racism in their lives (Environics Institute, 2010; Corenblum and Stephan, 2001; Currie, Wild, Schopflocher, Laing, and Veugelers, 2012). In the face of growing societal diversity, greater efforts are being made to acknowledge and accommodate racial and ethnic diversity (Tropp and Bianchi 2006). Addressing racism remains a challenge for many societies, and racism can manifest at the cultural, institutional, interpersonal, and even the intrapersonal levels if the targets of racism internalize those attitudes towards their own racial or
ethnic group (Brondolo, Libretti, Rivera, and Walsemann, 2012). This thesis will focus on interpersonal racial attitudes, but it is important to acknowledge the additional forms of racism listed above that exist in society.

**1.3.2 Why Understanding Racial Attitudes Matter: Answering The “So What” Question**

Societies are becoming increasingly more diverse and social norms and institutions have begun to change, with greater efforts being made to acknowledge and encourage racial and ethnic diversity (Tropp and Bianchi 2006). Encouraging positive racial attitudes is especially crucial for countries such as Canada that encourage multiculturalism. The key challenge for diverse multicultural societies like Canada is establishing a cosmopolitan sense of belonging that represents inclusive relations between the majority in-group and the minority out-group (Wu, Hou, and Schimmele, 2011), encouraging members of all ethnic groups to thrive socially, economically and individually. Negative racial attitudes, especially when combined with a multicultural society, can erode social cohesion and result in numerous social issues (Toye, 2007; Wu, Hou and Schimmele 2011; Brondolo, Libretti, Rivera, and Walsemann 2012), health concerns (Currie, Wild, Schopflocher, Laing, and Veugelers 2012), economic difficulties (Environics Institute, 2010), and personal issues (Michalos and Zumbo, 2001) for citizens.

**1.3.2.a Linkage Between Racial Attitudes and Social Cohesion**

The main concern at a social level, as previously stated, is social cohesion. Social cohesion is a concept that emerged in Canada and Europe in the early 1990s (Toye,
2007). In June 1999, a federal parliamentary committee issued a final report on social cohesion in Canada, concluding that tensions involving social cohesion were unlikely to disappear on their own. This led to the creation of an interdepartmental Social Cohesion Network to clarify the meaning of social cohesion and identify directions for future research. It was concluded that social cohesion requires, “Economic and social equity, peace, security, inclusion and access” (Toye, 2007: 3), but did not mean homogeneity or conformity.

The motivating concern from a government perspective is that the social exclusion of individuals and groups can become a significant threat to social cohesion and economic prosperity for society as a whole (Toye, 2007). It was found that communities that boasted high levels of social cohesion have better health, cities with high levels of social cohesion have lower infant mortality rates, and societies that have greater income disparities and lower social cohesion have higher levels of crime and violence and higher mortality rates (Toye, 2007). Essentially social cohesion is a factor not only in improving health outcomes, but was found to be a key factor in promoting economic growth in countries in the European Union in 2007 (Toye, 2007).

1.3.2 b Linkage Between Racial Attitudes and Aboriginal Health Outcomes

There is a disparity between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people’s health outcomes, as evidenced by the fact that Aboriginal people have a shorter expected lifespan (Public Health Agency of Canada, 2012; Veenstra, 2009). Currently, the life expectancy of a Métis man is 71.9 years and 77.7 years for a Métis woman, for a First Nations man is 71.1 years and 76.7 for a First Nations woman, and finally for an Inuit
man is 62.6 years and 71.7 years for an Inuit woman. Comparatively, for non-Aboriginal peoples the life expectancy for a man is 79 years and 83 years for a woman. Aboriginal peoples also suffer from a wide variety of health problems; in comparison to their non-Aboriginal counterparts their instances of tuberculosis is six to seven times higher, they are four to five times more likely to be diabetic, three times more likely to have heart disease, and twice as likely to report a long term disability (Kirmayer, Simpson, and Caro, 2003). Aboriginal people are more likely than non-Aboriginal people to die from injuries or poison, and have increased deaths as a result of diabetes. They also have a much higher suicide rate for youths than any other group of Canadian youths; with age standardized rates that are three to six times higher than the general population (Veenstra, 2009; Kirmayer, Simpson, and Caro, 2003). Research has indicated that these disparities in health outcomes are not fully explained by traditional risk factors, such as income, education, employment, and lifestyle choices (Currie, Wild, Schopflocher, Laing, and Veugelers, 2012).

Theories using experiences of racism and discrimination as an independent variable for health disparities among minority populations are gaining attention in countries, such as the USA (Brondolo, Libretti, Rivera, and Walsemann, 2012; Brondolo, Hausmann, Jhalani, Pencille, Atencio-Bacayon, Kumar, and Schwartz, 2011; Anderson, 2013), New Zealand (Harris, Tobias, Jeffreys, Waldgrave, Karlsen, and Nazroo, 2006), the United Kingdom, and Australia (Priest, Paradies, Treenny, Truong, Karlsen, Kelly, 2013), and are beginning to generate research in other countries, including Canada (Currie, Wild, Schopflocher, Laing, and Veugelers, 2012; Kirmayer, Simpson, and Cargo, 2003;
Veenstra, 2009). Overall, there appears to be a particularly harmful factor associated with race-related discrimination that degrades health by promoting depression, anxiety, and cynical hostility (Brondolo, Hausmann, Jhalani, Pencille, Atencio-Bacayon, Kumar, and Schwartz, 2011).

Currie, Wild, Schopflocher, Laing, and Veugelers note in their research (2012) that the idea that discrimination may affect health and psychological well-being is not innovative. They state that living in a social context that denies a person a sense of dignity can negatively affect their feelings of personal security and affect their sense of personal worth and competence, which holds inferences of inferiority in which few people can feel respected, valued, and confident. The result is adverse psychological states that can have enduring harmful affects on health. It is also noted by Kirmayer, Simpson and Cargo (2003) that an individual’s identity and self-esteem may draw on a collective identity, in this case race, and when that collective identity is devalued an individual’s esteem, social capital, power and mobility may suffer. Many studies emphasize emotional or mental health as a pathway to physical symptoms (Anderson, 2013).

Beyond simply the mental stress of being discriminated against, researchers have identified several ways racial discrimination can affect health, including: (1) restricting access to social resources, for example employment, housing, and education, (2) negatively affecting cognitive or other patho-psychological processes, (3) allostatic load (wear and tear on the body caused by prolonged mental stress) or other patho-physiological processes, (4) reducing healthy behaviours like exercise or increasing
unhealthy behaviours such as overeating, or substance (smoking, alcohol, drugs) misuse either directly as stress-coping or indirectly via self-regulation, and finally (5) direct physical injury caused by racist violence (Priest, Paradies, Trenerry, Truong, Karlsen, and Kelly, 2013; Anderson, 2013).

One should note that the second way of affecting health researchers identified above, access to social resources such as employment, will directly relate to the next section, economic difficulties. Lack of access to employment can affect health through lack of income, or poor health can prevent an individual from gaining or maintaining employment. Furthermore, Canadians have universal health care, meaning the cost of treatment is shared among all citizens. The potential monetary savings should motivate all Canadians to reduce racism and lower health costs.

1.3.2.c Linkage Between Racial Attitudes and Aboriginal Economic Outcomes

As pointed out above, there are potential economic costs that go hand in hand with health, one of which is unemployment. Unemployment is considered one of the larger economic issues as Aboriginal peoples’ unemployment superseded non-Aboriginal people’s unemployment in 2006 over two times at 13.2 percent and 5.2 percent respectively (Environs Institute, 2010). This problem is especially concerning for western provinces where Aboriginal peoples make up a larger proportion of the provinces’ total population. The estimated growth of the proportion of Aboriginal people in their 20s, and thus most eligible for employment, is expected to increase in Saskatchewan and Manitoba between 2001 and 2017 from 17 to 30 percent and 17 percent to 23 percent respectively (Statistics Canada, 2007). The potential impact these
young people will have on the labour market, and consequently the economy, is substantial.

Racial isolation in the workplace is also a concern. When Aboriginal people look for work it may be more difficult for them to gain employment. In a study looking at blue-collar jobs, it was found that in one quarter of all referrals in the businesses studied come from social networks consisting of friends and relatives (Brondolo, Libretti, Rivera, and Walsemann, 2012). The inference is that when social networks are more racially segregated it makes it difficult for members of the out-group to access employment firms that employ large numbers of in-group individuals (Brondolo, Libretti, Rivera, and Walsemann, 2012). Even if an out-group individual gains employment they may continue to experience discrimination in reduced opportunities for promotion, collaboration, or professional development. Out-group individuals may find that discrimination is communicated subtly through lowered expectations, decreased opportunities for collaboration or mentorship, or feedback that is either over or under accommodating (Brondolo, Libretti, Rivera, and Walsemann, 2012).

Additionally, Paas and Halapuu (2012) note that the key elements of global competition have shifted away from trade in goods, services and flows of capital, towards a competition for people. They outline the potential impact of Richard Florida’s ‘Three T (Technology, Talent, Tolerance)’ Theory, which stresses the role of the collaboration of technology, talent and tolerance in attracting and retaining creative and diverse people, which can spur economic growth and development. Economic growth and development is noticeably affected by the capacity of countries to attract and
integrate diverse, creative and innovative people, and to support the tolerance of diversity. An ethnically and culturally diverse population creates higher variability in the demand for goods and services, as well as higher variability of the source of labour through differing skills and business cultures. In turn, this creates favourable preconditions for new business activities and future economic growth (Paas and Halapuu, 2012). Racism, by nature, is conflicting with tolerance and, as such, countries that are perceived to have citizens that hold racist sentiments could have more difficulty when attempting to attract highly educated and skilled immigrants.

1.3.2.d Impact of Racial Attitudes on Dominant Group Members

Concerning the perpetrators of discrimination and their quality of life, one study out of Prince George, B.C., found that individuals who had high xenophobic, or racist, scores were negatively related to happiness, and also negatively related to satisfaction with life scores (Michalos and Zumbo, 2001). Such studies suggest that racism not only has a negative impact on those whom are the targets of racism as outlined above, but also for those who perpetrate racism in society.

1.3.2.e Summary: Why Understanding Racial Attitudes Matters

It is important to address negative racial attitudes in society so as to subvert the burgeoning social issues, health concerns, economic difficulties and personal problems that arise from leaving these negative attitudes unchecked. As stated above it is unlikely that the tensions that negatively affect social cohesion will disappear without some form of intervention. In order to intervene it is necessary to first to access what the
current racial attitudes are, and seek to discover the factors that influence them. By accessing attitudes and identifying factors that contribute to negative racial attitudes policy makers can create more effective policies to combat racism; researchers will also benefit by examining the results of a study with a large random probability sample size and be able to build on the CPIP results.

There is a relatively small body of research on Canadians’ attitudes towards other racial groups, especially when concerning attitudes of non-Aboriginal peoples towards Aboriginal peoples. Despite being Canada’s first inhabitants, Aboriginal peoples lag behind the rest of the country in terms of employment, education, health, life expectancy, and income (Statistics Canada 2008; Statistics Canada 2011). Additionally, studies have found that Aboriginal people are often subject to discrimination and stereotyping consistent with negative racial attitudes (Environics Institute, 2010; Currie, Wild, Schopflocher, Laing, and Veugelers, 2012). However, Canadian studies are few in number and more research needs to be done to address this literature gap; this thesis seeks to contribute to this emerging literature.

1.4 Road Map

This thesis is split into four chapters. Chapter Two is a literature review that defines concepts, examines multiple theories used to explain racial attitudes with a focus on contact theory, and discusses relevant studies done in Canada. Chapter Three is the data, analysis and discussion chapter. This chapter fully outlines the methodology used, summarizes findings at the univariate, bivariate and multivariate level, and finally discusses these findings as they relate to the hypotheses and research question. Chapter
Four is the concluding chapter; it reiterates all pertinent information as well as discusses direction for future researchers.
Chapter 2. Literature Review

There are few studies on non-Aboriginal Canadians’ attitudes towards Aboriginal people, and even fewer studies, with small sample sizes, that explicitly consider the effect of contact theory on new racism measures (Beaton et al., 2012; Vorauer and Sasaki, 2009). This chapter begins by defining key concepts, including contact, old-fashioned racism and new racism. The chapter then outlines individual contact theory, contrasting this theory with other prevalent theories factors that contribute to racial attitudes. Having established that contact theory is an appropriate model to test in the Canadian context, this chapter then identifies Canadian studies concerning racism or discrimination towards Aboriginal peoples and Canadian studies that evaluate current racial attitudes towards Aboriginal people. Through this literature review, this chapter demonstrates that there is insufficient understanding of the determinants of non-Aboriginal Canadians’ attitudes towards Aboriginal peoples.

2.1 Defining Concepts

In order to properly explain individual contact theory, some concepts first need to be defined. For the purpose of this thesis the term contact will refer to direct or face-to-face contact rather than indirect or imagined contact (Hewstone and Swart 2011). This definition is consistent with the broader literature on contact theory.

Racism is commonly defined as incorporating the norms, ideologies, and behaviours that perpetuate racial inequality. Racism can manifest at the cultural, institutional, interpersonal, and even the intrapersonal levels if the target of racism internalizes those attitudes towards their own racial or ethnic group (Brondolo, Libretti,
Rivera, and Walsemann, 2012). The type of racism this thesis examines is interpersonal racism. Interpersonal racism occurs when stereotypes held by the perpetrator are activated by the phenotypic or cultural characteristics of another individual. These stereotypes, rather than the individual’s personal characteristics, influence the perpetrator’s perceptions of and responses to that individual (Brondolo, Libretti, Rivera, and Walsemann 2012). Interpersonal race-based maltreatment can include social exclusion, discrimination at work or school, stigmatization, and physical threat or harassment (Brondolo, Libretti, Rivera, and Walsemann 2012).

The majority of residents in North America recognize that expressing racist sentiments is socially unacceptable, and are reluctant to utter or otherwise display them (Michalos and Zumbo, 2001; Sommer and Norton, 2006). Due to this awareness, two types of racism are widely identified in the academic literature: Old-Fashioned (or overt) racism and new racism (Huddy and Feldman, 2009). Old-fashioned racism is often linked to rhetoric that suggests members of another race, often non-Caucasians, are morally and biologically deficient, animal-like and dirty (Banks and Valentino, 2012). New racism in contrast, focuses on perceived unfair demands or special treatment of another racial group rather than perceived biological differences (Banks and Valentino, 2012). The following definitions have been adapted from Huddy and Feldman (2009) to fit the Canadian context:

- Old-Fashioned (overt) racism is reflected in negative feelings toward Aboriginal people and a belief that Aboriginal people are inherently inferior to non-Aboriginal people.

- New racism is a subtler racial prejudice conveyed through opposition to Aboriginal people’s demands and resentment of their special treatment.
As a contemporary concept in political science, new racism faces much contestation; while the concept is known by multiple names, such as symbolic racism, subtle racism, modern racism, or aversive racism, often the definitions are very similar with only minor alterations (Durrheim, Baillie, and Johnstone, 2008). The literature on new racism (and near identical conceptual counterparts) is vast throughout Canada, the USA and Europe. One thing all conceptual definitions of new racism hold in common is the belief that a racial group is not only demanding, but also undeserving and does not require any form of special government assistance (Huddy and Feldman, 2009).

A unique aspect regarding new racism sentiments and Aboriginal people, as opposed to the various ethnic groups that have been considered in other studies, is the fact that Aboriginal people in Canada have group rights granted to them through the treaties and through the Constitution.

2.1.1 Challenges in Researching Racial Attitudes

While these conceptual definitions of racism are consistent with the academic literature, it is important to note three challenges in measuring racial attitudes. First, a criticism of new racism measures is the fact that they may be confounded with conservative ideologies such as preference for small government, or individualism, which are a nonracial value (Banks and Valentino, 2012; Huddy and Feldman, 2009; Sears, Van Laar Carrillo and Kosterman, 1997). In fact, Kinder and Sanders believe that individualism has become entwined with racism (Huddy and Feldman, 2009). For this reason, in studying new racism it is important to include measures to control for
individualism. It should be noted that studies have been done that have found that new racism is a distinct idea that can be used to predict racial policy attitudes even after controlling for individualism (Rabinowitz, Sears, Sidanius and Krosnick 2009; Tarman and Sears 2005). For example, a Canadian study (N=86) done looking whether ideology (specifically, individualism) or modern racism (new racism) sentiments affected individuals’ decisions to assign hypothetical government reparations to abuse victims found that individuals who scored high in new racism were less likely to assign reparations when individuals were of Aboriginal rather than European descent (Blatz and Ross, 2009).

A second challenge with studying racial attitudes is that individuals differ in their understandings and perceptions of race. The majority of individuals understand that a person’s race is legally determined through the one-drop rule, whereby an individual inherits their race from their ancestors (Glasgow, Shulman and Covarrubias, 2009), regardless of an individuals phenotypic attributes. In Canada, Aboriginal people are legally defined under Section 35 (2) of the Constitution Act, 1982 as including the Indian (First Nation), Inuit, and Métis peoples of Canada. This legal definition likewise draws on the one-drop rule, and as such will be our method when considering Aboriginal peoples. Another way of considering race is with the understanding that an individual’s appearance is the result of their genetics, and again directly related to their ancestors (Glasgow, Shulman and Covarrubias, 2009). This means that phenotypic attributes often play a role in how individuals may perceive another person’s race. Unless otherwise informed, individuals may not perceive an individual to fit the phenotypic stereotype of
their legal race. This relates to the group saliency issue in contact theory that is discussed below in section 2.2.2.

A final challenge with studying racial attitudes, especially those that are self-reported, is that there is always a chance respondents will provide a more ‘moderate’ or ‘politically correct’ response if they feel their true answer would be socially undesirable (Huddy and Feldman, 2009; Krysan, 1998). However, when addressing racial attitudes, and in particular new racist attitudes, one must note that individuals may not conceptualize ‘racism’ to include new racism (Sommers and Norton, 2006). By conceptualizing racism narrowly to only include old-fashioned racism individuals protect their sense of self-identity by not including himself or herself in the aversive category of “racist”. This is problematic as those who are most likely to think racist thoughts or commit racist acts are also the people least likely to see these attitudes and actions as racist (Sommer and Norton, 2006). Additionally respondents who view the basis for their answers to be non-racial in nature protect their self-image of being nonracist (Krysan, 1998). However, this may actually work in the studies’ favour as it may reduce the effect of social desirability and as such people would give more honest responses rather than attempt to appear to be ‘politically correct’.

2.2 Explaining Racial Attitudes: Contact Theory and Other Theories Explained

There are many possible determinants of non-Aboriginal people’s attitudes towards Aboriginal peoples in Canada. As there is minimal research in this area, this thesis draws primarily on studies done in other countries that have racial conflicts (i.e. USA, South Africa, Australia), as well as countries in Europe looking at attitudes towards
immigrants. Paas and Halapuu (2012) identify a number of theories that focus on different determinants to explain why individuals have varying racial attitudes, including human capital theory, individual and collective economic theories, as well as collective and individual contact theories. Though individual contact theory is the focus of this thesis, the other theories will be discussed at the end of this section.

2.2.1 Contact Theory

Individual contact theory, or intergroup contact theory, is taken from Gordon Allport’s contact hypothesis (1954). This ‘contact hypothesis’ suggests that even deep-seated antipathies toward another group might be improved by regular interactions with members of that group, an idea that has generated a long history of research in social psychology (Dixon, Durrheim, Tredoux, Tropp, Clack, Eaton, and Quayle, 2010). It has been found that contact between in-group and out-group members often reduces negative racial attitudes using three main mediators: knowledge, anxiety, and empathy and perspective taking. Essentially, contact with out-group members allows individuals to increase knowledge about that out-group, reduces anxiety about intergroup contact, and increases empathy and perspective taking when considering out-group members. (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2008).

Individual contact theory relating to racial attitudes conducted in the United States largely considers whites’ attitudes towards blacks (Dixon Durrheim, Tredoux, Tropp, Clack, Eaton, and Quayle, 2010), though contact theory is also applied to many cases of historic or current racial tensions. A meta-analysis done by Pettigrew and Tropp in 2006 looked at 515 studies and a quarter of a million participants in 38 nations,
finding that intergroup contact typically corresponds with lower levels of prejudice, with 94 per cent of studies finding an inverse relationship between contact and prejudice against the out-group (Pettigrew and Tropp 2006). Their analysis found that contact would reduce not only racial prejudice, but also other forms of prejudice such as homophobia, ageism, and xenophobia (Pettigrew and Tropp 2006).

Allport (1954) initially had four conditions he felt were necessary for contact to reduce prejudice, stereotyping and other biases. The first was that those in contact with one another must have, and view themselves as having, equal status within the situation. The second is that participants should be working towards common goals. Third, the individuals are in a setting that requires cooperation. Fourth, the authorities, laws or customs of the given situation show approval (i.e. government, school administration – whomever they view as having authority).

Over the subsequent years researchers have added additional essential conditions resulting in a lengthy list that critics say do not indicate a clear coherent model (Eller and Abrams 2004). Pettigrew (1998) addressed this by stating that researchers need to differentiate between essential and facilitating conditions for contact to be successful in effecting racial attitudes. Pettigrew concluded that Allport’s four conditions, as well as a fifth one, friendship potential, were essential situational factors (1998).

As noted by Eller and Abrams (2004) in their research, friendship is likely to be dependent on equality of status, sharing common goals and a certain amount of cooperation, so friendship can be a good indicator of the other conditions. In support of
this finding, Levin, van Laar, and Sidanius (2009) found during their longitudinal study that when outgroup friendship was used to measure contact, the negative relationship between prejudice and contact became stronger. An additional meta-analysis focusing on studies that used varying measures of friendship by Davies, Tropp, Aron, Pettigrew and Wright (2011) noted that studies consistently found that friendship was a stronger indicator of positive intergroup attitudes than general contact.

It is important to note that during Pettigrew and Tropp’s meta-analysis in 2006 they did find that studies that did not create or measure the four essential conditions were still able to demonstrate a relationship between contact and attitudes; as such they concluded that all conditions should be considered facilitating rather than essential; additional studies have come to the same conclusion (Crisp and Turner 2009). It was noted that support of authorities seemed to be particularly significant for facilitating positive contact effects (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006; Levin, van Laar, and Sidanius, 2009).

2.2.2 Addressing Contact Theory Criticisms

Contact theory does have its critics and limitations. First, critics of contact theory point out that contact has an uneven relationship with different types of racial prejudice. In the USA, for example, it was found that contact was a fair predictor of whites peoples’ emotional acceptance of black people, but a poor predictor of their support for race-targeted policies (Dixon Durrheim, Tredoux, Tropp, Clack, Eaton, and Quayle, 2010; Krysan, 1998). Additionally, critics point out that the effects of contact seem to have more of an effect on in-group members than out-group members.
(Pettigrew and Tropp, 2008). Tropp and Bianchi (2006) suggest this difference exists because out-group members are often conscious that their group is devalued and they are more likely to experience prejudice or discrimination from the in-group; as such, out-group members tend to be cautious when interacting with members of the in-group until they are assured the in-group members are worthy of their trust.

Second, as studies examining contact theory have primarily been cross-sectional, and as such are unable to demonstrate causal effects, critics argue that contact may not reduce prejudice or new racism scores but rather that those with pre-existing low prejudice and new racism scores may be more likely to have contact or friendships with out-group members. However, research confirms that contact continues to be a significant indicator of racial attitudes in longitudinal studies (Binder, Zagefka, Brown, Funke, Kessler, Mummendey, Maquil, Demoulin, and Leyens, 2009; Brown, Eller, Leed, and Stace, 2007; Eller and Abrams, 2004; Stewart, Hewstone, Christ and Voci, 2011).

Finally, critics note that the influence of contact on attitudes is likely influenced by in-group members’ perceptions of homogeneity of the out-groups. Research suggests that people tend to see members of an out-group as more homogenous than their own group; overall this is associated with negative stereotypes and attitudes regarding an out-group (Hutchinson and Rosenthal, 2011). With this in mind, it is theorized that the effects of contact theory will only be generalized to the group if group membership is salient, meaning that if in-group individuals do not view the people they are interacting with as representatives of the out-group, then contact may not be successful in reducing negative racial attitudes (Brown, Vivian, and Hewstone, 1999).
An Edmonton study by Currie et al. (2012) illustrates how this could be an issue in the Canadian context. In the study, an Aboriginal participant reiterates something an ex-landlord said, “An ex-landlord commented my partner and I weren’t typical Natives, as I was a university student and my partner had a job” (Currie et al., 2012: 622). Another, albeit less overt, example reflects the sentiment that Aboriginal people may feel pressure to act differently in order to counteract negative stereotypes held by other Canadians:

Being Aboriginal in Canada is hard- originals but foreigners, second class citizens to white Canadians. I am part Canadian culture but when I go back home [to my First Nation] I am a somewhat different person- there is freedom at home to just be myself, and not try to fit into the “good Indian” that is not like “those Indians” (Currie et al., 2012: 623).

From these examples, one can see that there is are potential issues with group saliency when measuring the effects of contact in the Canadian context, first with the original respondent referencing a non-Aboriginal Canadians’ sentiment of ‘non-typical Natives’ and second with an Aboriginal person noting a difference between a ‘good Indian’ and ‘those Indians’. Despite these criticisms and concerns, contact theory remains a strong and evidence based theory in social psychology.

2.3 Additional Determinants and Understandings of Racial Attitudes: Other Theories

While contact theory is the primary theory to be tested in this thesis there are other theories that explain racial attitudes of note. Specifically individualism, human capital theory, collective contact theory, intergroup conflict theory, as well as a few contextual factors that may influence racial attitudes.
2.3.1 Individualism

When studying racial attitudes, as noted earlier, it is important to control for individualist attitudes. Individualism can be seen in two parts: first, the belief that it is an individual responsibility rather than government responsibility for economic well-being; and second, the belief that economic success or failure can be attributed to individual ability and effort (Gilens, 1995). Langford and Pointing (1992) noted that in the USA many whites used individualistic logic to blame blacks for their disadvantage, which contributed to negative feelings towards blacks; their research also suggests that the value orientation of white Americans towards rich and poor or worker relations also significantly influence attitudes towards racial policy issues. Similarly, Gilens (1995) found that individualism was an effective predictor of both attitudes towards blacks in the USA as well as attitudes towards welfare for blacks.

As noted in section 2.1.1, it can be difficult to discern which is driving responses to racial attitude questions, ideologies like individualism that claim to be “race neutral values” or actual negative racial attitudes. However, Sears, Van Laar, Carrillo, and Kosterman (1997) analyzed data from a series of representative surveys to examine whether new racism remained a strong predictor for opposition to affirmative action policies after individualistic ideology was controlled; they found that racism overshadows ideology when it comes to support for affirmative action. Other researchers have done studies that support the findings of Sears and his colleagues (Bobo, 1998; Blatz and Ross, 2009), suggesting that while individuals may believe or
justify their opinions or attitudes as being “race neutral”, they may still be driven by racism.

2.3.2 Human Capital Theory

Another prominent and well-researched theory that seeks to explain racial attitudes is, human capital theory. This theory suggests that the more education an individual has, the more tolerant or accepting of out-groups the individual will be (Pass and Halapuu 2012; Hello, Scheepers, and Gijsbert, 2002). However, the semipublic setting of surveys, even with questions involving response categories, can create social desirability pressures and result in the overstatement of liberal racial attitudes, especially by more educated respondents (Krysan, 1998). A liberal response may be acting in two ways: to reduce perceived potential judgment from the interviewer, and to protect the respondent’s self-image of not being racist (Krysan, 1998). While the human capital theory makes a well-grounded argument for education being a prevailing predictor of racial attitudes, social desirability pressures make education an exceedingly complicated determinant to consider, as people with higher levels of education seem to know ‘politically correct’ opinions and express them more readily in a research setting (Krysan, 1998).

One longitudinal study done by Van Laar, Sidanius, and Levin (2008) considered the effect that university courses that have ethnic studies content have on students’ racial attitudes. Their overall findings were that ethnic-related curricula had a significant affect on the white students’ attitudes, with those taking more of these courses having lower symbolic racism, and mixed results on the attitudes of minority group members.
They also noted that curricula affected the ratio of in-group to out-group friends in a number of cases, which they also state could have an effect on students racial attitudes, though they do not rule out other forms of contact also having an affect. Thus, the amount of contact an individual has with an out-group member may be affected by their education, or the amount of contact an individual has with out-group members may influence the types of courses they take.

To what extent might content-specific education influence racial attitudes in Canada? Researchers across Canada have noted the insufficiency of education on Aboriginal history and issues at the secondary school level (Godlewska, Moore, and Bednasek, 2010). In recent years, policy makers have worked with educators to implement new curricula in Saskatchewan; while the impact of this on racial attitudes will not be seen until the years ahead, these efforts have received some public criticism. While examining the public reaction to new curricula concerning Aboriginal peoples in Saskatchewan, and the reasons behind the reaction, Carol Schick (2014) notes that while education about Aboriginal peoples may be a pathway to reducing racism it also receives significant criticism. Despite the popular multicultural narrative that positions all Canadians equally, individuals continue to maintain that schools are ‘neutral spaces’ and therefore there is no space for ‘special’ education about Aboriginals since it would be unfair (Schick, 2014).

Looking beyond culture- and race-specific education levels, individuals with less economic security (i.e. lower levels of education, lack of skills, lower financial resources) are often thought to hold less tolerant attitudes (Pass and Halapuu, 2012). The reason
for this is the perception that social or ethnic groups are “competing” for resources (i.e. the labour or housing market). The level of competition one perceives either at the individual or national level can affect one’s level of ethnic prejudice (Hello, Scheepers, and Gijsbert, 2002; Hello, Scheepers, and Sleegers, 2006). Both individual and collective economic theories tend to focus on employment. Individually, a person who is unemployed or not stably employed is theorized to have less out-group tolerance because out-group members tend to be over represented in low skilled jobs those people are trying to get, or are currently employed in (Kunovich, 2004). Similarly, on the collective level, if a country or region has high levels of unemployment or low GDP then it is theorized that there will be less tolerance for out-groups (Paas and Halapuu, 2012). These economic theories, while viable explanations of potential out-group hostilities, leave little room for political intervention to improve attitudes, as one would assume it is always the goal of a government to lessen the unemployment rate as well as create more stable employment for citizens.

2.3.3 Collective Contact Theory

Collective contact theory focuses on the proportion of the population that comprises the majority in-group compared to the minority out-group in a given region (Paas and Halapuu, 2012), the idea being that the majority in-group may tolerate small numbers of out-group members but will feel more threatened as the out-group grows (Krysan, 2000). Essentially the theory posits that once the proportion of out-group members to be a certain overall percentage in-group members will have negative attitudes towards the out-group. However, Wu, Hou, and Schimmele (2011) found that
contact between the groups could often have an effect on racial attitudes, with a lack of interaction between the two groups resulting in more negative attitudes.

2.3.4 Intergroup Conflict Theory

The intergroup conflict theory also focuses on population proportion, however intergroup conflict theorist’s focus specifically on the perceived allocation of resources, believing that prejudice is based more so on perceived intergroup inequalities (Krysan, 2000). In some studies, having a high number of members of an out-group in a neighbourhood or community is correlated with decreased tolerance. This is also known as the intergroup conflict perspective or racial threat hypothesis, which states that as the minority population increases so do racial prejudicial attitudes (Branton and Jones, 2005: 360). It is closely linked with economic theories, though high rates of unemployment or low GDP may not be necessary, but rather only the perception that the out-group in the area poses a potential threat to the in-group. When combined with economic issues, this prejudice can be heightened further (Kunovich, 2004). It should be noted that increased out-group population does not necessarily always result in negative racial attitudes; it is only when the in-group members perceive their position to be threatened- whether imagined or not- that a large out-group population causes increased negative racial attitudes (Pettigrew, Wagner and Christ, 2010).

Considering both collective contact and intergroup conflict theory there are likely additional factors that can influence the perceived level of threat an out-group poses such as: prior history of group interactions, a rapidly increasing out-group, the nation making it difficult for the out-group to enter mainstream life, severe external
threats such as terrorist acts, and finally when leading politicians endorse anti-out-group sentiments either explicitly or implicitly (Pettigrew, Wagner, and Christ, 2010). As such, one can see that there are likely additional variables affecting racial attitudes when considering collective contact and conflict theories, more so than the actual out-group population.

2.3.5 Additional Factors Influencing Racial Attitudes

Other determinants that have been identified that may affect racial attitudes are: age, religion, the type of area a person lives in (Paas and Halapuu, 2012), gender (Hughes and Tuch, 2003), and emotion (Banks and Valentino, 2012), as well as perceived levels of crime, social disorder, and physical decay of the neighbourhood one lives in, which individuals often attributes to members of an out-group (Branton and Jones, 2005; Paas and Halapuu, 2012). It is also important to note that members of a minority group who perceive that they have been discriminated against may be more tolerant towards other groups in similar situations (Paas and Halapuu, 2012). It must be noted that some variables that are common determinants of racial attitudes remain stable (gender, religion, ethnicity), and as such cannot be manipulated through policy, whereas others can be influenced by government activity (attitudes towards socioeconomic security and political trust), and by individual choice (education, type of living area, work experience) (Paas and Halapuu, 2012).

2.3.6 Summary: Theories of Racial Attitudes
As detailed above, there are many theories explaining differences in individual racial attitudes. The theory used in this thesis is individual contact theory, as individual contact is one of the few determinants that governments can ethically manipulate when creating policies or programs to improve racial attitudes. There is an abundance of research on individual contact theory and other racial groups, but, as the next section will demonstrate, there is little to no research on contact regarding non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal peoples in Canada.

2.4 Canadian Studies of Attitudes Towards Aboriginal Peoples

Studies considering racial attitudes towards Aboriginal people are lacking in Canadian research. General attitudes towards Aboriginal people are being assessed more frequently in studies, which is an indication of increased willingness to address the question of what racial attitudes currently exist. Unfortunately, the few studies that do consider contact theory continue to have small sample sizes and thus results are not generalizable to the broader population. The next few sections will discuss general studies that evaluated racial attitudes towards Aboriginal people, Canadian studies that use contact theory and finally discuss the ‘forewarnings’ that can be taken from these studies.

2.4.1 General Studies on Attitudes Towards Aboriginal Peoples

One of the earliest studies on non-Aboriginal Canadians’ public perceptions and opinions of First Nations people was done by Gibbins and Pointing in 1978. They utilized a national opinion survey conducted in early 1976 involving 1,832 non-Aboriginal
respondents (Gibbins and Pointing, 1978). Gibbins and Pointing found that Canadians have held varying orientations or attitudes towards Aboriginal people since the 1970s, and that the majority of Canadians at the time held less positive attitudes than is desirable for a cohesive society.

The 2009 Urban Aboriginal Peoples Study (UAPS) included a telephone survey of a representative sample of 2,501 non-Aboriginal adults living in 10 urban areas (Environics Institute, 2010). It found that non-Aboriginal urban Canadians’ initial impressions of Aboriginal people are positive overall, with very few respondents expressing overtly negative stereotypes of Aboriginal people (Environics Institute, 2010). Despite the lack of expression of overtly negative stereotypes, nearly every respondent indicated they believed Aboriginal people were the subject of discrimination (Environics Institute, 2010). This belief holds true across all cities and socio-demographic groups, with respondents who have frequent contact with Aboriginal people most likely to agree (Environics Institute, 2010).

Additionally, the UAPS reported that very few people (7 percent) who reported worsening impression of Aboriginal peoples in recent years identified a negative personal experience with an Aboriginal person (contact) as a reason for their worsening impression of Aboriginal peoples, whereas nearly one-quarter of those with improved impressions reported having a personal relationship with Aboriginal people (Environics Institute, 2010). Aboriginal people becoming a more visible and positive presence in the local community and local media accounted for an additional twenty percent of improved impressions. These findings suggest support for contact theory, as overall
respondents who had more contact with Aboriginal people report better impressions of Aboriginal people, even if they perceive current Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal relations to be negative (Environics Institute, 2010). Though UAPS researchers did not apply contact theory to new racism measures, the findings of their study appear to support the hypothesis that increased contact with Aboriginal people may reduce new racism scores amongst non-Aboriginal people.

The 2011 Saskatchewan Election Study (SKES) found that while many Saskatchewan residents sympathize with Aboriginal peoples’ situation, there is considerable opposition to government-funded programs targeted at assisting Aboriginal people (Atkinson, Berdahl, McGrane, and White 2012). The SKES used two questions to measure racial attitudes, “German, Ukrainian and other immigrants to Saskatchewan overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Aboriginals should do the same without any special favours”; and “Generations of discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for Aboriginals to work their way out of the lower class.”, both questions capture new racism sentiments and the second one is replicated verbatim in the CPIP survey.

Another study to consider took place in 2012 and examined racial discrimination experienced by Aboriginal students at the University of Alberta. It found that 80 percent of their Aboriginal participants had experienced race-based discrimination, with two-thirds experiencing high levels of racism (Currie, Wild, Schopflocher, Laing, and Veugelers, 2012). When the researchers compared the study to a similar one conducted in the United States with white, Latino, and black participants, they noted that the
frequency of racism experienced by Aboriginal students was two to three times higher than that of the Latinos or blacks in the United States. Researchers also noted that the extent to which Aboriginal students relinquished their traditional culture was associated with less racism, meaning if they ‘white washed’ themselves they experienced less racism from other Canadians.

Furthermore, a study by Werhun and Penner (2010) described components of the Canadian Aboriginal stereotype to include beliefs regarding ability (i.e. ‘uneducated’, ‘lazy’, ‘primitive’, ‘ignorant’, ‘stupid’, ‘undependable’), social status (i.e. ‘poor’, ‘dirty’), personality (i.e. ‘aggressive’, ‘dishonest’, ‘disloyal’) and illness (i.e. ‘alcoholics’). With this overwhelmingly negative stereotype in place, it is not surprising that researchers have found intergroup contact between Aboriginal peoples and non-Aboriginal peoples to be strained. Both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Canadians have expressed that contact is often considered undesirable, to the point where both groups express anxiety about potential interactions with the other group (Corenblum and Stephan, 2001). Some research on attitudes towards Aboriginal peoples suggests that non-Aboriginal peoples hold both positive and negative beliefs about Aboriginal people simultaneously (Bell and Esses 2002), making it clear that additional research on non-Aboriginal people’s attitudes towards Aboriginal peoples needs to be done.

2.4.2 Contact Theory Studies in Canada

Of the few studies that look explicitly at contact and non-Aboriginal people’s attitudes towards Aboriginal peoples, the study by Beaton et al. (2012) seems to be the largest, involving 274 students who were enrolled in grades 9-12 (average age of 16
years old). The students identified as Euro-Canadian lived in the community the school was located in, and the Aboriginal students were bussed in from their own community. The study found that that contact had an uneven affect on the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal students. The overall findings suggest that both groups have a distinctly different idea of how they ‘should’ come together, and though friendship mediated negative racial attitudes these differing ideas complicate the process.

Though the Beaton et al. (2012) study is similar to the CPIP study, there are some important differences. Beaton et al. (2012) study participants were persons 18 years of age and under who lived in rural Eastern Canada and attended the same high school, while the CPIP study (which will be discussed further in Chapter 3) respondents are persons 18 years of age or older who live in cities in Western Canada. Additionally, while the Beaton et al. (2012) study results are limited by their smaller sample size and the relatively small geographical location that they consider, the CPIP survey uses random probability sampling and has a significantly higher sample size, making the results generalizable to the broader population.

Looking at Canadian racial attitudes more broadly (that is, all racial groups in Canadian cities rather than just Aboriginal peoples), the primary conclusions of a study by Wu, Hou and Schimmele (2011) support intergroup contact theory, and suggest that exposure to racial diversity can be a crucial tool for reducing intergroup antipathies and encouraging a more cosmopolitan sense of belonging.
Beyond this, there are few studies on non-Aboriginal people’s attitudes towards Aboriginal people specifically, and few that use interpersonal contact explicitly as an independent variable.

2.4.3 Summary of Existing Studies

When considering these studies collectively it is clear that while non-Aboriginal Canadians appear to recognize that previous stereotypes of Aboriginal people are problematic, or simply not politically correct, there is a perception from both non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal peoples that discrimination or racism continues to be frequently experienced by Aboriginal peoples in Canada. One can see that relations and attitudes towards Aboriginal people seem to have remained generally negative, and have yet to be effectively addressed.

2.5 Summary and Hypothesis

This thesis assesses current racial attitudes in prairie cities and the role contact plays in shaping those attitudes. While existing literature on contact theory examines a variety of in-group and out-group relationships, including race relationships, in numerous countries, there have been limited studies explicitly testing the effect of interpersonal contact with Aboriginal people on Non-Aboriginal people’s attitudes in Canada. Additionally, there are few studies done in Canada that examine new racism scores when considering the relationship between non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal Canadians. This thesis seeks to add to both the overall body of literature concerning contact theory, as well as the smaller body of literature concerning non-Aboriginal
people’s attitudes towards Aboriginal people in Canada, by testing the following hypothesis:

Contact with Aboriginal people reduces new and old-fashioned racism attitudes amongst non-Aboriginal people.

This thesis also seeks to build on existing research by exploring how contact levels may interact with education levels. Inspired by human capital theory, the second hypothesis to be tested is:

Contact has greater effect on the racial attitudes of those with lower education levels than those with higher education levels.

Studies concerning non-Aboriginal peoples attitudes towards Aboriginal people in Canada are few in number, theories to explain racial attitudes are not. By using both bivariate and multivariate analyses, which are outlined in Chapter Three, this thesis seeks to address not only contact theory but also aspects of the other theories discussed in this chapter.
Chapter 3. Data and Analysis

By examining univariate, bivariate and multivariate analyses this chapter seeks to test the two hypotheses (Contact with Aboriginal people reduces new and old-fashioned racism attitudes amongst non-Aboriginal people; and Contact has greater effect on the racial attitudes of those with lower education levels than those with higher education levels.). This chapter will go over the methodology, outline how the data was run both in a bivariate and multivariate analysis and the basic findings of the output, and finally discuss the multivariate output in respect to the varying theories discussed in chapter 2.

3.1 Methodology

3.1.1 The CPIP Survey

To examine the effect that interpersonal contact has on non-Aboriginal people’s attitudes towards Aboriginal people, this thesis utilizes original City Planning and Indigeneity on the Prairies (CPIP) survey data, which were collected June 10 - July 30, 2014. The CPIP survey includes measures for new and old-fashioned racism, contact, and key measures that have been shown to affect new racism in other studies (specifically gender, age, minority status, religiosity, education, income, employment status, and individualism). (For the complete list of all survey questions please go to appendix A.)

The University of Saskatchewan’s Social Science Research Laboratories (SSRL) administered the survey with WinCATI software utilizing random digit dialing from a sample provided by ASDE Survey Sampler out of Gatineau, Quebec. The survey includes
responses from 2696 residents 18 years of age and older in seven cities (400 from Edmonton, Calgary, Saskatoon, Regina, Brandon, and Winnipeg, and 296 from Thompson). With this sample size it is predicted that the results have a margin of error of +/- 1.76%, 19 times out of 20. Results are weighted according to age, gender, and region. The survey received ethics approval from the University of Saskatchewan Research Ethics Board.

3.1.2 Dependent and Independent Variables

The two dependent variables are new and old-fashioned racism attitudes. To measure new racism attitudes the respondents were asked to rate their agreement with three separate statements on a four point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree: “Aboriginal people should stop complaining about the past and simply get on with their lives”; “If Aboriginals would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites”; and “Generations of discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for Aboriginal people to work their way out of the lower class.” All of these questions are replicated or adapted from previous studies concerning new racism. Two of the measures, the try harder and the generations of discrimination questions, are used in many new racism scales and have been adapted to many groups. The third measure, the stop complaining question, was taken from the Modern Prejudiced Attitudes toward Aboriginals Scale [M-PATAS] (Morrison, Morrison, Harriman and Jewell, 2008) because it fit well with the other two questions, and it does not reference any specific policies or infer any potential action as a result of respondents’ answers.
The strongest new racism sentiments are found with the stop complaining question (59.1% agree), while the lowest new racism sentiments are found in the generations of discrimination question (28.7% people disagree). The try harder question is split nearly evenly (44.5% agree, 49.2% disagree) (see Table 1). For the purpose of bivariate and multivariate analysis, the new racism variables are combined into a single index constructed using mean scores; the index ranges from 0 (low new racism) to 3 (high new racism) and the index's Cronbach alpha score is 0.715. (The generations question was reverse-coded for the index.)

Old-fashioned racism was measured by asking respondents to rate their agreement with the statement, “I would be concerned if an Aboriginal family moved in next door.” This question was adapted from a previous study concerning old-fashioned racism and was chosen because it was one of the least inflammatory questions that could be found that measured old-fashioned racism. Overall, 12.9 percent of people agreed with the statement, indicating that old-fashioned racism is much less prevalent than new racism.

The independent variables, general contact with Aboriginal people and personal ties with Aboriginal people, were measured by asking the respondents two questions: “How often do you interact personally with Aboriginal people at your workplace or during your daily activities? Is it frequently, occasionally, very rarely or never?”; and “How many of your close friends or family are Aboriginal? Would you say none, a few, some, or many?” These questions were also taken from previous contact theory studies and were chosen because they evaluate two varying types of contact, both of which
have been discussed in contact theory literature. The survey found that while 60.8 percent of people perceived they have occasional or frequent contact with Aboriginal people on a daily basis, only 17.6 percent report some or many close relationships with Aboriginal people (see Table 1). It should be noted that one limitation on both contact measures is that there may be issues with non-Aboriginal people’s perceptions of group saliency when interacting with Aboriginal peoples either generally or when they have personal ties. As discussed in chapter 2, these issues arise when non-Aboriginal people do not perceive the Aboriginal person they are interacting with as a ‘typical’ or ‘representative’ member of the out-group (Binder et al 2009; Hewstone and Swart 2011).

3.1.3 Control Variables

In testing my hypotheses I control for a number of sociodemographic variables that other theories have found to be potentially influential: gender (female=0, male=1), age (in years), minority status (visible minority=1, other=0), religiosity (not at all important = 1, very important =4), education (no schooling =1, doctorate = 12), income (under $25,000 = 1, $150,000 and over = 7), and employment status (employed =1, other =0). Additionally two individualism questions were included looking at the level of agreement with two statements: “Government should leave it ENTIRELY to the private sector to create jobs” and “People who don’t get ahead should blame themselves, not the system”; with answers ranging from 0 (low individualism) to 3 (high individualism). It should be noted that the former question is also often used as an economic
conservatism measure, as economic conservatism \textsuperscript{10} is a concept that is encapsulated by individualism itself.

Table 1: 
*Descriptive Statistics for Key Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Racism Measures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop Complain</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Don’t Know/Refused)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try Harder</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Don’t Know/Refused)</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generations of Discrimination</strong></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Don’t Know/Refused)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old-Fashioned Racism</strong></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Don’t Know/Refused)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(I Already Have an Aboriginal Neighbour)*</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Contact</strong></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Rarely</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Don’t Know/Refused)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Ties</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Few</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2 Analysis

#### 3.2.1 Bivariate Analysis

I begin my analysis by considering the bivariate relationships between the two contact measures (personal ties, general contact) with the two racism measures (new racism index, old-fashioned racism measure). Drawing on the literature, I expect that respondents with high levels of contact with Aboriginal people to be less likely to hold racist attitudes. This expectation is met with respect to personal ties: there is a significant, negative correlation between the new racism index and the personal ties variable (Pearson’s R = -0.144, p<0.000). ANOVA confirms that those with a higher number of Aboriginal friends or family hold lower new racism attitudes than do those with lower levels of contact (see Table 2). Those with strong personal ties to Aboriginal people have a mean score of 1.2 on the new racism index, compared to 1.6 for people with no personal ties; this general pattern is found amongst all three individual questions that make up the new racism index, although the relationship is not linear for the ‘try harder’ and ‘generations’ questions. Further, those with a high number of Aboriginal friends or family had an average score of 0.5 on the old-fashioned racism measure, compared to 0.7 for those with no Aboriginal friends or family. The negative correlation between personal ties and old-fashioned racism (Pearson’s R = -0.083, p= 0.000) is weaker than the negative relationship between personal ties and new racism,
reflecting the greater variability in the new racism index scores and the low variability in the old-fashioned racism measure scores.

General contact has a less clear relationship with racial attitudes. Although there is a significant negative relationship between new racism attitudes and general contact (Pearson’s R = -0.109, p<0.000), the ANOVA shows a non-linear reduction in new racist attitudes with those having occasional (not frequent) general contact holding the least new racist attitudes. There are similar results concerning old-fashioned racism and general contact: while there is a significant negative relationship (Pearson’s R = -0.115, p<0.000), the ANOVA shows again that those having occasional (not frequent) general contact hold the least old-fashioned racism attitudes.
Table 2a:  
*Contact and Racism (ANOVA)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal Ties</th>
<th>General Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>A Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Racism Index</td>
<td>1.5916</td>
<td>1.3082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop Complain</td>
<td>1.9258</td>
<td>1.6018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try Harder</td>
<td>1.6742</td>
<td>1.2683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generations of Discrimination</td>
<td>1.1770</td>
<td>1.0355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old-Fashioned Racism</td>
<td>.7955</td>
<td>.4748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean scores used; 0= Low Racism Attitudes, 3= High Racism Attitudes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>General Contact</th>
<th>Personal Ties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Rarely</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Very Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.2 Multivariate Analysis

To what extent does contact help to explain variation in racial attitudes? To assess this fully, I turn to multivariate analysis (OLS regression), controlling for key variables (see Tables 3 and 4). For each dependent variable, I run two models. The first model examines includes my control variables and contact variables (using the binary dummy variables). Thus, the first model allows me to test the first hypothesis, which is that contact is negatively related to racism. The second model adds interaction (product) terms to assess the conditional relationship with education with both types of contact: “education x general contact (dummy)” and “education x personal ties (dummy)”. By including the interaction terms, the model is better able to assess whether the relationship with contact will vary across educational cohorts (the second hypothesis).

Looking at new racism, in the first model (Step 1) the personal ties variable is a significant predictor, whereas the general contact variable is not. As expected, as personal ties increase, new racism decreases. Both individualism questions are significant with the one examining blame being a particularly robust predictor of new racism attitudes: overall, as individualism increases, new racism scores increase. Further, gender (male dummy variable), religiosity, education, and minority status are found to be significant, while none of the cities differs significantly from the reference city (Calgary). In the second model (Step 2), education loses significance and the
interaction term education x personal ties found to be a significant, negative predictor of new racism. The education x general contact interaction term is not significant.
Table 3:  
*New Racism and Contact (OLS Regression)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (Dummy Variable)</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.066*</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.065*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.044*</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.044*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.082**</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.081* *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (11 Categories)</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.165**</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (7 Categories)</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status (Dummy)</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Status</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.068*</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.065*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism Jobs</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.100**</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.103* *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism Blame</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.398**</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.397* *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatoon</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>General Contact (Dummy)</td>
<td>Personal Ties (Dummy)</td>
<td>Education*</td>
<td>General Contact (Dummy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.262</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.222</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-0.117**</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.210*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.347*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Interaction terms for both Education*Personal Ties and Education*General Contact were created by multiplying the two variables together; Reference city is Calgary

**p < .000, *p < .005
Table 4: 
*Old-Fashioned Racism and Contact (OLS Regression)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (Dummy Variable)</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.063*</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.067*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.092**</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.092*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (11 Categories)</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-.167*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (7 Categories)</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status (Dummy)</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Status</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.114**</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.115*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism Jobs</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism Blame</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.156**</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.156*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.090*</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.090*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.050*</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.050*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatoon</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.075*</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.074*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>General Contact (Dummy)</td>
<td>Personal Ties (Dummy)</td>
<td>Education* General Contact (Dummy)</td>
<td>Education* Personal Ties (Dummy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R sq.</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Change</td>
<td>35.247</td>
<td>1.841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Interaction terms for both Education*Personal Ties and Education*General Contact were created by multiplying the two variables together; Reference city is Calgary

**p < .000, * p < .005
The analysis of old-fashioned racism attitudes (see Table 4) presents a somewhat different picture. In the first model (Step 1) personal ties is a significant, negative predictor of old-fashioned racism. However, general contact is also significant, negative predictor of old-fashioned racism. Additionally, and in contrast to our new racism findings, city of residence is significant positive predictor of old-fashioned racism: all cities with the exception of two (Brandon and Thompson) differ significantly from the reference city (Calgary). Again, as with new racism, the individualism blame question is an important and positive predictor of old-fashioned racial attitudes; however, the individualism jobs question was not significant for old-fashioned racial attitudes. Gender (male dummy variable), religiosity, and minority status, are also significant predictors, while education is not. In the second model (Step 2), unlike the new racism model, the education x personal ties interaction term is not significant. While the general contact remains significant in the second model, the personal ties variable loses significance when the interaction terms are added, and education becomes significant.

3.3 Discussion

3.3.1 First Conclusion: The Type of Contact Matters

    The analysis points to several main conclusions. The first is that the type of contact matters when considering new racism. There is a clear difference between the relationship between general contact and personal ties. While personal ties are related to a decrease both new and old-fashioned racism, and this relationship is seen even after key sociodemographic and individualism variables are controlled, general contact
is only significant when considering old-fashioned racism. Though general contact has a weak negative bivariate relationship with new racism, its relationship is not significant once controls are introduced.

Working on the theoretical assumption that contact precedes racial attitudes, this difference between general contact and personal ties makes sense concerning new racism and is consistent with the meta-analysis done by Davies et al. (2011) that looks specifically at studies using friendship as a contact measure when considering racial attitudes. While general contact may make individuals aware of Aboriginal peoples and the issues they may be facing enough to reduce old-fashioned racism, personal ties are more likely to foster a deeper and more empathetic understanding towards Aboriginal peoples and Aboriginal issues. As discussed in chapter 2, Allport and other researchers have outlined four facilitating conditions to improve racial attitudes: individuals have equal status, have a common goal, are in a setting requiring cooperation, and have support from the authorities, law or custom (Lau, Lau, Loper 2013; Hewstone and Swart 2011). While these conditions may occur in the context of general contact, their presence is by no means assured. In contrast, friendship or familial relationships are good predictors of the four conditions (Binder et al. 2009; Levin, van Laar and Sidanius 2003; Aberson, Shoemaker, and Tomolillo 2004; Pettigrew and Tropp 2006). Pettigrew and Tropp (2008) also noted friendship as a form of contact that is beneficial in enabling empathy and perspective taking, one of the three components of reducing negative racial attitudes that contact is said to affect.\textsuperscript{xii}
One last thing to note is that as an out-group member enters an in-group friend group, they may be then viewed as a member of the in-group and thus have a greater affect on members of that group’s attitudes towards other members of their race or group (Sechrist and Milford-Szafran, 2011).

Furthermore, the influence of contact on attitudes is likely influenced by in-group members' perceptions of homogeneity of the out-groups. Research suggests that people tend to see members of an out-group as more homogenous than their own group; this is associated with negative stereotypes and attitudes regarding an out-group (Hutchinson and Rosenthal, 2011). As discussed earlier, it is theorized that the effects of contact will only be generalized to the group if group membership is salient, meaning that if in-group individuals do not view the out-group people they are interacting with as representatives of the group, then contact may not be successful in reducing negative racial attitudes (Brown, Vivian, and Hewstone, 1999). As discussed in chapter two the way individuals conceptualize race, the one-drop rule or phenotypic attributes related to genetics, may influence their recognition of out-group members. Often if a person does not fit the stereotypical phenotype an individual believes a person of the out-group should look like they will not associate that person with the out-group unless otherwise informed of out-group membership.

3.3.2 Second Conclusion: Individuals’ Conceptualization of Racism Varies

The second conclusion, made clear by the differing responses to the old-fashioned racism and new racism measures, is that individuals have nuanced and varied racial attitudes. New racism attitudes are significantly higher than old-fashioned racism
attitudes (Table 1). Further there is considerably greater variability amongst the individual new racism questions, with the stop complaining question eliciting the highest new racism responses and the generations of discrimination question eliciting the lowest new racism responses. Again, this is consistent with previous research. It has been found that individuals may conceptualize racism in different ways, with some people only identifying old-fashioned racism with being racist (Sommer and Norton 2006). This may again contribute to the reason general contact has a significant negative relationship with old-fashioned racism but not new racism, since individuals may not view the new racism measures as racist sentiments. This is important when considering the social desirability effect of the questions, as those who do not perceive new racism sentiments to be a component of racism will be more willing to express new racism attitudes (Huddy and Feldman 2009) than individuals who include new racism attitudes in their conceptualization of racism.

3.3.3 Third Conclusion: Individualism is a Significant Predictor of Racial Attitudes

A third conclusion is that racial attitudes are strongly influenced by individualism, specifically when assigning blame. Looking at the multivariate models there is a consistent significant positive relationship between new and old-fashioned racism and the individualism blame question in all six models. As well, there is a significant positive relationship between the individualism job question and new racism. This is unsurprising as a study by Langford and Pointing (1992) looking at attitudes towards Aboriginal issues (not people) also found individualism to be an important determinant of policy responses.
Individualism may also allow people to express racist attitudes under the guise of socially acceptable “race neutral values”. However, as noted in chapter two, a study done in Canada shows that individuals who tended to be more conservative (or individualistic) in their ideological beliefs and who scored highly on new racism measures were still more likely to give reparations to people of European rather than Aboriginal descent (Blatz and Ross, 2009), indicating that people may not be as individualistic or race neutral as they believe themselves to be, whether consciously or unconsciously.

A contributing factor as to why individualism is a more robust predictor of racism attitudes than contact is that researchers have noted that while contact may affect the personal attitudes and stereotypes one holds, it may not affect individual’s ideological beliefs (such as individualism) that perpetuate systems of racial discrimination (Dixon, Durrheim and Tredoux, 2005). Researchers who examine the policy-implementation gap may wish to consider this when looking at new racism and opposition to race based policies.

3.3.4 Fourth Conclusion: The Affect of Education Varies for New and Old-fashioned Racism

The fourth conclusion is that education is a significant predictor of new racism attitudes, but not of old-fashioned racism attitudes. Moreover, the influence of personal ties on new racism attitudes vary with education levels; as education increases, personal ties have less influence on new racism scores. It has been postulated that individuals with higher levels of education may be more tolerant for several reasons, such as the
higher levels of economic security that come with higher education, broadened horizons, and increased political and social engagement (Pass and Halapuu 2012), or simply due to the fact that they are better equipped to understand the nuance behind new racism measures, and therefore more likely to alter their responses due to social desirability. It has also been suggested that individuals with higher education may give responses that are in line with principles or ideologies they agree with (such as tolerance) rather than focusing on the out-group that is being discussed (White, Atkinson, Berdahl and McGrane, 2015).

3.3.5 Sociodemographic Variations

The sociodemographic variations in attitudes are also of note. Gender, religiosity, and minority status are each significant in all four models. Male respondents tend to hold higher new and old-fashioned racism sentiments than female respondents; this finding is consistent with other studies (Pass and Halapuu 2012; Hughes and Tuch 2003). The higher one scored on religiosity, the more likely they were to new and old-fashioned racist sentiments. Allport (1946, 1963, 1966, 1967) also noted that religion was a factor in racial attitudes, finding that the frequency with which one attends church- or lack of attendance- affected an individual’s ‘tolerance’ for out-group members. Finally, minority status was found to also be a significant positive predictor in all four models. This finding is unexpected and curious. While the majority of contact theory studies focus on white respondents attitudes towards the out-group, Gibbins and Pointing’s (1978) study of Canadians attitudes towards ‘Indians’ (vernacular used at the time) referenced peoples who held minority status (specifically persons of
Africans/West Indies and French Canadians decent) holding more favourable attitudes towards ‘Indian’ people. These more favourable attitudes were explained by the fact that these individuals were more likely to have experienced discriminatory treatment from the in-group in Canada at the time and thus have more empathy for other minority groups. Similarly, research finds that ethnic minorities in Europe are more tolerant towards immigrants in their countries, again likely due empathy for another minority group (Pass and Halapuu 2012). The fact that the CPIP data finds an opposite relationship – racism is higher amongst visible minority respondents – is thus unanticipated.

One factor of minority attitudes, again discussed by Sechrist and Milford-Szafran (2011), may be the phenomena that members of a group tend to amend their attitudes to fit the overall consensus of the group they perceive themselves to be. So if visible minority individuals perceive themselves as being in the in-group with non-Aboriginal Canadians more so than relating to the minority status of Aboriginal people they may adopt the (primarily negative) attitudes and stereotypes that non-Aboriginal Canadians have towards Aboriginal peoples. Tying into this is a study by Sechrist and Milford-Szafran (2011) that examined the relationship between individuals’ perceptions of ‘important others’ for the purpose of their study they used close friends, and attitudes towards African Americans. They found that individuals who believed that their friend’s attitudes differed greatly from their own were more likely to amend their opinions in the same direction as their friend (either more positive or negative). The theory is that when an individual receives information from an in-group friend they are more likely to
give it deeper cognitive processing than information from an out-group member (Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe and Ropp). It may be that if members of minority groups perceive other Canadians who express negative racial attitudes towards Aboriginal people as an ‘important other’ they may shift their own perhaps previously neutral attitude to negative to foster friendships. One other possibility that is not tested in theory is that members of minority groups may resent the perceived special treatment of Aboriginal people, thinking that they should be included and receive the same treatment as their own groups, this may be especially true if they perceive that they have struggled to make a place for themselves in Canadian society.

Even though gender, religiosity, and minority status are considered to be stable variables throughout respondents’ lifetime and they cannot be manipulated in any meaningful way to improve racial attitudes, understanding these variations may have implications for policies targeted at reducing racist attitudes.

Finally the last interesting demographic variable of note is city of residence. Of the six cities included in the models (Calgary is the reference city), all but Brandon and Thompson were found to be a significant positive predictor of old-fashioned racism. There may be several reasons for this, including cities’ individual past history with Aboriginal peoples, the policies of the cities directed at fostering positive relationships between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people, local media portrayal of Aboriginal people, Aboriginal people’s involvement or presence in the community, or even the difference in population proportion for each city. According to Statistics Canada (2011), of the seven cities in the CPIP survey Calgary has the lowest total population percentage
with only 3.81 percent of the population being Aboriginal in 2011. Comparatively the other cities’ Aboriginal population percentages are as follows: Edmonton 6.5, Regina 9.72, Saskatoon 9.73, Winnipeg 11.33, Brandon 11, and Thompson 32.4. What may make Brandon and Thompson unique in that they are not a significant predictor of old-fashioned racism may be that while they have high Aboriginal populations they also have a notably smaller overall populations than the other five cities (with Thompson being the smallest). There additionally may be other variables that make Brandon and Thompson unique when considering old-fashioned racism.

3.4 Conclusion

The conclusions of this chapter show that the first hypothesis, contact with Aboriginal people reduces new and old-fashioned racism attitudes amongst non-Aboriginal people, is correct concerning this study. However it is prudent to note that the type of contact (general contact or personal ties) does matter as personal ties in the form of friendships or familial relationships seems to affect both old-fashioned and new racism attitudes while general contact only seems to affects old-fashioned racism. The second hypothesis, contact has greater effect on the racial attitudes of those with lower education levels than those with higher education levels, is correct concerning new racism attitudes concerning this study, however education has no affect on old-fashioned racism attitudes. The overall findings indicate when individuals have higher levels of education the affect of personal ties on new racism attitudes is decreased. Another interesting finding that was not hypothesized was the significance of individualism; while there is theory to support these findings so it is not entirely
unexpected it is noteworthy. Finally the sociodemographic variables, gender, religiosity, and minority status were all found to be significant indicating implication for policies. Implications for policy makers and future researchers will be discussed in the next and final chapter.
Chapter 4. Conclusion

4.1 Research Question, Hypotheses and “So What?”

This thesis set out to discover what, if any, effect contact with Aboriginal people might have on non-Aboriginal people’s attitudes towards Aboriginal people in seven prairies cities. Contact theory was chosen because the Aboriginal population is growing at a rate greater than that of non-Aboriginal Canadians, as well continuing reserve to urban migration increases the potential for contact between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Canadians. This is especially true of prairie cities in Western Canada as Aboriginal people make up a higher total proportion of the cities population than cities in Eastern Canada.

As previously stated there is a lack of information on attitudes towards Aboriginal people and contact theory (even when considering racial groups more broadly) in Canada. Though several studies have indicated that non-Aboriginal Canadians’ feelings toward Aboriginal people are generally negative (Atkinson, Berdahl, McGrane, and White 2012; Currie et al. 2012; Werhun and Penner, 2010; Corenblum and Stephan, 2001; Bell and Esses, 2002), few have explicitly considered contact as a potential mediator of negative racial attitudes, and none on a large scale looking at the general public. It is crucial that Canadian researchers explore the causes of negative racial attitudes, especially towards Aboriginal peoples as they are the youngest and fastest growing population in Canada, and stand to have an ever-increasing impact on society.
Negative racial attitudes can erode social cohesion, and while encouraging positive racial attitudes should be a goal of any country, it is especially crucial for multicultural countries such as Canada. The motivating concern from a government perspective is that the social exclusion of individuals and groups can become a significant threat to social cohesion (Toye, 2007), which can lead to a social (Toye, 2007; Wu, Hou and Schimmele 2011; Brondolo, Libretti, Rivera, and Walsemann 2012), health (Currie et al. 2012; Brondolo, Libretti, Rivera, and Walsemann, 2012; Brondolo, Hausmann, Jhalani, Pencille, Atencio-Bacayon, Kumar, and Schwartz, 2011; Anderson, 2013), and economic (Environs Institute, 2010; Brondolo, Libretti, Rivera, and Walsemann, 2012) consequences for society, as well as individual consequences, not only for those being discriminated against but for the perpetrators of racism as well (Michalos and Zumbo, 2001).

4.2 Summary of Study
4.2.1 Key Findings

Overall after analyzing the CPIP data this thesis finds that while general contact has a significant negative relationship with old-fashioned racism sentiments, it is actually contact in the form of personal ties that has significant negative relationship with both new and old-fashioned racial attitudes. As such, the increased urban Aboriginal presence – and thus presumed increased Aboriginal-non-Aboriginal general contact – alone should not be expected to result in positive racial attitudes. However, as Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples establish personal friendships, there is greater
potential opportunity for attitudinal change. These findings are consistent with the broader contact theory literature that has been generated in other countries.

Additionally the analysis finds individualism, specifically when assigning blame, to be a significant positive predictor of both new and old-fashioned racism, and individual’s level of education to be a significant negative predictor of new racism (with more highly educated people having lower levels of new racism scores). The reasons for the significance of individualism may be that the respondent uses individualistic sentiments as justification for their racial attitudes as a way to distance himself or herself from the label of “racist”.

Higher level of education, or human capital theory, is a very popular explanation for why individuals may hold lower negative racial attitudes and could have an effect for several reasons. Higher education typically leads to increased potential for contact with a more diverse group of people, exposure to different ways of thinking, recognition of a politically correct or socially desirable answer. Another explanation is that individuals with a higher education may give responses that are in line with principles or ideologies they agree with (such as tolerance) rather than focusing on the out-group that is being discussed.

Other sociodemographic variables of note in all four models are gender, religiosity and minority status. Though these variables cannot be manipulated, future policy makers may want to acknowledge the effect they may have when creating policies targeted at reducing racism. Additionally, city of residence (with Calgary as the reference city) was significant when considering old-fashioned racism with the
exception of Brandon and Thompson. There could be several reasons for this including Aboriginal population density, distribution, media attention, and historical interactions between the two groups.

4.2.2 Strengths and Limitations of Study

Strengths of the study include the sample size, sampling method, and the contribution it makes to contact theory literature as well as racial attitude literature in Canada. Though the study is cross sectional it was the most appropriate design as contact theory and attitudes towards Aboriginal people is a largely unaddressed area of study. As such this paper will provide not only information but also a direction for other researchers to build off.

Some limitations of the study include not having measures that have previously been tested with this sample, though the ones chosen have been tested and found to be valid and reliable by other researchers. A further limitation to the study is only looking at the effect contact has on non-Aboriginal people and not Aboriginal people. As the research on interpersonal contact and attitudes towards Aboriginal people is fairly new so it follows that this restriction on the sample was acceptable. Doing a cross sectional rather than longitudinal study prevents us from claiming absolute causality, though other longitudinal studies (Binder et al. 2009; Levin, van Laar and Sidanius 2003) involving contact theory and in-group and out-group contact have held true and there is no reason to believe that this study would not follow that trend. Additionally, time constraints limited the number of questions that could be asked, meaning a full psychometrically sound new and old-fashioned racism scale was not able to be feasibly
included; however, as this is a preliminary study to discover whether or not contact between non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal peoples influences the new racism scores of non-Aboriginal people, the number of questions was sufficient to test the theory.

4.3 Implications

4.3.1 Implications for Society and Policy Makers

Due to the significant negative relationship the sociodemographic variables such as gender, religiosity and minority status had on racial attitudes towards Aboriginal people, policymakers may seek to direct policies at specific sociodemographic groups, such as men, those with higher religiosity, and visible minorities.

4.3.2 Implications Theory and Research

Future researchers may want to look more closely at the quality of general contact (i.e. positive or negative generally) that is informing people’s racial attitudes. Additionally following with Davies et al.’s (2011) research concerning the different modes of friendship operationalization, future researchers may want to consider at what level of intimacy personal ties is least and most effects attitudes towards Aboriginal people (i.e. workplace friendship versus general friend versus close friendship), as well as the effect of the four facilitating conditions Allport had outlined (equal status between individuals; working towards a common goal; individuals are in a setting that requires cooperation; and approval of the perceived authorities). It may also be beneficial to examine non-Aboriginal Canadians’ conceptualization of ‘Aboriginal people’ and look into perceived group saliency in order to better determine the effects of contact theory in this context.
Additionally future researchers should investigate further the difference between visible minorities and non-visible minority racial attitudes, specifically why racism attitudes are higher among respondents who are visible minorities. Finally, future researchers may want to consider looking at new racism, individualism and attitudes not only towards Aboriginal people but another race neutral group (i.e. low income, or gender) to further control for individualism.

4.4 Final Statement

Allowing racism against any racial group, either new or old-fashioned, to exist unaddressed in a country where multicultural values are espoused as paramount the society is not only hypocritical but also damaging to the social cohesion of the country as a whole. Measuring and reporting the racial attitudes of respondents from seven Western prairie cities through the CPIP survey data provides evidence that there is likely an issue with negative racial attitudes, particularly new racism attitudes. In exposing these attitudes a dialogue can begin in earnest as to the factors behind these negative attitudes and encourage policy makers to create policy to address these attitudes. Promoting positive relations between Aboriginal people and non-Aboriginal people can only be done if individuals acknowledge there is an issue and strive to understand why there is a problem.

By conducting the study with a large sample size (n= 2696) and utilizing random probability sampling these results are more generalizable, at least to prairie cities. As more studies of similar content and size are completed to build a more complete understanding of racial attitudes and the factors that influence them across Canada; as
factors begin to be identified, policy makers and researchers are better able to address and study racial attitudes in Canada. Currently the CPIP survey results indicate that contact theory, human capital theory, and individualism all are factors affecting racial attitudes needing to be studied further.
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Appendix A:
Full CPIP Survey with all Questions and Segues

CITY PLANNING AND INDIGENEITY ON THE PRAIRIES 2014
NON-ABORIGINAL TELEPHONE SURVEY
(FINAL)

INTRODUCTION

INTRO1./INTRO3.
Hello, my name is (FIRST NAME ONLY) and I am calling on behalf of Dr. Ryan Walker at the University of Saskatchewan. We are conducting a short 15-minute telephone survey with non-Aboriginal people about their perspectives on Aboriginal issues in Prairie cities. Results of the survey will be published in academic reports and journals and presented at conferences.

INTRO2.
May I please speak with a person in your household who is 18 years of age or older and who is having the next birthday?

1. Yes, speaking CONTINUE
2. Yes, I'll get him/her REPEAT INTRODUCTION AND CONTINUE
3. Not available ARRANGE CALLBACK - REQUEST RESPONDENT FIRST NAME (RECORD IN NOTES) AND ARRANGE CALLBACK (PRESS THE CTRL AND END KEYS)

INTRO4.
First, are you an Aboriginal person; that is, First Nations, Métis or Inuit?

1. Yes SAY “Thank you very much, I have no further questions at this time. We are conducting separate interviews with Aboriginal people living in cities across the Prairies, but this particular survey is for non-Aboriginal people.” (PLEASE HIT CTRL-END AND LOG THE CALL AS "ABORIGINAL RESPONDENT")
2. No CONTINUE
3. Don’t Know THANK AND END INTERVIEW
INTRO5.
I would like to invite you to participate in this short survey. Participation is voluntary, and you can stop the survey at any time. Let me assure you that the information we collect is kept strictly confidential and none of the answers that you provide will be attributed to you personally. If you have any concerns or questions about the survey, you may contact the University of Saskatchewan Research Ethics Office toll free at 1-888-966-2975.

Are you willing to participate in the survey?

1. Yes CONTINUE
2. No THANK AND END INTERVIEW
3. Later/Not right now ARRANGE CALLBACK - REQUEST RESPONDENT FIRST NAME (RECORD IN NOTES) AND ARRANGE CALLBACK (PRESS THE CTRL AND END KEYS)

INTRO6.
Before we begin, can I please have your (complete six character) postal code?

IF RESPONDENT IS RELUCTANT, YOU CAN ASSURE THEM THAT THEIR POSTAL CODE WILL BE USED FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY (TO UNDERSTAND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CITIES AND BETWEEN AREAS OF THE CITY) AND WILL NOT BE USED TO IDENTIFY THEM IN ANY WAY.

ENSURE RESPONDENT PROVIDES COMPLETE SIX CHARACTER POSTAL CODE.

ALL SIX CHARACTER POSTAL CODES MUST BEGIN WITH AN ‘__(enter letter for that city/province)’, OTHERWISE THANK AND END THE INTERVIEW *NOW* (SIMULTANEOUSLY PRESS THE CTRL AND END KEYS) AND CODE AS ‘NOT QUALIFIED’.

1. (RECORD POSTAL CODE)

INTRO7.
(DO NOT READ)
RECORD SEX FROM RESPONDENT VOICE.

1. Male
2. Female
MAIN SURVEY (52 items total)

This survey is about Aboriginal people in Canada and specifically in your city. When we use the term “Aboriginal people” we mean First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people, and anyone who might self-identify as Aboriginal.

SECTION A: KNOWLEDGE (4 items)

A1.
In your opinion, what is the most important issue facing Aboriginal people in your city today? *(DO NOT READ – CODE ONE ONLY)*

1. Poverty/homelessness
2. Low education/dropping out of school
3. Land claims/territory rights
4. Poor health care system/health issues
5. Unemployment/lack of job opportunities
6. Alcohol/drug abuse/addiction
7. Acknowledgement/recognition/Treaty
8. Housing issues/poor living conditions
9. Equality/discrimination
10. Threat to culture and traditions/self-identity
11. Self-determination/independence
12. Suicide/mental health issues
13. Crime/violence
14. Low self-esteem/motivation
15. Insufficient government funding/support
16. Absence of leadership/self-sufficiency
17. Social issues/isolation/ability to integrate
18. Other (Please Specify): _______________________
88. (Don’t Know)
99. (Refused)

A2.
To the best of your knowledge is [insert city name] within a First Nations treaty area?

1. Yes
2. No
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

A3.
To the best of your knowledge what percentage of [insert city name]’s population is Aboriginal?
1. Enter population percent
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

A4.
To the best of your knowledge, what was the name of the Métis leader of the Red River Rebellion in Manitoba and the Northwest Rebellion in Saskatchewan during the late-1800s?

(DO NOT READ)

1. (Louis Riel)
2. (Other)
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

SECTION B: CONTACT (9 items)

B1.
How often do you interact personally with Aboriginal people at your workplace or during your daily activities? Is it... (READ LIST)

1. Frequently
2. Occasionally
3. Very Rarely
4. Never
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

B2.
How many of your close friends or family are Aboriginal? Would you say... (READ LIST)

1. None
2. A Few
3. Some
4. Many
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

I am going to read you a list of activities, and please tell me if you have done each of them in the past 12 months, over 12 months ago, or never. (Random B3-9)

B3.
Have you attended an Aboriginal spiritual or cultural ceremony, such as a pow-wow, a
smudging ceremony, or a sweat lodge ceremony?

*(DO NOT READ LIST)*

1. In past 12 months
2. Over 12 months ago
3. Never
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

B4.
Have you attended a performance of Aboriginal dance, music or singing?

*(DO NOT READ LIST)*

1. In past 12 months
2. Over 12 months ago
3. Never
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

B5.
Have you visited a museum exhibit about the lives and traditions of Aboriginal people?

*(DO NOT READ LIST)*

1. In past 12 months
2. Over 12 months ago
3. Never
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

B6.
Have you read a book about Aboriginal people?

*(DO NOT READ LIST)*

1. In past 12 months
2. Over 12 months ago
3. Never
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

B7.
Have you visited a First Nations reserve or Métis community?

*(DO NOT READ LIST)*
1. In past 12 months
2. Over 12 months ago
3. Never
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

B8. Have you watched television programming on the Aboriginal Peoples Television Network? *(DO NOT READ LIST)*

1. In past 12 months
2. Over 12 months ago
3. Never
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

B9. Have you visited a public space – such as a public park or square – that highlights Aboriginal culture? *(DO NOT READ LIST)*

1. In past 12 months
2. Over 12 months ago
3. Never
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

SECTION C: GOVERNANCE AND DEVELOPMENT (14 items)

In your opinion, would you say Aboriginal people and their cultures have made a major contribution, a moderate contribution, a minor contribution, or no contribution in the following areas...

*(Random C1-4)*

C1. The local identity of [insert city name here] *(DO NOT READ LIST)*

1. A Major Contribution
2. A Moderate Contribution
3. A Minor Contribution
4. No Contribution
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

C2.
Economic development in [insert city name here]

*(DO NOT READ LIST)*

1. A Major Contribution
2. A Moderate Contribution
3. A Minor Contribution
4. No Contribution
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

C3.
Arts and culture in [insert city name here]

*(DO NOT READ LIST)*

1. A Major Contribution
2. A Moderate Contribution
3. A Minor Contribution
4. No Contribution
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

C4.
The history of [insert city name here] and its surroundings

*(DO NOT READ LIST)*

1. A Major Contribution
2. A Moderate Contribution
3. A Minor Contribution
4. No Contribution
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

C5.
Would you describe the current relations between Aboriginal people and non-Aboriginal people in [insert city name here] as very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, or very negative?

*(DO NOT READ LIST)*

1. Very Positive
2. Somewhat Positive
3. Somewhat Negative
4. Very Negative
5. Neither Positive/Negative
6. (Don’t Know)
7. (Refused)

C6.
Do you think relations between Aboriginal people and non-Aboriginal people in [insert city name here] have improved, deteriorated or stayed about the same in recent years? *(DO NOT READ LIST)*

1. Improved
2. Deteriorated
3. About the Same
4. (Don’t Know)
5. (Refused)

C7.
Some people say that City Hall should engage with Aboriginal people and their organizations using different approaches than they use with non-Aboriginal people. Do you think having different approaches to engagement between City Hall and Aboriginal people is a...? *(READ LIST)*

1. Very Good Idea
2. Somewhat Good Idea
3. Somewhat Bad Idea
4. Very Bad Idea
5. (Don’t Know)
6. (Refused)

C8.
Which statement best reflects your opinion: *(READ LIST)*

1. Aboriginal communities in and around [insert city name] are an asset to the city.
2. Aboriginal communities in and around [Insert city name] are a hindrance to the city.
3. (Don’t Know)
4. (Refused)

For the following set of statements, please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree.
C9. The number of Aboriginal city councilors elected on city council should reflect the proportion of the city’s Aboriginal population. Do you...? (DO NOT READ LIST)

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Somewhat Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

C10. More of our streets, parks and public spaces should be named after local Aboriginal leaders, Aboriginal place names, and Aboriginal heritage. Do you...? (DO NOT READ LIST)

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Somewhat Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

C11. More of our city’s public buildings and facilities in the city should be built to reflect Aboriginal design elements in their architecture and interior design. Do you...? (DO NOT READ LIST)

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Somewhat Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

C12. More public art and monuments in the city should reflect the local Aboriginal cultures and histories. Do you...? (DO NOT READ LIST)

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Somewhat Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

C13.
City Hall should have an advisory committee of local Aboriginal leaders and citizens to consult with on municipal affairs. Do you...? (DO NOT READ LIST)

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Somewhat Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

C14.
City Hall should work closely with First Nations reserves in our region to plan for future growth and development. Do you...? (DO NOT READ LIST)

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Somewhat Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

SECTION D: RACIAL ATTITUDES (11 items)

I am now going to ask you a few general questions. For each of the following statements, please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree...

(Randomize D1- D3)

D1.
Aboriginal people should stop complaining about the past and simply get on with their lives. Do you...?
(DO NOT READ LIST)

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Somewhat Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)
D2.
It is important to honour treaties established with Aboriginal people. Do you...?  
(Do Not Read List)

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Somewhat Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

D3.
If Aboriginals would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites. Do you...?  
(Do Not Read List)

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Somewhat Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

D4.
How much of the racial tension that exists in Canada today do you think Aboriginal people are responsible for creating? Would you say it is...  
(Read List)

1. Not much at all
2. Some
3. Most
4. All of it.
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

D5.
Which of the following two statements best represents how you think about Aboriginal people?  
(Read)

1. Aboriginal people are just like other cultural or ethnic groups in Canada’s multicultural society
2. Aboriginal people have unique rights as the first inhabitants of Canada
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)
D6.
In your opinion, how important is it for non-Aboriginal Canadians to understand the history and cultures of Aboriginal people in Canada? Is it ...? *(READ LIST)*

1. Very Important
2. Somewhat Important
3. Not Very Important
4. Not Important at All
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

D7.
For the following statement please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree. I would be concerned if an Aboriginal family moved in next door. *(DO NOT READ LIST)*

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Somewhat Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
5. (I already live next door to an Aboriginal family.)
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

D8.
And again, For the following statement please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree. Generations of discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for Aboriginal people to work their way out of the lower class. *(DO NOT READ LIST)*

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Somewhat Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

D9.
In your opinion, are the problems facing Aboriginal people in [insert city name] caused primarily by...? *(READ LIST)*

1. Aboriginal People Themselves
2. Non-Aboriginal Peoples
3. Both Equally
4. Neither
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

D10. How often do you think that Aboriginal people experience discrimination in [insert city name] these days? Do they experience discrimination...? *(READ LIST)*

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. Rarely
4. Never
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

D11. For comparison’s sake, how often do you think that immigrant newcomers experience discrimination in [insert city name] these days...?

*(READ LIST)*

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. Rarely
4. Never
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

SECTION E: IDEOLOGY (4 items)

I am now going to ask a few general questions about your views on government and society.

E1. Government should leave it ENTIRELY to the private sector to create jobs. Do you...? *(READ LIST)*

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Somewhat Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

E2.
People who don’t get ahead should blame themselves, not the system. Do you...? (READ LIST)

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Somewhat Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

E3.
Government should see that everyone has a decent standard of living. Do you...? (READ LIST)

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Somewhat Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

E4.
In FEDERAL politics, do you usually think of yourself as a: Liberal, Conservative, New Democrat, Green, or none of these?

1. Liberal
2. Conservative
3. New Democrat
4. Green
5. Other (please specify)____________
6. None of these
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

SECTION F: DEMOGRAPHICS (10 items)

To make sure that we are talking to a cross section of residents in your city, we need to get a little information about your background.

F1.
In what year were you born?
0001. (ENTER YEAR OF BIRTH)
9999. (Refused)

F2.
What is the highest level of education that you have completed? *(READ LIST IF NECESSARY)*

1. No Schooling
2. Some Elementary School
3. Completed Elementary School
4. Some Secondary / High School
5. Completed Secondary / High School
6. Some Technical or Community College
7. Completed Technical or Community College
8. Some University
9. Bachelor's Degree
10. Master's Degree
11. Professional Degree (e.g., Degrees in Planning, Architecture, Engineering, Law, Medicine)
12. Doctorate
99. (Refused)

F3.
Are you currently self-employed, working for pay, retired, unemployed or looking for work, a student, caring for a family, or something else? *(READ LIST IF NECESSARY)*

*IF RESPONDENT PROVIDES TWO ANSWERS, ASK FOR THE CATEGORY THAT DESCRIBES THEM BEST. DO NOT USE THE ‘OTHER’ OPTION UNLESS THE CATEGORIES PROVIDED ARE UNSUITABLE.*

01. Self-employed (with or without employees)
02. Working for pay (full or part time, includes on paid leave)
03. Student and working for pay
04. Caring for children or other family members and working for pay
05. Retired and working for pay
06. Retired and not working
07. Unemployed / Looking for work
08. Student and not working
09. Caring for children or other family members full time
10. Disabled
11. Other
99. (Refused)

F4.
Counting yourself, how many people live in your household?

**IF ASKED, THIS INCLUDES ALL PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN THE HOUSEHOLD AND NOT JUST FAMILY MEMBERS.**

01. (RECORD NUMBER 1 – 20) (If answer = 1 SKIP F7)
99. (Refused)

F5. And how many of your household members are under 18 years of age?

01. (RECORD NUMBER 0 – 19)
99. (Refused)

F6. In which country were you born?

1  Canada  (SKIP TO F8)
2  Other Country - PLEASE SPECIFY  (CONTINUE)
9. (Refused)  (SKIP TO F8)

F7. In what year did you come to Canada?

0001. (RECORD YEAR 1901-2014)
9999. (Refused)

F8. Are you a member of a visible minority community (that is, a person, other than an Aboriginal person, who is non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour)?

1. Yes
2. No
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

F9. In your life would you say religion is.... (READ LIST)

1. Very Important
2. Somewhat Important
3. Not Very Important
4. Not Important at All
8. (Don’t Know)
9. (Refused)

F10.
Could you please tell me your total annual household income from all sources in 2013. Was it...? *(READ LIST)*

**IF ASKED, ALL SOURCES INCLUDE EMPLOYMENT INCOME (WAGES OR SALARY), SAVINGS, PENSIONS, RENT, ETC.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>$25,000 to less than $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>$50,000 to less than $75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>$75,000 to less than $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.</td>
<td>$100,000 to less than $125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.</td>
<td>$125,000 to less than $150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.</td>
<td>$150,000 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>(Don't Know)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>(Refused)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION**

Thank you very much. Those are all the questions that I have. For more information on the study itself you can contact Dr. Ryan Walker in the Department of Geography and Planning at the University of Saskatchewan at 306-966-5664.

**Endnotes**

1 “Generally speaking, social cohesion is a characteristic of the social unit; a macro-level
2 Racism is commonly defined as “incorporating the norms, ideologies, and behaviours that perpetuate racial inequality” (Brondolo, Libretti, Rivera, and Walsemann, 2012: 358).
3 Essentially social desirability pressures are caused by internalized egalitarian norms that inhibit respondents from honestly reporting their views and opinions, in this instance on racial matters (Huddy and Feldman, 2009: 424)
4 Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Regina, Saskatoon, Winnipeg, Thunder Bay, Toronto, Montreal and Halifax (Environics Institute, 2010)
5 The SSRL called all available numbers in Thompson and had 296 people agree to do the survey- this was acceptable because Thompson has a much lower population than the other cities.
6 Questions replicated from Morrison, Morrison, Harriman and Jewell (2008); Kinder and Sanders (1996); and Atkinson, Berdahl, McGrane and White (2012).
The “I already live next door to an Aboriginal family” option was not read to respondents but was recorded by interviewers. This question was modified from a question used in a study by Durrheim, Ballie, Johnstone (2008) and McConahay (1986).


These questions were replicated from Atkinson, Berdahl, McGrane and White (2012).

“Economic conservatism refers to a dimension of attitudes that are concerned with the involvement of the government and the regulation of private enterprise in the economic lives of its citizens” (Everett, 2013: 1)

The other two being: 1) increasing knowledge of the out-group and 2) decreasing anxiety around members of the out-group (Pettigrew and Tropp 2008).