

- 9 Strictly speaking, Table 11.1 does not exhaust the possible contrasts in the ethnolinguistic domain. Omitted are interactions among region, language, and race. We did explore them, at considerable peril of collinearity and with small numbers of observations at some of the intersections. There is a hint that francophones outside Quebec are peculiarly sensitive to racial context. But francophones inside Quebec seem utterly like non-francophones, inside and outside Quebec, in sensitivity. Similarly, patterns among visible-minority respondents seem undifferentiated by language. Making these points in a table would have made interpretation of coefficients unwieldy. That fact combined with the absence of effects dictated presenting the simpler pattern in what is already a complicated table.
- 10 See Table 11A.1.
- 11 "Theoretical" is here used in the sense intended by Achen (1977). The rest of the discussion in this paragraph mixes what he describes as "level" and "dispersion" effects.
- 12 Mobility and education are closely related to the local visible-minority percentage.
- 13 Details on reliability can be found in the appendix to this chapter.
- 14 Although the α for this scale is only 0.54, no alternative ordering of items dominates this one, in the sense that the α is always smaller. There is no reason to conclude that the scale should be broken up. Item scale correlations are 0.48 to 0.58 for all items, with the weakest links for the items that mention "welfare" by name. In a factor analysis of the items only one factor carries an eigenvalue greater than 1, all items load similarly on this first factor, and rotation of the axes yields nothing informative.
- 15 The wording separated by a slash indicates a wording experiment. One half the sample received the first wording and one-half, the second, with assignment to treatment determined by a random number. This randomization was motivated by our sense that the claim for choice might seem stronger if it were motivated by intensity of preference rather than simple ability to pay. As it happens, the reverse seems true, and the difference does not clear the minimum 5 percent threshold.
- 16 Our questionnaire has two other items about the system, but neither fits well with the one in the text. One question is about confidence in the actual availability of a bed when needed. This may be relevant to response to our core question, but it should be regarded as another variable in the estimation rather than as part of the definition of the dependent variable. We leave it aside here as something of a distraction from what is already a complicated argument. We also ask for perceptions of the system's essential fairness. Response to this question can go either way in its implications for the core issue, so we leave it aside as well.
- 17 The CPP question embodies a randomization on the wording of who would be better off. Ironically, the benefits are seen to be greater the more remote the beneficiary, and each contrast is statistically significant. Although the error in the

measure is tied to treatment, the administration of the treatment is purely at random relative to all other covariance in the data matrix. Were we to use this item alone as our pension indicator, we would dummy out the randomizations. As we are pooling this item's variance with that from the general pension item, we have elected to treat the randomization as measurement error.