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Abstract

This paper analyzes the constitutional discourse in Canada with specific reference to university education and its effect on the opinions of individuals. It proposes that competing conceptions of equality may lie at the heart of Canada's constitutional stalemate, and that university education influences which conception will be supported. Differentiated equality is equality defined as universal basic human rights augmented by group-specific rights where necessary. This contrasts with the more, traditional definition of equality, undifferentiated equality, where equality requires identical treatment of all citizens by the state.

The university-educated appear to be far more likely to have the cognitive capacities and social experience to come to support claims for differentiated equality than are the non-university-educated. This paper looks at the literature on the university experience, and what it may be from this experience that leads individuals to become more likely to support group-specific rights. The paper looks at the reasoning chains used by individuals, and posits that the university-educated employ more complex reasoning chains that include ideas as well as feelings.

The statistical analysis yields some interesting and significant results. There is a consistent difference between the university-educated and those who have never attended university on support for differentiated equality. Whether it is group specific rights for Aboriginal people, for Quebec, or for ethnic minorities in Canada, a 15-20% gap consistently appears between the university and non-university educated. The paper also attempts to gauge statistically what factors of the university experience are important in the development of support for either of the conceptions of equality.

If differentiated equality is the chosen route for resolving Canada's constitutional challenge, this paper reveals a number of hurdles, both conceptual and practical, that will have to be cleared before Canada will be able to move forward.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

There have been many solutions proposed to resolve Canada's constitutional stalemate. They include ideas such as: independence or sovereignty-association for Quebec and some Aboriginal nations; a Canada-Quebec union; a vision of a pan-Canadian nationalism based on the equality of all citizens, and many others.\(^1\) One of the proposed solutions is asymmetrical multinational federalism, a vision of Canada where national minorities are given different, or special, powers within the federation. This theory, which falls within the framework of the 'politics of difference', has been articulated by a number of theorists, including Will Kymlicka, Charles Taylor, Iris Marion Young, and Jane Jenson.\(^2\) The national minorities themselves have advocated this position during previous constitutional negotiations.

The Charlottetown Accord proposed a watered-down version of asymmetrical multinational federalism, giving special powers to both national minorities (distinct society for Quebec, self-governance to Aboriginal nations) but also symmetrical federalist provisions such as the Triple E Senate. The Accord was defeated in a nation-wide referendum in October of 1992. A study of the Accord found that the only significant demographic group that supported the Accord were the university educated.\(^3\)

---


This paper postulates that what may have caused this gap between the university-educated and the non-university-educated are competing conceptions of equality, one which is articulated pragmatically in a vision of asymmetrical federalism, the other taking the form of symmetrical federalism. Asymmetrical federalism falls within a conception of equality known as differentiated equality, whereas advocates of undifferentiated equality tend to support a vision of symmetrical federalism.

Yet the Charlottetown Accord is not a good test on its own, as it included many proposals and other political baggage that may have influenced the results. It is therefore necessary to test this idea further, and see if a gap exists between the university and the non-university educated on other, more specific issues relating to differentiated and undifferentiated equality. Is it possible that differentiated equality is a more complex conception than undifferentiated equality, and to reach a position of support for this conception requires certain cognitive skills and social experiences that are obtained in the university years? And if this is the case, what is it about the university experience that leads to one supporting one conception over the other?

This paper will attempt to break down these questions, and measure statistically whether or not a gap exists between the university and non-university educated on these competing claims of equality. It is the hypothesis of this paper that the cognitive development and social diversity inherent in the university experience will lead the university-educated to be more likely to support claims for differentiated equality. The university-educated will be more likely to support differentiated equality because they have been exposed to relativism and the value of diversity, both in lifestyles and cultures and in thought more generally. They will be more supportive of diversity than those who have not attended a university. And while many of those who support diversity will support undifferentiated equality because of their ideology or affect, a significant gap will
remain between the university-educated and the non-university-educated in their support for differentiated equality.

Chapter two gives a brief introduction into the competing theories of undifferentiated and differentiated equality, laying the theoretical foundation for the discussion that will follow. It discusses the history of the competing ideas, and how they have gained a following in contemporary discourse. It will be shown that these competing conceptions of equality are manifested in competing visions of Canada, and these competing visions frequently appear in our constitutional discourse.

Chapter three discusses the effects of a university education on the cognitive abilities and social experiences of those who have attended. Using literature from the fields of educational and political psychology, it posits a number of theories that may explain why the university-educated would be more likely to support a conception of equality that favours different, rather than identical treatment of citizens. It analyses the reasoning chains of both groups and shows how the university-educated are more likely to hold complex chains that include a number of factors, including ideas and feelings. The non-university educated are more likely to form their opinions based on affect alone.

Chapter four contains the explorative data analysis, and it attempts to answer the question of whether there exists a statistically significant gap between the university and the non-university educated on their support for claims for differentiated equality. The paper finds that over a number of surveys and a number of years, a 15-20% gap consistently appears between the university and the non-university educated in their support for ‘differentiated equality’.

Chapter five takes the analysis one step further, looking at the theory on the impact of university education, and trying to find indicators in the data that will allow a statistical analysis of what it is about a university education that leads to
increased support on issues of differentiated equality. The data illustrates that on questions that clearly articulate the differentiated/undifferentiated debate, many of the indicators posited by the educational theorists in chapter three appear to be statistically significant. The regression analyses also show that when emotionally charged issues such as distinct society and self-government are used as the dependent variable, feelings and ideology play a much more significant role.

There have been many proposals put forward to solve Canada’s constitutional challenge. Two of the major proposals seem to be at odds conceptually, and are holding up any progress in this area. One vision can be referred to as the ‘Trudeau’ vision, a view of equal treatment of all citizens and no preferential treatment based on ethnicity or nationalism. This is a vision of undifferentiated equality. On the other hand is the position articulated by many of the minorities themselves, and that is of equal rights for all, augmented by special rights designed to remedy inequalities or protect culture. This is a vision of differentiated equality.

If asymmetrical federalism is the solution to Canada’s constitutional stalemate, as many academic theorists, political elites, and national and ethnic minorities have posited, what are the conditions that will lead to popular support for these proposals? What is it about the university experience that makes citizens more likely to support this vision of the country? And how divided is the country over these two competing conceptions of equality, and with what results?
Chapter 2

The Competing Conceptions of Equality

Differing conceptions of equality may lie at the heart of Canada's constitutional stalemate. Canada's national minorities are demanding differential treatment on the basis of historical relationships and the need for justice and equality. Yet the Canadian population seems reluctant to give in to the demands of its minority nations. Cries of inequality and injustice are often heard when any 'special' treatment is proposed for Quebec or Aboriginal nations.

This is not a simple divide easily remedied, as it involves complex conceptions of equality and liberalism. On the one hand there is the popular notion of equality that began in the Enlightenment period in Europe, took hold in the American Revolution, and has become a nearly universal paradigm since the end of the Second World War. All people are equal, are should therefore be treated in the same way by governments, accorded the same rights and responsibilities. This can be termed 'colour-blind' equality, or undifferentiated equality.

Recently, a new form of equality politics has emerged, termed the politics of difference, or differentiated equality. Its position is that while universal human rights are necessary, they can and should be augmented by certain group rights in cases of historical injustice, oppression, or simply difference. Examples of differentiated equality include Aboriginal self-government and Quebec language laws, among others.

This is a complex debate as it involves conceptions of equality that may have at their foundation the just treatment of groups and individuals in society. On one hand, proponents of undifferentiated equality argue that societies will be too divided if we focus on difference and accord special treatment to groups based
on culture and ethnicity. The way to achieve a proper balance between group recognition and individual liberty is to focus on the individual, allowing them the freedom to choose the extent of their association with cultural or ethnic groups. Proponents of differentiated equality argue that history has shown that it is not difference itself that causes political and social strife, it is the lack of recognition and devaluation of groups that is at fault. As a result, the solution is to treat groups equally, and individuals within those groups will feel more included as they will be equally able to participate in the country, via their cultural group membership.

This chapter will briefly lay out both visions of equality, and both visions of Canada. It provides the foundation for the discussion on education and the quantitative analysis that follow.

2.1 Undifferentiated Equality and the Culture of Equality

Advocates of undifferentiated equality argue that “the best way for each citizen to enjoy similar benefits, opportunities and protections is for each individual to be treated approximately the same way by public institutions in the sense that each is granted similar political, social, and civil rights.” We are all equal to each other, and the state should not differentiate between us – for this would be unequal and unfair. The revolution of equal rights began during the Enlightenment, as people tried to eliminate the arbitrary divisions binding individuals by their sex, race, religion, class or occupation. Prior to this social revolution, social inequality was promoted and justified by the church and the state on the basis that people are different, and that some of these differences are inherently better than others.

In the over two hundred years since the Enlightenment heralded the moral equality of all persons, “the forces of light have struggled for liberty and political equality against the dark forces of irrational prejudice, arbitrary metaphysics, and the crumbling towers of patriarchal church, state, and family.”\(^5\) The American revolution was fought on the principles of the enlightenment, yet even in the U.S. the fight continued until the 1960s, when the civil rights movement finally ushered in what appeared to be equal status of all persons in America. Since then, equality fighters have worked to remove the last vestiges of inequality, and many have commented that we are closer to reaching the Enlightenment objective than ever before.

It is from this pedigree that the term equality has risen, giving it a moral weight and a historical advantage that is truly remarkable. One can hardly speak of equality in our era without thinking of the civil rights movement, the continued fight of blacks and women to be treated as substantive equals in society, as well as the horrors and atrocities connected with group-differentiated treatment, such as apartheid in South Africa and the Nazis in the mid-century.

And there is much to be learned from these achievements, as well as protected. As Iris Marion Young has stated, “Enlightenment ideals of liberty and political equality did and do much to inspire movements against oppression and domination, whose success has created social values and institutions we would not want to lose.”\(^6\)

This conception of equality has become the popular discourse in Western society. It has been enshrined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and is fiercely protected by the Canadian population.\(^7\)

---

\(^5\) Young, 1990: 156
\(^6\) Young, 1990: 157
Brian Barry, a British theorist, is one of the leading advocates of the undifferentiated equality vision, which he has referred to as 'the politics of solidarity'. This vision states that citizens belong to a single society, and share a common fate. This is one of his critiques of the 'politics of difference', and it focuses on the inability of differential treatment to bind a diverse citizenry together. Barry argues that differentiated equality divides groups, focusing on how they are different rather than promoting how they are the same. Individual equality allows people to practice their own religion, promote their own cultures, and live differently, but at the state level it ensures that the ties that bind are paramount, and that all citizens are deemed equal and receive identical treatment. Supporters of undifferentiated equality worry that differential treatment leads to a society where "group identities and group loyalties have primacy over any broader, society-wide identity and loyalty."

Barry offers a semantic critique of 'multiculturalists', whom he defines as the supporters of the politics of difference and differentiated equality. His critique is that 'multiculturalism' has been used to describe both cultural and ethnic diversity as well as a certain set of policies. As a result, it has become difficult to accept diversity "while rejecting the policies advanced under the name of multiculturalism." This critique is important, as it illustrates that criticisms of the politics of difference do not always entail a disdain for cultural and ethnic diversity. Rather, like Barry, they see a society that promotes the primacy of the individual and emphasizes the commonalities of all citizens as a way of avoiding the negative side-effects of cultural and ethnic diversity.

Barry's most strident critique of the politics of difference, and therefore for undifferentiated equality, is "the endemic tendency [of multiculturalists] to assume that distinctive cultural attributes are the defining features of all groups. This assumption leads to the conclusion that whatever problems a group may face are

---

9 Barry, 2001: 301
bound to arise in some way from its distinctive cultural attributes." First of all, which groups in society are deemed to have a culture? Quebecers, Aboriginal people, religious groups, the elderly, disabled, gays and lesbians? What distinguishes groups who need special powers from those who do not? The disadvantaged groups on Iris Young’s list include nearly 90% of the population. As Kwame Anthony Appiah has stated, “culture is not the problem, and it is not the solution.” While Barry notes that sometimes culture is the problem, it is not nearly as pervasive a problem as the multiculturalists would have us believe. Instead of picking and choosing which cultures require help and which do not, advocates of undifferentiated equality see the solution as one that focuses on the equal treatment of individuals, rather than groups, and treats all groups in an identical fashion. This would bring citizens together and focus on their similarities and common goals rather than on what divides them.

2.2 Differentiated Equality and the Politics of Difference

From the near realization of the Enlightenment ideals has come a new paradigm, from the voices of oppressed and disadvantaged groups in our society. The success of the movements against differential privilege has created new movements that focus on cultural pride and protection and group-differentiated treatment. This will be called differentiated equality, as it is a conception of equality that focuses on the needs to treat groups differently in order to achieve equal status of groups. The theory posits that it is only by achieving equal group status that individuals can be equal, as society is inherently structured around groups, some of which are advantaged, some of which are oppressed. By focusing solely on the individual, one ignores the fact that universalism is actually the doctrine of the majority, and that there are different ways of being, and that some wish to live in other ways.

---

10 Barry, 2001: 293
11 Barry, 2001: 305
12 Barry, 2001: 306
13 Barry, 2001: 306
Differentiated equality requires that "individuals not be denied opportunities or benefits because of their religion, race, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation, but its advocates argue that these protections must sometimes be augmented by group rights or special status for groups that suffer unjust disadvantages that cannot otherwise be rectified."\(^{15}\) This could mean self-government rights for Aboriginal nations who wish to protect their culture and live differently than the Anglo-Saxon majority, or language and immigration rights for Quebec, whose population wishes to protect its language and culture in an English continent. Proponents note that these group-specific rights are in addition to universal rights, but often these universal rights need to be interpreted through a different lens than is used for the English-Canadian majority.

The advocates of differentiated equality place the focus of the debate on the desirability and reality of social groups in society. For some theoretical proponents of undifferentiated equality, a decline in group relevance and identification is unavoidable, as well as desirable. And while it is beyond the purview of this study to debate the advantages and disadvantages for the individual and society of group membership, advocates of differentiated equality intone that the issue is purely academic, as social groups are present, and are influential upon the lives of individuals.\(^{16}\) Globalization and urbanization have not led to a lessening of social group ties, as many theorists had posited. In fact, "the urban concentration and interaction among groups that modernizing social processes introduce tend to reinforce group solidarity and differentiation. Attachment to specific traditions, practices, language, and other culturally specific forms is a crucial aspect of social existence."\(^{17}\)

\(^{14}\) Young, 1996  
\(^{15}\) Eisenberg, 1999: 6  
\(^{16}\) Young, 1990  
\(^{17}\) Young, 1990: 163
Proponents of this vision note that attempts at assimilation and cultural repression have rarely succeeded, and have more often increased hostility and hardened cultural borders and resolve. The Aboriginal population endured what may have been one of the longest and most strenuous assimilation attempts in history. From residential schools to the banning of the potlatch to the 1969 White Paper, the Canadian government has attempted to dismantle the culture of the many Aboriginal nations scattered across the country. Neither large nor well resourced, many Aboriginal cultures emerged from this assimilation attempt, devastated economically and psychologically, but intent nonetheless on preserving the remnants of their cultural heritage.

Advocates of differentiated equality argue that group differences exist in our society, contributing to advantageous social relations for some and subordination of others. Within this context, Iris Marion Young has outlined three ways in which the denial of difference can be oppressive to disadvantaged groups. The first is that blindness to difference inherently disadvantages groups who are not in the mainstream. Assimilation always implies entering the game after the rules have been set, and the rules will surely be advantageous to the creators. The more similar you are to those who developed the rules, the better you will do at the game.

Secondly, "the ideal of a universal humanity without social group difference allows privileged groups to ignore their own groups specificity. Blindness to difference perpetuates cultural imperialism by allowing norms expressing the point of view and experience of privileged groups to appear neutral and universal." Proponents note that we immediately assume that colour-blindness is a good thing, but unless we are all starting from equal positions, with rules we have all agreed upon, undifferentiated treatment and colour blindness will inherently favour those who wrote the rules and who set the standards of 'humanity'. For example, in the Canadian Charter, democratic rights are

18 Young, 1990: 165
espoused as universal rights, yet they conflict with some Aboriginal nations' desire for a more consensus-based decision-making. The final point made by Young is that the denigration of groups that deviate from these 'universal norms' can often produce an internal devaluation by members of the groups themselves.

Advocates propose that the promotion of a politics of difference and the realization by the dominant group of its lack of cultural neutrality can lead to an ideal situation where groups are meeting each other as equals and they can look at the existing rules, see how they advantage some and disadvantage others and restructure the process together for full inclusion.

At its heart, differentiated equality sees a fundamentally different view of liberation than does the undifferentiated view. The undifferentiated ideal involves denying the desirability and reality of social groups in society and sees the individual as the key instrument of liberation. The individual should be free to make his or her own decisions, including participation in social groups. It is equality between individuals that is paramount, and identical treatment of individuals will reach this goal. Differentiated equality/politics of difference argue that society should not eliminate or transcend group difference: "Rather, there is equality between socially and culturally differentiated groups, who mutually respect one another and affirm one another in their difference."\(^{19}\) The focal point remains the equality of individuals, yet it presumes that one of the key barriers to equality is one's social group, so eliminating group difference eliminates peoples' valuable cultural identities as well as the possibility for individual equality.

Will Kymlicka has posited three major justifications for group-differentiated rights: the equality argument, a history-based argument, and the value of cultural diversity. He does not place as much emphasis on the third, but sees it more as a positive side effect of the recognition of diversity. His description of the first two justifications neatly sums up what has been discussed above.

\(^{19}\) Young, 1990: 163
The equality argument posits that group-specific rights are needed to ensure that all citizens are treated with genuine equality. Group rights, many of which have been discussed in this country's constitutional debates, include such things as territorial autonomy, guaranteed representation, language rights, and self-government rights. These rights may be necessary to mitigate the influence of majority rule. The maintenance and development of minority cultures may be threatened by economic and political decisions made by the majority. The minority could be outvoted on issues that are critical to the survival of their culture. As Kymlicka notes, “the members of the majority culture do not face this problem [and often do not even recognize it in the minority]...Given the importance of cultural membership, this is a significant inequality, which, if not addressed, becomes a serious injustice...the protections [mentioned above] ensure that members of the minority have the same opportunity to live and work in their own culture as members of the majority.”

Proponents of this vision state that group-differentiated rights are designed [for the most part] to ensure that national minorities have the same opportunity to work and live and to develop their culture as the majority. By denying Quebecers and Aboriginal peoples the autonomy and self-rule they desire, we are restricting their opportunity to develop themselves in the manner in which they see fit. The historical justification relates directly to the equality argument, as it is the reason why some are provided with group-specific rights such as self-governance or language protections while other are not. The history-based argument aims to show that the minority has a historical claim to the group-differentiated right, “based on prior sovereignty, treaties, or some other historical agreement or precedent.” One need not look far in Canada to find national minorities whose claims to group-specific rights are based upon historical as well as equality arguments.

---

21 Kymlicka, 1995: 116
2.3 Conclusion

The Canadian population is grappling with a number of proposals to resolve our constitutional dilemma. The foundations of the major competing conceptions are outlined in this chapter, and they centre on differing conceptions of how the government should relate to its citizens. On one hand we have undifferentiated equality, a vision of equality whereby all citizens are treated identically by the state, and different groups are bound together by the rights they share with one another. Establishing a system where the individual is paramount mitigates division and conflict between national or ethnic groups, and allows individuals the freedom to join or leave groups as they please.

Differentiated equality posits that individuals cannot be substantively equal if their group is not treated with equal respect to the majority culture. It sees culture as an important player in the lives of individuals, and places a value on the maintenance of cultures. And while proponents of undifferentiated equality may value culture in its own right, they do not see it as the role of governments to protect culture. And at the heart lie different visions of what social cohesion may require. For differentiated theorists, conflict between ethnic and cultural groups is more likely if cultures are not recognized as important and treated with equal respect to the dominant culture. For undifferentiated theorists, nationalism and cultural protections have been the cause of much of the world's social strife, and only by eliminating group distinctions and differential treatment will individuals be able to fully realize their potential.

Differentiated equality is a newer concept in the popular discourse, and it may be a conceptually more complex theory. As a result, it is possible that certain segments of the population will be more likely to internalize it than others. And while the university-educated will probably be divided over the theory articulated above based on other ideas such as ideology or how much a group need the
assistance, the non-university-educated may find it easier to understand and support undifferentiated equality.
Chapter 3
The Impact of University on Students

The research of Richard Johnston and his colleagues on the Charlottetown Accord revealed that university education was one of the major predictors of support for the Accord. The Accord articulated a watered-down vision of differentiated equality by including the distinct society clause desired by Quebec as well as self-government rights for Aboriginal nations. University-educated individuals were 20% more likely to support the compromises of the Accord than were those who had not attended university. The university-educated were the only significant demographic group to have a majority who voted yes to the Accord, if only barely.

What was it about education that lead people to be more likely to support the Accord? Johnston hypothesized that it was their positive feelings towards Quebec and their support for minority rights that were the driving forces behind the decision of the university educated to support the Accord.22 As we will see in the discussion of reasoning chains, the university-educated are more likely to use both affect (feelings towards Quebec) and ideas (support for minority rights) when they form opinions on political issues. The less educated are more likely to focus on their feelings towards groups as a basis for their opinion building. The research on the Charlottetown Accord leads us in to the discussion of what it is about a university education that promotes the ideas in question, most notably for this study, the ideas of differentiated and undifferentiated equality.

The hypothesis of this paper is that the university-educated will be more positive towards the idea of difference, of different ways of living and the validity of alternative conceptions of the goals of society. They will also be more relativistic thinkers, realizing the unlikelihood and undesirability of there being a single ‘truth’

22 Johnston, 1996: 187
in a multicultural society. This may lead the university-educated to be more accommodating of claims for differentiated rights by minorities, as they realize that different cultures and ways of being require different powers and structures. Their positive feelings towards Quebec may lead them to support claims for assistance and differential treatment, but the complex nature of the educated individual's reasoning chain require that we look at the ideas that may be affecting their decisions.

There are many who have attended university who will not support differentiated equality, and for very good reasons, some of which were articulated in chapter two. The purpose of this chapter is to lay out what it is about a university education that predisposes individuals to support difference and to be more likely to see equality as including, and often requiring, differential treatment. What I propose is that a university education brings individuals to a position where they support cultural and ethnic diversity, understand and accept difference, and rely on a number of ideas as well as feelings to come to a position on these issues. Comparatively, those who have not attended university will be more likely to focus their opinion-formation on feelings, and will not acquire the cognitive abilities and social experiences to make them accepting of difference.

What is it about a university education that might enable people to understand and support difference, and use it as part of their reasoning chain when debating special rights for Quebeckers, Aboriginal people, and other minorities? This chapter will begin with a brief discussion of the political psychology literature on reasoning chains and the role of education. It will then look at the research on the impact of university on citizens, and what it may be about the university experience that leads to some accepting a differentiated conception of equality and others accepting an undifferentiated conception.

3.1 Ideas vs. Feelings and Education
The leading research on public opinion in the United States (and more recently in Canada) has focused on a central theme: the public is unaware, uninterested, and unprepared to take an active part in the governance of the nation. They rarely think about major issues and often fail to work through to a consistent position on ones they do think about. Yet more current research has found that lumping all of the citizenry into one group of uninterested, irrational individuals is not accurate. Citizens do reason about issues, but they do it in different ways, based on certain characteristics.

The major divide, articulated first by Stimson in 1975, is one of cognitive ability, which he measured using political awareness and education level. And while his research simply articulated this division, it led to research showing that education and information make the reasoning chains for decision-making more precise and consistent. Less sophisticated citizens do use simplified reasoning chains to make up their minds on political issues. Both groups rely on cognitive shortcuts, called heuristics, but the less sophisticated voters rely to a greater extent on these shortcuts. As Sniderman et al state: "...citizens compensate for a lack of information about political issues by relying on shortcuts in reasoning, or heuristics, and second, the heuristics they take advantage of systematically vary according to their level of political information and awareness."

Education is often used as a proxy for political sophistication, and it is a good one, because it covaries strongly with political awareness and information, and it is clearly and consistently measured. So the question in this section is: how do reasoning chains and heuristics vary by education level. What it is about education that does so is the focus of the next section in this chapter.

---
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3.2 Reasoning Chains, Heuristics and Education

As citizens do not go about their daily lives fully stocked with opinions on political issues, when asked what they think on a certain issue they must develop an answer, often on the spot. John Zaller posits that it is possible that they work out each issue in an ad-hoc way, but that it is more likely that individuals will follow some chain of reasoning.\textsuperscript{27} The starting point of this reasoning chain will be general considerations, though there are unlikely to be a great many of these considering the lack of political information held by most citizens. Paul Sniderman states that the three general considerations most often used by citizens are ideology, affect, and the desert heuristic.\textsuperscript{28} All of them are cognitive shortcuts that enable relatively uninformed citizens to develop positions on specific issues.

\textit{Ideological reasoning} occurs when people consult their general orientation towards liberalism or conservatism, and base their opinion on whether it conforms with this ideology. \textit{Affective reasoning} is basically one's feelings towards the groups in question, and basing one's opinion upon those feelings. \textit{The desert heuristic} occurs when citizens make up their mind on an issue on whether they feel the group in question deserves support. It must be stated as well that these heuristics can be related to each other, as one's feelings towards a group can affect their view of whether or not they think a group deserves assistance, and so on.\textsuperscript{29} The pattern of heuristical use and other considerations form the reasoning chain, and it should differ by education. Sniderman describes one possible reasoning chain, in this case using the example of people's support for government assistance for blacks in the United States.

\textsuperscript{28} Sniderman et al, 1991: 71
\textsuperscript{29} Sniderman et al, 1991: 73
“On this view of how people reason about policy, they move from abstract to specific. Their starting point can be ideology, or affect towards blacks, both being early in the causal chain. Then, moving from general to specific, their fix their attribution of the reasons that blacks have problems – the so-called desert heuristic. Finally, with this in place, they arrive at the most specific belief, at the end of the chain of reasoning, their opinion on the issue of government assistance for blacks.”

Sniderman et al found in their analysis that the reasoning chains of the less educated are indeed affect-driven: “What they think, both about what government should do for blacks and about why blacks have problems, depends on how they feel about blacks, with ideology having very little impact on either.” This is contrasted by their finding that the opinions of the well educated are determined more by ideology than by affect. Sniderman and his colleagues found that affect-driven reasoning chains, manifested primarily among the less educated, often follow a less meticulous path than the one laid out above. As the study found, rather than working their way along the chain hierarchically, from general to specific, the less educated skip over the intermediate steps, and go directly from affect to opinion. They then proceed to work their way backwards, filling in the holes in the chain. Therefore, what can be seen to hold together the belief systems of the less well-educated is their reliance upon the affect heuristic to enable them to come to opinions on issues without knowing that much about them.

For ideology-driven reasoning chains, the desert heuristic is the key, as it relates directly to liberal and conservative views by means of internal vs. external definitions of responsibility. And the educated are by far the most likely to use this type of reasoning chain to develop their opinions of issues. In the case of racial policy, “the more educated a person is, the more likely he is to base his
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position on assistance for blacks on his overall political outlook, favoring government assistance if he is liberal, opposing it if he is conservative.\textsuperscript{33}

Sniderman warns that while the distinction between the well educated and the less educated is instructive, it is not as straightforward as it would initially seem. It is too easy to say that the educated are cognition-driven while the uneducated are affect-driven. While the less educated are more likely to base their opinions on feelings, "the well educated, in working out their opinions about racial policy, take into account both their beliefs \textit{and} their feelings. A mark of the politically aware and sophisticated is, briefly, a readiness to take advantage of a variety of means to achieve consistency – and that includes feelings as well as beliefs."\textsuperscript{34}

Sniderman's work illustrates the different reasoning chains used by people of different education levels, and the importance of affect and cognition in the forming of political beliefs. As we move into a discussion of attitudes towards equality, and how they differ by education level, it will be important to understand that it is not simply affect that is driving the well educated, but also ideas. The concept of equality is complex, and the well educated are more likely to possess the abstract reasoning abilities that will enable them to include ideas such as equality in their reasoning chains. The less well educated will not be able to bring this consideration into their analysis, and will therefore need to rely more upon their feelings to guide their opinions on issues of equality. The next section will look at what it is about the university education that may cause these different reasoning chains and attitudes towards minorities and differential treatment.

\section*{3.3 The Impact of Higher Education}

Research in the United States has shown that the impact of higher education goes far beyond the cognitive and intellectual development of the individual

\begin{flushleft}
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students, or the preparation of students for the work force. It has also been shown that university is a major factor in the "shaping of attitudes, values, and beliefs of young adults...the promotion of humanitarian values and civic responsibility is regarded as an important national benefit of a college education."35 There are a wide variety of benefits accruing from higher education, both to the student and to society.

Many theoretical approaches have been advanced to describe the impact that university/college has on attending students: "Students may be affected by their courses, the curriculum, and by liberal professors. College experiences allow students to interact with diverse group of peers and adults and also provide them with opportunities that can challenge and broaden established viewpoints."36 These college impact theories focus on the environmental effects of the university experience, and how this environment will shape the beliefs of the students. Developmental theories state that "the less parochial environment of college has a strong potential to facilitate the ability of students to separate from absorption in themselves, to empathize with others, and to adopt more pluralistic beliefs."37 Quinley and Glock argue that "universities reduce prejudice by providing students with knowledge about the historical, social, and economic factors contributing to minority-group differences..."38 Students also increase their cognitive capacity, giving them critical thinking skills that allow them to evaluate different sides of complex issues, and rely less upon the beliefs of the authorities.

Both the university environment and cognitive development appear to be important in the development of positive attitudes towards diversity. The environment allows them to meet people of different cultures, to begin to grapple with difference and to understand the historical reasons behind claims for

36 Lottes and Kuriloff, 1994: 33
37 Lottes and Kuriloff, 1994: 33
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differentiated treatment. The cognitive development allows them to relinquish the right-or-wrong thinking they may have held, and to rely less upon authorities for the basis of their opinions. It allows them to develop more complex reasoning chains as well as the ideas that will be prominent within these chains.

We will begin by looking at the research in the area, and begin to develop a comprehensive model for the impact of higher education on the ideas related to equality. The research is divided into two areas, developmental models and college impact models. They will be looked at separately, and then brought together at the end.

### 3.4 Developmental Theories of Higher Education

Developmental theories address "the nature, structure, and processes of individual human growth...[they] describe the dimensions of student development and the phases of individual growth along each dimension."\(^{39}\) Often these theories describe stages that students pass through in their university years, indicating a progression from one level to another. This change may be a result of "biological and physical maturation, individual experiences and the environment, or [of] the interaction of the individual and the environment."\(^{40}\)

There are four major categories of developmental theories: psychosocial theories, cognitive-structural theories, typological models, and person-environment interaction models. Psychosocial and cognitive models will be discussed here, as they are the most researched and popular models in the development area.\(^{41}\)

---


\(^{40}\) Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991: 18

\(^{41}\) It is beyond the scope and length of this paper to examine other less prominent theories as well as the critiques of the theories articulated above. For a comprehensive view of the typological models, the person-environment models, and critiques, refer to Pascarella and Terenzini's comprehensive book, *How College Affects Students*, 1991.
3.4.1 Psychosocial Theories

Based on the work of Erik Erikson, psychosocial theories are ones that view individual development as "a process that involves the accomplishment of a series of developmental tasks...individuals over their life span are confronted by a series of developmental challenges to their current identity or developmental status that require some form of response...The individual's success in resolving each task can significantly affect the resolution of succeeding tasks and, consequently, the rate and extent of psychosocial development." Arthur Chickering is the most influential psychosocial theorist, and he developed a theory comprising seven stages of student development.

For Chickering, "development along each vector involves cycles of differentiation and integration...The student continually apprehends more complexity...These more differentiated perceptions and behaviors are subsequently integrated and organized so that a coherent picture of himself is established. Growth along the vectors is not simple maturational unfolding but requires stimulation..."

Most freshmen, says Chickering, are attempting to resolve three vectors: competence, managing emotions, and developing autonomy. Seniors are trying to resolve four different vectors: establishing identity, freeing interpersonal relationships, and establishing integrity. "The first three vectors represent finding oneself – determining one's capabilities, integrating self-control and interdependence, and finding sexual-social expression – and finding that one can negotiate and be competent within the college's academic and social environment." The second four vectors represent the solidifying of one's identity and purpose.

---
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Chickering provides a valuable model for administrators and student service directors at the universities themselves. He establishes the development stages that need to be focused upon and advocates strategies that will reach them—such as residence stay for freshmen. In terms of its relevance for ideas of equality, Chickering’s theory shows the social development that is necessary for difference to become accepted via the strength of one’s own personal identity. Without this identity development, new ideas and ways of being would not be internalized and their validity not recognized. Without the personal stimulation found in the university environment, those who do not attend university will often fail to develop the personal self-confidence and identity necessary to be receptive of difference.

3.4.2 Cognitive-Structural Theories

Following the work of Jean Piaget, cognitive-structuralists “seek to describe the process of change, concentrating on the cognitive structures individuals construct in order to give meaning to their worlds.” These theories also usually focus on stages, often hierarchical, with the attainment of one stage the necessary prerequisite for the attainment of the next. The concern of cognitive-structuralists is not the content of meaning, but the structure of meaning-making. Development occurs through conflict—change occurs because of confusion that must be resolved.

The two major theorists in this area are Lawrence Kohlberg and William Perry. Kohlberg’s is a theory of moral development and it attempts to describe justice reasoning—“how people reason about what they should do when faced with a moral dilemma.” Kohlberg’s concern is not with the content of moral decision-making, which is culturally determined, but with the process of moral decision-

---

45 Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991: 27
46 Rodgers, 1989: 131
making and the cognitive structures that are assumed to be universal. The theory is comprised of three levels of moral development—pre-conventional, conventional, and post-conventional. At the earlier stages in this theory, a sense of justice is based upon considerations of self-interest and material advantage. At the other end of the spectrum of moral development, and individual's action are guided by an "internalized, conscience-based set of moral principles." Kohlberg's theory is important to the study of conceptions of equality because it may be the case that prior to university education, people focus their sense of social justice upon self-interest, whereas, the university education allows the development of a more external, others-focused sense of justice. In terms of equality, the focus would shift from 'they are getting more than me' to 'they may need more than me'.

William Perry offers a theory of cognitive development during university. The development sequence in his work "manifests a logical order—an order in which one form leads to another through differentiations and reorganizations required for the meaningful interpretations of increasingly complex experience." Perry's model has nine positions, grouped into three larger categories: dualism modified (1-3), relativism discovered (4-6), and commitments in relativism developed (7-9). Position 5 is the most important stage, as it is the point where the perception of all knowledge and values, including the authorities, becomes relative and contextual. "Prior to the attainment of Position 5, cognitive structures or ways of perceiving one's world are dominated by a dualistic perception: things are either right or wrong, good or bad, and knowledge of which is which is derived from "Authority"." At Position 5, the individual begins to perceive multiple points of view as well as the indeterminacy of "Truth". Relativism and contextualism is discovered, and all future knowledge accumulation is seen through this lens. Post-position 5, people begin to make commitments within the relativism,
deciding that while things are rarely right or wrong, positions can be taken and judgments made according to relative validity of arguments.

Perry's theory offers a very useful perspective on the issue of differing conceptions of equality. The gap between the university-educated and the non-university-educated may be a manifestation of the pre-Position 5/post-Position 5 development that occurs during the university years. Equality pre-position 5 is dualistic, either right or wrong, knowledge of which is taken from Authority. Issues of equality are based on conceptions of fairness, which are amenable to right or wrong distinctions – something is either fair, the same, or it is not. And the Authority – usually political figures, will tell me whether things are fair or not. Equality post-position 5 is more complex, accompanying the realization that equality might mean more than identical treatment to more identical results, as well as the ability to understand that there are different ways of thinking and being, and that one is not necessarily right and others therefore wrong.

3.5 College Impact Models

Compared with developmental models, college impact theories assigns a much more important role to the institutional and social context in which the student lives. Institutional structures and values, as well as peer values are seen as the sources that influence the changes taking place in students: "These sociological models resemble the development theories in that students are seen as active participants in their own growth, but the environment is also seen as an active force that not only affords opportunities for change-inducing encounters but can also on occasion require a student to respond."50

Combining college impact models and developmental models allows a more complete view of how the environment affects students, and how the student develops as a result of their socialization. While the college impact models tend
to be unfulfilling and incomplete in attempting to explain what it is about college that leads to cognitive and moral changes, they are important for they focus the attention on the environment, something that developmental models often forget in their desire to explain the changes taking place.

3.5.1 Astin's Theory of "Involvement"

Astin's theory can be stated quite simply: "Students learn by becoming involved." By participating fully in the university experience, students are afforded a number of opportunities to meet people of varying backgrounds and who hold conflicting ideas. Astin's theory focuses not only on the impact of the environment, but also the importance of the student's role in exploiting the myriad of opportunities available to them: "...the individual plays a central role in determining the extent and nature of growth according to the quality of effort or involvement with the resources provided by the institution." This is an often forgotten point in the research on college impact, and it brings the psychological perspective, nearly exclusively manifested in the developmental theories, into play with the sociological determinants prevalent in college impact models.

3.5.2 Pascarella's General Model for Assessing Change

Pascarella describes five variables that have an impact on growth and development: one, students' background and precollege characteristics; two, the organizational structure of the institution (such as residence availability, size, selectivity). These two variables shape the third variable, the university environment which influences a fourth variable that discusses both the frequency and content of students' interactions with the major socializing agents on campus (the faculty and other students'). Quality of student effort is the fifth variable,
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and it relates to students pre-university characteristics as well as to the institutional environment.

Student change, for Pascarella, is seen as "a function of students' background characteristics, interactions with major socializing agents, and the quality of the students' efforts in learning and developing. The structural features of an institution are believed to have an indirect rather than a direct influence on student development, their effect being mediated through the institution's general environment, the quality of student effort, and students' interactions with peers and faculty members." Pascarella's model provides a holistic view of the university environment, and attempts to link the various factors that lead to socialization and student change during the university years.

3.6 College Impact, Development and Equality

In assessing the effect of a university education on people's conceptions of equality, one needs to look at both the developmental and college impact theories. As we have seen above, the developmental theories provide an interesting view of what cognitive and psychosocial changes might affect ideas. Yet what is creating this development is the environment in which the students' are developing. This makes college impact theories critically important, as they attempt to lay out the groundwork of influence and variables that will lead to cognitive and psychosocial development. Variables such as the peer group and the faculty, the size and selectivity of the institution, and the availability of residence facilities all affect the way that students' perceive the world around them. A student living at home at a large, non-selective, ethnically homogenous university will not undergo the same changes as someone attending a selective university with a diverse environment, frequent faculty-student interaction and a residence stay.
Support for differentiated equality requires an understanding of the historical and contemporary challenges of disadvantaged groups, and the rationale that lies behind their desire to live differently. The university education provides students with the background to today’s challenges, the cognitive abilities to understand difference and the need for it and the ability to question certain truths, and interaction with difference in a substantive fashion. There is no one theory that will allow us to explain how the university experience affects students, and how it changes their perception on difference. The college impact theories allow us to view the institutional and environmental influences in which the cognitive, psychosocial and moral development can take place. By taking a holistic view of the theories we can see that there are numerous interacting variables that lead to numerous, interacting changes. These changes provide students’ with a new way of perceiving their world, and this will allow for the understanding and appreciation of difference in our society, whether it be different viewpoints or different ways of being.

3.7 Conclusion

The four years an individual spends at university profoundly change the way they interact with their social environment. It improves their cognitive abilities, allowing them to find, process and use information more efficiently and effectively. It leads to the understanding of relativism, the indeterminacy of ‘truth’ and the acceptance of different ways of living and of thinking. This ability to understand and accept difference is what will lead people with a university education to be more likely to support claims by minority groups for differential treatment. And while ideology and other important factors may affect their support of government support for citizens in general, the university-educated will still be far more likely to support the desirability of difference in society.
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The university-educated hold different reasoning chains than those who have not attended university. They base their political opinions on ideas as well as feelings, whereas the less educated primarily base their opinions on affect. The next chapter will look at public opinion surveys that include questions of differentiated equality. It will establish whether or not the expected statistical difference exists between the university-educated and the non-university-educated in their support for the competing conceptions of equality. The statistics will also attempt to measure what it is about the university experience that leads to this support, following the theory discussed in this chapter.

University education, and education in general, is not a panacea for society's ills. Citizens can get to positions of high cognitive abilities without formal education, and some with formal education will not exhibit these abilities. Yet there is an important connection between education and democratic citizenship, and one that should not be taken lightly. John Dewey, the eminent educational psychologist, was one of the first to focus on the benefits of education, both to the individual and to society. He stated that:

"On the one side, citizens acquired through schooling not simply relevant information they required to reason about political choices, but more fundamentally the ability to manipulate information efficiently and to gather it effectively after they had left school. On the other side, quite apart from efficiencies in information processing, schools directed the minds of citizens to certain values - among them, openness of mind, a respect for science and empirical knowledge, an awareness of complexity and possibilities for change, and tolerance, not only of people but of points of view."55
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Chapter 4

University Education and the Competing Conceptions of Equality

Following the research on the different reasoning chains and experiences of those who have attended university versus those who have not, the hypothesis that will be tested is that the university-educated, because of their experiences and cognitive abilities, will be more likely to support claims for differential treatment for national and ethnic minorities than will the non-university-educated.

Following Johnston and his colleagues work on the Charlottetown Accord, this paper asks whether their finding (a 20% gap between the university-educated and non-university-educated) is generalizable to other more unambiguous issues and questions surrounding the competing conceptions of equality discussed in chapter two.

4.1 Methodology

There are always challenges associated with using data that was designed for purposes other than one's own. In this case, it was important that I find questions that were phrased in the vocabulary of differentiated and undifferentiated equality. As a result, it was necessary to use a number of different surveys that had questions that were worded properly for this analysis. The following surveys were used:

- Canadian Election Study 1993 (and Referendum study) (academic: ISR-York)
- Centre for Research on Information for Canada (CRIC) 2000 study
- Insight Canada Research 1996 survey

For specific collection dates and methods, please see Appendix One.
On each relevant question, I divided the education variable into two categories: Those who have never attended university and those who have attended or are attending university. The justification for dividing education in such a fashion is articulated in the previous chapter. The university experience and the cognitive abilities developed there, especially the realization of relativism and the value of diversity, both in thought and action, are what lead the university-educated to be more likely to support claims for differential treatment. For this study, the wording of the questions is important, so there will be time spent on each question explaining the strengths and weaknesses as indicators of differentiated equality.

When looking at statistical findings of the effect of university education on opinion, we must keep in mind that there are many factors that influence an individual's opinion on a specific issue. Therefore, while a 20% difference may not appear to be all that substantial, considering the number of other factors involved it is quite significant.

4.2 Education and Differentiated Equality

The first question, taken from the 2000 CRIC survey, asked respondents which of the following statements came closest to their own view: One, as Canada’s first people, aboriginals should be entitled to special rights or two, all Canadians should have exactly the same rights, otherwise we will not have true equality. The question is a very good one, as it gives a clear choice between differentiated equality – special rights – and identical treatment.
Figure 4.1 – CRIC 2000 v59\textsuperscript{57}
Pearson Correlation \textsuperscript{-227**} (Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed))
N=993

As we can see from figure 4.1, the educated are more than 20% more likely to support this claim for differentiated equality by Aboriginal nations. This question is more accurate than most, as it does not provide the particulars of the special rights (such as land claims or self-government), which may influence the findings due to people's negative reactions to the terms themselves. We will see the effect more clearly when we discuss special treatment for Quebec, and the negative perceptions of the term 'distinct society'.

Figure 4.2 provides a practical question on the same issue, asking respondents whether or not Aboriginal people should have some type of preferential access to hunting and fishing grounds in areas where they have traditionally lived. This is the differentiated equality choice, the undifferentiated choice being that when government regulates access to hunting and fishing grounds, they should treat everyone the same. This is another good question, as it provides a clear choice between special treatment – even giving a justification for why this might be necessary – and identical, colour-blind equality.

\textsuperscript{57} Question: Which of the following two statements comes the closest to your own view:
1 "as Canada's first people, aboriginals should be entitled to special considerations in some areas, such as access to hunting and fishing grounds" 2 "all Canadians should have exactly the same rights, otherwise we do not have true equality." 9 "don't know/not applicable"
Figure 4.2 yields similar results to 4.1. The university-educated are far more likely to support claims for different or 'special' treatment than those without any university experience. Even as we move away from the theoretical to the practical applications of differential treatment, where people are more likely to see their self-interest and threats to it, the support still lies disproportionately in the hands of the well educated. Even with a reason to support differentiated equality inserted into the question, those without a university education are still not understanding and accepting the claim, illustrating the need for certain conceptual reasoning skills in the acceptance of the claim.

Even with the well-educated supporting differentiated equality at a far higher level, it must be noted that in neither 4.1 nor 4.2 do a majority of university-educated support differentiated equality. This will be examined in more depth further on.

58 Question: Do you think that Aboriginal peoples should have some type of preferential access to hunting and fishing grounds in areas where they have traditionally lived, or do you think that when governments regulate access to hunting and fishing grounds they should treat everyone the same? 1 "aboriginal peoples should have some type of preferential treatment" 2 "everyone should be treated the same" 9 "don't know/not applicable"
Figure 4.3, from the 1993 Canadian Election Study, asked respondents whether Aboriginal nations should have the authority to make their own laws (support for differentiated equality), or should they have to abide by the same laws as others.

![Figure 4.3 CES 1993 cpsg8a](image)

**Pearson Correlation** -.156** (Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed))

**N=709**

Figure 4.3 illustrates that as more and more differentiated treatment is offered to Aboriginal people, the levels of support drop, even among the university-educated. This may reflect the level of autonomy that is being discussed when reference is made to law-making. Most Canadians, supportive of Aboriginal self-government, may see it as a municipal government rather than as a third order as many Aboriginal people desire. Whereas only 17.4% of respondents agreed that Aboriginal people should be able to make their own laws, the same study showed that the more theoretical term self-government was supported by 60% of the population (figure 4.4). It does make one wonder what the population would define as 'self-government' if that does not include making their own laws. This low level of support may also be due to the term 'laws', many people seeing laws as criminal rather than legislation for health care, as an example.

---

**Question:** Which comes closest to your own view:

1. Aboriginal people should have the right to make their own laws.
2. Aboriginal people should abide by the same laws as other Canadians.

---

[59] Question: Which comes closest to your own view:
1. Aboriginal people should have the right to make their own laws.
OR 2. Aboriginal people should abide by the same laws as other Canadians.
The claims for differential treatment by Aboriginal nations and those for Quebec, while very different from each other in practice, are similar conceptually. They both are demands by minority nations for different powers than are held by the majority, to protect their culture and their difference. Moving away from claims for differential treatment by Aboriginal nations to claims of differentiated equality for Quebec (sample does not include anyone from Quebec), we see a similar trend emerge, even when using the volatile term 'distinct society'. Figure 4.5 shows that while half of the non-university-educated were in favour of the proposal to recognize Quebec as a distinct society, nearly seven in ten of the university-educated supported Quebec's claims.

Question: Even though none of the other parts of the agreement will be implemented, do you think we should recognize Aboriginal self-government?
1 Yes 5 No 8 Don't Know 9 Refused
The same results were yielded three years later in Insight Research Group's 1996 poll. They found that while only 28.2% of the non-university-educated were in favour of recognizing Quebec as a distinct society, 44.3% of the university-educated were in favour (figure 4.6). The drop in support between the two polls (55.6% in favour in 1993, 37.2% in 1996) can be attributed to the 1995 referendum, which likely hardened opinion towards Quebec by the Rest of Canada, as well as the question wording. The 1993 question was asking respondents to comment on the proposal to recognize Quebec as a distinct society that was part of the Charlottetown Accord, whereas the 1996 poll simply asked in theory whether respondents supported recognizing the distinctiveness of Quebec.

\[\text{Figure 4.5 CES 1993 prc3}^{61}\]
\text{Pearson Correlation -.155** (Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed))}
\text{N=2216}

---

\text{Question: Do you agree or disagree with the following proposal. Recognizing Quebec as a distinct society.}
\text{1 Agree 5 Disagree 8 Don't Know 9 Refused}
There were other questions that touched on the differentiated-undifferentiated debate, yet in a less specific way. One of these questions was found in the 1993 Canadian Election Study, and it asked respondents whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement that all provinces should be treated the same. Once again, the university-educated were far more likely to disagree with this claim, supporting differentiated equality for provinces (figure 4.7).

---

**Figure 4.6 1996 Insight Group Q25**

Pearson Correlation $-0.177^{**}$ (Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed))

$N=473$

---

**Figure 4.7 CES 1993 mbsd11**

---

62 Question: Would you be personally in favour or not in favour of the Canadian constitution recognizing Quebec as a distinct society? 1 In favour 2 Not in favour 3 Don't know
Pearson Correlation .164** (Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed))
N=847

It should be noted as we move on to the next graph that over 65% of all respondents agreed with the statement that provinces should be treated equally, illustrating the difficulty one would have in trying to pass a constitutional amendment via popular ratification that includes in it anything differing from the undifferentiated equality espoused by the equality of the provinces doctrine.

One of the most fascinating questions available was one in the 1996 Insight Research poll (results in Figure 4.8), and it deserves some attention. The question provides more contextual information for respondents, and like in the aboriginal question with the arguments provided, the education gap is still present. The question states:

“Sometimes people talk about ‘equality of the provinces’. Some people think this means all provinces have to have exactly the same powers otherwise we don’t have real equality. Others say that while all provinces are equal, they should each have the right to be different to meet their own particular circumstances. This might mean special powers for Quebec over the French language. Which is closer to your own opinion?”

63 Question: All provinces should be treated the same, no matter how big or small they are.
1 Strongly Agree 2 Agree 3 Disagree 4 Strongly Disagree 8 No Opinion
This question is intriguing, for it is almost an educational question, teaching people about what differentiated equality might mean in a provincial context. The percentage of non-university-educated who support differential treatment for provinces with differing circumstances is over 50%, a surprisingly high amount. The university-educated are still far more likely to support this conception of differential treatment than those who have not attended university, by over 15% in this case.

Looking at this chart, one could imagine how the Rest of Canada could come to support increased autonomy for Quebec, as 63.3% of the respondents supported different powers for different circumstances. A very interesting test would be to follow this question with one prescribing different powers for different minority groups, rather than provinces. I would presume that the levels of support would drop back to what we are used to seeing, hovering between 30 and 40%.

People may be willing to support differentiated equality if they believe that their own difference will be supported in turn. If they agree with language rights for Quebec, then perhaps British Columbians will get more power over fishing or
lumber issues. In the case of provinces, everyone outside central Canada sees themselves as a minority, vulnerable to the economic and political decisions of central Canada. As the wording in the question changes to include other provincial issues, the levels of support increase even more:

"Sometimes people talk about 'equality of the provinces'. Some people think this means all provinces have to have exactly the same powers otherwise we don't have real equality. Others say that while all provinces are equal, they should each have the right to be different to meet their own particular circumstances. This might mean special powers for Alberta for oil, BC for fisheries, and Quebec over the French language. Which is closer to your own opinion?"

![Bar chart showing support for various views on provincial equality and differential treatment.](image)

**Figure 4.8a Insight 1996 Q50**

*Pearson Correlation .079* (Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed))

*N=834*

Majorities are simply shifting coalitions of minorities, and willing to protect the interests of other minority groups if they believe they will receive the same protection in return. Quebecers are going to be far more likely to support claims for differential treatment, as they realize that they require it themselves. Yet majorities will be far less likely to offer differentiated rights that they themselves will never be able to claim. Supporting Aboriginal self-government will not lead to

---

64 Sniderman et al, 1996
English-Canadians gaining new rights. Yet provincial rights discussions break up the English-Canada majority, placing everyone but Ontarians into minority status, willing to offer different treatment to Quebec as long as they receive it in turn.

It would seem that the university-educated are better able to generalize from a specific example than are those with less education. In figure 4.8 only the example of Quebec is used, and the university-educated can extrapolate from that example that if Quebec is given power over language, their province in turn will be likely to receive additional powers over other areas. Those with less education may be more likely to focus on Quebec, and base their support for the question on their feelings towards Quebec. In figure 4.8a, the question adds other examples, such as power over fisheries for BC and power over oil for Alberta, and support jumps 13% for the non-university-educated, but only 5% for the university-educated. This supports the claim that the university-educated are better able to generalize their own self-interest out of a specific example, once again using ideas as well as feelings. This reinforces the predictions of the educational theories, that the non-university educated need to be specifically told what's in it for them whereas the university-educated can extrapolate it themselves from the more general.

The next question on differentiated equality relates to ethnic minorities in Canada - should they be granted special treatment based on their current cultural practices? The question asks respondents whether or not members of the RCMP who are Sikh should have the right to wear their traditional turban, or should everyone have to wear the same hat. Seven in ten of those surveyed state that everyone should have to wear the same hat. Between educational categories, we see the now-familiar 15% gap between the university-educated and those who have not attended a university.

What is amazing about these findings is their consistency. This 15-20% gap has reappeared across minority groups and surveys and years. Whether it is
Aboriginal self-government, Quebec's distinct society, or ethnic minorities being discussed the gap remains, even with the surveys being seven years apart.

![Bar chart showing the percentage of university-educated and non-university-educated individuals in favor of the right to wear a turban.](image)

Figure 4.9 CES 1993 mbse

Pearson Correlation -.221 ** (Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed))

N=1318

This chapter illustrates that there is a consistent 15-20% gap between the university-educated and the non-university-educated on questions discussing the competing conceptions of equality. The university-educated appear far more likely to support claims for differentiated equality, and this appeared consistently over a number of surveys and over a number of years. And the more the questions touched on the differentiated-undifferentiated debate (such as figure 4.1 and 4.2), the more the gap increased.

Now that this theoretical gap has been statistically illustrated, the paper moves to a statistical analysis of the university education itself, and what skills, experiences or other factors within the university experience account for the 15-20% gap. The paper attempts to find indicators in the 1993 Canadian Election and Referendum data that would allow us to measure the factors articulated in the educational theory in chapter three.

---

**Question:** Members of the RCMP:
1 Should have the right to wear a turban for religious reasons 2 Should all wear the same hat regardless of their religion 8 Undecided
Chapter 5
Analyzing The Education Effect

Chapter five attempts to test statistically the theories presented in chapter three on the impact of the university/college experience on citizens' conceptions of equality. Using linear regression and questions from the 1993 CES mail back survey, this chapter will attempt to make the university gap disappear by introducing variables that may measure some of the development that occurs in university.

There is a strong and recurring gap that exists between those with a university education and those without in terms of support for minority claims for differentiated equality. Across the board we see significant differences in support for unique Aboriginal rights, Quebec distinct society and even in more general claims for differential treatment, including those for ethnic as well as national minorities. In the chapter on the effects of education and the differences in reasoning chains, several reasons were advanced as to why the difference may exist between educational levels. The major factor that was postulated was that the university experience makes people more understanding of difference, making it more likely that someone will promote that difference by supporting claims for differential treatment.

5.1 Effect of Education Indicators

There were a couple of questions in the 1993 Canadian Election Study that offer insight into the discussion. The first asked respondents if society would be better off if we all have similar values. I expected to see a strong educational gap, as the university experience would alert individuals to the benefits and value of a diversity of beliefs and ways of seeing the world. The predictions were borne out, as a strong educational gap emerged.
While nearly 50% of the non-university-educated agreed that society is better off if we have similar values, only 28.5% of the university-educated agreed, illustrating their acceptance of difference in values. A question posed in the 2000 Canadian Election Study asked a question along similar lines. It asked whether or not Canadian unity is weakened by Canadians of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds sticking to their old ways. 46.1% of the non-university-educated cohort agreed with the statement, compared to 26.8% of the university-educated group. This illustrates once again the value that the most educated place upon difference and diversity. The following question re-articulates the gap between the educational cohorts on the desirability of related values. The question asked whether those who come to Canada should try harder to become more like other Canadians. The responses can be seen in Figure 5.1a, and they show results similar to Figure 5.1.

---

66 **Question:** Society would be better off if we all had similar values and ideals.
1 Strongly Agree 2 Agree 3 Disagree 4 Strongly Disagree 8 No Opinion
One of the points made during the research on the effects of a university education was William Perry's theory that the university experience leads to individuals becoming more aware of relativism, and the indeterminacy of a single 'truth'. In terms of the politics of difference, this is important as those who believe in one truth are more likely to be wary of different ways of being and alternative ways of seeing the world. Relativism enables people to grasp the complexity of diversity and to help them understand how different and valid others' views are, no matter how much they seem to differ from our own 'truth'. The 1993 Canadian Election Study asked those surveyed whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement that most questions have just one right answer. As expected, the non-university-educated were nearly twice as likely to agree with this statement than the university-educated (figure 5.2).

---

**Question:** People who come to live in Canada should try harder to be more like other Canadians.
1 Agree 5 Disagree 8 Don't know 9 Refused
In Perry's developmental research on the impact of university, he postulated that not only do individuals learn relativism, as demonstrated in figure 5.2, but that they also learn to develop opinions that are independent of the opinions of 'authority'. Pre-position 5 thinkers (or pre-relativistic thinkers) perceive issues in a dualistic fashion: things are either right or they are wrong, and their decision of which is correct is derived from an authority. Therefore we can expect to see the university-educated as less dependent on authority. Figure 5.3 shows this to a certain extent, as the university-educated are far less likely to defer to authority, though the university-educated were still likely to support the 'authority' referred to in this question. This could be due to the vagueness of the question, which asks respondents to agree or disagree with the following statement: 'Respect for authority is one of the most important things children should learn'. Everyone would like their children to be somewhat respectful of authority, but the educated were almost three times as likely to disagree with this statement.

---

68 Question: For most questions there is just one right answer, once a person is able to get all the facts.
1 Strongly Agree 2 Agree 3 Disagree 4 Strongly Disagree 8 No Opinion
The theory on university education argues that those who are highly educated are able to bring more factors into their reasoning chains. By contrast with the more simplified reasoning chains of the less well-educated, there are many ideas, as well as feelings, upon which the well-educated come to positions on political issues. Seeing that the university-educated cohort hovered around 50% in their support for differentiated equality, the question becomes: what other factors are coming into play when the university-educated for their opinions on issues relating to equality?

One factor affecting the opinions of the university-educated cohort is ideology. Sniderman et al. state in *Reasoning and Choice* that one of the major concepts that divides conservatives and liberals is their view on the factors that lead to people being impoverished – whether the reasons are internally driven or societally driven. Liberals are more likely to see peoples’ gains or losses as environmentally or socially-driven whereas conservatives ascribe success or

---

69 Question: Respect for authority is one of the most important things that children should learn.
failure to an individual's personal characteristics. The indicators that will be used to measure ideology will follow Sniderman's view, and use questions that focus on the factors involved in an individual or groups' success or failure.

The crosstabulations in Figure 5.4 and 5.5 measure the level of support for differentiated equality, by educational level, by ideology. Only the 1993 Canadian Election Study data could be used for this effort, as the CRIC and Insight surveys, which had much stronger dependent variables, did not contain any strong independent variables upon which to gauge ideology. What I expect to find is a difference between the university-educated and the non-university-educated in the amount that ideology affects their support for differentiated equality. The most educated, according to Sniderman, should use ideology more in their reasoning about differentiated equality. Those without a university education would use affect more, though the indicators used may still capture the desert heuristic a bit.

The first test, from the 1993 Canadian Election Study, uses the following indicators. The standard university-educated, non-university-educated split is used for education level. The measure of differentiated equality is the question that asks whether or not Sikh officers in the RCMP should be allowed to wear turbans. The ideology measure asks respondents which of the following statements they support: One, if Aboriginal people try hard they will become well-off, or secondly, it is difficult for them to overcome poverty. This is a good measure of ideology, as it clearly delineates the internal vs. external locus of control.

---

1 Strongly Agree 2 Agree 3 Disagree 4 Strongly Disagree 8 No Opinion 70 Sniderman et al, 1991: 81
The results confirm the hypothesis stated above that among the university-educated, ideology will have a much greater influence than for the non-university-educated. The divide between liberals and conservatives is greater than 36% for the highly educated, and around 10% for the less educated. What is interesting is that even with an external locus of control (liberal) and a university education, support is still only 50.6%.

The same dependent variable is used in the second ideology measure, in this case being the question of support for the right of Sikh officers in the RCMP to wear their traditional turbans on duty. For ideology, the question used was whether or not respondents agreed with the following statement: If we do not get ahead, we have only ourselves to blame. While not as clear a delineation as the first one, it still proffers the choice between internal and external locus of control. And again, we see that our hypothesis is borne out, as the university-educated

---

Question (Ideology- mbse9): Which comes closer to your own view:
1 If Aboriginal peoples tried harder, they could be as well off as other Canadians
2 Social and economic conditions make it almost impossible for most Aboriginal Canadians to overcome poverty
8 Undecided
are divided by ideology, the non-university-educated showing no significant
difference at all.

**Ideology 2**

*Percentage support for differentiated equality*

![Bar chart showing support for differentiated equality by ideology and education level.](image)

*Figure 5.5 1993 CES mbsa2 by mbse7*

2 tailed significance for both university and no university $p=.000$

$N=1182$

The hypothesis can be tentatively confirmed, that ideology divides the university-
educated and plays virtually no significant role for the non-university-educated.
The debate discussed in chapter one, between those who favour colour-blind
equality – which fits nicely with a conservative ideology that espouses an internal
locus of control and minimal government interference – and those who favour a
politics of difference – government supporting disadvantaged groups – plays out
statistically in our data.

This discussion illustrates that, as stated by the education theory, the university
experience helps in the development of more sophisticated reasoning chains that
include a number of ideas as well as feelings. The data above shows that the

---

72 **Question:** Most people who don't get ahead should not blame the system; they have only
themselves to blame.
1 Strongly Agree 2 Agree 3 Disagree 4 Strongly Disagree 8 No Opinion
ideas of equality and ideology are being used in the reasoning chain of the university-educated. Feelings also play a role for the highly educated, interacting with ideas in the reasoning chain. For those without a university-education, it appears that affect plays a much more central role, and their reasoning chains are limited, without much consideration of the relevant ideas. This is demonstrated by the failure of ideological indicators to change support levels for claims for differentiated equality.

This section of chapter five has discussed education indicators measuring support for relativism, authority, and value heterogeneity as well as two measures of ideology. These will be important in the next section, as they will be the independent variables used in the regression analysis. The indicators will attempt to capture some of the factors that lead to the university-non-university gap. These factors were articulated in the chapter on education, and we will attempt to gauge their influence on the education effect in this section.

Two of the variables that will be used in the regression but that did not appear in this section are feelings (towards the group in question: Quebec, Aboriginal peoples, racial minorities) and majority rule versus minority rights. The justification for including these two indicators in the regression analysis is that a university education has been shown to make people far more agreeable to minorities in general. Richard Johnston and his colleagues show that in relation to the Charlottetown Accord, these two factors were primarily what led university-educated voters to support the Accord: "...relative to other groups, university-educated voters approached the document with two strong presumptions in their favour: they liked Quebec more and they were more likely to give minorities the

---

73 Question: Using the 0 to 100 scale, where 0 means very negative and 100 means very positive, I would like you to tell me how you feel about the following groups and places.

74 Question: Which is more important in a democratic society: letting the majority decide, or protecting the needs and rights of minorities?
benefit of the doubt. These two inclinations did most of the work in leading highly educated voters to accept general arguments and endorse key elements.\textsuperscript{75}

5.2 Education and Differentiated Equality: Mechanisms of Influence

5.2.1 Methodology

Indicators were chosen based on their applicability and relevance to the theory of the impact of university posited in chapter three. They related to various aspects of the university experience that could be measured in survey form. They include measures of: the understanding of relativism; respect for authority; ideology; the importance of similar values in society; majority rule versus minority rights; and feelings towards the groups in question. What will be attempted is to see whether these measures articulated in the theory actually play a role in education's effect on support for differentiated equality. If the theory is correct, the education coefficient should drop significantly from its 15-20\% level as a result of including these indicators in the regression.

There are many methodological challenges in this part of the study, particularly due to question availability and wording. The 1993 Canadian Election and Referendum data was used as it contained fairly strong dependent variables (for differentiated equality) as well as good independent variables. One can challenge the questions I have picked as indicators for the various elements stated above, and note that some key parts of the educational theory have been omitted from the analysis. The questions were chosen because they appeared to be the most accurate indicators of the effect in question, though by no means am I suggesting that they are perfect indicators.

\textsuperscript{75} Johnston et al: 1996, 187
As for the omitted measures, there are definitely some other factors I would have liked to measure, or have better indicators for, such as cognitive development (beyond relativism), and historical knowledge of the groups in question. But, as always, the study is limited by the data, and must focus on the measures available. I believe these indicators are still quite revealing and provide significant and intriguing results.

Each regression is done in two parts: without feelings included and with feelings included. The reason for doing this is because of the very strong role placed upon feelings in the literature on the Charlottetown Accord. As a result, it is instructive to do regressions without feelings included first, and then to see which variables are affected by feelings’ inclusion, and by how much. The feeling variable, like the others, runs from zero to one, where zero indicates very negative feelings and one indicates very positive feelings.

5.2.2 Regression Analysis

The first regression uses the strongest dependent variable in the survey, which asks whether members of the RCMP should be have the right to wear a turban for religious reasons, or should everyone have to wear the same hat, regardless of their religion. Six independent variables will be used in each regression, and their applicability and relevance to the educational theory has been discussed individually earlier on in this chapter.
Question 1: Sikhs in the RCMP

Table 5.1

Dependent Variable

Members of the RCMP:
One: Should have the right to wear a turban for religious reasons
Or Two: Should all wear the same hat regardless of their religion

Differentiated Equality - RCMP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Without Feelings</th>
<th>With Feelings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>-0.242</td>
<td>-0.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativism</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>-0.151</td>
<td>-0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar Values</td>
<td>-0.122</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority vs. Minority</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>1.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 849 849
R2 0.15 0.16

Standard errors in parentheses below coefficient estimates.
Coefficients in bold indicate p<0.05
Coefficients in bold and italics indicate p<0.01

The original education gap, indicated in the crosstabulation on this question, was 19%, or a bivariate regression coefficient of 0.19. We can see above that by including all the variables that the theory suggests are responsible for the educational effect on conceptions of equality, the difference drops to 5% (a
coefficient of 0.05), and slightly out of significance. The strongest coefficient in both regressions (with feelings and without feelings) was Authority, with those who support differentiated equality being more likely by nearly 25% to give a low priority to authority. Ideology was also a very influential indicator, as those of a liberal ideology were 15% more likely to support claims for differentiated equality than were conservatives. Similar values had a strong effect as well. Those who see the value of heterogeneity in society were 10% more likely to support this claim for differentiated equality.

Relativism was also significant, as 11% (without feelings) and 9% (with feelings) differences appeared. With this question wording, those who disagreed with the statement that most questions had just one right answer were 11% and 9% more likely to support differentiated equality. And those who chose minority rights over majority rule were 7% and 6% (with feelings) more likely to support differentiated equality. Not only did feelings for racial minorities have an effect on the other variables, it also had a 14% effect of its own. The more one liked racial minorities, the more likely one was to support claims by a racial minority for special treatment.

This question more than any other provides a glimpse of the possible effects of university education on support for differentiated equality. Most of the factors from the educational theory in chapter three (of which indicators could be found) turned out to be significant contributors to education's effect on questions of differentiated vs. undifferentiated equality. This is most likely due to the clear differentiated/undifferentiated wording of the question, and because this issue was not part of the emotionally charged Charlottetown debate.

Authority and relativism, key to William Perry’s development theory both served prominent roles, as did ideology, following Paul Sniderman’s discussion. The value of difference, articulated in the similar values question, was also strongly
significant. And while feelings were important, they figured in as one factor among many, diminishing other coefficients only minimally in the process.

The university-educated bring in many considerations when forming their opinions on issues. They use affect, generally liking minorities more, but their experience at university predisposes them to be more relativistic thinkers and supporters of difference and heterogeneity in general, which leads to the 15-20% gap articulated in chapter four. Ideology is important as the educated will use it to decide whether or not they support government assistance to groups. The university-educated appear to be more supportive of difference and diversity, and their ideology and feelings lead them to positions of support or rejection of government assistance and special rights for certain groups.
Question Two: Aboriginal People Should Make Their Own Laws

Table 5.2
Dependent Variable
Which comes closer to your own view:
One: Aboriginal people should have the right to make their own laws.
Or Two: Aboriginal people should abide by the same laws as other Canadians.

Differentiated Equality - Aboriginal Laws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Without Feelings</th>
<th>With Feelings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativism</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.061)</td>
<td>(0.061)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td><strong>-0.122</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.115</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar Values</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority vs. Minority</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.0942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert</td>
<td><strong>-0.170</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.162</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td><strong>1.027</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.070</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.045)</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N  849  849
R2  0.15  0.16

Standard errors in parentheses below coefficient estimates.
Coefficients in bold indicate p<0.05
Coefficients in bold and italics indicate p<0.01

As we look at the second question, relating to aboriginal law-making, we see once again that the education difference has dropped significantly, from 16%
(0.16) in the original crosstabulation, to 5% (0.05) and out of significance. The key variables in this regression are ideology and the desert heuristic.

For ideology we see that as one becomes more liberal, one supports this claim for differential treatment more by approximately 12%. This does not change much at all with the inclusion of feelings into the regression, dropping only 0.7% (0.07).

The desert heuristic, which asks whether Aboriginal people should be able to get out of poverty on their own or that the social and economic conditions make it nearly impossible for them to do so is the strongest coefficient in this regression. Those who believed that economic and social conditions make it difficult for Aboriginal people to extract themselves from their poverty were 17% more likely to support the claims of Aboriginal people to have their own law-making capacity. Those who believe that the causes of poverty for Aboriginal people are externally based are far more willing to endorse proposals to internalize the locus of control, to give Aboriginal peoples control over their own destiny.

Feelings once again play a role in the support for this differentiated equality claim, as those who have positive feelings were 10% more likely to support Aboriginal law-making capabilities, though this coefficient also bordered on insignificant. Surprisingly, feelings played relatively small role in a very controversial issue, ideology playing a much more prominent role, both on its own and via the desert heuristic which also measures locus of control.

In this question, and the two that follow (Tables 5.3 and 5.4), the importance of some of the indicators that measure the educational theory – relativism, authority, similar values – drop substantially, replaced in statistical importance by the more prominent, less subtle indicators such as feelings and ideology. I believe this is due both to measurement error, because it is easier to capture feelings and ideology than say, relativism, but also to the issues and the wording
of the dependent variables. Issues of Aboriginal law-making capacity and distinct society for Quebec are emotionally charged and rhetoric-laden, possibly leading to results that do not measure the differentiated/undifferentiated debate. The surveys used were conducted during and immediately following the Charlottetown referendum, and the emotional rhetoric may have strengthened feelings relative to the other variables.

Yet it is possible that these questions (Tables 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4) are more pragmatically accurate measures, as they indicate levels of support within a rhetorically and emotionally charged environment, something which is likely whenever these issues are debated. But for the purposes of this study, clearer, less charged questions, such as the dependent variable in Table 5.1, appear to be more instructive.
Question Three: Aboriginal Self-Government

Table 5.3

Dependent Variable:

Even though none of the other parts of the agreement will be implemented, do you think we should recognize Aboriginal self-government?

Differentiated Equality - Aboriginal self-government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Without Feelings</th>
<th>With Feelings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
<td>(0.062)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativism</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
<td>(0.048)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar Values</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority vs. Minority</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.045)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert</td>
<td>-0.248</td>
<td>-0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors in parentheses below coefficient estimates.
Coefficients in bold indicate p<0.05
Coefficients in bold and italics indicate p<0.01

The results on the Aboriginal self-government question in table 5.3 tell a story similar to the previous question, even thought the level of support is markedly higher. Chapter four revealed that support for Aboriginal self-government is 12%
higher among the university-educated than among the non-university educated. On this question, the education coefficient drops once again, from 12% (0.12) to 5% (0.05) and out of significance. The indicators that led to this decline are similar values, the desert heuristic and feelings.

Without feelings, the support for the similar values indicator played a significant role, those supporting a multiplicity of values being 9% more likely to support Aboriginal self-government. With the addition of feelings towards Aboriginal peoples included, this drops to 6% (and no longer significant). The desert heuristic measure once again plays a strong role, as those who believe that the cause of Aboriginal poverty is societal were 25% more likely to support Aboriginal self-government, following the trend that appeared in Table 5.2. When feelings enter the equation, the desert heuristic drops to 19%.

Feelings once again play an important role, as those who had positive feelings towards Aboriginal peoples were over 30% more likely to endorse Aboriginal self-government.

On this politically charged issue, feelings and ideology once again lead the way, as the desert heuristic may capture ideology on Aboriginal issues more accurately than the ideology indicator used here. The subtle indicators proposed by the educational theory are insignificant, with the importance of value heterogeneity (similar values) weakening with the inclusion of feelings.

On both questions measuring support for proposals in the Charlottetown Accord (Tables 5.3 and 5.4), feelings played the leading role, with ideology playing the secondary role. These questions are inferior measures of the differentiated/undifferentiated debate, as they appear to capture people's feelings about the Accord rather than their conceptions of equality. The results are still important, as mentioned above, for they illustrate the significance of feelings and ideology for emotionally charged issues.
Question Four: Distinct Society

Table 5.4
Dependent Variable:
Do you agree or disagree with the following proposal? Recognizing Quebec as a distinct society.

Differentiated Equality - Quebec
Distinct Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Without Feelings</th>
<th>With Feelings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.070)</td>
<td>(0.065)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativism</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>-0.110</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar Values</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority vs. Minority</td>
<td>-0.110</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.045)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.171</td>
<td>-0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
<td>(0.048)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors in parentheses below coefficient estimates.
Coefficients in bold indicate p<0.05
Coefficients in bold and italics indicate p<0.01

The question on support for distinct society for Quebec reveals the powerful effect of feelings on this particular issue. Whether it is reducing the coefficients of other variables or its own strength, feeling for Quebec really drives opinion on distinct society. As discussed above, this (like Table 5.3) is not an ideal measure.
of the differentiated-undifferentiated debate, as it has emotional baggage that might influence the results.

Prior to feelings being included, we observe that majority/minority orientation is significant, those supporting minority rights being 11% more likely to support distinct society. This drops to 9% with the inclusion of feelings into the regression. Ideology also played a role, with liberals being 11% more likely to support distinct society. When feelings are added, ideology drops to 7% and becomes insignificant. It appears that on the distinct society issue, the reasoning chains of all education levels focuses more on affect than ideas. Feelings themselves had a 0.56 coefficient, indicating that those who felt positively towards Quebec were 56% more likely to support the distinct society proposal.

Education has a 17% effect prior to feelings, but this drops to 12% when feelings are included. With a 12% effect left over, this regression does not explain away education, and there must be other factors that make education significant on this issue. This is the only regression where the additional variables do not make the education coefficient disappear, revealing a different dynamic on the Quebec issue that need not be ignored.

**5.3 Conclusion**

The dependent variable that measured differentiated equality most accurately revealed that the variables posited in the educational theory in chapter three do explain the difference across levels of education. And I believe that dependent variables that clearly articulate the differentiated-undifferentiated divide (such as those in figures 4.1 and 4.2) would show similar results to Table 5.1. Future research in this area requires a survey that is designed to clearly measure the differentiated-undifferentiated debate, including well-designed dependent and independent variables.
Table 5.1 indicates that the effects of education postulated in chapter three are relevant to the Canadian debate on differentiated vs. undifferentiated equality. Authority, relativism, value heterogeneity and support for minority rights all appear to decrease the educational coefficient. Ideology and affect appear important across all four regressions, indicating that they, following the educational theory as well, are important in the reasoning chains of the university-educated.

Table 5.2 is a well-worded question and one might assume that it would produce similar results as Table 5.1. Yet as articulated in chapter four, I believe there is confusion in the population with respect to the term 'law-making' (evidenced by a large difference in support between this question and support for self-government in general) and that this question got caught in the emotionally charged atmosphere of the referendum.

Tables 5.3 and 5.4 need to be taken with a grain of salt, as while they are examples of differentiated equality, they do not articulate the differentiated-undifferentiated debate in the same way the dependent variable in Table 5.1 does. They are important though, as they may reveal that issues relating to distinct society and self-government are so tied up with feelings that a clear discussion may be difficult.
Chapter 6
Conclusion

There exist in the world today over 5,000 ethnic groups, yet only 184 states. The notion of the homogenous nation-state is quickly being replaced by culturally pluralist multinational states, and the challenge becomes how to reconcile the aspirations of multiple cultures, ethnicities, and nations within the framework of a single state. Two of the competing solutions are prominent within the Canadian discourse, and are the focus of this study.

One of these theoretical solutions is undifferentiated equality. By ascribing to all citizens equal rights and treatment, the state acts as a bridge between groups, and protects the freedom of individuals. It focuses on the equality of individuals, rather than groups, and is inherently suspicious of differential treatment based on culture or ethnicity. Differential treatment on the basis of culture and ethnicity has led to much social strife and division, and only a focus on individual freedom and human rights can reconcile the goals of cultural plurality and a free and democratic society.

Differentiated equality is the competing vision. Proponents state that the just society must rest upon a foundation of universal basic human rights, but in many cases group-specific rights must augment these individual rights. Cultural and ethnic diversity is managed by treating all groups with equal respect, and providing distinct treatment to meet cultural needs and aspirations. The cause of inter-cultural strife is not difference itself, but the unequal relations, lack of recognition, and domination between groups. We live our lives through our cultures, and by treating everyone identically, we restrict the freedom of individuals of other cultures by forcing them to conform in order to succeed.

These two theories of equality and the visions of the country they articulate have dominated the discourse surrounding constitutional renewal in Canada. They are
not easily reconciled, and support for either has tended to be a zero-sum game. As a result, the Canadian polity is stuck in a deadlock between these two conceptions, a conceptual and rhetorical mess that may prove difficult to untangle.

The university-educated were the only significant demographic group that supported the Charlottetown Accord, and the data from this study confirms that the university-educated continue to think differently than the non-university-educated on issues of diversity. By around 20%, the university-educated are more supportive of claims for differentiated equality for Aboriginal nations, Quebec, as well as for other ethnic minorities. Across three surveys, seven years and multiple subject areas, the 15-20% gap consistently appears.

The research in this paper illustrates that there is something about university education that predisposes people to understand and be supportive of diversity and measures designed to accommodate and promote difference. Even though the questions were not designed to measure the differentiated/undifferentiated debate, they still provide a strong indication that education makes people reason differently about these issues.

The theory on the effect of a university education showed that there is both cognitive and social development that may account for the increased support for difference and diversity. Students learn to be relativistic thinkers, becoming aware of the validity and importance of alternative viewpoints. Students meet people of other cultures and interact with them on significant levels, as well as learning about the history of other cultures in their classes. They become more aware of the need to challenge existing viewpoints and authority. These are just a few examples of the changes that take place during the university years and that appear to lead to far greater support for difference and diversity amongst this cohort.
The regression analyses provide some statistical confirmation of the educational theory. The clearest dependent variable shows that some the factors articulated above, such as support for relativism, the desire to challenge authority, support for value heterogeneity in society and others are statistically significant aspects of the education coefficient. Dependent variables on more charged issues show the importance of feelings and ideology in determining opinions.

Researchers should design future questions in this area carefully to present the choice between differentiated and undifferentiated equality clearly. The questions on differentiated equality could also remain theoretical, which would divorce the group-orientation from the results. The clearest questions on differentiated equality were found in surveys that did not contain other key control variables such as feelings, ideology, and other educational indicators. To attempt to untangle the causal mess, it would be helpful to have a clear differentiated-undifferentiated question and strong independent variables in the same survey.

On a larger scale, the research agenda in this area should focus on what parts of the university experience affect the development of students who are supportive of difference and diversity, both in theory and in practice. While these students may disagree over the most desirable way of managing the cultural pluralism, they will be supportive of people of other cultures and value other ways of thinking and being. As Brian Barry articulated in chapter two, people can be favourable to cultural and ethnic diversity without supporting multiculturalist policies that are in place. The key to this research agenda would be to find out what it is exactly in the university experience that may lead to greater support for cultural and intellectual pluralism. Is it the courses and the professors, the other students, the cognitive development? Are all faculties likely to promote equal development? Are there specific characteristics of universities (class size, residence stay, etc) that make some more likely to produce students that are receptive to difference and diversity? A longitudinal study of students at a number of different sized universities might show what it is exactly about the
university experience that promotes acceptance and support for difference and diversity in general.

Education is important on issues of diversity and difference. The university experience predisposes one to think more relativistically, to challenge the wisdom of authority and the certainness of truths. It gives one the opportunity to meet people of diverse backgrounds, to learn and interact with diversity and difference on a substantive level. And it leads to the development of complex reasoning chains which ensure that feelings are not the only consideration brought to light when opinions are formed. And hopefully as the population becomes more educated, the value of difference and diversity will be questioned less, the debate becoming more and more about how to properly reconcile multiple nations and cultures within the social fabric of a single state.
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Appendix A: Survey methods

Centre for Research and Information on Canada (CRIC) 2000

La Centre de Reserche d’Opinion Publique (CROP) surveyed 1001 people in Quebec between Oct. 5th and Oct. 23rd, 2000, while Environics surveyed 1018 people in the other nine provinces between October 10th and Oct. 22nd, 2000. The results of surveys this size have a margin of error approximately 3%, 19 times out of 20.

Canadian Election Study (CES) 1993
Taken from Johnston et al, The Challenge of Direct Democracy

Interviewing began on 24 September 1992 and roughly eighty interviews were completed each day. Clearance of the total sample was controlled so that the sample interviewed each day was indistinguishable from each other day’s sample, within sampling error. By the fifth day of fieldwork, completions settled in at roughly the campaign average. Completions thereafter had roughly the same profile day-to-day: so many from that day’s release, so many from the day before, and so on. This entailed a drop in response rate at the very end, with the rate for the whole sample being 65 percent. For many purposes, interviews conducted over this thirty-two day span constitute a single sample, a 2530-person cross-section. But as daily replicates differed only in the passage of time – that is, day of interview was itself a random event – longitudinal comparisons are relatively easy.

A total of 2223 respondents were reinterviewed over the month following 31 October. These respondents were then folded into the sample released during the 1993 campaign. Of respondents who completed both referendum waves, 1434 were interviewed during the 1993 campaign, and of these 1312 were reinterviewed after the campaign.