**Appendix.**

**TableA1.** Descriptive statistics of variables used in the analysis.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | Mean(SD) | Minimum | Maximum | Skew | Kurtosis |
| Do more for immigrants | 1,073 | 0.72(0.34) | 0 | 1 | -0.81 | -0.53 |
| Do more for religious minorities | 1,073 | 0.60(0.35) | 0 | 1 | -0.29 | -0.96 |
| Female | 1,073 | 0.34(0.47) | 0 | 1 | 0.68 | -1.54 |
| Age (50 or over) | 1,073 | 0.67(0.47) | 0 | 1 | -0.71 | -1.49 |
| University educated | 1,073 | 0.51(0.50) | 0 | 1 | -0.05 | -2.00 |
| Incumbent | 1,073 | 0.23(0.42) | 0 | 1 | 1.29 | -0.35 |
| Elected | 1,073 | 0.42(0.49) | 0 | 1 | 0.31 | -1.90 |
| Ontario | 1,073 | 0.62(0.49) | 0 | 1 | -0.48 | -1.77 |
| Visible minority background | 1,073 | 0.08(0.28) | 0 | 1 | 3.0 | 7.0 |
| Percent visible minority | 1,073 | 12.73(16.52) | 0 | 96.98 | 2.17 | 4.62 |
| Percent unemployed | 1,073 | 3.65(1.13) | 0 | 14.31 | 2.56 | 17.37 |
| Population density per km2 | 1,073 | 723.17(1040.66) | 0.1 | 5492.60 | 2.55 | 6.97 |
| Left-Right ideology | 1,073 | 4.84(2.01) | 0 | 10 | 0.06 | 0.24 |
| Agreeableness | 1,073 | 5.39(1.07) | 1 | 7 | -0.59 | 0.03 |
| Conscientiousness | 1,073 | 5.96(0.92) | 1 | 7 | -0.98 | 0.94 |
| Openness to experience | 1,073 | 5.86(0.93) | 2 | 7 | -0.74 | 0.11 |
| Extraversion | 1,073 | 5.00(1.43) | 1 | 7 | -0.52 | -0.39 |
| Emotional stability | 1,073 | 5.68(1.43) | 1 | 7 | -0.84 | 0.57 |

*Note:* Outcome variables (do more for immigrants, do more for religious minorities) recoded to range from 0 (do less) to 1 (do more) with individuals selecting “about the same” coded as 0.5.

**Table A2.** Results from ordinal logistic regression analyses predicting support for doing more for immigrants (Models 1 and 2) and religious minorities (Models 3 and 4) as a function of social background, personality traits, and constituency characteristics without controlling for general left-right political orientation. Ordered logits with standard errors in parentheses.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Immigrants | Religious minorities |
|  | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
| Female | 0.41\*\*(0.14) | 0.43\*\*(0.14) | 0.19(0.13) | 0.21(0.13) |
| Age: 30-39(ref = Under 30) | 0.07(0.16) | 0.09(0.16) | -0.95\*\*\*(0.15) | -0.93\*\*\*(0.15) |
| Age: 40-49 | -0.59\*\*\*(0.13) | -0.55\*\*\*(0.13) | -1.62\*\*\*(0.10) | -1.60\*\*\*(0.12) |
| Age: 50-64 | -0.78\*\*\*(0.10) | -0.77\*\*\*(0.10) | -1.67\*\*\*(0.10) | -1.67\*\*\*(0.10) |
| Age: 65 and older | -0.73\*\*\*(0.12) | -0.70\*\*\*(0.12) | -1.76\*\*\*(0.12) | -1.77\*\*\*(0.12) |
| University education | 0.73\*\*\*(0.13) | 0.74\*\*\*(0.13) | 0.39\*\*(0.12) | 0.41\*\*\*(0.12) |
| Elected | -0.08(0.14) | -0.12(0.15) | 0.06(0.14) | 0.03(0.14) |
| Incumbent | 0.28(0.17) | 0.30(0.17) | 0.03(0.16) | 0.05(0.16) |
| Party member | -0.68(0.44) | -0.53(0.46) | -0.59(0.44) | -0.54(0.45) |
| Ontario | -0.20(0.13) | -0.21(0.13) | -0.01(0.13) | -0.01(0.13) |
| White (ref = non-White) | -0.13(0.22) | -0.07(0.23) | -0.27(0.21) | -0.27(0.22) |
| Agreeableness | 0.24\*\*\*(0.06) | 0.21\*\*(0.08) | 0.29\*\*\*(0.06) | 0.21\*\*(0.07) |
| Conscientiousness | -0.21\*\*(0.07) | -0.36\*\*\*(0.09) | -0.04(0.07) | -0.15(0.08) |
| Extraversion | -0.03(0.04) | 0.02(0.06) | 0.04(0.04) | 0.04(0.06) |
| Emotional stability | 0.04(0.07) | 0.07(0.08) | -0.05(0.06) | 0.02(0.08) |
| Openness to experience | 0.14\*(0.07) | 0.13(0.08) | 0.14\*(0.06) | 0.11(0.08) |
| Population density | 0.00\*(0.00) | 0.00\*(0.00) | 0.00(0.00) | 0.00(0.00) |
| Percent of visible minority (VM) residents | 0.00(0.01) | -0.04(0.03) | 0.01(0.01) | -0.07\*(0.03) |
| Percent of unemployed residents | -0.04(0.05) | -0.04(0.05) | -0.00(0.05) | 0.00(0.05) |
| Agreeableness x VM |  | 0.00(0.00) |  | 0.01(0.00) |
| Conscientiousness x VM |  | 0.01\*(0.00) |  | 0.01(0.00) |
| Extraversion x VM |  | -0.00(0.00) |  | -0.00(0.00) |
| Emotional stability x VM |  | -0.00(0.00) |  | -0.00(0.00) |
| Openness x VM |  | -0.00(0.00) |  | 0.00(0.00) |
| τ1 | -1.80(0.05) | -2.33(0.03) | -1.01(0.05) | -2.07(0.03) |
| τ2 | 0.26(0.11) | -0.26(0.10) | 1.33(0.11) | 0.29(0.10) |
| AIC | 1942.64 | 1944.67 | 2128.32 | 2129.34 |
| Deviance | 1896.64 | 1888.67 | 2082.32 | 2073.34 |
| Log Likelihood | -948.32 | -944.33 | -1041.16 | -1036.67 |
| *N* | 1073 | 1073 | 1073 | 1073 |

*Note:* \* *p* < .05; \*\* *p* < .01; \*\*\* *p* < .001. All models also include covariates contrasting two experimental conditions testing the effects of alternative question framing on candidates’ level of support for restricting religious symbols among municipal employees (not shown). Compared to the control condition, alternative question wordings were not associated with either outcome variable, *p*s < .05.