



Canadian
Reconciliation
Barometer

The Canadian Reconciliation Barometer

2021 Report

FEBRUARY 2022 • FINAL REPORT



The Canadian Reconciliation Barometer team conducted this research.

We dedicate this report to Residential School Survivors as well as to the families and communities whose children never returned home.

Website: <http://www.reconciliationbarometer.ca>

General inquiries: barometer@umanitoba.ca

Media inquiries: barometer.media@umanitoba.ca

Twitter: <https://twitter.com/BarometerLab>

Newsletter: Sign up at <https://katherinestarzyk.us20.list-manage.com/subscribe?u=1dec7a3214bf01e9552526f09&id=0535b37a62>

© Canadian Reconciliation Barometer 2021. All rights reserved.

Suggested citation: Canadian Reconciliation Barometer (2022). *The Canadian Reconciliation Barometer: 2021 Report*. <http://www.reconciliationbarometer.ca>

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the Residential School Survivors, Elders, and reconciliation leaders who continue to teach us what reconciliation means and survey respondents who graciously completed our surveys with care. We also gratefully acknowledge our current and previous financial and in-kind support. Without it, this research would not be possible. Finally, we want to acknowledge all the small kindnesses that people have provided along the way – the advice and mentorship, creative materials, open doors, care, and so much more.

Current Funding

2021–2026: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Insight Grant 435-2021-0394 (\$293,090). This is a competitive academic grant made possible by the Government of Canada. It covers the basic costs of our work, such as polling.

2021–2022: Psychology Undergraduate Research Experience Award for Jaden Dela Rosa, Department of Psychology, University of Manitoba (\$6,000).

Moving forward, we will be seeking other funding, support, and collaborations to increase our human and financial resources so that we may increase our impact. We welcome any inquiries or suggestions!

Current In-Kind Support

2020–Pres.: Probe Research in-kind support

2016–2025: University of Manitoba, in the form of one 3-credit course teaching release for Dr. Starzyk

2015–Pres.: National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation in-kind support of NCTR staff, facilities, and Survivor guidance

Past Funding and In-Kind Support

2020–2021: Mitacs Accelerate Industrial Fellowship in collaboration with Probe Research Inc. (\$55,000)

2020–2021: Canada Research Continuity Emergency Fund (\$10,164)

2019–2020: National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation Grant (\$10,000)

2017–2021: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Insight Grant 435-2017-0754 (\$192,430)

2015–2016: University of Manitoba University Research Grants Program (\$7,116)

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	6
Introduction	7
Project Aims and Purpose.....	7
Relevance to Call to Actions	7
Next Steps	8
Who and Where We Are	8
Project History.....	8
Current Team Members	9
Previous Team Members	12
Developing the Barometer	13
13 Indicators of Reconciliation	14
Other Questions	15
2021 Sample Details	15
Polling Partner	15
Samples.....	15
Sample Strengths and Weaknesses.....	16
A Statistical Primer on the Report	16
A Brief Note on Psychometrics.....	16
Statistical Comparisons.....	16
National Level Findings by Ethnicity Across Indicators	20
Detailed Findings	22
Indicator 1: Good Understanding of the Past and Present	22
Indicator 2: Acknowledgement of Government Harm	24
Indicator 3: Acknowledgement of Residential School Harm.....	26
Indicator 4: Acknowledgement of Ongoing Harm.....	28
Indicator 5: Engagement	30
Indicator 6: Mutually Respectful Relationships.....	32
Indicator 7: Nation-to-Nation Relationships	34
Indicator 8: Personal Equality	36
Indicator 9: Systemic Equality.....	38
Indicator 10: Representation and Leadership	40
Indicator 11: Indigenous Thriving.....	42
A Spotlight on Indigenous Languages	44
Indicator 12: Respect for the Natural World.....	45
Indicator 13: Apologies	47

Awareness of Residential Schools	49
Proud to be Indigenous.....	50
Appendix A: Demographic Questions	51

Executive Summary

Our first 2021 report summarizes responses from 1,119 Indigenous and 2,106 non-Indigenous people in Canada from different walks of life on 13 indicators of reconciliation across 5 regions.

Highlights:

What is reconciliation? Reconciliation requires a good understanding of the past and present, acknowledging harm, and meaningful apologies. It also requires engaging with Indigenous communities and respectful relationships at the individual and nation levels. Key also is equality between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples and thriving Indigenous families, youth, cultures, and languages. Lastly, reconciliation means respect for the natural world around us. *This is an evolving description of what we learned about reconciliation.*

What did we learn about Residential Schools? Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents were most likely to agree that Residential Schools and governments in Canada have harmed Indigenous Peoples and that those past harmful actions continue to negatively affect Indigenous Peoples. Both groups also agreed they have a truthful understanding of the past and present and, less so, that relationships are mutually respectful. There is more work to do to ensure that relationships are mutually respectful.

Do Indigenous and non-Indigenous people agree we are reconciling? Across indicators of reconciliation, Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents agreed more than they disagreed. For example, when asked about how Indigenous people are treated across sectors, both groups expressed most concern about the criminal justice and child welfare systems. Yet, Indigenous respondents perceived less progress on every indicator. Indigenous respondents disagreed that we are making progress for 7 of 13 indicators: Apologies, Respect for the Natural World, Systemic Equality, Indigenous Thriving, Indigenous Representation & Leadership, Nation-to-Nation Relationships, and Personal Equality.

Where do we need work and where are we doing well? One of the largest gaps between the groups was for Good Understanding of the Past and Present. For this indicator, Indigenous respondents scored much higher. In contrast, one of the smallest gaps between Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents was for Representation and Leadership. Unfortunately, the consensus was that Indigenous people are not represented as leaders and decision makers in key sectors. Personal equality is the indicator in which we are making the least progress, including Indigenous Peoples' financial security, mental health, job and promotion opportunities, education, and physical health.

What is reconciliation progress like across regions and respondents? It varied. The largest gaps between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples tended to be in the Prairie region. Indigenous people with higher incomes tended to think that reconciliation was progressing better than those with lower incomes.

How do Indigenous people feel about their identity? Overwhelmingly, Indigenous respondents are proud to be Indigenous.

Introduction

We must collectively work toward reconciliation so that future generations can live a good life. To help write a better future than the past, we must all reckon with today. The Canadian Reconciliation Barometer measures progress toward reconciliation. This is the first of what we hope to be many future reports.

The concept of “seven generations,” shared among many Indigenous peoples, suggests that what we do now will affect the lives of today’s children, their children, and several more generations. It is also a framework to understand the complex relationship and accountabilities associated with living respectfully with the past, present, and future. In the context of reconciliation, we understand that the harms inflicted upon communities are intergenerational and, as a result, the healing will also take many generations. This process may not necessarily be linear.

Project Aims and Purpose

Guided by the concept of seven generations, our team aims to:

- Understand what reconciliation means to Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Canada, on an ongoing and evolving basis.
- Respectfully track reconciliation progress using best practices in psychometrics (the science of psychological measurement) and public polling.
- Evaluate interventions and initiatives aimed at promoting reconciliation.
- Inform policy related to reconciliation, including developing recommendations on ongoing interventions that may be necessary.

In doing so, we intend to be one mechanism to increase transparency and accountability to ensure those who come after us enjoy good and just relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Peoples. Though hopeful, we believe caution, diligence, and awareness are necessary to ensure those within government and our broader society work toward effective solutions and do not repeat racist, fundamentally oppressive, or violent patterns of action. Given the history of genocide in Canada, we know we need to be vigilant. The path to a just future is not guaranteed. The processes of decolonization and the realization of a more holistic human rights framework will take a great deal of commitment, courage, and determination.

We intend to report our findings regularly to the public and to publish academic articles on this work. In the longer term, we hope to build an international network among those who do similar work.

Relevance to Call to Actions

Our work contributes to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s Call to Action 65:

“We call upon the federal government, through the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, and in collaboration with Aboriginal peoples, post-secondary institutions and educators, and the National Centre of Truth and Reconciliation and its partner institutions, to establish a national research program with multi-year funding to advance the understanding of reconciliation.”

This work is also consistent with some of the intended goals of the National Council for Reconciliation, as outlined in Calls to Action 53 to 56.

Next Steps

- Develop a secure base for this project through funding and personnel as well as to expand our ability to report findings.
- Consider and pilot potential new indicators for the 2023 report.
- Develop a platform to poll the same people over time (a longitudinal sample) to allow us to understand change within a group of people over time.
- Explore ways our work may connect with others who are doing similar work with the longer-term goal of building a comprehensive reporting system for reconciliation in Canada.

Who and Where We Are

Project History

In 2015, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada issued 94 Calls to Action, built upon decades of Residential School Survivors' advocacy. The Calls to Action, taken together with the Commission's 10 Principles of Reconciliation and the articles of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, chart a path forward toward a more just country.

In response to the Calls, a small group of like-minded researchers and practitioners met through the partnership and staff support of the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation to discuss whether and how to measure reconciliation. The seeds for the Canadian Reconciliation Barometer were planted.

Ry Moran, now Associate University Librarian – Reconciliation at the University of Victoria and previously the first Director of the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation, asked questions around how a team might monitor developments to understand successes and setbacks along the way. Dean Peachey, a retired Professor of Human Rights at the Global College of the University of Winnipeg, was inspired by the work of the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation in South Africa, where he researched transitional justice processes. Katherine Starzyk, an Associate Professor in the Department of Psychology at the University of Manitoba, had recently attended a United Nations Development Programme meeting on reconciliation in Johannesburg, South Africa, and acquired funding to start some related work. Together, the group developed a project plan and secured funding.

The work then began with a larger team that grew from 2016-2018 to include Lorena Sekwan Fontaine, Academic Lead and Associate Professor in the Department of Indigenous Studies at the University of Winnipeg, and talented emerging scholars Katelin Neufeld, Aleah Fontaine, and Iloradanon Efimoff. Then, in 2020, Mary Agnes Welch of Probe Research joined through a Mitacs partnership and significantly increased our expertise in public opinion polling and knowledge mobilization. Most recently, in 2021, we welcomed to the team master's student Erin White, undergraduate students Kristin Smith and Jaden Dela Rosa, and National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation Director of Research Brenda Gunn.

The Canadian Reconciliation Barometer is the work of many, not least of which are the people who have shared their stories and time with us. It will also be the work of many generations.

Current Team Members

Our team members are in Winnipeg, Manitoba, on Treaty 1 territory, the traditional land of the Anishinaabeg, Cree, Oji-Cree, Dakota, and Dene Peoples, and the homeland of the Métis nation, and Victoria, British Columbia, the traditional territory of the Lekwungen peoples and meeting place of the Songhees, Esquimalt, and WSÁNEĆ Peoples.

About half of our current team is Indigenous (Anishinaabe, Cree, Haida, and Métis). We also have many non-Indigenous identities (such as Afrikaans-speaking Dutch, Canadian, English, Filipino, French, German, Irish, Mennonite, Norwegian, Polish, Russian, and Scottish). Collectively, our team has a lived understanding of Canada's colonial projects, a deep understanding of the varied and rich Indigenous cultural traditions, and expertise in several areas.

Learn more about our team members below, listed in order of when they joined.



Katherine Starzyk

Principal Investigator (2015–present)

Katherine is an Associate Professor in Psychology at the University of Manitoba and Director of the [Social Justice Laboratory](#). She is also a Founding Member of the Centre for Human Rights Research and a Research Affiliate of the Centre for Social Science Research & Policy. Born in Poland, Katherine immigrated when she was seven years old. She brings her identities as a Polish Canadian woman to her research in the areas of social justice, intergroup relations, psychometrics (the science of psychological measurement), attitude change, and personality. Through this work, Katherine aims to help make social change through basic and applied research. She does this alongside talented students and collaborators.



Ry Moran

Co-Investigator (2015–present)

Ry is a proud member of the Red River Métis. Currently, Ry holds the office of Associate University Librarian (Reconciliation) at the University of Victoria. Previously, Ry was the Director of the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation (NCTR) from 2015–2020. Along the way, Ry contributed to major national initiatives including the creation of the National Student Memorial Register, designation of multiple Residential Schools as national historical sites, and the development and launch of the Indigenous Peoples Atlas of Canada. Prior to the NCTR, Ry served with the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, where he facilitated the gathering of nearly 7,000 video/audio-recorded statements of former Residential School Survivors and millions of pages of archival records. Photo credit: Nardella Photography.



Katelin Neufeld

Co-Investigator (2016–present)

Katelin is a settler whose Mennonite roots run throughout the prairies. She earned her Ph.D. in Social and Personality Psychology at the University of Manitoba; she was also a Visiting Scholar in New York University’s Psychology and Social Intervention program. After graduate school, Katelin completed a postdoctoral fellowship with the Barometer and Probe Research Inc. Currently, she is a Behavioural Research Scientist at the Canadian Centre for Child Protection. Katelin has expertise in developing methods to measure and shift peoples’ support for addressing social justice issues, such as fulfilling First Nations water rights. Katelin approaches these themes using quantitative and qualitative methods influenced by teachings she has received from Indigenous peoples, her training in experimental social psychology and measurement science, and experiences in cross-disciplinary collaborations.



Aleah Fontaine

Ph.D. Candidate Collaborator (2016–present)

Aleah is an Anishinaabe, English, Scottish, German, and Welsh Winnipegger, and is a member of Sagkeeng First Nation. Aleah completed her B.A. (Hons.) in Psychology with a minor in Native Studies and an M.A. in Clinical Psychology at the University of Manitoba. Aleah is now pursuing her Ph.D. in the Clinical Psychology program under the supervision of Dr. Katherine Starzyk. Recognizing the impact social structures and conditions have on health, Aleah’s research interests include attitudes toward social justice issues, intergroup relations, and mental well-being and includes both quantitative and qualitative research approaches. Currently, Aleah is exploring the relationships between emotional responses to social injustice and intergroup solidarity.



Lorena Sekwan Fontaine

Co-Investigator (2017–present)

Lorena is Cree-Anishinaabe from Sagkeeng First Nation in Manitoba. She is an Associate Professor in Human Rights and Co-Director of the Indigenous Languages Program at the University of Winnipeg. Lorena has spoken nationally and internationally and has authored articles on Residential School issues and Indigenous language rights in Canada. Her doctoral research was featured in the CBC documentary “Undoing Linguicide,” which was awarded the Radio Television Digital News Association’s Adrienne Clarkson Award for Diversity, Radio, and Network in 2017. Lorena has also worked with the Assembly of First Nations as an advisor on Indigenous languages.



Iloradanon Efimoff

Ph.D. Candidate Collaborator (2018–present)

Iloradanon is Haida and European settler from the northwest coast of British Columbia. After completing her B.A. (Hons.) in Applied Psychology at Douglas College in New Westminster, B.C., Iloradanon worked as a research assistant with the DUDES Club, an Indigenous men’s health organization in Vancouver. Iloradanon later completed her M.A. in Applied Social Psychology at the University of Saskatchewan in 2018, focusing on perceptions and attitudes towards White-presenting Indigenous peoples. She is currently a Ph.D.

Candidate in Social and Personality Psychology at the University of Manitoba under the supervision of Dr. Katherine Starzyk. Through her dissertation research, Iloradanon endeavors to create an accessible educational tool to help combat anti-Indigenous racism in Canada.



Mary Agnes Welch

Collaborator (2019–present)

Mary Agnes is a partner at [Probe Research](#), where she leads qualitative and quantitative projects for a variety of clients, particularly those in the non-profit, government, and labour sectors. She joined the firm in 2016 following a career as an award-winning politics and public policy journalist at the Winnipeg Free Press. A graduate of Columbia University’s journalism program, Mary Agnes builds on her rich experience covering public policy to capture and communicate the underlying research story, focusing on the insights that matter most. Clients benefit tremendously from Mary Agnes’ engaging approach and her significant skills as a focus group moderator and facilitator, as she uncovers what citizens really think about complex issues.



Erin White

M.A. Student Collaborator (2021–present)

Erin is new to the project in 2021 and will be involved throughout her graduate training. She is a Métis and Irish student from Winnipeg. Having recently completed her B.A. (Hons.) in Psychology, Erin is now a M.A. student in Clinical Psychology at the University of Manitoba under the supervision of Dr. Katherine Starzyk. For her master’s research, Erin will explore the effects of historical trauma on mental health and whether, as well as why, being connected to one’s culture can help protect Indigenous people from past harmful experiences.



Kristin Smith

Undergraduate Student Research Assistant (2021–present)

Kristin is supporting the project’s knowledge mobilization. She is a second-generation immigrant to Canada, descended from the Afrikaans-speaking Dutch settlers of South Africa. She is currently completing her bachelor’s degree with a double major in psychology and religion. As former Vice-President Advocacy of the University of Manitoba Students’ Union, Kristin constructed policy recommendations for presentation to provincial and federal legislators, including proposals for improvements to the delivery of programs that help northern, Indigenous, and low-income students overcome systemic barriers to post-secondary education. Following her graduation in 2022, Kristin intends to pursue a Juris Doctor.



Jaden Dela Rosa

Psychology Undergraduate Research Award Student (2021–present)

Jaden is supporting a qualitative analysis of the focus groups as a student research assistant on the project. She is a Filipino, French, and German settler from Winnipeg, Manitoba and is currently pursuing her B.Sc. (Hons) in Psychology at the University of Manitoba. She plans to pursue graduate studies with the goal of obtaining a Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology. Jaden’s research interests include social justice, reconciliation, cultural sensitivity, and

mental health. From 2019 onward, Jaden has supported the social, physical, and emotional needs of youth in care throughout the local community as a Respite Support Worker for MacDonald Youth Services.



Brenda Gunn

Co-Investigator (2021–present)

Brenda is the Academic and Research Director at the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation and a Professor in the Faculty of Law, University of Manitoba. As a proud Metis woman, Brenda combines academic research with activism pushing for greater recognition of Indigenous Peoples’ inherent rights as determined by their own legal traditions. Brenda worked at a community legal clinic in Guatemala on a case of genocide and continues to be actively involved in the international Indigenous Peoples’ movement. She developed a handbook that is one of the main resources in Canada on understanding the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (http://www.indigenousbar.ca/pdf/undrip_handbook.pdf) and has delivered workshops on the Declaration across Canada and internationally.

Previous Team Members



Dean Peachey

Collaborator (2015–2021)

Dean is a retired Professor of Human Rights at the University of Winnipeg, where he also served as Executive Director of Global College and Coordinator of the Bachelor of Arts program in Human Rights. Most recently, Dean has focused on transitional justice and reconciliation in Canada and parts of Africa. Previously, Dean also worked to develop the theory and practice of conflict resolution in Canada. While living in Kitchener, Ont., Dean founded Conflict Resolution Network Canada, taught Peace and Conflict Studies at Conrad Grebel University College and the University of Waterloo, served as President of the Fund for Dispute Resolution, and was a member of the Ontario Civilian Commission on Police Services.

We also thank previous research assistants Jessica Trickey, Leora Strand, Sandra Hunter, Tegan Ledoux, and Ashley Hayward for their contributions.

Finally, we gratefully acknowledge the support of the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation staff in this project. Special thanks to Senior Archivist Jesse Boiteau and Head of Archives Raymond Frogner for their support of our archival research.

Developing the Barometer

The Canadian Reconciliation Barometer is an online survey that Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada complete. The survey covers 13 indicators of reconciliation, with several statements representing each indicator, for a total of 64 statements.

Through several years of work, we developed the survey statements by:

- Studying what First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Residential School Survivors said reconciliation means to them in their sacred testimony to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, now housed at the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation.
- Conducting focus groups and interviews with reconciliation leaders across Canada.
- Connecting with groups around the world that have developed measures of reconciliation.

We also centered our approach in psychometrics, the science of psychological measurement. One principle of psychometrics is that each statement consists of two components: true score and error. The true score is the meaningful portion of an answer, whereas the error represents the influence of other factors not relevant to the topic, like how tired respondents were when they took the survey. The goal is always to create statements with little error in measurement and that represent what we want to know. We can do this by writing clear statements and asking multiple statements about a topic because our measurement of reconciliation will always be more accurate with more statements. Keeping in mind that surveys in online polls need to be short, we determined that we needed at least 3-5 statements for each topic. For these reasons, we emphasize the averages (statistical means) of individual statements within an indicator. We also report the findings for specific statements for interested readers.

Mindful that asking a question may affect how people think about themselves and others, we did not ask any questions that would reinforce any negative stereotypes about Indigenous Peoples. We took a strength-based approach.

We also kept our understanding of reconciliation, gained from studying Residential School Survivor testimony and talking to reconciliation leaders across Canada, while we wrote the statements. For each question, respondents read a statement and then indicated how much they agreed with it by selecting one of five options: strongly disagree (coded as -1), disagree (-.5), neither agree nor disagree (0), agree (.5), or strongly agree (1). These were the response options for all the key statements, which makes it possible to compare progress across the 13 indicators. We assigned the answers numerical codes (i.e., -1, -.5, etc., as above).

“Agree” responses or positive scores signal reconciliation. Similar responses or agreement between Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents’ answers also signal reconciliation.

Finally, we deliberately aimed for a very large sample size—bigger than most traditional national polls—to make sure we could properly report on subgroups. We created quotas for several demographic characteristics so that our Indigenous and non-Indigenous samples could be representative of the general population in Canada. We also weighted responses to correct for any over- or under-sampling. Weighting is a widely accepted and practiced approach in polling.

13 Indicators of Reconciliation

What does reconciliation mean? All of us come from different backgrounds and have had a range of different life experiences that influence our perspective on this question. Yet, there are also several themes, components, or indicators of reconciliation that people commonly mention. Through studying what First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Residential School Survivors said in their sacred testimony to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, speaking with reconciliation leaders across Canada in focus groups and interviews, and studying other reconciliation barometers around the globe, we identified 13 common indicators of reconciliation. We define each indicator below and list their statements in the results section.

Good Understanding of the Past and Present: Respondents have a good understanding of Indigenous Peoples' experiences past and present.

Acknowledgement of Government Harm: Respondents acknowledge that governments in Canada have harmed Indigenous Peoples intentionally, systematically, and for a long time.

Acknowledgement of Residential School Harm: Respondents acknowledge that Residential Schools have harmed Indigenous Peoples.

Acknowledgement of Ongoing Harm: Respondents acknowledge that past harmful actions continue to negatively affect Indigenous Peoples.

Engagement: Respondents are interested in and support Indigenous causes and communities.

Mutually Respectful Relationships: Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada have relationships with each other that they value and that are characterized by mutual personal and cultural respect, interpersonal trust, and comfort.

Nation-to-Nation Relationships: Indigenous nations are in a nation-to-nation relationship with Canada with the rights and resources to achieve their goals.

Personal Equality: Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada have equal life outcomes.

Systemic Equality: Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples are treated fairly in social systems.

Representation and Leadership: Indigenous Peoples are decision-makers or leaders in key sectors of society.

Indigenous Thriving: Indigenous individuals, communities, and cultures in Canada are doing well.

Respect for the Natural World: Groups in Canada are acting so that the natural world can be healthy now and in the future.

Apologies: Groups who have harmed Indigenous Peoples have responded appropriately, by acknowledging the harm as well as their responsibility for the harm, showing remorse, and providing sincere apologies.

Other Questions

We asked respondents several other questions to understand the characteristics of our samples, the demographics of the respondents, and whether respondents had heard anything about Residential Schools before taking the survey. We also asked Indigenous respondents to rate how proud they feel to be Indigenous. Appendix B includes a list of these questions. In the appended tables, we report our findings by some of these demographic characteristics.

2021 Sample Details

Polling Partner

We completed the polls in collaboration with Probe Research Inc. (<https://www.probe-research.com>), who provided expert advice on the survey design, quotas, weighting responses (many thanks to Terry Barna!), and knowledge mobilization. Qualtrics Panels brokered access to respondents and managed the surveys in field.

Samples

This report is based on data from two independent samples, meaning two different groups of respondents. The first poll included 1,575 (994 non-Indigenous, 582 Indigenous) respondents and we collected data from December 22, 2020, to February 19, 2021. The second poll included 1,650 (1,112 non-Indigenous, 537 Indigenous) respondents and we collected data from April 22, 2021, to June 8, 2021. Our total sample was 3,225 respondents (2,106 non-Indigenous, 1,112 Indigenous). We were able to combine the data from these two polls because the findings, including the psychometric properties, were the same across them.

SAMPLE QUOTAS. We set our quotas using the 2016 Census data, as the 2021 data was not yet available. We aimed to recruit a sample that was nationally representative of age, gender, visible minority status, and highest level of education in five different regions. For Indigenous respondents, we also aimed to recruit a sample that was nationally representative of Indigenous group (First Nations, Métis, or Inuit) and residence on or off reserve. In some regions, we slightly oversampled so that we could compare regions to each other.

In **both samples**, our quotas were based on the following categories:

Region: British Columbia, Prairies (Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba), Ontario, Quebec, and Atlantic (New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland & Labrador, Prince Edward Island). Region was intersected with gender and age.

Gender: Man, woman (intersected with region and age). We also included non-binary respondents in our survey but there were too few people from this gender group in our sample to include in our analyses.

Age: 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65+ (intersected with region and gender).

Education: High school or less, college/trade school, university (set nationally).

Ethnicity: Indigenous, non-Indigenous (set regionally).

For the **non-Indigenous samples only**, we included the following additional quota:

Visible minority (no, yes; set nationally)

For the **Indigenous samples only**, we included the following additional quotas:

Group membership (First Nations, Métis, Inuit; set nationally)

Live on or off reserve (soft targets set nationally)

Some quotas were challenging to fill. To promptly collect the data, we chose to release some of our quotas over time. To correct for any under or oversampling of groups, we weighted respondents' answers.

RESPONDENT WEIGHTS. We weighted respondents' answers for region, gender, and age, within each of the two Indigenous and non-Indigenous samples and nationally, so that our samples would be nationally representative on these variables. The median and mean weight was 1.19, with a range from .28 to 7.05.

Sample Strengths and Weaknesses

Due to our fine-grained age quotas, our sample has many people across varying ages. Notably, we have excellent representation of younger adults. For the Indigenous samples, the proportions of respondents who are First Nations, Métis, and Inuit and live on and off reserve is also excellent.

Unfortunately, we were not able to recruit respondents from the Northwest Territories, the Yukon, and Nunavut. Approximately 15% of our sample did, however, indicate that they live in a prescribed northern zone.

A Statistical Primer on the Report

A Brief Note on Psychometrics

The statements have gone through a rigorous process of psychometric evaluation (the study of measurement). Our statements are highly internally consistent and represent the 13 indicators of reconciliation well for both the Indigenous and non-Indigenous samples. We also have evidence of convergent and discriminant validity. An academic manuscript that will follow this report will describe in full our process for developing and validating this barometer.

Statistical Comparisons


In this report, we use averages, bar graphs, confidence intervals, overall scores, percentages in stacked histograms, emoticons, and effect sizes.

AVERAGES. We report average responses across groups (e.g., Indigenous vs. non-Indigenous, across regions) and across statements. To compute an average, we coded respondents' answers as a number. As

the table below describes, we coded respondents' answers so that strongly disagree = -1, disagree = -.5, neither agree nor disagree = 0, .5 = agree, 1 = strongly agree. With this transformation, positive numbers mean people typically agreed and negative numbers mean people typically disagreed. For example, for the "History" finding in Figure 1, the average for the Indigenous bar is .50. This means that Indigenous respondents typically agreed with this statement.

Answer →	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Code →	-1	-.5	0	.5	1

BAR GRAPHS. We often present bar graphs, like the one below. The navy bars represent non-Indigenous participants. The teal bars represent Indigenous participants. The numbers attached to each bar represent the average or typical response within each group. The horizontal line represents 0, or neither agree nor disagree. The tick marks on the vertical line represent the five response options (-1, -.5, 0, .5, 1).




CONFIDENCE INTERVALS. We represent **95% confidence intervals** for the averages as “whiskers” below and above the top of the bars in the graphs. They look like a capital letter “I”. For a set of bars:

- **When the whiskers do not overlap, the scores differ significantly.** In such cases, there is a greater than 95% chance that the findings would replicate given another independent sample with the same demographic characteristics at that point in time.
- When the whiskers do overlap, the responses are similar across groups.

For example, confidence intervals between Indigenous and non-Indigenous do not overlap the figure above, meaning these differences are significant.

OVERALL SCORE. We share an overall score for many of the indicators, which is the average of each statement in an indicator. For example, in the figure above, we calculated an overall score by taking the average of participant's responses to each statement (Past Challenges, Current Challenges, History, and Current Events).

PERCENTAGES. We report the average percentage of respondents who selected each response option. Percentages show how many respondents out of the total number of respondents selected a particular response option. We present percentages in **stacked histograms**, shown below.




Here, on average, 3% of non-Indigenous respondents strongly disagreed (as indicated by the legend above the stacked histograms) with the statement, 14% of non-Indigenous respondents on average disagreed with the statement, and so on.

EMOTICONS. To provide a more accessible way to summarize the group averages, we also use colored emoticons. Navy emoticons represent non-Indigenous respondents and teal emoticons represent Indigenous respondents, with a different emoticon for each response option:



For example,    means that non-Indigenous respondents “agree” and Indigenous respondents “strongly agree.” We explain the arrow between the emoticons in the effect size section.

EFFECT SIZES. We also comment on the **size of differences** between the average scores of the Indigenous and non-Indigenous samples or the “**effect size.**” The effect sizes are based on **Cohen’s d**, and we illustrate the differences with colored arrows between the emoticons:



We rely on the above in our interpretation, but we recognize that these cut-offs are arbitrary, somewhat contested, and evolving, as the understanding of this metric improves.

In some cases, even effects that are small may be important. This will be true when the outcome affects many people or is socially important, as reconciliation does and is.

Finally, readers should note that even with a large difference, responses are still more alike than different from each other. As an example, the difference between Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents is large ($d = 1.03$) for the statement “I take part in Indigenous cultural events.” Clearly, and perhaps as one may expect, Indigenous respondents take part in Indigenous cultural events more than do non-Indigenous respondents. Yet, even for this statement, approximately 60% of responses across both groups are the same. We encourage readers to be mindful of these similarities and differences within the results.

National Level Findings by Ethnicity Across Indicators

Figure 1 represents the findings across the **13 indicators of reconciliation** by ethnicity at the national level. Each indicator is the average of several statements that respondents replied to.

The **vertical midline represents the “neither agree nor disagree”** response option on the 5-point rating scale that accompanied each statement. We scored this midline value as 0. The possible range of scores is from -1 (strongly disagree or “SD”) to 1 (strongly agree or “SA”).

The **navy bars** represent the average non-Indigenous response. The **teal bars** represent the average Indigenous response.


If a bar’s score is above zero or to the right of the midline (e.g., Residential School Harm), this means respondents agreed with the statements. If the bar is below zero or to the left of the midline (e.g., Personal Equality), respondents disagreed.

The “whiskers” on the bars represent the 95% confidence intervals for each of the average estimates. When the whiskers do not overlap, the groups’ scores differ significantly. **When the whiskers overlap, the responses are similar across groups** (e.g., Respectful Relationships).

We have listed the indicators in order from highest to lowest average among Indigenous respondents. Thus, Indigenous respondents most agreed that Residential Schools were harmful and least agreed that Indigenous Peoples experience personal equality.

Positive scores indicate progress.
Similarity in group responses indicates progress.


Figure 1.
All Indicators by Ethnicity at the National Level



INDICATORS with MORE PROGRESS. Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents were most likely to agree that Residential Schools and governments in Canada have harmed Indigenous Peoples (Residential School Harm) and that those past harmful actions continue to negatively affect Indigenous Peoples (Ongoing Harm). Both also agreed they have a truthful understanding of the past and present (Good Understanding) and, less so, that relationships are mutually respectful (Respectful Relationships). Indigenous respondents (but not non-Indigenous respondents) agreed that they engage with and support Indigenous experiences and causes (Engagement).

INDICATORS with LESS PROGRESS. Indigenous respondents disagreed that we are making progress for 7 of 13 indicators: Apologies, Respect for the Natural World, Systemic Equality, Indigenous Thriving, Indigenous Representation & Leadership, Nation-to-Nation Relationships, and Personal Equality. For all these indicators, the average for Indigenous respondents was significantly lower than both the “neither agree nor disagree” category and the non-Indigenous respondent averages.

CONSENSUS between GROUPS. Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents agreed with each other more than they disagreed, but the degree of disagreement is statistically significant for every indicator. Below we show each group’s average response and how similar the responses were across groups. Though some of these differences are small (and so the responses are similar), even small differences matter for such outcomes, especially at population levels.



Detailed Findings

Indicator 1: Good Understanding of the Past and Present

Respondents have a good understanding of Indigenous Peoples' experiences, past and present.

Instructions and Statements

How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? I have a good understanding of... (Statements appeared in random order.)

- the challenges Indigenous Peoples have faced in the past. (Past Challenges)
- the challenges Indigenous Peoples face today. (Current Challenges)
- the history of Indigenous Peoples in Canada. (History)
- what is happening right now for Indigenous Peoples. (Current Events)

Findings

Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents agreed that they have a good understanding of the past and present. However, Indigenous Peoples were more likely to agree on every statement: that they have a good understanding of the challenges Indigenous Peoples have faced in the past, the challenges Indigenous Peoples face today, the history of Indigenous Peoples in Canada, and what is happening right now for Indigenous Peoples. These differences were medium in size.

The pattern of understanding was, however, similar across both groups. Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents most agreed that they have a good understanding of the challenges Indigenous

Peoples have faced in the past and face today. Both groups also least agreed they have a good understanding of what is happening right now for Indigenous Peoples.

Thus, there is a knowledge gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples as well as in the understanding of current events for both groups. These findings underscore the continued importance of learning about Indigenous Peoples. Schools are key to this, but other opportunities must exist outside of schools. The findings also suggest more focus on Indigenous current events is necessary. Mainstream media can complement the efforts of Indigenous outlets to achieve this.


Figure 2. Good Understanding of the Past and Present by Ethnicity and Statement at the National Level



Breakdown of the Overall Score

Adding the two agree categories in Figure 3, the results indicate that, on average, **56% of non-Indigenous** and **78% of Indigenous respondents** agreed they have a good understanding of the past and present.


Figure 3. Good Understanding of the Past and Present Average Endorsement of Answer Choices by Ethnicity at the National Level



Regional Comparisons

The response pattern is relatively similar across the country. All regions, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents reported they have a good understand of the past and present though Indigenous respondents scored higher than did non-Indigenous respondents. There was also some slight variation in understanding. Specifically, respondents from the Atlantic region scored slightly lower than did respondents from other regions.

Figure 4. Good Understanding of the Past and Present by Ethnicity and Region



Indicator 2: Acknowledgement of Government Harm

Respondents acknowledge that governments in Canada have harmed Indigenous Peoples intentionally, systematically, and for a long time.

Instructions and Statements

Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with the following. For a long time, governments in Canada have... (Statements appeared in random order.)

- been slow to change policies that hurt Indigenous Peoples. (Slow to Change)
- done things to weaken Indigenous cultures. (Weakened Cultures)
- hurt Indigenous Peoples. (Hurt)
- harmed Indigenous Peoples on purpose. (Harmed on Purpose)


Findings

Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents agreed that governments in Canada have harmed Indigenous Peoples intentionally, systematically, and for a long time. However, Indigenous Peoples were more likely to agree on every indicator; that governments in Canada have been slow to change policies that hurt Indigenous Peoples, done things to weaken Indigenous cultures, hurt Indigenous

Peoples, and harmed Indigenous Peoples on purpose. The effect size of these differences is medium.

The pattern of understanding was similar across both groups. Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents alike most agreed that governments in Canada have been slow to change harmful policies.


Figure 5. Acknowledgement of Government Harm by Ethnicity and Statement at the National Level



Breakdown of the Overall Score

Adding the two agree categories, the results indicate that, on average, **57% of non-Indigenous** and **75% of Indigenous respondents** agreed that governments in Canada have harmed Indigenous Peoples intentionally, systematically, and for a long time.


Figure 6. Acknowledgement of Government Harm Overall Average Endorsement of Answer Choices by Ethnicity at the National Level



Regional Comparisons

Across most regions, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents acknowledged government harm though Indigenous respondents viewed government actions more negatively than did non-Indigenous respondents. The one exception was Quebec, where Indigenous and non-Indigenous responses were similar. The pattern for this indicator is relatively similar across the country, except for Quebec, where acknowledgement is lower and similar for both groups. This different pattern of results for Quebec may have occurred because that Indigenous subsample was wealthier than the other regions, and only for the Indigenous respondents, as income increased, perceptions of past government harm decreased. This link between income and attitudes was strongest in Quebec, followed by the Atlantic region and British Columbia. Notably, the largest gap in acknowledgement of past government harm is in the Prairie region.

Figure 7. Acknowledgement of Government Harm by Ethnicity and Region



Indicator 3: Acknowledgement of Residential School Harm

Respondents acknowledge that Residential Schools have harmed Indigenous Peoples.



Instructions and Statements

How much do you agree or disagree with the below? (Statements appeared in random order.)

- Indian Residential Schools are one of many ways governments have hurt Indigenous Peoples. (Government Role)
- The priests, nuns, and others who worked in Indian Residential Schools abused the children there. (Child Abuse)
- Indian Residential Schools were a bad idea. (Schools Bad Idea)
- A goal of Indian Residential Schools was to get rid of Indigenous cultures. (Destroy Cultures)


Findings ↔

Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents agreed that Residential Schools are one of many ways governments have hurt Indigenous Peoples; the priests, nuns, and others who worked in Residential Schools abused the children there; and Residential Schools were a bad idea. Within each group, Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents agreed at about the same level on these three statements, respectively.

Although less so, both groups also agreed that a goal of Residential Schools was to get rid of Indigenous cultures.

Compared to non-Indigenous respondents, however, Indigenous respondents agreed more with each statement. The effect size of these differences is medium.


Figure 8. Acknowledgement of Residential School Harm by Ethnicity and Statement at the National Level



Breakdown of the Overall Score

Adding the two agree categories, the results indicate that, on average, **61% of non-Indigenous** and **82% of Indigenous respondents** agreed that Residential Schools have harmed Indigenous Peoples.


Figure 9. Acknowledgement of Past Government Harm Overall Average Endorsement of Answer Choices by Ethnicity at the National Level



Regional Comparisons

The pattern of findings for this indicator is very similar to that of acknowledgement of government harm. Across most regions, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents agreed that Residential Schools were harmful though Indigenous respondents viewed the schools more negatively than did non-Indigenous respondents. The one exception was Quebec, where Indigenous and non-Indigenous responses were similar. This different pattern of results for Quebec may have occurred because that Indigenous subsample was wealthier than the other regions, and only for the Indigenous sample, as income increased, perceptions of past government harm decreased. This link between income and attitudes was strongest in Quebec, followed by the Atlantic region and British Columbia. Again, as well, the largest gap in acknowledgement of past government harm was in the Prairie region.

Figure 10. Acknowledgement of Residential School Harm by Ethnicity and Region



Indicator 4: Acknowledgement of Ongoing Harm

Respondents acknowledge that past harmful actions continue to negatively affect Indigenous Peoples.

Instructions and Statements

Because of past policies, such as Indian Residential Schools, Indigenous Peoples are still suffering...

(Statements appeared in random order.)

- psychological harm. (Psychological)
- across many generations. (Intergenerational)
- spiritual harm. (Spiritual)
- physical harm. (Physical)


Findings

Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents saw a connection between the past and present—a concept some scholars call “privity.” Reflecting the pattern for a good understanding and acknowledgement of government and residential school harm, however, Indigenous respondents agreed more strongly than did non-Indigenous respondents that policies such as Residential Schools have caused psychological harm, harm across many generations, spiritual harm, and

physical harm. The effect size of these differences is small to medium.

Yet, both groups showed a similar pattern of agreement across the statements. Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents most agreed that the past harm was psychological, intergenerational, and spiritual. For both groups agreement was lower for physical suffering.


Figure 11. Acknowledgement of Ongoing Harm Averages by Ethnicity and Statement at the National Level



Breakdown of the Overall Score

Adding the two agree categories, the results indicate that, on average, **63% of non-Indigenous** and **79% of Indigenous respondents** agreed that past harmful actions continue to negatively affect Indigenous Peoples.


Figure 12. Acknowledgement of Ongoing Harm Overall Average Endorsement of Answer Choices by Ethnicity at the National Level



Regional Comparisons

The pattern for this indicator is relatively similar across the country, though several differences among regions exist. Indigenous responses in Quebec and the Atlantic stand out, because of the lower levels of acknowledgement of ongoing harm, compared to the other three regions. Again, this different pattern of results for Quebec may have occurred because that Indigenous subsample was wealthier than the other regions, and only for the Indigenous sample, as income increased, perceptions of past government harm decreased. This pattern was strongest in Quebec, followed by the Atlantic region, British Columbia, as well as the Prairies in this case. Also replicating other acknowledgement indicators, the largest gap in acknowledgement of past government harm was in the Prairie region.

Figure 13. Acknowledgement of Ongoing Harm Averages by Ethnicity and Region



Indicator 5: Engagement

Respondents are interested in and support Indigenous causes and communities.

Instructions and Statements

Next, we want to get a sense of what you think and do. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers. Just let us know how much you agree or disagree with each one. (Statements appeared in random order.)

- I do things to support Indigenous Peoples' causes. (Support Causes)
- I am working on learning more about Indigenous Peoples in Canada. (Learning About Peoples)
- I take time to learn about Indigenous communities in my area. (Learning About Communities)
- I take part in Indigenous cultural events. (Cultural Events)
- I work with Indigenous Peoples for justice. (Support Justice)

Findings

Indigenous respondents somewhat agreed that they support Indigenous Peoples' causes; are learning about Indigenous Peoples in Canada and communities in their area; take part in Indigenous cultural events; and work with Indigenous Peoples for justice. In contrast, non-Indigenous respondents only slightly agreed that they support Indigenous Peoples' causes and are learning about Indigenous Peoples in Canada as well as communities in their area. Non-Indigenous respondents slightly disagreed that they participated in Indigenous cultural events and worked with Indigenous Peoples for justice. Even Indigenous respondents,

however, least agreed that they take part in Indigenous cultural events and work with Indigenous Peoples for justice.

Notably, of all the statements in the survey, the pattern of answers was least consistent between Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents for these engagement statements. The biggest gaps between the groups were for participation in Indigenous cultural events and working with Indigenous Peoples for justice. The effect size of these differences is large.


Figure 14. Engagement Averages by Ethnicity and Statement at the National Level



Breakdown of the Overall Score

Adding the two agree categories, the results indicate that, on average, **34% of non-Indigenous** and **67% of Indigenous respondents** agreed they are interested in and support Indigenous causes and communities.


Figure 15. Engagement Overall Average Endorsement of Answer Choices by Ethnicity at the National Level



Regional Comparisons

The pattern for this indicator is relatively similar across the country. Across all regions, Indigenous respondents agreed they are interested in and support Indigenous causes and communities, whereas non-Indigenous respondents typically chose the neutral “neither agree nor disagree” option. Within the Indigenous sample, respondents from Quebec reported the highest engagement. This was in part due to income. In Quebec, as well as Ontario, more wealthy Indigenous respondents reported being more engaged.

Figure 16. Engagement Overall Averages by Ethnicity and Region



Indicator 6: Mutually Respectful Relationships

Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada have relationships with each other that they value and that are characterized by mutual personal and cultural respect, interpersonal trust, and comfort.



Instructions and Statements

Now please think about the personal relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada. In these relationships, both people... (Statements appeared in random order.)

- value the relationship. (Value Relationship)
- feel comfortable together. (Feel Comfortable Together)
- respect each other. (Respect Each Other)
- respect each other’s cultures. (Respect Cultures)
- trust one another. (Trust One Another)

Findings


Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents somewhat agreed that relationships are mutually respectful, with one exception. Indigenous respondents’ average score did not significantly differ from the midpoint, which represented “neither agree nor disagree”, for the statement on trusting one another. This was also the lowest score for non-Indigenous respondents.

Unfortunately, respondents agreed less for these statements than for most of the indicators we have already discussed. Thus, there is much room for

improvement before Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples value the relationships they have with each other, feel comfortable together, respect each other, respect each other’s cultures, and trust one another.

For all the statements, Indigenous respondents were less positive than were non-Indigenous respondents. The effect size of these gaps is small, but the importance of this difference in perceptions may have important real-world outcomes.


Figure 17. Mutually Respectful Relationships by Ethnicity and Statement at the National Level



Breakdown of the Overall Score

Adding the two agree categories, the results indicate that, on average, **45% of non-Indigenous** and **42% of Indigenous respondents** agreed that Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada have relationships with each other that they value and that are characterized by mutual personal and cultural respect, interpersonal trust, and comfort.


Figure 18. *Mutually Respectful Relationships Overall Average Endorsement of Answer Choices by Ethnicity at the National Level*



Regional Comparisons

Unlike the previous indicators, the pattern for this one varies somewhat across the country. In most regions, non-Indigenous respondents reported more positive relationships than did Indigenous respondents. The pattern for Quebec is the exception; in that province, Indigenous respondents reported more positive relationships than did non-Indigenous respondents. This different pattern of results for Quebec may have occurred because that Indigenous subsample was more wealthy than other regions, and for only the Indigenous sample, as income increased, so did perceptions of positive relationships. The lowest ratings for Indigenous respondents were in the Prairies and Atlantic regions.

Figure 19. *Mutually Respectful Relationships by Ethnicity and Region*



Indicator 7: Nation-to-Nation Relationships

Indigenous nations are in a nation-to-nation relationship with Canada, with the rights and resources to achieve their goals.

Instructions and Statements

Now let's think about the relationships between Indigenous nations and governments in Canada. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following? In Canada... (Statements appeared in random order.)

- governments respect the rights of Indigenous nations to make their own decisions. (Respect Decisions)
- governments honor Indigenous nations' rights. (Honor Rights)
- Indigenous nations have what they need (e.g., money, land) to reach their goals. (Support Goals)
- governments treat Indigenous nations like they treat other countries. (Nation-to-Nation)

Findings


Indigenous respondents disagreed somewhat that Indigenous nations have nation-to-nation relationships with governments in Canada. This was true for every statement.

Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents alike disagreed most with the statement that governments treat Indigenous Nations like they treat other countries (Nation-to-Nation). Indigenous respondents disagreed less that Indigenous nations have what they need to reach their goals and disagreed the least that governments in Canada

honor Indigenous Nations' rights and respect the rights of Indigenous Nations to make their own decisions.

In comparison, non-Indigenous respondents were neutral about whether Indigenous nations have what they need to reach their goals and agreed somewhat that governments in Canada honor Indigenous nations' rights and respect the rights of Indigenous nations to make their own decisions. The average effect size of these differences was medium.


Figure 20. Nation-to-Nation Relationships by Ethnicity and Statement at the National Level



Breakdown of the Overall Score

Adding the two agree categories, the results indicate that, on average, **36% of non-Indigenous** and **26% of Indigenous respondents** agreed that Indigenous nations are in a nation-to-nation relationship with Canada, with the rights and resources to achieve their goals.


Figure 21. Nation-to-Nation Relationships Overall Average Endorsement of Answer Choices by Ethnicity at the National Level



Regional Comparisons

There are several stories in this data. First, in four of the five regions, Indigenous respondents disagreed that Indigenous nations are in a nation-to-nation relationship with Canada, especially among Indigenous respondents in the Prairies and Ontario. The gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous responses was also largest in these two regions. The exception to the national pattern was Quebec, where both groups' scores were equivalent to neither agree nor disagree. In every region, as Indigenous respondents' income increased, they were more likely to agree that Indigenous nations are in a nation-to-nation relationship with Canada. This association also existed for non-Indigenous respondents in BC. In comparison, non-Indigenous responses for all regions either did not differ from the mid-point (neither agree nor disagree) or were very close to it.

Figure 22. Nation-to-Nation Relationships by Ethnicity and Region



Indicator 8: Personal Equality

Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada think they have equal life outcomes.

Instructions and Statements

Now we have some statements on your views about society. Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada have equal... (Statements appeared in random order.)

- physical health
- educational outcomes
- job and promotion opportunities
- mental health
- financial security


Findings

In all ways, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents disagreed that Indigenous Peoples have equal outcomes. Indigenous respondents expressed the most concern about financial security, mental health, and job/promotion opportunities, and then education and physical health. Though comparisons among these statements were statistically significant, the effect size of these differences was typically small,

meaning that Indigenous respondents were similarly concerned about all these outcomes.

As well, Indigenous respondents agreed less than did non-Indigenous respondents that Indigenous Peoples have good personal outcomes for all the statements. This represents a gap in understanding across groups.


Figure 23. Personal Equality by Ethnicity and Statement at the National Level



Breakdown of the Overall Score

Adding the two agree categories, the results indicate that, on average, **28% of non-Indigenous** and **24% of Indigenous respondents** agreed that Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada think they have equal life outcomes.


Figure 24. Personal Equality Average Endorsement of Answer Choices by Ethnicity at the National Level



Regional Comparisons

The pattern for this indicator is relatively similar across the country. In all regions, non-Indigenous respondents disagreed that Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada have equal life outcomes. This was also true of Indigenous respondents, except in Quebec. The biggest gap between the groups was in the Prairies. Indigenous respondents with higher incomes in Quebec and BC were more likely to agree that Indigenous people in Canada have equal life outcomes. Conversely, non-Indigenous respondents in the Atlantic and Ontario with lower incomes were more likely to agree. These findings suggest people may rely on their own well-being in making decisions about larger groups.

Figure 25. Personal Equality by Ethnicity and Region



Indicator 9: Systemic Equality

Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples are treated fairly in social systems.

Instructions and Statements

Please tell us how much you agree or disagree that Indigenous Peoples are treated fairly in each of the following. (Statements appeared in random order.)

- The arts (Arts)
- Sports
- Education (Educ)
- Workplaces (Work)
- Health care
- Media
- The child welfare system (Child Welfare)
- The criminal justice system (Criminal Justice)

Findings

Overall, Indigenous respondents disagreed somewhat that Indigenous peoples are treated fairly in social systems. This was also true in most individual sectors. In contrast, non-Indigenous respondents' overall score did not significantly differ from "neither disagree nor agree." Non-Indigenous respondents did, however, somewhat disagree that Indigenous Peoples are treated fairly in work, child welfare, and criminal justice.

Across both groups, respondents expressed the most concern about how Indigenous Peoples are treated in the criminal justice and child welfare systems. On a brighter note, attitudes were

somewhat positive for the arts, a sector for which both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents somewhat agreed that Indigenous Peoples are treated well.

As well, Indigenous respondents agreed less than non-Indigenous respondents that Indigenous Peoples are treated fairly in the overall score and across all individual sectors. The effect size of these differences was small to medium.

In sum, everyone agrees that much room for progress remains and there is a gap in perceptions across groups.


Figure 26. Systemic Equality by Ethnicity and Statement at the National Level



Breakdown of the Overall Score

Adding the two agree categories, the results indicate that, on average, **36% of non-Indigenous** and **33% of Indigenous respondents** agreed that Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples are treated fairly in social systems.


Figure 27. Systemic Equality Average Endorsement of Answer Choices by Ethnicity at the National Level



Regional Comparisons

The pattern for this indicator is relatively similar across the country. In all regions except Quebec, Indigenous respondents disagreed that Indigenous Peoples are treated fairly across sectors. In comparison, non-Indigenous respondents tended to choose neither agree nor disagree. The biggest gap between the groups was in the Prairies, followed by the Atlantic region and Ontario. Indigenous respondents with higher incomes in Quebec, BC, and the Prairies were more likely to agree that Indigenous people in Canada have equal life outcomes.

Figure 28. Systemic Equality by Ethnicity and Region



Indicator 10: Representation and Leadership

Indigenous Peoples are decision makers or leaders in key sectors of society.

Instructions and Statements

And how much you agree or disagree that Indigenous Peoples are decision makers or leaders in the following? (Statements appeared in random order.)

- The arts (Arts)
- Sports
- Education (Educ)
- Workplaces (Work)
- Media
- Health care (Health)
- The child welfare system (Child)
- Government (Gov)
- The criminal justice system (Justice)

Findings


Overall, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents disagreed somewhat that Indigenous Peoples are represented as decision makers or leaders in key sectors of society. This was also true in all but one individual sector. The exception was the arts, a sector for which both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents somewhat agreed that Indigenous Peoples are represented as decision makers or leaders.

Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents expressed most concern for the criminal justice system. Indigenous respondents were next most

concerned about government and the child welfare system. For non-Indigenous respondents, the pattern for the remaining sectors was not identical but similar to that of Indigenous respondents.

Except for the arts, Indigenous respondents also agreed less than did non-Indigenous respondents that Indigenous Peoples are decision makers or leaders overall and in all individual sectors. Yet, the effect size of these differences was small. This is the indicator for which there is the greatest similarity between groups.


Figure 29. Representation and Leadership by Ethnicity and Statement at the National Level



Breakdown of the Overall Score

Adding the two agree categories, the results indicate that, on average, **25% of non-Indigenous** and **27% of Indigenous respondents** agreed that Indigenous Peoples are decision makers or leaders in key sectors of society.


Figure 30. Representation and Leadership Average Endorsement of Answer Choices by Ethnicity at the National Level



Regional Comparisons

The pattern for this indicator is relatively similar across the country. In all regions except Quebec, Indigenous respondents disagreed that Indigenous Peoples are represented as decision makers or leaders in key sectors of society. Non-Indigenous respondents also disagreed, but to a lesser extent. The biggest gap between the groups was in the Prairies, followed by the Atlantic region and Ontario. There was no difference between Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents in BC. Indigenous respondents with higher incomes in Quebec were more likely to agree that Indigenous Peoples are decision makers or leaders. Conversely, non-Indigenous respondents in Ontario with lower incomes were more likely to agree.

Figure 31. Representation and Leadership by Ethnicity and Region



Indicator 11: Indigenous Thriving

Indigenous individuals, communities, and cultures in Canada are doing well.

Instructions and Statements

Please rate how much you agree or disagree that the following are doing well. (Statements appeared in random order.)

- Indigenous cultures (Cultures)
- Indigenous families (Families)
- Indigenous youth (Youth)
- Indigenous languages (Languages)


Findings

Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents disagreed that Indigenous Peoples have equal outcomes for both the overall score and for three of the four statements measuring Indigenous thriving. Indigenous respondents disagreed most that Indigenous languages are thriving followed by Indigenous youth, whereas non-Indigenous respondents disagreed most that Indigenous youth are thriving followed by Indigenous languages. Both groups also expressed concern about Indigenous families. Finally, both groups were most positive about Indigenous cultures. Yet, Indigenous

respondents disagreed that Indigenous cultures are thriving, whereas non-Indigenous respondents somewhat agreed that Indigenous cultures are thriving.

Though these differences are real, they are relatively small in effect size. Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents had similar attitudes toward each statement. Thus, non-Indigenous and Indigenous respondents were similarly concerned about these outcomes.


Figure 32. Indigenous Thriving by Ethnicity and Statement at the National Level



Breakdown of the Overall Score

Adding the two agree categories, the results indicate that, on average, **29% of non-Indigenous** and **30% of Indigenous respondents** agreed that Indigenous individuals, communities, and cultures in Canada are doing well.


Figure 33. Indigenous Thriving Average Endorsement of Answer Choices by Ethnicity at the National Level



Regional Comparisons

The pattern for this indicator is relatively similar across the country. In all regions, Indigenous respondents disagreed that Indigenous Peoples are thriving; this was true even in Quebec. In comparison, non-Indigenous respondents chose neither agree nor disagree, except those from Ontario, who disagreed. The biggest gap between the groups was in the Prairies, followed by the Atlantic region and Ontario. The difference between Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents was not significant in BC and Quebec because of the large confidence interval for the Indigenous samples in those regions. Finally, Indigenous respondents with higher incomes in Quebec and BC were more likely to agree that Indigenous Peoples are thriving.

Figure 34. Indigenous Thriving by Ethnicity and Region



A Spotlight on Indigenous Languages


In 2017 (<https://www.canadiangeographic.ca/article/mapping-indigenous-languages-canada>), there were at least 60 Indigenous languages belonging to 12 families in use in Canada. Yet, both non-Indigenous and Indigenous respondents reported that Indigenous languages are not doing well.

Figure 35. Indigenous Languages Endorsement of Answer Choices by Ethnicity at the National Level



Figure 36. Indigenous Languages by Select Demographic Characteristics

Indigenous respondents who were **more concerned** about Indigenous languages (disagreed Indigenous languages are doing well) tended to:



Notes. -1 = Strongly Disagree, -.5 = Disagree, 0 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, .5 = Agree, and 1 = Strongly Agree.

Indicator 12: Respect for the Natural World

Definition

Groups in Canada are acting so that the natural world can be healthy now and in the future.



Instructions and Statements

Now we'd like you to think about the natural world—all the plants, animals, rocks, rivers, land, and so on. For each of the following groups in Canada, how much do you agree or disagree that they are acting so that the natural world can be healthy now and in the future? (Statements appeared in random order.)

- People of all ages (All Ages)
- People of all political beliefs (All Political Beliefs)
- The federal Government of Canada (Government)
- Resource extraction industries (e.g., mining, oil, and forestry) (Resource Industry)


Findings

In general, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents expressed concern about how various groups in Canada treat the natural world. The findings did, however, vary by group and statement.

Indigenous respondents somewhat disagreed that groups in Canada are respecting the natural world. In contrast, non-Indigenous respondents neither agreed nor disagreed, as the overall score is equivalent to the midpoint. On balance, though, this difference was relatively small.

At the statement level, the pattern of agreement varied across statements. Both groups disagreed that resource extraction industries treat the natural world in respectful ways and agreed that people of all ages treat the natural world in respectful ways. Only Indigenous respondents, however, also disagreed that the Government of Canada and people of all political beliefs treat the natural world in respectful ways. In comparison, non-Indigenous respondents somewhat agreed that the government is acting respectfully to nature and neither agreed nor disagreed for people of all political beliefs.


Figure 37. *Respect for the Natural World by Ethnicity and Statement at the National Level*



Breakdown of the Overall Score

Adding the two agree categories, the results indicate that, on average, **32% of non-Indigenous** and **29% of Indigenous respondents** agreed that groups in Canada are acting so that the natural world can be healthy now and in the future.


Figure 38. *Respect for the Natural World Average Endorsement of Answer Choices by Ethnicity at the National Level*



Regional Comparisons

The pattern for this indicator varied across the country. In the Atlantic, Prairies, and Ontario, Indigenous respondents disagreed that groups in Canada are acting so that the natural world can be healthy now and in the future. In comparison, Indigenous respondents in BC and non-Indigenous respondents in all regions neither agreed nor disagreed, whereas Indigenous respondents in Quebec agreed. Finally, Indigenous respondents with higher incomes in Quebec and BC were more likely to agree that groups in Canada are acting so that the natural world can be healthy now and in the future.

Figure 39. *Respect for the Natural World by Ethnicity and Region*



Indicator 13: Apologies

Groups who have harmed Indigenous Peoples have responded appropriately, by acknowledging the harm as well as their responsibility for the harm, showing remorse, and providing sincere apologies.

Instructions and Statements

How much do you agree or disagree that groups who have harmed Indigenous Peoples... (Statements appeared in random order.)


- have acknowledged the harm they caused. (Acknowledge Harm)
- accept responsibility. (Responsibility)
- have provided sincere apologies. (Sincere Apologies)
- show remorse.

Findings

Overall and for most of the statements, Indigenous respondents disagreed that groups who have harmed Indigenous Peoples show remorse, have provided sincere apologies, and accept responsibility. Indigenous participants neither agreed nor disagreed that groups who have harmed Indigenous peoples have acknowledged the harm they caused. In contrast, non-Indigenous

respondents somewhat agreed that such groups have responded appropriately, with one exception. For “show remorse,” non-Indigenous respondents neither agreed nor disagreed. The effect size of these differences is small. Thus, though Indigenous peoples are more positive about progress on this indicator, both groups’ responses suggest much work remains.


Figure 40. Apologies by Ethnicity and Statement at the National Level



Breakdown of the Overall Score

Adding the two agree categories, the results indicate that, on average, **38% of non-Indigenous** and **33% of Indigenous respondents** agreed that groups who have harmed Indigenous Peoples have responded appropriately, by acknowledging the harm as well as their responsibility for the harm, showing remorse, and providing sincere apologies.


Figure 41. Apologies Average Endorsement of Answer Choices by Ethnicity at the National Level



Regional Comparisons

The pattern for this indicator was varied across the country. Indigenous respondents in the Prairies and Ontario disagreed groups who have harmed Indigenous Peoples have responded appropriately. The value for BC and the Atlantic were equivalent to “neither disagree nor agree” and in Quebec Indigenous respondents agreed. Indigenous respondents with higher incomes in Quebec as well as both Indigenous and non-Indigenous respondents in BC were more likely to agree that groups who have harmed Indigenous Peoples have responded appropriately. In comparison, non-Indigenous responses across regions were equivalent to “neither agree nor disagree” in all regions but the Prairies.

Figure 42. Apologies by Ethnicity and Region



Awareness of Residential Schools

Across the country, **65%** of non-Indigenous respondents and **87%** of Indigenous respondents had previously read or heard anything about Residential Schools. These percentages were much lower in our Quebec sample. Without the Quebec subsample, the average would be 71% for non-Indigenous respondents and 90% for Indigenous respondents.

Statement


Before today, have you read or heard anything about Indian Residential Schools?
Response options: No, yes

Figure 43. Awareness of Residential Schools by Ethnicity



Regional Comparisons

Figure 43. Awareness of Residential Schools by Ethnicity and Region



Proud to be Indigenous


Across the country, **85%** of Indigenous respondents agreed they are proud to be Indigenous. This high level of agreement was consistent across all regions, with some slight variation. The value ranged from 82-83% in Ontario, the Prairies, and the Atlantic, to 90-92% in British Columbia and Quebec.

Statement

“I am proud to be [First Nations, Métis, Inuit].” (Autofilled based on an earlier answer.)


Response options: Strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat agree, strongly agree.

Figure 44. Proud to be Indigenous Endorsement of Answer Choices by Region



The graph below represents the same information as above, but as an average of all responses.

Figure 45. Proud to be Indigenous Endorsement by Region



Appendix A: Demographic Questions

Note that respondents did not see the titles.

1. Gender

What is your gender?

Man

Woman

I identify my gender as (please specify): _____

2. Province of Residence

In what province or territory do you live?

Alberta

British Columbia

Manitoba

New Brunswick

Newfoundland and Labrador

Northwest Territories

Nova Scotia

Nunavut

Ontario

Prince Edward Island

Québec

Saskatchewan

Yukon

3. Age

What is your age?

17 or younger (terminate if selected)

18-24

25-34

35-44

45-54

55-64

65-74

75-84

85-94

95+

4. Ethnicity

What is your ethnicity? Please check off as many as applicable. Examples within brackets are not complete—other groups are possible within categories.

Arab

Black
Chinese
Filipino
Indigenous (First Nations, Métis, Inuk)
Japanese
Korean
Latin American
South Asian (e.g., East Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, etc.)
Southeast Asian (e.g., Vietnamese, Cambodian, Laotian, Thai, etc.)
West Asian (e.g., Iranian, Afghan, etc.)
White
Other (please specify): _____

[If Indigenous] Which of the following groups do you belong to? Select all that apply.

First Nations
Métis
Inuk (Inuit)
North American Indian
Indigenous other (please specify): _____

[If Indigenous] Do you live on or off reserve?

On reserve
Off reserve

5. Education

Which of the following have you completed, if any? Check all that apply.

High school or an equivalent (e.g., a GED)
A registered apprenticeship or other trades certificate or diploma
A college, CEGEP, or other non-university certificate or diploma
A university certificate, diploma, or degree
None of these

What is the highest grade you completed from kindergarten to grade 12?

[Dropdown list from 0, Kindergarten, Grade 1... to Grade 12 or 13]

Not counting elementary, middle school, and high school, how many years of post-secondary education have you completed, if any?

[Numerical drop-down list, starting at 0]

6. Community Type

Which best describes where you currently live?

A city
A suburban area outside a city

A town or village

A rural area

7. Live in a Prescribed Northern Zone

[Displayed if participants selected Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec]

Do you live in a prescribed Northern Zone, that is, a region that qualifies for a Northern Residents reduction from the Canadian Revenue Agency?

Yes

No

Not sure

[Displays only if “not sure” selected]

[If “not sure” selected by Alberta resident, display this question in page:]

Here are some of the prescribed Northern Zones in your province.

(*location is in Wood Buffalo National Park)

Adams Landing	Forestry West	Kemp River	Point Brule	Boyer 164
Angus Tower *	Zama	Kenny Woods	Quatre Fourches	Bushe River 207
Assumption	(airfield)	La Crête	Rainbow Imperial	Child Lake 164A
Berdinskies	Fort Chipewyan	Lambert Creek	(airfield)	Chipewyan 201
Big Slough	Fort Smith	Tower	Rainbow Lake	Chipewyan 201A
Boyer	Settlement	Little Fishery	Rocky Lane	Chipewyan 201B
Boyer Settlement	Fort Vermilion	Little Red River	Slavey Creek	Chipewyan 201C
Buffalo Head	Fox Lake	Lutose	Steen River	Chipewyan 201D
Prairie	Garden Creek	Margaret Lake	Sweetgrass	Chipewyan 201E
Carcajou	Garden River	Meander River	Landing	Chipewyan 201F
Carlson Landing	(Pakwanutik River)	Meander River	Vermilion Chutes	Chipewyan 201G
Chateh	Habay	Station	Wadlin Tower	Fox Lake 162
Cherry Mountain *	Hay Camp	Metis	Warden Station *	Hay Lake 209
Davidson Lake *	High Level	North Vermilion	Wentzel Lake	Jackfish Point 214
Embarras	High Rock *	Settlement	Zama Lake	John D’Or Prairie
(Athabasca	Hutch Lake	Old Fort		215
River)	Indian Cabins	Paddle Prairie	Reserves:	Tall Cree 173
Embarras Portage	Jackfish	Paddle Prairie	Amber River 211	Tall Cree 173A
Fifth Meridian	Jackfish River	Metis	Beaver Ranch 163	Upper Hay River
Fitzgerald (Slave	John D’Or Prairie	Settlement	Bistcho Lake 213	212
River)	Keg River	Parsons Lake *		Zama Lake 210
Footner Lake		Peace Point		
		Pine Lake *		

[If “not sure” selected by British Columbia resident, display this question in page:] Here are some of the prescribed Northern Zones in your province.

Andy Bailey Recreation Area	Good Hope Lake	Nelson Forks	Tahltan	Liard River 3
Atlin	Gutah	New Polaris Mine	Taku	McDames Creek 2
Atlin Park	Hyland Post	Niteal	Taku River	McDonald Lake 1
Atlin Recreation Area	Hyland Ranch	Old Fort Nelson	Tamarack	Mosquito Creek 5
Bear Camp	Hyland River Park	Pavey	Tarahne Park	Muddy River 1
Ben-My-Chree	Iskut	Pennington	Telegraph Creek	One Mile Point 1
Bennett	Jacksons	Pleasant Camp	Tetsa River Park	Prophet River 4
Boulder City	Kahntah	Porter Landing	Toad River	Salmon Creek 3
Boya Lake Park	Kledo Creek Park	Prophet River	Trutch	Silver Salmon Lake 5
Callison Ranch	Klua	Prophet River Recreation Area	Tulsequah	Snake 5
Cariboo Meadows	Laketon	Rainy Hollow	White Pass	Stikine River 7
Cassiar (Troutline Creek)	Liard River	Rupert	Reserves:	Summit Lake Mile 392
Centreville	Liard River	Saloon	Atlin-Teslin Indian Cemetery 4	Tahltan 1
Coal River	Lindeman	Scotia Bay	Blue River 1	Tahltan 10
Days Ranch	Log Cabin	Sheslay	Classy Creek 8	Tahltan Forks 5
Dease Lake	Lower Post	Sikanni (railway siding / point ferroviaire)	Dease Lake 9	Taku 6
Defot	Magnum Mine	Skooks Landing	Dease River 2	Tatcho Creek 11
Eddontenajon	Maxhamish Lake Park	Smith River	Dease River 3	Telegraph Creek 6
Ekwan	McDame	Smith River	Five Mile Point 3	Telegraph Creek 6A
Elleh	Meadows	Military Reserve	Fontas 1	Teslin Lake 7
Engineer	Mosquito Flats	Snake River	Fort Nelson 2	Teslin Lake 9
Fireside	Mount Edziza Park	Steamboat	Hiusta's Meadow 2	Upper Tahltan 4
Fontas	Mount Edziza Recreation Area	Stikine River	Horse Ranch Pass 4	Weissener Lake 3
Fort Nelson	Muncho Lake	Recreation Area	Jennings River 8	
Fraser (White Pass)	Muncho Lake Park	Stone Mountain Park	Kahntah 3	
Gleam	Muskwa	Surprise	Kluachon Lake 1	

[If “not sure” selected by Manitoba resident, display this question in page:]

Here are some of the prescribed Northern Zones in your province.

Amery	Gods Lake Narrows	Le Pensie	Omineeseenowenik	Willbeach
Back	Gods River	Leaf Rapids	Oxford House	Wivenhoe
Belcher	Herchmer	Limestone	Piponshewanik	York Factory
Bird	Herriot	(railway siding)	Port Nelson	Zed Lake
Brochet	Island Lake	Long Spruce	Port Churchill	Provincial

Burge Lake	Jacam	Long Spruce	Red Sucker Lake	Recreation
Provincial	Johnsonkank	(generating	Ruttan Mine	Park
Recreation	Kakapawanis	station)	St. Theresa Point	
Park	Kapaneewekamik Place	Luke	Sawbill	Reserves:
Bylot	Kapuskaypachik	Lynn Lake	Shamattawa	Brochet 197
Charlebois	Kellett	Matawak	Silcox	Fox Lake 1
Chesnaye	Kettle (generating	Mathias Columb	South Indian Lake	Fox Lake (Bird)
Churchill	station)	(Granville Lake)	South Knife Lake	2
Cromarty	Kettle Rapids	M'Clintock	Starnes	Gods Lake 23
Digges	Kitchiokonim Place	McVeigh	Sundance	Island Lake 22
Drybrough	Kitchisakik	Mistuhekasookun	Tadoule Lake	Island Lake
Duck Lake	Kosapachekaywinasinne	Nonsuch	Thibaudeau	22A
Post	Kosapechekanesik	North Knife Lake	Tidal	Lac Brochet
Fort Churchill	Lac Brochet	North River	Waasagomach	197A
Fort Hall	Lamprey	Nunalla	Weesakachak	Oxford House
Fox Mine	Lawledge	O'Day	Weir River	24
Garden Hill				Red Sucker
Gillam				Lake 1976
Gods Lake				Shamattawa 1

[If "not sure" selected by Saskatchewan resident, display this question in page:]

Here are some of the prescribed Northern Zones in your province.

Beaver Lake	Collins Bay	Points North	Reserves: Chicken	Fond du Lac 227
Black Lake	Eldorado	Landing (north of	224	Fond du Lac 228
Bushell	Fond du Lac	Wollaston Lake)	Chicken 225	Fond du Lac 229
Camsell Portage	Goldfields	Stony Rapids	Chicken 226	Fond du Lac 231
Cluff Lake	Gunnar	Uranium City		Fond du Lac 232
	Lorado	Waterloo Lake		Fond du Lac 233
		Wollaston Lake		Lac la Hache 220

[If "not sure" selected by Ontario resident, display this question in page:]

Here are some of the prescribed Northern Zones in your province.

Angling Lake	Ghost River (west	Opasquia	Weagamow Lake	Keewaywin
Attawapiskat	of	Provincial Park	Webequie	Kingfisher 1
Bearskin Lake	Moosonee)	Peawanuck (north	Winisk	Marten Falls 65
Big Beaver House	Kasabonika	of	Winisk River	Moose Factory 68
Big Lake (south of	Kasabonika Lake	Webequie)	Provincial	Sachigo Lake 1
Winisk)	Kashechewan	Polar Bear	Park	Sachigo Lake 2
Big Trout Lake	Kingfisher Lake	Provincial	Wunnummin Lake	Sachigo Lake 3
	Lake River	Park		Sandy Lake 88

Cape Henrietta-Maria	Lansdowne House	Ponask	Reserves:	Wapekeka 1
Wilderness Area	Lingman Lake	Sachigo Lake	Attawapiskat 91	Wapekeka 2
Deer Lake	Moose Factory	Sandy Lake	Attawapiskat 91A	Weagamow Lake
(Northern Ontario)	Moosonee	Sandy Lake,	Bearskin Lake	87
Fort Albany	Muskrat Dam	Favourable	Big Trout Lake	Winisk 90
Fort Hope	Lake	Lake P.O.	Factory Island 1	Wunnumin 1
Fort Hope,	North Spirit Lake	Summer Beaver	Fort Albany 67	Wunnumin 2
Eabamet P.O.	Ogoki	Sutton Lake	Fort Hope 64	Wunnumin Lake
Fort Severn	Old Fort Albany	Gorge	Fort Severn 89	86
Galeton	Wilderness Area	Wilderness Area		
	Opasquia	Tidewater		
		Provincial		
		Park		
		Wawakapewin		
		(Long		
		Dog Lake)		

[If “not sure” selected by Québec resident, display this question in page:]

Here are some of the prescribed Northern Zones in your province.

Achiwapaschikisit	Etamamiou	Kutawanis	Nemiscau	Tasiujaq
Aguanish	Factory Point	Kuujuuaq (Fort	(Nemaska)	Tête-à-la-Baleine
Akulivik	Fermont	Chimo)	Nitchequon	Umingmaqautik
Anaukaskayach	Fire Lake	Kuujuuarapik	Old Fort Bay	Umiujaq
Askwasimwakwanan	Forget	(Poste-de-la-	Passe-Gagnon	Vieux-Comptoir
Aupaluk	Fort MacKenzie	Baleine)	Penney’s Room	Vieux-Fort
Awikwataukach	Gagnon	L’Île-Michon	Pischu	Vieux-Poste
Aylmer Sound	Harrington Harbour	Lac-Dufresne	Amakwayitach	Waco
Baie-des-Ha!Ha!	Île-du-Vieux-Fort	(North	Pointe-à-Maurier	Waskaganish
(North	Île-Verte, L’	Shore)	Pointe-Parent	(Fort-Rupert,
Shore)	(Archipeldu-Vieux-	Lac Eon	Pointe-Rocheuse	Rupert
Baie-des-Loups	Fort)	Lac-Salé	Port-Saint-Servan	House)
Baie-des-Moutons	Inukjuak (Port	Laforge	Povungnituk	Wawaw Pimi
Baie-Johan-Beetz	Harrison)	La Grande-Deux	(Puvirnituk)	Emichinanuch
Baie-Rouge	Istuyakamikw	(LG2)	Premio	Wemindji
Blanc-Sablon	Ivujivik	La Grande-	Purtuniqu	(Nouveau-
Bonne-Espérance	Kachimumiskwanuch	Quatre (LG4)	Quaqtaq	Comptoir)
Border-Beacon	Kanaaupscow	La Grande-Trois	(Koartak)	Whapmagoostui
Bradore-Bay	Kangiqsualujjuaq	(LG3)	Radisson	(Poste-de-la-
Brisay	(George	La Grande-Un	Rivière-Saint-	Baleine)
Burnt Creek	River, Port-	(LG1)	Paul	Wolf Bay
Canatiche	NouveauQuébec)	La John		

Caniapiscau (Duplanter)	Kangiqsujuaq (Maricourt,	La Romaine	Rochers-du-	Reserves:
Cape Hopes	Wakeham Bay)	La Tabatière	Cormoran	Intowin
Advance	Kangirsuk (Bellin,	Les Mélèzes	Roggan River	Natashquan 1
Chevery	Payne Bay)	Lourdes-de-	Saint-Augustin	Romaine 2
Chico	Kapistauchisitanach	Blanc-Sablon	(North	
Chiman	Kattiniq	Machisatat	Shore)	
Uchimaskwaw	Kawawachikamach	Matimekosh	Sakami	
Chisasibi (Fort-	Kegaska	Middle Bay	Salluit (Sugluk)	
George)	Keyano	Mikwasiskwaw	Salmon Bay	
Déception	Killiniq (Port Burwell)	Umitukap	Sangumaniq	
Eastmain		Aytakunich	Schefferville	
Eric		Mont-Wright	Shekatika	
		Musquaro	Spar Mica	
		Mutton Bay	Stick Point	
		Naskapis		
		Natashquan		

Based on this list, would you say you live in a prescribed Northern Zone?

Yes

No

Still not sure

8. Date of Birth

When were you born? Please enter in the format of month-day-year (MM-DD-YYYY).

9. Status in Canada

What is your status within Canada?

Citizen at birth

Citizen by naturalization

Permanent resident

Other (e.g., temporary resident, refugee): _____

[If other than citizen at birth to 4]

How many years you have lived in Canada?

[If other than citizen at birth to 4]

Were your parents born in Canada?

Yes, both parents were born in Canada

One parent was born in Canada, the other outside Canada

No, both parents were born outside Canada

10. Political Orientation

If there were a federal election tomorrow, which party would you vote for, if any?

Bloc Québécois
Conservative Party of Canada
Green Party of Canada
Liberal Party
New Democratic Party
People's Party of Canada
Another party (please specify): _____
I would not vote

11. Religious Affiliation

What is your religious affiliation, if any?

Buddhist
Christian
 Anglican
 Baptist
 Catholic
 Christian Orthodox
 Lutheran
 Pentecostal
 Presbyterian
 United
 Other Christian (please specify): _____
Hindu
Jewish
Muslim
Sikh
Traditional Indigenous Spirituality
No religious affiliation (e.g., Agnostic, Atheist, Humanist, etc.)
Other (e.g., Baha'i, Pagan, New Age, etc.) (please specify): _____

12. Income

What is your annual household income?

[drop-down list]

Under \$10,000
\$10,000-\$19,999
\$20,000-\$29,999
\$30,000-\$39,999
\$40,000-\$49,999
\$50,000-\$59,999
\$60,000-\$69,999
\$70,000-\$79,999
\$80,000-\$89,999
\$90,000-\$99,999

\$100,000-\$109,999
\$110,000-\$119,999
\$120,000-\$129,999
\$130,000-\$139,999
\$140,000-\$149,999
\$150,000-\$159,999
\$160,000-\$169,999
\$170,000-\$179,999
\$180,000-\$189,999
\$190,000-\$199,999
\$200,000+



Canadian
Reconciliation
Barometer