# Online Appendix

Nationalist and cosmopolitan approaches to the nation:
A citizen's perspective and its electoral impact

*French Politics*

Hugo Cossette-Lefebvre
Department of Philosophy, McGill University

Jean-François Daoust
Politics and International Relations, University of Edinburgh

**Question wording**

*Age*

In what year were you born? [If refusal: How old are you?]

*Gender*

What is your gender?

*Education*

What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

- No schooling
- Elementary school (unfinished)
- Elementary school (completed)
- Secondary 1
- Secondary 2
- Secondary 3
- Secondary 4
- Secondary 5 (Diplôme d'Études Secondaires)
- Secondary 5 (Diplôme d'Études Professionnelles)
- CEGEP (unfinished)
- CEGEP (completed with Diplôme d'Études Collégiales)
- CEGEP (Technical program)
- Some higher education
- Undergraduate degree
- Postgraduate degree
- I prefer not to answer

*Place of birth*

Where were you born?

- In Quebec
- In another part of Canada
- Somewhere else
- Don't know
- I prefer not to answer

*Religious affiliation*

Do you consider yourself as belonging to any particular religion or denomination?

- Yes
- No =
- I prefer not to answer

*Language*

What is the principal language you first learned at home in your childhood and that you still understand?

- French
- English
- Other
- I don't know
- I prefer not to answer

*Left-right ideology*

In political matters people talk of "the left" and "the right". On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is the most left and 10 is the most right, where would place the following political parties?

a. Quebec Liberal Party

b. Parti Québécois

c. Coalition Avenir Québec

d. Québec Solidaire

And on the same scale, where would you place your own views, generally speaking?

- 0: left
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10: right
- I don't know
- I prefer not to answer

*Quebec independence*

If there were today a referendum on independence that asked whether Quebec should be an independent country, would you vote YES or NO?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know
- I prefer not to answer

*Immigrants' contribution*

Please tell us if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements:
[immigrants make an important contribution to Quebec]


*Nationhood*

Some people say that the following things are important for being truly Québécois. Others say that they are not important. How important do you think each of the following is?

| | Very important | Somewhat important | Not very important | Not important at all | I don't know | I prefer not to answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| To have been born in Quebec | | | | | | |
| To have lived in Quebec | | | | | | |
| To be able to speak French | | | | | | |
| To be a Catholic | | | | | | |
| To respect Quebec's political institutions and laws | | | | | | |
| To feel Québécois | | | | | | |
| To have French ancestry | | | | | | |
| To share Quebecers' values | | | | | | |

Latent Class Analysis (LCA) is not new (Lazarsfeld 1950; Lazarsfeld et al. 1968) but it is recently more popular to use in social sciences. For recent examples, see Oser (2017), Oser et al. (2013) ad Hooghe et al. (2017). The method consists of extracting "latent classes", which can be loosely compared to latent factor (from factor analysis) based on patterns on responses across a battery of items. It allows to construct a neat typology.

Below, we first show different model fit indicators (with our model in bold) in Table SM.1 and the results of the LCA in Table SM.2

**Table SM1. Latent Class Analysis model fit statistics.**

| Number of cluster | Cluster proportion | LL | BIC | AIC |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | -1527. | 3189 | 3090 |
| **2** | **.57; .43** | **- 528** | **1267** | **1113** |
| 3 | .14; .62; .23 | 246 | -207 | -416 |
| 4 | .11; .36; .40; .13 | 590 | -820 | -1084 |

*Notes: LL = log likelihood; BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion; Aikaike Criterion Information.*

**Table SM2. Latent class analysis and items on nationhood**

| | Latent factor 1 (Civic nationalism) | Latent factor 2 (Ethnic nationalism) | Changes (factor 1 – factor 2) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pr(factor) | .57 | .43 | |
| Born in Quebec | .29 | .8 | -.51 |
| Lived in Quebec | .5 | .84 | -.34 |
| Having French ancestry | .12 | .46 | -.34 |
| Being catholic | .06 | .3 | -.24 |
| Immigrant contribution | .24 | .46 | -.22 |
| Able to speak French | .77 | .93 | -.16 |
| Feeling Quebecois | .73 | .87 | -.14 |
| To share Quebeckers' values | .76 | .9 | -.14 |
| Respect laws and institutions | .83 | .87 | -.04 |

Note: to compute the latent class analysis, we used the *gsem* function in Stata 15 and then the *lcprob* and *lcmean* options to obtain the probability to be classified in each factor and then the response patterns.

**Table SM3. Multinomial regression predicting vote choice**

| | PLQ | PQ | QS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ethnic nationalism | -2.75*** | -0.84 | -2.23*** |
| | (0.48) | (0.44) | (0.50) |
| Age | 0.60 | 0.03 | -2.72*** |
| | (0.39) | (0.35) | (0.40) |
| Gender (woman=1) | 0.00 | 0.48** | 0.55** |
| | (0.16) | (0.16) | (0.17) |
| Education | 0.42 | 0.36 | 0.35 |
| | (0.23) | (0.24) | (0.25) |
| Francophone | -2.76*** | 0.54 | 0.48 |
| | (0.22) | (0.39) | (0.37) |
| Religious affiliation | 0.59*** | 0.00 | -0.28 |
| | (0.17) | (0.16) | (0.19) |
| Born in Quebec | -0.08 | -0.15 | -0.14 |
| | (0.30) | (0.32) | (0.32) |
| Quebec independence | -2.07*** | 2.11*** | 0.96*** |
| | (0.34) | (0.17) | (0.18) |
| Left-right ideology | 0.47 | -2.72*** | -4.90*** |
| | (0.41) | (0.42) | (0.51) |
| Constant | 2.03*** | -0.65 | 2.55*** |
| | (0.49) | (0.58) | (0.57) |
| N | | 1833 | |
| Pseudo-$R^2$ Nagelkerke | | 0.289 | |

*Notes: Multinomial regression where the CAQ is the reference category.*

*Standard errors in parentheses.* \* $p < 0.05$, \*\* $p < 0.01$, \*\*\* $p < 0.001$