

Food Safety

Table of Contents

1. How concerned are you, if at all, with the safety of the food that you eat? Would you say...	1
2.	
(TOP2BOX SUMMARY) Please tell me the the degree to which you are confident that food imported from this region is safe. Would you say very confident, somewhat confident, not very confident, not at all confident?)	2
2. (LOW2BOX SUMMARY) Please tell me the the degree to which you are confident that food imported from this region is safe. Would you say very confident, somewhat confident, not very confident, not at all confident?)	3
2. 1. (The United States) Please tell me the the degree to which you are confident that food imported from this region is safe. Would you say very confident, somewhat confident, not very confident, not at all confident?)	4
2. 2. (South America) Please tell me the the degree to which you are confident that food imported from this region is safe. Would you say very confident, somewhat confident, not very confident, not at all confident?)	5
2. 3. (Asia, including China and Australia) Please tell me the the degree to which you are confident that food imported from this region is safe. Would you say very confident, somewhat confident, not very confident, not at all confident?)	6
2. 4. (European Countries) Please tell me the the degree to which you are confident that food imported from this region is safe. Would you say very confident, somewhat confident, not very confident, not at all confident?)	7
2. 5. (African Countries) Please tell me the the degree to which you are confident that food imported from this region is safe. Would you say very confident, somewhat confident, not very confident, not at all confident?)	8
3. And would you be willing to pay more for your food if you knew that it came from a source that underwent more stringent safety inspection protocols in that country and at our border? Would you say...	9
4. (TOP2BOX SUMMARY) Would you say this organization is doing either a very good, good, bad, or very bad job when it comes to ensuring the quality and safety of various food and agricultural products that are imported into Canada for Canadians to consume.)	10
4. (LOW2BOX SUMMARY) Would you say this organization is doing either a very good, good, bad, or very bad job when it comes to ensuring the quality and safety of various food and agricultural products that are imported into Canada for Canadians to consume.)	11
4. 1. (Federal Government inspectors) Would you say this organization is doing either a very good, good, bad, or very bad job when it comes to ensuring the quality and safety of various food and agricultural products that are imported into Canada for Canadians to consume.)	12
4. 2. (Provincial Government Inspectors) Would you say this organization is doing either a very good, good, bad, or very bad job when it comes to ensuring the quality and safety of various food and agricultural products that are imported into Canada for Canadians to consume.)	13
4. 3. (Industry or food sector importers and processors) Would you say this organization is doing either a very good, good, bad, or very bad job when it comes to ensuring the quality and safety of various food and agricultural products that are imported into Canada for Canadians to consume.)	14
5. Tell me, in the past 2 years, have you personally suffered from some form of food poisoning?	15
6. And tell me, what do you mostly attribute that food poisoning to? Would you mostly attribute it to either...	16
Region:	17
Province:	18
Canadian Markets:	19
Urban / Rural	21
Census Metropolitan Area:	22
Census Division	30
Respondent's Sex:	46
Language of Interview:	47
What age group do you fall into?	48
What is your current marital status?	49
Including yourself, how many people currently live in your household?	50
Do you have any children under the age of 18 currently living in your household?	51
And what are the ages of each of the children under 18 who are currently living in your household?	52
What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?	54

Which one of the following categories best describes your current employment status? 55

And which of the following categories best describes your annual household income? 56

Food Safety

1. How concerned are you, if at all, with the safety of the food that you eat? Would you say...

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Very concerned	302 30%	235 29%	67 37% A	34 36%	53 28%	107 30%	105 30%	65 32%	80 30%	120 29%
Somewhat concerned	359 36%	302 37%	57 32%	25 27%	79 41% C	126 35%	126 36%	84 41%	93 35%	140 33%
Not really concerned	219 22%	178 22%	41 23%	22 24%	38 20%	80 23%	75 22%	29 14%	67 25% G	104 25% G
Not at all concerned	117 12%	102 13%	15 8%	10 11%	22 11%	43 12%	41 12%	23 11%	27 10%	54 13%
Don't know/Refused	5 0	2 0	1 0	2 2% DEF	0 -	1 0	0 -	2 1% I	1 0	0 -
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY										
Concerned (Top2Box)	661 66%	537 66%	124 69%	59 63%	132 69%	233 65%	231 67%	150 73% I	173 65%	260 62%
Not Concerned (Low2Box)	336 34%	280 34%	56 31%	32 34%	61 31%	123 35%	115 33%	52 26% G	94 35% G	158 38% G

Detailed tables

Food Safety

Detailed tables

2. (TOP2BOX SUMMARY) Please tell me the degree to which you are confident that food imported from this region is safe. Would you say very confident, somewhat confident, not very confident, not at all confident?)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
The United States	804 80%	662 81%	142 78%	66 71%	146 76%	299 84%	287 83%	145 71%	217 81%	357 85%
South America	577 58%	480 59%	96 53%	35 37%	104 54%	222 62%	211 61%	93 45%	146 55%	279 67%
Asia, including China and Australia	409 41%	339 41%	70 39%	27 29%	83 43%	156 44%	139 40%	76 37%	98 37%	194 46%
European Countries	772 77%	644 79%	128 71%	51 55%	130 68%	285 80%	298 86%	123 60%	204 76%	365 87%
African Countries	415 41%	350 43%	65 36%	26 27%	84 44%	156 44%	146 42%	68 33%	105 39%	201 48%
					C	C	C			GH

Food Safety

Detailed tables

2. (LOW2BOX SUMMARY) Please tell me the degree to which you are confident that food imported from this region is safe. Would you say very confident, somewhat confident, not very confident, not at all confident?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
The United States	190 19%	154 19%	36 20%	24 25% E	47 24% E	58 16%	59 17%	56 27% HI	49 18%	61 15%
South America	409 41%	329 40%	80 44%	54 58% DEF	86 45%	132 37%	134 39%	103 51% I	118 44% I	137 33%
Asia, including China and Australia	575 57%	469 57%	106 59%	63 67% E	108 56%	197 55%	202 58%	124 60%	165 62% I	220 53%
European Countries	214 21%	165 20%	49 27%	36 39% EF	60 31% EF	70 20% F	46 13%	73 36% HI	62 23% I	50 12%
African Countries	561 56%	450 55%	111 61%	63 68% DEF	106 55%	195 55%	192 55%	129 63% I	158 59% I	210 50%

Food Safety

Detailed tables

2.1. (The United States) Please tell me the degree to which you are confident that food imported from this region is safe. Would you say very confident, somewhat confident, not very confident, not at all confident?)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: The United States										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Very confident	291 29%	242 30%	49 27%	21 23%	48 25%	112 31%	110 32%	51 25%	76 28%	144 34% G
Somewhat confident	513 51%	420 51%	93 52%	45 48%	98 51%	187 52%	177 51%	94 46%	142 53%	213 51%
Not very confident	117 12%	94 11%	23 13%	10 11%	30 15%	36 10%	40 12%	33 16% I	29 11%	41 10%
Not at all confident	72 7%	60 7%	13 7%	13 14% EF	17 9%	22 6%	19 5%	22 11% I	19 7%	20 5%
Don't know/Refused	8 1%	3 0	3 2%	4 4% DEF	0 -	1 0	1 0	4 2% I	1 0	0 -
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY										
Confident (Top2Box)	804 80%	662 81%	142 78%	66 71%	146 76%	299 84% CD	287 83% C	145 71%	217 81% G	357 85% G
Not Confident (Low2Box)	190 19%	154 19%	36 20%	24 25% E	47 24% E	58 16%	59 17%	56 27% HI	49 18%	61 15%

Food Safety

Detailed tables

2.2. (South America) Please tell me the degree to which you are confident that food imported from this region is safe. Would you say very confident, somewhat confident, not very confident, not at all confident?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: South America										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Very confident	79 8%	62 8%	17 9%	4 5%	16 8%	29 8%	28 8%	17 8%	19 7%	36 9%
Somewhat confident	498 50%	418 51%	79 44%	31 33%	88 46% C	192 54% C	183 53% C	76 37% G	128 48% H	243 58% I
Not very confident	279 28%	220 27%	59 33%	27 29%	60 31%	90 25%	99 29%	62 30%	82 31%	105 25%
Not at all confident	130 13%	109 13%	21 11%	27 29% DEF	26 13%	42 12%	34 10%	41 20% I	36 13% I	32 8%
Don't know/Refused	16 2%	10 1%	5 3%	5 5% EF	3 1%	4 1%	2 1%	8 4% HI	3 1%	3 1%
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY										
Confident (Top2Box)	577 58%	480 59%	96 53%	35 37%	104 54% C	222 62% C	211 61% C	93 45%	146 55%	279 67% GH
Not Confident (Low2Box)	409 41%	329 40%	80 44%	54 58% DEF	86 45%	132 37%	134 39%	103 51% I	118 44% I	137 33%

Food Safety

Detailed tables

2.3. (Asia, including China and Australia) Please tell me the the degree to which you are confident that food imported from this region is safe. Would you say very confident, somewhat confident, not very confident, not at all confident?)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: Asia, including China and Australia										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Very confident	58 6%	42 5%	16 9%	4 5%	15 8%	21 6%	17 5%	19 9%	14 5%	19 5%
Somewhat confident	351 35%	297 36%	54 30%	23 24%	68 35%	135 38%	123 35%	58 28%	84 31%	175 42%
Not very confident	336 34%	280 34%	56 31%	31 33%	58 30%	117 33%	126 36%	64 31%	97 36%	136 33%
Not at all confident	239 24%	189 23%	50 28%	32 34%	50 26%	80 22%	76 22%	59 29%	67 25%	84 20%
Don't know/Refused	18 2%	11 1%	5 3%	4 4%	2 1%	5 1%	5 1%	4 2%	5 2%	4 1%
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY										
Confident (Top2Box)	409 41%	339 41%	70 39%	27 29%	83 43%	156 44%	139 40%	76 37%	98 37%	194 46%
Not Confident (Low2Box)	575 57%	469 57%	106 59%	63 67%	108 56%	197 55%	202 58%	124 60%	165 62%	220 53%

Food Safety

Detailed tables

2.4. (European Countries) Please tell me the the degree to which you are confident that food imported from this region is safe. Would you say very confident, somewhat confident, not very confident, not at all confident?)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: European Countries										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Very confident	255 25%	207 25%	47 26%	8 9%	39 20%	85 24%	119 34%	36 18%	51 19%	144 34%
Somewhat confident	517 52%	436 53%	81 45%	43 46%	92 47%	200 56%	179 52%	87 43%	153 57%	221 53%
Not very confident	141 14%	106 13%	36 20%	21 23%	43 22%	40 11%	36 10%	45 22%	42 16%	38 9%
Not at all confident	73 7%	60 7%	13 7%	15 16%	17 9%	31 9%	10 3%	28 14%	20 8%	13 3%
Don't know/Refused	16 2%	10 1%	4 2%	7 7%	2 1%	2 1%	2 1%	8 4%	1 0	3 1%
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY										
Confident (Top2Box)	772 77%	644 79%	128 71%	51 55%	130 68%	285 80%	298 86%	123 60%	204 76%	365 87%
Not Confident (Low2Box)	214 21%	165 20%	49 27%	36 39%	60 31%	70 20%	46 13%	73 36%	62 23%	50 12%

Food Safety

Detailed tables

2.5. (African Countries) Please tell me the degree to which you are confident that food imported from this region is safe. Would you say very confident, somewhat confident, not very confident, not at all confident?)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: African Countries										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Very confident	50 5%	40 5%	9 5%	4 4%	12 6%	15 4%	17 5%	15 7%	11 4%	19 5%
Somewhat confident	366 36%	310 38%	56 31%	22 24%	72 37%	140 39%	129 37%	53 26%	94 35%	182 44%
Not very confident	338 34%	268 33%	69 38%	26 28%	59 31%	118 33%	132 38%	70 34%	95 35%	142 34%
Not at all confident	223 22%	181 22%	42 23%	37 40%	47 24%	78 22%	60 17%	60 29%	63 24%	68 16%
Don't know/Refused	26 3%	19 2%	4 2%	5 5%	3 1%	6 2%	8 2%	7 4%	4 2%	7 2%
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY										
Confident (Top2Box)	415 41%	350 43%	65 36%	26 27%	84 44%	156 44%	146 42%	68 33%	105 39%	201 48%
Not Confident (Low2Box)	561 56%	450 55%	111 61%	63 68%	106 55%	195 55%	192 55%	129 63%	158 59%	210 50%

Food Safety

Detailed tables

3. And would you be willing to pay more for your food if you knew that it came from a source that underwent more stringent safety inspection protocols in that country and at our border? Would you say...

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Definitely yes	278 28%	229 28%	49 27%	25 26%	41 21%	107 30% D	105 30% D	43 21%	74 28%	133 32% G
Probably yes	475 47%	389 48%	85 47%	44 46%	99 51%	161 45%	170 49%	103 51%	131 49%	195 47%
Probably not	159 16%	133 16%	26 14%	11 12%	31 16%	63 18%	49 14%	30 15%	39 15%	66 16%
Definitely not	86 9%	65 8%	20 11%	11 12%	23 12% F	27 8%	22 6%	26 13% I	23 9%	23 5%
Don't know/Refused	6 1%	3 0	1 0	3 3% DEF	0 -	0 -	1 0	2 1%	0 -	1 0
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY										
Yes (Top2Box)	752 75%	618 75%	134 74%	68 73%	139 72%	268 75%	275 79%	146 72%	205 77%	328 78%
No (Low2Box)	244 24%	198 24%	46 25%	23 24%	54 28%	90 25%	71 20%	56 27%	63 23%	89 21%

Food Safety

Detailed tables

4. (TOP2BOX SUMMARY) Would you say this organization is doing either a very good, good, bad, or very bad job when it comes to ensuring the quality and safety of various food and agricultural products that are imported into Canada for Canadians to consume.)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Federal Government inspectors	780 78%	637 78%	143 79%	66 71%	153 79%	283 79%	273 79%	152 74%	216 81%	337 81%
Provincial Government Inspectors	801 80%	655 80%	146 81%	72 77%	160 83%	289 81%	275 79%	162 79%	224 84%	340 81%
Industry or food sector importers and processors	678 68%	558 68%	120 67%	61 65%	142 73% F	250 70%	222 64%	139 68%	186 69%	291 70%

Food Safety

Detailed tables

4. (LOW2BOX SUMMARY) Would you say this organization is doing either a very good, good, bad, or very bad job when it comes to ensuring the quality and safety of various food and agricultural products that are imported into Canada for Canadians to consume.)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Federal Government inspectors	139 14%	112 14%	28 15%	18 20% F	29 15%	53 15%	39 11%	37 18% I	35 13%	50 12%
Provincial Government Inspectors	108 11%	87 11%	20 11%	12 13%	21 11%	45 13%	29 8%	29 14%	30 11%	37 9%
Industry or food sector importers and processors	185 19%	145 18%	41 23%	18 19%	36 19%	70 20%	61 18%	42 20%	48 18%	73 17%

Food Safety

Detailed tables

4.1. (Federal Government inspectors) Would you say this organization is doing either a very good, good, bad, or very bad job when it comes to ensuring the quality and safety of various food and agricultural products that are imported into Canada for Canadians to consume.)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: Federal Government inspectors										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Very good	131 13%	103 13%	28 16%	11 12%	24 12%	39 11%	55 16%	34 17%	30 11%	57 14%
Good	649 65%	535 65%	114 63%	55 59%	129 67%	243 68%	218 63%	118 57%	187 70%	280 67%
Bad	122 12%	99 12%	23 13%	14 15%	26 14%	46 13%	35 10%	29 14%	32 12%	46 11%
Very Bad	17 2%	13 2%	4 2%	5 5%	2 1%	6 2%	4 1%	8 4%	3 1%	5 1%
Don't know/Refused	83 8%	70 9%	11 6%	9 10%	11 6%	22 6%	35 10%	15 7%	16 6%	31 7%
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY										
Very Good/ Good (Top2Box)	780 78%	637 78%	143 79%	66 71%	153 79%	283 79%	273 79%	152 74%	216 81%	337 81%
Bad/ Very Bad (Low2Box)	139 14%	112 14%	28 15%	18 20%	29 15%	53 15%	39 11%	37 18%	35 13%	50 12%

Food Safety

Detailed tables

4.2. (Provincial Government Inspectors) Would you say this organization is doing either a very good, good, bad, or very bad job when it comes to ensuring the quality and safety of various food and agricultural products that are imported into Canada for Canadians to consume.)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: Provincial Government Inspectors										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Very good	132 13%	106 13%	26 14%	11 12%	30 16%	40 11%	48 14%	39 19% HI	30 11%	51 12%
Good	669 67%	549 67%	120 66%	61 65%	130 67%	249 70%	227 65%	124 61%	193 72% G	288 69% G
Bad	90 9%	74 9%	16 9%	11 12%	17 9%	38 11%	24 7%	23 11%	26 10%	32 8%
Very Bad	18 2%	13 2%	5 3%	2 2%	4 2%	7 2%	5 1%	6 3%	4 2%	4 1%
Don't know/Refused	93 9%	76 9%	15 8%	9 10%	12 6%	23 6%	43 12% DE	13 6%	14 5%	41 10% H
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY										
Very Good/ Good (Top2Box)	801 80%	655 80%	146 81%	72 77%	160 83%	289 81%	275 79%	162 79%	224 84%	340 81%
Bad/ Very Bad (Low2Box)	108 11%	87 11%	20 11%	12 13%	21 11%	45 13%	29 8%	29 14%	30 11%	37 9%

Food Safety

Detailed tables

4.3. (Industry or food sector importers and processors) Would you say this organization is doing either a very good, good, bad, or very bad job when it comes to ensuring the quality and safety of various food and agricultural products that are imported into Canada for Canadians to consume.)

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: Industry or food sector importers and processors										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Very good	72 7%	53 6%	19 10%	10 10% F	23 12% EF	24 7%	15 4%	26 13% HI	17 6%	24 6%
Good	607 61%	505 62%	102 56%	51 55%	119 62%	226 63%	206 60%	113 55%	168 63%	267 64% G
Bad	165 16%	129 16%	36 20%	14 15%	33 17%	63 18%	55 16%	37 18%	43 16%	66 16%
Very Bad	21 2%	16 2%	5 3%	4 4%	4 2%	7 2%	6 2%	5 2%	6 2%	7 2%
Don't know/Refused	138 14%	116 14%	20 11%	15 16% D	15 8%	38 10%	64 18% DE	24 12%	33 12%	54 13%
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY										
Very Good/ Good (Top2Box)	678 68%	558 68%	120 67%	61 65%	142 73% F	250 70%	222 64%	139 68%	186 69%	291 70%
Bad/ Very Bad (Low2Box)	185 19%	145 18%	41 23%	18 19%	36 19%	70 20%	61 18%	42 20%	48 18%	73 17%

Food Safety

Detailed tables

5. Tell me, in the past 2 years, have you personally suffered from some form of food poisoning?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Yes	207 21%	172 21%	36 20%	14 15%	31 16%	74 21%	86 25% D	47 23%	49 18%	96 23%
No	788 79%	645 79%	143 79%	77 82%	162 84% F	283 79%	259 75%	154 75%	218 81%	322 77%
Don't know/Refused	7 1%	2 0	3 1%	2 2% DE	0 -	1 0	1 0	3 1%	1 0	1 0

Food Safety

Detailed tables

6. And tell me, what do you mostly attribute that food poisoning to? Would you mostly attribute it to either...

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: Have suffered from food poisoning										
Unweighted Base	191	156	35	14	28	69	78	43	44	87
Weighted Base	207	172	36*	14**	31**	74*	86*	47*	49*	96*
Bad or unhygienic cooking of the food that was served to you by someone who prepared it for you	107	90	17	6	20	32	49	24	28	51
	52%	52%	48%	40%	63%	43%	57%	50%	57%	53%
Tainted food that was contaminated or unsafe before it was cooked or prepared by someone	72	61	11	6	7	32	26	18	15	33
	35%	35%	32%	43%	24%	44%	30%	38%	32%	34%
Other	15	12	3	1	1	8	4	5	4	3
	7%	7%	8%	8%	3%	11%	4%	10%	8%	3%
Don't know/Refused	13	9	4	1	3	2	7	1	2	9
	6%	5%	12%	8%	10%	2%	8%	2%	4%	10%

Food Safety DEMOGRAPHICS

Region:

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
British Columbia	140	115	24	10	20	59	49	21	40	62
	14%	14%	13%	11%	10%	16%	14%	10%	15%	15%
Alberta	96	84	12	5	26	28	36	11	21	52
	10%	10%	7%	5%	13% CE	8%	11%	5%	8%	12% G
Sask/Man	67	47	19	12	16	24	14	21	16	21
	7%	6%	10% A	13% F	9% F	7%	4%	10% I	6%	5%
Ontario	386	320	66	28	58	147	149	65	95	178
	38%	39%	36%	29%	30%	41% CD	43% CD	32%	36%	42% G
Quebec	238	198	40	30	61	68	75	64	73	76
	24%	24%	22%	32% EF	32% EF	19%	22%	31% I	27% I	18%
Atlantic	76	56	20	9	12	31	23	22	21	29
	8%	7%	11%	9%	6%	9%	7%	11%	8%	7%

Detailed tables

Food Safety DEMOGRAPHICS

Province:

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

Detailed tables

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
British Columbia	140 14%	115 14%	24 13%	10 11%	20 10%	59 16%	49 14%	21 10%	40 15%	62 15%
Alberta	96 10%	84 10%	12 7%	5 5%	26 13% CE	28 8%	36 11%	11 5%	21 8%	52 12% G
Saskatchewan	31 3%	20 2%	11 6% A	10 10% EF	9 5% F	10 3%	3 1%	11 5%	7 3%	10 2%
Manitoba	36 4%	27 3%	7 4%	2 3%	7 4%	15 4%	11 3%	10 5%	9 4%	11 3%
Ontario	386 38%	320 39%	66 36%	28 29%	58 30%	147 41% CD	149 43% CD	65 32%	95 36%	178 42% G
Quebec	238 24%	198 24%	40 22%	30 32% EF	61 32% EF	68 19%	75 22%	64 31% I	73 27% I	76 18%
New Brunswick	23 2%	23 3% B	0 -	3 3%	5 3%	7 2%	7 2%	7 4%	3 1%	10 2%
Nova Scotia	33 3%	25 3%	8 5%	5 5%	4 2%	15 4%	9 3%	11 5%	10 4%	12 3%
Prince Edward Island	4 0	1 0	3 2% A	0 -	2 1%	2 0	1 0	1 0	3 1%	1 0
Newfoundland	15 2%	7 1%	9 5% A	2 2%	1 0	7 2%	6 2%	2 1%	5 2%	7 2%

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Canadian Markets:

Detailed tables

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
WEST (NET)	301	246	55	25	63	111	100	51	78	135
	30%	30%	30%	27%	32%	31%	29%	25%	29%	32%
- British Columbia	139	115	24	9	20	59	49	20	40	62
	14%	14%	13%	10%	10%	16%	14%	10%	15%	15%
- Alberta	96	84	12	5	26	28	36	11	21	52
	10%	10%	7%	5%	13% CE	8%	11%	5%	8%	12% G
- Saskatchewan/Manitoba	65	47	19	11	16	24	14	20	16	21
	7%	6%	10% A	12% F	9% F	7%	4%	10% I	6%	5%
ONTARIO (NET)	386	320	66	28	58	147	149	65	95	178
	38%	39%	36%	29%	30%	41% CD	43% CD	32%	36%	42% G
- GTA	179	174	4	9	22	61	84	27	34	99
	18%	21% B	2%	9%	11%	17%	24% CDE	13%	13%	24% GH
- Central Ontario	74	54	20	6	13	33	22	16	20	28
	7%	7%	11% A	6%	7%	9%	6%	8%	8%	7%
- Eastern Ontario	49	35	14	3	8	20	18	8	11	24
	5%	4%	7%	4%	4%	5%	5%	4%	4%	6%
- SouthWest Ontario	56	37	19	7	9	27	12	8	21	16
	6%	5%	11% A	8%	4%	7% F	4%	4%	8% I	4%
- Northern Ontario	28	20	9	3	7	7	12	7	9	11
	3%	2%	5%	3%	3%	2%	4%	3%	3%	3%

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Canadian Markets:

Detailed tables

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I
 * small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
QUEBEC (NET)	238 24%	198 24%	40 22%	30 32% EF	61 32% EF	68 19%	75 22%	64 31% I	73 27% I	76 18%
- Montreal CMA - Quebec	122 12%	116 14% B	6 3%	13 14%	30 15% E	34 9%	43 12%	36 17% I	38 14% I	37 9%
- Other - Quebec	116 12%	82 10%	34 19% A	16 18% EF	31 16% EF	34 10%	32 9%	29 14%	35 13%	39 9%
Atlantic	76 8%	56 7%	20 11%	9 9%	12 6%	31 9%	23 7%	22 11%	21 8%	29 7%

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Urban / Rural

Detailed tables

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I
 * small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Urban	819	819	0	62	160	289	298	158	221	347
	82%	100%	-	66%	83%	81%	86%	77%	83%	83%
		B			C	C	C			
Rural	181	0	181	30	33	68	49	45	46	71
	18%	-	100%	32%	17%	19%	14%	22%	17%	17%
		A		DEF						
Not specified	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
	0	-	-	2%	-	-	-	1%	-	-
				DEF				I		

Food Safety

DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Metropolitan Area:

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

Small Base			REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +	
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	
Base: All respondents											
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404	
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418	
St. John's	7 1%	5 1%	3 1%	0 -	0 -	2 1%	5 2%	0 -	3 1%	4 1%	
Grand Falls-Windsor	2 0	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 0	
Charlottetown	2 0	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -	
Halifax	15 2%	15 2%	0 -	3 3% D	0 -	8 2%	5 1%	6 3%	4 1%	5 1%	
Truro	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	
New Glasgow	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	
Cape Breton	4 0	4 1%	0 -	2 2%	0 -	2 0	1 0	3 1%	0 -	1 0	
Moncton	4 0	4 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	2 1%	1 1%	0 -	2 1%	
Saint John	4 0	4 0	0 -	0 -	3 1% F	1 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -	2 1%	
Fredericton	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0	
Matane	2 0	2 0	0 -	2 2% DEF	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	
Rimouski	3 0	2 0	1 1%	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	1 0	
Riviere-du-Loup	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	

Detailed tables

Food Safety

DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Metropolitan Area:

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Chicoutimi - Jonquiere	5 1%	5 1%	0 -	1 1%	1 0	3 1%	1 0	3 1%	2 1%	1 0
Alma	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Dolbeau	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -
Sept-Iles	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Quebec	25 3%	23 3%	2 1%	1 1%	7 4%	8 2%	9 3%	3 2%	8 3%	11 3%
Thetford Mines	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -
Sherbrooke	4 0	3 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	3 1%	1 0	1 0	1 0
Victoriaville	4 0	4 0	0 -	1 1%	1 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -	1 0	2 0
Trois-Rivieres	6 1%	6 1%	1 0	1 1%	1 0	2 0	3 1%	1 0	2 1%	4 1%
Shawinigan	2 0	1 0	1 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	0 -
La Tuque	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Drummondville	2 0	2 0	0 -	2 2% EF	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -
Granby	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0	0 -	2 0
Sorel	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -

Detailed tables

Food Safety

DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Metropolitan Area:

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Joliette	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu	5 0	5 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	2 1%	1 0	1 0	1 0	3 1%
Montreal	115 11%	113 14% B	2 1%	10 11%	29 15%	33 9%	41 12%	34 17% I	36 13% I	34 8%
Salaberry-de-Valleyfield	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -
Rouyn-Noranda	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Cornwall	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Hawkesbury	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Ottawa - Hull	39 4%	36 4%	3 1%	2 2%	6 3%	14 4%	17 5%	3 1%	12 4%	17 4%
Brockville	3 0	1 0	2 1% A	1 1%	1 0	1 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -	1 0
Pembroke	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Kingston	3 0	2 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	3 1%	0 -	1 0	1 0
Belleville	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0

Detailed tables

Food Safety

DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Metropolitan Area:

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Peterborough	5 1%	4 1%	1 1%	0 -	3 2% E	0 -	2 1%	2 1%	3 1%	1 0
Lindsay	4 0	0 -	4 2% A	2 3% DF	0 -	2 0	0 -	2 1% I	1 0	0 -
Oshawa	11 1%	11 1%	0 -	2 2%	1 0	5 1%	2 1%	4 2%	2 1%	6 1%
Toronto	167 17%	163 20% B	4 2%	7 7%	21 11%	56 16% C	81 23% CDE	23 11%	33 12%	93 22% GH
Hamilton	16 2%	15 2%	1 0	0 -	1 0	6 2%	9 2%	1 0	2 1%	11 3%
St. Catharines - Niagara	10 1%	9 1%	1 1%	1 1%	3 1%	5 1%	2 1%	2 1%	3 1%	4 1%
Kitchener	16 2%	15 2%	1 0	0 -	3 2%	7 2%	6 2%	6 3%	5 2%	5 1%
Woodstock	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -
Tillsonburg	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -
Simcoe	3 0	2 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	3 1%	0 -	0 -	3 1% I	0 -
Guelph	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Stratford	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0
London	11 1%	11 1%	0 -	0 -	3 1%	7 2% F	1 0	2 1%	5 2% I	1 0
Chatham	3 0	2 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 0	1 0	1 0	0 -	2 0

Detailed tables

Food Safety

DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Metropolitan Area:

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Leamington	8 1%	6 1%	2 1%	2 2% E	3 1% E	0 -	3 1%	1 0	3 1%	3 1%
Windsor	8 1%	6 1%	3 1%	2 2%	0 -	5 1%	2 1%	1 0	3 1%	3 1%
Sarnia	4 0	3 0	1 1%	1 1%	0 -	2 1%	1 0	1 0	1 0	2 0
Owen Sound	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Barrie	8 1%	5 1%	2 1%	0 -	0 -	5 1%	2 1%	1 0	2 1%	3 1%
Orillia	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -
Midland	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -
North Bay	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	2 0	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -
Sudbury	2 0	2 0	0 -	1 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -
Haileybury	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	1 1%	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0
Sault Ste. Marie	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Thunder Bay	3 0	3 0	0 -	1 1%	1 0	1 0	1 0	2 1%	0 -	1 0
Kenora	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Winnipeg	20 2%	19 2%	1 0	1 1%	3 2%	9 2%	8 2%	5 3%	6 2%	5 1%

Detailed tables

Food Safety

DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Metropolitan Area:

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Brandon	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -
Thompson	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 0
Regina	7 1%	6 1%	1 0	1 1%	3 2% F	3 1%	0 -	1 0	2 1%	1 0
Moose Jaw	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Swift Current	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -
Saskatoon	9 1%	9 1%	0 -	2 2%	1 1%	3 1%	3 1%	2 1%	4 1%	3 1%
North Battleford	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Prince Albert	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Medicine Hat	2 0	2 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0
Lethbridge	2 0	2 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0
Calgary	31 3%	29 4%	2 1%	1 1%	7 4%	7 2%	16 5% E	2 1%	4 1%	16 4%
Red Deer	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 0
Edmonton	34 3%	32 4% B	2 1%	0 -	11 6% C	12 3%	11 3%	4 2%	6 2%	22 5% G
Grand Centre	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -

Detailed tables

Food Safety

DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Metropolitan Area:

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Grande Prairie	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Wood Buffalo	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -	3 1%
Kelowna	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Kamloops	4 0	3 0	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	1 0	1 0	1 0	0 -	2 1%
Chilliwack	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	3 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	3 1%
Abbotsford	5 1%	5 1%	0 -	0 -	2 1%	2 1%	1 0	2 1%	0 -	3 1%
Vancouver	74 7%	74 9% B	0 -	6 7%	11 6%	26 7%	29 8%	7 4%	23 9% G	33 8%
Victoria	6 1%	6 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	3 1%	2 0	1 0	1 0	2 1%
Duncan	1 0	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 0
Nanaimo	4 0	4 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	2 1%	0 -	2 1%	2 1%
Courtenay	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	1 0	1 0
Campbell River	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Williams Lake	2 0	1 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0

Detailed tables

Food Safety

DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Metropolitan Area:

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Prince George	4 0	4 1%	0 -	2 2% F	0 -	3 1%	0 -	3 1% I	2 1%	0 -
Dawson Creek	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0
Whitehorse	66 7%	25 3%	40 22% A	3 3%	16 8%	27 8%	18 5%	16 8%	20 7%	27 6%
Not in a CMA/Unknown	134 13%	43 5%	89 49% A	27 29% DEF	28 14% F	47 13%	30 9%	37 18% I	34 13%	50 12%

Detailed tables

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Division

Detailed tables

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
BRITISH COLUMBIA										
East Kootenay Regional District	9 1%	3 0	6 3% A	1 1%	1 0	3 1%	4 1%	2 1%	4 1%	3 1%
Central Kootenay Regional District	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Kootenay Boundary Regional District	3 0	0 -	3 2% A	0 -	0 -	1 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	3 1%
Okanagan-Similkameen Regional District	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Fraser Valley Regional District	8 1%	8 1%	0 -	0 -	2 1%	5 1%	1 0	2 1%	0 -	6 1%
Greater Vancouver Regional District	74 7%	74 9% B	0 -	6 7%	11 6%	26 7%	29 8%	7 4%	23 9% G	33 8%
Capital Regional District	6 1%	6 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	3 1%	2 0	1 0	1 0	2 1%
Cowichan Valley Regional District	3 0	1 0	2 1% A	0 -	0 -	1 0	2 0	1 0	1 1%	1 0
Nanaimo Regional District	8 1%	8 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	4 1%	4 1%	0 -	3 1%	4 1%
Comox-Strathcona Regional District	4 0	4 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	3 1%	0 -	1 0	2 1%
Sunshine Coast Regional District	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 0
Thompson-Nicola Regional District	5 1%	3 0	2 1%	1 1%	2 1%	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0	2 1%

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Division

Detailed tables

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I
 * small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Central Okanagan Regional District	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Columbia-Shuswap Regional District	2 0	1 0	2 1% A	0 -	1 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	1 0
Cariboo Regional District	3 0	1 0	2 1% A	0 -	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 0
Bilkley-Nechako Regional District	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Fraser-Fort George Regional District	6 1%	4 1%	2 1%	2 2% F	2 1%	3 1%	0 -	3 1%	2 1%	2 0
Peace River Regional District	3 0	2 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	3 1%	0 -	1 1%	0 -	2 0
ALBERTA										
Division No. 1	2 0	2 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0
Division No. 2	3 0	3 0	0 -	2 2%	0 -	1 0	1 0	2 1%	1 0	1 0
Division No. 3	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	1 1%	0 -	0 -	2 0	2 1%	1 0	0 -
Division No. 6	34 3%	31 4%	3 2%	1 2%	8 4%	7 2%	17 5% E	2 1%	5 2%	17 4%
Division No. 7	2 0	2 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	2 0	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0
Division No. 8	6 1%	5 1%	1 0	0 -	2 1%	3 1%	1 0	1 0	2 1%	2 0

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Division

Detailed tables

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Division No. 11	34 3%	32 4% B	2 1%	0 -	11 6% C	12 3%	11 3%	4 2%	6 2%	22 5% G
Division No. 12	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -
Division No. 13	2 0	1 0	1 1%	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%
Division No. 14	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0
Division No. 15	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Division No. 16	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -	3 1%
Division No. 17	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Division No. 18	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	1 1% EF	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Division No. 19	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
SASKATCHEWAN										
Division No. 3	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Division No. 5	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	1 1%	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	1 0
Division No. 6	7 1%	6 1%	1 0	1 1%	3 2% F	3 1%	0 -	1 0	2 1%	1 0
Division No. 7	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Division

Detailed tables

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Division No. 8	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -
Division No. 9	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Division No. 11	9 1%	9 1%	0 -	2 2%	1 1%	3 1%	3 1%	2 1%	4 1%	3 1%
Division No. 12	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Division No. 13	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	1 1% EF	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Division No. 14	3 0	0 -	3 2% A	3 3% DEF	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	1 0
Division No. 15	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Division No. 16	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Division No. 18	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	1 2% EF	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
MANITOBA										
Division No. 1	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Division No. 2	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -
Division No. 3	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0
Division No. 6	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Division

Detailed tables

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I
 * small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Division No. 7	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -
Division No. 11	19 2%	19 2% B	0 -	1 1%	3 2%	9 2%	7 2%	5 3%	6 2%	5 1%
Division No. 13	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -
Division No. 14	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Division No. 15	3 0	0 -	3 2% A	1 1%	1 1%	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%
Division No. 17	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Division No. 22	3 0	2 0	2 1%	0 -	2 1%	1 0	1 0	2 1%	1 0	1 0
ONTARIO										
Stormont Dundas and Glengarry	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	1 1%	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -
Prescott and Russell	2 0	1 0	1 1%	1 1%	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Ottawa	27 3%	26 3%	2 1%	1 1%	4 2%	11 3%	12 3%	2 1%	6 2%	16 4% G
Leeds and Grenville	3 0	1 0	2 1% A	1 1%	1 0	1 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -	1 0
Lanark County	3 0	2 0	2 1%	0 -	0 -	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	3 1%
Frontenac County	3 0	2 0	2 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	3 1%	0 -	1 0	2 0

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Division

Detailed tables

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Lennox and Addington	2 0	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 0
Hastings County	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0
Prince Edward Division	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -
Northumberland County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Peterborough County	6 1%	4 1%	2 1%	1 1%	3 2% E	0 -	2 1%	3 1%	3 1%	1 0
Kawartha Lakes Division	4 0	0 -	4 2% A	2 3% DF	0 -	2 0	0 -	2 1% I	1 0	0 -
Durham Regional Municipality	19 2%	19 2% B	0 -	2 2%	1 0	9 2%	7 2%	5 2%	2 1%	13 3% H
York Regional Municipality	21 2%	16 2%	4 2%	1 1%	4 2%	6 2%	10 3%	2 1%	6 2%	10 2%
Toronto	83 8%	83 10% B	0 -	2 2%	9 5%	22 6%	48 14% CDE	16 8%	11 4%	45 11% H
Peel Regional Municipality	40 4%	40 5% B	0 -	2 2%	6 3%	19 5%	14 4%	3 2%	12 4%	21 5%
Dufferin County	2 0	2 0	1 0	2 2% EF	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -
Wellington County	6 1%	1 0	5 3% A	1 1%	1 0	4 1%	1 0	1 0	1 0	3 1%
Halton Regional Municipality	18 2%	18 2%	0 -	1 1%	2 1%	8 2%	8 2%	1 0	3 1%	12 3%

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Division

Detailed tables

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I
 * small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Hamilton	9 1%	8 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -	4 1%	5 1%	1 0	0 -	8 2% H
Niagara Regional Municipality	11 1%	10 1%	1 1%	1 1%	3 1%	6 2%	2 1%	2 1%	3 1%	4 1%
Haldimand-Norfolk Regional Municipality	4 0	3 0	1 1%	0 -	1 0	3 1%	0 -	0 -	3 1%	1 0
Brant County	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Waterloo Regional Municipality	16 2%	15 2%	1 0	0 -	3 2%	7 2%	6 2%	6 3%	5 2%	5 1%
Perth County	3 0	2 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	3 1%
Oxford County	3 0	3 0	0 -	1 1%	2 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -
Elgin County	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Chatham-Kent Division	3 0	2 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 0	1 0	1 0	0 -	2 0
Essex County	16 2%	12 1%	4 2%	3 4%	3 1%	5 1%	5 1%	2 1%	6 2%	5 1%

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Division

Detailed tables

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I
 * small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Lambton County	6 1%	3 0	3 2% A	1 1%	0 -	4 1%	1 0	1 0	1 0	4 1%
Middlesex County	11 1%	10 1%	1 0	0 -	4 2%	6 2%	1 0	2 1%	6 2% I	0 -
Huron County	3 0	0 -	3 2% A	0 -	0 -	1 0	2 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -
Grey County	5 1%	2 0	4 2% A	1 1%	0 -	3 1%	1 0	2 1%	1 0	1 0
Simcoe County	15 2%	10 1%	5 3%	1 1%	2 1%	9 2%	4 1%	2 1%	5 2%	4 1%
Muskoka District Municipality	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	1 0	1 0
Haliburton County	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	2 0
Renfrew County	2 0	1 0	2 1%	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	2 1%	1 0
Nipissing County	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	2 0	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -
Sudbury District	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 0
Greater Sudbury Division	2 0	2 0	0 -	1 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -
Timiskaming District	3 0	1 0	2 1% A	1 1%	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0
Algoma District	7 1%	5 1%	2 1%	0 -	1 0	2 0	4 1%	2 1%	3 1%	3 1%
Thunder Bay District	4 0	3 0	1 0	1 1%	1 0	1 0	2 1%	2 1%	1 0	1 0

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Division

Detailed tables

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Rainy River District	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Kenora District	4 0	2 0	3 1% A	0 -	2 1%	2 0	1 0	0 -	2 1%	2 0
QUEBEC										
La Haute-Gaspésie	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Matana	2 0	2 0	0 -	2 2% DEF	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Rimouski-Neigette	3 0	2 0	1 1%	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	1 0
Lee Basques	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Rivière-du-Loup	2 0	1 0	1 1%	1 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -
Kamouraska	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Charlevoix-Est	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
L'Islet	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Montmagny	3 0	0 -	3 1% A	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	2 0
La C ^{te} -de-Beaupr,	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
La Jacques-Cartier	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Comm. Urbaine de Qu,bec	17 2%	17 2%	0 -	1 1%	6 3%	4 1%	5 1%	3 2%	6 2%	6 1%
Desjardins	3 0	2 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	3 1%	0 -	0 -	2 0
Les Chutes-de-la-ChaudiŠre	4 0	4 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	2 1%	1 0	0 -	2 1%	2 0
La Nouvelle-Beauce	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Beauce-Sartigan	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	1 1% EF	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
L'Amiante	3 0	2 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	2 1%	0 -	1 0
L'ŕable	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
LotbiniŠre	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Portneuf	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Le Cente-de-la-Mauricie	2 0	1 0	1 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	0 -
Francheville	7 1%	6 1%	2 1%	1 1%	2 1%	2 0	3 1%	2 1%	2 1%	4 1%

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Division

Detailed tables

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Arthabaska	5 0	4 0	1 1%	2 2% E	1 0	0 -	2 1%	1 1%	1 0	2 0
Le Haut-Saint-François	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Le Val-Saint-François	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 0
La Région-Sherbrooke	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	2 1%	1 0	1 0	0 -
Memphrémagog	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -
Brome-Missisquoi	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -
La Haute-Yamaska	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0	0 -	2 0
Drummond	3 0	2 0	1 1%	2 2% EF	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0
Nicolet-Yamaska	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -
D'Au-ray	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Le Bas-Richelieu	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Rouville	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Le Haut-Richelieu	5 0	5 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	2 1%	1 0	1 0	1 0	3 1%
La Vallée-du-Richelieu	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 0

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Division

Detailed tables

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Champlain	15 1%	15 2%	0 -	2 2%	7 4% E	2 0	4 1%	8 4% HI	3 1%	3 1%
Lajemmerai	5 0	4 0	1 1%	0 -	2 1%	1 0	2 0	0 -	2 1%	3 1%
L'Assomption	5 0	5 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	3 1%	1 0	2 1%	0 -	3 1%
Joliette	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Montcalm	2 0	1 0	1 0	1 1%	1 1%	0 -	0 -	1 1%	1 0	0 -
Les Mouulins	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -
Laval	6 1%	6 1%	0 -	2 2% DE	0 -	0 -	4 1%	2 1%	2 1%	2 0
Comm. Urbaine-de-Montréal	54 5%	54 7% B	0 -	3 3%	12 6%	15 4%	23 7%	16 8% I	19 7% I	13 3%
Roussillon	6 1%	6 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	5 1% F	0 -	1 0	3 1%	2 0
Le Haut-Saint-Laurent	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	1 1% EF	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Beauharnois-Salaberry	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -
Vaudreuil-Soulanges	4 0	4 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	3 1%	0 -	1 0	3 1%
Deux-Montagnes	6 1%	5 1%	1 1%	2 2%	1 0	2 1%	1 0	2 1%	0 -	3 1%
Thérèse-De-Blainville	8 1%	8 1%	0 -	1 1%	2 1%	2 1%	3 1%	2 1%	3 1%	2 0

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Division

Detailed tables

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Mirabel	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0
La Rivière-du-Nord	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	0 -
Argenteuil	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Les Pays-d'en-Haut	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0
Les Laurentides	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -
Antoine-Labelle	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Comm. Urbaine-de-l'Outaouais	10 1%	10 1%	0 -	1 1%	3 1%	2 0	5 1%	1 0	6 2% I	1 0
Les Collines-de-l'Outaouais	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
La Vallée-de-la-Gatineau	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -
Pontiac	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Rouyn-Noranda	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Abitibi	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -
Le Haut-Saint-Maurice	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Le Domaine-du-Roy	2 0	1 0	1 1%	0 -	1 1%	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 0

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Division

Detailed tables

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Maria-Chapdelaine	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -
Lac-Saint-Jean-Est	3 0	2 0	1 1%	1 1%	0 -	1 0	1 0	2 1%	0 -	1 0
Le Fjord-du-Saguenay	7 1%	6 1%	1 1%	1 1%	2 1%	4 1%	1 0	3 1%	3 1%	2 0
Sept-Rivières - Caniapiscau	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
NEW BRUNSWICK										
Saint John County	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0
Sunbury County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Queens County	2 0	2 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Kings County	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0
Westmorland County	6 1%	6 1%	0 -	2 2%	0 -	2 1%	2 1%	3 2% H	0 -	2 1%
Northumberland County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
York County	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0
Carleton County	4 0	4 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	3 1%	0 -	1 0	3 1%
Victoria County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Division

Detailed tables

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Madawaska County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Restigouche County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
NOVA SCOTIA										
Shelburne County	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Yarmouth County	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -
Digby County	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -
Lunenburg County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Hants County	4 0	0 -	4 2% A	0 -	2 1%	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	4 1%
Halifax County	15 2%	15 2%	0 -	3 3% D	0 -	8 2%	5 1%	6 3%	4 1%	5 1%
Colchester County	2 0	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0
Cumberland County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -
Pictou County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -
Richmond County	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Cape Breton County	4 0	4 1%	0 -	2 2%	0 -	2 0	1 0	3 1%	0 -	1 0

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Division

Detailed tables

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I
 * small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
P.E.I.										
Kings County	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Queens County	2 0	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -
Prince County	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -
NEWFOUNDLAND										
Division No. 1	8 1%	5 1%	3 2%	0 -	0 -	3 1%	5 2%	0 -	3 1%	4 1%
Division No. 2	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Division No. 3	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Division No. 4	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Division No. 6	3 0	1 0	2 1%	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0	0 -	2 0
Division No. 7	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Division No. 9	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Not specified	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 2% DEF	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1% I	0 -	0 -

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Respondent's Sex:

Detailed tables

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Male	491	404	85	47	99	163	174	87	122	244
	49%	49%	47%	51%	51%	46%	50%	43%	46%	58%
Female	511	415	96	46	94	194	173	117	145	174
	51%	51%	53%	49%	49%	54%	50%	57%	54%	42%
								I	I	

Food Safety
DEMOGRAPHICS
Language of Interview:

Detailed tables

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
English	775	630	143	64	134	295	274	145	198	344
	77%	77%	79%	68%	69%	83% CD	79% CD	71%	74%	82% GH
French	227	189	38	30	59	62	73	60	69	74
	23%	23%	21%	32% EF	31% EF	17%	21%	29% I	26% I	18%

Food Safety

DEMOGRAPHICS

What age group do you fall into?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
18 to 24	101 10%	85 10%	16 9%	5 6%	29 15% CF	43 12% F	22 6%	19 9%	28 11%	42 10%
25 to 34	194 19%	169 21% B	25 14%	11 11%	26 14%	62 17%	94 27% CDE	35 17%	52 20%	100 24%
35 to 44	171 17%	144 18%	27 15%	7 8%	24 12%	72 20% CD	68 20% CD	27 13%	33 12%	98 23% GH
45 to 54	222 22%	180 22%	42 23%	14 15%	49 25% C	83 23%	76 22%	39 19%	56 21%	100 24%
55 to 64	158 16%	122 15%	36 20%	22 23% EF	34 17%	53 15%	50 15%	26 13%	48 18%	56 13%
65+	150 15%	115 14%	33 18%	34 37% DEF	31 16%	45 13%	36 10%	59 29% HI	50 19% I	22 5%
Refused	5 1%	3 0	3 1%	1 1%	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
STATISTICS										
Average age	46	45	49 A	57 DEF	47	45	44	50 I	47 I	42
Standard Deviation	16.7	16.5	16.2	19.1	17.6	15.9	15.0	19.6	17.6	13.4
Standard Error	0.5	0.6	1.2	1.9	1.3	0.8	0.8	1.4	1.1	0.7

Detailed tables

Food Safety

DEMOGRAPHICS

What is your current marital status?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Single or never married	224 22%	189 23%	33 18%	18 20%	41 21%	84 24%	78 23%	65 32% I	64 24%	75 18%
Married	511 51%	422 51%	90 50%	40 43%	88 46%	176 49%	204 59% CDE	53 26%	137 51% G	260 62% GH
Common-law or living with a partner	102 10%	78 10%	24 13%	8 9%	23 12%	41 12%	27 8%	12 6%	25 9%	57 14% G
Divorced or separated	101 10%	81 10%	20 11%	13 14% F	24 13% F	40 11% F	23 7%	41 20% HI	29 11% I	20 5%
Widowed	57 6%	44 5%	13 7%	13 14% EF	16 8% F	15 4%	12 3%	33 16% HI	12 4% I	6 1%
Refused	7 1%	5 1%	2 1%	1 1%	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0

Detailed tables

Food Safety

DEMOGRAPHICS

Including yourself, how many people currently live in your household?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
1 person	190 19%	150 18%	37 21%	27 29% EF	42 22%	58 16%	60 17%	80 39% HI	56 21% I	36 9%
2 persons	331 33%	264 32%	67 37%	36 38%	61 32%	117 33%	112 32%	56 27%	107 40% GI	130 31%
3 persons	206 21%	174 21%	32 18%	14 15%	41 21%	88 25% CF	63 18%	27 13%	59 22% G	99 24% G
4 persons	176 18%	147 18%	29 16%	8 8%	34 18% C	60 17% C	75 22% C	26 13%	27 10%	105 25% GH
5 persons	61 6%	51 6%	9 5%	2 2%	13 7%	20 6%	26 8% C	8 4%	12 5%	34 8%
6 persons	18 2%	15 2%	2 1%	2 2%	2 1%	8 2%	6 2%	1 0	5 2%	9 2%
7 persons	5 1%	4 1%	1 0	1 1%	0 -	4 1%	0 -	3 1% I	2 1%	0 -
8 persons	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	3 1%
9 persons	2 0	2 0	0 -	2 2% EF	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -
10+ persons	3 0	1 0	1 1%	3 3% DEF	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	1 0
Refused	8 1%	6 1%	2 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	3 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -
STATISTICS										
Mean	2.70	2.73	2.59	2.58	2.59	2.76	2.76	2.31	2.45	3.05 GH

Detailed tables

Food Safety

DEMOGRAPHICS

Do you have any children under the age of 18 currently living in your household?

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: Excludes respondents living alone										
Unweighted Base	794	652	142	69	152	296	273	118	216	367
Weighted Base	804	662	142	67*	151	299	283	124	212	382
Yes	326 41%	269 41%	57 40%	22 33%	56 37%	123 41%	125 44%	56 45% H	65 31%	185 48% H
No	478 59%	393 59%	85 60%	45 67%	95 63%	175 59%	158 56%	68 55%	146 69% GI	197 52%

Detailed tables

Food Safety

DEMOGRAPHICS

And what are the ages of each of the children under 18 who are currently living in your household?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
ALL AGES										
Base: Children under the age of 18 currently living in household										
Unweighted Base	303	249	54	20	51	114	118	49	61	172
Weighted Base	326	269	57*	22**	56*	123	125	56*	65*	185
Under 1 year old	34 10%	29 11%	6 10%	1 3%	9 16%	9 7%	16 13%	7 13%	4 6%	19 10%
One year old	39 12%	33 12%	6 11%	3 12%	7 13%	15 12%	14 11%	6 11%	11 16%	22 12%
Two years old	44 13%	36 14%	7 12%	4 17%	6 11%	19 15%	15 12%	12 22% H	4 6%	26 14%
Three years old	33 10%	27 10%	5 10%	4 17%	4 7%	13 11%	12 10%	7 13%	9 14%	16 9%
Four years old	26 8%	18 7%	8 14%	2 10%	3 5%	8 7%	13 10%	0 -	2 4%	24 13% G
Five years old	34 10%	31 11%	3 6%	6 25%	2 3%	14 11%	13 10%	9 16%	5 8%	20 11%
Six years old	32 10%	30 11%	2 4%	5 23%	3 5%	10 8%	15 12%	6 12%	8 13%	16 9%
Seven years old	31 9%	27 10%	4 7%	2 9%	5 9%	12 10%	12 9%	6 11%	7 11%	16 8%
Eight years old	22 7%	18 7%	4 8%	3 13%	4 8%	8 6%	7 6%	8 15% H	1 1%	12 7%
Nine years old	24 7%	21 8%	3 5%	0 -	8 14%	6 5%	10 8%	4 8%	6 9%	14 7%
Ten years old	24 7%	17 6%	8 13%	3 14%	4 6%	7 6%	11 9%	3 5%	3 5%	16 9%
Eleven years old	26 8%	23 8%	3 6%	2 8%	4 7%	9 7%	12 9%	5 10%	2 3%	16 8%
Twelve years old	33 10%	29 11%	5 8%	3 14%	4 7%	10 8%	16 13%	4 6%	8 13%	21 12%

Detailed tables

Food Safety

DEMOGRAPHICS

And what are the ages of each of the children under 18 who are currently living in your household?

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Thirteen years old	28 9%	21 8%	8 13%	4 20%	4 7%	11 9%	9 7%	8 14%	2 4%	15 8%
Fourteen years old	18 6%	16 6%	2 4%	0 -	3 6%	9 7%	6 5%	2 3%	3 4%	13 7%
Fifteen years old	34 10%	28 11%	6 10%	3 13%	7 12%	16 13%	8 7%	7 13%	7 10%	15 8%
Sixteen years old	25 8%	17 6%	8 13%	3 15%	7 13%	7 5%	8 6%	4 6%	9 14%	12 7%
Seventeen years old	36 11%	26 9%	11 19% A	7 33%	6 12%	12 10%	11 9%	10 18%	7 11%	17 9%
Refused	7 2%	7 3%	0 -	0 -	1 2%	3 2%	4 3%	0 -	1 1%	2 1%

Detailed tables

DEMOGRAPHICS

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

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Grade school or some high school	94	62	30	94	0	0	0	58	16	7
	9%	8%	16% A	100% DEF	-	-	-	29% HI	6% I	2%
Complete high school	193	160	33	0	193	0	0	55	70	46
	19%	20%	18%	-	100% CEF	-	-	27% I	26% I	11%
Some community college or university, but did not finish	141	116	25	0	0	141	0	24	43	55
	14%	14%	14%	-	-	39% CDF	-	12%	16%	13%
Complete technical or trade school/Community college	217	173	43	0	0	217	0	38	65	95
	22%	21%	24%	-	-	61% CDF	-	18%	24%	23%
Complete university degree, such as a Bachelor's	241	201	40	0	0	0	241	16	53	150
	24%	24%	22%	-	-	-	69% CDE	8%	20% G	36% GH
Post-graduate degree, such as a Master's or Ph.D.	106	97	9	0	0	0	106	11	19	66
	11%	12% B	5%	-	-	-	31% CDE	5%	7%	16% GH
Refused	11	10	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	0
	1%	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	1% I	1%	-

Food Safety

DEMOGRAPHICS

Which one of the following categories best describes your current employment status?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Working full-time	477 48%	408 50% B	67 37%	17 18%	88 45% C	177 49% C	193 56% CD	39 19%	131 49% G	271 65% GH
Working part-time	80 8%	67 8%	13 7%	6 7%	17 9%	28 8%	29 8%	19 9%	16 6%	34 8%
Self-employed	96 10%	69 8%	27 15% A	9 10%	15 8%	33 9%	39 11%	17 8%	23 9%	46 11%
Unemployed, but looking for work	36 4%	29 4%	7 4%	7 7% F	12 6% F	12 3%	5 1%	21 10% HI	6 2%	6 1%
Attending school full-time/A student	36 4%	32 4%	4 2%	1 1%	4 2%	16 5%	15 4%	12 6%	8 3%	12 3%
Retired	182 18%	140 17%	43 24% A	35 38% DEF	36 19%	58 16%	51 15%	58 28% I	67 25% I	29 7%
Not in the workforce/A full-time homemaker	71 7%	55 7%	16 9%	12 13% F	18 9% F	28 8% F	12 3%	30 15% HI	15 6%	17 4%
Other/Social assistance/Disability	15 2%	13 2%	2 1%	4 4% F	4 2%	5 1%	2 1%	7 4% I	3 1%	4 1%
Refused	8 1%	6 1%	3 2%	2 2% E	0 -	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -

Detailed tables

DEMOGRAPHICS

And which of the following categories best describes your annual household income?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

* small base

Small base		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1002	815	185	99	196	358	337	206	271	404
Weighted Base	1002	819	181	94*	193	357	347	204	267	418
Under \$10,000	40 4%	31 4%	7 4%	16 17% DEF	10 5% F	9 2%	4 1%	40 19% HI	0 -	0 -
\$10,000 to just under \$20,000	71 7%	51 6%	20 11% A	20 21% DEF	20 10% EF	19 5%	12 3%	71 35% HI	0 -	0 -
\$20,000 to just under \$30,000	94 9%	76 9%	18 10%	23 24% DEF	25 13% F	34 10% F	11 3%	94 46% HI	0 -	0 -
\$30,000 to just under \$40,000	86 9%	71 9%	16 9%	8 8%	28 15% EF	27 8%	23 7%	0 -	86 32% GI	0 -
\$40,000 to just under \$50,000	90 9%	71 9%	19 11%	4 5%	19 10% F	50 14% CF	16 5%	0 -	90 34% GI	0 -
\$50,000 to just under \$60,000	91 9%	79 10%	11 6%	4 4%	23 12% C	30 8%	32 9%	0 -	91 34% GI	0 -
\$60,000 to just under \$70,000	64 6%	47 6%	17 9%	1 1%	6 3%	28 8% CD	29 8% CD	0 -	0 -	64 15% GH
\$70,000 to just under \$80,000	53 5%	40 5%	13 7%	1 1%	5 3%	22 6% C	24 7% C	0 -	0 -	53 13% GH
\$80,000 to just under \$100,000	117 12%	98 12%	18 10%	3 4%	20 11% C	42 12% C	51 15% C	0 -	0 -	117 28% GH
\$100,000 and over	185 18%	161 20% B	23 13%	1 1%	14 7% C	57 16% CD	112 32% CDE	0 -	0 -	185 44% GH
Refused	112 11%	93 11%	19 11%	13 13%	22 11%	38 11%	32 9%	0 -	0 -	0 -