



Table of Contents

Table Description

<u>1</u>	1_1. The following questions have to do with white-collar crime. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Canada should hold its companies to the highest ethical standards, both at home and abroad
<u>2</u>	1_2. The following questions have to do with white-collar crime. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - When Canadian companies and executives are involved in unethical or corrupt corporate practices, such as paying bribes, they should face tough consequences
<u>3</u>	1_3. The following questions have to do with white-collar crime. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - It is not fair to innocent workers if the consequences a company faces for unethical or corrupt practices by a small number of people jeopardize their jobs or the company's survival
<u>4</u>	1_4. The following questions have to do with white-collar crime. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - If a company is found to have been involved in unethical or corrupt corporate practices, the individual people who commit the unlawful acts should bear most of the responsibility
<u>5</u>	1_5. The following questions have to do with white-collar crime. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Canada's laws for dealing with companies involved in unethical or corrupt corporate practices should be similar to other developed countries, such as the United States and Britain, so that Canadian companies are operating on a level playing field with their foreign competitors
<u>6</u>	1_6. The following questions have to do with white-collar crime. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Canada should make it easier for companies to come forward, to cooperate, and to self-report any corporate wrongdoing that has been uncovered
<u>7</u>	1. The following questions have to do with white-collar crime. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Top 2 Box Summary
<u>8</u>	1. The following questions have to do with white-collar crime. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Bottom 2 Box Summary
<u>9</u>	2. Now that you have learned a bit more about the different ways that countries can approach dealing with unethical and corrupt corporate practices, do you think Canada should:
<u>10</u>	3_1. Based on what you've just learned about the system used in the U.S. and Britain called deferred prosecution agreements or DPAs, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Canada should have access to the same types of tools that other developed countries have to fight unethical or corrupt corporate practices
<u>11</u>	3_2. Based on what you've just learned about the system used in the U.S. and Britain called deferred prosecution agreements or DPAs, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Canada should add deferred prosecution agreements (DPAs) to the list of tools available to prosecutors so they have another way to enforce Canada's laws

<u>12</u>	3_3. Based on what you've just learned about the system used in the U.S. and Britain called deferred prosecution agreements or DPAs, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Deferred-prosecution agreements (DPAs) can be a good way for companies to cooperate with authorities and make amends for wrongdoing without jeopardizing the jobs of innocent employees
<u>13</u>	3_4. Based on what you've just learned about the system used in the U.S. and Britain called deferred prosecution agreements or DPAs, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Individual executives who commit unlawful acts should be prosecuted personally even when the companies they work for are not
<u>14</u>	3_5. Based on what you've just learned about the system used in the U.S. and Britain called deferred prosecution agreements or DPAs, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Deferred-prosecution agreements (DPAs) should not be used when unethical or unlawful practices reflect a corrupt corporate culture throughout the company
<u>15</u>	3_6. Based on what you've just learned about the system used in the U.S. and Britain called deferred prosecution agreements or DPAs, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Deferred-prosecution agreements (DPAs) are not a strong enough deterrent to stop companies from engaging in unethical or corrupt practices
<u>16</u>	3. Based on what you've just learned about the system used in the U.S. and Britain called deferred prosecution agreements or DPAs, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Top 2 Box Summary
<u>17</u>	3. Based on what you've just learned about the system used in the U.S. and Britain called deferred prosecution agreements or DPAs, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Bottom 2 Box Summary
<u>18</u>	4_1. There are a number of factors that the Government of Canada may consider when drafting white-collar crime legislation. Please indicate how important or unimportant you consider each of the following factors. - Legislation should be structured to target the individual business executives who may have personally broken the law
<u>19</u>	4_2. There are a number of factors that the Government of Canada may consider when drafting white-collar crime legislation. Please indicate how important or unimportant you consider each of the following factors. - Legislation should be structured to ensure that innocent people don't lose their jobs, their pensions or their investments because of the actions of individual executives at a company
<u>20</u>	4_3. There are a number of factors that the Government of Canada may consider when drafting white-collar crime legislation. Please indicate how important or unimportant you consider each of the following factors. - Legislation should be structured to take into account the negative impact that law enforcement efforts could have on Canadian jobs, company shareholders and the economy as a whole
<u>21</u>	4_4. There are a number of factors that the Government of Canada may consider when drafting white-collar crime legislation. Please indicate how important or unimportant you consider each of the following factors. - Legislation should be structured to make it easier for companies to come forward and cooperate with law enforcement
<u>22</u>	4. There are a number of factors that the Government of Canada may consider when drafting white-collar crime legislation. Please indicate how important or unimportant you consider each of the following factors. - Top 2 Box Summary
<u>23</u>	4. There are a number of factors that the Government of Canada may consider when drafting white-collar crime legislation. Please indicate how important or unimportant you consider each of the following factors. - Bottom 2 Box Summary
<u>24</u>	5. In the United States, the public prosecutor decides the terms of a deferred prosecution agreement with a corporation, without the involvement of a judge. In the UK, a judge is mandated to oversee the terms and conditions. Which do you think would be more effective, a system with or without the involvement of a judge?
<u>25</u>	6. Now that you have learned a bit more about the different ways that countries can approach dealing with unethical and corrupt corporate practices, do you think Canada should:

26	7. Please indicate which of the following best described your stance:
27	GENDER
28	AGE
29	EDUCATION
30	REGION
31	INCOME
32	HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION
33	HHCMP1. How many people are living or staying at your current address?
34	EMPLOYMENT STATUS
35	USMAR2. What is your marital status?
36	US01PGS. How much of your household's grocery shopping do you, yourself, do?
37	CAETHN2. Sometimes people identify themselves with a specific ethnicity or cultural background which is different from their citizenship or nationality. Thinking about your own identity in ethnic or cultural terms, please select which group you most identify yourself with.

1_1. The following questions have to do with white-collar crime. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Canada should hold its companies to the highest ethical standards, both at home and abroad

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Top 2 Box (Net)	933	132	97	64	358	215	66	315	175	210	126	194	739
	93%	98%	91%	98%	93%	89%	93%	89%	96%	94%	96%	91%	93%
		BE*	*	E*			*		G		G		
Strongly agree	704	107	66	51	285	144	52	228	137	163	95	137	567
	70%	79%	62%	78%	74%	60%	73%	65%	75%	73%	72%	64%	72%
		BE*	*	BE*	BE		E*		G				
Somewhat agree	229	25	31	13	73	72	14	87	39	47	31	57	172
	23%	19%	29%	20%	19%	30%	20%	25%	21%	21%	24%	27%	22%
		*	*	*		AD	*						
Bottom 2 Box (Net)	49	1	5	1	21	16	5	26	5	11	1	15	34
	5%	1%	5%	1%	6%	7%	7%	7%	3%	5%	1%	7%	4%
		*	*	*	A	A	A*	J					
Somewhat disagree	33	1	4	-	13	13	3	18	2	8	1	11	22
	3%	1%	3%	-	3%	5%	4%	5%	1%	4%	*	5%	3%
		*	*	*			*	J					
Strongly disagree	16	-	2	1	9	3	2	7	3	3	*	4	12
	2%	-	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	*	2%	2%
		*	*	*			*						
Don't know	22	2	4	*	5	10	*	11	1	3	4	4	17
	2%	1%	4%	1%	1%	4%	*	3%	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%
		*	*	*			*						
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

1_2. The following questions have to do with white-collar crime. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - When Canadian companies and executives are involved in unethical or corrupt corporate practices, such as paying bribes, they should face tough consequences

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Top 2 Box (Net)	926	128	96	64	351	221	66	311	175	212	123	196	729
	92%	95%	90%	97%	91%	92%	92%	88%	96%	95%	93%	92%	92%
		*	*	*			*		G	G			
Strongly agree	730	101	75	54	278	170	51	243	133	176	91	147	583
	73%	75%	71%	82%	72%	71%	72%	69%	73%	79%	70%	69%	74%
		*	*	*			*			G			
Somewhat agree	196	27	21	10	72	51	14	67	42	35	31	49	146
	19%	20%	20%	15%	19%	21%	20%	19%	23%	16%	24%	23%	19%
		*	*	*			*						
Bottom 2 Box (Net)	44	5	3	1	22	9	5	21	6	9	3	11	33
	4%	4%	2%	2%	6%	4%	7%	6%	3%	4%	3%	5%	4%
		*	*	*			*						
Somewhat disagree	29	5	*	1	15	5	3	15	5	5	2	7	23
	3%	4%	*	2%	4%	2%	4%	4%	3%	2%	2%	3%	3%
		*	*	*			*						
Strongly disagree	15	-	2	-	7	4	2	6	1	4	1	4	11
	1%	-	2%	-	2%	2%	2%	2%	*	2%	1%	2%	1%
		*	*	*			*						
Don't know	34	2	8	*	12	11	1	20	1	3	5	6	28
	3%	1%	7%	1%	3%	5%	1%	6%	1%	1%	4%	3%	4%
		*	A*	*			*	HI			H		
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

1_3. The following questions have to do with white-collar crime. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - It is not fair to innocent workers if the consequences a company faces for unethical or corrupt practices by a small number of people jeopardize their jobs or the company's survival

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Top 2 Box (Net)	876	119	88	55	342	210	62	306	165	197	111	185	690
	87%	88%	82%	85%	89%	87%	87%	87%	91%	88%	84%	87%	87%
		*	*	*			*						
Strongly agree	528	70	50	32	212	129	35	186	96	123	64	114	414
	53%	52%	47%	49%	55%	53%	49%	53%	53%	55%	48%	53%	52%
		*	*	*			*						
Somewhat agree	348	48	38	23	131	81	27	120	69	74	47	72	276
	35%	36%	36%	35%	34%	34%	38%	34%	38%	33%	36%	34%	35%
		*	*	*			*						
Bottom 2 Box (Net)	92	10	13	5	38	19	7	31	14	18	16	23	69
	9%	7%	13%	8%	10%	8%	10%	9%	8%	8%	12%	11%	9%
		*	*	*			*						
Somewhat disagree	68	9	12	5	24	12	6	20	10	17	11	16	52
	7%	7%	11%	7%	6%	5%	9%	6%	6%	8%	8%	7%	7%
		*	*	*			*						
Strongly disagree	25	*	1	1	14	7	1	11	4	1	5	8	17
	2%	*	1%	1%	4%	3%	1%	3%	2%	1%	4%	4%	2%
		*	*	*			*				I		
Don't know	36	7	5	5	5	12	2	16	3	8	5	5	31
	4%	5%	5%	7%	1%	5%	3%	5%	2%	4%	4%	2%	4%
		D*	D*	D*		D	*						
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

1_4. The following questions have to do with white-collar crime. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - If a company is found to have been involved in unethical or corrupt corporate practices, the individual people who commit the unlawful acts should bear most of the responsibility

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Top 2 Box (Net)	890	128	93	57	340	211	62	294	168	206	122	179	711
	89%	95%	87%	88%	88%	87%	87%	84%	93%	92%	93%	84%	90%
		EF*	*	*			*		G	G	G		K
Strongly agree	622	78	64	43	231	159	46	205	120	149	79	130	491
	62%	58%	60%	65%	60%	66%	65%	58%	66%	67%	60%	61%	62%
		*	*	*			*						
Somewhat agree	268	50	29	14	108	51	16	90	48	56	43	49	220
	27%	37%	27%	22%	28%	21%	22%	25%	26%	25%	33%	23%	28%
		EF*	*	*			*						
Bottom 2 Box (Net)	82	4	8	8	35	19	9	39	11	16	6	28	55
	8%	3%	7%	12%	9%	8%	13%	11%	6%	7%	4%	13%	7%
		*	*	A*	A		A*	J				L	
Somewhat disagree	61	4	5	4	25	15	8	31	6	13	5	22	39
	6%	3%	4%	6%	7%	6%	11%	9%	3%	6%	4%	10%	5%
		*	*	*			A*	H				L	
Strongly disagree	22	-	3	4	10	4	1	8	5	3	1	6	16
	2%	-	3%	6%	3%	1%	1%	2%	3%	1%	1%	3%	2%
		*	*	AE*			*						
Don't know	32	3	6	*	10	12	*	19	2	2	3	7	25
	3%	2%	6%	1%	3%	5%	*	5%	1%	1%	2%	3%	3%
		*	*	*			*	I					
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

1_5. The following questions have to do with white-collar crime. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Canada's laws for dealing with companies involved in unethical or corrupt corporate practices should be similar to other developed countries, such as the United States and Britain, so that Canadian companies are operating on a level playing field with their foreign competitors

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Top 2 Box (Net)	804	108	81	54	319	191	51	268	151	196	106	168	635
	80%	80%	76%	82%	83%	79%	72%	76%	83%	88%	81%	79%	80%
		*	*	*	F		*			G			
Strongly agree	460	57	53	33	189	98	30	155	77	121	58	90	370
	46%	42%	49%	51%	49%	40%	42%	44%	42%	54%	44%	42%	47%
		*	*	*			*			GH			
Somewhat agree	344	51	29	20	129	94	22	113	73	74	49	78	266
	34%	38%	27%	31%	34%	39%	30%	32%	40%	33%	37%	37%	34%
		*	*	*			*						
Bottom 2 Box (Net)	118	13	15	7	38	32	13	47	25	19	13	33	85
	12%	10%	14%	10%	10%	13%	18%	13%	14%	9%	10%	15%	11%
		*	*	*			D*						
Somewhat disagree	93	11	11	5	32	25	10	38	23	11	11	25	68
	9%	8%	10%	7%	8%	10%	15%	11%	13%	5%	9%	12%	9%
		*	*	*			*	I	I				
Strongly disagree	25	2	4	2	7	7	2	9	2	8	2	7	17
	2%	2%	4%	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%	1%	4%	2%	3%	2%
		*	*	*			*						
Don't know	82	14	10	5	28	18	7	38	6	9	12	12	70
	8%	10%	10%	8%	7%	7%	10%	11%	4%	4%	9%	6%	9%
		*	*	*			*	HI					
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I/J/K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I/J/K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

1_6. The following questions have to do with white-collar crime. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Canada should make it easier for companies to come forward, to cooperate, and to self-report any corporate wrongdoing that has been uncovered

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Top 2 Box (Net)	908	125	91	63	342	220	68	311	169	207	119	188	720
	90%	93%	85%	96%	89%	91%	95%	88%	93%	93%	90%	88%	91%
		*	*	*			B*						
Strongly agree	582	78	55	42	221	141	44	201	103	137	75	119	463
	58%	58%	52%	64%	57%	59%	62%	57%	57%	61%	57%	56%	59%
		*	*	*			*						
Somewhat agree	326	47	36	20	122	78	23	109	66	70	44	69	257
	32%	35%	33%	31%	32%	33%	33%	31%	36%	32%	33%	32%	33%
		*	*	*			*						
Bottom 2 Box (Net)	51	7	7	1	23	12	2	22	8	9	7	20	31
	5%	5%	6%	1%	6%	5%	3%	6%	4%	4%	5%	9%	4%
		*	*	*			*					L	
Somewhat disagree	40	5	6	1	15	11	1	14	7	8	6	17	23
	4%	4%	6%	1%	4%	5%	2%	4%	4%	3%	5%	8%	3%
		*	*	*			*					L	
Strongly disagree	12	2	1	-	8	1	1	7	1	2	1	3	9
	1%	1%	1%	-	2%	*	1%	2%	*	1%	1%	1%	1%
		*	*	*			*						
Don't know	44	3	9	2	20	9	1	20	5	7	5	6	39
	4%	2%	8%	3%	5%	4%	2%	6%	3%	3%	4%	3%	5%
		*	A*	*			*						
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

1. The following questions have to do with white-collar crime. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Top 2 Box Summary

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Canada should hold its companies to the highest ethical standards, both at home and abroad	933	132	97	64	358	215	66	315	175	210	126	194	739
	93%	98%	91%	98%	93%	89%	93%	89%	96%	94%	96%	91%	93%
		BE*	*	E*			*		G		G		
When Canadian companies and executives are involved in unethical or corrupt corporate practices, such as paying bribes, they should	926	128	96	64	351	221	66	311	175	212	123	196	729
Canada should make it easier for companies to come forward, to cooperate, and to self-report any corporate wrongdoing that has been	92%	95%	90%	97%	91%	92%	92%	88%	96%	95%	93%	92%	92%
		*	*	*			*		G	G			
If a company is found to have been involved in unethical or corrupt corporate practices, the individual people who commit the unlawful acts	908	125	91	63	342	220	68	311	169	207	119	188	720
It is not fair to innocent workers if the consequences a company faces for unethical or corrupt practices by a small number of people	90%	93%	85%	96%	89%	91%	95%	88%	93%	93%	90%	88%	91%
Canada's laws for dealing with companies involved in unethical or corrupt corporate practices should be similar to other developed		*	*	*			B*						
Statistics:	890	128	93	57	340	211	62	294	168	206	122	179	711
Overlap formula used	89%	95%	87%	88%	88%	87%	87%	84%	93%	92%	93%	84%	90%
- Column Proportions:		EF*	*	*			*		G	G	G		K
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L	876	119	88	55	342	210	62	306	165	197	111	185	690
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)	87%	88%	82%	85%	89%	87%	87%	87%	91%	88%	84%	87%	87%
- Column Means:		*	*	*			*						
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L	804	108	81	54	319	191	51	268	151	196	106	168	635
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)	80%	80%	76%	82%	83%	79%	72%	76%	83%	88%	81%	79%	80%
		*	*	*	F		*			G			

Overlap formula used

- Column Proportions:

Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L

Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

- Column Means:

Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L

Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

1. The following questions have to do with white-collar crime. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Bottom 2 Box Summary

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Canada's laws for dealing with companies involved in unethical or corrupt corporate practices should be similar to other developed	118	13	15	7	38	32	13	47	25	19	13	33	85
It is not fair to innocent workers if the consequences a company faces for unethical or corrupt practices by a small number of people	12%	10%	14%	10%	10%	13%	18%	13%	14%	9%	10%	15%	11%
If a company is found to have been involved in unethical or corrupt corporate practices, the individual people who commit the unlawful acts		*	*	*			D*						
Canada should make it easier for companies to come forward, to cooperate, and to self-report any corporate wrongdoing that has been	92	10	13	5	38	19	7	31	14	18	16	23	69
Canada should hold its companies to the highest ethical standards, both at home and abroad	9%	7%	13%	8%	10%	8%	10%	9%	8%	8%	12%	11%	9%
When Canadian companies and executives are involved in unethical or corrupt corporate practices, such as paying bribes, they should		*	*	*			*						
	82	4	8	8	35	19	9	39	11	16	6	28	55
	8%	3%	7%	12%	9%	8%	13%	11%	6%	7%	4%	13%	7%
		*	*	A*	A		A*	J				L	
	51	7	7	1	23	12	2	22	8	9	7	20	31
	5%	5%	6%	1%	6%	5%	3%	6%	4%	4%	5%	9%	4%
		*	*	*			*					L	
	49	1	5	1	21	16	5	26	5	11	1	15	34
	5%	1%	5%	1%	6%	7%	7%	7%	3%	5%	1%	7%	4%
		*	*	*	A	A	A*	J					
	44	5	3	1	22	9	5	21	6	9	3	11	33
	4%	4%	2%	2%	6%	4%	7%	6%	3%	4%	3%	5%	4%
		*	*	*			*						

Statistics:

Overlap formula used

- Column Proportions:

Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L

Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

- Column Means:

Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L

Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

2. Now that you have learned a bit more about the different ways that countries can approach dealing with unethical and corrupt corporate practices, do you think Canada should:

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Stick with the current system which gives prosecutors the choice to 1. Negotiate a guilty plea, 2. Go to court in hopes of securing a	189	22	13	8	88	43	16	75	43	34	26	51	138
Adopt a system like in the U.S. and Britain, which allows prosecutors to 1. Negotiate a guilty plea, 2. Go to court in hopes of securing a	19%	16%	12%	12%	23%	18%	22%	21%	24%	15%	19%	24%	17%
I don't know		*	*	*	B		*						
	633	89	69	47	227	162	38	205	109	161	90	127	506
	63%	66%	65%	72%	59%	67%	54%	58%	60%	72%	69%	59%	64%
		*	*	F*		F	*			GH			
	182	23	25	10	69	37	17	72	30	28	16	36	146
	18%	17%	23%	16%	18%	15%	24%	20%	16%	12%	12%	17%	18%
		*	*	*			*	I					
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
[Table of Contents](#)

3_1. Based on what you've just learned about the system used in the U.S. and Britain called deferred prosecution agreements or DPAs, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Canada should have access to the same types of tools that other developed countries have to fight unethical or corrupt corporate practices

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Top 2 Box (Net)	859	116	91	57	327	207	60	290	162	195	116	187	672
	86%	86%	85%	88%	85%	86%	85%	82%	89%	87%	89%	87%	85%
		*	*	*			*						
Strongly agree	538	77	56	39	208	121	37	188	104	117	71	116	423
	54%	57%	53%	60%	54%	50%	51%	53%	57%	52%	54%	54%	53%
		*	*	*			*						
Somewhat agree	320	39	35	18	119	85	24	102	58	78	45	71	249
	32%	29%	32%	28%	31%	35%	33%	29%	32%	35%	34%	33%	32%
		*	*	*			*						
Bottom 2 Box (Net)	81	6	8	3	39	20	6	35	13	20	7	17	64
	8%	4%	7%	5%	10%	8%	8%	10%	7%	9%	6%	8%	8%
		*	*	*			*						
Somewhat disagree	67	5	6	2	33	16	5	31	8	16	6	15	53
	7%	4%	6%	3%	9%	7%	7%	9%	5%	7%	5%	7%	7%
		*	*	*			*						
Strongly disagree	14	1	2	1	6	4	1	4	5	4	1	3	11
	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%
		*	*	*			*						
Don't know	64	13	8	5	19	15	5	28	7	9	7	10	55
	6%	9%	7%	8%	5%	6%	7%	8%	4%	4%	6%	4%	7%
		*	*	*			*						
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

3_2. Based on what you've just learned about the system used in the U.S. and Britain called deferred prosecution agreements or DPAs, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Canada should add deferred prosecution agreements (DPAs) to the list of tools available to prosecutors so they have another way to enforce Canada's laws

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Top 2 Box (Net)	798	105	88	52	303	201	49	273	154	186	108	172	626
	80%	78%	82%	80%	79%	83%	69%	77%	84%	83%	82%	81%	79%
		*	F*	*		F	*						
Strongly agree	445	53	52	30	183	100	27	154	86	103	55	94	351
	44%	40%	49%	46%	48%	41%	37%	44%	47%	46%	42%	44%	44%
		*	*	*			*						
Somewhat agree	353	52	36	22	120	101	23	119	68	83	53	78	276
	35%	38%	33%	34%	31%	42%	32%	34%	37%	37%	40%	36%	35%
		*	*	*		D	*						
Bottom 2 Box (Net)	99	13	9	6	44	15	12	37	19	22	11	21	78
	10%	10%	8%	9%	11%	6%	16%	10%	11%	10%	8%	10%	10%
		*	*	*			E*						
Somewhat disagree	63	8	7	4	28	10	6	25	10	12	7	11	52
	6%	6%	7%	6%	7%	4%	8%	7%	5%	5%	5%	5%	7%
		*	*	*			*						
Strongly disagree	36	6	1	2	16	5	6	11	9	10	4	10	26
	4%	4%	1%	3%	4%	2%	8%	3%	5%	4%	3%	5%	3%
		*	*	*			BE*						
Don't know	107	16	10	7	37	25	10	43	9	16	13	21	86
	11%	12%	10%	11%	10%	11%	14%	12%	5%	7%	10%	10%	11%
		*	*	*			*	H					
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

3_3. Based on what you've just learned about the system used in the U.S. and Britain called deferred prosecution agreements or DPAs, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Deferred-prosecution agreements (DPAs) can be a good way for companies to cooperate with authorities and make amends for wrongdoing without jeopardizing the jobs of innocent employees

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Top 2 Box (Net)	805	106	87	52	319	186	54	270	148	193	111	172	633
	80%	79%	82%	80%	83%	77%	76%	77%	81%	86%	84%	81%	80%
		*	*	*			*			G			
Strongly agree	406	47	37	27	165	103	27	148	74	94	52	90	316
	40%	35%	35%	41%	43%	43%	39%	42%	40%	42%	40%	42%	40%
		*	*	*			*						
Somewhat agree	399	59	50	25	154	84	26	122	74	98	58	83	317
	40%	44%	47%	39%	40%	35%	37%	35%	41%	44%	44%	39%	40%
		*	*	*			*			G			
Bottom 2 Box (Net)	111	14	6	4	37	39	10	47	27	19	10	28	83
	11%	10%	6%	6%	10%	16%	14%	13%	15%	9%	7%	13%	11%
		*	*	*		BD	*						
Somewhat disagree	88	11	6	2	25	36	8	39	19	17	4	22	66
	9%	8%	6%	2%	7%	15%	11%	11%	11%	8%	3%	10%	8%
		*	*	*		BCD	*	J	J				
Strongly disagree	23	3	*	3	12	3	2	8	8	2	5	5	18
	2%	2%	*	4%	3%	1%	3%	2%	4%	1%	4%	3%	2%
		*	*	*			*						
Don't know	88	15	13	9	28	15	8	35	7	12	11	14	74
	9%	11%	12%	14%	7%	6%	11%	10%	4%	5%	9%	6%	9%
		*	*	*			*	H					
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

3_4. Based on what you've just learned about the system used in the U.S. and Britain called deferred prosecution agreements or DPAs, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Individual executives who commit unlawful acts should be prosecuted personally even when the companies they work for are not

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Top 2 Box (Net)	849	113	92	58	325	202	59	285	163	197	114	162	688
	85%	84%	86%	89%	84%	84%	83%	81%	90%	88%	87%	76%	87%
		*	*	*			*		G	G			K
Strongly agree	563	75	61	33	221	132	42	189	113	123	80	108	455
	56%	56%	57%	50%	57%	55%	59%	54%	62%	55%	61%	50%	58%
		*	*	*			*						
Somewhat agree	286	38	31	26	104	70	17	96	50	74	35	54	232
	29%	29%	29%	39%	27%	29%	24%	27%	27%	33%	26%	25%	29%
		*	*	*			*						
Bottom 2 Box (Net)	80	10	6	4	34	18	9	35	13	13	10	32	47
	8%	7%	5%	6%	9%	8%	12%	10%	7%	6%	7%	15%	6%
		*	*	*			*					L	
Somewhat disagree	62	7	6	*	30	14	4	30	7	10	7	23	39
	6%	5%	5%	1%	8%	6%	6%	8%	4%	5%	6%	11%	5%
		*	*	*			*					L	
Strongly disagree	18	2	-	3	4	4	4	5	6	3	2	9	9
	2%	2%	-	5%	1%	2%	6%	1%	3%	1%	2%	4%	1%
		*	*	BD*			BD*					L	
Don't know	75	12	9	3	26	21	4	33	6	13	7	20	55
	7%	9%	9%	5%	7%	9%	5%	9%	4%	6%	6%	9%	7%
		*	*	*			*	H					
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

3_5. Based on what you've just learned about the system used in the U.S. and Britain called deferred prosecution agreements or DPAs, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Deferred-prosecution agreements (DPAs) should not be used when unethical or unlawful practices reflect a corrupt corporate culture throughout the company

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Top 2 Box (Net)	679	97	65	42	266	168	42	236	126	163	86	142	537
	68%	72%	61%	65%	69%	69%	59%	67%	69%	73%	66%	66%	68%
		*	*	*			*						
Strongly agree	380	65	38	26	144	86	21	130	73	93	50	82	298
	38%	48%	35%	40%	38%	36%	29%	37%	40%	42%	38%	38%	38%
		EF*	*	*			*						
Somewhat agree	299	32	27	16	121	81	21	106	53	70	36	60	239
	30%	24%	25%	24%	32%	34%	30%	30%	29%	31%	28%	28%	30%
		*	*	*			*						
Bottom 2 Box (Net)	190	17	24	11	80	41	17	67	39	40	27	43	147
	19%	12%	22%	16%	21%	17%	24%	19%	21%	18%	20%	20%	19%
		*	*	*			A*						
Somewhat disagree	129	11	16	7	56	32	8	46	31	24	15	32	97
	13%	9%	15%	10%	14%	13%	11%	13%	17%	11%	11%	15%	12%
		*	*	*			*						
Strongly disagree	61	5	8	4	25	9	9	20	7	16	11	11	50
	6%	4%	7%	6%	6%	4%	13%	6%	4%	7%	9%	5%	6%
		*	*	*			ADE*						
Don't know	136	21	18	12	39	33	12	49	17	21	19	29	107
	13%	16%	17%	19%	10%	14%	17%	14%	9%	9%	14%	13%	14%
		*	*	*			*						
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

3_6. Based on what you've just learned about the system used in the U.S. and Britain called deferred prosecution agreements or DPAs, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Deferred-prosecution agreements (DPAs) are not a strong enough deterrent to stop companies from engaging in unethical or corrupt practices

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Top 2 Box (Net)	619	79	63	36	241	155	45	226	115	136	76	144	475
	62%	59%	59%	55%	63%	64%	63%	64%	63%	61%	58%	67%	60%
		*	*	*			*						
Strongly agree	258	36	22	10	104	72	15	97	52	54	33	66	192
	26%	27%	20%	16%	27%	30%	21%	27%	29%	24%	25%	31%	24%
		*	*	*		C	*						
Somewhat agree	361	43	41	25	137	83	30	129	63	81	43	78	283
	36%	32%	39%	39%	36%	35%	42%	37%	35%	36%	33%	36%	36%
		*	*	*			*						
Bottom 2 Box (Net)	235	27	24	21	95	56	12	77	49	58	34	43	192
	23%	20%	22%	32%	25%	23%	17%	22%	27%	26%	26%	20%	24%
		*	*	*			*						
Somewhat disagree	199	26	19	18	77	51	8	67	39	50	28	39	160
	20%	19%	18%	27%	20%	21%	12%	19%	21%	22%	22%	18%	20%
		*	*	F*			*						
Strongly disagree	37	2	5	3	18	5	4	10	10	8	6	4	32
	4%	1%	4%	5%	5%	2%	5%	3%	6%	4%	4%	2%	4%
		*	*	*			*						
Don't know	150	28	20	9	49	30	14	50	18	30	21	26	123
	15%	21%	19%	14%	13%	13%	20%	14%	10%	13%	16%	12%	16%
		*	*	*			*						
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

3. Based on what you've just learned about the system used in the U.S. and Britain called deferred prosecution agreements or DPAs, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Top 2 Box Summary

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Canada should have access to the same types of tools that other developed countries have to fight unethical or corrupt corporate practices	859	116	91	57	327	207	60	290	162	195	116	187	672
	86%	86%	85%	88%	85%	86%	85%	82%	89%	87%	89%	87%	85%
		*	*	*			*						
Individual executives who commit unlawful acts should be prosecuted personally even when the companies they work for are not	849	113	92	58	325	202	59	285	163	197	114	162	688
	85%	84%	86%	89%	84%	84%	83%	81%	90%	88%	87%	76%	87%
		*	*	*			*		G	G			K
Deferred-prosecution agreements (DPAs) can be a good way for companies to cooperate with authorities and make amends for wrongdoing	805	106	87	52	319	186	54	270	148	193	111	172	633
	80%	79%	82%	80%	83%	77%	76%	77%	81%	86%	84%	81%	80%
		*	*	*			*			G			
Canada should add deferred prosecution agreements (DPAs) to the list of tools available to prosecutors so they have another way to	798	105	88	52	303	201	49	273	154	186	108	172	626
	80%	78%	82%	80%	79%	83%	69%	77%	84%	83%	82%	81%	79%
		*	F*	*		F	*						
Deferred-prosecution agreements (DPAs) should not be used when unethical or unlawful practices reflect a corrupt corporate culture	679	97	65	42	266	168	42	236	126	163	86	142	537
	68%	72%	61%	65%	69%	69%	59%	67%	69%	73%	66%	66%	68%
		*	*	*			*						
Deferred-prosecution agreements (DPAs) are not a strong enough deterrent to stop companies from engaging in unethical or	619	79	63	36	241	155	45	226	115	136	76	144	475
	62%	59%	59%	55%	63%	64%	63%	64%	63%	61%	58%	67%	60%
		*	*	*			*						

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
[Table of Contents](#)

3. Based on what you've just learned about the system used in the U.S. and Britain called deferred prosecution agreements or DPAs, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. - Bottom 2 Box Summary

	Total	REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
		BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Deferred-prosecution agreements (DPAs) are not a strong enough deterrent to stop companies from engaging in unethical or	235	27	24	21	95	56	12	77	49	58	34	43	192
	23%	20%	22%	32%	25%	23%	17%	22%	27%	26%	26%	20%	24%
		*	*	*			*						
Deferred-prosecution agreements (DPAs) should not be used when unethical or unlawful practices reflect a corrupt corporate culture	190	17	24	11	80	41	17	67	39	40	27	43	147
	19%	12%	22%	16%	21%	17%	24%	19%	21%	18%	20%	20%	19%
		*	*	*			A*						
Deferred-prosecution agreements (DPAs) can be a good way for companies to cooperate with authorities and make amends for wrongdoing	111	14	6	4	37	39	10	47	27	19	10	28	83
	11%	10%	6%	6%	10%	16%	14%	13%	15%	9%	7%	13%	11%
		*	*	*		BD	*						
Canada should add deferred prosecution agreements (DPAs) to the list of tools available to prosecutors so they have another way to	99	13	9	6	44	15	12	37	19	22	11	21	78
	10%	10%	8%	9%	11%	6%	16%	10%	11%	10%	8%	10%	10%
		*	*	*			E*						
Canada should have access to the same types of tools that other developed countries have to fight unethical or corrupt corporate practices	81	6	8	3	39	20	6	35	13	20	7	17	64
	8%	4%	7%	5%	10%	8%	8%	10%	7%	9%	6%	8%	8%
		*	*	*			*						
Individual executives who commit unlawful acts should be prosecuted personally even when the companies they work for are not	80	10	6	4	34	18	9	35	13	13	10	32	47
	8%	7%	5%	6%	9%	8%	12%	10%	7%	6%	7%	15%	6%
		*	*	*			*					L	

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I/J/K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I/J/K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
[Table of Contents](#)

4_1. There are a number of factors that the Government of Canada may consider when drafting white-collar crime legislation. Please indicate how important or unimportant you consider each of the following factors. - Legislation should be structured to target the individual business executives who may have personally broken the law

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Top 2 Box (Net)	913	124	91	60	353	220	64	306	176	208	127	191	722
	91%	92%	85%	92%	92%	91%	90%	87%	97%	93%	97%	89%	91%
		*	*	*			*		G	G	G		
Very important	672	98	73	46	254	158	43	228	132	151	85	130	542
	67%	73%	68%	71%	66%	66%	60%	65%	73%	68%	65%	61%	69%
		*	*	*			*						
Somewhat important	242	26	18	14	99	62	22	78	44	56	42	61	180
	24%	19%	17%	22%	26%	26%	30%	22%	24%	25%	32%	29%	23%
		*	*	*			B*				G		
Bottom 2 Box (Net)	39	3	8	1	14	10	3	17	4	10	2	17	23
	4%	2%	7%	2%	4%	4%	4%	5%	2%	4%	1%	8%	3%
		*	*	*			*					L	
Not very important	31	3	7	1	8	10	3	14	2	9	1	15	16
	3%	2%	6%	1%	2%	4%	4%	4%	1%	4%	*	7%	2%
		*	D*	*			*					L	
Not at all important	8	-	1	*	7	-	-	3	2	1	1	2	6
	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	-	-	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	1%
		*	*	*			*						
Don't know	51	8	8	4	17	11	4	29	2	6	3	6	46
	5%	6%	8%	6%	5%	4%	6%	8%	1%	3%	2%	3%	6%
		*	*	*			*	HIJ					
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

4_2. There are a number of factors that the Government of Canada may consider when drafting white-collar crime legislation. Please indicate how important or unimportant you consider each of the following factors. - Legislation should be structured to ensure that innocent people don't lose their jobs, their pensions or their investments because of the actions of individual executives at a company

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Top 2 Box (Net)	908	122	92	59	354	215	66	307	168	211	121	193	714
	90%	91%	86%	90%	92%	89%	93%	87%	92%	94%	92%	91%	90%
		*	*	*			*			G			
Very important	686	99	69	46	271	151	50	243	126	153	87	142	544
	68%	74%	65%	71%	70%	63%	70%	69%	69%	69%	66%	66%	69%
		*	*	*			*						
Somewhat important	222	23	23	13	83	64	16	65	42	58	34	52	170
	22%	17%	22%	19%	22%	27%	23%	18%	23%	26%	26%	24%	22%
		*	*	*			*						
Bottom 2 Box (Net)	48	5	6	3	17	14	3	17	11	6	7	15	32
	5%	3%	6%	5%	4%	6%	4%	5%	6%	3%	5%	7%	4%
		*	*	*			*						
Not very important	38	5	4	3	14	11	2	16	6	6	6	13	26
	4%	3%	4%	5%	4%	4%	3%	5%	3%	3%	4%	6%	3%
		*	*	*			*						
Not at all important	9	-	2	-	3	3	1	1	5	-	1	3	7
	1%	-	2%	-	1%	1%	1%	*	3%	-	1%	1%	1%
		*	*	*			*		GI				
Don't know	49	8	9	3	15	12	2	28	4	6	3	5	44
	5%	6%	8%	5%	4%	5%	3%	8%	2%	3%	2%	2%	6%
		*	*	*			*	HIJ					
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

4_3. There are a number of factors that the Government of Canada may consider when drafting white-collar crime legislation. Please indicate how important or unimportant you consider each of the following factors. - Legislation should be structured to take into account the negative impact that law enforcement efforts could have on Canadian jobs, company shareholders and the economy as a whole

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Top 2 Box (Net)	782	93	80	47	312	194	56	270	142	184	106	176	606
	78%	69%	75%	71%	81%	80%	79%	77%	78%	82%	81%	82%	77%
		*	*	*	A	A	*						
Very important	374	46	40	25	150	88	26	145	72	82	42	100	274
	37%	34%	37%	38%	39%	36%	36%	41%	40%	36%	32%	47%	35%
		*	*	*			*					L	
Somewhat important	409	48	41	22	162	106	31	125	70	102	64	76	333
	41%	35%	38%	34%	42%	44%	43%	35%	38%	46%	49%	36%	42%
		*	*	*			*			G	G		
Bottom 2 Box (Net)	140	24	16	11	47	31	10	43	30	31	20	23	117
	14%	18%	15%	17%	12%	13%	14%	12%	17%	14%	15%	11%	15%
		*	*	*			*						
Not very important	99	20	11	10	31	20	7	32	21	19	14	20	79
	10%	15%	11%	15%	8%	8%	10%	9%	11%	9%	10%	9%	10%
		*	*	*			*						
Not at all important	41	5	5	1	16	11	3	11	9	12	6	3	38
	4%	3%	5%	2%	4%	4%	4%	3%	5%	5%	5%	1%	5%
		*	*	*			*						
Don't know	81	17	10	7	25	17	5	39	10	8	5	14	67
	8%	12%	9%	11%	7%	7%	7%	11%	5%	4%	4%	7%	8%
		*	*	*			*	IJ					
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

4_4. There are a number of factors that the Government of Canada may consider when drafting white-collar crime legislation. Please indicate how important or unimportant you consider each of the following factors. - Legislation should be structured to make it easier for companies to come forward and cooperate with law enforcement

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Top 2 Box (Net)	895	117	93	60	346	214	65	303	168	206	121	195	700
	89%	87%	88%	91%	90%	89%	91%	86%	92%	92%	92%	91%	89%
		*	*	*			*						
Very important	525	62	58	36	206	125	38	177	107	120	63	111	413
	52%	46%	55%	55%	54%	52%	53%	50%	59%	54%	48%	52%	52%
		*	*	*			*						
Somewhat important	371	56	35	24	139	89	27	127	60	86	57	84	287
	37%	41%	33%	37%	36%	37%	38%	36%	33%	38%	43%	39%	36%
		*	*	*			*						
Bottom 2 Box (Net)	43	5	4	1	18	12	3	16	8	8	7	13	30
	4%	3%	4%	2%	5%	5%	4%	4%	5%	4%	6%	6%	4%
		*	*	*			*						
Not very important	31	2	4	1	11	11	2	11	3	8	6	11	20
	3%	1%	4%	2%	3%	5%	3%	3%	2%	3%	5%	5%	3%
		*	*	*			*						
Not at all important	12	3	-	-	7	1	1	5	5	*	1	2	10
	1%	2%	-	-	2%	1%	1%	1%	3%	*	1%	1%	1%
		*	*	*			*		I				
Don't know	66	13	9	4	22	15	3	33	6	10	3	5	60
	7%	9%	8%	7%	6%	6%	5%	9%	3%	4%	3%	2%	8%
		*	*	*			*	HIJ					K
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

4. There are a number of factors that the Government of Canada may consider when drafting white-collar crime legislation. Please indicate how important or unimportant you consider each of the following factors. - Top 2 Box Summary

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Legislation should be structured to target the individual business executives who may have personally broken the law	913	124	91	60	353	220	64	306	176	208	127	191	722
	91%	92%	85%	92%	92%	91%	90%	87%	97%	93%	97%	89%	91%
		*	*	*			*		G	G	G		
Legislation should be structured to ensure that innocent people don't lose their jobs, their pensions or their investments because of the	908	122	92	59	354	215	66	307	168	211	121	193	714
Legislation should be structured to make it easier for companies to come forward and cooperate with law enforcement	90%	91%	86%	90%	92%	89%	93%	87%	92%	94%	92%	91%	90%
		*	*	*			*			G			
	895	117	93	60	346	214	65	303	168	206	121	195	700
	89%	87%	88%	91%	90%	89%	91%	86%	92%	92%	92%	91%	89%
		*	*	*			*						
Legislation should be structured to take into account the negative impact that law enforcement efforts could have on Canadian	782	93	80	47	312	194	56	270	142	184	106	176	606
Statistics:	78%	69%	75%	71%	81%	80%	79%	77%	78%	82%	81%	82%	77%
		*	*	*	A	A	*						

Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

4. There are a number of factors that the Government of Canada may consider when drafting white-collar crime legislation. Please indicate how important or unimportant you consider each of the following factors. - Bottom 2 Box Summary

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Legislation should be structured to take into account the negative impact that law enforcement efforts could have on Canadian	140	24	16	11	47	31	10	43	30	31	20	23	117
Legislation should be structured to ensure that innocent people don't lose their jobs, their pensions or their investments because of the	14%	18%	15%	17%	12%	13%	14%	12%	17%	14%	15%	11%	15%
Legislation should be structured to make it easier for companies to come forward and cooperate with law enforcement		*	*	*			*						
Legislation should be structured to target the individual business executives who may have personally broken the law	48	5	6	3	17	14	3	17	11	6	7	15	32
	5%	3%	6%	5%	4%	6%	4%	5%	6%	3%	5%	7%	4%
		*	*	*			*						
	43	5	4	1	18	12	3	16	8	8	7	13	30
	4%	3%	4%	2%	5%	5%	4%	4%	5%	4%	6%	6%	4%
		*	*	*			*						
	39	3	8	1	14	10	3	17	4	10	2	17	23
	4%	2%	7%	2%	4%	4%	4%	5%	2%	4%	1%	8%	3%
		*	*	*			*					L	

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
[Table of Contents](#)

5. In the United States, the public prosecutor decides the terms of a deferred prosecution agreement with a corporation, without the involvement of a judge. In the UK, a judge is mandated to oversee the terms and conditions. Which do you think would be more effective, a system with or without the involvement of a judge?

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
With the involvement of a judge	888	123	94	52	343	208	68	318	158	192	117	195	694
	88%	91%	89%	79%	89%	86%	96%	90%	87%	86%	89%	91%	88%
		C*	*	*	C		CE*						
Without the involvement of a judge	116	12	12	13	42	34	3	34	24	32	14	19	97
	12%	9%	11%	21%	11%	14%	4%	10%	13%	14%	11%	9%	12%
		*	*	ADF*		F	*						
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

6. Now that you have learned a bit more about the different ways that countries can approach dealing with unethical and corrupt corporate practices, do you think Canada should:

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Stick with the current system which gives prosecutors the choice to 1. Negotiate a guilty plea, 2. Go to court in hopes of securing a	163	22	11	8	70	40	13	68	35	32	20	47	116
Adopt a system like in the U.S. and Britain, which allows prosecutors to 1. Negotiate a guilty plea, 2. Go to court in hopes of securing a	16%	16%	10%	12%	18%	17%	18%	19%	19%	14%	15%	22%	15%
I don't know		*	*	*			*					L	
	677	95	72	50	254	161	44	216	123	166	98	138	539
	67%	71%	67%	77%	66%	67%	62%	61%	67%	74%	75%	65%	68%
		*	*	*			*			G	G		
	164	17	24	7	62	40	14	68	24	25	13	29	136
	16%	13%	23%	11%	16%	17%	20%	19%	13%	11%	10%	13%	17%
		*	*	*			*	IJ					
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
[Table of Contents](#)

7. Please indicate which of the following best described your stance:

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
I am aware of and support the LEAP manifesto.	115	10	6	8	37	51	4	58	24	22	8	22	93
	11%	7%	5%	12%	10%	21%	6%	16%	13%	10%	6%	11%	12%
		*	*	*		ABDF	*	IJ					
I am aware of and do not support the LEAP manifesto.	85	12	20	3	28	20	1	16	19	25	18	22	63
	8%	9%	19%	5%	7%	8%	2%	4%	11%	11%	14%	10%	8%
		*	CDEF*	*			*		G	G	G		
I am not aware of the LEAP manifesto.	624	95	62	42	247	125	52	203	116	138	88	132	492
	62%	70%	59%	65%	64%	52%	72%	58%	64%	62%	67%	62%	62%
		E*	*	*	E		E*						
Don't know	180	18	18	12	73	45	14	75	24	38	18	37	143
	18%	13%	17%	19%	19%	19%	20%	21%	13%	17%	13%	17%	18%
		*	*	*			*	H					
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

GENDER

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Male	487	57	53	34	159	149	36	176	97	108	67	102	385
	49%	42%	50%	52%	41%	62%	50%	50%	54%	48%	51%	48%	49%
		*	*	*		AD	*						
Female	517	78	53	31	226	93	36	176	84	116	65	112	406
	51%	58%	50%	48%	59%	38%	50%	50%	46%	52%	49%	52%	51%
		E*	*	*	E		*						
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
18-34 (Net)	280	37	42	19	95	62	26	105	50	50	36	88	192
	28%	27%	39%	29%	25%	26%	37%	30%	28%	22%	28%	41%	24%
		*	DE*	*			D*					L	
18-24	131	19	23	14	43	22	11	57	14	20	15	41	89
	13%	14%	21%	21%	11%	9%	15%	16%	8%	9%	11%	19%	11%
		*	DE*	DE*			*	HI				L	
25-34	149	18	19	5	52	40	16	49	36	30	21	46	103
	15%	13%	18%	8%	14%	16%	22%	14%	20%	13%	16%	22%	13%
		*	*	*			C*					L	
35-54 (Net)	371	37	21	15	155	113	29	144	66	78	58	115	256
	37%	28%	19%	24%	40%	47%	41%	41%	36%	35%	44%	54%	32%
		*	*	*	ABC	ABC	BC*					L	
35-44	156	17	10	2	66	52	9	55	32	37	25	76	80
	16%	12%	9%	3%	17%	22%	13%	16%	18%	17%	19%	35%	10%
		*	*	*	C	BC	C*					L	
45-54	216	21	11	13	89	61	20	89	34	41	33	40	176
	21%	15%	10%	20%	23%	25%	28%	25%	19%	18%	25%	19%	22%
		*	*	*	B	B	AB*						
55+ (Net)	352	60	44	31	135	66	16	103	66	96	37	11	342
	35%	45%	41%	48%	35%	27%	22%	29%	36%	43%	28%	5%	43%
		EF*	EF*	EF*	F		*			GJ			K
55-64	173	24	24	21	61	33	10	51	34	47	23	11	162
	17%	18%	23%	32%	16%	14%	14%	15%	19%	21%	17%	5%	21%
		*	*	DEF*			*						K
65+	179	36	20	10	74	33	6	52	31	48	15	-	179
	18%	27%	18%	16%	19%	14%	9%	15%	17%	22%	11%	-	23%
		EF*	*	*	F		*			J			K
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Summary													
Mean	46.9	49.4	45.9	48.3	47.6	45.7	42.5	45.7	47.1	49.4	44.9	36.3	49.8
		F*	*	F*	F		*			GJ			K
STD. DEV.	17.02	18.4	19.8	18.09	16.79	15.06	15.66	16.8	16.58	16.74	15.03	10.97	17.24
STD. ERR.	0.54	1.65	1.93	2.1	0.88	0.99	1.5	0.97	1.23	1.09	1.17	0.75	0.61
Median	48	52	46.62	53.77	48.85	45	44.96	47.3	47	50.92	47	36	52

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I/J/K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I/J/K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
[Table of Contents](#)

EDUCATION

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Primary School or less	7	-	2	-	-	4	1	5	-	2	-	-	7
	1%	-	2%	-	-	2%	1%	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%
		*	D*	*		D	D*						
Some high school	108	11	16	4	34	32	12	56	16	21	4	26	82
	11%	8%	15%	6%	9%	13%	17%	16%	9%	9%	3%	12%	10%
		*	*	*			CD*	IJ					
Graduated high school	341	39	29	32	132	86	23	137	74	65	27	69	272
	34%	29%	27%	49%	34%	36%	33%	39%	41%	29%	21%	32%	34%
		*	*	ABD*			*	IJ	IJ				
Some college / CEGEP / Trade School	119	18	13	5	51	24	8	46	19	28	13	27	92
	12%	13%	13%	8%	13%	10%	11%	13%	10%	12%	10%	13%	12%
		*	*	*			*						
Graduated from college / CEGEP / Trade School	199	33	17	9	76	46	18	58	33	52	28	39	159
	20%	24%	16%	14%	20%	19%	25%	16%	18%	23%	21%	18%	20%
		*	*	*			*						
Some university, but did not finish	76	14	12	3	27	17	3	27	11	18	14	11	66
	8%	11%	11%	5%	7%	7%	4%	8%	6%	8%	11%	5%	8%
		*	*	*			*						
University undergraduate degree, such as a Bachelor's Degree	99	11	11	6	42	22	6	17	17	23	30	29	70
	10%	8%	10%	10%	11%	9%	9%	5%	10%	10%	23%	14%	9%
		*	*	*			*			G	GHI		
University graduate degree, such as a Master's or PhD	56	9	6	6	23	10	1	8	11	16	14	13	43
	6%	7%	6%	9%	6%	4%	1%	2%	6%	7%	11%	6%	5%
		*	*	F*			*		G	G	G		
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Summary													
<HS	115	11	18	4	34	36	13	61	16	23	4	26	89
	11%	8%	17%	6%	9%	15%	18%	17%	9%	10%	3%	12%	11%
		*	D*	*		D	ACD*	HIJ		J			
HS	341	39	29	32	132	86	23	137	74	65	27	69	272
	34%	29%	27%	49%	34%	36%	33%	39%	41%	29%	21%	32%	34%
		*	*	ABD*			*	IJ	IJ				
Post Sec	394	65	43	17	153	87	28	130	63	98	55	77	317
	39%	48%	40%	27%	40%	36%	39%	37%	34%	44%	42%	36%	40%
		C*	*	*			*						
Univ Grad	155	20	18	12	66	32	7	25	29	38	44	42	112
	15%	15%	16%	19%	17%	13%	10%	7%	16%	17%	34%	20%	14%
		*	*	*			*		G	G	GHI		

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

REGION

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
BC	135	135	-	-	-	-	-	48	36	27	16	22	112
	13%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	13%	20%	12%	12%	10%	14%
		BCDEF*	*	*			*						
AB	107	-	107	-	-	-	-	22	13	29	22	27	79
	11%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	6%	7%	13%	17%	13%	10%
		*	ACDEF*	*			*			G	GH		
SK/MB	65	-	-	65	-	-	-	21	12	17	5	5	61
	7%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	6%	7%	8%	4%	2%	8%
		*	*	ABDEF*			*						K
Ontario	385	-	-	-	385	-	-	133	54	82	67	89	295
	38%	-	-	-	100%	-	-	38%	30%	37%	51%	42%	37%
		*	*	*	ABCEF		*				GHI		
Quebec	241	-	-	-	-	241	-	100	50	59	16	59	182
	24%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	29%	28%	26%	12%	28%	23%
		*	*	*		ABCDF	*	J	J	J			
Atlantic	71	-	-	-	-	-	71	29	17	10	5	11	60
	7%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	8%	9%	5%	4%	5%	8%
		*	*	*			ABCDE*						
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
 Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
 Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
 Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
 Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

INCOME

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
<\$25K	196	29	15	17	67	50	18	196	-	-	-	34	162
	20%	21%	14%	26%	17%	21%	25%	56%	-	-	-	16%	20%
		*	*	*			*	HIJ					
\$25K - <\$55K	309	44	17	16	109	97	26	156	152	-	-	56	253
	31%	33%	16%	24%	28%	40%	36%	44%	84%	-	-	26%	32%
		B*	*	*	B	BCD	B*	IJ	GIJ				
\$55K - <\$100K	253	38	31	18	92	62	12	-	30	223	-	62	192
	25%	28%	29%	28%	24%	26%	17%	-	16%	100%	-	29%	24%
		*	*	*			*		GJ	GHJ			
\$100K - <\$150K	103	13	16	4	52	14	4	-	-	-	103	36	66
	10%	9%	15%	6%	14%	6%	6%	-	-	-	78%	17%	8%
		*	E*	*	E		*				GHI	L	
\$150K+	29	3	7	1	15	2	1	-	-	-	29	8	21
	3%	3%	6%	1%	4%	1%	2%	-	-	-	22%	4%	3%
		*	E*	*			*				GHI		
Prefer not to answer	115	8	21	10	49	16	11	-	-	-	-	18	97
	11%	6%	20%	15%	13%	7%	15%	-	-	-	-	8%	12%
		*	AE*	*	E		AE*						
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Summary													
Under \$50K	443	64	25	29	157	130	38	352	90	-	-	77	365
	44%	47%	24%	44%	41%	54%	53%	100%	50%	-	-	36%	46%
		B*	*	B*	B	BD	BD*	HIJ	IJ				K
\$50K+	446	63	60	27	178	96	23	-	92	223	131	118	328
	44%	47%	56%	41%	46%	40%	32%	-	50%	100%	100%	55%	42%
		F*	EF*	*	F		*		G	GH	GH	L	
Under \$40K	352	48	22	21	133	100	29	352	-	-	-	65	287
	35%	35%	20%	33%	34%	42%	40%	100%	-	-	-	31%	36%
		B*	*	*	B	B	B*	HIJ					
\$40K to less than \$60K	182	36	13	12	54	50	17	-	182	-	-	34	148
	18%	27%	12%	18%	14%	21%	23%	-	100%	-	-	16%	19%
		BD*	*	*			BD*		GIJ				
\$60K to less than \$100K	223	27	29	17	82	59	10	-	-	223	-	52	171
	22%	20%	27%	26%	21%	24%	14%	-	-	100%	-	25%	22%
		*	F*	*			*			GHJ			
\$100K or more	131	16	22	5	67	16	5	-	-	-	131	44	87
	13%	12%	21%	7%	17%	7%	7%	-	-	-	100%	21%	11%
		*	CEF*	*	EF		*				GHI	L	
Mean (,000)	59.5	57.5		51.5	64.2	50.5	50.8	23.2	49.6	77.3	140.3	67.8	57.2
		*	ACDEF*	*	EF		*		G	GH	GHI	L	
STD. DEV.	43.87	50.18	52.83	36.29	46.27	31.25	37.24	9.43	5.13	11.3	42.38	45.71	43.08
STD. ERR.	1.47	4.46	5.72	4.87	2.53	2.08	4.79	0.5	0.38	0.76	3.7	3.27	1.64

Statistics:
Overlap formula used

- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Kids	214	22	27	5	89	59	11	65	34	52	44	214	-
	21%	17%	25%	7%	23%	24%	15%	19%	19%	23%	34%	100%	-
		*	C*	*	C	C	*				GH	L	
No Kids	790	112	79	61	295	182	60	287	148	171	87	-	790
	79%	83%	75%	93%	77%	76%	85%	81%	81%	77%	66%	-	100%
		*	*	BDE*			*	J	J				K
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

HHCMP1. How many people are living or staying at your current address?

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
1	246	32	30	17	77	69	20	142	42	28	6	-	246
	24%	24%	28%	27%	20%	29%	27%	40%	23%	13%	4%	-	31%
		*	*	*		D	*	HIJ	IJ	J			K
2	398	61	38	31	147	94	27	108	84	109	51	13	384
	40%	46%	36%	48%	38%	39%	37%	31%	46%	49%	39%	6%	49%
		*	*	*			*		G	G			K
3	179	27	14	9	77	39	14	60	26	48	30	81	97
	18%	20%	13%	14%	20%	16%	19%	17%	15%	22%	23%	38%	12%
		*	*	*			*					L	
4	102	10	12	5	47	19	7	20	17	22	27	58	43
	10%	8%	11%	8%	12%	8%	10%	6%	9%	10%	20%	27%	5%
		*	*	*			*				GHI	L	
5	58	2	12	1	25	16	3	16	5	14	14	42	16
	6%	1%	11%	1%	7%	7%	5%	5%	3%	6%	11%	20%	2%
		*	AC*	*	A	A	*				GH	L	
6	17	2	-	2	11	2	1	5	5	2	3	14	4
	2%	2%	-	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%	6%	*
		*	*	*			*					L	
7	3	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	2	*	-	3	-
	*	-	-	-	*	1%	-	-	1%	*	-	2%	-
		*	*	*			*					L	
9	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-
	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-
		*	*	*			*						
12+	1	-	-	-	-	*	1	1	-	-	-	*	1
	*	-	-	-	-	*	1%	*	-	-	-	*	*
		*	*	*			*						
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)

EMPLOYMENT STATUS

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Employed full-time	340	43	38	17	106	112	25	83	71	90	78	116	224
	34%	32%	35%	26%	27%	46%	36%	24%	39%	40%	59%	54%	28%
		*	*	*		ACD	*		G	G	GHI	L	
Employed part-time	138	15	13	8	72	22	8	53	25	32	11	28	110
	14%	11%	12%	13%	19%	9%	11%	15%	14%	15%	8%	13%	14%
		*	*	*	E		*						
Self employed	47	4	1	6	19	15	3	14	9	11	11	13	35
	5%	3%	1%	9%	5%	6%	4%	4%	5%	5%	8%	6%	4%
		*	*	B*			*						
Unemployed but looking for a job	63	5	13	5	20	14	6	35	14	7	1	8	55
	6%	4%	12%	8%	5%	6%	8%	10%	7%	3%	1%	4%	7%
		*	AD*	*			*	IJ	J				
Unemployed and not looking for a job/Long-term sick or disabled	76	8	5	5	42	11	5	55	2	10	5	5	71
	8%	6%	5%	7%	11%	4%	6%	16%	1%	4%	4%	2%	9%
		*	*	*	E		*	HIJ					K
Full-time parent, homemaker	39	10	2	-	17	6	4	17	12	3	4	24	16
	4%	7%	2%	-	4%	3%	5%	5%	6%	1%	3%	11%	2%
		*	*	*			*		I			L	
Retired	238	42	23	19	91	50	13	74	46	61	17	2	236
	24%	31%	22%	29%	24%	21%	18%	21%	25%	27%	13%	1%	30%
		F*	*	*			*		J	J			K
Student/Pupil	52	8	9	5	13	11	6	19	4	9	3	17	35
	5%	6%	8%	7%	3%	4%	8%	5%	2%	4%	2%	8%	4%
		*	*	*			*						
Prefer not to answer	10	-	2	*	4	2	2	2	1	-	2	1	9
	1%	-	2%	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	-	2%	1%	1%
		*	*	*			A*						
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

USMAR2. What is your marital status?

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Single, never married	354	44	35	28	121	96	29	176	54	51	24	53	301
	35%	33%	33%	43%	32%	40%	41%	50%	30%	23%	19%	25%	38%
		*	*	*			*	HIJ	J				K
Living with partner	115	17	14	3	33	44	5	29	28	34	16	42	73
	11%	12%	13%	4%	8%	18%	8%	8%	15%	15%	12%	20%	9%
		*	*	*		CDF	*		G	G		L	
Married	399	57	39	28	175	73	27	75	74	121	87	107	291
	40%	42%	37%	43%	46%	30%	37%	21%	41%	54%	66%	50%	37%
		E*	*	*	E		*		G	GH	GHI	L	
Widowed	36	4	7	-	17	5	2	18	5	4	-	4	32
	4%	3%	7%	-	4%	2%	3%	5%	3%	2%	-	2%	4%
		*	*	*			*	J					
Divorced or separated	100	13	11	6	39	23	8	54	21	14	3	7	93
	10%	9%	10%	9%	10%	10%	11%	15%	11%	6%	3%	3%	12%
		*	*	*			*	IJ	J				K
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
[Table of Contents](#)

US01PGS. How much of your household's grocery shopping do you, yourself, do?

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
All of it	495	64	42	32	184	133	40	224	92	100	40	93	402
	49%	48%	40%	49%	48%	55%	57%	64%	51%	45%	30%	44%	51%
		*	*	*		B	B*	HIJ	J	J			
Almost all of it	218	34	22	12	100	42	8	54	45	64	29	50	168
	22%	25%	21%	19%	26%	17%	11%	15%	25%	29%	22%	23%	21%
		F*	*	*	EF		*		G	G			
About half of it	181	19	26	16	62	47	11	53	29	45	33	44	138
	18%	14%	24%	24%	16%	19%	16%	15%	16%	20%	25%	21%	17%
		*	*	*			*				G		
Less than half of it	85	11	14	6	31	14	9	17	12	8	26	18	67
	8%	8%	13%	9%	8%	6%	12%	5%	7%	4%	20%	8%	8%
		*	E*	*			*				GHI		
None	25	6	2	-	8	6	3	4	3	6	4	9	16
	2%	5%	2%	-	2%	3%	4%	1%	2%	3%	3%	4%	2%
		*	*	*			*						
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:
Overlap formula used
- Column Proportions:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
[Table of Contents](#)

CAETHN2. Sometimes people identify themselves with a specific ethnicity or cultural background which is different from their citizenship or nationality. Thinking about your own identity in ethnic or cultural terms, please select which group you most identify yourself with.

		REGION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME				HOUSEHOLD	
	Total	BC	AB	SK/MB	Ontario	Quebec	Atlantic	<\$40K	\$40K - <\$60K	\$60K - <\$100K	\$100K+	Kids	No Kids
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Base: All Respondents (unwtd)	1004	124	105	74	360	232	109	302	181	234	164	215	789
Base: All Respondents (wtd)	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
Aboriginal (North American Indian, Métis, Inuit, etc.)	18	4	-	5	4	4	1	13	2	-	-	7	11
	2%	3%	-	7%	1%	2%	2%	4%	1%	-	-	3%	1%
		*	*	BDE*			*	IJ					
African	4	-	-	*	2	2	*	1	1	1	*	2	2
	*	-	-	1%	*	1%	*	*	1%	1%	*	1%	*
		*	*	*			*						
American (US)	7	2	-	-	3	3	-	4	*	2	-	4	3
	1%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	-	1%	*	1%	-	2%	*
		*	*	*			*						
Arabic / Middle Eastern	5	-	1	-	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	3
	*	-	1%	-	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	*
		*	*	*			*						
British	35	8	3	1	21	-	-	7	4	9	10	2	32
	3%	6%	3%	2%	6%	-	-	2%	2%	4%	7%	1%	4%
		EF*	E*	*	EF		*				GH		
Canadian	775	102	84	46	280	198	65	268	151	177	95	150	626
	77%	76%	79%	70%	73%	82%	92%	76%	83%	79%	72%	70%	79%
		*	*	*		CD	ABCDE*		J				K
Caribbean (not including Jamaican)	5	-	-	-	4	2	-	1	2	-	-	2	3
	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	*	1%	-	-	1%	*
		*	*	*			*						
Chinese	26	5	2	1	17	*	-	4	4	3	9	5	21
	3%	4%	2%	1%	5%	*	-	1%	2%	1%	7%	3%	3%
		E*	*	*	E		*				GI		
Dutch (Netherlands)	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*
		*	*	*			*						
East Indian (India)	8	1	1	-	5	1	-	1	3	3	2	3	5
	1%	1%	*	-	1%	*	-	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
		*	*	*			*						
Filipino	12	2	3	2	4	1	-	7	-	4	-	4	8
	1%	2%	3%	2%	1%	*	-	2%	-	2%	-	2%	1%
		*	*	*			*						
French	11	-	-	-	1	10	1	4	2	4	-	4	8
	1%	-	-	-	*	4%	2%	1%	1%	2%	-	2%	1%
		*	*	*		AD	D*						
German	7	1	3	1	3	-	-	3	-	2	1	1	6
	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	1%	*	1%
		*	E*	*			*						
Greek	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	1
	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	*
		*	*	*			*						
Hungarian	1	-	-	-	1	*	-	*	1	-	-	-	1
	*	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	1%	-	-	-	*
		*	*	*			*						
Iranian	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	*	2	-	2	*
	*	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	*	1%	-	1%	*
		*	*	*			*						

Irish	11	2	*	2	4	2	*	3	1	4	1	4	7
	1%	2%	*	3%	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%
Italian	8	-	-	*	6	2	-	3	*	3	2	5	3
	1%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	*	1%	2%	3%	*
Jamaican / Caribbean	3	-	-	-	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	3
	*	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	*
Japanese	2	-	*	-	2	-	*	*	-	*	2	2	1
	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	*	-	*	1%	1%	*
Korean	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	2
	*	1%	-	-	*	-	-	*	1%	-	-	-	*
Latin American (other than Mexican)	2	-	-	2	-	*	-	2	-	*	-	-	2
	*	-	-	3%	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	*
Mexican	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
	*	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-
Pakistani	3	1	-	-	2	*	-	1	1	*	-	2	1
	*	*	-	-	*	*	-	*	*	*	-	1%	*
Polish	6	-	-	-	4	2	-	2	1	2	1	1	5
	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	*	*	1%
Russian	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*
Ukrainian	11	-	3	5	2	1	-	4	*	1	4	2	8
	1%	-	3%	7%	1%	*	-	1%	*	1%	3%	1%	1%
Vietnamese	3	-	-	-	3	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	2
	*	-	-	-	1%	-	-	*	-	-	-	1%	*
Other Central / Eastern European (Romanian, Slovak, etc.)	4	-	*	-	2	2	-	1	1	*	2	1	3
	*	-	*	-	*	1%	-	*	1%	*	1%	*	*
Other Western European (Belgium, Norway, etc.)	3	1	*	-	-	1	*	-	1	1	*	-	3
	*	1%	*	-	-	*	*	-	*	*	*	-	*
Other South Asian / South East Asian (Bangladeshi, Indonesian, etc.)	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	2
	*	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	*	-	-	*
Other	14	4	1	*	4	5	-	10	2	1	1	4	10
	1%	3%	*	1%	1%	2%	-	3%	1%	*	1%	2%	1%
Prefer not to say	9	-	-	1	6	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	8
	1%	-	-	1%	1%	*	2%	1%	1%	*	*	1%	1%
Sigma	1004	135	107	65	385	241	71	352	182	223	131	214	790
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Statistics:

Overlap formula used

- Column Proportions:

Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)
- Column Means:
Columns Tested (5%): A/B/C/D/E/F,G/H/I/J,K/L
Minimum Base: 30 (**), Small Base: 100 (*)

[Table of Contents](#)