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# Executive Summary

Léger is pleased to present the Privy Council Office with this report on findings from a series of focus groups and a quantitative survey aimed at capturing Canadians’ perceptions of current events that are relevant to the Government of Canada.

This report was prepared by Léger who was contracted by the Privy Council Office (contract number 35035-145078-001/CY awarded October 10th, 2014).

## 1.1 Background and Objectives

The Communications and Consultations Secretariat of the Privy Council Office (PCO) provides advice and support to the Government of Canada, the Clerk of the Privy Council and to departments/agencies on matters relating to communications and consultations, and facilitates the coordination of the Government of Canada’s activities in these areas. One tool used in order to fulfill its mandate is public opinion research.

PCO mandated Léger to conduct a survey and focus groups to explore in more detail the concerns and the perceptions of Canadians on current events that are relevant to the federal government.

Through the use of a survey and focus groups, PCO wanted to explore the perceptions of Canadians on the state of current events, including for example, their opinions on the current state of the economy. This input is needed because complex issues are often difficult to communicate to the Canadian public in a manner that is easily and clearly understood. By carrying out this research the Canadian Government will be able to ensure a better understanding of the views and concerns of the public and to develop effective communications strategies and products.

## 1.2 Methodology

**Qualitative Research**

A series of sixteen (16) focus groups was held during the course of this research. At each location, groups were comprised of Canadians aged 18 and over, containing a good mix of gender as well as ethnic and educational backgrounds. In addition, groups were split according to income categories. One group in each location was held with participants who have an individual income of less than $75,000 (or a family income of less than $100,000), while the other was held with those who have an individual income of $75,000 or more (or a family income of $100,000 or more). All participants were also head or co-head of households. The schedule and locations of the groups are presented in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Location** | **Date** | **Time** | **Language** |
| Vancouver, British Columbia  | Saturday, 18 October 2014  | 1st group: 10:00AM-11:30AM 2nd group: 12:00PM-1:30PM | English |
| Calgary, Alberta | Monday, 20 October 2014  | 1st group: 5:30PM-7:00PM 2nd group: 7:30PM-9:00PM | English |
| North York, Ontario  | Tuesday, 21 October 2014 | 1st group: 5:30PM-7:00PM 2nd group: 7:30PM-9:00PM | English |
| Montreal, Quebec | Saturday, 25 October 2014  | 1st group: 10:00AM-11:30AM 2nd group: 12:00PM-1:30PM | French |
| Moncton, New Brunswick | Monday, 3 November 2014  | 1st group: 5:30PM-7:00PM 2nd group: 7:30PM-9:00PM | English |
| Kitchener, Ontario | Tuesday, 4 November 2014 | 1st group: 5:30PM-7:00PM 2nd group: 7:30PM-9:00PM | English |
| Mississauga, Ontario | Wednesday, 5 November 2014 | 1st group: 5:30PM-7:00PM 2nd group: 7:30PM-9:00PM | English |
| Quebec City,Quebec | Thursday, 6 November 2014 | 1st group: 5:30PM-7:00PM 2nd group: 7:30PM-9:00PM | French |

Twelve (12) participants were recruited for each focus group, ensuring that a minimum of 8 to 10 recruits attended. All participants were recruited over the phone using a recruitment screening questionnaire, presented in Appendix B. Participating individuals were given a $75 cash incentive to compensate them for their time and cover basic travel expenses.

**Quantitative Research**

The quantitative portion of the research was conducted over the phone. Fieldwork for the survey was held from October 17th to November 2nd, 2014. The national response rate for the survey was 18.9%. Complete call dispositions are presented in Appendix A. A pre-test of 30 interviews, 15 in each official language, was completed on October 16th, 2014. Survey interviews lasted 6 minutes on average.

In total, 3,000 adult Canadians were interviewed in all regions of the country. The national margin of error for the survey is +/- 1.8% in 19 times out of 20. The complete survey questionnaire used during fieldwork is included in Appendix D.

Survey data were weighted by age, gender and region to ensure that they were fully-representative of the Canadian adult population. Details regarding the weighting procedures can be found in Appendix A. Detailed statistical tables are provided under separate cover.

## 1.3 Overview of Qualitative Findings

**Top-of-Mind Priorities for Canadians**

When asked to identify what the Canadian Government’s main priorities should be, fostering economic growth and creating quality jobs were mentioned most often, but a wide array of issues were raised as well. Many participants across all locations talked about the need for Canada’s economy to become more diversified. There was a sense that Canada relied too much on a handful of sectors or provinces to sustain itself.

The environment and sustainability were also mentioned by many, particularly in Quebec City, Montreal, Vancouver and Calgary. Improving public safety and fighting poverty, especially among children, were other priorities raised spontaneously by participants.

**State of the Canadian Economy**

Most participants had a rather lukewarm outlook on the Canadian economy. They were neither upbeat, nor outright negative about the state of the economy. There was a pervasive sense that the country’s economy could be stronger than it is, while also not being as bad as it could be. Clearly, the 2008-2009 economic downturn was still present in participants’ minds, with most not being convinced that Canada had fully-recovered five years later.

Yet, Canada was also seen to have come out of the recession better than most other countries, including its major trading partners in the US and Europe. Canada’s strong banking sector was identified by many as the reason for the country’s resiliency compared to the United States and Europe.

**Ebola Crisis**

Participants had almost unanimously heard about the Ebola crisis in Western Africa in the media. Views of the crisis and its impact on Canadians proved to be highly complex. On the one hand, participants felt that the situation in Africa was sad and scary for the local population in affected countries. Yet when asked about what they had heard about Ebola, participants had a clear tendency to focus their attention on the North American angle to the crisis. More specifically, they talked about the situation in Texas, where a Liberian national had arrived in the United State with the virus and consequently triggered a large-scale containment effort. Most participants felt that the media in the United States and in Canada largely overstated the risks and created a false sense of panic among the general population.

**Public Safety**

The focus group schedule for this research project was impacted by the attacks perpetrated in St-Jean-sur-Richelieuand Ottawa on October 20th and 22nd. The Vancouver, Calgary and North York groups were held prior to the attacks (North York was held after the St-Jean-sur-Richelieu incident, but prior to the Ottawa attack), while those in Montreal, Moncton, Kitchener, Mississauga and Quebec City were held subsequently.

While the attacks were seen as extremely shocking and disturbing by all participants, most of them did not feel personally threatened by extremism and said they would not change their daily habits. Nevertheless, participants were mostly in agreement with the fact that increased security measures may need to be taken, especially with regards to electronic surveillance and swifter police intervention against suspected terrorists.

**The Islamic State (ISIS or ISIL)**

One of the main finding from discussions about this international threat is that there are no redeeming features to ISIS. This organisation was seen as bad, evil. Although a couple of participants talked about the need to understand how it came into existence before posing a final judgement, all others were unanimous in condemning its actions and its objectives. Everything about ISIS was seen as indefensible.

This unequivocal stance about ISIS meant that most participants were favourable to Canada’s military involvement in Iraq and nearly all participants favoured diverse forms of humanitarian assistance as well. It was hard for most participants to accept that Canada could sit on the sidelines while its allies decided to engage this international threat.

A few participants across all locations were cognisant of the fact that Canadian citizens had enrolled in ISIS over the past few years. They felt highly disturbed by this reality and unanimously felt that removing Canadian passports from anyone suspected of wanting to join ISIS was a perfectly reasonable measure.

## 1.4 Note on Interpretation of Research Findings

The views and observations expressed in this document do not reflect those of the Privy Council Office. This report was compiled by Léger based on the research conducted specifically for this project.

While care and consideration was taken to represent the target audience, findings from this qualitative research (i.e. focus groups) should be considered directional only and results should not be projected as representative of the entire Canadian population. It is intended to provide deeper insight into the underlying reasons for opinions or lack thereof.

## 1.5 Political Neutrality Statement and Contact Information

Léger certifies that the final deliverables fully comply with the Government of Canada’s political neutrality requirements outlined in the *Communications Policy* of the Government of Canada and Procedures for Planning and Contracting Public Opinion Research.

Additional information

Supplier name: Léger

PWGSC Contract Number: 35035-145078-001/CY

Contract Award Date: October 10th, 2014

The expenditure for this project is $151,445.77 (including HST).

To obtain more information on this study, please email por-rop@pco-bcp.gc.ca

# Sommaire

Léger est heureuse de présenter au Bureau du Conseil privé ce rapport contenant les faits saillants tirés d’une série de groupes de discussion et d’un sondage quantitatif visant à illustrer les perceptions des Canadiens relativement aux événements qui revêtent de l’importance aux yeux du gouvernement du Canada.

Ce rapport a été préparé par la firme Léger, qui a été mandatée par le Bureau du Conseil privé (numéro de contrat 35035-145078-001/CY, octroyé le 10 octobre 2014).

## 2.1 Mise en contexte et objectifs

Le Secrétariat des communications et des consultations du Bureau du Conseil privé (BCP) conseille et soutient le gouvernement du Canada, le greffier du Bureau du Conseil privé ainsi que les services et les agences en matière de communications et de consultations, et le Secrétariat facilite la coordination des activités du gouvernement du Canada reliées à ces domaines. L’un des outils employés par le Secrétariat pour remplir son mandat est la recherche sur l’opinion publique.

Le BCP a confié à Léger le mandat de mener un sondage et des groupes de discussion pour explorer plus en détail les préoccupations et les perceptions des Canadiens à propos d’événements de l’actualité qui revêtent de l’importance aux yeux du gouvernement fédéral.

Par l’entremise d’un sondage et de groupes de discussion, le BCP souhaitait explorer les perceptions des Canadiens par rapport à certains événements, dont, par exemple, l’état actuel de l’économie. Ces données sont importantes puisque les enjeux complexes sont souvent difficiles à communiquer au public canadien de manière facilement intelligible. En menant cette recherche, le gouvernement canadien sera en mesure de s’assurer une meilleure compréhension des points de vue et des préoccupations du public et de développer des stratégies et des produits de communication efficaces.

## 2.2 Méthodologie

**Recherche qualitative**

Une série de seize (16) groupes de discussion a été menée dans le cadre de cette recherche. Dans chaque lieu, les groupes étaient formés de Canadiens âgés de 18 ans ou plus, avec une représentation équitable des sexes et une diversification des origines ethniques et du niveau de scolarité. De plus, les groupes étaient séparés en fonction de leur fourchette de revenus. Pour chacun des lieux, un groupe de discussion était formé de participants dont le revenu personnel est de moins de 75 000 $ (ou dont le revenu familial est de moins de 100 000 $) et l’autre était formé d’individus dont le revenu personnel est de 75 000 $ ou plus (ou dont le revenu familial est de 100 000 $ ou plus). Tous les participants étaient aussi chefs ou cochefs de leur ménage. L’horaire et l’emplacement des groupes sont présentés dans le tableau ci-dessous.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Emplacement** | **Date** | **Heure** | **Langue** |
| Vancouver, Colombie-Britannique  | Samedi 18 octobre 2014  | 1er groupe : de 10 h à 11 h 302e groupe : de 12 h à 13 h 30 | Anglais |
| Calgary, Alberta | Lundi 20 octobre 2014  | 1er groupe : de 17 h 30 à 19 h2e groupe : de 19 h 30 à 21 h | Anglais |
| North York, Ontario  | Mardi 21 octobre 2014 | 1er groupe : de 17 h 30 à 19 h2e groupe : de 19 h 30 à 21 h | Anglais |
| Montréal, Québec | Samedi 25 octobre 2014  | 1er groupe : de 10 h à 11 h 302e groupe : de 12 h à 13 h 30 | Français |
| Moncton, Nouveau-Brunswick | Lundi 3 novembre 2014  | 1er groupe : de 17 h 30 à 19 h2e groupe : de 19 h 30 à 21 h | Anglais |
| Kitchener, Ontario | Mardi 4 novembre 2014 | 1er groupe : de 17 h 30 à 19 h2e groupe : de 19 h 30 à 21 h | Anglais |
| Mississauga, Ontario | Mercredi 5 novembre 2014 | 1er groupe : de 17 h 30 à 19 h2e groupe : de 19 h 30 à 21 h | Anglais |
| Québec,Québec | Jeudi 6 novembre 2014 | 1er groupe : de 17 h 30 à 19 h2e groupe : de 19 h 30 à 21 h | Français |

Douze (12) participants ont été recrutés pour chaque groupe de discussion de manière à assurer la présence d’un minimum de huit (8) à dix (10) personnes recrutées. Tous les participants ont été recrutés par téléphone à l’aide d’un questionnaire de dépistage, présenté à l’annexe B. Les individus qui ont accepté de participer recevront la somme de 75 $ en argent comptant pour les remercier de leur temps et couvrir leurs frais de déplacement.

**Recherche quantitative**

La portion quantitative de la recherche a été menée par téléphone. Le travail sur le terrain réalisé dans le cadre du sondage s’est déroulé entre le 17 octobre et le 2 novembre 2014. Le taux de réponse national au sondage a été de 18,9 %. La répartition complète des appels est présentée à l’annexe A. Un prétest de 30 entrevues, soit 15 dans chaque langue officielle, a été réalisé le 16 octobre 2014. Les entrevues de sondage ont duré 6 minutes en moyenne.

En tout, 3 000 adultes canadiens ont été sondés dans toutes les régions du pays. La marge nationale d’erreur de ce sondage est de +/- 1,8 %, 19 fois sur 20. Le questionnaire du sondage complet utilisé durant le travail sur le terrain est inclus à l’annexe D.

Les données du sondage ont été pondérées sur la base de l’âge, du sexe et de la région, et ce, pour assurer une représentation réaliste de la population canadienne adulte. Les détails concernant les procédures de pondération peuvent être trouvés à l’annexe A. Des tableaux statistiques détaillés sont fournis séparément.

## 2.3 Aperçu des conclusions relatives à la portion qualitative

**Principales priorités pour les Canadiens**

Lorsqu’on a voulu savoir quelles devraient être les principales priorités du gouvernement canadien, les réponses les plus fréquemment mentionnées étaient la croissance économique et la création d’emplois de qualité, mais une grande quantité de questions ont également été soulevées. Dans tous les groupes, de nombreux participants ont parlé de la nécessité de diversifier davantage l’économie canadienne. L’impression que le Canada compte trop sur une poignée de secteurs ou de provinces pour se maintenir à flot s’est dégagée.

L’environnement et le développement durable ont également été mentionnés par un bon nombre de participants, en particulier dans les villes de Québec, Montréal, Vancouver et Calgary. L’amélioration de la sécurité publique et la lutte contre la pauvreté, en particulier chez les enfants, sont d’autres priorités exprimées spontanément par les participants.

**État de l’économie canadienne**

La plupart des participants avaient une vision plutôt mitigée de l’économie canadienne. Ils n’étaient ni optimistes ni carrément pessimistes quant à l’état de l’économie. Le sentiment prévalant était que l’économie du pays pourrait être plus forte qu’elle ne l’est, tout en n’étant pas aussi mauvaise qu’elle pourrait l’être. De toute évidence, la crise économique de 2008-2009 était encore présente à l’esprit des participants; la majorité d’entre eux n’était pas persuadée que le Canada s’en soit complètement remis, cinq ans plus tard.

Pourtant, le Canada était également considéré comme s’étant mieux sorti de la récession que la plupart des autres pays, y compris ses principaux partenaires commerciaux aux États-Unis et en Europe. Plusieurs participants considèrent que le solide secteur bancaire canadien explique la résilience du pays comparativement aux États-Unis et à l’Europe.

**La crise de l’Ebola**

Les participants avaient presque tous entendu parler, dans les médias, de la crise de l’Ebola en Afrique de l’Ouest. Les points de vue concernant la crise et ses impacts sur les Canadiens se sont avérés très complexes. D’une part, les participants ont estimé que la situation en Afrique était triste et effrayante pour la population des pays touchés. D’autre part, lorsqu’on les interroge sur ce qu’ils ont entendu sur l’Ebola, les participants ont une nette tendance à concentrer leur attention sur l’angle nord-américain de la crise. Plus précisément, ils ont parlé de la situation au Texas (États-Unis), où un ressortissant libérien contaminé par le virus est entré, ce qui a exigé un effort de confinement à grande échelle. La plupart des participants ont estimé que les médias aux États-Unis et au Canada ont largement surestimé les risques et ont semé une panique injustifiée au sein de la population générale.

**Sécurité publique**

Le calendrier des groupes de discussion pour ce projet de recherche a été touché par les attentats perpétrés à Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu et à Ottawa les 20 et 22 octobre. Les séances de Vancouver, de Calgary et de North York ont eu lieu avant les attentats (celle de North York a eu lieu après la fusillade de Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, mais avant celle d’Ottawa), tandis que les rencontres prévues à Montréal, Moncton, Kitchener, Mississauga et Québec ont eu lieu par la suite.

Alors que les attentats sont considérés comme extrêmement bouleversants et inquiétants par tous les participants, la plupart de ces derniers ne se sentent pas personnellement menacés par l’extrémisme et affirment ne pas avoir l’intention de modifier leurs habitudes quotidiennes. Toutefois, les participants étaient pour la plupart en accord avec le fait que le renforcement des mesures de sécurité peut être nécessaire, particulièrement en ce qui concerne la surveillance électronique et l’intervention plus rapide de la police contre de présumés terroristes.

**L’État islamique (EI)**

L’une des principales conclusions qui émergent des discussions au sujet de cette menace internationale est qu’il n’y a rien de bon dans l’EI. Cette organisation est perçue comme mauvaise et néfaste. Bien que quelques participants aient parlé de la nécessité de comprendre les fondements de l’organisation avant de poser un jugement définitif, tous les autres ont unanimement condamné ses actions et ses objectifs. Tout ce que concerne l’EI est considéré comme inacceptable.

Cette prise de position sans équivoque sur l’EI signifiait que la plupart des participants appuyaient la participation militaire du Canada en Irak et que presque tous les participants étaient également en accord avec le fait d’offrir diverses formes d’aide humanitaire. Il était difficile pour la plupart des participants d’accepter que le Canada puisse rester à l’écart alors que ses alliés ont décidé de lutter contre cette menace internationale.

Quelques participants des différents groupes étaient conscients du fait que des citoyens canadiens avaient adhéré à l’EI au cours des dernières années. Ils étaient très perturbés par cette réalité et tous jugeaient raisonnable la mesure de suppression du passeport canadien chez toute personne soupçonnée de vouloir joindre l’EI.

## 2.4 Note sur l’interprétation des conclusions de la recherche

Les opinions et les observations exprimées dans ce document ne reflètent pas celles du Bureau du Conseil privé. Ce rapport a été rédigé par la firme Léger d’après la recherche menée expressément pour ce projet.

Bien que toutes les précautions aient été prises pour représenter le public cible, les conclusions de cette recherche qualitative (c.-à-d. les groupes de discussion) devraient être considérées comme purement indicatives et les résultats ne devraient pas être généralisés à l’ensemble de la population canadienne. Cette recherche vise à permettre une meilleure compréhension des raisons sous-jacentes à une opinion ou à l’absence d’opinion.

## 2.5 Déclaration de neutralité politique et coordonnées

Léger certifie que les résultats livrés sont entièrement conformes aux exigences du gouvernement du Canada en matière de neutralité politique, exigences décrites dans la *Politique de communication* du gouvernement du Canada et dans la *Procédure de planification et d’attribution de marchés de services de recherche sur l’opinion publique*.

Renseignements supplémentaires :

Nom du fournisseur : Léger

Numéro de contrat TPSGC : 35035-145078-001/CY

Date d’octroi du contrat : 10 octobre 2014

Les dépenses pour ce projet s’élèvent à 149 000 $ (TVH comprise).

Pour obtenir de plus amples renseignements au sujet de cette étude, veuillez envoyer un courriel à l’adresse suivante : por-rop@pco-bcp.gc.ca.

# Detailed Qualitative Findings

This section of the report presents the detailed findings from a series of sixteen focus groups regarding Canadians’ views on Canadian Government priorities, held from October 18th to November 6th, 2014.

## 3.1 Top-of-Mind Priorities for Canadians

When asked to spontaneously identify what the Canadian Government’s main priorities should be, fostering economic growth and creating quality jobs were mentioned most often, but a wide array of issues were raised as well. While views on the state of the country’s economy were rather fair, as discussed below, participants in Moncton and across Ontario locations were more likely than others to spontaneously talk about the sad state of their *local* economy. There was a clear sense that the local job market was not very strong, with mostly low pay and low benefits jobs on offer. Participants felt that previous years and decades had brought better paying jobs and benefits but that these good times were mostly gone.

Many participants volunteered that Canada’s economy needed to become more diversified. They believed that Canada relied too much on a handful of sectors or provinces to sustain its long term growth. That left some participants feeling uneasy about the future state of the economy. Participants talked about the strength of the natural resources sector, which they saw as a good thing, but mentioned that they would like to see more conscious efforts put into diversifying the country’s sources of income and growth. The idea of diversification was also raised regarding international trade, with some participants wanting Canada to be more actively seeking trade partners aside from the United States. Those who had heard of recent trade initiatives, including the trade agreement with Europe, thought this was a very good idea.

Many Vancouver participants raised the importance of better training programs for trades. They felt that jobs in this sector were very important and offered good prospects for young people, but they believed these opportunities were not emphasised enough.

The environment and sustainability were also mentioned by many, especially in Quebec City, Montreal, Vancouver and Calgary. Often, this priority was linked with the aforementioned need to diversify the economy, as many participants said they wanted Canada to become a leader in new technologies that could form the backbone of a stronger economy that would be sustainable for decades to come.

The need to improve public safety was another priority raised spontaneously by a few participants across locations, most noticeably during groups held after the attacks in St-Jean-sur-Richelieu and Ottawa on October 20th and 22nd, respectively. Improving Canada’s transportation infrastructure, including public transportation and roads, was also viewed by a few participants as a key priority and so was poverty, especially child poverty. Better access to affordable housing was a concern as well, more specifically in Vancouver.

3.2 Views on the State of the Canadian Economy

Participants were asked to complete a short written exercise about their perception of the current state of the Canadian economy. They were provided with a list of adjectives, either positive, neutral or negative, and asked to select up to three words that best portrayed the state of the economy according to them.

Results of this exercise have shown that most participants had a rather lukewarm outlook on the Canadian economy. They were neither upbeat, nor outright negative about the state of the economy. There was a pervasive sense that the country’s economy could be stronger than it is, while also not being as bad as it could be. Clearly, the 2008-2009 economic downturn was still present in participants’ minds, with most not being convinced that Canada had fully-recovered five years later.

Yet, Canada was also seen to have come out of the recession better than most other countries, including its major trading partners in the US and Europe. Canada’s strong banking sector was identified by many as the reason for the country’s resiliency compared to the United States and Europe. In general, most participants felt that Canada was not directly threatened by the potential of an international economic downturn.

While the US economy was seen as stronger than it was in the past few years, it wasn’t perceived as being very strong. The European economy was seen as weaker, without being a major source of worry. Only a handful of participants mentioned that the fall in oil prices and the corresponding devaluation of the Canadian dollar could be a threat to the economy. In short, the outlook appeared as neither great, nor scary. However, participants from Moncton and from Ontario locations were somewhat less positive than those from other regions. Their more negative outlook stemmed from their personal experiences on the job market, or that of their loved ones.

The word most often chosen to describe the Canadian economy was uneven. Those who chose this qualifier mostly talked about regional disparities across Canada, with some provinces (mainly Western provinces) seen as doing better than provinces in Central and Eastern Canada. Interestingly, this sense was particularly strong in Vancouver and Calgary, where participants felt that a stronger economy across Canada would benefit everyone, including themselves. Participants from Ontario locations also talked at length about social inequality and how quality jobs were becoming a rarity in their community, creating a growing divide between rich and poor. In all Ontario locations there was a pervasive sense that a large number of full-time quality jobs, mostly in the manufacturing sector, had been replaced by short-term contract work with lower pay and reduced benefits in the service industry.

3.3 Ebola Crisis

Participants had almost unanimously heard about the Ebola crisis in Western Africa in the media. Participants in the Vancouver sessions were slightly more likely to talk about it on an unprompted basis, but their focus was more local: they had heard that the hospital in Richmond had been proposed as the provincial treatment centre should a case of Ebola be diagnosed anywhere in BC. This raised concerns about the level of local preparedness to deal with the situation.

Views of the crisis and its impact on Canadians proved to be highly complex. On the one hand, participants felt that the situation in Africa was sad and scary for the local population in affected countries. Some felt that the international community should do more to help. There was a general sense that Canada was doing something to help, mostly by providing financial assistance, but few were able to list very specific actions taken by the government. Those few talked about Canada’s efforts to provide vaccines for victims, with a handful being aware of the added funding to speed up clinical trials for a Canadian-made vaccine and to provide some equipment for international health workers on the ground.

This empathetic outlook for the plight of affected countries contrasted with immediate responses when asked about what they had heard about Ebola in a general sense. In this case, participants across all locations had a clear tendency to focus their attention on the North American angle to the crisis. More specifically, they talked about the situation in Texas, where a Liberian national had arrived in the United States with the virus and consequently triggered a large-scale containment effort. They then transposed this situation onto the Canadian context, asking aloud whether the country was prepared for this eventuality. Most participants felt that the media in the United States and in Canada largely overstated the risks and created a false sense of panic among the general population. Most said that from what they had heard, the Ebola virus was not easy to catch and that actual risks for them and their families were very low. For most participants, the situation was not a source of worry in general.

Nevertheless, there was a strong desire for participants to receive more information from governments and health authorities about the virus and the actual risks for Canadians. They also expressed interest in learning more about local preparedness plans and training for local health workers.

Participants mostly trusted that the federal and provincial governments would do what it takes to protect Canadians. At the same time, most felt that there was little that the Canadian government could do to entirely eradicate the possibility that one or more international travellers could arrive in Canada with the virus. Their doubts stemmed mostly from their own experiences with international travel by plane, where anyone carrying a virus (flu, cold) could easily infect those sitting nearby. They felt that anyone coming from an affected country or having been to an affected country without necessarily arriving directly from there could enter Canada without much trouble. They believed that beyond asking questions upon arrival and doing basic health tests at the airport, little else could be done. The Canadian government’s decision to stop emitting new travel visas from the affected countries, which was taken during the conduct of fieldwork, was well-received in general. Participants viewed this as an appropriate precaution to try and protect Canadians.

3.4 Public Safety

The focus group schedule for this research project was impacted by the attacks perpetrated in St-Jean-sur-Richelieu and Ottawa on October 20th and 22nd, resulting in the tragic deaths of Warrant Officer Patrice Vincent and Corporal Nathan Cirillo. The Vancouver, Calgary and North York groups were held prior to the attacks (North York was held after the St-Jean-sur-Richelieu incident, but prior to the Ottawa attack), while those in Montreal, Moncton, Kitchener, Mississauga and Quebec City were held subsequently.

While the attacks were seen as extremely shocking and disturbing by all participants, most of them did not feel personally threatened by extremism and said they would not change their daily habits. Nevertheless, participants were mostly in agreement with the fact that increased security measures may need to be taken. As such, they felt it was acceptable for the government to increase its surveillance over telecommunications and the Internet, as well as to act more swiftly against individuals who are suspected of plotting attacks on Canadian soil. But these issues remained difficult to grasp for most participants, as it was difficult for them to think of concrete ways in which increased security could affect them at a personal level. They did not instinctively see an inverse relationship between increased security and diminished individual freedom but rather felt that if someone has nothing to hide, as they did, then increased surveillance should not pose a problem. A few participants also felt there was a need for better integration of immigrants into Canadian society in order to reduce the threat of extremism.

3.5 The Islamic State (ISIS or ISIL)

A handful of participants raised unprompted support for, or concerns with, Canada’s intervention against ISIS in Iraq. Once this topic of discussion was raised directly, a few clear conclusions emerged. The main finding from these discussions is that there are no redeeming features to ISIS. This organisation was seen as bad, evil. Although a couple of participants talked about the need to understand how it came into existence before posing a final judgement, all others were unanimous in condemning its actions and its objectives. Everything about ISIS is indefensible. The exact contours of ISIS, starting from its composition and its actual size, were not well understood by most, however.

This unequivocal stance about ISIS meant that most participants were favourable to Canada’s military involvement in Iraq and nearly all participants favoured diverse forms of humanitarian assistance to help those affected. It was hard for most participants to accept that Canada could sit on the sidelines while its allies decided to engage this international threat, risking lives of their own. They felt that Canada had a responsibility to act, both because of the despicable nature of the enemy and to share the burden with its international allies. Only a few participants across locations would have preferred that Canada stay entirely out of the fray until the situation improved. Despite strong support for Canada’s involvement, some participants worried about the long term implications of the mission, including the potential of very high human and financial costs. Some disagreement over the best means to intervene was also noticeable, but the complexity of the situation on the ground made it difficult for participants to provide a clear response regarding the best solution to tackle this crisis and reduce the threat posed to Canada.

Group discussions that took place after the St-Jean-sur-Richelieu and Ottawa attacks revealed that the link between these attacks and the rise of ISIS or ISIL in Iraq and Syria was not straightforward for most participants. Although most could see a clear link between the two situations once the topic was raised in a direct manner, it was seldom discussed on an unprompted basis. Even some participants who talked about the direct threat to Canada issued by ISIS’s leadership did not readily make the link between the attacks and this formal threat.

A few participants across all locations were cognisant of the fact that Canadian citizens had enrolled in ISIS over the past few years. They felt highly disturbed by this reality and could not understand how this was possible. Participants unanimously felt that removing Canadian passports from anyone suspected of wanting to join ISIS was a perfectly reasonable measure.

# Appendix A – Detailed Research Methodology

A.1 Quantitative Methodology

The quantitative portion of the research was conducted over the phone. Fieldwork for the survey was held from October 17th to November 2nd, 2014. The national response rate for the survey was 18.9%. Complete call dispositions are presented below. A pre-test of 30 interviews, 15 in each official language, was completed on October 16th, 2014. Survey interviews lasted 6 minutes on average.

In total, 3,008 adult Canadians were interviewed in all regions of the country. The national margin of error for the survey is +/- 1.8% in 19 times out of 20. The complete survey questionnaire used during fieldwork is included in Appendix D.

**Computer Aided Telephone Interviewing (CATI)**

Telephone interviewing was conducted using Léger’s CATI technology. Highly trained data analysts program each survey in CATI then perform thorough testing to ensure accuracy in set-up and data collection.

Léger’s CATI system handles sampling and questionnaire completion electronically, removing the possibility of misdials and imposing control over skip patterns, branching, and valid ranges. The system can be used to automate many calculations that would slow unaided interviewers.

CATI also removes the need for separate coding and data entry cycles, further reducing the opportunity for error. CATI also ensures correct timing of call-backs. To keep complaints to a minimum, no number is called twice in a two-hour period and each number is called on different days of the week and at different times of the day (i.e. late afternoon, evening, daytime). This system ensures all scheduled appointments are kept, maximizing the response rate and sample representativeness.

**Field and Quality-Control**

Léger’s call centre is located in Montreal and has a total of 100 stations. All interviews for this research were conducted out of our Montreal call centre. This call centre is divided into three distinct divisions: One consisting of English only interviewers, one of French only interviewers and one of bilingual interviewers. This ensures that all telephone surveys can easily be conducted in either official language. If at any time, a potential respondent wished to conduct the survey in French (or vice-versa), they were quickly transferred to a French or bilingual interviewer, no matter when or where the call was made.

Léger integrates all projects to a Virtual Call Centre™ (VCC) platform. The Virtual Call Centre™ is a system enabling interviewers in our call centre to conduct telephone surveys supported by questionnaire and sample management provided over the Internet. The efficiency of the VCC greatly benefits the success of any project.

The VCC allows both the bilingual and English (or French) interviewers to have access to the same survey as well as the same sample data base. This is particularly important for a telephone survey that demands tight fielding timeline. We utilized all languages seamlessly to ensure that data collection was finished in the prescribed timeline. Additionally, having the VCC system allowed us to manage provincial and other quotas simultaneously.

Once the questionnaire was installed, a close validation of the programmed questionnaire was carried out to avoid any potential data error. This validation ensured that the data entry process conformed to the survey's basic logic.

The VCC system allowed for questionnaire changes to be completed quickly and accurately. By allowing the Research Manager access from anywhere in the world, Léger’s research staff can receive changes and update the survey program within a very short time. This procedure allowed for the nimble management process required for the project.

**Interview Monitoring**

Léger’s call centre enables data collection supervisors to monitor interviews as they are being conducted. Monitoring is essential to ensure the proper administration of a questionnaire. Through ongoing monitoring, supervisors ensured the questionnaire was administered properly and provided timely feedback to interviewers regarding potential issues with coding or wording.

Offsite (remote) monitoring was also available via three-way teleconferencing, both during the pre-test and throughout the duration of the data collection process. Léger’s monitoring system allows project managers and clients to monitor interviews as they happen. Upon request, interview recordings could be available through a secure FTP site so that clients could listen to the quality of our interviews.

Senior supervisors monitored interviews throughout field to ensure flow, clarity, consistency and comprehension of the survey. The Project Authority would have been notified immediately of any issue. If a serious issue had been found, fielding would have ceased until the problem was rectified.

With Centralus, our proprietary software, project managers could check on frequencies, the number of completes, quotas (if any), and the response rate at any time during field. This “real-time” management tool allowed for any issues to be quickly flagged and corrected.

**Field Supervision and Quality Control**

All interviewers used by Léger during this project received customized training with respect to interview techniques, and in-depth training on our call centre CATI software. Once they have completed their probationary period, Léger’s interviewers are evaluated every six months based on the following:

* reading integrity (never suggesting or interpreting respondent answers);
* appropriate follow-up to open-ended questions; and
* quality control (good pronunciation, zero tolerance for bias).

For each project, our field staff members go through a practice session before fielding. During these practice sessions, interviewers will work with one other to role-play a simulated interviewer/respondent survey. The field supervisor will allow interviewing to commence only when satisfied that each interviewer is able to conduct a proper, professional interview. Intensive monitoring, editing, and verification are conducted throughout the fielding process.

Phone interviews were monitored throughout the data collection period, with a minimum of 10% of each interviewer’s phone calls being monitored. By insisting on ongoing monitoring, we are able to ensure the quality of the data collected.

**Data Cleaning**

Upon completion of data collection, Léger’s data analysts and data processing department cleaned the data thoroughly, ensuring that:

* all closed-ended questions were within the allowable or logical range (allowable ranges would be confirmed with the client in any circumstance where it is not obvious from the questionnaire);
* outliers were verified and, if necessary, excluded from the data;
* all skip patterns had been followed correctly;
* the data was complete (except where it is intentional and within client expectations); and
* information was consistent and logical across questions, with no contradictions in the data.

The data was checked and cleaned after the first night of field and at project completion. During analysis, all numbers were double-checked and any outliers are double- checked to ensure the data has been entered accurately in the first place. If necessary, the original phone call could be reviewed to check the answer.

**Coding**

All projects have a team of coders assigned to edit, clean, and develop meaningful codes for the answers to open-ended questions. Léger developed the code book and code open-ended questions accordingly. All data from open-ended questions was checked by different coders to ensure data was accurate and correctly coded. All coding for the NBHC project was done in accordance with the requirements of the RFP and included:

* verbatim transcriptions; and
* coding and sorting into categories from comments to open-ended questions.

**Maximizing the response rate**

Low response rate threatens a survey’s reliability and validity. Through Léger Marketing’s experience surveying various populations, we have established the following methods to maximize response rates:

* including a toll free number for call backs if necessary;
* patience and rapport development in speaking with respondents, which helps to keep participants engaged in the survey and limits mid survey drop offs;
* prepare arguments to be used by interviewers to inform respondents of the importance of their participation: usefulness of the study for them and their family, etc.
* use of experienced field personnel in contacting households and identify the appropriate respondent;
* making a minimum of 8 call-backs to each number and setting appointments for call-backs (even for the initial contact); and
* include contact information for a senior researcher so respondents can verify the validity of the research.
* 25% of all calls are made to cell phone numbers in order to maximise the representativeness of the sampling frame and ensure that a sufficient number of younger, and often highly mobile, individuals are included in the final sample.

**Call Dispositions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Total** |
| **TOTAL SAMPLE** | **23741** |
| **Invalid sample** | 3673 |
| No service | 3182 |
| Non-residential | 96 |
| Fax / modem / Mobile Phone/ Pager | 395 |
| **Numbers outside of sample** | 787 |
| Language Barrier | 416 |
| Unqualified | 289 |
| Quota attained | 82 |
| **EFFECTIVE SAMPLE** | **19281** |
| **Non-completed interviews** | 16273 |
| Refusal | 9796 |
| No answer | 2843 |
| Answering machine | 2134 |
| Line busy | 474 |
| Incompleted | 189 |
| Appointment | 837 |
| **COMPLETED INTERVIEWS** | **3008** |
|  |  |
| **Response rate:** | **18.9%** |

The response rate is calculated using the following formula:

*(Completed interviews + Out of Sample) / (Total sample - Invalid sample)*

**Non Response Bias**

An effective response rate of 18.9 per cent is very good for a national telephone survey of 3,008 respondents conducted in two weeks, easily surpassing typical rates for similar studies. This higher than average response rate minimizes the risks of an important non-response bias in the survey as it decreases the likelihood of an unrepresentative sample.

Nevertheless, a basic comparison of the un-weighted and weighted samples sizes was conducted to identify potential issues (see table below). As is typically the case for a telephone survey targeting homes with a fixed telephone line, younger individuals are more difficult to reach. As a result, we can see that the most significant gap between the un-weighted sample and the sample weighted using Statistics Canada’s 2011 census figures appears among the 18-24 and 25-34 age cohorts. This is the direct result of the changes in telecommunications practices among the younger, more mobile, cohorts. We also notice a gender gap, as women were more likely to have taken part in the survey.

**Weighted and Un-Weighted Samples**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Un-Weighted** | **Weighted** |
| Region |
| Atlantic | 210 | 214 |
| Quebec | 711 | 719 |
| Ontario | 115 | 1150 |
| Prairies | 201 | 194 |
| Alberta | 327 | 319 |
| BC/North | 404 | 411 |
| Age |
| 18-34 | 428 | 826 |
| 35-54 | 1006 | 1118 |
| 55+ | 1471 | 1001 |
| Gender |
| Male | 1358 | 1457 |
| Female | 1650 | 1551 |

However, there is no evidence from the data that having achieved a different age or gender distribution prior to weighting would have significantly changed the results for this study. The basic weight that was applied (age, gender and region) corrected this imbalance for data analysis purposes.

## A.2 Qualitative Portion

A series of sixteen (12) focus groups was held during the course of this research. At each location, groups were comprised of Canadians aged 21 and over, containing a good mix of gender as well as ethnic and educational backgrounds. In addition, groups were split according to income categories. One group in each location was held with participants who have an individual income of less than $75,000 (or a family income of less than $100,000), while the other was held with those who have an individual income of $75,000 or more (or a family income of $100,000 or more). All participants were also head or co-head of households. The schedule and locations of the groups are presented in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Location** | **Date** | **Time** | **Language** |
| Vancouver, British Columbia  | Saturday, 18 October 2014  | 1st group: 10:00AM-12:00PM 2nd group: 12:00PM-2:00PM | English |
| Calgary, Alberta | Monday, 20 October 2014  | 1st group: 5:30PM-7:30PM 2nd group: 7:30PM-9:00PM | English |
| North York, Ontario  | Tuesday, 21 October 2014 | 1st group: 5:30PM-7:30PM 2nd group: 7:30PM-9:00PM | English |
| Montreal, Quebec | Saturday, 25 October 2014  | 1st group: 10:00AM-12:00PM 2nd group: 12:00PM-2:00PM | French |
| Moncton, New Brunswick | Monday, 3 November 2014  | 1st group: 5:30PM-7:30PM 2nd group: 7:30PM-9:30PM | English |
| Kitchener, Ontario | Tuesday, 4 November 2014 | 1st group: 5:30PM-7:30PM 2nd group: 7:30PM-9:30PM | English |
| Mississauga, Ontario | Wednesday, 5 November 2014 | 1st group: 5:30PM-7:30PM 2nd group: 7:30PM-9:30PM | English |
| Quebec City,Quebec | Thursday, 6 November 2014 | 1st group: 5:30PM-7:30PM 2nd group: 7:30PM-9:30PM | French |

Twelve (12) participants were recruited for each focus group, ensuring that a minimum of 8 to 10 recruits attended. Group participants were recruited using a formal recruitment screening questionnaire administered via a telephone interview. The fully-detailed recruiting questionnaire is presented in Appendix B. The recruitment screener was devised by Léger in accordance with the specifications of the project authority and following all Market Research and Intelligence Association (MRIA) standards and guidelines for the conduct of qualitative research.

Each group lasted between 90 minutes and 2 hours. Participating individuals were given a $75 cash incentive to compensate them for their time and cover basic travel expenses. All groups were moderated by a Léger research professional qualified for work with the federal government as per the Standing Offer for Public Opinion Research of the Government of Canada. Focus groups were held using a moderation guide devised by the Léger senior research in collaboration with the PCO.

In accordance with the MRIA guidelines for the conduct of qualitative research, Léger provided participants with details specific to the conduct of the groups. Such details included the audio/video taping of the discussion, the presence and purpose of the one-way mirror, basic rules about privacy and confidentiality including the fact that tapes will be destroyed according to MRIA guidelines, and that participation is voluntary.

As is standard with qualitative research done on behalf of the Government of Canada, the following conditions were also applied for all participants:

* They had not participated in a discussion group within the last six months;
* They had not attended, in the past two years, a focus group discussion or in-depth interview on issues related to the topic at hand;
* They had not attended five or more focus groups or in-depth interviews in the past five years;
* At least one third of the participants recruited for each group must never have attended a group discussion or in-depth interview before;
* They had a sufficient command of English (or French for the Quebec City groups) to fully participate in the focus group sessions; and,
* They or their family are not employed in any of the following:
	+ A research firm
	+ A magazine or newspaper
	+ An advertising agency or graphic design firm
	+ A political party
	+ A radio or television station
	+ A public relations company
	+ Federal or provincial government

As with all research conducted by Léger, contact information was kept entirely confidential and all information that could allow for the identification of participants was removed from the data, in accordance with the *Privacy Act* of Canada.

# Appendix B – Recruitment Guide

## B.1 English Version

**GEN POP FOCUS GROUP SCREENER**

**Perceptions of Canadians on the state of current events**

Hello, I'm \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ of Léger, a marketing research company. We are organizing a research project on behalf of the Government of Canada. This research project is about some current events that are relevant to the federal government.

We are preparing to hold a few research sessions with people like yourself. In these sessions, individuals are asked to sit down with several others and give their opinions and share their ideas. We are organizing several of these group discussions, and would be interested in possibly having you participate.

Your participation is voluntary. All information collected, used and/or disclosed will be used for research purposes only and the research is entirely confidential. The names of participants will not be provided to the government or any third party. May I continue?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes  | 1 |  |
| No | 2 | **Thank and terminate** |

I need to ask you a few questions to see if you fit the profile of the type of people we are looking for in this research.

**Note to recruiter: When terminating a call with someone, say: *Thank you for your cooperation. We already have enough participants who have a similar profile to yours, so we are unable to invite you to participate.***

1) **Record gender:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Male | 1 | **Equal number of men and women in groups** |
| Female | 2 |

2) Do you, or does anyone in your household, work in any of the following areas? **(Read list)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **No** | **Yes** |
| A marketing research firm | ( ) | ( ) |
| A magazine or newspaper | ( ) | ( ) |
| An advertising agency or graphic design firm | ( ) | ( ) |
| A political party | ( ) | ( ) |
| A radio or television station | ( ) | ( ) |
| A public relations company | ( ) | ( ) |
| Federal or provincial government (Crown Corporations count as NO) | ( ) | ( ) |

**If ‘yes’ to any, thank and terminate.**

3) Sometimes participants are asked to watch videos, read a document and/or write out their answers to a questionnaire during the discussion.  Is there any reason why you could not participate?

Yes                1             THANK & TERMINATE

No                 2

TERMINATE IF RESPONDENT OFFERS ANY REASON SUCH AS SIGHT OR HEARING PROBLEM, A WRITTEN OR VERBAL LANGUAGE PROBLEM, A CONCERN WITH NOT BEING ABLE TO COMMUNICATE EFFECTIVELY OR IF YOU HAVE A CONCERN.”

4) Are you the head, or co-head of your household, that is, a person who makes key decisions in your household?

 Yes **(Continue)**

 No/Don’t know/Refused **(Thank and terminate)**

5) We would like to talk to people in different age groups. Into which **one** of the following groups should I place you? **(Read List)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Under 18 | 1 | **Thank and terminate** |
| 18-21 | 2 |  |
| 22-34 | 3 | **Recruit cross-section** |
| 35-54 | 4 |
| 55 or over | 5 |

Q6a)      How many people above the age of 18 are there in your household?

1. One          **ASK 6B**
2. More than one         **SKIP TO 6C**

Q6b)    **[IF Q6a=1 ASK]** Was your household’s income for 2013 greater or less than 75 thousand dollars?

$75K or greater  Q**ualifies for group 2**

Less than $75K  **Qualifies for group 1**

                  Refused               **THANK AND TERMINATE**

Q6c)    **[IF Q6a=2 ASK]** Was your household’s income for 2013 greater or less than 100 thousand

dollars?

$100K or greater  **Qualifies for group 2**

Less than $100K  **Qualifies for group 1**

Refused               **THANK AND TERMINATE**

7) What is the highest level of education you have attained? **(Do not read list – Recruit good cross-section of education levels)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Some high school or less | 1 |
| Completed high school | 2 |
| Post-secondary technical training | 3 |
| Some college/university | 4 |
| Completed college/university | 5 |
| Post-graduate studies | 6 |

8) Were you born in Canada or were you born elsewhere?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Canadian-born | 1 |  |
| Born elsewhere | 2 | **Two to three participants born elsewhere per group** |

9) As I mentioned to you earlier, we are organizing some discussion groups among people like yourself. Have you ever taken part in such discussion groups?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | 1 |  |
| No | 2 | **Go to Q.13** |

10) And when was the last time you attended a discussion group?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 6 months ago or less  | 1 | **Thank and terminate** |
| **OR** more than 6 months ago | 2 |  |

11) How many times did you attend a discussion group or an in-depth interview in the last five years?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Less than 5 times  | 1 |  |
| **OR** 5 times or more | 2 |  **Thank and terminate** |

12) What topics have you ever discussed?

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 **(If related to economy, thank and terminate)**

13) Thank you. We would like to invite you to participate in one of our group discussions. The discussion group will last 2 hours. Refreshments will be provided at the meeting, and you will be paid $75 for your participation.

 Would you be willing to participate in one of these sessions?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | 1 | **Go to appropriate city and group type invitation** |
| No | 2 | **Thank and terminate** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **City** | **Language** | **Recruit** | **Participate** | **Dates** | **Location** |
| Downtown Vancouver, British Columbia (Recruitment Richmond\*) | English | 24 | 16-20 | Sat 18 October, 2014 (10:00 AM and 12:00PM) | SmartPoint Research301-1140 Homer StreetVancouver, BCV6B 2X6 Canada |
|
| Calgary, Alberta(suburbs)\* | English | 24 | 16-20 | Mon 20 October, 2014 (5:30 PM and 7:30 PM) | Léger (Consumer Vision)808-4th Avenue SW, Suite 1000Calgary (Alberta) T2P 3E8 |
| North York, Ontario  | English | 24 | 16-20 | Tue 21 October, 2014 (5:30 PM and 7:30 PM) | Head Research601-5075 Yonge Street NORTH YORK ON M2N 6C6 |
|
| Montreal, Quebec(suburbs)\* | French/Simultaneous translation required  | 24 | 16-20 | Sat 25 October, 2014 (10:00 AM and 12:00PM) | Léger (Consumer Vision)507 Place d’Armes, suite 600Montréal, QC |
| Moncton, New Brunswick | English | 24 | 16-20 | Monday 3 November, 2014 (5:30 PM and 7:30 PM) | CRA 68 Highfield Street, Suite 101, Moncton, E1C 5N3 |
|
| Kitchener, Ontario | English | 24 | 16-20 | Tuesday 4 November, 2014 (5:30 PM and 7:30 PM) | PMG Intelligence560 Parkside Dr. Unit 3WATERLOO ON N2L 5Z4 |
| Mississauga, Ontario | English | 24 | 16-20 | Wednesday 5 November, 2014 (5:30 PM and 7:30 PM) | ACCE international / 2575B Dunwin Drive Mississauga, Ontario, Canada L5L 3N9 |
| Quebec City,Quebec | French/Simultaneous translation required | 24 | 16-20 | Thursday 6 November, 2014 (5:30 PM and 7:30 PM) | Leger/Consumer Vision580 rue grande-Allée Est,Quebec City, QC |
| **Total** | **-** | **192** | **128-160** | **-** | **-** |

***\* Participants recruited from Richmond in BC and from the Suburbs in Montreal and Calgary.***

**“Coordinates” Section**

Someone from our office will be calling you back to confirm these arrangements. Could I please have your phone number where we can reach you during the evening and during the day?

**Name:**

**Evening phone: Work phone:**

**Thank you very much!**

**Recruited by:**

**Confirmed by:**

As we are only inviting a small number of people to take part, your participation is very important to us. If for some reason you are unable to participate, please call so that we can get someone to replace you. You can reach us at \_\_\_\_ at our office. Please ask for \_\_\_\_.

To ensure that the focus groups run smoothly, we remind you:

* To turn off your cellular phones – to avoid disruptions during the group;
* To arrive 15 minutes earlier – to have sufficient time to park/sign in;
* To bring reading glasses, if necessary to be able to go over the test material;
* To bring a photo ID to collect your incentive;
* That the session will be recorded for analysis purposes only.

**Group specifications:**

* All head or co-head of households
* Group 1: lower income group. Invididual income of less than $75,000 or household income of less than $100,000.
* Group 2: high income group. Invididual income of $75,000 and above or household income of $100,000 or more.
* Good mix of age (18 and above), gender and education for all groups.
* Minimum of two participants per group born outside of Canada

## B.2 Version française

**RECRUTEMENT POPULATION GÉNÉRALE**

**Perception des Canadiens sur différents sujets d’actualité**

Bonjour,

Je suis \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ de la firme de recherche Léger. Nous organisons un projet de recherche pour le Gouvernement du Canada. Ce projet porte essentiellement sur différents sujets d’actualité impliquant le gouvernement fédéral.

Nous nous préparons à mener une série de discussion avec des gens comme vous. Durant ces discussions, les participants sont appelés à partager leurs opinions et leurs idées avec les autres personnes présentes. Nous organisons présentement ces groupes et nous serions intéressés à vous compter parmi nos participants.

Votre participation est entièrement volontaire, et toute l’information que vous fournirez est entièrement confidentielle. Les noms complets des participants ne seront pas fournis ni au gouvernement ni à une tierce partie. Est-ce que je peux poursuivre?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Oui  | 1 |  |
| Non | 2 | **Remercier et terminer.** |

J’aimerais maintenant vous poser quelques questions pour voir si vous rencontrez nos critères d’éligibilité pour participer.

**Note au recruteur : Terminez dès qu’un répondant refuse de répondre à une question. Lorsque vous terminez, dites : *Merci de votre coopération. Nous avons déjà atteint le nombre de participants qui ont un profil similaire au vôtre. Nous ne pouvons donc pas vous inviter à participer.***

1. **Indiquez le sexe :**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Homme | 1 | Équilibre dans chaque groupe |
| Femme | 2 |

2) Est-ce que vous ou quelqu’un dans votre foyer travaille dans un des domaines suivants? **(lire)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Non** | **Oui** |
| Une compagnie de recherche marketing | ( ) | ( ) |
| Une revue ou un journal | ( ) | ( ) |
| Une agence de publicité ou une firme de graphisme | ( ) | ( ) |
| Un parti politique | ( ) | ( ) |
| Une station de radio ou de télévision | ( ) | ( ) |
| Une compagnie de relations publiques | ( ) | ( ) |
| Gouvernement fédéral ou provincial (si Société d’État, inscrire NON) | ( ) | ( ) |

**SI "OUI" À UN DES CAS, REMERCIER ET TERMINER**

3) Parfois les participants à un groupe de discussion doivent regarder des vidéos, lire des documents ou répondre à un questionnaire durant la discussion. Y a-t-il une raison pour laquelle vous ne pourriez pas participer ?

 Oui REMERCIER ET TERMINER

Non

REMERCIER ET TERMINER SI LE RÉPONDANT MENTIONNE UNE OU PLUSIEURS RAISONS COMME UN PROBLÈME DE VISION OU D’AUDITION, AINSI QU’UN PROBLEME DE LANGAGE VERBAL, UNE INQUIÉTUDE QUANT À SA CAPACITÉ DE COMMUNIQUER, OU ENCORE SI VOUS AVEZ DES INQUIÉTUDES.

4) Êtes-vous la personne en charge de prendre des décisions, ou qui partage la prise de décision, dans votre foyer?

 Oui **(Poursuivre)**

 Non/NSP/Refus **(Remercier et mettre fin à l’entrevue)**

5) Nous aimerions parler à des gens de différents groupes d’âge. Dans lequel de ces groupes vous situez-vous? **(Lire)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Moins de 18 | 1 | **Remercier et terminer** |
| 18-21 | 2 | **S’assurer une bonne répartition** |
| 22-34 | 3 |
| 35-54 | 4 |
| 55 ou plus | 4 |

Q6a)      Combien y a-t-il de personnes âgées de 18 ans et plus dans votre foyer, en vous incluant?

1. Une          **DEMANDER 6B**
2. Plus d’une          **PASSER À 6C**

Q6b)    **[si Q6a=1 demander]** Est-ce que le revenu total de votre foyer en 2012 était supérieur ou

inférieur à 75 000$ ?

75 000$ ou plus  **Qualifié pour groupe 2**

Moins de 75 000$  **Qualifié pour groupe 1**

                  Refus               **REMERCIER ET TERMINER L’ENTREVUE**

Q6c)    **[SI Q6a=2 DEMANDER]** Est-ce que le revenu total de votre foyer en 2012 était supérieur ou

inférieur à 100 000$ ?

100 000$ ou plus  **Qualifié pour groupe 2**

Moins de 100 000$  **Qualifié pour groupe 1**

                  Refus               **REMERCIER ET TERMINER L’ENTREVUE**

7) Quel est le plus haut niveau d’éducation que vous avez reçu? **(Ne pas lire - s’assurer d’une bonne répartition)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| École secondaire partiellement ou moins | 1 |
| École secondaire complétée | 2 |
| École technique, postsecondaire professionnel (cégep) | 3 |
| Université partiellement | 4 |
| Diplômé de premier cycle universitaire  | 5 |
| Diplôme de cycle universitaire supérieur | 6 |

8) Êtes-vous né au Canada ou dans un autre pays?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Au Canada | 1 |  |
| Dans un autre pays | 2 |  **De deux à trois recrues par groupe** |

9) Comme je vous l’ai mentionné plus tôt, nous organisons des groupes de discussion avec des résidents de [NOM VILLE]. Avez-vous déjà participé à de tels groupes de discussion?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Oui | 1 |  |
| Non | 2 | **Aller à Q.13** |

10) Quand avez-vous participé à un groupe de discussion pour la dernière fois?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Il y a 6 mois ou moins  | 1 | **Remercier et terminer** |
| **OU** il y a plus de 6 mois | 2 |  |

11) Combien de fois avez-vous participé à un groupe de discussion ou à une entrevue en profondeur (aussi appelée entrevue individuelle) au cours des **cinq** dernières années? **(Ne pas lire)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Moins de 5 fois  | 1 |  |
| **OU** 5 fois ou plus | 2 |  **Remercier et terminer** |

12) Quels sont tous les sujets dont vous avez discuté dans ces groupes ou durant ces entrevues en profondeur?

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 **(Si un sujet est relié à l’économie, remercier et terminer.)**

13) Merci. Nous aimerions vous inviter à participer à un de nos groupes de discussion. Ce groupe durera environ 2 heures. Des rafraîchissements seront fournis durant la rencontre, et vous serez payés 75 $ pour votre participation.

 Acceptez-vous de participer à un de ces groupes?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Oui | 1 | **Aller voir la bonne ville et le bon type de groupe.**  |
| Non | 2 | **Remercier et terminer** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ville** | **Langue** | **Recrues** | **Participants** | **Dates** | **Endroits** |
| Vancouver, Colombie-Britannique (Recrutement Richmond\*) | Anglais | 24 | 16-20 | Samedi, 18 octobre 2014 (10h00 et 12h00) | SmartPoint Research301-1140 Homer StreetVancouver, BCV6B 2X6 Canada |
|
| Calgary, Alberta(banlieues)\* | Anglais | 24 | 16-20 | Lundi 20 octobre 2014 (17h30 et 19h30) | Léger (Consumer Vision)808-4th Avenue SW, Suite 1000Calgary (Alberta) T2P 3E8 |
| North York, Ontario  | Anglais | 24 | 16-20 | Mardi, 21 octobre 2014 (17h30 et 19h30) | Head Research601-5075 Yonge Street NORTH YORK ON M2N 6C6 |
|
| Montréal, Québec(banlieues)\* | Français | 24 | 16-20 | Samedi, 25 Octobre 2014 (10h00 et 12h00) | Léger (Consumer Vision)507 Place d’Armes, suite 600Montréal, QC |
| Moncton, Nouveau-Brunswick | Anglais | 24 | 16-20 | Lundi, 3 novembre 2014 (17h30 et 19h30) | CRA 68 Highfield Street, Suite 101, Moncton, E1C 5N3 |
|
| Kitchener, Ontario | Anglais | 24 | 16-20 | Mardi, 4 novembre 2014 (17h30 et 19h30) | PMG Intelligence560 Parkside Dr. Unit 3WATERLOO ON N2L 5Z4 |
| Mississauga, Ontario | Anglais | 24 | 16-20 | Mercredi, 5 novembre 2014 (17h30 et 19h30) | ACCE international / 2575B Dunwin Drive Mississauga, Ontario, Canada L5L 3N9 |
| Québec,Québec | Français | 24 | 16-20 | Jeudi 6 novembre 2014 (17h30 et 19h30) | Leger/Consumer Vision580 rue grande-Allée Est,Québec, QC |
| **Total** | **-** | **192** | **128-160** | **-** | **-** |

\*Participants de Vancouver recrutés à Richmond, alors que ceux de Montréal et Calgary sont recrutés en banlieue.

**“Coordonnées”**

Quelqu’un de notre entreprise vous contactera pour confirmer la tenue du groupe. Pourriez-vous me laisser un numéro de téléphone où nous pouvons vous rejoindre en soirée ainsi qu’au cours de la journée?

**Nom :**

**Téléphone en soirée : Téléphone au travail :**

**Merci beaucoup**

**Recruté par :**

**Confirmé par :**

Comme nous avons sélectionné un nombre limité de participants, votre participation est très importante pour nous. Si pour une raison particulière vous n’êtes plus en mesure de participer à ce groupe, s’il vous plaît appelez-nous pour nous en faire part afin que nous puissions vous remplacer. Vous pouvez nous joindre au \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ à nos bureaux et demandez pour \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Pour assurer le bon déroulement du groupe de discussion, nous vous rappelons :

* D’éteindre votre cellulaire – afin d’éviter les dérangements durant les groupes;
* D’arriver 15 minutes plus tôt – afin d’avoir suffisamment de temps pour stationner votre véhicule et donner votre présence;
* D’apporter vos lunettes de lecture, si nécessaire, afin de participer à l’évaluation du matériel;
* D’apporter une pièce d’identité avec photo afin de pouvoir recevoir votre compensation;
* Que la session sera enregistrée pour des fins d’analyse.

# Appendix C – Discussion Guide

C.1 English Version

**MODERATOR’S GUIDE – OCTOBER 2014**

**INTRODUCTION (5 Minutes)**

* Introduce moderator and welcome participants to the focus group.
	+ As we indicated during the recruiting process, we are conducting focus group discussions on behalf of the Government of Canada.
	+ The focus of tonight’s discussion will be Government priorities. But before we discuss these ads, I’d like to brief you on how a focus group works, for those of you who haven’t attended one before.

* The discussion will last approximately 2 hours. Feel free to excuse yourself during the session if necessary.
* Explanation re:
	+ Audio-taping – The session is being audio-taped for analysis purposes, in case we need to double-check the proceedings against our notes. These audio-tapes remain in our possession and will not be released to anyone without written consent from all participants.
	+ One-way mirror – There are observers representing the government and the creative agency for the ads who will be watching the discussion from behind the glass.
	+ It is also important for you to know that your responses today will in no way affect your dealings with the Government of Canada.
	+ Confidentiality – Please note that anything you say during these groups will be held in the strictest confidence. We do not attribute comments to specific people. Our report summarizes the findings from the groups but does not mention anyone by name. The report can be accessed through the Library of Parliament or Archives Canada.
* Describe how a discussion group functions:
	+ Discussion groups are designed to stimulate an open and honest discussion. My role as a moderator is to guide the discussion and encourage everyone to participate. Another function of the moderator is to ensure that the discussion stays on topic and on time.
	+ Your role is to answer questions and voice your opinions. We are looking for minority as well as majority opinion in a focus group, so don't hold back if you have a comment even if you feel your opinion may be different from others in the group. There may or may not be others who share your point of view. Everyone's opinion is important and should be respected.
	+ I would also like to stress that there are no wrong answers. We are simply looking for your opinions and attitudes. This is not a test of your knowledge. We did not expect you to do anything in preparation for this group.

Please note that the moderator is not an employee of the Government of Canada and may not be able to answer some of your questions about the program we will be discussing. If important questions do come up over the course of the group, we will try to get answers for you before you leave.

* (Moderator introduces herself/himself). Participants should introduce themselves, using their first names only.
	+ What are your main hobbies or pastimes?

**WARM UP: General Context (25 Minutes)**

* Thinking of the issues facing Canada today, which one would you say the Government of Canada should focus on most? FLIP CHART – PROBE – [ENSURE PARTICIPANTS FOCUS ON CURRENT FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ISSUES]
* What makes you say that?
* PROMPT IF NECESSARY: Ebola (prompt on issue understanding and federal government response)

**ECONOMIC SITUATION (20 Minutes)**

* **WORD ASSOCIATION EXERCISE ON ECONOMY – top three words and why chosen**
* Overall, how is Canada’s economy doing? What makes you say that? Where do you think the Canadian economy is headed?
* What are the biggest threats to or concerns you have about Canada’s economy? [FLIP CHART CONCERNS]
* Is Canada’s national economic situation different from the economic situation in other countries? What is different? Do you feel that the situation in the US and/or Europe will have an impact on us here? What will that be?
	+ What if their economic situation gets worse?
* If you were the Government of Canada, what measures would you take to respond to the potential impact here?
* Are you aware of anything the Government of Canada has being doing recently to support the economy and jobs? Is there anything that jumps out? What should the Government be doing?

**COUNTER-TERRORISM (30 Minutes)**

* Have you read seen or heard any news recently about a group called the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, known as ISIS or ISIL? What was it that you read, saw or heard?
* And, have you read seen or heard any news recently about actions the Canadian Government has taken in reaction to a group called the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, known as ISIS or ISIL? What was it that you read, saw or heard?
* The Federal Government of Canada recently announced that the Canadian Armed Forces would join the international coalition fighting ISIL in Iraq. Do you support or oppose the Canadian Government sending Canadian Armed Forces to launch air strikes against ISIL? What makes you say that?

**CONCLUSION [5 Minutes]**

We have covered a lot of topics today and really appreciate you taking the time and energy to come down here and give your opinion. Your input is very important and insightful!

* To conclude, I wanted to ask you whether you have any last thoughts that you want to give the Government of Canada.

C.3 Version française

**GUIDE D’ANIMATION**

**OCTOBRE 2014**

**Section 1 : Introduction et règles de base (10 minutes)**

* Présentez le modérateur et souhaitez la bienvenue aux participants au groupe de discussion.
	+ Comme nous l’avons indiqué durant le processus de recrutement, nous animons des groupes de discussion au nom du gouvernement du Canada.
	+ La discussion de ce soir porte sur les priorités du gouvernement. Avant que nous discutions de ces publicités, je voudrais vous donner des directives sur la façon dont fonctionne un groupe de discussion, pour ceux d’entre vous qui n’y auraient jamais participé auparavant.
* La discussion durera environ 2 heures. N’hésitez pas à vous retirer au cours de la séance, lorsque nécessaire.
* Explications au sujet de :
	+ Enregistrement sonore : la séance est enregistrée à des fins d’analyse, au cas où nous devrions vérifier une deuxième fois les démarches et nos notes. Ces enregistrements sonores sur bandes magnétiques demeurent en notre possession et ne seront jamais remis à quiconque sans consentement écrit de tous les participants.
	+ Miroir d’observation : des observateurs représentant le gouvernement surveilleront le groupe de discussion derrière le miroir d’observation.
	+ Il est également important que vous sachiez que les réponses que vous donnerez aujourd’hui n’affecteront aucunement vos relations d’affaires avec le gouvernement du Canada.
	+ Confidentialité : Veuillez noter que tout ce vous direz au cours de ces discussions en groupe sera maintenu sous haute confidentialité. Nous n’associons pas les commentaires aux personnes qui les ont formulés. Notre rapport résume les conclusions des groupes, mais aucun nom n’est mentionné. Le rapport est accessible par l’entremise de la bibliothèque du Parlement ou d’Archives Canada.
* Décrivez le fonctionnement d’un groupe de discussion :
	+ Les groupes de discussion sont conçus pour stimuler une discussion ouverte et honnête. Mon rôle comme modérateur consiste à guider la discussion et à encourager la participation de chacun. Une autre fonction du modérateur est de s’assurer que la discussion porte toujours sur le sujet qui nous importe et respecte les contraintes de temps.
	+ Votre rôle consiste à répondre aux questions et à exprimer vos opinions. Nous recherchons l’opinion tant de la minorité que de la majorité dans un groupe de discussion, alors n’hésitez pas à faire part de vos commentaires même si vous sentez que votre avis peut être différent de celui des autres membres du groupe. Il est possible que certains partagent votre point de vue ou que personne ne le partage. L’opinion de chacun est importante et doit être respectée.
	+ Je voudrais également souligner qu’il n'y a aucune mauvaise réponse. Nous voulons simplement connaître vos opinions et perceptions. Il ne s’agit pas d’un test de connaissances. Nous ne nous attendons pas à ce que vous vous soyez préparés d’une quelconque façon en vue de participer à ce groupe.

Veuillez noter que le modérateur n’est pas un employé du gouvernement du Canada et peut se trouver dans l’incapacité de répondre à certaines de vos questions sur le programme dont il sera question. Si des questions importantes sont soulevées au cours de la rencontre, nous essayerons de vous fournir les réponses avant votre départ.

* (Le modérateur se présente.) Les participants devraient se présenter en donnant leurs prénoms seulement.
	+ Quels sont vos passe-temps favoris?
	+ Sonder au besoin : Ebola (sonder sur compréhension de l’enjeu et la réponse du gouvernement)

**Réchauffement : contexte général (25 minutes)**

* Pensant à tous les enjeux importants aujourd’hui, lequel devrait être la principale priorité du Gouvernement du Canada selon vous? INSCRIRE AU TABLEAU – DEMANDER D’EXPLIQUER (S’ASSURER QUE LES PARTICIPANTS DISCUTENT D’ENJEUX FÉDÉRAUX ACTUELS).
* Pourquoi dites-vous cela?

**LA CONJONCTURE ÉCONOMIQUE (20 MINUTES)**

* Jeux d’association de mots sur l’économie – trois mots choisis et pourquoi
* Globalement, comment se porte l’économie canadienne selon vous? Qu’est-ce qui vous fait penser ça? Et l’économie canadienne évolue dans quelle direction selon vous?
* Quelles sont les principales menaces envers l’économie du Canada? (Inscrire au tableau)
* Est-ce que la conjoncture économique du Canada diffère de celle d’autres pays? En quoi est-elle différente? Croyez-vous que la situation en Europe ou aux États-Unis pourrait avoir un impact ici? Quel serait cet impact?
	+ Que se passera-t-il si leur situation empire?
	+ Si vous étiez le Gouvernement du Canada, que feriez-vous pour palier à un impact potentiel ici?
* Êtes-vous au courant de mesures que le Gouvernement du Canada a pris pour soutenir l’économie du pays et créer des emplois? Y a-t-il des choses que vous avez remarquées? Qu’est-ce que le Gouvernement devrait faire?

**LUTTE AU TERRORISME (30 Minutes)**

* Avez-vous récemment lu, vu ou entendu des nouvelles à propos d’un groupe nommé l’État islamique en Iraq et en Syrie, aussi connu sous l’acronyme EI? Qu’avez-vous lu, vu ou entendu?
* Avez-vous récemment lu, vu ou entendu des nouvelles à propos des actions prises par le Gouvernement du Canada en réaction à un groupe nommé l’État islamique en Iraq et en Syrie, aussi connu sous l’acronyme EI? Qu’avez-vous lu, vu ou entendu?
* Le Gouvernement du Canada a récemment annoncé que les Forces armées canadiennes se joindraient à la coalition internationale qui combat l’État islamique en Iraq. Êtes-vous en faveur ou opposé à ce que le Gouvernement du Canada envoie les Forces armées canadiennes pour lancer des attaques aériennes contre l’État islamique en Iraq? Pourquoi dites-vous cela?

**CONCLUSION (5 MINUTES)**

Nous avons couvert plusieurs sujets aujourd’hui et apprécions grandement que vous ayez pris le temps et fait l’effort de venir discuter avec nous. Vos suggestions et commentaires sont très importants.

* En conclusion, avez-vous d’autres pensées que vous aimeriez partager avec le Gouvernement du Canada?

# Appendix D – Survey Questionnaire

D.1 English Version

**PCO Survey – Fall 2014**

**INTRO.**

Hello, my name is \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. I’m calling on behalf of Léger, a national research firm. We are currently conducting a study on behalf of the Government of Canada and I’d like to ask you a few questions on current issues of interest to Canadians. Your responses will be kept entirely confidential and anonymous. This survey is registered with the Marketing Research and Intelligence Association's (MRIA).

Would you prefer that I continue in English or French? Préférez-vous continuer en français ou en anglais?

[IF NEEDED: Je vous remercie. Quelqu'un vous rappellera bientôt pour mener le sondage en français.]

1. May I please speak with the person in your household who is 18 years of age or older and who has had the most recent birthday? Would that be you? **[IF THAT PERSON IS NOT AVAILABLE ARRANGE CALLBACK]**

Yes **=> CONTINUE**

No **=> ASK TO SPEAK TO ‘ELIGIBLE’ PERSON AND START AGAIN**

REFUSED **=> THANK AND TERMINATE**

1. Would you be willing to take part in this survey? We can do it now or at a time more convenient for you.

Yes, now **=> CONTINUE**

Yes, call later **=> SCHEDULE CALLBACK DATE AND TIME**

REFUSED **=> THANK AND TERMINATE**

**[IF ASKED]** The survey will take about 5 minutes to complete.

1A. Thinking of the issues facing Canada today, which one would you say the Government of Canada should focus on most? **[CAPTURE FIRST MENTION]**

**[NO PRE-CODED LIST - INTERVIEWER NOTE: TOP ANSWER MUST BE RECORDED FIRST]**

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[DO NOT READ] I don’t know / Refusal

1B. Are there any others? **[MULTIPLE MENTIONS]**

**[NO PRE-CODED LIST]**

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[DO NOT READ] I don’t know / Refusal

**[ROTATE QUESTIONS 2, 3 – THEN ASK Q4, FOLLOWED BY Q5]**

2. Using a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is terrible and 10 is excellent, how would you rate the current state of **the Canadian economy**?

1-10

[DO NOT READ] I don’t know / Refusal

3. Using a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is terrible and 10 is excellent, how would you rate the current state of **the United States economy**?

1-10

[DO NOT READ] I don’t know / Refusal

3B. Using a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is terrible and 10 is excellent, how would you rate the current state of **the [INSERT PROVINCE]** economy?

1-10

[DO NOT READ] I don’t know / Refusal

4. Using a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is terrible and 10 is excellent, how would you rate the current state of **the economy of China**?

1-10

[DO NOT READ] I don’t know / Refusal

5. Over the next six months, do you **think** the Canadian economy will be stronger, weaker or will there be no change?

**[NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT SAYS “HOPE” IT WILL BE STRONGER, CLARIFY WHETHER S/HE MEANS HOPE OR ACTUALLY THINK]**

Stronger

Weaker

No change

[DO NOT READ] I don’t know / Refusal

6. Thinking about the global economy, in your view, has the global economy turned the corner on the economic crisis, is the worst yet to come or have things stabilized but not yet begun to improve?

Turned the corner

Worst yet to come

Stabilized, but not yet begun to improve

[DO NOT READ] I don’t know / Refusal

**[SPLIT SAMPLE 7/8]**

7a. Have you read seen or heard any news recently about a group called the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, known as ISIS or ISIL?

7b. What was it that you read, saw or heard?

8a. Have you read seen or heard any news recently about actions the Canadian Government has taken in reaction to a group called the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, known as ISIS or ISIL?

8b. What was it that you read, saw or heard?

9a. The Federal Government of Canada recently announced that the Canadian Armed Forces would join the international coalition fighting ISIL in Iraq.

Do you support or oppose the Canadian Government sending Canadian Armed Forces to launch air strikes against ISIL? Would that be strongly or somewhat [support/oppose]?

**IF SUPPORT AT Q9a, ASK:**

9b. What is the main reason you support this decision?

**IF OPPOSE AT Q9a, ASK:**

9c. What is the main reason you oppose this decision?

**STANDARD DEMOGRAPHICS**

Finally, I’d like to ask you some questions for statistical purposes. I'd like to remind you that all your answers are completely confidential.

D1. Which of the following categories best describes your current employment status? Are you...? **[READ LIST, ACCEPT ONE RESPONSE]**

Working full-time (35 or more hours per week)

Working part-time (less than 35 hours per week)

Self-employed

Student attending full time school (not working)

Unemployed, but looking for work

Not in the workforce (e.g. unemployed, but not looking for work, a full-time homemaker or parent)

Retired

Other

[DO NOT READ] REFUSED

D2. What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed to date?
**[READ LIST, ACCEPT ONE RESPONSE]**

Elementary school or less

Secondary school

Some post-secondary

College, vocational or trade school

Undergraduate university program

Graduate or professional university program

[DO NOT READ] REFUSED

D3. In what year were you born?

RECORD YEAR: \_\_ \_\_ \_\_ \_\_

[DO NOT READ] REFUSED

D4. Are there any children under the age of 18 currently living in your household?

Yes

No

[DO NOT READ] REFUSED

D.2 Version française

***Questionnaire BCP***

***Automne 2014***

Bonjour, je m’appelle \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. Je vous appelle au nom de la firme de recherche Léger. Nous menons présentement une étude pour le compte du Gouvernement du Canada au sujet d'enjeux actuels importants pour les Canadiens et nous aimerions que vous participiez. Je tiens à signaler que vos réponses demeureront absolument confidentielles et que ce sondage est enregistré auprès de l'Association de la recherche et de l'intelligence marketing (ARIM).

1. Pourrais-je parler à un membre de votre foyer qui a 18 ans ou plus ayant le plus récemment célébré son anniversaire? Seriez-vous cette personne ? **[SI LA PERSONNE N’EST PAS DISPONIBLE, FIXER UN MOMENT POUR LE RAPPEL]**

Oui **=> CONTINUER**

Non **=> DEMANDER LA PERSONNE ÉLIGIBLE ET RECOMMENCER**

REFUS [DÉCLARATION SPONTANÉE] **=> REMERCIER ET TERMINER**

1. Seriez-vous disponible pour prendre part à ce sondage ? Nous pouvons le faire dès maintenant ou à un moment plus propice pour vous.

Oui, maintenant **=> CONTINUER**

Oui, rappeler **=> CÉDULER LA DATE ET L’HEURE POUR UN RAPPEL**

REFUS **=> REMERCIER ET TERMINER**

**[SI DEMANDÉ]** Le sondage est d’une durée d’environ 7 minutes.

1A. Si vous songez aux enjeux avec lesquels le Canada est aux prises en ce moment, sur lequel de ces enjeux le gouvernement du Canada devrait-il le plus axer ses efforts, selon vous?

**[PAS DE LISTE PRÉCODÉE – NOTE À L’INTERVIEWER : NOTEZ LA PREMIÈRE RÉPONSE]**

Inscrire la réponse : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[NE PAS LIRE] Ne sait pas / Refus

1B.Y en a-t-il d’autres? **[ACCEPTER PLUSIEURS RÉPONSES]**

**[PAS DE LISTE PRÉCODÉE]**

Inscrire la réponse : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[NE PAS LIRE] Ne sait pas / Refus

**[ASSURER LA ROTATION DES QUESTIONS 2, 3 – ENSUITE POSER Q3B, SUIVI DE Q4]**

2. En utilisant une échelle de 1 à 10, où 1 signifie « très mauvais » et 10, « excellent », comment évaluez-vous l’état actuel de l’économie du Canada?

1-10

[NE PAS LIRE] Ne sait pas / Refus

3. En utilisant une échelle de 1 à 10, où 1 signifie « très mauvais » et 10, « excellent », comment évaluez-vous l’état actuel de l’économie des États-Unis?

1-10

[NE PAS LIRE] Ne sait pas / Refus

4. En utilisant une échelle de 1 à 10, où 1 signifie « très mauvais » et 10, « excellent », comment évaluez-vous l’état actuel de l’économie [de / de l’ / de la / du] [INSÉREZ LA PROVINCE]?

1-10

[NE PAS LIRE] Ne sait pas / Refus

5. En utilisant une échelle de 1 à 10, où 1 signifie « très mauvais » et 10, « excellent », comment évaluez-vous l’état actuel de l’économie de la Chine?

1-10

[NE PAS LIRE] Ne sait pas / Refus

5. Au cours des six prochains mois, **croyez-vous** que l’économie du Canada s’améliorera, se détériorera ou ne changera pas?

**[NOTE À L’INTERVIEWEUR : SI LE RÉPONDANT DIT QU’IL « ESPÈRE » QU’ELLE S’AMÉLIORERA, DEMANDEZ-LUI DE PRÉCISER S’IL VEUT DIRE QU’IL ESPÈRE QU’ELLE S’AMÉLIORERA OU S’IL PENSE VRAIMENT QU’ELLE S’AMÉLIORERA.]**

S’améliorera

Se détériorera

Ne changera pas

[NE PAS LIRE] Ne sait pas / Refus

6. En ce qui concerne l'économie mondiale, croyez-vous qu'elle a commencé à remonter la pente, qu'il faut s'attendre au pire ou que la situation s'est stabilisée sans pour autant s'être améliorée?

A commencé à remonter la pente

Il faut s'attendre à pire

La situation s'est stabilisée sans pour autant s'être améliorée

[NE PAS LIRE] Ne sait pas / Refus

**[ÉCHANTILLON DIVISÉ Q7 ET Q8]**

7A. Avez-vous récemment lu, vu ou entendu des nouvelles à propos d’un groupe nommé l’État islamique en Iraq et en Syrie, aussi connu sous l’acronyme EI?

Oui

Non

[NE PAS LIRE] Ne sait pas / Refus

7B. **[POSER SI Q7A=Oui]** Qu’avez-vous lu, vu ou entendu?

Inscrire la réponse : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[NE PAS LIRE] Ne sait pas / Refus

8A. Avez-vous récemment lu, vu ou entendu des nouvelles à propos des actions prises par le Gouvernement du Canada en réaction à un groupe nommé l’État islamique en Iraq et en Syrie, aussi connu sous l’acronyme EI?

Oui

Non

[NE PAS LIRE] Ne sait pas / Refus

8B. **[POSER SI Q8A=Oui]** Qu’avez-vous lu, vu ou entendu?

Inscrire la réponse : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[NE PAS LIRE] Ne sait pas / Refus

9A. Le Gouvernement du Canada a récemment annoncé que les Forces armées canadiennes se joindraient à la coalition internationale qui combat l’État islamique en Iraq.

Êtes-vous en faveur ou opposé à ce que le Gouvernement du Canada envoie les Forces armées canadiennes pour lancer des attaques aériennes contre l’État islamique en Iraq? Est-ce très ou plutôt [en faveur / opposé]

Très favorable

Plutôt favorable

Plutôt opposé

Très opposé

[NE PAS LIRE] Ne sait pas / Refus

**SI FAVORABLE À Q9A, DEMANDER :**

9B. Pourquoi êtes-vous en faveur de cette décision?

Inscrire la réponse : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[NE PAS LIRE] Ne sait pas / Refus

**SI OPPOSÉ À Q9A, DEMANDER :**

9B. Pourquoi êtes-vous opposé à cette décision?

Inscrire la réponse : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[NE PAS LIRE] Ne sait pas / Refus

**QUESTIONS DÉMOGRAPHIQUES**

**Voilà qui met fin au sondage que nous avons effectué pour le compte du Bureau du Conseil privé du Canada.**

**Dans les mois à venir, le rapport sera disponible à Bibliothèque et archives Canada. Nous vous remercions beaucoup d'avoir pris le temps d'y participer, nous vous en sommes reconnaissants.**