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## HIGHLIGHTS

- Overall, before follow-up non-response rates were slightly lower for the EFS than those found in the 1991 Edit Sample Study.
- Non-response rates were drastically reduced by follow-up. Only a handful of questions had after follow-up non-response rates of more than 4\%.
- $55 \%$ of respondent completed questionnaires failed edit using the rule of six. The 1991 Edit Sample Study found a 2B Edit Failure Rate of $\mathbf{8 7 \%}$. If the 1991 mandatory/non-mandatory edit method had been used, the edit failure rate would have been about the same as in 1991.
- Use of the rule of six instead of 1991 edits for the NCT did not cause a large increase in after follow-up non-response rates.
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## INTRODUCTION

The 1993 National Census Test (NCT) was the major field test of proposed questionnaire changes under the 1996 Content Determination Project. The NCT took place in November 1993, and selected households from the ten provinces using a Labour Force Survey (LFS) based sample and twelve special samples consisting of certain ethnic groups residing in large metropolitan centres. Any new questions, or major changes to questions proposed for the 1996 Census were to be tested in the NCT. Although the test involved all aspects of survey and Census taking, its primary goal was to provide subject matter analysts and Census Management with the necessary data to decide whether or not the new or improved questions worked well enough to be considered for inclusion on the 1996 Census questionnaire.

## METHODOLOGY

The NCT used two different methods to sample households. Approximately 17,000 households were selected using old rotations of the LFS. The LFS uses a multi-stage stratified sampling technique which keeps travelling costs lower than using a more random sampling method. Also, use of the LFS design provided a sample that was nationally and regionally representative, and allowed use of the LFS weighting system which was already in place. Another 4,000 households were selected as the twelve Special Population Samples. These samples were selected to try to target specific ethnic populations in large cities. Ten of the samples were selected using the 1991 Census database, and two were selected using Métis membership lists. The specific EAs selected for several of the samples that were selected using the Census base were chosen on the advice of the local Regional Office. The remainder were chosen by pinpointing EAs with a high concentration of the desired ethnic group.

The NCT had an Edit Failure Study (EFS) based on the same idea as the Edit Sample Study (ESS) carried out for the 1991 Census, and the Response Rate Sample Study (RRSS) carried out for the 1988 NCT. The EFS involved data capture of a sample of questionnaires immediately
after mailback (to the regional office) by the respondent. This provides a database of respondent answers before edit and follow-up have been attempted, and before the interviewer has in any way altered the questionnaire data. One half of the questionnaires from the LFS based sample had specially marked labels which designated them for capture as a part of the EFS if they were returned to the RO by November 30th. These questionnaires were then separated from the unmarked questionnaires, sent to data capture, and then returned to the regular flow of the NCT questionnaires which were being sorted into interviewer assignments and then sent to the interviewers for edit and follow-up. The EFS differed from the ESS in that questionnaires were captured in the ROs, as opposed to photocopies of questionnaires being captured in Ottawa. The EFS differed from the RRSS because no follow-up was done for RRSS questionnaires, the questionnaires were simply mailed back to Ottawa and captured.

## RESPONSE RATES

## Method

As done for the 1991 ESS, item response rates were calculated for each question on a completed questionnaire. Records that were entirely blank were excluded from the database on which the response rates were calculated. This meant that Out of Scope, Refusal, and Non-Contact households, as well as Temporary Resident and Foreign Resident households were not considered in the calculation of response rates. These rates were calculated for Subject Matter analysts to provide them with an indicator of how well their questions worked. For each step and question on the questionnaire, the non-response rate was calculated, along with the multiple response rate (if applicable) and/or the partial response rate (if applicable). Response rates were also calculated based on many different sets of data. Response rates were calculated based on:

EFS data (Before Follow-up)
LFS data
LFS data (Weighted)
Each of 12 Special Population Samples:
Blacks in Halifax, Montreal and Toronto
Asians in Montréal, Toronto, and Vancouver
Latin Americans in Montreal
Aboriginals in Winnipeg, Regina, and Edmonton
Métis in Winnipeg and Saskatoon

Response rates were calculated for each step/question based on the number of persons/households that were supposed to answer that question (number of records in scope). Unfortunately, when a filter question for a skip pattern is not answered, or is answered in an ambiguous fashion, it is impossible to determine whether or not a given record is in scope for a subsequent question. This is because the question might have been legitimately skipped by the respondent. There are two different methods of determining whether or not a record is in scope for a question when there is ambiguity caused by an improperly answered filter question. The Definite method assumes that a record is out of scope unless it is clearly in scope. The Potential method assumes that a record is in scope unless it is clearly out of scope. In practice, the Definite method provides a lower bound and the Potential method provides an upper bound on the actual non-response rate for a question. For questions not designed to be skipped on the questionnaire, only one set of response rates was provided, while for the remaining questions, Definite and Potential rates were provided. The specifications of how the response rates were to be calculated were sent out for approval by Subject Matter areas, and corrections were received and incorporated. Response rate tables are included in Appendix A. The following sections present highlights of the results for each set of response rate tables.

## Results

EFS Subsample - Definite Method

These rates are the most interesting for the purpose of the NCT because they allow insight into the amount of difficulty the actual respondents encountered when answering each question. Nonresponse rates were relatively high for the coverage steps and household questions $\mathbf{~} 7.8 \%$ $18.6 \%$ ), although for the Steps, the non-response rates were not higher than usual. Some of this non-response is due to capture problems, when household information was captured for persons other than person 1 on the questionnaire. This was found to be a common problem (for the EFS data only) for capture of Q47-Q49 data in Montreal. Question 2, Relationship to Person One, had an extremely high non-response rate ( $21.5 \%$ ). This was found to be mostly due to the circle not being checked for Person 1. To take this into account, a response rate was then calculated that only considered persons with person numbers greater than one (3.0\%). The remodelled question on Ethnic Origin also had a non-response rate that was relatively high (12.3\%), but not unusual for this question. Many of the traditional trends concerning non-response rates held true for the EFS data. Questions with multiple parts had higher non-response rates for the latter parts. Non-response rates were generally higher the closer one gets to the end of the questionnaire. Non-response rates were highest for the Income question (23.6\%-33.1\%). At the request of the Labour area, 'derived' response rates were created for Industry and Occupation. Multiple response rates were high for Q9 (Language), Q16 (Ethnic Origin), Q25 (Degrees Obtained), and Q47 (Who Pays).

## EFS Subsample -Potential Method

As expected, the potential response rates are considerably higher than the definite response rates. Many of the questions that were to be skipped by most respondents suffered greatly because of it when their potential response rates were calculated. These questions were most affected by the inclusion of largely blank records as in scope for the question. Most of the non-response
rates were near $20 \%$. The questions with the highest non-response rates were Year of Immigration (43.8\%), Start Job (53.2\%), and Self Employed/Incorporated (63.0\%).

## Weighted vs Unweighted Response Rates (LFS Sample)

It was left up to each Subject Matter area as to whether they would use weighted or unweighted response rates. For the large majority of questions, the difference between the rates is minimal. There are a few questions with significant differences. The differences seem to occur for questions with few respondents. Using the definite method, Q15 (Year of Immigration) went from $2.1 \%$ unweighted to $1.3 \%$ weighted and Q32 (Start Job) went from $1.5 \%$ unweighted to $2.1 \%$ weighted. As well, the non-response rates for some parts of Q46 (Income) were considerably higher using unweighted counts. Using the Potential method, the same trends occurred for Q15 and Q32.

LFS Sample - Definite Method

The first thing that stands out about the LFS non-response rates is that they are considerably lower than the non-response rates from before follow-up. Well over half of the questions had an after follow-up non-response rate of less than $2 \%$. Aside from the Income question, there are only a handful of questions with non-response rates of more than 4\% (Q16, Q35, Q36, Q38, Q40, and Q42). Question 2 has a non-response rate of $10.1 \%$ when the person 1 column is considered. This becomes only $1.6 \%$ when the person 1 column is excluded. A response rate was calculated for Question 6 (Common-Law Status) which considered only respondents aged .15 and over, although the non-response rate for this population did not differ much from the non-response rate of the entire sample. Before follow-up, Q46k, Total Income, had the highest non-response rate on the questionnaire. After follow-up, the non-response rate for Q46k is noticeably lower than those of the other parts of Q46. This likely has to do with the special edit rule for Q46. The non-response rates for the household questions and steps were reduced more
drastically than the person level questions, although some of this was due to correction of the capture/file problems mentioned earlier. Multiple response rates were high for Q 9 ( $19.2 \%$ ), Q16 (34.8\%), Q25 (24.4\%), Q47 (35.7\%), and Q49 (17.7\%). All other questions had multiple response rates of $1.5 \%$ or lower.

## LFS Sample - Potential Method

The potential non-response rates are also considerably lower than those from before follow-up. Most of the potential non-response rates are now under $10 \%$. As observed for the potential nonresponse rates from before follow-up, the questions with the fewest number of in scope respondent records have the highest potential non-response rates. This is again because these questions are most affected by the addition of records with unanswered filter questions to the number of in scope records. The affected questions and potential non-response rates are: Q15 ( $17.2 \%$ ), Q32 ( $18.6 \%$ ), and Q40 (33.2\%).

Special Population Samples - Definite Method

Before making conclusions about response patterns of specific ethnic populations based on these response rates, it should be mentioned that the response rates are based on all of the responses given for each sample, not merely on the respondents that are a part of the ethnic group that was targeted by that sample. From examining NCT responses to the questions on Race and Aboriginal Status, it was found that some of the samples did not contain many persons in the desired ethnic group. In particular, the target success rates for the samples Aboriginals in Edmonton, Aboriginals in Winnipeg, Latin Americans in Montreal, and Blacks in Montreal were extremely poor.

Definite response rate tables were created for each of the twelve Special Population Samples. Because a detailed discussion of results for each of the samples would be too lengthy, only
trends and results that stand out and/or differ from the LFS sample results will be listed. Particular attention will be paid to the potentially ethnicity related questions that would most likely be affected by the makeup of the samples (Q9-Q19).

Blacks in Halifax - High non-response for Q14. High multiple response for Q16, Q47.

Asians in Montréal - High non-response for Q14. High multiple response for Q9, Q41.

Blacks in Montreal - High non-response for Q15. Low non-response for Q46. High multiple response for $\mathrm{Q} 9, \mathrm{Q} 10, \mathrm{Q} 11, \mathrm{Q} 41$. Low multiple response for $\mathrm{Q} 16, \mathrm{Q} 25, \mathrm{Q} 49$.

Latin Americans in Montréal - High non-response for Q14. Low non-response for Q46. High multiple response for $\mathrm{Q} 9, \mathrm{Q} 10, \mathrm{Q} 11$. Low multiple response for $\mathrm{Q} 16, \mathrm{Q} 49$.

Asians in Toronto - High non-response for Q14, Q41, Q46. Low non-response for Q16. High multiple response for $\mathrm{Q} 9, \mathrm{Q} 18$. Low multiple response for $\mathrm{Q} 16, \mathrm{Q} 47, \mathrm{Q} 49$.

Blacks in Toronto - High non-response for Q9-Q14. High multiple response for Q9, Q13, Q18. Low multiple response for Q16.

Aboriginals in Winnipeg - High multiple response for Q9. High partial response for Q19.

Métis in Winnipeg - High non-response for Q13, Q18, Q46a-j. Low non-response for Q17, Q46k. High multiple response for Q16. High partial response for Q19.

Aboriginals in Regina - High non-response for Q14, Q15. High partial response for Q19.

Métis in Saskatoon - High non-response for Q17, Q18, Q19. High multiple response for Q16, Q18. Low multiple response for Q 9 . High partial response for Q 19 . Only one immigrant response.

Aboriginals in Edmonton - High non-response for Q13, Q14, Q17, Q19. High partial response for Q19.

Asians in Vancouver - High non-response for Q9, Q13, Q14. High multiple response for Q9, Q10, Q11, Q18. Low multiple response for Q16.

Special Population Samples - Potential Method

There are few new trends apparent in these tables that have not appeared in other tables. The potential non-response rates are low for the Blacks in Montréal sample, high for the Asians in Vancouver sample, and very high for the Blacks in Toronto sample. Throughout, the potential non-response rates are high for the questions with few in scope records (Q15, Q24, Q32, Q40).

## Comparison with 1991 ESS

The 1991 ESS found before follow-up non-response rates for respondent completed questionnaires. Although there are differences between the Census and NCT and the ESS and EFS, some comparison will be made that will only show the major differences in non-response rates. Overall, the non-response rates are slightly lower for the EFS than for the ESS. The EFS had higher non-response rates for Q2, but when Person 1 is excluded, the rate is lower than for the ESS. The EFS non-response rates are higher for Q25, Q34, Q35, Q37, Q38, Q39, Q42, Q44, Q46a, and Q46k. All the non-response rates for these questions increased by roughly $4 \%$ $5 \%$. Among questions that had much lower non-response rates for the EFS were Q7b, Q7c (down 10\%), Q9 (down 6\%), Q14 (down 7\%), Q20 (down 9\%), Q33 (down 7\%), and Step 3 (down 9\%).

## EVALUATION OF THE RULE OF SEX

## Introduction

For the 1991 Census, each question on the 2B questionnaire was to be edited by the Census Representative after mailback by the respondent. Whether the questionnaire passed or failed edit (and thus, whether or not follow-up was attempted), was based on a set of edit rules. Each question on the questionnaire was designated as either mandatory or non-mandatory (on the 1991 Census 2B questionnaire, approximately one half of the questions were mandatory). If a mandatory question was not answered correctly, the questionnaire failed edit automatically, and all the questions that were not answered correctly were to be followed-up. If no mandatory questions were answered incorrectly, the questionnaire then failed edit if six or more of the remaining (non-mandatory) questions were not answered correctly. The 1991 Edit Sample Study (ESS) used a simulation of these field edits to estimate that before follow-up, 87.2\% of 2B questionnaires failed edit. After follow-up (follow-up was not necessarily done, or correctly done, on any given questionnaire), the 2B questionnaire edit failure rate (EFR) was estimated to be still $69.3 \%$. It should be mentioned here that in 1991, as well as for the National Census Test (NCT), there are some edits that cannot be simulated because the necessary information was not captured. As an example, a questionnaire fails edit if there are more people listed in Step 2 (the household roster) than in Question 1. Because information from the roster is not captured, this edit cannot be simulated. As well, the ESS frame only included questionnaires that were mailed back relatively shortly after Census day. In this way, the ESS has a frame similar to that of the Edit-Failure Study (EFS) of the NCT. Thus, although the difference is likely very small, the actual edit failure rates for the Census and the NCT are slightly higher than estimated by simulation.

The 1993 NCT has implemented a different method of questionnaire edit. The new method is known as the "rule of six": if six or more questions are not answered correctly, then the questionnaire fails edit, and follow-up should be attempted. There are still a few exceptions to this rule (Steps 2-6) that could require mandatory follow-up. All the exceptions pertain to cases
where there is doubt about the number of usual residents of the household, which could cause a change in the number of persons on the questionnaire, and thus cause a large number of nonresponses for a missed person.

There are three major questions about how the rule of six worked in the NCT that will be examined:

1. How did the "rule" affect data quality?
2. How did the "rule" affect the amount of follow-up that should have been done?
3. How was the "rule" applied by field staff?

The Edit Failure Study selected a one half sample of the LFS portion of the NCT. Of these households, the households that mailed back their questionnaires before November 30 were included in the EFS. The EFS sample excludes questionnaire data that were obtained through follow-up by interviewers. Thus, the data reflect the answers of the respondents themselves, not the information obtained through interviews.

## Results

## Follow-Up

The edit failure rates found for the NCT EFS should not be expected to be the same as those for the ESS. Firstly, there are differences between the surveys and samples themselves: The NCT used many trained LFS interviewers, whereas the Census used mostly interviewers with: little training. The ESS captured only questionnaires that were mailed back within a week of Census day; the EFS captured questionnaires that were mailed back up to three weeks after NCT day. It is usually expected that the EFRs are lower for questionnaires that are promptly mailed back. The Census has more publicity than the NCT. Secondly, there are the differences between the questionnaires. There were several new questions on the NCT questionnaire (Q9,

Q17, Q18, Q24, Q26, Q27, Q36, Q41, Q43), and there were several questions on the Census 2B that were not on the NCT questionnaire (Religion, Fertility, several Education questions, and several Household questions). As well, there were many Census questions that were slightly modified or totally redesigned for the NCT. Thus, the EFRs for the EFS are not necessarily supposed to mirror those of the Census.

Several different edit rules and permutations of data were used in the simulation of Edit Failure Rates. Unless mentioned otherwise, EFRs refer to edit using the rule of six. The results mentioned here are listed in Table A, which shows the EFR using the rules of $5,6,7$, and 8. Table A also shows the amount of edit failure caused by mandatory steps. Simulation of edit by the rule of six on before follow-up (EFS) data yielded an EFR of $55.0 \%$. Thus, potentially $55.0 \%$ of the questionnaires mailed back to the Regional Offices by respondents failed edit and subsequently should have had follow-up attempted. $2.7 \%$ of the questionnaires failed edit because of the "mandatory" steps. Question 2 had a high non-response rate before follow-up because of the check circle being left blank for Person 1. It is likely that the circle will, as in the Census, be pre-checked for Person 1 in 1996, so it was decided to determine what the EFR would have been if the circle had been pre-checked for the NCT. If Q2 is assumed to pass edit for all Person 1s, then the rule of six EFR drops to $53.0 \%$. Another issue that has a large effect on the EFR is whether the edit of Q46 considers the question to be a single entity (and therefore contribute no more than one edit failure per person to the rule of six), or as eleven separate parts (in which case, Q46 could cause eleven edit failures per person). Unless otherwise indicated, Q46 has been considered as separate parts for the calculation of EFRs. However, the special edit rule for Q46 in the Interviewer's Manual (NCT-40) does not clearly indicate which case should apply. For the rates listed thus far, Q46 has been considered as separate parts. If Q46 is considered as a single edit pass or failure, and Q2 is still considered answered for all Person 1 s , then the EFR drops from $53.0 \%$ to $\mathbf{4 5 . 1 \%}$. For the simulation of the rule of six using the ESS, Q2 had the Person 1 circle pre-checked, and Q46 was considered as one question, so the EFR of $45.1 \%$ is the corresponding rate to the $\mathbf{6 . 4 \%}$ figure found using ESS data.

Table A
Edit Failure Rates

| Data Edited <br> and <br> Questions Modified | Rule of 5 5 <br> (\%) | Rule of 6 <br> (\%) | Rule of 7 <br> (\%) | Rule of 8 <br> $(\%)$ | Mandatory <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EFS | 59.2 | 55.0 | 51.7 | 49.3 | 2.7 |
| EFS (Q2) | 56.8 | 53.0 | 50.3 | 47.8 | 2.7 |
| EFS (Q2,Q46) | 50.1 | 45.1 | 41.6 | 38.5 | 2.7 |
| EFS, 91 Edit | 86.6 | 86.4 | 86.2 | 86.2 | 86.1 |
| EFS, 91 Edit (Q2) | 78.5 | 78.2 | 78.0 | 77.9 | 77.8 |
| NCT | 23.3 | 20.0 | 17.6 | 16.0 | 1.0 |
| NCT (Q2) | 22.0 | 19.1 | 16.9 | 15.6 | 1.0 |
| NCT (Q2,Q46) | 16.2 | 13.1 | 10.9 | 9.8 | 1.0 |
| EFS After Follow-Up | 25.6 | 22.1 | 19.4 | 17.7 | 1.8 |
| EFS After Follow-Up (Q2) | 24.1 | 20.9 | 18.7 | 17.2 | 1.8 |
| EFS After Follow-Up (Q2,Q46) | 18.3 | 14.9 | 12.8 | 11.5 | 1.8 |
| EFS After Follow-Up, 91 Edit | 66.1 | 65.8 | 65.5 | 65.4 | 65.4 |
| EFS After Follow-Up, 91 Edit (Q2) | 54.2 | 54.0 | 53.6 | 53.5 | 53.4 |

Table B

## 2A Edit Failure Rates

| Data Edited <br> and <br> Questions Modified | Rule of 1 <br> (\%) | Rule of 2 | Rule of 3 | Rule of 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (\%) | (\%) | (\%) |  |  |
| EFS 2A | 73.6 | 40.4 | 25.3 | 15.1 |
| EFS 2A (Q2) | 49.9 | 33.0 | 19.4 | 13.5 |

The EFRs mentioned above were based on before follow-up EFS data. Simulation of edit, with the same modifications as mentioned above, was also performed on the NCT data as a whole (LFS based sample only, after follow-up), and on after follow-up data for the same households that were. included in the EFS. Simulated edit using the rule of six on NCT data calculated an EFR of $20.0 \%$. Modification of the edit of Q2 caused the EFR to drop to $19.1 \%$, and further modification of the edit of Q46 caused the EFR to drop to $13.1 \%$. Using the NCT data, $1.0 \%$ of the EFR was due to the mandatory steps. Simulating edit of after follow-up EFS data, the EFRs were 22.1 \% (unaltered), $20.9 \%$ (Q2 edit modified), and $14.9 \%$ (Q2 and Q46 edits modified). $1.8 \%$ of the EFRs for after follow-up EFS data was due to the mandatory steps.

To evaluate the effectiveness of the rule of six, it is necessary to compare what edit results happened using the rule of six vs what would have happened using the 1991 mandatory/nonmandatory edits. Thus, a simulation of the 1991 method of mandatory and non-mandatory steps and questions was performed. By editing before follow-up EFS data using the 1991 edit rules, and EFR of $86.4 \%$ is found. All but $0.2 \%$ of the edit failures were due to mandatory steps and questions. As above, the edits were modified for Q2 to eliminate Q2 failing edit for Person 1 (Q2 could not have failed edit for Person 1 on the 1991 Questionnaire). This caused the EFR to drop to $\mathbf{7 8 . 2 \%}$, of which all but $0.4 \%$ was due to mandatory steps and questions. $\mathbf{7 8 . 2 \%}$ corresponds to the $87.2 \%$ EFR found for the 1991 Census 2B in the ESS. The 1991 edits were also simulated on the after follow-up data for EFS households. This yielded an EFR of $\mathbf{6 5 . 8 \%}$ (all but $0.4 \%$ mandatory) with the edit as is, and an EFR of $54.0 \%$ (all but $0.6 \%$ mandatory) with the edit for Q2 modified. No changes were made here to the edit of Q46 because Q46 was mandatory if it was totally blank, and had no effect on edit failure of the questionnaire otherwise.

The NCT only tested a 2B type questionnaire, so to estimate what the EFR using a "rule of $\mathrm{X}^{\prime \prime}$ technique would have been for a 2A. Questionnaire, the NCT questionnaire was truncated such that only steps and questions corresponding to those that appeared on the 1991 Census 2A were considered. Simulation of the rule of two on before follow-up data produced a $40.4 \%$ EFR. With the edit for Q2 modified (as it was in 1991), the EFR dropped to $33.0 \%$. These EFRs are
listed in Table B. The corresponding figure found using ESS data on 1991 Census 2B questionnaires is $25.5 \%$. Even with the edit for Q2 modified, there is a large difference between the figures for the EFS and the ESS. This is because of the EFS/ESS differences mentioned above, and because in the simulation using ESS data, all of the steps and questions were considered non-mandatory, whereas for the EFS, the mandatory steps are still considered mandatory. Also, simulation using a truncated long form would be expected to find a higher EFR than simulation using a legitimate short form. In studying Table B, it is obvious that any movement of the edit threshold (shown for 1-4) causes a significant change in the estimated 2A EFR.

Much of the analysis plans for the rule of six were based on Interviewer Control Sheet information. Listed on the control sheet are, for each household, whether or not the questionnaire was received from the Regional Office (and thus, mailed back by the respondent), whether or not the interviewer passed or failed the questionnaire, and whether or not follow-up was attempted or completed. Unfortunately, a significant portion of the control sheet information was missing. The indicator of the result of interviewer edit was available for roughly one half of the households. Using only the result of edit and "mailed back" columns of the control sheets; an EFR of $40.1 \%$ is found for respondent completed questionnaires. However, by also using the column that indicated follow-up was attempted (there were many instances of the follow-up columns being completed when the edit column was blank), and assuming that for "mailed back" households, follow-up was only attempted for failed edit households, an EFR of $54.6 \%$ is found.

By the results of EFR simulation listed in Table A, it can be seen that, potentially, the rule of six caused a $31 \%$ reduction in the edit failure rate ( $55 \%$ vs $86 \%$ ) compared with the mandatory/non-mandatory method of edit. This could represent a large reduction of follow-up for the 1996 Census. It was observed from control list information that follow-up actually did occur for some questionnaires that passed edit (interviewer or simulated edit), and that some questionnaires failed simulated edit, but passed interviewer edit. Because the control list shows that there were occurences of interviewers following-up for households that passed edit (the
interviewer marked them as passed on the Control list), it is possible that the reduction of follow-up was lower than $31 \%$. The mandatory steps have a relatively small effect on the amount of follow-up done for edit using the rule of six. However, when the mandatory/nonmandatory 1991 edits are used, almost all of the edit failure is due to mandatory steps and questions. It can be seen from Table A that considering Q46 as a single edit failure would have a considerable effect on the EFR using the rule of six. Movement of the edit threshold that considers the rules of $5,6,7$, and 8 have a relatively small effect on the EFR. Comparison of the EFR of the NCT and the after follow-up NCT data shows that there little bias of the EFS sample, and that the EFR for interviewer completed questionnaires is comparable to that of respondent completed questionnaires.

## Data Quality

A major concern about the implementation of the rule of six is that a relaxation of the edit rules would have an adverse effect on incoming data quality because less follow-up was done, and after follow-up non-response rates would be higher than if the 1991 edit method had been used. To address this concern, a simulation was performed that attempted to compare after follow-up non-response rates using the rule of six and the 1991 edit rules. This would give, for each question, the amount of non-response attributable to the rule of six being used instead of the 1991 edit rules. This was done by examining the edit simulation and response rate data to find households that passed edit using the rule of six, but would have failed edit using the mandatory/non-mandatory edits. For these households, two different methods were used to determine what the difference in after follow-up non-response rates would be. The first method makes the assumptions that 1) Interviewer edit achieved the same result for each household as simulated edit; and 2) Follow-up of failed edit questionnaires was always successful, and all missing information was obtained. Although these assumptions are somewhat idealistic, they do allow for calculation of the maximum difference in after follow-up non-response rates that could be caused by the rule of six, and they discount factors related to the difference between NCT and Census interviewers which can colour the results. The second method excludes the
assumptions and attempts to model what actually occurred in the field. This involved, for each question, finding how often a non-response on a failed edit questionnaire was successfully followed-up. Ideally, it would have been desirable to use the actual interviewer edit from the control list to determine edit failure for this model. Unfortunately, much of this data was missing, so the simulated edit was used. The proportion of unsuccessful follow-up was calculated as follows: Each questionnaire was edited using before follow-up data. This information was linked with the non-response rates for each question from before and after follow-up. Then, the rate of unsuccessful follow-up for each question was considered to be the number of non-responses after follow-up divided by the number of non-responses before followup, for failed edit households. This rate was used to estimate the after follow-up non-response rates for edit using the rule of six, and for mandatory and non-mandatory questions using the 1991 edits.

Table $\mathbf{C}$ shows the estimated increase in after follow-up non-response rates due to the use of the rule of six instead of 1991 edits. It shows the difference calculated with and without the assumptions about perfect edit and follow-up (with the assumptions provides a maximum difference). For these calculations, Q46 was considered as eleven part questions. It should be noted that because some passed edit questionnaires were followed-up, the difference between what actually occurred in the NCT and what is simulated for 1991 edits may be even less than indicated in the table. The largest difference shown in the Table is for Q2. This is again due to the check circle for Person 1. If Q2 is made to pass edit for Person 1, then the difference in the after follow-up non-response rate for Q2 is reduced to $0.2 \%$ or less, depending on the assumptions. (Note that all of the other rates would then increase slightly as more questionnaires would have passed edit).

It can be seen from Table C that after the modification for Q 2 , the differences in after follow-up non-response rates are, for most if not all questions, insignificant, and that the implementation of the rule of six seems to have had a minimal effect on the level of incoming data quality. The actual after follow-up non-response rates that these differences should be viewed against are in the Appendix (Table 3 should be used for questions that cannot be skipped, Table 4 for questions

Table C
Difference in After Follow-Up Non-Response Rates
Due to Use of the Rule of Six

| Question | Difference in After Follow-Up Non-Response Rate - <br> With Assumptions | Difference in After FollowUp Non-Response Rate Without Assumptions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q2 | 6.9 | 3.2 |
| Q3 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Q4 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Q5 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Q6 | 0.8 | 0.5 |
| Q7A | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Q7B | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| Q7C | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| Q8 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Q9 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Q10 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Q11 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Q12 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Q13 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Q14 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Q15 | 1.8 | 1.3 |
| Q16 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
| Q17 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Q18 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Q19 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Q20 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Q21 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Q22 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Q23 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Q24 | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| Q25 | 0.4 | 0.2 |


| Q26A | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q26B | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Q26C | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Q26D | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Q27 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Q28 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Q29 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| Q30 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Q31 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| Q32 | 1.2 | 1.0 |
| Q33 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Q34 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Q35 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Q36 | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| Q37 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Q38 | 0.8 | 0.6 |
| Q39 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Q40 | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| Q41 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Q42 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Q43 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Q44 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Q45 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Q46A | 1.3 | 0.6 |
| Q46B | 3.0 | 1.4 |
| Q46C | 2.9 | 1.4 |
| Q46D | 2.4 | 1.2 |
| Q46E | 2.5 | 1.2 |
| Q46F | 2.6 | 1.3 |
| Q46G | 2.7 | 1.4 |
| Q46H | 2.3 | 1.1 |
| Q46I | 3.0 | 1.5 |
| Q46J | 3.3 | 1.6 |
| Q46K | 1.6 | 1.0 |

that can be skipped). The decision on whether or not this amount of increase in non-response is a problem or not rests with the subject matter areas concerned. The distribution in Graph 1 shows a significant decline in the number of edit failures after follow-up. The EFRs found in the 1991 ESS were $87 \%$ before follow-up, and $69 \%$ after follow-up. The corresponding figures for the EFS, using the 1991 edits, but keeping in mind that the rule of six was actually used, show an EFR of $86 \%$ before follow-up and $66 \%$ after follow-up. This suggests that in the field, the rule of six caused the same type of decrease in the EFR that the 1991 edits did for the ESS. Another reflection of the effect that the rule of six had on data quality is the distribution of number of edit failures per questionnaire, from before and after follow-up. These figures are shown in Graphs 1 and 2, which have been separated to allow different scaling.

Application of the Rule of Six by Field Staff

As mentioned above, as have likely occurred in the past, there were some irregularities about the use of the edit rules in the field. Not only are there significant differences between the results of edit by simulation and edit by interviewer, there was also a significant amount of follow-up done for questionnaires that passed edit by the interviewer.

Information obtained from the interviewer debriefing sessions indicates that most of the interviewers found the principle of the rule of six itself easy to apply. The few negative comments about the edit procedure were mostly directed at factors other than the rule of six itself. For example; some complained that the edit was unclear for $\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{Q} 42$, and Q 46 , that the manuals were unclear for some specific situations, or that the concept of mandatory steps was confusing. These problems are either procedural, or are just as much a problem using the 1991 edit method.

## GRAPH 1

## Distribution of \# of Errors per HHLD

 Before and After Follow-Up ( $0-6$ Errors)

Belors Follow-Up - Aher Follow-Up

## GRAPH 2

## Distribution of \# of Errors per HHLD Before and After Follow-Up (>6 Errors)



## APPENDIX

Each table lists a set of response rates which includes \% of non-response, \% of multiple response, \% of partial response, and (for tables 1-4) \% single response. The denominator for the calculation of the response rates for each question is also listed (\# of in scope records). Definite method tables are broken up into Household level questions and Person level questions. Multiple response may be valid or invalid. Multiple responses are invalid for Steps 3,5, and 7; and Questions $2,4,5,6,7,8,19,20,21,22,23,28,29,39,42,43$, and 48. If there were no responses for a given cell, the cell was left blank. If there was any response, a percentage was entered in the cell, even if the percentage was $0.0 \%$. In some tables, there are two rates listed for Q 2 . The second rate was calculated only on respondents with a person number greater than 1. Foe some tables, a response rate was calculated for Q 6 that considered only respondents aged 15 and over. Response rates for the 'derived' variables Industry (combining Q34, Q35) and Occupation (combining Q37, Q38) were produced and included at the request of the Labour Subject Matter area. The tables listing potential response rates include only questions that could legitimately have been skipped. Questions that could not be skipped had only one set of rates and were included in the Definite tables. The difference between Definite and Potential is explained in the text.

The tables included in the Appendix are:

Table 1 EFS Definite
Table 2 EFS Potential
Table 3 LFS Definite Unwgtd.
Table 4 LFS Potential Unwgtd.
Table 5 LFS Definite Wgtd.
Table 6 LFS Potential Wgtd.
Table 7 Halifax Black Definite
Table 8 Montréal Asian Definite
Table 9 Montréal Black Definite
Table 10 Montréal Latin American Definite
Table 11 Toronto Asian Definite
Table 12 Toronto Black Definite
Table 13 Winnipeg Aboriginal Definite
Table 14 Winnipeg Métis Definite
Table 15 Regina Aboriginal Definite

## Table 16 Saskatoon Métis Definite

Table 17 Edmonton Aborignal Definite
Table 18 Vancouver Asian Definite
Table 19 Halifax Black Potential.
Table 20 Montréal Asian Potential
Table 21 Montréal Black Potential
Table 22 Montréal Latin American Potential
Table 23 Toronto Asian Potential
Table 24 Toronto Black Potential
Table 25 Winnipeg Aboriginal Potential
Table 26 Winnipeg Métis Potential
Table 27 Regina Aboriginal Potential
Table 28 Saskatoon Métis Potential
Table 29 Edmonton Aboriginal Potential
Table 30 Vancouver Asian Potential

Table 1
EFS Item Response Rates
Definite Method

| Step / <br> Question <br> Number | Step 1 <br> Question <br> Name | In Scope <br> (\# Records) | Single Response (\%) | NonResponse (\%) | Multiple Response (\%) | Partial Response <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household Level Steps / Questions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DType | Dwelling Type | 3813 | 91.1 | 8.9 |  |  |
| Step 3 | Persons Left Out | 3813 | 85.0 | 15.0 |  |  |
| Step 5 | Temporary Residents | 3813 | 88.7 | 11.1 | 0.1 |  |
| Step 7 | Agriculuiral Operator | 3813 | 92.2 | 7.8 |  |  |
| Q47 | Who Pays | 3813 | 52.0 | 18.3 | 29.7 |  |
| Q48 | Tenure | 3813 | 81.3 | 18.6 | 0.1 |  |
| Q49 | Who Completed | 3813 | 65.7 | 18.6 | 15.6 |  |
| Person Level Questions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q2 | Relationship to Person 1 | 9995 | 78.1 | 21.5 | 0.4 |  |
| Q2 | R2P1 (Person 2 Onwards) | 6182 | 96.4 | 3.0 | 0.6 |  |
| Q3 | Date of Birth | 9995 | 97.6 | 2.1 |  | 0.2 |
| Q4 | Sex | 9995 | 97.6 | 2.3 | 0.0 |  |
| Q5 | Marital Status | 9995 | 95.3 | 4.7 | 0.1 |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status | 9995 | 89.9 | 10.1 | 0.0 |  |
| Q7(a) | Activity Limitation - Home | 9995 | 94.6 | 5.4 | 0.0 |  |
| Q7(b) | Activity Limitation - Work | 9995 | 88.0 | 11.6 | 0.4 |  |
| Q7(c) | Activity Limitation - Other | 9995 | 88.6 | 11.4 |  |  |
| Q8 | Long Term Disabilities | 9995 | 93.5 | 6.5 |  |  |
| Q9 | Language | 9995 | 78.1 | 3.6 | 18.3 |  |
| Q10 | Home Language | 9995 | 95.2 | 3.5 | 1.3 |  |
| Q11 | Mother Tongue | 9995 | 94.8 | 3.9 | 1.3 |  |
| Q12 | Place of Birth | 9995 | 97.0 | 3.0 | 0.1 |  |
| Q13 | Citizenship | 9995 | 94.9 | 3.8 | 1.3 |  |
| Q14 | Landed Immigrant | 9995 | 93.6 | 6.4 |  |  |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 806 | 97.0 | 3.0 |  |  |
| Q16 | Ethnic Origin | 9995 | 55.2 | 12.3 | 32.4 |  |
| Q17 | Aboriginal | 9995 | 94.1 | 5.8 | 0.1 |  |
| Q18 | Race | 9285 | 97.6 | 1.7 | 0.7 |  |
| Q19 | Indian Band | 9995 | 93.4 | 6.2 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| Q20 | Registered Indian | 9995 | 93.0 | 7.0 |  |  |
| Q21 | Mobility Status - 1 Year | 8039 | 94.3 | 3.9 | 0.2 | 1.7 |
| Q22 | Mobility Status - 5 Year | 8039 | 92.0 | 3.6 | 0.1 | 4.3 |
| Q23 | School Attendance | 8039 | 95.4 | 4.5 | 0.1 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 1099 | 96.3 | 2.7 | 1.0 |  |
| Q25 | Degrees Obtained | 8039 | 67.7 | 8.2 | 24.2 |  |


| Q26(a) | Unpaid Work - Housework | 8039 | 94.3 | 5.4 | 0.3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q26(b) | Unpaid Work - Childcare | 8039 | 91.6 | 8.2 | 0.2 |  |
| Q26(c) | Unpaid Work - Care/Seniors | 8039 | 92.6 | 7.3 | 0.1 |  |
| Q26(d) | Unpaid Work - Care/Others | 8039 | 90.0 | 9.9 | 0.1 |  |
| Q27 | Unpaid Volunteer Work | 8039 | 93.5 | 6.4 | 0.1 |  |
| Q28 | Hours Worked | 8039 | 92.0 | 6.9 | 1.1 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 3307 | 90.7 | 9.3 | 0.0 |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 3307 | 93.8 | 6.2 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 3307 | 90.7 | 8.8 | 0.5 |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 417 | 97.1 | 2.6 | 0.2 |  |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 3307 | 88.0 | 11.4 | 0.6 |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 5239 | 89.3 | 9.6 |  | 1.1 |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 5239 | 87.0 | 13.0 |  |  |
|  | $\cdots$ Industry | 5239 | 86.4 | 9.0 |  | 4.7 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 5239 | 82.9 | 16.0 | 1.2 |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 5239 | 87.9 | 12.1 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 5239 | 81.0 | 19.0 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 5239 | 80.7 | 11.8 |  | 7.5 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 5239 | 87.9 | 11.6 | 0.6 |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 530 | 97.2 | 2.6 | 0.2 |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 5239 | 87.6 | 10.8 | 1.6 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 5239 | 84.0 | 12.8 | 3.3 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 3135 | 96.6 | 1.5 | 2.0 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 5239 | 89.6 | 10.2 | 0.2 |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time. | 4402 | 98.8 | 1.1 | 0.1 |  |
| Q46(a) | Income - Wages, Salaries | 8039 | 73.6 | 23.6 |  | 2.8 |
| Q46(b) | Income - Unincorp. Business | 8039 | 68.0 | 31.6 |  | 0.4 |
| Q46(c) | Income - Farm Self Empl. | 8039 | 67.8 | 31.5 |  | 0.7 |
| Q46(d) | Income - OAS, GIS | 8039. | 70.0 | 27.8 |  | 2.2 |
| Q46(e) | Income - CPP, QPP | 8039 | 69.5 | 28.5 |  | 2.0 |
| Q46(t) | Income - UI | 8039 | 67.7 | 30.7 | $\cdots$ | 1.6 |
| Q46(g) | Income - Other Government | 8039 | 68.1 | 30.8 |  | 1.1 |
| Q46(h) | Income - Dividends, Interest | 8039 | 68.3 | 29.6 |  | 2.2 |
| Q46(i) | Income - Retirement Pensions | 8039 | 67.8 | 30.9 |  | 1.2 |
| Q46(j) | Income - Other | 8039 | 67.3 | 32.5 |  | 0.2 |
| Q46(k) | Income - Total | 8039 | 65.3 | 33.1 |  | 1.5 |

Table 2
EFS Item Response Rates
Potential Method

| Step $/$ <br> Question <br> Number | Step 1 <br> Question <br> Name | In Scope (i) Records) | Single <br> Response <br> (\%) | NorResponse (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partin] Response. (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 1442 | 56.2 | 43.8 |  |  |
| Q18 | Race | 9870 | 93.4 | 5.9 | 0.7 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 1469 | 73.3 | 25.9 | 0.8 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 3950 | 81.4 | 18.5 | 0.0 |  |
| Q30 | Neiw Job | 3950 | 84.2 | 15.8 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Wori | 3950 | 81.3 | 18.3 | 0.4 |  |
| Q32 | Stant Job | 1198 | 47.6 | 52.3 | 0.1 |  |
| Q33 | Lest Worked | 3950 | 78.7 | 20.8 | 0.5 |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 6177 | 78.6 | 20.4 |  | 1.0 |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 6177 | 76.0 | 24.0 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 6177 | 75.4 | 19.7 |  | 4.9 |
| Q36 | General lndustry | 6177 | 72.4 | 26.6 | 1.0 |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 6177 | 77.1 | 22.9 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 6177 | 70.6 | 29.4 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 6177 | 70.2 | 22.5 |  | 7.2 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 6177 | 77.0 | 22.5 | 0.5 |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 1943 | 36.9 | 63.0 | 0.1 |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 6177 | 77.3 | 21.3 | 1.5 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 6177 | 73.4 | 23.7 | 2.9 | . |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 4719 | 72.6 | 25.9 | 1.6 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 6177 | 80.0 | 19.9 | 0.1 |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 5750 | 80.5 | 19.5 | 0.1 |  |

Table 3
NCT - LFS Sample
Unweighted Definite Response Rates

| Step 1 Question Number | Step / <br> Question <br> Name | In Scope <br> (" Records) | Single Response (\%) | NonResponse (\%) | Multiple Response (\%) | Partin Response (\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Houschold Level Srepe / Questions. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DType | Dwelling Type | 12265 | 99.3 | 0.7 |  |  |
| Step 3 | Persons Left Out | 12265 | 97.2 | 2.8 | 0.0 |  |
| Step 5 | Temporary Residents | 12265 | 98.1 | 1.8 | 0.0 |  |
| Step 7 | Agriculural Operator | 12265 | 98.7 | 1.3 | 0.0 |  |
| Q47 | - Who Pays | 12265 | 62.7 | 1.7 | 35.7 |  |
| Q48 | Tenure | 12265 | 97.5 | 2.4 | - 0.1 |  |
| Q49 | Who Completed | 12265 | 80.1 | 2.3 | 17.7 |  |
| Person Level Questions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q2 | Relationship to Person 1 | 32696 | 89.8 | 10.1 | 0.1 |  |
| Q2 | R2P1 (Person 2 Onwards) | 20431 | 98.3 | 1.6 | 0.2 |  |
| Q3 | Date of Birth | 32696 | 99.1 | 0.5 |  | 0.4 |
| Q4 | Sex | 32696 | 99.4 | 0.6 |  |  |
| Q5 | Marital States | 32696 | 98.7 | - 1.3 | 0.0 |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law. Status | 32696 | 96.6 | . 3.4 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Stalus (15+) | 25652 | 96.7 | $\begin{array}{r}-3.3 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  |  |
| Q7(a) | Activity Limitation - Home | 32696 | 98.8 | - 1.2 | 0.0 |  |
| Q7(b) | Activity Limitation - Work | 32696 | 96.9 | 3.0 | 0.2 |  |
| Q7(c) | Activity Limitation - Other | 32696 | 96.6 | - 3.4 | - |  |
| Q8 | Long Term Disabilities | 32696 | 98.2 | $\cdots$ | 0.0 |  |
| Q9 | Lenguage | 32696 | 79.9 | $\cdots 0.9$ | 19.2 |  |
| Q10 | Home Language | 32696 | 98.1 | - 0.9 | 1.0 |  |
| Q11 | Mother Tongue | 32696 | 98.2 | $\begin{array}{r}\text { - }-0.9 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 0.9 |  |
| Q12 | Place of Birth | 32696 | 99.1 | 0.8 | 0.1 |  |
| Q13 | ${ }^{-}$Citizenship | 32696 | 97.8 | 1.3 | 1.0 |  |
| Q14 | Landed Immigrant | 32696 | 98.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 |  |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 2761 | 97.9 | 2.1 |  |  |
| Q16 | Ethnic Origin | 32696 | 61.2 | 4.0 | 34.8 |  |
| Q17 | Aboriginal | 32696 | 98.8 | 1.1 | 0.0 |  |
| Q18 | Race | 31733 | 99.0 | 0.3 | 0.6 |  |
| Q19 | Indian Band | 32696 | 98.2 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Q20 | Registered lndisn | 32696 | 98.7 | 1.3 |  |  |
| Q21 | Mobility Stans - 1 Year | 25652 | 98.5 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.5 |
| Q22 | Mobility Stans - 5 Year | 25652 | 97.0 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 1.8 |
| Q23 | School Attendence | 25652 | 99.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 3826 | 96.9 | 2.2 | 0.8 |  |


| Q25 | Degrees Obtained | 25652 | 73.6 | 2.0 | 24.4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q26(a) | Unpaid Work - Housework | 25652 | 98.4 | 1.5 | 0.1 |  |
| Q26(b) | Unpaid Work - Childcare. | 25652 | 98.1 | 1.8 | 0.0 |  |
| Q26(c) | Unpaid Work - Care/Seniors | 25652 | 98.4 | 1.6 | 0.0 |  |
| Q26(d) | Unpaid Work - Care/OGhers | 25652 | 97.3 | 2.7 | 0.0 |  |
| Q27 | Unpaid Volunteer Work | 25652 | 98.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 |  |
| Q28 | Hours Worked | 25652 | 97.3 | 2.1 | 0.5 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 11845 | 97.9 | 2.1 | 0.0 |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 11845 | 98.8 | 1.2 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 11845 | 98.4 | 1.4 | 0.2 |  |
| Q32. | Stiat Job | 1752 | 98.5 | 1.5 |  |  |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 11845 | 98.1 | 1.5 | 0.4 |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 17461 | 96.4 | 3.0 |  | 0.6 |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 17461 | 95.8 | 4.2 |  | - |
|  | Industry | 17461 | 95.5 | 2.7 |  | 1.8 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 17461 | 94.7 | 4.6 | 0.6 |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 17461 | 96.7 | 3.3 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 17461 | 93.1 | 6.9 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 17461 | 92.9 | 3.2 |  | 3.9 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 17461 | 96.8 | 3.1 | 0.2 |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 2042 | 94.8 | 5.1 | 0.0 |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 17461 | 95.5 | 3.0 | 1.5 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 17461 | 94.5 | 4.1 | 1.5 |  |
| Q43 | Trinsportation to Work | 13612 | 98.7 | 0.5 | 0.7 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 17461 | 96.1 | 3.8 | 0.1 |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 15849 | 99.5 | 0.5 | 0.1 |  |
| Q46(a) | Income - Wages, Salaries | 25652 | 81.7 | 14.2 |  | 4.0 |
| Q46(b) | Income - Unincorp. Business | 25652 | 80.5 | 18.8 |  | 0.7 |
| Q46(c) | Income - Farm Self Empl. | 25652 | 80.5 | 18.9 |  | 0.6 |
| Q46(d) | Income - OAS, GIS | 25652 | 80.7 | 17.4 |  | 2.0 |
| Q46(c) | Income - CPP, QPP | 25652 | 80.3 | 17.7 |  | 2.0 |
| Q46(1) | Income - U! | 25652 | 80.0 | 18.4 |  | 1.6 |
| Q46(g) | Income - Other Government | 25652 | 80.3 | 18.5 |  | 1.1 |
| Q46(h) | Income - Dividends, Interest | 25652 | 79.6 | 18.1 |  | $2: 3$ |
| Q46(i) | Income - Retirement Pensions | 25652 | 80.0 | 18.9 |  | 1.1 |
| Q46(J) | Income - Other | 25652 | 80.2 | 19.6 |  | 0.2 |
| Q46(k) | Income - Total | 25652 | 82.9 | 13.1 |  | 4.0 |

Table 4
NCT - LFS Sample
Unweighted Potential Response Rates

| Step 1. <br> Question Number | Step I <br> Question Name | In Scope <br> (" Records) | Single Response (\%) | NorResponse <br> (5) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\$) | Partial Response (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 3348 | 82.8 | 17.2 |  |  |
| Q18 | Race | 32110 | 98.3 | 1.1 | 0.6 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 4084 | 91.2 | 8.1 | 0.8 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 12526 | 95.6 | 4.3 | 0.0 |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 12526 | 96.5 | 3.5 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 12526 | 96.0 | 3.8 | 0.2 |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 2312 | 81.4 | 18.6 |  |  |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 12526 | 95.7 | 4.0 | 0.4 |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 18191 | 93.8 | 5.5 |  | 0.6 |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 18191 | 93.1 | 6.9 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 18191 | 92.8 | 5.2 |  | 2.0 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 18191 | 92.1 | 7.3 | 0.6 |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 18191 | 94.1 | 5.9 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 18191 | 90.4 | 9.6 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 18191 | 90.3 | 5.8 |  | 4.0 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 18191 | 94.1 | 5.7 | 0.2 |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 3107 | 66.2 | 33.8 | 0.1 |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 18191 | 93.0 | 5.6 | 1.4 |  |
| Q42. | Place of Work | 18191 | 91.9 | 6.7 | 1.5 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 15068 | 92.9 | 6.4 | 0.7 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 18191 | 93.6 | 6.4 | 0.0 |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 17166 | 94.3 | 5.7 | 0.1 |  |

Table 5

## NCT - LFS Sample

Weighted Definite Response Rates.

| Step / <br> Question Number | Step 1 Question Name | In Scope (Weighted (Records) | NonResponse <br> (\%) | Multiple Response <br> (\%) | Partial Response (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Houschold Level Steps / Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| DType | Dwelling Type | 10469696 | 1.1 |  |  |
| Step 3 | Persons Left Out | 10469696 | 2.8 | 0.0 |  |
| Step 5 | Temporary Residents | 10469696 | 1.8 | 0.0 |  |
| Step 7 | Agriculural Operator | 10469696 | 1.3 | 0.0 |  |
| Q47 | Who Pays | 10469696 | 1.8 | 36.0 |  |
| Q48 | Tenure | 10469696 | 2.5 | 0.1 |  |
| Q49 | Who Completad | 10469696 | 2.8 | 17.4 |  |
| Person Level Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q2 | Relationship to Person 1 | 27293574 | 9.5 | 0.1 |  |
| Q2 | R2P1 (Person 2 Onwards) | 16823878 | 1.5 | 0.1 |  |
| Q3 | Dase of Birth | 27293574 | 0.6 |  | 0.5 |
| Q4 | Sex | 27293574 | 0.8 |  |  |
| Q5 | Marital Status | 27293574 | 1.4 | 0.0 |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status | 27293574 | 3.2 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status (15 +) | 21654932 | 3.0 |  |  |
| Q7(a) | Activity Limitation - Home | 27293574 | 1.2 | 0.0 |  |
| Q7(b) | Activity Limitation - Work | 27293574 | 2.8 | 0.2 |  |
| Q7(c) | Activity Limitation - Other | 27293574 | 3.3 |  |  |
| Q8 | Long Term Disabilitics | 27293574 | 1.8 | 0.0 |  |
| Q9 | Language | 27293574 | 0.9 | 24.6 |  |
| Q10 | Home Language | 27293574 | 1.0 | 1.8 |  |
| Q11 | Mother Toague | 27293574. | 1.0 | 1.4 |  |
| Q12 | Plece of Birth | 27293574 | 0.9 | 0.1 |  |
| Q13 | $\because$ Citizenship | 27293574 : | 1.3 | 15 |  |
| Q14 | Landed Immigrant | 27293574 | 2.1 | 0.0 |  |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 3871826 | 1.3 |  |  |
| Q16 | Ethmic Origin | 27293574 | 3.8 | 32.6 |  |
| Q17 | Aboriginal | 27293574 | 1.1 | 0.0 |  |
| Q18 | Race | 26592805 | 0.3 | 1.0 |  |
| Q19 | Indian Band | 27293574 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Q20 | Registered Indian | 27293574 | 1.2 |  |  |
| Q21 | Mobility Status - 1 Year | 21654932 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.5 |
| Q22 | Mobility Status - 5 Year | 21654932 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 2.2 |
| Q23 | School Attendance | 21654932 | 1.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 3411913 | 2.2 | 0.9 |  |


| Q25 | Degroes Obtained | 21654932 | 2.1 | 26.2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q26(a) | Umpaid Work - Housework | 21654932 | 1.5 | 0.1 |  |
| Q26(b) | Unpaid Work - Childcare | 21654932 | 1.8 | 0.1 |  |
| Q26(c) | Umpaid Work - Care/Seniora | 21654932 | 1.6 | 0.0 |  |
| Q26(d) | Unpaid Work - Care/Others | 21654932 | 2.7 | 0.0 |  |
| Q27 | Unpaid Volunteer Work | 21654932 | 1.6 | 0.0 |  |
| Q28 | Hours Worked | 21654932 | 2.3 | 0.6 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 9346596 | 2.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 9346596 | 1.1 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 9346596 | 1.3 | 0.2 |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 1.405972 | 2.1 |  |  |
| Q33 | Lest Worked | 9346596 | 1.7 | 0.4 |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 15079918 | 2.9 |  | 0.4 |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 15079918 | 4.0 |  | -"* |
|  | Inctustry | 15079918 | 2.5 |  | 1.8 |
| Q36 | General lndustry | 15079918 | 4.2 | 0.6 |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 15079918 | 3.0 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most lmportant Duties | 15079918 | 6.2 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 15079918 | 2.9 |  | 3.5 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 15079918 | 2.8 | 0.2 |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - lacorporated | 1645276 | 5.5 | 0.0 |  |
| Q41 | Woris Language | 15079918 | 3.0 | 2.1 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 15079918 | 3.6 | 1.3 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 12095650 | 0.7 | 0.7 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 15079918 | 3.9 | 0.1 |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 13764185 | 0.5 | 0.1 |  |
| Q46(a) | Income - Wages, Salaries | 21654932 | 11.3 |  | 3.4 |
| Q46(b) | Income - Unincorp. Business | 21.654932 | 17.4 |  | 0.7 |
| Q46(c) | Income - Farm Self Empl. | 21.654 .932 | 17.5 |  | 0.4 |
| Q46(d) | Income - OAS, GIS | 21654932 | 16.3 |  | 1.8 |
| Q46(c) | lncome - CPP; QPP. | 21.654 .932 | 16.7 |  | 1.9 |
| Q46(f) | Income - UI | 21654932 | 17.4 |  | $1.2 \cdots$ |
| Q46(s) | Income - Other Government | 21.654932. | 17.4 |  | $1.1 \cdots$ |
| Q46(b) | Income - Dividends, Interest | 21654.932 | 17.1 |  | 2.5 |
| Q46(i) | locome - Retirement Pensions | 21654932 | 17.8 |  | 1.0 |
| Q46(j) | Income - Other | 21654932 | 18.4 |  | 0.2 . |
| Q46(k) | Income - Total | 21654932 | 12.0 |  | 3.9 |

Table 6

## NCT - LFS Sample

Weighted Potential Response Rates

| Step / <br> Question Number | Step / <br> Question Name | In Scope (Weighted (Records) | Non- <br> Response (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial Response (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 4451655 | 12.0 |  |  |
| Q18 | Race | 26903119 | 1.1 | 1.0 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 3646503 | 8.3 | 0.9 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 9971689 | 4.6 | 0.0 |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 9971689 | 3.8 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 9971689 | 4.0 | 0.2 |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 1877155 | 20.8 |  |  |
| Q33 | Lest Worked | 9971689 | 4.6 | 0.4 |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 15747115 | 5.5 |  | 0.4 |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 15747115 | 6.8 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 15747115 | 5.1 |  | 2.0 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 15747115 | 7.0 | 0.6 |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 15747115 | 5.6 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 15747115 | 9.0 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 15747115 | 5.5 |  | 3.7 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 15747115 | 5.5 | 0.2 |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 2533236 | 34.8 | 0.0 |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 15747115 | 5.6 | 2.0 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 15747115 | 6.3 | 1.3 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation so Work | 13298936 | 6.2 | 0.7 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 15747115 | 6.5 | 0.0 |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 14933136 | 5.8 | 0.1 | . |

## Table 7

NCT - Blacks in Halifax Sample
Unweighted Definite Response Rates

| Step / <br> Question <br> Number | Step $/$ <br> Question <br> Name | In Scope (I Records) | NorRespoase <br> (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial <br> Response <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household Level Steps / Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| DType | Dwelling Type | 248 | 5.2 |  |  |
| Step 3 | Persons Left Out | 248 | 0.4 |  |  |
| Step 5 | Temporary Residents | 248 | 0.4 | 0.4 |  |
| Step 7 | Agricultural Operator | 248 | 0.4 |  |  |
| Q47 | Who Pays | 248 | 1.6 | 17.7 |  |
| Q48 | Tenure | 248 | 3.2 |  |  |
| Q49 | Who Completed | 248 | 3.2 | 10.1 |  |
| Person Level Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q2 | Relationship to Person 1 | 654 | 6.0 | 0.2 |  |
| Q2 | R2P1 (Person 2 Onwards) | 406 | 3.2 | 0.2 |  |
| Q3 | Date of Birth | 654 | 1.4 |  | 1.2 |
| Q4 | Sex | 654 | 1.1 |  |  |
| Q5 | Marital Status | 654 | 2.0 | 0.3 |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status | 654 | 2.8 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status ( $15+$ ) | 465 | 2.8 |  |  |
| Q7(a) | Activity Limitation - Home | 654 | 1.4 |  |  |
| Q7(b) | Activity Limitation - Wort | 654 | 1.7 | 0.6 |  |
| Q7(c) | Activity Limitation - Other | 654 | 1.5 |  |  |
| Q8 | Long Term Disabilities | 654 | 2.1 |  |  |
| Q9 | Lenguage | 654 | 0.5 | 4.3 |  |
| Q10 | Home Language | 654 | 0.9 | 1.4 |  |
| Q11 | Mother Tongue | 654 | 0.5 | 0.3 |  |
| Q12 | Place of Birth | 654 |  |  |  |
| Q13 | Citizenship | 654 | 0.3 | 0.6 |  |
| Q14 | Landed Immigrant | 654 | 3.1 |  |  |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 37 | 2.7 |  |  |
| Q16 | Ethnic Origin | 654 | 5.0 | 43.3 |  |
| Q17 | Aboriginal | 654 | 0.9 | 0.3 |  |
| Q18 | Race | 636 | 0.5 | 6.1 |  |
| Q19 | Indian Band | 654 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.8 |
| Q20 | Registered Indian | 654 | 1.2 |  |  |
| Q21 | Mobility Status - 1 Year | 465 | 0.4 |  | 0.6 |
| Q22 | Mobility Status - 5 Year | 465 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.9 |
| Q23 | School Attendance | 465 | 1.5 |  |  |
| Q24 | - Schood Language | 87 | 4.6 | 3.4 |  |


| Q25 | Degrees Obtained | 465 | 3.7 | 15.9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q26(a) | Urpaid Work - Housework | 465 | 1.7. | 0.4 |  |
| Q26(b) | Unpaid Work - Childcare | 465 | 2.4 | 0.2 |  |
| Q26(c) | Urpaid Work - Care/Seniors | 465 | 3.2 |  |  |
| Q26(d) | Unpaid Work - Care/Others | 465 | 3.9 |  |  |
| Q27 | Unpaid Volunteer Work | 465 | 3.0 |  |  |
| Q28 | Hours Worked | 465 | 2.6 | 0.2 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 285 | 4.6 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 285 | 3.5 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 285 | 4.9 | 1.1 |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 45 |  |  |  |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 285 | 2.5 | 0.4 |  |
| Q34 | Employer. | 226 | 3.5 |  |  |
| Q35 | Type of Business .. | 226 | 6.2 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 226 | 3.5 |  | 2.7 |
| Q36 | General Iodustry | 226 | 8.4 |  |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 226 | 4.9 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 226 | 8.4 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 226 | 4.9 |  | 3.5 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 226 | 4.0 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporited | 11 | 27.3 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 226 | 4.0 | 0.4 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 226 | 4.9 | 1.3 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 187 | 0.5 |  |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 226 | 6.6 |  |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 193 | 0.5 |  |  |
| Q46(a) | Income - Wages, Salaries | 465 | 9.5 |  | 4.9 |
| Q46(b) | Income - Unincorp. Business | 465 | 12.0 |  | 1.3 |
| Q46(c) | Income - Farm Self Exupl. | 465 | 12.7 |  | 0.4 |
| Q46(d) | lncome - OAS, GIS | 465 | 12.7 |  | 0.2 |
| Q46(c) | Incorne - CPP, QPP | 465 | 12.5 |  | 1.1 |
| Q46(f) | - Income - Ul | 465 | 14.0 |  | 1.5 |
| Q46(8) | Income - Other Goverament | 465 | 13.8 |  | 2.4 |
| Q46(h) | Income - Dividends, Interest | 465 | 13.5 |  | 0.9 |
| Q46(i) | Income - Retirement Pensions | 465 | 13.1 |  |  |
| Q46(j) | lucome - Other | 465 | 14.4 |  | 0.6 |
| Q46(k) | Income - Toul | 465 | 9.2 .. | . | 6.2 |

Table 8
NCT - Asians in Montreal Sample
Unweighted Definite Response Rates

| Step 1 <br> Question <br> Number | Step 1 <br> Question <br> Name | In Scope ( ${ }^{(1)}$ Records) | NorResponse (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partinal Response (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Houschold Level Steps / Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| DType | Dwelling Type | 278 | 1.4 |  |  |
| Step 3 | Persons Left Out | 278 | 5.0 |  |  |
| Step 5 | Temporary Residents | 278 | 3.6 |  |  |
| Step 7 | Agricultural Operator | 278 | 2.5 |  |  |
| Q47 | Who Pays | 278 | 1.8 | 42.8 |  |
| Q48 | Tenure | 278 | 2.9 |  |  |
| Q49 | Who Completed | 278 | 1.8 | 20.9 |  |
| Person Level Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q2 | - Relationship to Person 1 | 1032 | 12.9 | 0.4 |  |
| Q2 | R2P1 (Person 2 Onwards) | 754 | 1.2 | 0.5 |  |
| Q3 | Date of Birth | 1032 | 1.0 |  | 0.8 |
| Q4 | Sex | 1032 | 0.5 |  |  |
| QS | Marital Status | 1032 | 0.7 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status. | 1032 | 3.1 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status (15+) | 777 | 3.0 |  |  |
| Q7(a) | Activity Limitation - Home | 1032 | 1.6 |  |  |
| Q7(b) | Activity Limitation - Woris | 1032 | 1.1 |  |  |
| Q7(c) | Activity Limitation - Other | 1032 | 2.2 |  |  |
| Q8 | Long Term Disabilitice | 1032 | 1.8 |  |  |
| Q9 | Language | 1032 | 0.8 | 72.2 |  |
| Q10 | Home Language | 1032 | 1.0 | 7.4 |  |
| Q11 | Mother Tongue | 1032 | 1.0 | 3.7 |  |
| Q12 | Place of Birth | 1032 | 0.6 | 0.2 | , |
| Q13 | Citizenstip | 1032 | 1.4 | 2.5 |  |
| Q14 | Landed Immigrant | 1032 | 3.5 | , | ; ... |
| Q15 | Year of tmmigration | 340 | 15 |  | 4 |
| Q16 | Ehnic Origin. | 1032 | 3.5 | 12.0 | * $\cdot$ |
| Q17 | Aboriginal | 1032 | 1.7 | . |  |
| Q18 | Race : | 1014 | 0.2 | 1.2 |  |
| Q19 | Incian Band | 1032 | 13 |  |  |
| Q20 | Registered Iodian | 1032 | 1.4 | $\because$ | $\cdots$ |
| Q21 | Mobility Status - 1 Year | 771 | 0.6 |  | 0.4 |
| Q22 | Mobility Status - 5 Year | 777 | 1.4 |  | 2.1 |
| Q23 | School Attendunce | 777 | 1.4 |  |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 231 | 1.7 | 0.9 |  |


| Q25 | Degrees Obtained | 777 | 2.1 | 22.9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q26(a) | Unpaid Work - Housewort | 777 | 1.3 | 0.1 |  |
| Q26(b) | Unpaid Work - Childcare | 777 | 1.3 | 0.5 |  |
| Q26(c) | Uapaid Work - Care/Seniors | 777 | 1.3 |  |  |
| Q26(d) | Uspaid Work - Care/Others | 777. | 2.1 |  |  |
| Q27 | Uapaid Volunteer Work | 777 | 1.2 |  |  |
| Q28 | Hours Worked | 777 | 3.6 | 0.3 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 296 | 3.0 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 296 | 1.7 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 296 | 2.4 |  |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 40 | 5.0 |  |  |
| Q33 | Lest Worked | 296 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 548 | 3.1 |  | 0.4 |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 548 | 2.9 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 548 | 2.6 |  | 0.9 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 548 | 3.6 | 0.2 |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 548 | 2.7 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 548 | 6.0 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 548 | 2.7 |  | 3.3 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 548 | 2.0 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 96 | 6.3 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 548 | 3.5 | 10.2 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 548 | 4.0 | 0.9 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 493 |  | 1.0 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 548 | 2.9 |  |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 503 | 0.6 |  | . |
| Q46(a) | Income - Wages, Sularies | 777 | 13.9 |  | 3.5 |
| Q46(b) | Incorne - Unincorp. Business | 777 | 18.8 |  | 1.4 |
| Q46(c) | lncome - Farm Self Empl. | 777 | 19.9 |  | 0.1 |
| Q46(d) | - Income - OAS, GIS | 777 | 19.7 |  | 0.5 |
| Q46(e) | Income - CPP, QPP | 777 | 20.6 |  | 0.5 |
| Q46(1) | - Income - UI | 777 | 20.1 | $\because$ | 0.4 |
| Q46(s) | Income - Other Government | 777. | 19.9 | - ... $\cdot$ | -0.1 |
| Q46(b) | Income - Dividends, Interest | 777 | 18.5 | ". | 2.4 |
| Q46(i) | Income - Retirement Pensions | 777 | $20.1{ }^{-}$ | $\cdots$ | 0.1 . |
| Q46()) | Income - Other | 777 | 19.9 | $\cdots$ | . |
| Q46(k) | lncome - Total | 77 | 13.3 |  | 6.2 |

Table 9
NCT - Blacks in Montreal Sample
Unweighted Definite Response Rates

| Step $/$ <br> Question Number | Step 1 <br> Question <br> Name | ln Scope ( (Records) | NonResponse (\%) | Multiple <br> Response (\%) | Partial Respoase (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household Level Steps / Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| DType | Dwelling Type | 231 | 1.7 |  |  |
| Step 3 | Persons Left Out | 231 | 0.9 |  |  |
| Step 5 | Temporary Residents | 231 | 0.4 |  |  |
| Step 7 | -.... Agricultural Operator | 231 |  |  |  |
| Q47 | $\ldots$... Who Pays | 231 | 1.3 | 20.8 |  |
| Q48 | Tenure | 231 | 1.3 |  |  |
| Q49 | Who Completed | 231 | 1.3 | 4.3 |  |
| Person Level Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q2 | Relationship to Person 1 | 550 | 8.0 | 0.2 |  |
| Q2 | R2P1 (Person 2 Onwards) | 319 | 0.6 | 0.3 |  |
| Q3 | Date of Birth | 550 | 0.5 |  | 0.2 |
| Q4 | Sex | 5so. | 0.4 |  |  |
| Q5 | Marital Status | S50 | 1.1 |  |  |
| Q6 | Commor-Law Status | 550 | 1.1 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status (15+) | 405 | 1.2 |  |  |
| Q7(a) | Activity Limitation - Home | 550 | 0.4 |  |  |
| Q7(b) | Activity Limitation - Work | 550 | 0.9 | 0.2 |  |
| Q7(c) | Activity Limitation - Other | 550 | 2.9 |  |  |
| Q8 | Long Term Disabilities | 550 | 1.1 |  |  |
| Q9 | Language | 550 | 0.4 | 44.2 |  |
| Q10 | Home Language | 550 | 0.5 | 3.8 |  |
| Q11 | Mother Tongue | 550 | 0.4 | 3.1 |  |
| Q12 | - Place of Birth | 550 | 0.5 : | 0.2 | $\checkmark$ |
| Q13 | Citizenship | 550 | 1.3 | 0.4 : | $\cdots$ |
| Q14 | Landed lmmigrant | 550 | 0.7 |  | $\ldots$ |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 103 | 6.8 | $\cdots$ |  |
| Q16 | Ethaic Origin | 550 | 1.1 | 19.8 |  |
| Q17 | - Aborigina | 550 | 1.1 | . |  |
| Q18 | ... Race | 540 | 0.2 | 0.4 |  |
| Q19 | :... Indian Band | 550 | 0.4 |  |  |
| Q20 | Registered Indian | 550 | 1.3 |  |  |
| Q21 | Mobility Sutus - 1 Year | 405 | 2.2 |  |  |
| Q22 | Mobility Status - 5 Year | 405 | 2.0 | 0.2 | 1.0 |
| Q23 | School Attendance | 405 | 1.7 |  |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 63 | 1.6 |  |  |


| Q25 | Degrees Obtained | 405 | 2.7 | 6.9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q26(a) | Uupaid Work - Housework | 405 | 2.2 |  |  |
| Q26(b) | Umpaid Work - Childcare | 405 | 2.0 |  |  |
| Q26(c) | Unpaid Wort - CarelSeniors | 405 | 2.5 |  |  |
| Q26(d) | Uapaid Work - Care/Others | 405 | 3.5 |  |  |
| Q27 | Umpaid Volunteer Work | 405 | 1.7 |  |  |
| Q28 | Hours Worked | 405 | 1.7 |  |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 231 | 0.9 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 231 | 1.7 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 231 | 0.4 | 0.4 |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 61 | 1.6 | 1.6 |  |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 231 | 1.3 | 0.4 |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 226 | 1.3 |  |  |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 226 | 0.9 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 226 | 0.9 |  | 0.4 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 226 | 2.2 | 0.9 |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 226 | 1.8 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 226 | 3.1 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 226 | 0.9 |  | 3.1 |
| Q39 | - Class of Worker | 226 | 0.9 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 2 |  |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 226 | 1.3 | 10.2 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 226 | 2.2 | 1.8 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 215 | 0.5 | 0.5 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 226 | 1.8 |  | - |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 197 |  |  |  |
| Q46(a) | Income - Wages, Salaries | 405 | 3.2 |  | 2.2 |
| Q46(b) | Income - Unincorp. Business | 405 | 4.2 | . | 0.5 |
| Q46(c) | Income - Farm Self Emipl. | 405 | 4.4 |  | 0.5 |
| Q46(d) | tncome - OAS, GIS | 405 | 4.2 | . | 1.2 |
| Q46(e) | Income - CPP, QPP | 405 | 4.9 |  | 1.0 |
| Q46(1) | Income - U I | 405 | 6.2 |  | 1.2 |
| Q46(B) | Income - Other Goverument | 405 | 5.2 |  | 0.5 |
| Q46(b) | Income - Dividends, Interest | 405 | 5.4 |  | 0.5 |
| Q46(i) | Income - Retirement Pensions | 405 | 4.2 |  | 0.5 |
| Q46(0) | Income - Other | 405 | 5.2 |  | 0.7 |
| Q46(k) | Income - Total | 405 | 7.2 |  | 3.5 |

Table 10
NCT - Latin Americans in Montreal Sample
Unweighted Definite Response Rates

| Step 1 <br> Question <br> Number | Srep 1 <br> Question Name | In Scope ( Records) | NorResponse (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial <br> Response <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household Level Steps / Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| DType | Dwelling Type | 212 | 2.4 |  |  |
| Step 3 | Persons Left Out | 212 | 0.9 |  |  |
| Step 5 | Temporary Residents | 212 | 1.9 |  |  |
| Step 7 | Agriculural Operator | 212 | 0.5 |  |  |
| Q47 | Who Pays | 212 | 1.4 | 26.4 |  |
| Q48 | Tenure | 212 | 2.8 |  |  |
| Q49 | Who Completed | 212 | 0.5 | 8.0 |  |
| Person Level Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q2 | Relationship to Person 1 | 476 | 8.6 | 0.4 |  |
| Q2 | R2P1 (Person 2 Oawards) | 264 | 0.8 | 0.8 |  |
| Q3 | Date of Birth | 476 | 0.6 |  | 0.8 |
| Q4 | Sex | 476 | 0.8 |  |  |
| Q5 | Marital Stalus | 476 | 2.3 | 0.2 |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status | 476 | 4.0 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status (15+) | 380 | 2.9 |  |  |
| Q7(a) | Activity Limitation - Home | 476 | 0.4 |  |  |
| Q7(b) | Activity Limitation - Work | 476 | 1.7 |  |  |
| Q7(c) | Activity Limitation - Other | 476 | 1.7 |  |  |
| Q8 | Long Term Disebilities | 476 | 1.3 |  |  |
| Q9 | Language | 476 | 0.8 . | 61.8 |  |
| Q10 | Home Language | 476 | $1.3{ }^{7}$ | - 6.1 |  |
| Q11 | - Mother Tongue. | 476 | 0.4 | 3.6 |  |
| Q12 | Place of Birth | 476 | 0.2 | 0.4 |  |
| Q13 | Citizenship | 476 | 1.7 | 2.5 |  |
| Q14 | Landed Irmigrant | 476 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 224 | $0.9 \cdots$ |  |  |
| Q16 | Ethnic Origin | 476 | 2.3 | 17.4 |  |
| Q17 | Aboriginal | 476 | 2.1 | 0.4 |  |
| Q18 | Race | 463 |  | 0.9 |  |
| Q19 | Indian Band. | 476 | 0.8 |  | 0.2 |
| Q20 | Registered Indian | 476 | 0.8 |  |  |
| Q21 | Mobility Stutus - 1 Year | 380 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.8 |
| Q22 | Mobility Status - 5 Year | 380 | 1.3 |  | 1.3 |
| Q23 | School Attendance | 380 | 0.5 | 0.3 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 48 | 2.1 | 2.1 |  |


| Q25 | Degrees Obtained | 380 | 0.8 | 15.8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q26(a) | Unpaid Work - Housework | 380 | 1.8 | 0.3 |  |
| Q26(b) | Unpaid Wort - Childcare | 380 | 0.8 |  |  |
| Q26(c) | Unpaid Work - Care/Seniors | 380 | 0.8 |  |  |
| Q26(d) | - Unpaid Work - Care/Others | 380 | 1.3 |  |  |
| Q27 | Unpaid Volunteer Work | 380 | 2.1 |  |  |
| Q28 | Hours Worked | 380 | 1.1 | 0.8 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 237 | 0.4 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 237 | 0.4 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 237 | 0.4 | 0.8 |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 59 | 3.4 |  |  |
| Q33 | List Worked | 237 | 0.4 |  |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 194 | 1.5 |  | 2.1 |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 194 | 1.5 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 194 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 194 | 1.5 |  |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 194 | 1.5 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most lmportant Duties | 194 | 6.7 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 194 | 1.5 |  | 5.2 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 194 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 13 | 7.7 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 194 | 1.5 | 8.8 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 194 | 3.6 | 0.5 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 180 |  | 1.7 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 194 | 4.6 | 0.5 |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 164 | 1.8 |  |  |
| Q46(a) | Income - Wages, Salaries | 380 | 5.0 |  | 2.4 |
| Q46(b) | Income - Unincorp. Business | 380 | 6.8 |  | 0.3 |
| Q46(c) | Income - Farm Self Empl. | 380 | 6.6 |  |  |
| Q46(d) | Income - OAS, GIS | $\begin{array}{r}\cdots 380 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 6.6 |  | 3.7 |
| Q46(c) | Income - CPP, QPP | 380 | 7.1 |  | 3.4 |
| Q46( $)$ | Income - UI | 380 | 6.1 | $\cdots$ | 1.8 |
| Q46(B) | lncome - Other Governmens | 380 | 7.6 |  | 2.1 |
| Q46(h) | Income - Dividends, Interest | 380 | 6.3 |  | 2.1 |
| Q46(i) | Income - Retirement Pensions | 380 | 8.7 |  | 2.1 |
| Q46(j) | Income - Other | 380 | 8.4 |  | 0.5 |
| Q46(k) | Income - Total | 380 | 6.8 |  | 5.8 |

Table 11
NCT - Asians in Toronto Sample
Unweighted Definite Response Rates

| Step $/$ <br> Question <br> Number | Step 1 <br> Question <br> Name | In Scope (Hecords) | NorResponse (\%) | Multiple Response (\%) | Partial Response (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household Level Steps / Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| DType | Dwelling Type | 246 | 0.4 |  |  |
| Step 3 | Persons Left Out | 246 | 4.5 |  |  |
| Step 5 | Temporary Residents | 246 | 3.3 |  |  |
| Step 7 | Agriculoural Operator | 246 | 2.4 |  |  |
| Q47 | Who Pays | 246 | 1.2 | 19.1 | \% |
| Q48 | Tenure | 246 | 4.1 |  | $\cdots$ |
| Q49 | Who Completed | 246 | 2.0 | 6.1 |  |
| Person Level Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q2 | Relationship to Person 1 | 426 | 6.1 | 0.2 |  |
| Q2 | R2P1 (Person 2 Onwards) | 180 | 0.6 | 0.6 |  |
| Q3 | Date of Birth | 426 | 0.2 |  | 0.9 |
| Q4 | Sex | 426 | 0.2 |  |  |
| Q5 | Marital Status | 426 | 1.4 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Lew Status | 426 | 2.6 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status (15+) | 378 | 2.4 |  |  |
| Q7(a) | Activity Limitation - Home | 426 | 1.6 |  |  |
| Q7(b) | Activity Limitation - Work | 426 | 3.8 |  |  |
| Q7(c) | Activity Limitation - Other | 426 | 5.4 | . |  |
| Q8 | Long Term Disabilities | 426 | 3.3 |  |  |
| Q9 | Language | 426 | 1.4 | 39.0 |  |
| Q10 | Home Language | 426 | 0.7 | 2.3 |  |
| Q11 | Mother Toague | 426 | 0.7 | 0.7 |  |
| Q12 | $\cdots \quad$ Place of Birth | 426 | 1.4 |  |  |
| Q13 | Citizenship - .-. | 426 | 2.6 | 2.6 | $\div$ |
| Q14 | Landed Immigrant | 426 | 6.6 |  | $\rightarrow$ |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 314 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Q16 | Ethaic Origin | 426 | 0.9 | 6.1 |  |
| Q17 | Aboriginal | 426 | 0.9 |  |  |
| Q18 | Race | 418 | 0.7 | 4.8 |  |
| Q19 | Indian Band | 426 | 1.2 |  |  |
| Q20 | Registered Indian | 426 | 0.9 |  |  |
| Q21 | Mobility Stalus - 1 Year | 378 | 1.1 |  | 2.4 |
| Q22 | Mobility Stalus - 5 Year | 378 | 1.6 |  | 6.9 |
| Q23 | School Attendance | 378 | 1.6 |  |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 56 | 3.6 |  |  |


| Q25 | Degrees Obeained | 378 | 2.1 | 10.1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q26(a) | Unpaid Work - Housework | 378 | 1.1 |  |  |
| Q26(b) | Uapaid Work - Childcare | 378 | 1.9 |  |  |
| Q26(c) | Urpaid Work - Care/Seniors | 378 | 1.6 |  |  |
| Q26(d) | Unpaid Work - Care/Others | 378 | 5.8 |  |  |
| Q27 | Unpaid Volunteer Work | 378 | 1.3 |  |  |
| Q28 | Hours Worked | 378 | 2.4 | 0.8 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 256 | 2.3 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 256 | 2.0 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 256 | 2.3 |  |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 15 |  |  |  |
| Q33 | Lest Worked | 256 | 4.7 |  |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 141 | 19.9 |  |  |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 141 | 23.4 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 141 | 17.7 |  | 7.8 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 141 | 22.7 |  |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 141 | 19.9 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 141 | 27.7 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 141 | 19.1 |  | 9.2 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 141 | 15.6 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 25 | 4.0 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 141 | 17.0 | 1.4 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 141 | 19.1 | 0.7 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 93 | 3.2 |  |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 141 | 14.9 | 1.4 |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 107 | 1.9 |  |  |
| Q46(a) | Income - Wages, Salaries | 378 | 24.1 |  | 0.3 |
| Q46(b) | Income - Unincorp. Business | 378 | 27.8 |  | 0.8 |
| Q46(c) | Income - Farm Self Empl. | 378 | 29.6 |  |  |
| Q46(d) | Income - OAS, GIS | 378 | 24.6 |  | 1.3 |
| Q46(c) | Income - CPP, QPP | 378 | 27.2 |  | 0.8 |
| Q46(1) | Income. - UI | 378 | 29.4. |  | 0.3 |
| Q46(g) | Income - Other Goverament | 378 | 25.4 | . | 1.3 |
| Q46(b) | Income - Dividends, Interest | 378 | 27.5 |  | 0.8 |
| Q46(i) | Income - Recirement Pensions | 378 | 28.8 |  | 0.3 |
| Q460) | Income - Other | 378 | 27.8 |  |  |
| Q46(k) | Income - Total | 378 | 11.9 |  | 2.4 |

Table 12
NCT - Blacks in Toronto Sample
Unweighted Definite Response Rates

| Step $/$ <br> Question <br> Number | Step 1 <br> Question <br> Name | In Scope (" Records) | NonResponse <br> (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial Response (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household Level Steps / Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| DType | Dwelling Type | 208 | 2.9 |  |  |
| Step 3 | Persons Left Out | 208 | 1.9 |  |  |
| Step 5 | Teraporary Residents | 208 | 1.0 | 0.5 |  |
| Step 7 | Agricultural Operator | 208 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Q47 | Who Pays | 208 | 1.4 | 32.2 |  |
| Q48 | Tenure | 208 | 11.1 |  |  |
| Q49 | Who Completed | 208 | 1.9 | 14.9 |  |
| Person Level Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q2 | Relationship to Person 1 | 723 | 5.9 | 0.3 |  |
| Q2 | R2P1 (Person 2 Onwards) | 515 | 0.2 | 0.4 |  |
| Q3 | Date of Birth | 723 | 0.7 |  | 0.8 |
| Q4 | Sex | 723 | 0.4 |  |  |
| Q5 | Marital Status | 723 | 1.9 |  |  |
| Q6 | Commor-Law Status | 723. | 2.5 | 0.1 |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status ( $15+$ ) | 491 | 2.6 |  |  |
| Q7(a) | Activity Limitation - Home | 723 | 3.2 |  |  |
| Q7(b) | Activity Limitation - Work | 723 | 7.2 |  |  |
| Q7(c) | Activity Limitation - Other | 723 | 8.2 |  |  |
| Q8 | Long Term Disabilities | 723 | 8.2 |  |  |
| Q9 | Language | 723 | 2.4 | 27.8 | S |
| Q10 | ${ }^{*}$ Home Language | 723 | 2.9 | 1.7 | $\because$ |
| Q11 | ... Mother Tongue | 723 | 4.6 | - 1.8 |  |
| Q12 | Place of Birth . .. | 723 | 5.3 | $\cdots 0.6$ | $\therefore$ |
| Q13 | $\cdots$ Citizenship | 723 | 4.1 | 3.5 | $\because 8$ |
| Q14 | Landed lmmigrant .... | 723 | 8.6 | \% ${ }^{2}$ | $\cdots \cdots$ |
| Q15 | Year of lmmigration | 444 | 0.5 | $\cdots 8$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Q16 | Ebric Origin | 723 | 4.1 . | -6.6 ${ }^{\text {+ }}$ |  |
| Q17 | Aboriginal | 723 | * 2.2 | $\cdots$ |  |
| Q18 | Race | 706 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots 2.1$ | : |
| Q19 | Indian Band | 723 | 2.2 | $\cdots$ | 0.1 |
| Q20 | Registered Indian | 723 | 2.4 |  |  |
| Q21 | Mobility Same - 1 Year | 491 | 2.2 |  | 2.0 |
| Q22 | Mobility Stuns - 5 Year | 491 | 2.6 | 0.4 | 4.5 |
| Q23 | School Attendance | 491 | 2.6 | 0.2 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 135 | 6.7 |  |  |


| Q25 | Degrees Oblained | 491 | 2.4 | 7.5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q26(a) | Unpaid Work - Housewort | 491. | 1.6 |  |  |
| Q26(b) | Unpaid Work - Childcare | 491 | 2.9 | 0.2 |  |
| Q26(c) | Umpaid Work - Care/Seniors | 491. | 3.5 |  | - |
| Q26(d) | Unpaid Work - Care/Others | 491 | 3.5 |  |  |
| Q27 | Unpaid Volunteer Work | 491 | 2.9 |  |  |
| Q28 | Hours Worked | 491 | 2.9 |  |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 275 | 1.5 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 275 | 1.8 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 275 | 5.1 |  |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 88 | 2.3 | 1.1 |  |
| Q33 | Lest Worked | 275 | 0.7 | 0.4 |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 283 | 3.5 |  | 0.4 |
| Q35. | Type of Business | 283 | 5.3 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 283 | 2.1 |  | 4.6 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 283 | 2.5 |  |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 283 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most lmportant Duties | 283 | 7.4 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 283 | 5.3 |  | 2.5 |
| Q39 | Class of Woriker | 283 | 1.4 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 9 | 11.1 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 283 | 6.0 |  |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 283 | 4.9 | 0.7 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 240 |  | 1.7 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 283 | 1.8 |  |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 239 | 0.4 |  |  |
| Q46(a) | Income - Wages, Salaries | 491 | 8.1 |  | 1.8 |
| Q46(b) | Income - Unincorp. Business | 491 | 10.0 |  |  |
| Q46(c) | Income - Farm Self Empl. | 491 | 11.0 |  |  |
| Q46(d) | Income - OAS, GIS | 491 | 10.0 |  | 0.4 |
| Q46(e) | Income - CPP, QPP | 491 | $\therefore 12.0$ |  | 0.2 |
| Q46(1) | Income - UI | 491 | 12.2 |  | 0.2 |
| Q46(g) | Income - Other Government | 491 | $\cdots$ |  | . 0.4 |
| Q46(h) | Income - Dividends, Interest | 491 | 11.0 |  | 0.2 |
| Q46(i) | Income - Retirement Pensions | 491 | 11.4 | . | \%..... |
| Q46(j) | Income - Other | 491 | 10.4 |  | -0.2 |
| Q46(k) | Income - Toul | 491 | 10.2 |  | 1.6 |

Table 13

## NCT - Aboriginals in Winnipeg Sample <br> Unweighted Definite Response Rates

| Step 1 <br> Question <br> Number | Step $/$ <br> Question <br> Name | In Scope <br> (" Records) | NonResponse (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial <br> Response <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Houschold Level Steps / Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| DType | Dwelling Type | 259 |  |  |  |
| Step 3 | Persons Left Out | 259 | 4.6 |  |  |
| Step 5 | Temporary Residents | 259 | 2.3 |  |  |
| Step 7 | - Agricultural Operator | 259 | 0.8 |  |  |
| Q47 | Who Pays | 259 | 2.7 | 40.9 | . |
| Q48 | Tenure | 259 | 1.5 |  |  |
| Q49 | Who Completed | 259 | 1.9 | 20.8 |  |
| Person Level Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q2 | Relationship to Person 1 | 670 | 9.4 |  |  |
| Q2 | R2P1 (Person 2 Onwards) | 411 | 0.5 |  |  |
| Q3 | Date of Birth | 670 | 0.3 |  | 0.9 |
| Q4 | Sex | 670 | 0.7 |  |  |
| Q5 | Marital Stabus | 670 | 1.2 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status | 670 | 4.6 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status (15 +) | 574 | 4.9 |  |  |
| Q7(a) | Activity Limitation - Home | 670 | 1.5 |  |  |
| Q7(b) | Activity Limitation - Work | 670 | 4.2 |  |  |
| Q7(c) | Activity Limitation - Other | 670 | 3.6 |  |  |
| Q8 | Long Term Disabilities | 670 | 2.1 |  |  |
| Q9 | Language | 670 | 1.5 | 36.0 | . |
| Q10 | Home Language | 670 | 1.8 | 1.6 |  |
| ${ }^{\text {Q11 }}$ | Mother Tongue | 670 | 1.6 | 0.4 |  |
| Q12 | Place of Birth | . 670 | 0.6 |  |  |
| $\therefore$ Q13 | Citizenship | $\therefore 670$ | 0.6 | 1.8 | :. |
| Q14 | Landed Immigrant $\ldots$ | - 6.670 | 1.5 |  | $\because$ |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 137 | 0.7 |  | : |
| Q16 | Ethnic Origin | 670 | 5.1 | 31.2 |  |
| Q17 | Aboriginal | 670 | $1: 2$ |  |  |
| Q18 | Race | 626 | 1.3 | 2.4 |  |
| Q19 | Indian Band | 670 | 1.2 |  | 1.6 |
| Q20 | Registered Indian | 670 | 1.2 |  |  |
| Q21 | Mobility Status - 1 Year | 574 | 0.5 |  |  |
| Q22 | Mobility Statas - 5 Year | 574 | 2.1 |  |  |
| Q23 | School Attendance | 574 | 0.5 |  |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 84 |  |  |  |


| Q25 | Degrees Obtained | 574 | 1.6 | 25.8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q26(a) | Unpaid Work - Housework | 574 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Q26(b) | Unpaid Work - Childeare | 574 | 0.7 |  |  |
| Q26(c) | Urpaid Work - Care/Seniors | 574 | 0.9 |  |  |
| Q26(d) | Unpaid Work - Care/Others | 574 | 0.9 |  |  |
| Q27 | Unpaid Volunteer Work | 574 | 0.7 |  |  |
| Q28 | Hours Worked | 574 | 2.6 | 0.5 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 258 | 1.9 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 258 | 1.2 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 258 | 1.6 |  |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 33 | 3.0 |  |  |
| Q33 | Lest Worked | 258 | 2.3 |  |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 367 | 2.2 |  |  |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 367 | 3.8 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 367 | 1.9 |  | 2.2 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 367 | 4.6 |  |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 367 | 2.5 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 367 | 5.2 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 367 | 2.5 |  | 2.7 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 367 | 2.7 | 0.3 |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 22 |  |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 367 | 1.6 |  |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 367 | 3.8 | 0.3 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 318 | 0.6 |  |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 367 | 3.5 |  |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 336 | 0.6 |  |  |
| Q46(a) | Income - Wages, Salaries | 574 | 11.7 |  | 5,1 |
| Q46(b) | lncome - Unincorp. Business | 574 | 16.7 |  | 0.3 |
| Q46(c) | Income - Farm Self Empl. | 574 | 17.9 |  | 0.2 |
| Q46(d) | Income - OAS, GIS | 574 | 13.1 |  | 3.8 |
| Q46(c) | lacome - CPP, QPP | 574 | 13.8 |  | 3.5 |
| Q46(t) | Income - UI | 574 | 17.2 |  | -. 0.5 |
| Q46(8) | Income - Other Government | 574 | 16.9 |  | 1.4 |
| Q46(h) | Income - Dividends, Interest | 574 | 14.6 |  | 2.8 |
| Q46(i) | Income - Retirement Pensions | 574 | 15.9 |  | 1.9 |
| Q46(j) | Income - Other | 574 | 18.8 |  |  |
| Q46(k) | Income - Total | 574 | 12.4 |  | 4.2 |

Table 14
NCT - Metis in Winnipeg Sample
Unweighted Definite Response Rates

| Step $/$ <br> Question <br> Number | Slep 1 <br> Question <br> Name | In Scope <br> ( ( Records) | NonResponse (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial Response <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household Level Steps / Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| DType | Dwelling Type | 231 | 1.3 |  |  |
| Step 3 | Persons Left Out | 231 | 3.5 |  |  |
| Step 5 | Temporary Residents | 231 | 0.9 |  |  |
| Step 7 | Agriculural Operator | 231 | 1.3 |  |  |
| Q47 | Who Pays | 231 | 1.3 | 29.4 |  |
| Q48 | Tenure | 231 | 3.0 |  |  |
| Q49 | Who Completed | 231 | 2.6 | 23.8 |  |
| Person Level Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q2 | Relationship to Person 1 | 684 | 12.6 |  |  |
| Q2 | R2P1 (Person 2 Onwards) | 453 | 1.1 |  |  |
| Q3 | Date of Birth | 684 | 0.6 |  | 0.6 |
| Q4 | Sex | 684 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Q5 | Marital Status | 684 | 0.9 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status | 684 | 5.6 |  |  |
| Q6 | Commor-Law Status (15+) | 479 | 4.8 |  |  |
| Q7(a) | Activity Limitation - Home | 684 | 1.3 |  |  |
| Q7(b) | Activity Limitation - Work | 684 | 1.5 |  |  |
| Q7(c) | Activity Limitation - Other | 684 | 2.5 |  |  |
| Q8 | Long Term Disabilities | 684 | 1.8 | 0.1 |  |
| Q9 | Language | 684 | 0.3 | - 20.5 |  |
| Q10 | Home Language | 684 | 0.4 |  |  |
| Q11 | Mother Toague | 684 | 0.1 | 0.4 |  |
| Q12 | Place of Birth | 684 | 0.3 |  |  |
| Q13 | Citizenship | 684 | 5.1 | 0.7 |  |
| Q14 | Landed Immigrant | 684 | 0.4 |  |  |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 39 |  |  |  |
| Q16 | Ethnic Origin | 684 | 2.9 | 43.3 |  |
| Q17 | Aboriginal | 684 | 0.3 | 0.3 |  |
| Q18 | Race | 320 | 1.6 | 1.6 |  |
| Q19 | Lndian Band | 684 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 11.1 |
| Q20 | Registered Indian | 684 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Q21 | Mobility Status - 1 Year | 479 | 0.6 |  |  |
| Q22 | Mobility Status - 5 Year | 479 | 0.6 |  | 1.0 |
| Q23 | School Attendance | 479 | 0.6 |  |  |
| Q24 | Schoot Language | 81 |  |  |  |


| Q25 | Degrees Obtained | 479 | 1.0 | 20.0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q26(a) | Unpaid Work - Housework | 479 | 1.7 |  |  |
| Q26(b) | Unpaid Work - Childcare | 479 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Q26(c) | Uspaid Work - Care/Seniors | 479 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Q26(d) | Unpaid Work - Care/Others | 479 | 1.3 |  |  |
| Q27 | Urpaid Volunteer Work | 479 | 0.8 |  |  |
| Q28 | - Hours Worked | 479 | 1.9 | 0.4 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 246 | 1.2 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 246 | 1.2 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 246 | 1.2 | 0.4 |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 62 | 1.6 |  |  |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 246 | 1.6 | 0.4 |  |
| Q34 | Employer. | 305 | 4.3 |  | 0.7 |
| Q35 | Type of Business. | 305 | 4.9 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 305 | 4.3 |  | 0.7 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 305 | 6.9 |  |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 305 | 6.2 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 305 | 7.2 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 305 | 6.2 |  | 1.0 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 305 | 5.9 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 7 |  |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 305 | 4.6 | 1.6 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 305 | 5.2 | 0.7 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 268 |  | 1.5 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 305 | 4.9 |  |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 271 | 0.4 |  |  |
| Q46(a) | Income - Wages, Salaries | 479 | 23.2 |  | 2.5 |
| Q46(b) | Income - Unincorp. Business | 479 | 26.5 |  | 0.6 |
| Q46(c) | Income - Farm Selr Empl. | 479 | 26.9 |  | 0.4 |
| Q46(d) | Income - OAS, GIS | 479 | 26.7 |  | 2.5 |
| Q46(c) | Income - CPP, QPP | 479 | 26.7 | $\cdot$ | 1.9 |
| Q46(1) | Income - Ul | 479 | 26.9 | - | 1.0 |
| Q46(B) | lncome - Other Goverument | 479 | 26.5 |  | 2.9 |
| Q46(h) | Income - Dividends, Interest | 479 | 28.2 |  | 1.7 |
| Q46(i) | Income - Retirement Pensions | 479 | 27.6 |  | 0.2 |
| Q46(j) | lncome - Other | 479 | 28.2 |  | 0.2 |
| Q46(k) | Income - Total | 479 | 6.7 |  | 2.9 |

Table 15
NCT - Aboriginals in Regina Sample
Unweighted Definite Response Rates

| Step / <br> Question <br> Number | Step $/$ <br> Question <br> Name | In Scope (I Records) | NonResponse (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial <br> Response <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Houschold Level Steps / Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| DType | Dwelling Type | 233 |  |  |  |
| Step 3 | Persons Left Out | 233 | 3.0 |  |  |
| Step 5 | Temporary Residents | 233 | 1.7 |  |  |
| Step 7 | Agriculural Operator | 233 | 0.9 |  |  |
| Q47 | Who Pays | 233 | 1.7 | 25.3 | $\cdots$ |
| Q48 | Tenure | 233 | 3.9 |  | $\cdots$ |
| Q49 | Who Completed | 233 | 2.1 | 27.5 |  |
| Person Level Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q2 | Relationship to Person 1 | 545 | 11.7 |  |  |
| Q2 | R2P1 (Person 2 Onwards) | 312 | 2.6 |  |  |
| Q3 | Date of Birch | 545 | 2.2 |  | 1.8 |
| Q4 | Sex | 545 | 1.8 |  |  |
| QS | Marital Status | 545 | 0.7 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status | 545 | 2.2 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status ( $15+$ ) | 411 | 1.9 |  |  |
| Q7(a) | Activity Limitation - Home | 545 | 3.9 |  |  |
| Q7(b) | Activity Limitation - Work | 545 | 6.8 | 0.2 |  |
| Q7(c) | Activity Limitation - Other | 545 | 6.4 |  |  |
| Q8 | Long Term Disabilities | 545 | 4.2 |  |  |
| Q9 | Language - | 545 | 1.5 | 11.4 |  |
| Q10 | Home Language | 545 | 0.7 |  |  |
| Q11 | Mother Tongue | 545 | 1.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Q12 | Place of Birth | 545 | 2.6 |  | . |
| Q13 | Citizenship | 545 | 2.2 | 0.4 | 23 |
| Q14 | - Landed lmmigrant | 545 | 5.5 |  | $\cdots$ |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 24 | 12.5 |  |  |
| Q16 | Ethric Origin . | 545 | 3.5 | 39.4 |  |
| Q17 | Aboriginal | 545 | 1.5 |  |  |
| Q18 | Race | 326 | 0.9 | 0.3 |  |
| Q19 | Indian Band | 545 | 3.7 |  | 27.9 |
| Q20 | Registered Indian | 545 | 2.2 |  |  |
| Q21 | Mobility Status - 1 Year | 411 | 2.9 |  | 0.7 |
| Q22 | Mobility Stutus - 5 Year | 411 | 3.9 |  | 1.7 |
| Q23 | School Attendance | 411 | 2.7 |  |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 51 | 3.9 |  |  |


| Q25 | Degrees Obtained | 411 | 4.9 | 13.9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q26(s) | Unpaid Work - Housework | 411 | 4.1 | 0.2 |  |
| Q26(b) | Unpaid Work - Childcare | 411 | 4.6 | 0.2 |  |
| Q26(c) | Unpaid Work - Care/Seniors | 411 | 4.1 |  |  |
| Q26(d) | Unpaid Work - Care/Others | 411 | 7.5 | 0.2 |  |
| Q27 | Unpaid Volunteer Work | 411 | 3.6 |  |  |
| Q28 | Hours Worked | 411 | 3.6 |  |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 278 | 3.2 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 278 | 2.9 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 278 | 2.9 |  |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 38 | 7.9 |  |  |
| Q33 | Lest Worked | 278 | 3.2 | 0.4 |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 181 | 3.3 |  |  |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 181 | 6.6 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 181 | 2.8 |  | 4.4 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 181 | 5.0 | 0.6 |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 181 | 5.0 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 181 | 8.3 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 181 | 5.0 |  | 3.3 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 181 | 3.3 | 0.6 |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 12 | 16.7 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 181 | 3.3 |  |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 181 | 5.5 | 0.6 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 156 |  |  |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 181 | 6.1 | 0.6 |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 160 | 0.6 |  |  |
| Q46(a) | Income - Wages, Salaries | 411 | 23.8 |  | 7.5 |
| Q46(b) | Income - Unincorp. Business | 411 | 28.5 |  |  |
| Q46(c) | Income - Farm Self Empl. | 411 | 29.4 |  | 0.5 |
| Q46(d) | lncome - OAS, GIS | 411 | 25.8 |  | 3.4 |
| Q46(e) | lncome - CPP, QPP | 411 | 27.0 |  | 3.6 |
| Q46(f) | Income - Ul | 411 | 26.5 |  | 2.2 |
| Q46(g) | Income - Other Government | 411 | 25.8 |  | 4.6 |
| Q46(h) | Income - Dividends, Interest | 411 | 28.2 |  | 2.2 |
| Q46(i) | Income - Retirement Pensions | 411 | 29.4 |  | 1.5 |
| Q46(j) | Income - Other | 411 | 28.5 |  | 0.5 |
| Q46(k) | Income - Toul | 411 | 9.5 |  | 5.1 |

Table 16
NCT - Metis in Saskatoon Sample
Uuweighted Definite Response Rates

| Step 1 <br> Question <br> Number | Slep 1 <br> Question Name | In Scope ( Records) | NonResponse (\%) | Multiple Response (\%) | Partial Response (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household Level Steps / Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| DType | Dwelling Type | 178 | 1.7 |  |  |
| Step 3 | Persons Left Out | 178 | 3.9 |  |  |
| Step 5 | Temporary Residents | 178 | 0.6 | 0.6 |  |
| Step 7 | Agriculural Operator | 178 | 1.7 |  |  |
| Q47 | Who Pays | 178 | 1.1 | 36.5 |  |
| Q48 | Tenure | 178 | 1.7. | 0.6 |  |
| Q49 | Who Completed | 178 | 2.2 | 12.9 |  |
| Person Level Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q2 | Relationship to Person 1 | 571 | 15.4 |  |  |
| Q2 | R2P1 (Person 2 Onwards) | 393 | 5.6 |  |  |
| Q3 | Date of Birth | 571 | 0.4 |  | 0.9 |
| Q4 | Sex | 571 | 2.1 |  |  |
| Q5 | Marital Stataus | 571 | 1.9 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status | 571 | 3.2 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status (15+) | 387 | 3.1 |  |  |
| Q7(a) | Activity Limitation - Home | 571 | 1.4 |  |  |
| Q7(b) | Activity Limitation - Work | 571 | 3.2 |  |  |
| Q7(c) | Activity Limitation - Other | 571 | 2.8 |  |  |
| Q8 | Long Term Disabilities | 571 | 1.8 |  |  |
| Q9 | -.. Language | 571 | 1.2 | 11.7 |  |
| Q10. | Home Language | 571 | 1.9 | 0.5 |  |
| Q11 | $\cdots$ Mother Tongue | 571 | 1.2 | 0.9 |  |
| Q12 | $\cdots$ Place of Birth | 571 | 0.5 | 1.1 |  |
| Q13 | Citizenship . | 571 | 0.4 | 0.5 |  |
| Q14 | Landed Immigrapt ....: | 571 | 0.9 |  |  |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 1 |  |  |  |
| Q16 | Ethnic Origin | 571 | 3.9 | 45.5 |  |
| Q17 | -- Aboriginal | 571 | 2.3 | 0.4 |  |
| Q18 | Race | 233 | 2.1 | 3.9 |  |
| Q19 | Indian Bend | 571 | 3.3 | 0.2 | 14.5 |
| Q20 | Registered Indian | 571 | 1.6 |  |  |
| Q21 | Mobility Staus - 1 Year | 387 | 0.5 |  | 0.3 |
| Q22 | Mobility Status - 5 Year | 387 | 2.3 |  | 13 |
| Q23 | School Attendance | 387 | 0.5 | 0.5 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 93 | 2.2 |  |  |


| Q25 | Degrees Obrained | 387 | 0.5 | 24.5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q26(a) | Unpsid Work - Housework | 387 | 0.8 |  |  |
| Q26(b) | Unpaid Work - Childeare | 387 | 1.0 | 0.8 |  |
| Q26(c) | Unpaid Work - Care/Seniors | 387 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Q26(d) | Unpaid Work - Care/Others | 387 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Q27 | Unpaid Volunteer Work | 387 | 0.5 |  |  |
| Q28 | Hours Worked | 387 | 3.1 | 0.3 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 199 | 4.5 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 199 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 199 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 43 | 2.3 |  |  |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 199 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 253 | 7.1 |  | 0.8 |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 253 | 10.7 |  |  |
|  | Lodustry | 253 | 7.1 |  | 3.6 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 253 | 9.5 | 0.4 |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 253 | 9.9 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Lmportant Duties | 253 | 12.6 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 253 | 9.5 |  | 3.6 |
| Q39 | Class of Worter | 253 | 9.1 | 1.2 |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 12 | 8.3 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 253 | 4.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 253 | 7.5 |  |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 220 | 2.3 |  |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 253 | 5.5 |  |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 217 | 1.4 | 1.4 |  |
| Q46(a) | Income - Wages, Salaries | 387 | 10.3 |  | 1.8 |
| Q46(b) | Income - Unincorp. Business | 387 | 13.4 |  |  |
| Q46(c) | Income - Farm Seir Empl. | 387 | 13.2 |  |  |
| Q46(d) | Income - OAS, GIS | 387 | 12.4 |  | 0.5 |
| Q46(e) | Income - CPP, QPP | 387 | 12.1 |  | 0.8 |
| Q46(1) | Income - Ul | 387 | 12.1 |  | 2.1 |
| Q46(g) | Income - Other Goverument | 387 | . 14.0 |  | 1.0 |
| Q46(b) | Income - Dividends, Interest | 387 | 12.1 | - | 0.8 |
| Q46(i) | Income - Retirement Pensiona | 387 | 14.0 |  | 0.3 |
| Q46(j) | Income - Other | 387 | 13.2 |  |  |
| Q46(k) | lscome - Toral | 387 | - 10.6 |  | 0.8 |

Table 17
NCT - Aboriginals in Edmonton Sample
Unweighted Definite Response Rates

| Step $/$ <br> Question <br> Number | Step $/$ <br> Question <br> Name | In Scope (1 Records) | NorResponse <br> (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial <br> Response <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Houschold Level Steps / Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| DType | Dwelling Type | 233 |  |  |  |
| Step 3 | Persons Left Out | 233 | 4.7 |  |  |
| Step 5 | Temporary Residents | 233 | 3.9 |  |  |
| Step 7 | -i. Agricultural Operator | 233 | 1.7 |  |  |
| Q47 | …) Who Pays | 233 | 3.0 | 30.9 |  |
| Q48 | Tenure | 233 | 3.9 |  |  |
| Q49 | Who Completed | 233 | 4.7 | 13.7 |  |
| Person Level Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q2 | Relationship to Person 1 | 545 | 5.3 |  |  |
| Q2 | R2P1 (Person 2 Onwards) | 312 | 1.3 |  |  |
| Q3 | Date of Birth | 545 | 1.7 |  | 0.4 |
| Q4 | Sex | 545 | 1.1 |  |  |
| Q5 | Marital Status | 545 | 2.6 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Staus | 545 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Q6 | Common-Law Status (15+) | 433 | 4.4 |  |  |
| Q7(a) | Activity Limitation - Home | 545 | 3.3 |  |  |
| Q7(b) | Activity Limitation - Work | 545 | 4.2 | 0.2 |  |
| Q7(c) | Activity Limitation - Other . | 545 | 6.1 |  |  |
| Q8 | Long Term Disabilities | 545 | 3.7 |  |  |
| Q9 | Language | 545 | 2.0 | 24.8 |  |
| Q10 | Home Language | 545 | 2.2 |  |  |
| Q11 | Mother Tongue. | 545 | 2.6 | 1.1 |  |
| Q12 | Place of Birth | 545 | 2.4 |  |  |
| Q13 | Citizenship | 545 | 3.1 | 1.7 | \% |
| Q14. | Landed Immigrant | 545 | 4.0 |  |  |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | $\because 86$ | 1.2 |  |  |
| Q16 | Ethnic Origin | 545 | 5.5 | 39.3 |  |
| Q17 | Aboriginal | 545 | 2.8 |  |  |
| Q18 | Race | 471 | 1.3 | 1.7 |  |
| Q19 | Indian Band | 545 | 2.4 |  | 4.4. |
| Q20 | Registered Indian | 545 | 2.4 |  |  |
| Q21 | Mobility Status - 1 Year | 433 | 2.5 |  | 0.9 |
| Q22 | Mobility Status - 5 Year | 433. | 2.5 |  | 1.6 |
| Q23 | School Attendance | 433 | 3.0 |  |  |
| Q24 | : School Language | 54 |  |  |  |


| Q25 | Degrees Obtained | 433 | 3.5 | 20.3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q26(a) | Unpaid Work - Housework | 433 | 2.8 |  |  |
| Q26(b) | Unpaid Work - Childcare | 433 | 4.6 |  |  |
| Q26(c) | Unpaid Work - Care/Seniors | 433 | 3.9 |  |  |
| Q26(d) | Unpaid Work - Care/Others | 433 | 4.8 |  |  |
| Q27 | Umpaid Volunteer Work | 433 | 3.5 |  |  |
| Q28 | Hours Worked | 433 | 4.6 |  |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 187 | 1.6 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 187 | 1.1 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 187 | 1.1 |  |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 44 | 4.5 |  |  |
| Q33 | Lest Worked. | 187 | 0.5 |  |  |
| Q34 | Employer. | 298 | 2.3 |  | 0.7 |
| Q35 | Type of Business. | 298 | 5.0 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 298 | 2.0 |  | 3.4 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 298 | 4.0 |  |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 298 | 3.7 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 298 | 8.1 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 298 | 3.4 |  | 5.0 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 298 | 3.7 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 16 |  |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 298 | 2.3 |  |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 298 | 5.4 | 1.3 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 246 |  |  |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 298 | 3.7 |  |  |
| Q4S | Full Time or Part Time | 267 |  |  |  |
| Q46(a) | lncome - Wages, Salaries | 433 | 13.9 |  | 0.7 |
| Q46(b) | Incoure - Unincorp. Business | 433 | 20.1 | $\cdots$ |  |
| Q46(c) | Income - Farm Self Empl. | 433 | 18.9 |  |  |
| Q46(d) | Income - OAS, GIS | 433 | 18.5 |  | 0.9 |
| Q46(c) | Income - CPP, QPP | 433 | 19.9 | . | 1.4 |
| Q46(f) | Income - UI | 433 | 19.6 | - | 1.4 |
| Q46(g) | Income - Other Government | 433 | 19.4 |  | 1.6 |
| Q46(b) | Income - Dividends, Interest | 433 | 19.2 | $\cdots$ | 1.8 |
| Q46(i) | Income - Retirement Pensions | 433 | 20.6 |  | 0.9 |
| Q46(j) | Income - Other | 433 | 22.4 |  | . |
| Q46(k) | Income - Total | 433 | 12.9 |  | 0.5 |

Table 18
NCT - Asians in Vancouver Stample
Unweighted Definite Response Rates

| Step 1 <br> Question Number | Step $/$ <br> Question Name | In Scope <br> (" Records) | Nor Response <br> (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial Response <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Houschold Level Steps / Questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| DType | Dwelling Type | 279 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Step 3 | Persons Left Out | 279 | 3.9 |  |  |
| Step 5 | Temporary Residents | 279 | 4.7 |  |  |
| Step 7 | - Agricultural Operator | 279 | 3.2 |  |  |
| Q47 | Who Pays | 279 | 3.2 | 43.4 | $\ldots$ |
| Q48 | Tenure | 279 | 3.6 |  | … |
| Q49 | Who Completed | 279 | 3.6 | 20.8 | - |
| Person Level Questions |  |  |  |  |  |



| Q25 | Degrees Obtained | 875 | 1.3 | 14.9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q26(a) | Unpaid Work - Housework | 875 | 1.6 | 0.3 |  |
| Q26(b) | Unpaid Work - Childcare | 875 | 2.7 | 0.5 |  |
| Q26(c) | Urpaid Work - Care/Seniors | 875 | 2.9 |  |  |
| Q26(d) | Unpaid Work - Care/Others | 875 | 2.4 |  |  |
| Q27 | Unpaid Volunteer Work | 875 | 1.6 |  |  |
| Q28 | Hours Worked | 875 | 3.7 | 0.2 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 408 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 408 | 0.5 |  |  |
| Q31. | Look for Work | 408 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 65 | 6.2 |  |  |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 408 | 2.0 |  |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 563 | 7.5 |  | 0.7 |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 563 | 8.7 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 563 | 5.3 |  | 5.5 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 563 | 7.6 | 1.2 |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 563 | 7.5 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 563 | 12.6 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 563 | 7.5 |  | 5.2 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 563 | 5.2 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 57 | 5.3 |  |  |
| Q41 | Wort Language | 563 | 5.0 | 6.2 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 563 | 11.5 | 1.4 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 375 | 0.5 | 1.1 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 563 | 7.1 |  |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Pairt Time | 474 | 1.3 |  |  |
| Q46(a) | Income - Wages, Salaries | 875 | 19.5 |  | 1.5 |
| Q46(b) | Lncome - Unincorp. Business | 875 | 27.2 |  |  |
| Q46(c) | Income - Farm Self Eupl. | 875 | 27.0 |  |  |
| Q46(d) | Income - OAS, GIS | 875 | 26.9 |  | 0.3 |
| Q46(c) | Income - CPP, QPP | 875 | 27.5 |  | 0.1 |
| Q46(f) | - Income - Ul | 875 | 27.1 |  | 0.2 |
| Q46(g) | Income - Other Government | 875 | 27.3 |  | 0.3 |
| Q46(h) | Income - Dividends, Interest | 875 | 27.1 |  | 1.7 |
| Q46(i) | Income - Retirement Pensions | 875 | 28.1 |  | 0.3 |
| Q46(j) | Income - Other | 875 | 28.5 |  | 0.2 |
| Q46(k) | Income - Total | 875 | 26.6 |  | 1.9 |

Table 19
NCT - Blacks in Halifax Sample
Unweighted Potential Response Rates

| Step $/$ <br> Question <br> Number | Step 1 <br> Question <br> Name | In Scope <br> (" Records) | NonResponse <br> (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial Response (\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 57 | 36.8 |  |  |
| Q18 | Race | 644 | 0.5 | 6.1 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 94 | 11.7 | 3.2 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 298 | 7.4 |  | . |
| Q30 | New Job | 298 | 6.4 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 298 | 7.7 | 1.0 |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 73 | 28.8 |  |  |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 298 | 5.0 | 0.3 |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 245 | 9.0 |  |  |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 245 | 11.4 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 245 | 9.0 |  | 2.4 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 245 | 13.1 |  |  |
| Q37. | Kind of Work | 245 | 10.2 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 245 | 13.5 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 245 | 10.2 |  | 3.3 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 245 | 9.4 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 34 | 73.5 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 245 | 9.4 | 0.4 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 245 | 10.2 | 1.2 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 220 | 10.0 | 0.5 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 245 | 12.2 |  |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 227 | 9.3 | 0.4 |  |

Table 20
NCT - Asians in Montreal Sample
Unweighted Potential Response Rates

| Step $/$ <br> Question <br> Number | Step $/$ <br> Question <br> Name | In Scope <br> (H Records) | NonResponse (\%) | Multiple Response (\%) | Partial Response (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q15 | Year of immigration | 376 | 8.5 | . |  |
| Q18 | Race | 1032 | 1.5 | 1.2 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 242 | 5.8 | 0.8 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 326 | 6.4 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 326 | 5.5 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 326 | 5.8 |  |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 61 | 31.1 |  |  |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 326 | 4.6 |  |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 579 | 7.6 |  | 0.3 |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 579 | 7.4 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 579 | 7.1 |  | 0.9 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 579 | 8.1 | 0.2 |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 579 | 7.3 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 579 | 10.4 |  |  |
|  | : Occupation | 579 | 7.3 |  | 3.1 |
| Q39. | Class of Worker | 579 | 6.6 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 135 | 32.6 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 579 | 7.9 | 9.7 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 579 | 8.5 | 0.9 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 549 | 6.9 | 0.9 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 579 | 7.4 |  |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 550 | 7.5 |  |  |

Table 21
NCT - Blacks in Montreal Sample
Unweighted Potential Response Rates

| Step 1 Question Number | Step 1 <br> Question <br> Name | In Scope (" Records) | NonResponse (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial Response (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q15 | Year of lmmigration | 107 | 10.3 |  |  |
| Q18 | Race | 546 | 0.5 | 0.4 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 70 | 11.4 |  |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 238 | 3.8 |  |  |
| Q30 | - New Job | 238 | 4.6 |  |  |
| Q31 | .-. Look for Work | 238 | 3.4 | 0.4 | - |
| Q32 | Start Job | 70 | 12.9 | 1.4 |  |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 238 | 4.2 | 0.4 |  |
| Q34 | Enployer | 237 | 4.2 |  |  |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 237 | 3.8 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 237 | 3.8 |  | 0.4 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 237 | 5.1 | 0.8 |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 237 | 4.6 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 237 | 5.9 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 237 | 3.8 |  | 3.0 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 237 | 3.8 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 11 | 81.8 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 237 | 4.2 | 10.1 |  |
| Q42 | Pisce of Work | 237 | 5.1 | 1.7 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | - 229 | 4.4 | 0.4 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 237 | 4.6 |  |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 212 | 4.2 |  |  |

Table 22
NCT - Latin Americans in Montreal Sample Unweighted Potential Response Rates

| Step 1 <br> Question <br> Number | Step $/$ <br> Question Name | In Scope (Records) | NonResponse <br> (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial Response (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 251 | 6.0 |  |  |
| Q18 | Race | 475 | 0.4 | 1.1 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 51 | 5.9 | 2.0 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 244 | 2.0 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 244 | 2.0 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 244 | 2.0 | 0.8 |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 68 | 8.8 |  |  |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 244 | 2.0 |  |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 199 | 4.0 |  | 2.0 |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 199 | 4.0 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 199 | 3.5 |  | 1.0 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 199 | 4.0 |  |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 199 | 3.5 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 199 | 8.5 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 199 | 3.5 |  | 5.0 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 199 | 3.0 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 19 | 36.8 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 199 | 3.5 | 8.5 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 199 | 5.5 | 0.5 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 192 | 3.1 | 1.6 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 199 | 6.5 | 0.5 |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 178 | 5.6 |  |  |

Table 23
NCT - Asians in Toronto Sample
Unweighted Potential Response Rates

| Step 1 <br> Question <br> Number | Step $/$ Question Name | In Scope <br> (" Records) | NonResponse <br> (\%) | Multiple Response <br> (\%) | Partial Response (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 342 | 5.0 |  |  |
| Q18 | Race | 422 | 1.4 | 4.7 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 62 | 11.3 |  |  |
| Q29 | Leyoff | 268 | 3.7 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 268 | 3.4 |  |  |
| Q31 | -- Look for Work | 268 | 3.7 |  |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 26 | 34.6 |  |  |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 268 | 6.0 |  | . |
| Q34 | Employer | 162 | 27.8 |  |  |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 162 | 30.9 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 162 | 25.9 |  | 6.8 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 162 | 30.2 |  |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 162 | 27.8 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 162 | 34.6 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 162 | 27.2 |  | 8.0 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 162 | 24.1 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 64 | 54.7 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 162 | 25.3 | 1.2 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 162 | 26.5 | 0.6 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 137 | 27.0 | 2.2 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 162 | 22.8 |  |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 145 | 22.8 |  | . |

Table 24
NCT - Blacks in Toronto Sample
Unweighted Potential Response Rates

| Slep 1 <br> Question <br> Number | Step $/$ <br> Question <br> - Name | In Scope (" Records) | NonResponse <br> (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial Response <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 506 | 6.5 |  |  |
| Q18 | Race | 722 | 1.0 | 2.4 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 149 | 14.8 |  |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 289 | 5.5 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 289 | 5.9 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 289 | 9.0 |  |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 116 | 23.3 | 0.9 |  |
| Q33 | Lest Worked | 289 | 4.8 | 0.3 |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 299 | 8.4 |  | 0.3 |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 299 | 10.0 |  |  |
|  | Industry. | 299 | 7.0 |  | 4.3 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 299 | 7.4 |  |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 299 | 10.4 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 299 | 12.0 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 299 | 10.0 |  | 2.3 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 299 | 6.4 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 28 | 71.4 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 299 | 10.7 |  |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 299 | 9.7 |  |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 270 | 7.0 | 1.5 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 299 | 6.7 |  |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 260 | 7.3 |  |  |

Table 25
NCT - Aboriginals in Winnipeg Sample
Unweighted Potential Response Rates

| Step 1 <br> Question Number | Step 1 <br> Question Name | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In Scope } \\ & \text { (" Records) } \end{aligned}$ | Non- <br> Response <br> (\%) | Multiple Response (\%) | Partial <br> Response <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 147 | 7.5 |  |  |
| Q18 | Race . | 634 | 2.1 | 2.4 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 87 | 3.4 |  |  |
| Q29 | Lxyoff | 276 | 3.6 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 276 | 2.9 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 276 | 3.3 |  |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 45 | 20.0 |  |  |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 276 | 3.6 |  |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 388 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 388 | 7.2 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 388 | 5.4 |  | 2.1 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 388 | 8.2 |  |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 388 | 5.9 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 388 | 8.5 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 388 | 5.9 |  | 2.6 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 388 | 6.2 | 0.3 |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporatod | 48 | 50.0 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 388 | 5.4 | . |  |
| Q42 | . . . Place of Work | 388 | 7.2 | 0.3 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 352 | 6.5 |  |  |
| Q44. | ..i. Weeks Worked | 388 | 6.7 |  |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 368 | 6.3 | $\because$ | : |

Table 26
NCT - Metis in Winnipeg Sample
Unweighted Potential Response Rates

| Step / <br> Question <br> Number | Suep 1 <br> Question <br> Name | In Scope <br> ( $/$ Records) | NorResponse (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial <br> Response <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 42 | 4.8 |  |  |
| Q18 | Race | 324 | 2.5 | 1.5 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 84 | 3.6 |  |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 257 | 2.3 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 257 | 2.3 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 257 | 2.3 | 0.4 |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 72 | 9.7 |  |  |
| Q33 | Lest Worked | 257 | 2.7 | 0.4 |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 318 | 6.6 |  | 0.6 |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 318 | 7.2 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 318 | 6.6 |  | 0.6 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 318 | 9.4 |  |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 318 | 8.5 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 318 | 9.4 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 318 | 8.5 |  | 0.9 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 318 | 8.2 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 33 | 69.7 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 318 | 6.9 | 1.6 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 318 | 7.5 | 0.6 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 297 | 7.4 | 1.3 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 318 | 7.2 |  |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 298 | 8.1 |  |  |

Table 27
NCT - Aboriginals in Regina Sample Unweighted Potential Response Rates

| Step $/$ <br> Question <br> Number | Step 1 Question Name | In Scope ( ${ }^{(1}$ Records) | NonResponse (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial Response <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 54 | 55.6 |  |  |
| Q18 | Race | 334 | 3.0 | 0.3 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 62 | 19.4 | , |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 293 | 7.5 |  |  |
| Q30 | $\cdots$. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ New Job | 293 | 7.2 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 293 | 7.2 |  | ... |
| Q32 | $\cdots$ - ${ }^{\text {an... }}$ Start Job | 59 | 40.7 |  |  |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 293 | 7.5 | 0.3 | $\cdots$ |
| Q34 | Employer | 206 | 12.6 |  |  |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 206 | 15.5 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 206 | 12.1 |  | 3.9 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 206 | 14.1 | 0.5 |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 206 | 14.6 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 206 | 17.5 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 206 | 14.6 |  | 2.9 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 206 | 12.1 | 0.5 |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporited | 37 | 73.0 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 206 | 12.1 |  |  |
| Q42 | Place of Worl | 206 | 14.1 | 1.0 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 192 | 13.5 | 0.5 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 206 | 14.6 | 0.5 |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 196 | 13.8 |  |  |

Table 28
NCT - Metis in Saskatoon Sample
Unweighted Potential Response Rates

| Step 1 <br> Question <br> Number | Step / Question Name | In Scope <br> (" Records) | NonResponse (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial Response (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 6 | 83.3 | . |  |
| Q18 | Race | 248 | 4.8 | 3.6 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 97 | 4.1 |  |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 212 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 212 | 2.4 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 212 | 2.4 |  |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 50 | 12.0 |  |  |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 212 | 2.4 |  |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 267 | 10.1 |  | 0.7 |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 267 | 13.5 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 267 | 10.1 |  | 3.4 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 267 | 12.4 | 0.4 |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 267 | 12.7 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 267 | 15.4 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 267 | 12.4 |  | 3.4 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 267 | 12.0 | 1.1 |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 45 | 48.9 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 267 | 7.1 | 1.9 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 267 | 10.5 |  |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Woris | 253 | 9.1 | 2.4 |  |
| Q44 | - Weeks Worked | 267 | 9.0 |  |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 243 | 8.6 | 1.2 |  |

Table 29
NCT - Aboriginals in Edmonton Sample
Unweighted Potential Response Rates

| Step 1 Question Number | Step I <br> Question <br> Name | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In Scope } \\ & \text { (I Records) } \end{aligned}$ | NorResponse (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial. <br> Response <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 108 | 16.7 |  |  |
| Q18 | Race | 486 | 3.3 | 1.6 |  |
| Q24 | School Lagguage | 67 | 17.9 |  |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 207 | 8.7 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 207 | 7.7 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 207 | 7.7 |  |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 62 | 29.0 |  | - |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 207 | 7.2 |  |  |
| Q34 | Ermployer | 319 | 6.6 |  | 0.6 |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 319 | 9.1 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 319 | 6.3 |  | 3.1 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 319 | 8.5 |  |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 319 | 8.2 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 319 | 12.2 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 319 | 7.8 |  | 4.7 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 319 | 8.5 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 43 | 51.2 |  |  |
| Q41 | . Work Language | 319 | 6.6. |  |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 319 | 9.7 | 1.3 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 286 | 8.4 | 0.3 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 319 | 7.8 |  |  |
| Q4S | Full Time or Part Time | 297 | 6.4. |  |  |

Table 30
NCT - Asians in Vancouver Sample
Unweighted Potential Response Rates

| Step 1 <br> Question <br> Number | Step 1 <br> Question <br> Name | In Scope <br> (\# Records) | NonResponse (\%) | Multiple <br> Response <br> (\%) | Partial Response (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q15 | Year of Immigration | 757 | 8.5 |  |  |
| Q18 | Race | 1090 | 1.9 | 2.5 |  |
| Q24 | School Language | 186 | 4.3 | 1.6 |  |
| Q29 | Layoff | 442 | 3.8 |  |  |
| Q30 | New Job | 442 | 3.2 |  |  |
| Q31 | Look for Work | 442 | 3.8 |  |  |
| Q32 | Start Job | 85 | 20.0 |  |  |
| Q33 | Last Worked | 442 | 4.8 |  |  |
| Q34 | Employer | 603 | 10.9 |  | 0.7 |
| Q35 | Type of Business | 603 | 13.3 |  |  |
|  | Industry | 603 | 9.0 |  | 6.3 |
| Q36 | General Industry | 603 | 12.4 | 1.2 |  |
| Q37 | Kind of Work | 603 | 11.8 |  |  |
| Q38 | Most Important Duties | 603 | 16.9 |  |  |
|  | Occupation | 603 | 11.8 |  | 5.1 |
| Q39 | Class of Worker | 603 | 10.0 |  |  |
| Q40 | Self Employed - Incorporated | 117 | 47.0 |  |  |
| Q41 | Work Language | 603 | 9.3 | 6.1 |  |
| Q42 | Place of Work | 603 | 15.6 | 1.3 |  |
| Q43 | Transportation to Work | 480 | 11.3 | 1.0 |  |
| Q44 | Weeks Worked | 603 | 11.3 |  |  |
| Q45 | Full Time or Part Time | 551 | 10.9 |  |  |
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