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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Canadian Heritage commissioned Phoenix SPI to conduct a client satisfaction survey related to the Trade Routes program. Trade Routes is part of the department's strategy to expand international markets for Canada's arts and cultural sector. This survey was designed to determine clients' level of satisfaction with the four program components: market entry support, in-market assistance, research, and contributions. Because some clients did not have access to the Internet, a mixed-mode approach was used, which included both online and mail-out surveys. In total, 733 responded to the survey, which was available online from October 17 to November 16, 2007. Of these, 201 were current clients of Trade Routes, and 532 were former clients or non-clients that had businesses in the Arts and Cultural sector. This represents an overall response rate of $28 \%$.

## Current Clients

## Awareness and Perceptions of Trade Routes

Three-quarters of surveyed clients were at least moderately familiar with the program overall, although familiarity was much more likely to be moderate than strong ( $53 \%$ vs. $22 \%$ ). Familiarity was also relatively widespread for the four service components: $78 \%$ were at least moderately familiar with the Contributions Program, $67 \%$ with Market Entry Support, $46 \%$ with In-Market Assistance, and $39 \%$ with Research. Just over half of current clients had used Trade Routes for up to two years (54\%), with most of these having used it for one year or less (37\%).

During the previous 12 months, clients were much more likely to have dealt with Trade Routes using emails to program staff ( $81 \%$ ) and the program's website ( $75 \%$ ) than any other method ( $26-53 \%$ ). The least-used method was the 1-866 toll-free phone number. Satisfaction with the service channels used was strongest regarding personal interactions, such as in-person service and emailing a specific officer (77-78\% satisfied, with 54-57\% very satisfied). Following this, $69-71 \%$ were satisfied with service received through the website, telephone, and mail/fax. Satisfaction was lowest for more generic channels - 58\% each with the 1-866 number and generic email. Most clients had received at least some of what they needed ( $83 \%$ ), including $46 \%$ that had received everything they needed.

## Overall Perceptions of Service

In total, $68 \%$ of clients were satisfied with the overall quality of service they received during the previous 12 months ( $35 \%$ were very satisfied). They tended to agree widely that they had been served in their preferred official language ( $97 \%$ ), and by courteous staff ( $92 \%$ ). There was also widespread agreement that staff were knowledgeable and competent ( $84 \%$ ), provided full information on service requirements ( $81 \%$ ), and that they were treated fairly ( $81 \%$ ). Smaller majorities agreed that they had easy access to program staff ( $71 \%$ ), the information was clear and easy to understand (69\%), the service was timely (65\%) and that staff went the extra mile (64\%).

## Perceived Impacts

Fully $80 \%$ of clients rated the program as valuable or useful to their organization, with a clear majority assessing it as very useful ( $61 \%$ ). Moreover, majorities (54-85\%) identified at least moderate impacts in all of the areas examined. Impacts were most widespread in terms of developing international markets ( $85 \%$ ), and building networks and partnerships ( $82 \%$ ). Following this were improving export readiness ( $71 \%$ ), exposure to markets and best practices $(67 \%)$, strategic advice ( $60 \%$ ), informed investment and export decisions ( $57 \%$ ), and skills development ( $54 \%$ ). As well, clients' use of the program resulted in increased trade-related connections, a better understanding of international markets, increased exports, and expanded markets - potential outcomes that were identified by $77 \%$ to $84 \%$ of surveyed clients. All of these were deemed to be very important outcomes by two-thirds or more of the clients that identified them (66-76\%).

Almost all Trade Routes clients ( $91 \%$ ) are at least moderately likely to use the program again in the future. More than three-quarters (78\%) consider this to be very likely.

## Trade Routes Services

In total, $64 \%$ of clients had used the Contributions Program in the previous 12 months, making it the most widely-used service. Following this, $45 \%$ had used Market Entry Support, $32 \%$ In-Market Assistance, and $19 \%$ the Research service. It is worth noting that familiarity with these services followed the same pattern.

Presented below are the results for specific Trade Routes services; that is, assessments of the service received by those who used each specific service and who answered the survey module that corresponded with the service ${ }^{1}$. Caution should be exercised when interpreting these results due to the relatively small sample sizes that assessed each service.

## Contributions Program

Clients ( $\mathrm{n}=113$ ) of this service needed assistance for international market development much more often than for export preparedness ( $93 \%$ vs. $31 \%$ ). They were twice as likely to participate in international trade shows and visits to new markets than any other type of activity ( $75 \%$ vs. $35 \%$ or less). As well,

- Clients were largely satisfied with the overall quality of service they received ( $61 \%$ ), although more tended to be moderately, not very satisfied ( $34 \%$ vs. $27 \%$ ).
- Satisfaction with specific aspects of the service varied considerably from a low of $27 \%$ to a high of $93 \%$. Clients were most satisfied with staff courteousness (93\%) and staff knowledge/competence ( $81 \%$ ). They were least satisfied with the timeliness of the approval process ( $27 \%$ ). The latter was the only area where a majority expressed dissatisfaction (58\%).
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- Twenty-eight percent experienced problems when using this service, most of which had to do with delays and timeliness issues.
- Potential changes to the program preferred by clients (asked of all 201 Trade Routes clients, whether or not they had used the Contributions Program) were earlier notification of the outcome of applications (73\%), online applications ( $49 \%$ ), and an approval-in-principle system (43\%).


## Market Entry Support

Clients who had used this service $(\mathrm{n}=82)$ were most likely to have dealt with headquarters (in Gatineau), or the Montreal or Toronto offices (22-29\%), and to have participated in international trade shows and information sessions (46-48\%). As well,

- Approximately two-thirds (68\%) were satisfied with the overall quality of service they received. Moreover, at least three-quarters were satisfied with each aspect of service. This was highest in terms of staff knowledge/competence and ease of access to service ( $86-87 \%$ ), and lowest regarding service timeliness ( $75 \%$ ).
- Timeliness issues were also the most common problems identified by the 10 clients who had experienced difficulties with this service in the previous 12 months.
- One-third of all Trade Routes clients $(\mathrm{n}=201)$ felt that the number of Trade Commissioners should be expanded, with cities in Western Canada identified most often as new locations, and with Calgary heading the list (45\%).


## In-Market Assistance

Clients who had used this service $(\mathrm{n}=56)$ were similarly likely to have dealt with many of the international offices, with New York leading the way ( $32 \%$ ), followed by Shanghai, Los Angeles, and London (23-27\%). They were least likely to have used the Paris office (16\%). As well,

- Considerable numbers participated in events, such as market visits ( $52 \%$ ), trade shows and conferences (52\%), and networking events (46\%).
- Satisfaction with the service received was relatively high: $73 \%$ overall, with $43 \%$ very satisfied. Between $70 \%$ and $79 \%$ expressed satisfaction with all aspects of the service, with service timeliness ranking the lowest.
- Among the few who experienced problems ( $\mathrm{n}=11$ ), difficulty accessing a Cultural Trade Development Officer was identified most often.
- A majority ( $57 \%$ ) of all Trade Routes clients $(\mathrm{n}=201)$ favour expanding the number of Cultural Trade Development Officers. New locations identified most often were Berlin (66\%), Tokyo (51\%), and Sao Paulo (43\%).


## Research

Clients who had used this service ( $\mathrm{n}=32$ ) offered modest appraisals of the overall quality of service received: 52\% expressed satisfaction, with $34 \%$ neutral. As well,

- Clients were most likely to be satisfied with the clarity and accessibility of the research ( $67 \%$ ), followed by its relevance ( $65 \%$ ). Satisfaction was lowest regarding its comprehensiveness (44\%).
- Only four clients experienced problems with the service.
- Twenty-two percent of all Trade Routes clients $(\mathrm{n}=201)$ favoured suggestions for new directions for the Research service, the most prevalent of which was market reports by cultural sector ( $70 \%$ ).


## Non-Clients and Former Clients

Familiarity with Trade Routes was relatively limited among non-clients. In total, $71 \%$ of non-clients were no more than a little familiar with Trade Routes overall. The proportion of non-clients that were at least moderately familiar with each Trade Routes service ranged from $15 \%$ to $25 \%$, and many were completely unfamiliar with these services ( $38-52 \%$ ). That said, $63 \%$ said they were aware of the program before being contacted for this research, over one-quarter ( $29 \%$ ) of whom had been, but were not currently, clients in the past. The most common reason for not continuing using the program was that they had received all the assistance needed ( $25 \%$ ). Others had discontinued use because they were not satisfied with the service (13\%), felt the program was not appropriate for their level of exporting ( $12 \%$ ), or their proposal had been declined ( $12 \%$ ). Fully $75 \%$ of former clients think it is at least moderately likely that they will use Trade Routes in the future ( $47 \%$ said this is very likely).

Former clients $(\mathrm{n}=120)$ offered mixed assessments of the overall value of the program to their organization. In total, $45 \%$ rated the program as valuable or useful to them ( $32 \%$ judged it to be very useful to them). That said, $24 \%$ were neutral, while one in five felt that the program was of little or no use to their organization. Perceived impacts of the program were most widespread in terms of building networks and partnerships (70\%), and developing international markets ( $69 \%$ ). These were the same items that ranked first for current clients. However, impacts in all areas were less likely to be identified by former clients than current clients. As well, former clients were much less likely to have identified positive Trade Routes outcomes than current clients: compare $74 \%$ vs. $84 \%$ had increased trade-related connections, $69 \%$ vs. $83 \%$ developed a better understanding of international markets, $60 \%$ vs. $77 \%$ had expanded their markets, and $57 \%$ vs. $82 \%$ had increased exports. That said, these outcomes were similarly important to current clients and former clients among those who identified them.

## Conclusions and Implications

Most current clients of the Trade Routes program exhibited moderate familiarity with the program overall, although more than one in five consider themselves to be very familiar. Familiarity is clearly driven by the Contributions Program and, to a lesser degree, Market Entry Support. Awareness of In-Market Assistance and Research services is much lower. For many clients, familiarity with the program is based on multiple years of using it.

Use of Trades Routes' four distinct services follows a similar pattern to familiarity, with usage being led by the Contributions Program, followed by Market Entry Support. Levels of use are much lower for the other two services.

To the extent that Canadian Heritage would like to increase future use of Trade Routes services, it should take measures to raise awareness of them among program clients and non-clients. For clients, this should be aimed at increasing awareness of In-Market Assistance, Research services and, to a lesser extent, Market Entry Support.

In their dealings with the program, current clients tend to use electronic channels, both generic (generic email addresses, program website) and specific (individuals' email). There was widespread satisfaction with the channels, regardless of which was used. This was particularly the case, however, when it involved direct contact with program representatives, whether through in person, email or phone service. Implicit in the notion of direct contact with program officers is the receipt of personalized, customized service that responds to the specific needs of client organizations. Not surprisingly, satisfaction with the less-personalized channels (generic email, the 1-866 phone number) was noticeably lower, which would explain, in part, why these are less-used channels.

In terms of satisfaction with the Trade Routes program itself, overall satisfaction was relatively widespread ( $68 \%$ ), as was satisfaction with the various service dimensions, such as service in the official language of choice, courteousness and competence of staff, being treated fairly, etc. ( $64 \%$ satisfied or higher for each aspect of service). Satisfaction with specific services varied considerably, from a high of almost three-quarters for In-Market Assistance to a low of just over half for Research services. It is noteworthy that satisfaction was considerably lower for Research services than other services ( $53 \%$ vs. $61-73 \%$ ). The two specific areas in which significant numbers (24-25\%) expressed dissatisfaction with Research services were the comprehensiveness and usefulness/ relevance of the research. These would appear to be areas to focus improvements aimed at raising satisfaction with this service. The large majority ( $84 \%$ ) of Research clients needed information in the form of targeted studies of specific countries or markets, and over $70 \%$ suggested market reports by cultural sector as a new direction for research.

Satisfaction with specific aspects of the remaining three services followed similar patterns. Satisfaction with staff knowledge and competence was among the highest (top two or better), and satisfaction with timing or timeliness was always the lowest. Moreover, problems encountered with the services also tended to relate to timing. Going forward, increasing Trade Routes' ability to respond quickly to clients might be expected to lead to greater satisfaction with service. However, this should not come at the expense of having knowledgeable and competent staff dealing directly with clients.

In general, dissatisfaction with each of the four services tended to be limited, with one main exception - one-quarter expressed dissatisfaction with the Contributions Program. Clients who used the Contributions Program were also more likely to have encountered problems using that service during the previous 12 months, compared to use of the other services ( $28 \%$ vs. $20 \%$ or less for other services). Finally, dissatisfaction was expressed with specific service dimensions of the Contributions Program. In six of the eight areas assessed, the proportion of users that expressed dissatisfaction reached double digits. The Contributions Program emerges as the service most in need of attention, from the perspective of current clients. This is perhaps the most pressing issue given that it is the service that is most known and used.

Despite the general satisfaction with Trade Routes among current clients, there is evidence of some dissatisfaction with the program; that is, $17 \%$ expressed dissatisfaction with the Trade Routes program as a whole. Moreover, fewer than half of those seeking service received everything they needed (one in ten received nothing of what they needed). In terms of service delivery, aspects of service that tended to yield higher levels of dissatisfaction included the timeliness of service ( $24 \%$ dissatisfied), access to staff ( $16 \%$ ), staff going the extra mile ( $16 \%$ ), and clarity of the information ( $13 \%$ ). As noted, the timeliness of service was also rated lower for the specific Trade Routes services.

In terms of the impact or overall value of Trade Routes, the large majority of surveyed clients $(80 \%)$ attributed value to the program for their organization, with $61 \%$ viewing it as very useful. Moreover, the majority said that Trades Routes had at least a moderate impact on their organization in all of the areas examined, with many attributing a big impact to the program, particularly in the area of developing international markets ( $64 \%$ said big impact) and building networks, partnerships and contacts (54\%).

In addition, strong majorities (77-84\%) said their organization experienced each of the four potential outcomes assessed, and almost everyone felt these were at least moderately important, with two-thirds or more rating them as very important to their organization (66$76 \%$ ). So, not only were most organizations experiencing the outcomes, the outcomes themselves were judged to be important. Former clients also felt these outcomes were important, although fewer felt that they had been achieved (57-74\%). As a summary measure of utility, almost all current clients said they would use the program again in the future, with more than three-quarters describing this as very likely. In short, Trade Routes appears to be meeting its objectives for most surveyed clients in terms of strengthening their presence and capacity in the international marketplace for cultural services.

In addition to addressing the perceived deficiencies identified above, clients offered feedback on specific issues relating to expanding or improving the program. Significant numbers favour expanding the number of Cultural Trade Commissioners. Any such expansion should clearly focus on the west (top four mentions for new locations). Internationally, even more favour expansion of the number of Trade Development Officers ( $57 \%$ ), with the top preferred locations being Berlin, Tokyo and Sao Paulo. As noted above, specific feedback for the Contributions Program includes earlier notification of verdicts, online applications, and approval in principle. Most were unsure about the expansion of Research services, while the majority favour expansion of Trade Routes investment initiatives, where relevant.

It is important to offer an observation regarding the identity or branding of Trade Routes. Through this research, it was apparent that many of those who are Trade Routes clients do not view themselves as such. For instance, during the fieldwork the reminder email was changed for those on the Trade Routes client list (i.e. not the DFAIT list), all of whom the program views as clients, to explicitly inform them that they were clients of the program. Even after the reminder was changed, only 41 completed the client version of the questionnaire, while twice as many (87) completed the non-client/former client version. Clearly, there is an identity issue here, no doubt due, at least in part, to the seamless service delivery involving others (e.g. DFAIT). This has the potential to hamper accountability by increasing confusion/uncertainty regarding assessments of the service received. This is an issue that Trade Routes officials should consider.

## More Information:

Supplier Name: Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc. PWGSC Contract Number: C1111-070401-001/CY Award Date: September $6^{\text {th }} 2007$

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

## INTRODUCTION

The Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH) commissioned Phoenix Strategic Perspectives to conduct a client satisfaction survey related to the Trade Routes program.

## Background

The Trade Routes program is part of PCH's strategy to expand international markets for Canada's arts and cultural sector. The strategic objective of Trade Routes is to ensure that Canadian arts and cultural entrepreneurs have access to the Government of Canada's network of trade programs and services in order to expand their export capacity and market development.

Trade Routes is the only comprehensive and cohesive trade development program specifically designed for the arts and cultural sector, including performing arts, visual arts, crafts, design, film/video, and broadcasting/television, music/sound recording, publishing, heritage, and new media. Trade Routes provides international business development services to support Canada's entrepreneurs in the arts and cultural sector so that they become export-ready and can take advantage of opportunities in the global marketplace.

Trade Routes consists of the following four components that are intended to support the program as an export continuum:

## Market Entry Support

Market Entry Support provides direct support to arts and cultural clients from both PCH headquarters and Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) regional offices (Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, Moncton, Halifax and St. John's). The Trade Routes Cultural Trade Commissioners (CTCs) provide services to clients with a focus on export preparedness and international market development, and help with skills development and export counselling.

## In-Market Assistance

The In-Market Assistance component offers services to arts and cultural exporters from five key sites around the world (Shanghai, New York, Los Angeles, Paris and London). During the years 2002-2005, the program had a position in Singapore, which has since been relocated to Shanghai. Five Cultural Trade Development Officers, one per site, develop and implement strategies and deliver services to promote Canadian cultural goods and services. They conduct outreach activities and connect with potential partners for Canada's arts and cultural sectors. They work with Canadians interested in exporting to specific markets, and with local partners interested in Canadian contacts.

## Contributions Program

The Contributions component provides financial support to organizations in the arts and cultural sector in order to support the development and implementation of long-term export strategies. This component supports Canadian cultural exporters in export preparedness and international market development.

## Research

The Research component supports targeted studies of specific markets and countries, including surveys and profiles of export patterns for Canadian cultural sectors, and the development of statistical data on Canadian cultural exporters and cultural trade.

## Research Objectives

The department wanted to undertake a client satisfaction survey with clients who use one or more of the above-mentioned components of the Trade Routes program. This survey was designed to determine clients' level of satisfaction with the four program components: market entry support, in-market assistance, research and contributions.

More specifically, the objectives of the survey were to assess:

- The need to access the Trade Routes program;
- The level of awareness of Trade Routes activities;
- The use of research products;
- The services of the Cultural Trade Commissioners in Canada and Cultural Trade Development Officers abroad;
- The level of satisfaction with the Trade Routes program;
- The impact of the four components of the Trade Routes program; and
- Recommendations and suggestions for program renewal.

The findings will be integrated into the analysis for the summative evaluation of Trade Routes, which will examine the performance and the impact of the program including changes, improvements and recommendations. The survey will also contribute to program renewal.

## Research Design

To meet the research objectives, a mixed methodology was used, consisting of 1) an online survey conducted with Trade Routes clients, and 2) a mail survey conducted with those few clients that do not have access to the Internet.

The following specifications applied to this study:

- The research consisted of a census survey of Trades Routes clients, and a random sample of potential clients - organizations that might have used the program. The sample was drawn from two sources: 1) a client list provided by the Trade Routes program, and 2) a list of potential clients provided by DFAIT.
- In total, 733 individuals completed the survey (all did so online), yielding an overall response rate of $28 \%$. This included both clients $(\mathrm{n}=201)$ and nonclients/former clients $(\mathrm{n}=532)$. No margin of error is provided because the exact size of the client universe for the Trade Routes program is not known.
- The response rate is calculated as the total number of completed surveys ( n $=733$ ), divided by the number of valid contacts that received the survey ( n $=2,609$ ), multiplied by 100 .
- As a separate calculation, the number of valid contacts $(\mathrm{n}=2,609)$ is based on the total email or mailing addresses in all lists provided ( $\mathrm{n}=3,935$ ), minus duplicate individuals between the lists $(\mathrm{n}=418)$, duplicate firms between the lists $(\mathrm{n}=412)$, and bad or invalid contact coordinates ( $\mathrm{n}=$ 496). This latter group were removed from the calculation because they did not receive an invitation to the survey.
- Those who began the survey but did not complete it - i.e. terminations were included in the response rate calculation as non-respondents.
- The table below presents information on the size of the sample, its source, the disposition of the sample vis-à-vis survey completion, and calculation of the response rate.

|  | Total | Trade <br> Routes <br> List | DFAIT <br> List | Mail <br> (both <br> lists) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial Lists | $\mathbf{3 9 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ |
| Duplicates between lists | 418 | 0 | 418 | 0 |
| Duplicate companies | 412 | 92 | 320 | 0 |
| Completes | 733 | 452 | 281 | 0 |
| Bad/Invalid | 496 | 185 | 309 | 2 |
| Terminations | 118 | 69 | 49 | 0 |
| Refusals | $\mathbf{7 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 4}$ | 0 |
| Response Rate | $\mathbf{2 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 \%}$ |

- PCH provided Phoenix with the sample lists, both for the online and mail surveys. These lists contained relevant contact information, including email addresses for online survey respondents and mailing address for mail survey respondents.
- In advance of the fieldwork, a letter was sent by email (as a PDF attachment; on PCH letterhead). The letter explained the background and purpose of the research, offered assurances of confidentiality, introduced Phoenix as the firm hired to conduct the study, encouraged participation, and provided the name and coordinates for a contact person at PCH/Trade Routes who could answer questions about the research and confirm its legitimacy.
- Shortly after the PCH notification letter was sent, Phoenix sent invitation emails to all potential online survey respondents. The email supplemented the PCH letter, reiterated assurances of confidentiality, and encouraged participation. The email contained a URL link to the survey. Mail survey respondents received the same notification letter and survey invitation via the mail, along with the questionnaire and a postage-paid return envelope.
- The questionnaire averaged a little more than 18 minutes to complete for Trade Routes clients. The questionnaire completed by non-clients averaged about five and a half minutes. The time it took clients to complete the questionnaire was related to the number of Trade Routes services the respondent had used.
- There was one version of the questionnaire, with formatting modified to support each data collection method.
- The questionnaire was available in French and English, as was the collateral material, such as invitations and reminders.
- The survey introduction included the following phrase: "This survey is registered with the national survey registration system".
- For the online survey:
- The survey was programmed by Elemental Data Collection under subcontract to Phoenix. Prior to going 'live', the programming was carefully reviewed and tested by Phoenix and PCH officials to ensure proper functioning.
- Respondents were able to leave the survey for whatever reason, save their data and resume completing it at their convenience.
- The survey was available to respondents October 17 to November 16, 2007. It resided on a non-government server, ensuring confidentiality of responses.
- Online respondent support was available should respondents encounter any difficulties completing the questionnaire.
- As a reminder regime, up to four emails were sent to potential respondents that had not yet completed the survey. Each reminder was sent approximately one week apart.
- The initial email distribution of survey invitations resulted in numerous bounce backs. To address this, PCH rechecked the contact information in the lists and a second wave of invitations was sent out for those bounce-back emails for which updated addresses were obtained.
- Many individuals/companies on the list of Trade Routes clients (provided to Phoenix by program staff) said they were not clients of the program when, according to the program, they are. This issue was explored with Trade Routes officers to determine whether or not such companies were in fact clients, and if so, why they were not aware of this. It was determined that most, if not all, of these types of respondents were in fact clients; however, because of the seamless approach to service delivery, where some Trade Routes services are provided by employees working out of DFAIT offices, some clients (i.e. users of Trade Routes services) may not be aware
of the Trade Routes program or that one or more of the services they used are part of this program. To address this issue in the data collection, the reminder emails sent to individuals on the Trade Routes list (not the DFAIT list) were modified to inform potential respondents that they were Trade Routes clients. The final breakdown of clients vs. non-clients/former clients for each of the two lists is as follows:

| Type of List | Clients |  <br> Former Clients | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trade Routes List | 50 | 231 | 281 |
| DFAIT List | 151 | 301 | 452 |

- For the mail survey:
- The questionnaire was sent with a cover letter. Respondents were encouraged to fax back the questionnaire, although they had the option of mailing it back. All mail-out surveys were sent with postage pre-paid envelopes. Two reminder letters were sent to respondents that had not yet completed the survey.


## Note to Readers

- For editorial purposes, 'clients' and 'current clients' refers to those whose organization had used the Trade Routes program in the previous 12 months. The term 'non-clients' denotes those who had at one time been clients of the program, but not in the last 12 months, and those who were never users of Trade Routes.
- At times, the number of respondents (i.e. not the percentage) who answered certain questions or answered in a certain way is provided. The following method is used to denote this: $\mathrm{n}=100$, which means the number of respondents, in this instance, is 100 . The number of respondents changes throughout the report because questions were often asked of sub-samples of the survey population (e.g. users of a specific service). Accordingly, readers should be aware of this and exercise caution when interpreting results based on smaller numbers of respondents.
- Some of the graphs do not sum to $100 \%$ due to rounding.

Appended to this report is a copy of the online version of the questionnaire, as well as the collateral material ${ }^{2}$.
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## Chapter 1: Current Trade Routes Clients

This chapter presents the results for the client portion of the survey. It was completed by 201 respondents, each of whom used Trade Routes services during the previous 12 months.

## 1.1- BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This section provides background information on the current clients of Trade Routes.

## Type of Organization

Half of surveyed clients described the organization they work for as a forprofit company. Following this, 19\% were with not-for-profit companies, $16 \%$ were individual entrepreneurs, and $13 \%$ were not-for-profit associations. Few worked for national, provincial, or municipal associations.


## Area of Arts and Cultural Sector Involvement

The leading areas of arts and cultural sector involvement among clients were film and video (31\%), broadcasting and television (26\%), performing arts (25\%), music or sound recording (22\%), and new media ( $21 \%$ ). A number of clients also operate in visual arts (14\%), publishing (13\%), design ( $11 \%$ ), and crafts (9\%). Others were involved in heritage areas ( $4 \%$ ).

Sectors included in the 'other' category were education, diverse arts, and research, among others.


## 1.2 - UsE OF Trade Routes program

This section examines familiarity with the Trade Routes program, as well as use of the program among current clients $(\mathrm{n}=201)$.

Before answering questions about the program, respondents were given the following information:

Trade Routes is a trade development program designed for the arts and cultural sector. The program is part of the Department of Canadian Heritage's strategy to expand international markets for Canada's arts and cultural sector. The program provides international business development services to help Canada's cultural entrepreneurs become export-ready and take advantage of opportunities in the global marketplace. The Trade Routes program consists of four services: Market Entry Support, In-Market Assistance, Contributions Program, and Research.

## Relatively Widespread Overall Familiarity with Trade Routes

Exactly three-quarters of surveyed clients were at least moderately familiar with the Trade Routes program overall. However, they were much more likely to be moderately than very familiar ( $53 \%$ vs. $22 \%$ ).


## Familiarity Highest for Contributions \& Market Entry Support Services

Participants were asked to rate their familiarity with the individual services offered through the Trade Routes program. The four services were ${ }^{3}$ :

- Market Entry Support
- In-Market Assistance
- Contributions
- Research

[^2]Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc.

Clients were noticeably more likely to be at least moderately familiar with Contributions (78\%), followed by Market Entry Support (67\%). Following this, 46\% expressed at least moderate familiarity with In-Market Assistance, and $39 \%$ with Research. For almost all services, clients were more apt to be moderately, not very familiar. The exception was Contributions, where strong familiarity was higher than moderate familiarity ( $42 \%$ vs. $36 \%$ ).

Familiarity with Trade Routes Services


Base $=201$
Phoenix SPI: November 2007

Clients were least familiar with In-Market Assistance (53\%) and Research (60\%), with majorities no more than a little familiar with each service. Moreover, approximately onefifth (21-23\%) were not familiar at all with these services.

## Over Half Used Trade Routes for 2 Years or Less

Just over half of surveyed clients used the Trade Routes program for two years or less (54\%). The single greatest proportion of respondents had used the program for one year or less ( $37 \%$ ). Among longer-term users, $23 \%$ had used the program for three years, $8 \%$ for four years, and $12 \%$ for five years.
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## Contributions Program - Most Widely Used Service in Past 12 Months

Of the four Trade Routes services, only one was used by a majority of clients in the previous 12 months - the Contributions program, used by almost two-thirds (64\%). Following this were Market Entry Support, used by almost half (45\%), and In-Market Assistance, used by approximately one-third (32\%).

Less than one in five (19\%) used Research services in the previous year.


## Emailing Specific Officers, Website - Most Used Service Channels

During the previous 12 months, clients used a range of channels in their dealings with the program. Of these, two stood out - strong majorities had emailed specific officers ( $81 \%$ ) and used the Trade Routes website (75\%). Other channels used by around half of clients included mail or fax (53\%), in-person visits to offices or events (52\%), and the phone (not including the toll-free 1-866 number) ( $47 \%$ ). Considerably fewer used less-direct channels - the generic Trade Routes email (35\%) or the 1-866 phone number in their program dealings ( $26 \%$ ).
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Between $2 \%$ and $14 \%$ were unsure or provided no response. This was lowest concerning in-person visits and specific email accounts, and highest regarding the 1-866 number.

## Widespread Satisfaction With Service Channels Used

Clients were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with the service channels they had used during the previous year (using a 5 -point scale: $5=$ very satisfied, $1=$ very dissatisfied).

In all cases, a majority of clients were satisfied with the service channels used. More than three-quarters (77-78\%) were satisfied with in-person service, and with service received when emailing specific officers. Moreover, clear majorities were very satisfied with each of these ( $54-57 \%$ ). More than two-thirds ( $69-71 \%$ ) expressed satisfaction with the Trade Routes website, service received through the telephone (excluding the 1-866 number) and mail or fax.

More than half of those who used the 1-866 number and the generic email (58\%) were satisfied with the service they received when using these channels.


Dissatisfaction ranged from $8 \%$ to $16 \%$, and was highest regarding service from specific emails to program officers, the 1-866 number, and generic email.

## 1.3-OVERALL Perceptions of Service

This section of the report presents client perceptions of the overall level of service they received in their dealings with the Trade Routes program during the previous 12 months.

## Two-thirds Satisfied with Overall Quality of Service

In total, $68 \%$ of surveyed clients were satisfied with the overall quality of service they received during the previous 12 months (scores of 4-5 on 5-point scale). Moreover, more than half of these were very satisfied (35\%). Among the rest, $17 \%$ were dissatisfied (scores of 1-2), and $12 \%$ were neutral - neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.


## Almost All Received Service in Official Language, Courteous Service from Staff

Clients were asked to rate their level of agreement with various statements about the service they received from the program during the past 12 months (using a 5-point scale; 5 $=$ strongly agree, $1=$ strongly disagree). Service areas assessed included the following:

- Trade Routes staff were knowledgeable and competent
- Trade Routes staff were courteous
- Service was provided in a timely manner
- They were treated fairly
- They were able to get through to Trade Routes staff without difficulty
- They received service in the official language of your choice (i.e. English or French)
- They were informed of everything they had to do in order to get the service
- The information they received was clear and easy to understand
- Trade Routes staff went the extra mile to make sure they got what they needed

Each of these areas was positively assessed by more than six in ten (64-97\%). Moreover, in each area, clients were significantly more apt to offer strong, rather than moderate agreement ( $38-84 \%$ vs. $13-30 \%$ ).

Clients were in near-unanimous agreement that they had been served in the official language of their choice ( $97 \%$ ) and that program staff were courteous ( $92 \%$ ). Decisive majorities also agreed that the staff were knowledgeable and competent, that they were
fully informed of the service requirements, and that they were treated fairly $(81-84 \%)$. Smaller majorities felt that it was easy to access program staff ( $71 \%$ ), the information they received was clear and easy to understand ( $69 \%$ ), the service was provided in a timely manner, and that staff went the extra mile (64-65\%).


Negative perceptions of service ranged from $4 \%$ to $24 \%$. Disagreement was highest in four areas. Notably, one-quarter ( $24 \%$ ) did not agree that the service they received was timely, $16 \%$ each did not experience easy access to staff, and service that went the extra mile, while $13 \%$ did not think the information they received was clear.

## Most Received At Least Some of What They Needed

In the end, most Trade Routes clients received all (46\%) or part ( $37 \%$ ) of what they needed. Just $11 \%$ did not receive the information or service they were looking for.


## 1.4 - Assessment of Specific Trade Routes Services

This section presents client perceptions and assessments of the specific Trade Routes services they had used in the previous 12 months ( $\mathrm{n}=38-129$ ). To minimize the response burden, users of multiple services (i.e. more than two of the four) were randomly asked about only two of the services they had used.

### 1.4.1 - MARKET-ENTRY SUPPORT

In total, $45 \%$ of clients had used the Trade Routes' Market Entry Support service during the past year. The following questions are about their use of this service during the last 12 months. Unless otherwise indicated, the total number of respondents in this section is $82^{4}$. Caution should be exercised when interpreting the results due to the relatively small sample size.

## Offices in Central Canada Used Most Often for Market Entry Support

In terms of the offices responsible for Market Entry Support, those in Central Canada were used most often. Specifically, this includes the headquarters in Gatineau (29\%), and the offices in Montreal ( $29 \%$ ) and Toronto ( $22 \%$ ). Following this was support received from the Vancouver office (16\%). Offices used less often included those in St. John's, Winnipeg, and Moncton (4-9\%).

${ }^{4} 82$ of the 90 who had used this service in the past year completed this module.
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## International Market Development - Most Needed Type of Support

Clients of this service were most likely to need support or assistance in the area of international market development $-74 \%$ used this type of support. Following, at a distance, was support with building networks and partnerships (43\%). Approximately onequarter used assistance in terms of exporting. More specifically, $27 \%$ sought assistance in terms of developing an export plan, and $24 \%$ each for export-readiness assessments, and with export counselling. Clients were least apt to require assistance in terms of skills development (15\%).


A further 9\% sought assistance or support in other areas, including greater financial assistance, visiting trade shows, and getting products to market.

## Almost Half Participated in International Trade Show \& Info Session

While no single initiative or event was participated in by a majority of clients, almost half had attended an international trade show ( $48 \%$ ) and/or an information session (46\%). Following this, just over one-quarter had attended a networking event (28\%) or participated in a trade mission organized by Trade Routes ( $26 \%$ ).


Smaller groups had participated in an incoming trade mission (18\%) or matchmaking event ( $12 \%$ ). Those who used Market-Entry Support were considerably less likely to attend
training compared to the other initiatives and events - just 5-6\% attended a training session or took pre-market training.

## Two-Thirds Satisfied with Overall Quality of Service

Approximately two-thirds (68\%) of those who used Market-Entry Support were satisfied with the overall quality of service they received in the last 12 months. This includes just over one-third (35\%) who were very satisfied with the service. The remaining clients were similarly likely to hold a neutral view or express dissatisfaction (12-13\%).


## Many Satisfied with All Aspects of Market-Entry Support Service

Participants were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the following aspects of Market-Entry Support (using a 5-point scale: $5=$ very satisfied, $1=$ very dissatisfied):

- The knowledge and competence of the staff.
- The ease of access to the service.
- The timeliness of the service.
- The accuracy of the information you received.
- The events/initiatives in which you took part.

Clear majorities were satisfied with each aspect of the service received when using Market-Entry Support (75-87\% satisfied). Fully 87\% expressed satisfaction with the level of knowledge and competence of the staff, with more than half expressing strong satisfaction (53\%). Similarly high proportions expressed satisfaction with the ease of access to service ( $86 \%$ ), accuracy of the information they received ( $84 \%$ ) and with the events or initiatives they took part in $(80 \%)$. Moreover, almost half were very satisfied with each of these. Exactly three-quarters were satisfied that the service they received was timely.


Base $=70-82$; those who used Market Entry Support
NA removed $=\mathbf{5 - 1 2 \%}$
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Dissatisfaction ranged from $1 \%$ to $9 \%$. Those who were not satisfied in each were more likely to hold neutral rather than negative views ( $9-16 \%$ vs. $1-9 \%$ ).

Note that overall satisfaction is significantly lower than clients' satisfaction with particular aspects of the Market-Entry Support service ( $68 \%$ overall vs. $75-87 \%$ ).

## Few Experienced Problems with Market-Entry Support

Almost three-quarters of those who had used Market-Entry Support (74\%) indicated that they did not experience any problems during the last 12 months. Among the rest, $12 \%$ had encountered problems with the service they received, while $13 \%$ were unsure.

Several of those who did experience problems ( $\mathrm{n}=10$ ) noted difficulties related to the timeliness of the service ( $\mathrm{n}=5$ ), a lack of or incomplete information ( $\mathrm{n}=4$ ), difficulty accessing or contacting the Cultural Trade Commissioner ( $\mathrm{n}=$ 3 ), and inconsistent information ( $\mathrm{n}=$ 2). One person each pointed to a lack of courtesy and responsiveness, not being acknowledged by headquarters, lack of funding, and difficulty using the website.


### 1.4.2 - In-MARKET ASSISTANCE

In total, $32 \%$ of clients had used Trade Routes' In-Market Assistance during the past year. The following questions are about their use of this service during the previous 12 months. Unless otherwise indicated, the total number of respondents in this section is $56^{5}$. Caution should be exercised when interpreting the results due to the relatively small sample size.

## Range of In-Market Assistance Offices Dealt With

Clients were similarly likely to deal with most international Trade Routes offices when using In-Market Assistance. New York lead the way (32\%), followed by Shanghai, Los Angeles, and London (23-27\%). Clients were least likely to use the Paris office ( $16 \%$ ).

One-quarter were unsure or gave no response.


## Networking Opportunities - Assistance Needed Most Often

Two-thirds of surveyed clients sought assistance with networking opportunities, while more than half (54\%) sought information on local organizations. Following this, around half (46-50\%) needed assistance with market access issues and advocacy, as well as visit information. A smaller but significant group (32\%) required in-market support in the form of market research.


Types of assistance included in the 'other' category are information from Singapore, project assistance, event organizing, and referrals.
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Market Visits, Trade Shows, Networking Events - Events Used Most Often
Just over half of In-Market Assistance clients (52\% each) participated in market visits and attended trade shows and conferences. Significant numbers attended networking events ( $46 \%$ ), followed by trade missions (39\%). A smaller proportion took part in workshops or training events (21\%) and matchmaking events (12\%).


As well, $18 \%$ did not participate in any of these, while $2 \%$ were unsure.

## High Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Service

In total, $73 \%$ of those who used In-Market Assistance were satisfied with the overall quality of service they received, including $43 \%$ who were very satisfied. Among the rest, $16 \%$ were dissatisfied, while $9 \%$ were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.


## Widespread Satisfaction with Aspects of In-Market Assistance

Participants were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the following aspects of InMarket Assistance (using a 5-point scale: $5=$ very satisfied, $1=$ very dissatisfied):

- The knowledge and competence of the staff.
- The ease of access to the service.
- The timeliness of the service.
- The accuracy of the information they received.
- The events/initiatives in which they took part.

Again, perceptions of service were positive, with majorities of respondents (70-80\%) indicating they were satisfied with service received in each area. They were most apt to be satisfied with the knowledge and competence of the staff, and the events and initiatives they took part in $(79-80 \%)$. This was followed closely by ease of access to service, and the accuracy of the information received ( $76 \%$ each).

Satisfaction was more likely to be strong than moderate in each service area. Clients were less satisfied with the timeless of the service they received (70\%). This was also the only aspect in which satisfaction was slightly more apt to be moderate than strong.


Dissatisfaction ranged from $6 \%$ to $13 \%$, and was highest regarding the timeliness of, and ease of access to, service (12-13\%).

## Most Did Not Experience Problems

The large majority of clients did not experience any problems with InMarket Assistance in the past 12 months ( $70 \%$ ). That said, $20 \%$ had encountered problems (11\% were unsure).

Of those who encountered problems ( $\mathrm{n}=11$ ), six cited difficulty accessing or contacting their Cultural Trade Development Officer, and four had problems related to the timeliness of service. Three each identified a lack of or

incomplete information, inconsistent information, and insufficient funding.

### 1.4.3 - Contributions Program

In total, $64 \%$ of clients had used Trade Routes' Contributions Program during the previous year. The following questions are about their use of this service during the last 12 months. Unless otherwise indicated, the total number of respondents in this section is $113^{6}$. Caution should be exercised when interpreting the results due to the relatively small sample size.

## Almost All Sought Assistance with International Market Development

Of the two areas in which the Contributions Program provides assistance - international market development and export preparedness - almost everyone (93\%) sought assistance with the former. A considerably smaller number (31\%) sought aid related to export preparedness.


## International Trade Shows \& Visits to New Markets - Most Undertaken Activity

Of all the activities and events associated with Export Preparedness and International Market Development (IMD), only one was widely used. Almost three-quarters (73\%) had attended international trade shows or made visits to new markets outside of Canada. This is not surprising given the considerable group who sought assistance with International Market Development.

Other IMD activities or events undertaken by smaller groups included incoming and outgoing trade buyers missions (35\%), providing market information and market services ( $33 \%$ ), providing strategic support at key trade shows and contact events outside Canada ( $31 \%$ ), and conducting business-to-business networking at international events in Canada or internationally ( $26 \%$ ). A small number ( $6 \%$ ) undertook feasibility studies.
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Similar numbers participated in activities and events associated with export preparedness. These included developing new alliances/financial partnering and developing marketing strategies ( $34 \%$ each), developing innovative advertising tools and approaches for specific international activities ( $29 \%$ ), professional development in international business, and firsthand, online exposure to international markets and their business practices ( $25 \%$ each).

A considerable proportion (40\%) did not participate in any of the above activities/events.

## Most Satisfied with Overall Quality of Service, Significant Number Dissatisfied

In total, $61 \%$ of Contributions Program clients were very ( $27 \%$ ) or moderately (34\%) satisfied with the overall quality of service they received. However, just over one-quarter (26\%) expressed dissatisfaction (11\% were neutral).


## Service from Staff Most Favourable Aspect of Contributions Program Service

Participants were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the following aspects of the Contributions Program (using a 5-point scale: $5=$ very satisfied, $1=$ very dissatisfied):

- The clarity of the information they received.
- The ease-of-use of the application process.
- The transparency of the process.
- The timeliness of approval process.
- The reporting requirements are reasonable and adequately explained.
- The promptness in obtaining answers from HQ staff.
- The knowledge and competence of the staff.
- The courteousness of the staff.

Satisfaction with aspects of Contributions Program service was noticeably higher regarding measures of staff service. In total, $93 \%$ of clients were satisfied with the courteousness of the staff, including $69 \%$ who felt strongly about it. Following this, $81 \%$ were satisfied with the staff's knowledge and competence ( $48 \%$ very satisfied). Just over three-quarters (76\%) were satisfied with the clarity of information they received, and $69 \%$ with the promptness with which they obtained answers from HQ staff.


Smaller majorities were satisfied with process requirements. Sixty-seven percent expressed satisfaction with the explanation of the reporting requirements, $62 \%$ with the ease of the application process, and $51 \%$ with its transparency. Only $20 \%$ to $24 \%$ were very satisfied with these aspects.

The only dimension in which the majority were dissatisfied was the timeliness of the approval process ( $58 \%$ vs. $3-28 \%$ with other aspects). Moreover, they were three times more likely to be very dissatisfied with this aspect compared to any other ( $39 \%$ vs. $2-12 \%$ of others). Only $27 \%$ were satisfied with the timeliness of the approval process.

## Most Did Not Encounter Problems with Service, But 28\% Did

More than two-thirds (68\%) did not encounter any problems with the service they received regarding the Contributions Program in the previous 12 months. However, more than one-quarter reported problems (28\%).

| Problems with Contributions Program? |
| :---: | :---: |
| Q30: During the past 12 months, were there any problems with the service you received |
| regarding Trade Routes' Contributions Program service? |

## Timeliness - Most Widespread Problem Experienced

Issues related to timeliness were encountered by many of the 32 clients who experienced problems. More specifically, $72 \%$ cited delays and timeliness issues in general, while $56 \%$ experienced problems with service timeliness. A number of other issues related to the information received. It was seen to be incomplete ( $34 \%$ ), inconsistent (31\%), and occasionally incorrect (6\%). As well, $44 \%$ cited issues related to procedural
 complexities.

Issues included in the 'other' category include abruptness of service, correspondence issues, and difficulties with application templates.

### 1.4.4 - RESEARCH

In total, $19 \%$ of clients had used Trade Routes' Research service during the past year. The following questions are about their use of this service during the last 12 months. Unless otherwise indicated, the total number of respondents in this section is $32^{7}$. Caution should be exercised when interpreting the results due to the small sample size.

## Majority Need Targeted Market/Country Research

The large majority of Research clients needed information in the form of targeted studies of specific countries or markets ( $84 \%$ ). Following this, almost half needed research in the form of statistical data on Canadian cultural trade. Information on export patterns for Canadian cultural sectors was sought by a further $28 \%$ of those who used Research services.


## Moderate Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Service

Just over half (53\%) were satisfied with the overall quality of service they received when using the Research service in the previous 12 months. Moreover, this was much more likely to be moderate, not strong satisfaction ( $41 \%$ vs. $12 \%$ ). That said, most of the rest ( $34 \%$ ) were neutral; very few expressed dissatisfaction (6\%).
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## Two-thirds Satisfied with Clarity of Research Information and Document Length

Participants were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the following aspects of the Research service (using a 5 -point scale: $5=$ very satisfied, $1=$ very dissatisfied):

- The relevance and usefulness of the research to themselves or their organization.
- The comprehensiveness of the research.
- The clarity and ease of understanding the research.
- The length of the reports and documents.

A modest proportion of clients were satisfied with various aspects of this service, (46-67\% satisfied).

Approximately two-thirds were satisfied that the research was clear and understandable (67\%), and that it was relevant and useful to their organization (65\%). More than half (58\%) were satisfied with the length of the reports or documents, and just under half were
 satisfied with their comprehensiveness ( $46 \%$ ). For each dimension, clients were more likely to be moderately, as opposed to very satisfied.

Dissatisfaction ranged from a low of $8 \%$ regarding the clarity of the research, to a high of one-quarter in terms of the document's length and comprehensiveness (24-25\%).

## Few Experienced Problems with Research Service

Just $12 \%(\mathrm{n}=4)$ of Research clients had encountered problems with the service they received in the last year. Conversely, $72 \%$ experienced no problems ( $16 \%$ were unsure).

Two clients each reported difficulties accessing the research, and accessing or contacting Trade Routes staff. One person each pointed to information lacking relevance, and a lack of courtesy from Trade Routes staff.

## 1.5 - Impact of Trade Routes

This section describes client perceptions of the usefulness, impacts and outcomes of the Trade Routes program for their organization. The questions in this section were asked of all surveyed clients.

## Trade Routes Considered Valuable to Organization

Fully $80 \%$ of Trade Routes clients viewed the program as valuable or useful to their organization. Moreover, $61 \%$ rated it a very useful.

Among the rest, $7 \%$ each did not feel the program was useful, or held a neutral view. Four percent were unsure.


## Most Attribute at Least Moderate Impact of Trade Routes in all Areas - Strongest for Developing International Markets \& Networking

Clients were asked to assess the impact of Trade Routes on their organization in a number of areas, including:

- Improving their export readiness.
- Helping them to develop international market(s).
- Building networks/partnerships/contacts.
- Providing strategic advice on doing business in one or more international markets.
- Skills development for them or their staff in international business.
- Helping them to make informed decisions about where to invest and/or export.
- First-hand/on-line exposure to markets and their business practices.

Two areas stood out in terms of the impact Trade Routes has had on client organizations. The impact was most widespread in terms of helping to develop international markets ( $85 \%$ ) and building networks, partnerships or contacts ( $82 \%$ ). Moreover, majorities of $64 \%$ and $54 \%$ respectively characterized the impact of Trade Routes as major in these areas. Following this, many identified at least moderate impact in terms of their organization's export readiness ( $71 \%$ ), and its exposure to markets and their business practices $(67 \%)$. More than one-third (37-38\%) judged the impact to be major in these areas.

Smaller majorities described at least moderate impacts in terms of strategic advice on doing business internationally (60\%), making informed export and investment decisions (57\%), and skills development (54\%).


No more than $22 \%$ perceived Trade Routes to have had no impact at all in these areas. This was highest vis-à-vis making informed investment and export decisions ( $22 \%$ ), followed by skills development (19\%), strategic advice on international markets, and exposure to markets and best practices ( $17 \%$ each).

## Widespread Achievement of Trade Routes Outcomes

Most clients felt that their use of the program resulted in achieving the full range of potential objectives for their organization. More specifically, $84 \%$ achieved better/increased trade-related networks or connections, 83\% a better/increased understanding of international markets, and $82 \%$ increased exports of products/services.

Lagging slightly behind, 77\% had diversified or expanded the markets for their products or services.
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## Almost All Consider Trade Routes Outcomes Important

Trade Routes clients were asked to assess the importance to their business of each of the potential outcomes they had identified. Recall that these included the following:

- Increased exports of products/ services
- Diversified/expanded markets for products/services
- Increased trade-related networks/ connections
- Better/increased understanding of international markets

Each of these objectives was deemed to be at least moderately important by more than nine in ten clients who identified them ( $93-99 \%$ ). There was somewhat greater variation in terms of those who attributed strong importance to them. Leading the way, increased traderelated connections were seen as a very important outcome by $76 \%$, having diversified or expanded their markets by $71 \%$, and having increased exports by $70 \%$. Having a greater understanding of international markets was identified by $66 \%$ as being a very important outcome by those who identified this.

Less than one percent saw any of these as not important at all to their business, while no more than $7 \%$ saw these outcomes to be of minimal importance.

## Importance of Trade Routes Outcomes to Business

Q40. How would you rate the importance of these outcome(s) to your business?


Base $\mathbf{= 1 2 9 - 1 4 5 ;}$; Outcomes identified by Trade Routes clients
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## More Than Three-quarters Very Likely to Use Trade Routes in Future

Almost all Trade Routes clients ( $91 \%$ ) are at least moderately likely to use the program again in the future. More than three-quarters (78\%) consider this to be very likely. Just 5\% are unlikely to use the program again.


## 1.6 - FUTURE DIRECTIONS

This section looks at some potential new directions for the Trade Routes program. In this section, clients were asked about all Trade Routes services, including those they did not use. Where this was the case, participants were provided a description of the service.

### 1.6.1 - MARKET-ENTRY SUPPORT

## Few Think Cultural Trade Commissioners Should be Relocated

Just $11 \%$ felt that one or more of the Cultural Trade Commissioners across Canada should be relocated. Current offices are in Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, Halifax, Moncton and St. John's.

Almost half (48\%) do not think any of the offices should be relocated, while $40 \%$ were uncertain.


More Than One-third Think Number of Trade Commissioners Should be Expanded
Over one-third (36\%) felt that the number of Trade Commissioners should be expanded beyond the current seven. Just over one-quarter (28\%) disagree with such expansion, and $35 \%$ were unsure.

Numerous New Locations Suggested, But Calgary \& The West Lead by Wide Margin
Those who would like to see the creation of additional Trade Commissioners ( $\mathrm{n}=73$ ) were asked to identify the preferred locations. Surveyed clients were considerably more likely to suggest locating a new Trade Commissioner in Calgary compared to any other city: 45\% vs. $23 \%$ or less elsewhere. Following this, $23 \%$ suggested Edmonton, 19\% Regina, and 14\% Saskatoon. Smaller groups suggested cities outside of the Western provinces including Charlottetown (12\%), Montreal (5\%), Quebec City, Ottawa, (4\% each), Toronto, and Halifax (3\% each).


Additional locations in the 'other' category were Victoria, and the identification of more cities in general.

### 1.6.2 - In-MARKET ASSISTANCE

## Few Support Relocating Cultural Trade Development Officers

Only 15\% felt that one or more of the five Cultural Trade Development Officers at Canadian missions abroad should be relocated. Current Officers are located in Shanghai, Los Angeles, New York, Paris and London.

Conversely, the large majority either do not think this is necessary ( $42 \%$ ) or are simply unsure (43\%).

## Majority Support Expanding Number of Cultural Trade Development Officers

More than half (57\%) of surveyed clients support expanding the number of Cultural Trade Development Officers. Eleven percent do not think the number should be increased, while $32 \%$ were unsure.

| Should Number of Trade Development Officers Be Expanded? |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Q48: Do you think the number of Cultural Trade Development Officers should be expanded? |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ 11 \% \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DK/NR } \\ \mathbf{3 2 \%} \end{gathered}$ |
| Base $=201$ |  |
| Phoenix SPI: November 2007 |  |

## Berlin, Tokyo, Sao Paulo - Top Preferred Locations for Additional Officers

Those who thought that the number of Cultural Trade Development Officers should be expanded $(\mathrm{n}=115)$ suggested most often expansion to three new locations. Leading the way was Berlin ( $66 \%$ ), followed Tokyo (51\%), Sao Paulo (43\%), and Mumbai (34\%). Between one-fifth and one-quarter suggested Seoul, Boston, Buenos Aires, Chicago, and South Africa. Locations suggested less often were Miami, Santiago and Dallas.


Proposed locations in the 'other' category were Seattle, one in every country that has an ambassador to Canada, and everywhere possible.

### 1.6.3 - CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM

## Earlier Notification - Top Preferred Change to Contributions Program

In terms of changes to the Contributions Program, Trade Routes clients were most likely to prefer having earlier notification of their approval or rejection (73\%). Smaller but considerable numbers also suggest online applications (49\%) and notifications of approval-inprinciple ${ }^{8}$ (43\%). Other changes were suggested by relatively few respondents and included having more flexible deadlines, and increased financial support (3\% each).

In total, $15 \%$ did not suggest any changes to the Contributions
 Program, including $13 \%$ who offered no response. Suggestions included in the 'other' category are a streamlined application process, greater transparency in the process, clearer guidelines, and deadlines not based on the federal government's fiscal year.

### 1.6.4-ReSEARCH SERVICE

## No Consensus on Additional Research Areas

Clients were given the following information about the current areas the Research service focuses on:

At the present time, the Research service focuses on the analysis of international trade statistics on cultural goods and services, targeted studies of specific markets and countries, surveys and profiles of export patterns.

They were then asked whether there were any other research activities they would like to be carried out.


[^6]The majority were unsure if there were any additional research activities they would like to see $(51 \%)$. Those who held an opinion on this issue were similarly likely to perceive a need for $(22 \%)$, or no need for ( $27 \%$ ), additional research activities.

## Market Reports by Cultural Sector - Top Suggested Research Activity

Those who felt that the Research service should carry out additional activities ( $\mathrm{n}=44$ ) pointed to a range of possible directions. The most prevalent was a focus on market reports by cultural sectors ( $70 \%$ ). Approximately half would like better access to research on the Trade Routes websites (55\%), more studies corresponding to priority markets (52\%), and increased awareness of available studies ( $50 \%$ ).

Suggested areas made less often, but still by significant numbers, included updating material or data already available (48\%), producing market reports by regions (43\%), providing succinct fact sheets ( $36 \%$ ), and more market reports in general ( $32 \%$ ). Suggestions made by approximately one-quarter included summary sheets of market reports ( $27 \%$ ) and developing shorter reports ( $25 \%$ ).

## Additional Research Activities



Base $=44$; those who think research activities should be expanded Multiple responses accepted
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A number of other suggestions were made by much smaller numbers. These included research on potential partners, more niche market reports, analyzing government and industry incentives, emerging digital media trends, research on proven methods, and providing profiling and psychographic information.

## Half Support Expanding Trade Routes' Investment Where Relevant

Fully 53\% of surveyed clients think that Trade Routes should expand its investment initiatives within the program for those subsectors where investment is relevant (e.g. foreign direct investment in interactive media, location shooting). Support was split between those who think the program should definitely (29\%) or probably (24\%) do this. Conversely, $12 \%$ said the program should probably or definitely not make such investments.


Approximately one-third (34\%) were unsure or gave no response.

## Faster Approvals - Top Suggestion to Improve Trade Routes

Clients were asked to identify one suggestion they could offer to improve the quality of service received from the Trade Routes program. One in five suggested faster approvals. Following this was increased funding or grants ( $11 \%$ ). Other recommendations were made by small numbers (3$5 \%$ ), including more or better communication, improving the application process, and acquiring a better understanding of the industry.

A number of other suggestions
 were made by handfuls of clients. These included more support from overseas representatives, better or more flexible deadlines, more or clearer information, greater awareness of cultural products, clearer program guidelines, political support for arts, improved service, and better relationships with clients.

## 1.7 - Corporate Profile \& Characteristics

This section presents information on the characteristics of respondents' organizations and the respondents themselves.

## Number of Employees



## Age of Organization

Age of Business/Organization
Q56: How long has your business or organization been in existence?


Base $=201$
Phoenix SPI: November 2007

## Province or Territory

## Province/Territory

Q57: In which province/territory are you located? If you are located in more than one province, please identify the location of your main office


Base $=201$
Phoenix SPI: November 2007

## Region



## Annual Export Revenues



## Group Membership

## Group Membership

Q59: Are you a member of any of the following groups?


Base $=201$
DK/NR $=\mathbf{3 \%}$
Phoenix SPI: November 2007

## Language



Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc.

## CHAPTER 2: NON-CLIENTS AND FORMER CLIENTS

This chapter presents the results of the survey completed by those who are not current Trade Routes clients ( $\mathrm{n}=532$ ). This includes both arts and cultural sector organizations that were never Trade Routes clients, as well as former clients - organizations that had used Trade Routes in the past, but had not used the program in the previous 12 months.

In total, $94 \%$ were certain they had not used the Trade Routes program in the last 12 months, while $6 \%$ were uncertain. This group is deemed to be non-clients of the program. For ease of reference, the term 'non-client' is used to denote organizations that have never used Trade Routes, as well as those who have used the program in previous years, but did not use it in the previous 12 months.

## 2.1-BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This section provides background information on non-client and former client respondents.

## Type of Organization

Almost half of these respondents described the organization they work for as a for-profit company ( $48 \%$ ). Following this, $27 \%$ were individual entrepreneurs, and $13 \%$ worked for not-for-profit companies. A further $7 \%$ were with not-for-profit associations. Few described their organizations as associations or academic institutions and chambers of commerce.


## Area of Arts and Cultural Sector Involvement

The leading areas of arts and cultural sector involvement were film and video ( $30 \%$ ), performing arts ( $26 \%$ ), and music or sound recording ( $26 \%$ ). Numerous non-clients operate in new media (18\%), publishing (17\%), broadcasting and television (16\%), design, and visual arts ( $15 \%$ each). Others were involved in crafts ( $10 \%$ ), and heritage areas ( $8 \%$ ).


Sectors included in the 'other' category are education, exhibits and festivals, fashion, and architecture.

## 2.2 - Use of Trade Routes Program

This section examines familiarity with the Trade Routes program, as well as use of the program among the non-client group ( $\mathrm{N}=532$ ).

Before answering questions about the program, respondents were given the following description of Trade Routes:

Trade Routes is a trade development program designed for the arts and cultural sector. The program is part of the Department of Canadian Heritage's strategy to expand international markets for Canada's arts and cultural sector. The program provides international business development services to help Canada's cultural entrepreneurs become export-ready and take advantage of opportunities in the global marketplace. The Trade Routes program consists of four services: Market Entry Support, In-Market Assistance, Contributions Program, and Research.

## Limited Familiarity with Trade Routes

In total, $71 \%$ were no more than a little familiar with the program overall. Moreover, $32 \%$ were not familiar with it at all.

Most of the rest were moderately familiar with the program ( $24 \%$ ), while few (5\%) were very familiar with it.


## Lack of Familiarity with Services - Highest for Contributions, Market Entry Support

Participants were asked to rate their familiarity with the individual services offered through the Trade Routes program ${ }^{9}$ :

- Market Entry Support
- In-Market Assistance
- Contributions
- Research

The proportion that were at least moderately familiar with each Trade Routes service ranged from $15 \%$ to $25 \%$. In each case, they were at least twice as likely to be moderately, rather than very familiar.

[^7]Non-clients/former clients were noticeably more apt to be at least moderately familiar with the Contributions Program and Market Entry Support (25\% each).


Approximately half were completely unfamiliar with the Research (52\%), In-Market Assistance (49\%), and Contributions (45\%) services. Non-clients were less likely to be unfamiliar with Market Entry Support (38\%).

## 2.3 - Relationship to Trade Routes Program

This section describes the relationship of non-clients (includes former clients) to the Trade Routes Program in terms of their awareness and past use, and reasons for not using the program at this time.

## Most Previously Aware of Trade Routes

Prior to this research, $63 \%$ of these respondents said they were aware of the Trade Routes program. Conversely, $35 \%$ were not, and $2 \%$ were unsure.


Many Had Used Trade Routes in Past
More than one-quarter (29\%) of those who were previously aware of Trade Routes and not currently clients said they had used the program in the past. Almost twothirds (64\%) had not.


## Over Half of Former Clients Were Clients for Less Than Two Years

Most of those who had used Trade Routes in the past ( $\mathrm{n}=$ 120) were not long-term clients of the program. The greatest proportion of former clients had used the program for less than two years (55\%). Following this, $12 \%$ had used it for two years, and $19 \%$ for three years. Just $13 \%$ were clients for four or five years.


## No Longer Needed - Most Common Reason for Discontinuing Trade Routes

Former Trade Routes clients $(\mathrm{n}=120)$ provided a range of reasons to explain their lack of use of the program at this time. The most common reason, offered by $25 \%$, was that they had received all the assistance their organization had needed. Others had discontinued use because they were not satisfied with the service (13\%), felt the program was not appropriate for their level of exporting ( $12 \%$ ), or their proposal had been declined ( $12 \%$ ). Smaller numbers said they were no longer considering exporting ( $8 \%$ ), had missed the deadline (7\%), or were unaware of the program (5\%).


In total, $16 \%$ did not respond. Reasons included in the 'other' category are having received alternative assistance, having other priorities, and having reorganized the firm.

Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc.

## 2.4 - Impact of Trade Routes (FORMER Clients)

This section describes former clients' perceptions of the usefulness, impacts and outcomes of the Trade Routes program for their organization. Caution should be exercised when interpreting the results due to the relatively small sample size.

## Modest Perceptions on Overall Value to Organization

Former Trade Routes clients offered mixed assessments of the overall value of the program to their organization. In total, $45 \%$ rated the program as valuable or useful to them. Moreover, $32 \%$ of these judged the program to be very useful to them. A further $24 \%$ held a neutral view, while one in five felt that the program was of little use to their organization. Eleven percent were unsure.


## Networking, Developing International Markets - Impacts Identified Most Often

Former clients were asked to assess the impact of Trade Routes on their organization in a number of areas, including:

- Improving their export readiness.
- Helping them to develop international market(s).
- Building networks/partnerships/contacts.
- Providing strategic advice on doing business in one or more international markets.
- Skills development for themselves or their staff in international business.
- Helping them make informed decisions about where to invest and/or export.
- First-hand/on-line exposure to markets and their business practices.

Two areas stood out in terms of the impact Trade Routes has had on former clients' organizations. The impacts most often identified were building networks, partnerships and contacts ( $70 \%$ ), and helping to develop international markets ( $69 \%$ ). Around one-third (33$34 \%$ ) also characterized the impact in these areas to be major. Following this, more than half noted at least moderate impacts in terms of their organization's export readiness ( $57 \%$ ). All remaining areas were identified by minorities of former clients. These included exposure to markets and their business practices (49\%), strategic advice on doing business internationally ( $41 \%$ ), skills development ( $40 \%$ ), and making informed export and investment decisions (35\%).


Considerable numbers judged Trade Routes to have had no impact in these areas. This was highest regarding making informed investment and export decisions (40\%), followed by skills development ( $36 \%$ ), strategic advice on international markets ( $31 \%$ ), and exposure to markets and best practices (29\%).

## Widespread Achievement of Trade Routes Outcomes

Majorities of former clients felt that their use of the program had resulted in achieving potential objectives for their organization. More specifically, $74 \%$ achieved better or increased trade-related networks or connection, $69 \%$ a better/increased understanding of international markets, $60 \%$ had diversified or expanded the markets for their products or services, and $57 \%$ had increased exports of products or services.


## Almost All Consider Trade Routes Outcomes Important

Former Trade Routes clients were asked to assess the importance to their business of each of the achieved outcomes they had identified. Recall that these included the following:

- Increased exports of products/ services
- Diversified/expanded markets for products/services
- Increased trade-related networks/ connections
- Better/increased understanding of international markets

Each of these objectives was deemed to be at least moderately important by virtually all of the former clients that had identified them (92-96\%). Moreover, three of four were viewed as very important by $60 \%$ or more. These included increased exports ( $69 \%$ ), diversified or expanded markets ( $65 \%$ ), and increased trade-related connections ( $60 \%$ ). Having a greater understanding of international markets, at $52 \%$, was the least likely to be seen as very important to their business.


Between $4 \%$ and $8 \%$ felt that these outcomes were not very important, while none saw them as unimportant to their business.

## Three-quarters Likely to Use Trade Routes in Future

Exactly three-quarters of former Trade Routes clients are at least moderately likely to use the program again in the future. This includes almost half (47\%) that consider this to be very likely.

Conversely, $11 \%$ are unlikely to use the program again.


## 2.5 - Future Directions

This section provides non-clients' suggestions for improvement, as well as general comments about the Trade Routes program.

## Suggestions \& Feedback on Trade Routes

More than half of non-clients did not provide a suggestion or feedback about the program (55\%). Among those who did ( $\mathrm{n}=103$ ), a number of suggestions were offered by small numbers of respondents ( $4-8 \%$ ). Some of these were items, such as improving support from staff and their knowledge level, increasing the number of accepted applications, providing more program information, and making the deadline more flexible. Other comments simply reflected satisfaction, such as they were satisfied with the program in general, or noting that it helps to promote Canadian companies in international markets.


Suggestions included in the 'other' category are increase the current financial support offered, improve the time between acceptance and financial support, and simplify the application process.

## 2.6 - Corporate Profile \& Characteristics

This section presents information on the characteristics of non-client respondents' organizations and the respondents themselves.

## Number of Employees



## Age of Organization



Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc.

## Province or Territory

## Province/Territory: Non-Clients \& Former Clients

Q57: In which province/territory are you located? If you are located in more than one province, please identify the location of your main office


Base $=532$
DK/NR = Less than $1 \%$
Phoenix SPI: November 2007

## Region

## Region: Non-Clients \& Former Clients



Base $=532$
Phoenix SPI: November 2007

## Annual Export Revenues



## Group Membership

## Group Membership: Non-Clients \& Former Clients

Q59: Are you a member of any of the following groups?


## Language



Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc.

## COMPARISON OF CLIENTS AND NON-CLIENTS (INCLUDING Former Clients)

This section presents comparisons of the results for the current client and non-client groups. The latter includes former clients.

## Overall Familiarity with Trade Routes



## Familiarity with Trade Routes Services

Familiarity with Trade Routes Services (very/moderate): Clients vs. Non-Clients \& Former Clients

|  | Clients <br> $\%$ | Non-Clients/ <br> Former <br> Clients <br> $\%$ | Gap <br> $+/-$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contributions | $\mathbf{7 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{- 5 3}$ |
| Market Entry Support | $\mathbf{6 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $-\mathbf{4 2}$ |
| In-Market Assistance | $\mathbf{4 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 9}$ |
| Research | $\mathbf{3 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | -24 |

Phoenix SPI: November 2007
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## Specific Impacts of Trade Routes on Business

| Specific Impacts of Trade Routes on Organization <br> (major/moderate): <br> Clients vs. Former Clients |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Clients <br> $\%$ | Former <br> Clients <br> $\%$ | Gap <br> $+/-$ |
|  | $\mathbf{5 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 5}$ | $-\mathbf{- 2 2}$ |
| Informed investment/export decisions | $\mathbf{5 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 1}$ | -19 |
| Strategic advice on int'l. markets | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 9}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 8}$ |
| Exposure to markets/best practices | $\mathbf{6 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 9}$ | -16 |
| Developing int'l. markets | $\mathbf{8 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 7}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 4}$ |
| Improving export readiness | $\mathbf{7 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | -14 |
| Skills development | $\mathbf{5 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 2}$ |
| Building <br> networks/partnerships/contacts | $\mathbf{8 2}$ |  |  |

## Overall Value of Trade Routes



Base $=$ All Trade Routes clients, including former clients DK/NR $=\mathbf{4 - 1 1 \%}$

Phoenix SPI: November 2007

## Trade Routes Outcomes



## Importance of Trade Routes Outcomes

| Importance of Trade Routes Outcomes to Business (very/moderate): <br> Clients vs. Former Clients |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Clients <br> $\%$ | Former <br> Clients <br> $\%$ | Gap <br> $+/-$ |
|  | $\mathbf{9 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 6}$ | +5 |
| Increased exports | $\mathbf{9 3}$ | $\mathbf{9 2}$ | -1 |
| Diversified/expanded markets | $\mathbf{9 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 6}$ | -3 |
| Increased trade-related connections | $\mathbf{9 6}$ | $\mathbf{9 2}$ | -4 |
| Greater understanding of int’l. <br> markets |  |  |  |

## Likelihood of Using Trade Routes in Future



Type of Organization

| Area of Arts \& Cultural Sector Involvement: <br> Clients vs. Non-Clients \& Former Clients |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Clients <br> $\%$ | Non-Clients/ <br> Former <br> Clients <br> $\%$ | Gap <br> ++- |
| Publishing | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $+\mathbf{+ 4}$ |
| Music/sound recording | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 6}$ | +4 |
| Design | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | +4 |
| Heritage | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | +4 |
| Crafts | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $+\mathbf{1}$ |
| Performing arts | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 6}$ | $+\mathbf{1}$ |
| Visual Arts | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $+\mathbf{1}$ |
| Film/video | $\mathbf{3 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | -1 |
| New Media | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $\mathbf{- 3}$ |

Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc.

Area of Arts and Cultural Sector Involvement

| Area of Arts \& Cultural Sector Involvement: <br> Clients vs. Non-Clients \& Former Clients |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Clients <br> $\%$ | Non-Clients/ <br> Former <br> Clients <br> $\%$ | Gap <br> $+/-$ |
| Publishing | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | +4 |
| Music/sound recording | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 6}$ | +4 |
| Design | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | +4 |
| Heritage | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | +4 |
| Crafts | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $+\mathbf{1}$ |
| Performing arts | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 6}$ | $+\mathbf{1}$ |
| Visual Arts | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $+\mathbf{1}$ |
| Film/video | $\mathbf{3 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | -1 |
| New Media | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $-\mathbf{3}$ |

## Number of Employees



## Age of Organization

## Age of Business/Organization


$\mathrm{DK} / \mathrm{NR}=\mathbf{1 \%}$ or less
Phoenix SPI: November 2007

## Province or Territory

## Province/Territory

Q57: In which province/territory are you located? If you are located in more than one province, please identify the location of your main office


DK/NR = Less than $\mathbf{1 \%}$
Phoenix SPI: November 2007

## Region



## Annual Export Revenues

## Annual Export Revenues

Q58: What has been the approximate value of your organization's annual revenues from the export of its products or services over the past two years?


DK/NR $=\mathbf{9 - 1 0 \%}$
Phoenix SPI: November 2007

## Group Membership

## Group Membership



DK/NR $=\mathbf{2 - 3 \%}$
Phoenix SPI: November 2007

## Language



Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc.

## APPENDIX

# Department of Canadian Heritage: 

# Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey <br> Online Version 

Final: October 19, 2007

## Text for Introduction Page of Survey

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this online survey about Canadian Heritage's Trade Routes program. This survey is registered with the national survey registration system ${ }^{10}$.

Your responses will be kept entirely confidential. The research is being conducted by Phoenix Strategic Perspectives, an independent research firm. Canadian Heritage will only receive combined results - no individuals or organizations will be identified in any way.

The survey should only take 15 minutes or less to complete. You can save your responses at any time and return to complete the questionnaire at your convenience.

If you have any questions about the survey, please contact Philippe Azzie of Phoenix by phone (613-260-1700, x 222) or email (pazzie@ phoenixspi.ca).

## PROGRAMMING NOTES:

- BLUE LINES INDICATE SCREEN BREAKS.
- DON'T KNOW RESPONSE OPTION TO BE INCLUDED WHERE APPPROPRIATE.
- USERS OF MULTIPLE SERVICES OF TRADE ROUTES PROGRAM: IF CLIENT USED MORE THAN ONE OF THE FOUR SERVICES (I.E. MARKET ENTRY SUPPORT, IN-MARKET ASSISTANCE, CONTRIBUTIONS, RESEARCH), HE/SHE WILL COMPLETE SECTION 4 FOR TWO SERVICES ONLY (DETERMINED AT RANDOM). THIS WILL BE MONITORED DURING FIELDWORK; ADJUSTMENTS MAY BE MADE.

[^8]Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc.

## Section 1: Background Information

The first two questions are for background purposes.

1. Which of the following best describes the organization you work for?

| Individual entrepreneur (i.e. self-employed) | $[$ | $]$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| For-profit company | $[$ | $]$ | CHECK ONE ONLY |
| Not-for-profit corporation | $[$ | $]$ |  |
| Not-for profit association | $[$ | $]$ |  |
| Academic institution or Chamber of Commerce | $[$ | $]$ |  |
| National/provincial/territorial/municipal association [ | $]$ |  |  |
| Other (specify): |  |  |  |

2. In which area of the arts and cultural sector are you involved? If you are involved in more than one area, please check all that apply.

Film/video
Broadcasting/television
Music/sound recording
New media
Performing arts
Crafts
Visual arts
Publishing
Heritage
Design
Other (specify): $\qquad$

## Section 2: Use of Trade Routes Program

Trade Routes is a trade development program designed for the arts and cultural sector. The program is part of the Department of Canadian Heritage's strategy to expand international markets for Canada's arts and cultural sector. The program provides international business development services to help Canada's cultural entrepreneurs become export-ready and take advantage of opportunities in the global marketplace. The Trade Routes program consists of four services: Market Entry Support, In-Market Assistance, Contributions Program, and Research.
3. How familiar would you say you are with the Trade Routes program, both overall and with respect to individual services?

| Trade Routes Services | Level of Familiarity |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all | Only a little | Moderately familiar | $\begin{gathered} \text { Very } \\ \text { familiar } \end{gathered}$ |
| Overall Trade Routes Program | O | O | O | O |
| Market Entry Support: This service provides direct support to arts and cultural clients from both Canadian Heritage's headquarters and the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade regional offices (Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, Moncton, Halifax and St. John's). Based out of these regional offices, the Trade Routes Cultural Trade Commissioners (CTCs) provide services to clients throughout Canada, with a focus on export preparedness and international market development, and help with skills development and export counselling. | O | O | O | O |
| In-Market Assistance: This component offers services to arts and cultural exporters from five locations around the world (Shanghai, New York, Los Angeles, Paris and London). During the years 2002-2005, the program had a position in Singapore (but it has since been relocated to Shanghai). Five Cultural Trade Development Officers, one per site, develop and implement strategies and deliver services to promote Canadian cultural goods and services. They conduct outreach activities and connect with potential partners for Canada's arts and cultural sectors. They work with Canadians interested in exporting to specific markets, and with local partners interested in Canadian contacts. | O | O | O | O |


| Contributions: This service provides financial support to arts <br> and cultural entrepreneurs to develop and implement effective <br> long-term export strategies. It supports Canadian cultural <br> exporters in export preparedness and international market <br> development. | O | O | O | O |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Research: This service offers targeted studies of specific <br> markets and countries, including surveys and profiles of export <br> patterns for Canadian cultural sectors, and the development of <br> statistical data on Canadian cultural exporters and cultural trade. | O | O | O | O |

4. During the last 12 months, has your organization used the Trade Routes program? This includes use of any of the four specific services (i.e. Market Entry Support, In-Market Assistance, Contributions, or Research).

| Yes | $[$ | CHECK ONE ONLY |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No* | $[$ |  |

*NOTE: RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE NOT USED TRADE ROUTES ('NON-CLIENTS') WILL BE ASKED TO COMPLETE A MINI-QUESTIONNAIRE (SEE APPENDIX TO MAIN QUESTIONNAIRE).
5. How long has your organization used the Trade Routes program?

1 year or less
2 years
[ ]
3 years
4 years
5 years
[ ] CHECK ONE ONLY
[ ]
[ ]
[ ]
6. Please identify which of the four Trade Routes services your organization has used during the past 12 months.

| Trade Routes Services ${ }^{\mathbf{1 1}}$ | Used service? |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | Yes | No |
| Market Entry Support | O | O |
| In-Market Assistance | O | O |
| Contributions | O | O |
| Research | O | O |

USE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION TO DETERMINE WHICH SERVICE MODULE(S) WILL BE COMPLETED BY RESPONDENT IN SECTION 4.
7. Thinking about your use of the Trade Routes program in the past 12 months, which of the following channels did you use in your dealings with the program? Please include both contact initiated by you and contact initiated by program officials.

| Service Channel | Used? |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes | No |
| 1-866 number |  |  |
| Telephone (NOT including 1-866 toll-free number) |  |  |
| Email (Trade Routes generic e-mail account) |  |  |
| Email (specific officer's account) |  |  |
| In-person (includes office visits, events, etc.) |  |  |
| Trade Routes website |  |  |
| Mail or fax |  |  |

## OVERALL SATISFACTION QUESTION ASKED FOR EACH SERVICE CHANNEL USED:

8. a-f. Overall, how satisfied were you with the service you received when using (INSERT SERVICE CHANNEL) in your dealings with the Trade Routes program?

[^9]Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc.

## SECTION 3: Overall Perceptions of Service

9. Thinking about the service you received as part of the Trade Routes program during the past 12 months, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. To do this, please use a 5 -point scale, where ' 1 ' means strongly disagree, ' 5 ' means strongly agree, and ' 3 ' means neither.

PLACE YOUR SCORES IN THE TABLE BELOW. IF SOMETHING DOES NOT APPLY TO YOU, PLEASE CHECK THE 'N/A' BOX

|  | Strongly <br> disagree <br> $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | Neither <br> $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | Strongly <br> agree <br> $\mathbf{5}$ | N/A |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trade Routes staff were knowledgeable and <br> competent | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| Trade Routes staff were courteous | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| Service was provided in a timely manner | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| You were treated fairly | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| You were able to get through to Trade Routes <br> staff without difficulty | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| You received service in the official language of <br> your choice (i.e. English or French) | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| You were informed of everything you had to do <br> in order to get the service | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The information you received was clear and easy <br> to understand | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| Trade Routes staff went the extra mile to make <br> sure you got what you needed | O | O | O | O | O | O |

10. How satisfied were you with the overall quality of service you received when using the Trade Routes program during the last 12 months? Please use a 5-point scale, where ' 1 ' is very dissatisfied, ' 5 ' is very satisfied, and ' 3 ' is neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.


Very Dissatisfied
Neither
Very Satisfied
11. In the end, did you get what you needed?

| Yes | $[$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No, or | $[$ | CHECK ONE ONLY |  |
| You got part of what you needed | $[$ | $]$ |  |

## Section 4: Assessment of Specific Services of Trade Routes

QUESTIONS IN THIS SECTION WILL BE ASKED OF THOSE WHO USED SPECIFIC TRADE ROUTES SERVICES. SEE PROGRAMMING INSTRUCTIONS IN FRONT-END NOTE.

## Market Entry Support

Earlier you mentioned that you used Trade Routes' Market Entry Support service during the past 12 months. The following questions are about your use of this specific service. For all of the questions in this section, please focus on the last 12 months.

## Click here for short description of service ${ }^{12}$.

12. Which of the following offices is responsible for the Market Entry Support service you received? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

| Headquarters (Gatineau, Quebec) | [ | $]$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Vancouver (responsible for clients in British Columbia, Alberta and Yukon) | $[$ | $]$ |
| Winnipeg (responsible for clients in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, NWT and Nunavut) | $[$ | $]$ |
| Toronto (responsible for clients in Ontario) | $[$ | $]$ |
| Montreal (responsible for clients in Quebec) | $[$ | $]$ |
| Moncton (responsible for clients in New Brunswick, PEI and Francophone Nova Scotia)[ | $]$ |  |
| St. John's (responsible for clients in Newfoundland and Labrador and Nova Scotia)[ |  |  |

13. In which of the following areas did you need support or assistance?

| Export-readiness assessment | $[$ | $]$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Export plan development | $[$ | $]$ |
| International market development | $[$ | $]$ | CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

Other (specify): $\qquad$
14. Did you participate in any of the following types of initiatives or events?

Information session
Training session
Pre-market training
Networking event $\begin{array}{lll}{[ } & ] & \\ {[ } & ] \\ {[ } & ] \\ {[ } & ]\end{array}$ CHECK ALL THAT APPLY
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Trade mission (organized by Trade Routes) [ ]
Other (specify):
No, did not participate in any of these
15. Thinking about the service that you received related to Trade Routes' Market Entry Support service during the past 12 months, please indicate your level of satisfaction in each of the following areas.

PLACE YOUR SCORES IN THE TABLE BELOW. IF SOMETHING DOES NOT APPLY TO YOU, PLEASE CHECK THE 'N/A' (NOT APPLICABLE) BOX

|  | Very <br> dissatisfied <br> $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | Neither <br> $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | Very <br> satisfied <br> $\mathbf{5}$ | N/A |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The knowledge and competence of the staff. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The ease of access to the service. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The timeliness of the service. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The accuracy of the information you received. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The events/initiatives in which you took part. | O | O | O | O | O | O |

16. Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of service you received regarding Trade Routes' Market Entry Support service during the last 12 months?

17. During the past 12 months, were there any problems with the service you received regarding Trade Routes' Market Entry Support service?
Yes
No
[ ]
[ ]

IF YES:
18. What problem(s) did you encounter?

Received incorrect information Received out-dated information Lack of/incomplete information Received inconsistent information Difficulty accessing/contacting Cultural Trade Commissioner Lack of courtesy/responsiveness Timeliness of service Other (specify): $\qquad$

## In-Market Assistance

Earlier you mentioned that you used Trade Routes' In-Market Assistance service during the past 12 months. The following questions are about your use of this specific service. For all of the questions in this section, please focus on the last 12 months.

## Click here for short description of service ${ }^{13}$.

19. Which of the following offices did you deal with for the In-Market Assistance service?

| Shanghai | $[$ | $]$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Los Angeles | $[$ | $]$ |
| New York | $[$ | $]$ |
| Paris | $[$ | $]$ |
| London | $[$ | $]$ |

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY
Paris
[ ]
20. In which of the following areas did you need support or assistance?

| Market research | $[$ | $]$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Networking opportunities | $[$ | $]$ |  |
| Information on local organizations | $[$ | $]$ | CHECK ALL THAT APPLY |
| Visit information | $[$ | $]$ |  |
| Market access issues/advocacy | $[$ | $]$ |  |
| Other (specify): |  |  |  |
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21. Did you participate in any of the following types of initiatives or events?

| Mission | $[$ | $]$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Matchmaking event | $[$ | $]$ |  |
| Networking event | $[$ | $]$ | CHECK ALL THAT APPLY |
| Workshop/training event | $[$ | $]$ |  |
| Market visit | $[$ | $]$ |  |
| Trade show/conference | $[$ | $]$ |  |
| Other (specify): |  |  |  |
| No, did not participate in any of these | $[$ | $]$ |  |

22. Thinking about the service that you received related to Trade Routes' In-Market Assistance service during the past 12 months, please indicate your level of satisfaction in each of the following areas.

PLACE YOUR SCORES IN THE TABLE BELOW. IF SOMETHING DOES NOT APPLY TO YOU, PLEASE CHECK THE 'N/A' (NOT APPLICABLE) BOX

|  | Very <br> dissatisfied <br> $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | Neither <br> $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | Very <br> satisfied <br> $\mathbf{5}$ | N/A |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The knowledge and competence of the staff. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The ease of access to the service. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The timeliness of the service. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The accuracy of the information you received. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The events/initiatives in which you took part. | O | O | O | O | O | O |

23. Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of service you received regarding Trade Routes' In-Market Assistance service during the last 12 months?

24. During the past 12 months, were there any problems with the service you received regarding Trade Routes' In-Market Assistance service?

| Yes | $\left[\begin{array}{ll}] \\ \text { No } & {[ }\end{array}\right]$ |
| :--- | :--- |

IF YES:
25. What problem(s) did you encounter?

Received incorrect information [ ]
Lack of/incomplete information
Received inconsistent information
Difficulty accessing/ contacting
Cultural Trade Development Officer [ ]
Lack of courtesy/responsiveness [ ]
Timeliness of service [ ]
Other (specify):

## Contributions Program

Earlier you mentioned that you used Trade Routes' Contributions program service during the past 12 months. The following questions are about your use of this specific service. For all of the questions in this section, please focus on the last 12 months.

## Click here for short description of service ${ }^{14}$.

26. In which of the following areas did you need support or assistance through the Contributions program?

Export preparedness [ ] CHECK ALL THAT APPLY
International market development
27. Did you participate in any of the following types of activities or events? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

## Export Preparedness:

Professional development in international business [ ]
First-hand, online exposure to markets outside Canada and their business practices [ ]
Development of new alliances and financial partnering [ ]
Development of marketing strategies
Development of innovative advertising tools and approaches for specific international activities
[ ]
Other (specify): $\qquad$
No, did not participate in any of these
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## International Market Development:

Attending international trade shows and visits to new markets outside of Canada [ ]
Providing strategic support at key trade shows and contact events outside of Canada [ ]
Providing market information and market services
Developing innovative in-market tools (virtual trade shows, etc.) [ ]
Incoming and outgoing trade/buyers missions (support for and participation in) [ ]
Conducting business-to-business networking at international events in Canada (incoming
foreign delegates only) or internationally
[
Undertaking feasibility studies
Other (specify):
No, did not participate in any of these
28. Thinking about the service that you received related to Trade Routes' Contributions program during the past 12 months, please indicate your level of satisfaction in each of the following areas.

PLACE YOUR SCORES IN THE TABLE BELOW. IF SOMETHING DOES NOT APPLY TO YOU, PLEASE CHECK THE 'N/A' (NOT APPLICABLE) BOX

|  | Very <br> dissatisfied <br> $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | Neither <br> $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | Very <br> satisfied <br> $\mathbf{5}$ | N/A |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The clarity of the information you received. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The ease-of-use of the application process. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The transparency of the process. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The timeliness of approval process. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The reporting requirements are reasonable and <br> adequately explained. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The promptness in obtaining answers from HQ <br> staff. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The knowledge and competence of the staff. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The courteousness of the staff. | O | O | O | O | O | O |

29. Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of service you received regarding Trade Routes' Contributions Program service during the last 12 months?

30. During the past 12 months, were there any problems with the service you received regarding Trade Routes' Contributions Program service?

| Yes | $\left[\begin{array}{ll}] \\ \text { No } & {[ }\end{array}\right]$ |
| :--- | :--- |

IF YES:
31. What problem(s) did you encounter?

Received incorrect information [ ]
Received incomplete information [ ]
Received inconsistent information [ ] CHECK ALL THAT APPLY
Complexity/difficulty of procedure(s)[ ]
Delays/timelines not respected [ ]
Timeliness of service [ ]
Other (specify):

## Research

Earlier you mentioned that you used Trade Routes' Research service during the past 12 months. The following questions are about your use of this specific service. For all of the questions in this section, please focus on the last 12 months.

## Click here for short description of service ${ }^{15}$.

32. What type of research information did you need?

Targeted study of specific market/country [ ]
Export patterns for Canadian cultural sectors [ ] CHECK ALL THAT APPLY
Statistical data on Canadian cultural trade [ ]
Other (specify): $\qquad$
${ }^{15}$ Short description would be accessible here as reminder for those who want it (pulled from question 3)
Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc.
33. Thinking about the service that you received related to Trade Routes' Research service during the past 12 months, please indicate your level of satisfaction in each of the following areas.

PLACE YOUR SCORES IN THE TABLE BELOW. IF SOMETHING DOES NOT APPLY TO YOU, PLEASE CHECK THE 'N/A’ (NOT APPLICABLE) BOX

|  | Very <br> dissatisfied <br> $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | Neither <br> $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | Very <br> satisfied <br> $\mathbf{5}$ | N/A |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The relevance and usefulness of the research to <br> you/your organization. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The comprehensiveness of the research. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The clarity and ease of understanding the <br> research. | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| The length of the reports and documents. | O | O | O | O | O | O |

34. Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of service you received regarding Trade Routes' Research service during the last 12 months?

35. During the past 12 months, were there any problems with the service you received regarding Trade Routes' Research service?
```
Yes [ ]
No [ ]
```

IF YES:
36. What problem(s) did you encounter?

Received incorrect/outdated

| information | $[$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Information lacked relevance | $[$ |  |

Difficulty accessing research [ ] CHECK ALL THAT APPLY
Research not in user-friendly format [ ]
Difficulty accessing/contacting staff [ ]
Lack of courtesy/responsiveness
Timeliness of service

## Section 5: Impact of Trade Routes

The next few questions focus on the value and impact of the Trades Routes program on your organization. For questions in this section, please reflect on your total use of the program, not only during the past 12 months.
37. All things considered, how would you rate the overall value or usefulness of the Trade Routes program to your organization? Please use a 5 -point scale, where ' 1 ' is not useful at all, and ' 5 ' is very useful. CHECK ONE BOX ON SCALE.


Not useful at all
Very Useful
38. Please rate the impact of the Trade Routes program on your organization in each of the following areas.

PLACE YOUR SCORES IN THE TABLE BELOW. IF SOMETHING DOES NOT APPLY TO YOU, PLEASE CHECK THE 'N/A' BOX

|  | No <br> impact | Minor <br> impact | Moderate <br> impact | Major <br> impact | N/A |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Improving your export readiness. | O | O | O | O | O |
| Helping you develop international market(s). | O | O | O | O | O |
| Building networks/partnerships/contacts. | O | O | O | O | O |
| Providing strategic advice on doing business <br> in one or more international markets. | O | O | O | O | O |
| Skills development for you/your staff in <br> international business. | O | O | O | O | O |
| Helping you make informed decisions about <br> where to invest and/or export. | O | O | O | O | O |
| First-hand/on-line exposure to markets and <br> their business practices. | O | O | O | O | O |

39. Please indicate whether or not your use of the Trade Routes program has resulted in any of the potential outcomes for your organization identified in the table below.

IF SOMETHING DOES NOT APPLY TO YOU, PLEASE CHECK THE 'N/A' BOX

| Potential Outcomes | Yes | No | N/A |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Increased exports of products/services | O | O | O |
| Diversified/expanded markets for products/services | O | O | O |
| Increased trade-related networks/connections | O | O | O |
| Better/increased understanding of international markets | O | O | O |

40. How would you rate the importance of these outcome(s) to your business?

TABLE WILL ONLY INCLUDE OUTCOMES CITED BY RESPONDENT IN PREVIOUS QUESTION

| Potential Outcomes | Not <br> Important <br> at all | Not Very <br> Important | Moderately <br> Important | Very <br> Important |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Increased exports of products/ <br> services | O | O | O | O |
| Diversified/expanded markets for <br> products/services | O | O | O | O |
| Increased trade-related networks/ <br> connections | O | O | O | O |
| Better/increased understanding of <br> international markets | O | O | O | O |

41. How likely is it that your organization will use the Trade Routes program in future?

| Very likely | $[$ | $]$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Moderately likely | $[$ | $]$ | CHECK ONE ONLY

## Future Directions

This section looks at a number of potential new directions for the Trades Routes program and its related services.
42. Market Entry Support service. At the present time, there are seven Cultural Trade Commissioners across Canada (Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, Halifax, Moncton and St. John's). Do you think any of these positions should be relocated?

| Yes | $[$ | $]$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |$\quad$ CHECK ONE ONLY

## IF YES:

43. Which positions should be relocated, and what cities should they be moved to? PLEASE IDENTIFY THE POSITION(S) YOU THINK SHOULD BE MOVED AND THE NEW CITY(IES) THAT YOU THINK IT SHOULD BE MOVED TO.

Text box
44. In addition to these Trade Commissioners, do you think the number of Cultural Trade Commissioners across Canada should be expanded?

| Yes | $[$ | $]$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No | $[$ | CHECK ONE ONLY |

## IF YES:

45. In which location(s) should this expansion occur? Since these Trade Commissioners are co-located at Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada's Regional Offices, we have identified the remaining potential locations, for easy reference.

Edmonton
Calgary
Saskatoon
Regina
Charlottetown
CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

Other (specify): $\qquad$
46. In-Market Assistance service. At the present time, there are five Cultural Trade Development Officers at Canadian missions abroad (Shanghai, Los Angeles, New York, Paris and London). Do you think any of these positions should be relocated?

```
Yes [ ] CHECK ONE ONLY
No
[ ]
```


## IF YES:

47. Which positions should be relocated, and what cities should they be moved to? PLEASE IDENTIFY THE POSITION(S) YOU THINK SHOULD BE MOVED AND THE NEW CITY(IES) THAT YOU THINK IT SHOULD BE MOVED TO.

Text box
48. Do you think the number of Cultural Trade Development Officers should be expanded?

| Yes | $[$ | CHECK ONE ONLY |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No | $[$ |  |

## IF YES:

49. In which location(s) should this expansion occur?

| Chicago | $[$ | $]$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Boston | $[$ | $]$ |
| Miami | $[$ | $]$ |
| Dallas | $[$ | $]$ |
| Germany (Berlin) | $[$ | $]$ |
| Brazil (Sao Paulo) | $[$ | $]$ |
| CHECK ALL THAT APPLY |  |  |
| Argentina (Bueno Aires) | $[$ | $]$ |
| Chile (Santiago) | $[$ | $]$ |
| Korea (Seoul) | $[$ | $]$ |
| Japan (Tokyo) | $[$ | $]$ |
| India (Mumbai) | $[$ | $]$ |
| South Africa | $[$ | $]$ |
| Other (specify): |  |  |

50. Contributions Program. Are there any changes to the Contributions program that you would like to see carried out? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

Earlier notification of approval or rejection
Notification of approval-in-principle, with the understanding that there is always a possibility that the file might be rejected in its final approval stages
Online applications
Other (specify): $\qquad$
No, no changes
[ ]
51. Research service. At the present time, the Research service focuses on the analysis of international trade statistics on cultural goods and services, targeted studies of specific markets and countries, surveys and profiles of export patterns. Are there any other research activities that you would like to see carried out?

| Yes | $[$ | $]$ | CHECK ONE ONLY |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No | $[$ | $]$ |  |

IF YES:
52. What research activities? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

Succinct fact sheets
More market reports
Market reports by cultural sectors
Market reports by regions
Summary sheets of market reports
Improving access to research on Trade Routes website Increasing awareness of available studies
Developing shorter reports
Increasing market studies that correspond to priority markets Updating available material/data
[ ]

Other (specify): $\qquad$
53. Do you think that Trade Routes should expand its investment initiatives within the program for those sub-sectors where investment is relevant (e.g. foreign direct investment in interactive media, location shooting)?

Definitely
Probably
Probably not
Definitely not
[ ]
[ ] CHECK ONE ONLY
[ ]
[ ]
54. If you could offer one suggestion to improve the quality of service you received from the Trade Routes program, what would that be?

```
Text box
```


## SECTION 7: Corporate Profile/Demographics

These last questions are for background and analytical purposes only. Please remember that your responses to these and other questions will be kept confidential.
55. Excluding yourself, how many full-time employees work for your organization in Canada?

Please include part-time employees as full-time equivalents.

| None/no one | $[$ | $]$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1-5$ | $[$ | $]$ |
| $6-25$ | $[$ | $]$ |
| CHECK ONE ONLY |  |  |
| $26-49$ | $[$ | $]$ |
| $50-99$ | $[$ | $]$ |
| 100 or more | $[$ |  |

56. How long has your business or organization been in existence?

Less than 2 years
2-5 years
6-10 years
11-20 years
More than 20 years
[ ]
[ ]
[ ] CHECK ONE ONLY
[ ]
[ ]
57. In which province/territory are you located? If you are located in more than one province, please identify the location of your main office.

| National Capital Region | $[$ | $]$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | $[$ | $]$ |
| Nova Scotia | $[$ | $]$ |
| Prince Edward Island | $[$ | $]$ |
| New Brunswick | $[$ | $]$ |
| Quebec | $[$ | $]$ |
| Ontario | $[$ | CHECK ONE ONLY |
| Manitoba | $[$ | $]$ |
| Saskatchewan | $[$ | $]$ |
| Alberta | $[$ | $]$ |
| British Columbia | $[$ | $]$ |
| North West Territories | $[$ | $]$ |
| Yukon | $[$ |  |
| Nunavut |  |  |
| Other (please specify): |  |  |

58. What has been the approximate value of your organization's annual revenues from the export of its products or services over the past two years?

None
Under \$25,000
\$25,000 to \$50,000
$\$ 51,000$ to $\$ 100,000$
\$101,000 to \$250,000
$\$ 251,000$ to $\$ 500,000$
More than $\$ 500,000$

| $[$ | $]$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $[$ | $]$ |  |
| $[$ | $]$ | CHECK ONE ONLY |
| $[$ | $]$ |  |
| $[$ | $]$ |  |
| $[$ | $]$ |  |
| $[$ | $]$ |  |

59. Are you a member of any of the following groups?

| Aboriginal person | $[$ | $]$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Youth (18-30 years of age) | $[$ | $]$ | CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

60. What is your first official language?

English
French
[ ]
[ ]

That completes the survey.
Thank you for taking the time to participate.

## Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey Non-Client Questionnaire

1. Prior to this research, were you aware of the Trade Routes program?
```
Yes [ ]
No [ ] GO TO SECTION 7 (DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS)
```

IF YES:
2. Has your organization used the Trade Routes program in the past?

| Yes | $[$ | $]$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No | $[$ | $]$ | | GO TO Q5 BELOW AND THEN SECTION 7 IN MAIN SURVEY |
| :--- |
| (DEMO QUESTIONS) |

IF YES:
3. How long did you use the Trade Routes program?

Less than 2 years
2 years
3 years
4 years
5 years
[ ]
[ ]
[ ] CHECK ONE ONLY
[ ]
[ ]
4. Why did your organization not use the Trade Routes program during the past 12 months?

Received all the assistance we needed
Not satisfied with service
[ ]
No longer considering exporting
CHECK ALL THAT APPLY
Other (specify): $\qquad$

IF RESPONDENT HAS USED PROGRAM IN PAST, GO TO Q5 BELOW AND THEN TO SECTION 5 QUESTIONS (IMPACT OF TRADE ROUTS) IN MAIN SURVEY AND SECTION 7 (DEMOS), BUT NOT SECTION 6 (FUTURE DIRECTIONS)
5. Do you have any comments or feedback you would like to share about the Trade Routes program? If so, please provide below.

Text box Heritage canadien

October 15, 2007

## Re: Department of Canadian Heritage Research Regarding the Trade Routes Program

The Department of Canadian Heritage is conducting research related to its Trade Routes Program. Trade Routes is a comprehensive trade development program specifically designed for the arts and cultural sector. The program provides international business development services to support Canada's entrepreneurs in the arts and cultural sector in order to help them become export-ready and take advantage of opportunities in the global marketplace.

At this time, the department would like to evaluate the performance and impact of the program. Canadian Heritage has commissioned Phoenix Strategic Perspectives, an independent research firm, to undertake this research on its behalf. When you are contacted by Phoenix, please consider participating in this important research. Your participation is completely voluntary, but would be greatly appreciated. The findings will be used to help improve the program so that it better meets the export and market development needs of cultural organizations and entrepreneurs.

Please note that results from the study will be posted on the departmental Website and will be available to all participants of the research. Please be assured, however, that all information collected from the survey will be kept strictly confidential - no individuals or organizations will be identified in any way.

If you would like more information about the study, please contact Jo-Anne Stewart, Acting Director, Strategic Policy, Planning and Outreach Directorate, Trade and Investment Branch of the Department of Canadian Heritage by phone (819 934-4782) or by email at (jo-anne_stewart@pch.gc.ca).

We hope that you will take part in this valuable research.
Thank you.
Yours sincerely,


Keith Chang Director General Trade and Investment Branch

## Email Invitation

## Re: Canadian Heritage Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey

Phoenix Strategic Perspectives is conducting a client satisfaction survey for the Department of Canadian Heritage related to its Trade Routes program. Please take the time to participate in this important research. Your feedback will help the department better support entrepreneurs in the arts and cultural sector.

We ask that you complete the survey even if you have never been involved in the Trade Routes Program. In this case, the survey will be very short.

The survey should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. To participate, please click on the link below and then enter the password provided. If you need to stop while completing the questionnaire, you can return to it and continue at a later time. We kindly ask that you complete the survey by November $15^{\text {th }}$.

Link to survey: [Enter URL]
Password: [Enter password]
Please be assured that your responses will be treated in confidence - no individuals will be identified in any way. Results from the survey will be posted on the departmental Web site and will be available to all participants.

For more information about the survey, please see the background letter on the study from Canadian Heritage:

Link to background letter [Enter URL]
If you have any questions, please contact Philippe Azzie at Phoenix at 613-260-1700, ext. 222, or pazzie@phoenixspi.ca. If you would prefer to receive a paper copy of the survey, please contact Mr. Azzie and he will send you one by fax or email, along with information on how it can be returned.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.
Sincerely,
Stephen Kiar
President
Phoenix SPI
www.phoenixspi.ca

## Revised Email Invitation

## Re: Canadian Heritage Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey

Phoenix Strategic Perspectives is conducting a client satisfaction survey for the Department of Canadian Heritage, part of the Government of Canada, related to its Trade Routes program. Please take the time to participate in this important research. Your feedback will help the department better support entrepreneurs in the arts and cultural sector.

We have been informed by the Government of Canada that you are a client of the Trade Routes program and have used one or more of its services.

The survey should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. To participate, please click on the link below and then enter the password provided. If you need to stop while completing the questionnaire, you can return to it and continue at a later time. We kindly ask that you complete the survey by November 15th.

Link to survey: [Enter URL]
Password: [Enter password]
Please be assured that your responses will be treated in confidence - no individuals will be identified in any way. Results from the survey will be posted on the departmental Web site and will be available to all participants.

For more information about the survey, please see the background letter on the study from Canadian Heritage:

Link to background letter [Enter URL]
If you have any questions, please contact Philippe Azzie at Phoenix at 613-260-1700, ext. 222 , or pazzie@phoenixspi.ca. If you would prefer to receive a paper copy of the survey, please contact Mr. Azzie and he will send you one by fax or email, along with information on how it can be returned.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.
Sincerely,
Stephen Kiar
President
Phoenix SPI
www.phoenixspi.ca

## First Email Reminder

## Reminder - Canadian Heritage Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey

Approximately one week ago, we invited you to take part in a survey we are conducting for the Department of Canadian Heritage on the Trade Routes program. Please take the time to participate in this important research. Your feedback will help the Department better support organizations and entrepreneurs in the arts and cultural sector.

Please complete the survey even if you have never used the Trade Routes program. In this case, the survey will be very short.

The survey should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. To participate, please click on the link below and then enter the password provided. If you have already begun to complete the questionnaire, you will automatically be taken to the point at which you stopped. We kindly ask that you complete the survey by November 15th.

Link to survey: [Enter URL]
Password: [Enter password]
Please be assured that your responses will be treated in confidence - no individuals or organizations will be identified in any way. If you have any questions, please contact Philippe Azzie at Phoenix at 613-260-1700, ext. 222, or pazzie@phoenixspi.ca.

Thank you.
Stephen Kiar
President
Phoenix SPI
www.phoenixspi.ca

## Final Email Reminder:

## Final Reminder -Canadian Heritage Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey

Approximately two weeks ago, we invited you to take part in a survey we are conducting for the Department of Canadian Heritage on the Trade Routes program.

Please complete the survey even if you have never used the Trade Routes program. In this case, the survey will be very short.

This study is coming to an end. Please take a few minutes to complete the survey - it should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. To participate, please click on the link below and then enter the password provided. If you have already begun the questionnaire, you will automatically be taken to the point at which you stopped. We kindly ask that you complete the survey by November 15 th.

Link to survey: [Enter URL]
Password: [Enter password]
Please be assured that your responses will be treated in confidence - no individuals or organizations will be identified in any way. If you have any questions, please contact Philippe Azzie at Phoenix at 613-260-1700, ext. 222, or pazzie@ phoenixspi.ca.

Thank you.
Stephen Kiar
President
Phoenix SPI
www.phoenixspi.ca

## Revised Final Email Reminder:

## Final Reminder -Canadian Heritage Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey

Approximately two weeks ago, we invited you to take part in a survey we are conducting for the Department of Canadian Heritage, part of the Government of Canada, on the Trade Routes program.

We have been informed by the Government of Canada that you are a client of the Trade Routes program and have used one or more of its services.

This study is coming to an end. Please take a few minutes to complete the survey - it should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. To participate, please click on the link below and then enter the password provided. If you have already begun the questionnaire, you will automatically be taken to the point at which you stopped. We kindly ask that you complete the survey by November 15th.

Link to survey: [Enter URL]
Password: [Enter password]
Please be assured that your responses will be treated in confidence - no individuals or organizations will be identified in any way. If you have any questions, please contact Philippe Azzie at Phoenix at 613-260-1700, ext. 222, or pazzie@ phoenixspi.ca.

Thank you.
Stephen Kiar
President
Phoenix SPI
www.phoenixspi.ca

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version
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Table Q5 Page 9..........Q5. How long has your organization used the Trade Routes program?
Table 96A Page 10........@6. Used during 12 months: Market Entry Support
Table 26B Page 11.......@6. Used during 12 months: In-Market Assistance
Table 06C Page 12........06. Used during 12 months: Contributions
Table Q6D Page 13........06. Used during 12 months: Research
Table Q7B Page 15.......@7. Channels used in dealings with the program: Telephone (NOT including 1-866 toll-free numbe
Table Q7C Page 16........Q7. Channels used in dealings with the program: Email (Trade Routes generic e-mail account)
Table Q7D Page 17........Q7. Channels used in dealings with the program: Email (specific officer's account)
Table Q7E Page 18._....@7. Channels used in dealings with the program: In-person (includes office visits, events, etc.)
Table Q7F Page 19.......@7. Channels used in dealings with the program: Trade Routes website
Table Q7G Page 20.......Q7. Channels used in dealings with the program: Mail or fax
Table Q8A Page 21.......@8. Satisfaction: 1-866 number
Table Q8B Page 22........@8. Satisfaction: Telephone (NOT including 1-866 toll-free number)
Table Q8C Page 23.......@8. Satisfaction: Email (Trade Routes generic e-mail account)
Table Q8D Page 24.......@8. Satisfaction: Email (specific officer's account
Table Q8E Page 25.......@8. Satisfaction: In-person (includes office visits, events, etc.)
Table Q8F Page 26........@8. Satisfaction: Trade Routes website
Table Q8G Page 27.......@8. Satisfaction: Mail or fax
Table Q9A Page 28........@9. Agreement: Trade Routes staff were knowledgeable and competent
Table Q9B Page 29........@9. Agreement: Trade Routes staff were courteous
Table Q9C Page 30........99. Agreement: Service was provided in a timely manner
Table @9D Page 31........@9. Agreement: You were treated fairly
Table Q9E Page 32........@9. Agreement: You were able to get through to Trade Routes staff without difficulty
Table Q9F Page 33........@9. Agreement: You received service in the official language of your choice (i.e. English or French)
```
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```
table of content
Table Q9G Page 34.......Q9. Agreement: You were informed of everything you had to do in order to get the service
Table Q9H Page 35.......@9. Agreement: The information you received was clear and easy to understand
Table Q9I Page 36.......@9. Agreement: Trade Routes staff went the extra mile to make sure you got what you needed
Table Q10 Page 37.......Q10. How satisfied were you with the overall quality of service you received when using the Trade Routes program during the last 12 months?
Table Q11 Page 38........11. In the end, did you get what you needed?
Table Q12 Page 39.......012. Which of the following offices is responsible for the Market Entry Support service you received?
Table Q13 Page 40........013. In which of the following areas did you need support or assistance?
Table Q14 Page 41.......Q14. Did you participate in any of the following types of initiatives or events?
Table Q15A Page 42......@15. Satisfaction: The knowledge and competence of the staff.
Table 015B Page 43.......015. Satisfaction: The ease of access to the service
Table Q15C Page 44.......Q15. Satisfaction: The timeliness of the service.
Table Q15D Page 45......Q15. Satisfaction: The accuracy of the information you received
Table Q15E Page 46.......@15. Satisfaction: The events/initiatives in which you took part.
Table Q16 Page 47.......@16. Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of service you received regarding Trade Routes' Market Entry Support service during the last 12 months?
Table Q17 Page 48.......Q17. During the past 12 months, were there any problems with the service you received regarding Trade Routes' Market Entry Support service?
Table Q18 Page 49........Q18. What problem(s) did you encounter?
Table Q19 Page 50........Q19. Which of the following offices did you deal with for the In-Market Assistance service?
Table Q20 Page 51.......Q20. In which of the following areas did you need support or assistance?
Table q21 Page 52.......@21. Did you participate in any of the following types of initiatives or events?
Table Q22A Page 53.......Q22. Satisfaction: The knowledge and competence of the staff
Table Q22B Page 54.......022. Satisfaction: The ease of access to the service,
Table Q22C Page 55......@22. Satisfaction: The timeliness of the service,
Table Q22D Page 56.......@22. Satisfaction: The accuracy of the information you received
Table Q22E Page 57.......@22. Satisfaction: The events/initiatives in which you took part.
Table Q23 Page 58.......@23. Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of service you received regarding Trade Routes' In-Market Assistance service during the last 12 months?
Table Q24 Page 59.......@24. During the past 12 months, were there any problems with the service you received regarding Trade Routes' In-Market Assistance service?
Table q25 Page 60........@25. What problem(s) did you encounter?
Table Q26 Page 61.......@26. In which of the following areas did you need support or assistance through the Contributions program?
Table Q27 Page 62........@27. Did you participate in any of the following types of activities or events
Table @28A Page 64.......@28. Satisfaction: The clarity of the information you received.
Table Q28B Page 65.......@28. Satisfaction: The ease-of-use of the application process
Table Q28C Page 66.......Q28. Satisfaction: The transparency of the process.
Table Q28D Page 67.......Q28. Satisfaction: The timeliness of approval process.
Table Q28E Page 68.......228. Satisfaction: The reporting requirements are reasonable and adequately explained.
```
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```
table of content
Table Q28F Page 69.......@28. Satisfaction: The promptness in obtaining answers from HQ staff
Table Q28G Page 70.......Q28. Satisfaction: The knowledge and competence of the staff
Table @28H Page 71.......@28. Satisfaction: The courteousness of the staff
Table Q29 Page 72.......@29. Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of service you received regarding Trade Routes' Contributions Program service during the last 12 months?
Table Q30 Page 73......@30. During the past 12 months, were there any problems with the service you received regarding Trade Routes' Contributions Program service?
Table Q31 Page 74........@31. What problem(s) did you encounter?
Table Q32 Page 75.......@32. What type of research information did you need?
Table Q33A Page 76.......833. Satisfaction: The relevance and usefulness of the research to you/your organization
Table Q33B Page 77......@33. Satisfaction: The comprehensiveness of the research
Table Q33C Page 78.......033. Satisfaction: The clarity and ease of understanding the research
Table Q33D Page 79.......Q33. Satisfaction: The length of the reports and documents
Table Q34 Page 80.......Q34. Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of service you received regarding Trade Routes' Research service during the last 12 months?
Table Q35 Page 81.......Q35. During the past 12 months, were there any problems with the service you received regarding Trade Routes' Research service?
Table Q36 Page 82........Q36. What problem(s) did you encounter
Table Q37 Page 83.......@37 All things considered, how would you rate the overall value or usefulness of the Trade Routes program to your organization?
Table Q38A Page 84.......Q38. Impact: Improving your export readiness.
Table Q38B Page 85.......Q38. Impact: Helping you develop international market(s)
Table Q38C Page 86......Q38. Impact: Building networks/partnerships/contacts
Table Q38D Page 87......Q38. Impact: Providing strategic advice on doing business in one or more international markets.
Table Q38E Page 88.......@38. Impact: Skills development for you/your staff in international business.
Table Q38F Page 89......Q38. Impact: Helping you make informed decisions about where to invest and/or export.
Table Q38G Page 90......Q38. Impact: First-hand/on-line exposure to markets and their business practices.
Table Q39A Page 91.......Q39. Resulted in outcomes: Increased exports of products/services
Table Q39B Page 92.......&39. Resulted in outcomes: Diversified/expanded markets for products/services
Table Q39C Page 93......@39. Resulted in outcomes: Increased trade-related networks/connections
Table Q39D Page 94.......Q39. Resulted in outcomes: Better/increased understanding of international markets
Table Q40A Page 95......Q40. How would you rate the importance of these outcome(s) to your business? Increased exports of products/ services
Table Q40B Page 96......Q40. How would you rate the importance of these outcome(s) to your business? Diversified/expanded markets for products/services
Table Q40C Page 97.......Q40. How would you rate the importance of these outcome(s) to your business? Increased trade-related networks/ connections
Table Q40D Page 98......Q40. How would you rate the importance of these outcome(s) to your business? Better/increased understanding of international markets
Table Q41 Page 99.......Q41. How likely is it that your organization will use the Trade Routes program in future?
Table Q42 Page 100......@42. Market Entry Support service - do you think any of these positions should be relocated?
Table Q43 Page 101......Q43. Which positions should be relocated, and what cities should they be moved to?
Table Q44 Page 102......Q44. In addition to these Trade Commissioners, do you think the number of Cultural Trade Commissioners across Canada should be expanded?
```
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## table of content

Table Q45 Page 103........Q45. In which location(s) should this expansion occur?
Table 246 Page 104.......Q46. In-Market Assistance service. Do you think any of these positions should be relocated?
Table 947 Page $105 \ldots .$. . Q47. Which positions should be relocated, and what cities should they be moved to?
Table 248 Page 106.......248. Do you think the number of Cultural Trade Development Officers should be expanded?
Table 249 Page 107........Q49. In which location(s) should this expansion occur?
Table $Q 50$ Page 109....... 250 . Contributions Program - Are there any changes to the Contributions program that you would like to see carried out?
Table 251 Page $110 \ldots . . . .851$. Research service. Are there any other research activities that you would like to see carried out?
Table 852 Page 111........ 852 . What research activities?
Table 253 Page 112......@53. Do you think that Trade Routes should expand its investment initiatives within the program for those sub-sectors where investment is relevant?
Table 054 Page $113 . \ldots .$. . 254 . If you could offer one suggestion to improve the quality of service you received from the Trade Routes program, what would that be?
Table $\mathbf{Q 5 5}$ Page 114.......Q55. Excluding yourself, how many full-time employees work for your organization in Canada? Please include part-time employees as full-time equivalents
Table 256 Page 115.......Q56. How long has your business or organization been in existence
Table 057 Page 116.......057. In which province/territory are you located? If you are located in more than one province, please identify the location of your main office
Table 258 Page $117 \ldots . . . \mathrm{Q} 58$. What has been the approximate value of your organization's annual revenues from the export of its products or services over the past two years?
Table 259 Page 118........259. Are you a member of any of the following groups?
Table 960 Page $119 \ldots . . .260$. What is your first official language?

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q1. Which of the following best describes the organization you work for?
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CLIENT
Q2. In which area of the arts and cultural sector are you involved?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| TOTAL | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Film/video | 63 | 2 | 31 | 21 | 9 | 15 | 18 | 14 | 16 | 46 | 17 |
|  | 31\% | 25\% | 30\% | 33\% | 39\% | 34\% | 41\% | 26\% | 27\% | 36\% | 23\% |
| Broadcasting/television | 53 | 1 | 23 | 19 | 9 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 13 | 36 | 17 |
|  | 26\% | 12\% | 22\% | 30\% | 39\% | 27\% | 30\% | 28\% | 22\% | 28\% | 23\% |
| Performing arts | 51 | 2 | 23 | 20 | 6 | 7 | 12 | 8 | 24 | 21 | 30 |
|  | 25\% | 25\% | 22\% | 31\% | 26\% | 16\% | 27\% | 15\% | 40\% | 16\% | 41\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | FH |  | J |
| Music/sound recording | 44 | - | 32 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 11 | 15 | 12 | 33 | 11 |
|  | 22\% |  | 30\% | 16\% | 9\% | 14\% | 25\% | 28\% | 20\% | 26\% | 15\% |
|  |  |  | DE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New media | 43 | - | 19 | 17 | 7 | 16 | 8 | 6 | 13 | 34 | 9 |
|  | 21\% |  | 18\% | 27\% | 30\% | 36\% | 18\% | 11\% | 22\% | 27\% | 12\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | H |  |  |  | к |  |
| Visual arts | 29 | 2 | 20 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 10 | 8 | 24 | 5 |
|  | $14 \%$ | 25\% | 19\% | 6\% | $9 \%$ | 16\% | 9\% | 19\% | 13\% | 19\% | 7\% |
|  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |  | K |  |
| Publishing | 26 | 2 | 12 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 12 | 14 |
|  | 13\% | 25\% | 11\% | 14\% | 13\% | 7\% | 11\% | 17\% | 15\% | 9\% | 19\% |
| Design | 23 | 2 | 16 | 5 | - | 12 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 21 | 2 |
|  | 11\% | 25\% | 15\% | 8\% |  | $27 \%$ | 2\% | 11\% | 7\% | 16\% | 3\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | GHI |  |  |  | K |  |
| Crafts | 18 | 1 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 14 | 4 |
|  | $9 \%$ | 12\% | 10\% | 5\% | 9\% | 11\% | 2\% | 9\% | 12\% | 11\% | 5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | G |  |  |
| Heritage | 8 | - | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 2 |
|  | $4 \%$ |  | 4\% | 3\% | 9\% | 2\% | 5\% | 2\% | 7\% | 5\% | 3\% |
| Other | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | 2 | - |
|  | 1\% |  | 1\% | 2\% |  | 2\% |  | 2\% |  | 2\% |  |
| CHI-SQUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## CLIENT

Q3. Familiar: Overall Trade Routes Program

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | тоtal | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Not at all | 3 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | - | - | 2 | 1 |
|  | 1\% |  | 1\% | 2\% | 4\% | 2\% | 5\% |  |  | 2\% | 1\% |
| Only a little | 46 | 3 | 25 | 16 | 1 | 14 | 5 | 18 | 9 | 21 | 25 |
|  | 23\% | 38\% | 24\% | 25\% | 4\% | 32\% | 11\% | 34\% | 15\% | 16\% | 34\% |
|  |  |  | E | E |  | GI |  | GI |  |  | J |
| Moderately familiar | 107 | 4 | 52 | 37 | 14 | 21 | 27 | 24 | 35 | 68 | 39 |
|  | 53\% | 50\% | 50\% | 58\% | 61\% | 48\% | 61\% | 45\% | 58\% | 53\% | 53\% |
| Very familiar | 45 | 1 | 27 | 10 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 16 | 37 | 8 |
|  | 22\% | 12\% | 26\% | 16\% | 30\% | 18\% | 23\% | 21\% | 27\% | 29\% | 11\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHI-SQUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Q3. Familiar: Market Entry Support

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (c) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| тоtal | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Not at all | 18 | - | 8 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 9 |
|  | 9\% |  | $8 \%$ | 11\% | 9\% | 14\% | 7\% | 11\% | 5\% | 7\% | 12\% |
| Only a little | 49 | 3 | 25 | 19 | 2 | 17 | 9 | 12 | 11 | 27 | 22 |
|  | 24\% | 38\% | 24\% | 30\% | 9\% | 39\% | 20\% | 23\% | 18\% | 21\% | 30\% |
|  |  |  | E | E |  | I |  |  |  |  |  |
| Moderately familiar | 84 | 4 | 37 | 29 | 14 | 16 | 16 | 22 | 30 | 50 | 34 |
|  | 42\% | 50\% | 35\% | 45\% | 61\% | 36\% | 36\% | 42\% | 50\% | 39\% | 47\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very familiar | 50 | 1 | 35 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 16 | 13 | 16 | 42 | 8 |
|  | 25\% | 12\% | 33\% | 14\% | 22\% | 11\% | 36\% | 25\% | 27\% | 33\% | 11\% |
|  |  |  | D |  |  |  | F |  | F | K |  |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## CLIENT

Q3. Familiar: In-Market Assistance
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## CLIENT

Q3. Familiar: Contributions
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CLIENT
Q3. Familiar: Research

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | English | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Not at all | 47 | - | 24 | 16 | 6 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 13 | 24 | 23 |
|  | 23\% |  | 23\% | 25\% | 26\% | 34\% | 18\% | 21\% | 22\% | 19\% | 32\% |
| Only a little | 75 | 6 | 37 | 25 | 7 | 19 | 17 | 18 | 21 | 43 | 32 |
|  | 37\% | 75\% | 35\% | 39\% | 30\% | 43\% | 39\% | 34\% | 35\% | 34\% | 44\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Moderately familiar | 58 | 1 | 27 | 22 | 8 | 7 | 14 | 18 | 19 | 43 | 15 |
|  | 29\% | 12\% | 26\% | 34\% | 35\% | 16\% | 32\% | 34\% | 32\% | 34\% | 21\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  | K |  |
| Very familiar | 21 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 18 | 3 |
|  | 10\% | 12\% | 16\% | 2\% | 9\% | 7\% | 11\% | 11\% | 12\% | 14\% | 4\% |
|  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |  | K |  |
| CHI-SQUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Q4. During the last 12 months, has your organization used the Trade Routes program?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | Language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LeSS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (c) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Yes | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Chi-square |  |  | ------ |  | -----> | <-------- | -- | -------- | ------> | <-------- | --------> |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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CLIENT
Q5. How long has your organization used the Trade Routes program?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | Language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | English | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 year or less | 74 | 1 | 44 | 23 | 5 | 19 | 12 | 21 | 22 | 37 | 37 |
|  | 37\% | 12\% | 42\% ${ }_{\text {BE }}$ | 36\% | 22\% | 43\% | 27\% | 40\% | 37\% | 29\% | 51\% |
| 2 years | 34 | - | 14 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 7 | ${ }^{6}$ | 8 | 25 | \% |
|  | 17\% |  | 13\% | 20\% | 30\% | $30 \%$ HI | 16\% | 11\% | 13\% | 20\% | 12\% |
| 3 years | 47 | 2 | 22 | 16 | 7 | 7 | 18 | 12 | 10 | 30 | 17 |
|  | 23\% | 25\% | 21\% | 25\% | 30\% | 16\% | 41\% | 23\% | 17\% | 23\% | 23\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | FI |  |  |  |  |
| 4 years | 16 | 1 | 9 | 6 | - | - | 2 | 5 | 9 | 13 | 3 |
|  | 8\% | 12\% | 9\% | 9\% |  |  | 5\% | $9 \%$ | 15\% | 10\% | 4\% |
| 5 years | 24 | 4 | 13 | 3 | ${ }^{4}$ | 4 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 18 | 6 |
|  | 12\% | 50\% | 12\% | 5\% | 17\% | 9\% | $9 \%$ | 13\% | 15\% | 14\% | $8 \%$ |
| Don't Know | 6 | - | 3 | 3 | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
|  | 3\% |  | 3\% | 5\% |  | 2\% | 2\% | 4\% | 3\% | 4\% | 1\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## CLIENT

Q6. Used during 12 months: Market Entry Support
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## CLIENT

Q6. Used during 12 months: In-Market Assistance

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | English | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Yes | 65 | 3 | 30 | 20 | 11 | 14 | 13 | 17 | 21 | 45 | 20 |
|  | 32\% | 38\% | 29\% | 31\% | 48\% | 32\% | 30\% | 32\% | 35\% | 35\% | 27\% |
| No |  |  | 75 | 44 | 12 | 30 | 31 | 36 | 39 | 83 | 53 |
|  | $68 \%$ | 62\% | 71\% | 69\% | 52\% | 68\% | 70\% | 68\% | 65\% | 65\% | 73\% |
| CHI-SQUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## CLIENT

Q6. Used during 12 months: Contributions
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CLIENT
Q7. Channels used in dealings with the program: 1-866 number
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CLIENT
Q7. Channels used in dealings with the program: Telephone (NOT including 1-866 toll-free number)

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Yes | 94 | 3 | 54 | 29 | 8 | 19 | 25 | 18 | 32 | 71 | 23 |
|  | 47\% | 38\% | 51\% | 45\% | 35\% | 43\% | 57\% | 34\% | 53\% | 55\% | 32\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H |  | H | K |  |
| No | 82 | 5 | 39 | 25 | 12 | 21 | 11 | 28 | 22 | 43 | 39 |
|  | 41\% | 62\% | 37\% | 39\% | 52\% | 48\% | 25\% | 53\% | 37\% | 34\% | 53\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | G |  | G |  |  | J |
| Don't Know/Can't Recall | 25 | - | 12 | 10 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 14 | 11 |
|  | 12\% |  | 11\% | 16\% | 13\% | 9\% | 18\% | 13\% | 10\% | 11\% | 15\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q7. Channels used in dealings with the program: Email (Trade Routes generic e-mail account)

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| тоtal | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Yes | 71 | 5 | 40 | 18 | 7 | 19 | 17 | 23 | 12 | 47 | 24 |
|  | 35\% | 62\% | 38\% | 28\% | 30\% | 43\% | $39 \%$ I | 438 | 20\% | 37\% | 33\% |
| No | $115$ | 2 | 59 |  | 13 | 23 | 26 | 23 | 43 | 71 | 44 |
|  | 57\% | 25\% | 56\% | $\begin{array}{r} 64 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 57\% | 52\% | 59\% | 43\% | 72\% | 55\% | 60\% |
| Don't Know/Can't Recall |  |  | 6 |  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 10 | 5 |
|  | 7\% | 12\% | 6\% | 8\% | 13\% | 5\% | 2\% | $13 \%$ G | 8\% | 8\% | 7\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q7. Channels used in dealings with the program: Email (specific officer's account)


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q7. Channels used in dealings with the program: In-person (includes office visits, events, etc.)


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q7. Channels used in dealings with the program: Trade Routes website


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q7. Channels used in dealings with the program: Mail or fax

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | Language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Yes | 106 | 2 | 57 | 35 | 12 | 17 | 27 | 25 | 37 | 64 | 42 |
|  | 53\% | 25\% | 54\% | 55\% | 52\% | 39\% | 61\% | 47\% | 62\% | 50\% | 58\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  | F |  |  |
| No | 83 | 6 | 41 | 25 | 10 | 24 | 14 | 24 | 21 | 55 | 28 |
|  | 41\% | 75\% | 39\% | 39\% | 43\% | 55\% | 32\% | 45\% | 35\% | 43\% | 38\% |
|  |  | CD |  |  |  | GI |  |  |  |  |  |
| Don't Know/Can't Recall | 12 | - | 7 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 3 |
|  | 6\% |  | 7\% | 6\% | 4\% | 7\% | 7\% | 8\% | 3\% | 7\% | 4\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q8. Satisfaction: 1-866 number


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q8. Satisfaction: Telephone (NOT including 1-866 toll-free number)


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q8. Satisfaction: Email (Trade Routes generic e-mail account)

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (c) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 71 | 5 | 40 | 18 | 7 | 19 | 17 | 23 | 12 | 47 | 24 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1- Very Dissatisfied | 4 | - | 3 | 1 | - | - | 2 | 2 | - | 1 | 3 |
|  | 6\% |  | 8\% | 6\% |  |  | 12\% | $9 \%$ |  | 2\% | 12\% |
| 2 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | - | 4 | 2 |
|  | 8\% | 20\% | 5\% | 11\% | 14\% | 5\% | 12\% | 13\% |  | 9\% | 8\% |
| 3 - Neither | 13 | - | 7 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 5 |
|  | 18\% |  | 18\% | 28\% | 14\% | 26\% | 24\% | 9\% | 17\% | 17\% | 21\% |
| 4 | 22 | 1 | 10 | 8 | 3 | , | 3 | 8 | 5 | 12 | 10 |
|  | 31\% | 20\% | 25\% | 44\% | 43\% | 32\% | 18\% | 35\% | 42\% | 26\% | 42\% |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 19 | 3 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 4 |
|  | 27\% | 60\% | 30\% | 6\% | 29\% | 21\% | 29\% | 22\% | 42\% | 32\% | 17\% |
| Don't Know | 7 | - | 6 | 1 | - | 3 | 1 | 3 | - | 7 | - |
|  | 10\% |  | 15\% | 6\% |  | 16\% | 6\% | 13\% |  | 15\% |  |
| воттом 2 вох | 10 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | - | 5 | 5 |
|  | 14\% | 20\% | 12\% | 17\% | 14\% | 5\% | 24\% | 22\% |  | 11\% | 21\% |
| TOP 2 box | 41 | 4 | 22 | 9 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 13 | 10 | 27 | 14 |
|  | 58\% | 80\% | 55\% | 50\% | 71\% | 53\% | 47\% | 57\% | 83\% | 57\% | 58\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | G |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEAN | 3.7 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 3.4 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q8. Satisfaction: Email (specific officer's account)

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | YEARS IN EXISTENCE |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | тOTAL | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | 26+ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | ( 1 ) | (J) | (K) |
| тоtal | 163 | 5 | 85 | 52 | 20 | 30 | 39 | 41 | 53 | 108 | 55 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1- Very Dissatisfied | 18 | - | 9 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 9 | 9 |
|  | 11\% |  | 11\% | 15\% | 5\% | 7\% | 13\% | 17\% | 8\% | 8\% | 16\% |
| 2 | 8 | - | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 |
|  | 5\% |  | 4\% | 6\% | 10\% | 3\% | 8\% | 5\% | $4 \%$ | 5\% | 5\% |
| 3 - Neither | 10 | - | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 |
|  | 6\% |  | 5\% | 6\% | 15\% | 10\% | 8\% | 5\% | 4\% | 5\% | $9 \%$ |
| 4 | 32 | - | 17 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 13 | 21 | 11 |
|  | 20\% |  | 20\% | 17\% | 30\% | 13\% | 18\% | 20\% | 25\% | 19\% | 20\% |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 93 | 5 | 50 | 29 | 8 | 19 | 21 | 21 | 32 | 66 | 27 |
|  | 57\% | $100 \%$ | 59\% | 56\% | 40\% | 63\% | 54\% | 51\% | 60\% | 61\% | 49\% |
| Don't Know | 2 | - | 2 | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | 2 | - |
|  | 1\% |  | 2\% |  |  | 3\% |  | 2\% |  | 2\% |  |
| воттом 2 вох | 26 | - | 12 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 14 | 12 |
|  | 16\% |  | 14\% | 21\% | 15\% | 10\% | 21\% | 22\% | 11\% | 13\% | 22\% |
| TOP 2 box | 125 | 5 | 67 | 38 | 14 | 23 | 28 | 29 | 45 | 87 | 38 |
|  | 77\% | $100 \%$ | 79\% | 73\% | 70\% | 77\% | 72\% | 71\% | 85\% | 81\% | 69\% |
| CHI-SQUARE <br> <-----------------11.71 <br> -6.88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEAN | 4.1 | 5.0 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 3.8 |
| MEDIAN | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q8. Satisfaction: In-person (includes office visits, events, etc.)

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 105 |  | 51 | 35 | 16 | 21 | 24 | 26 | 34 | 71 | 34 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1- Very Dissatisfied | 7 | - | 5 | 1 | 1 | - | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
|  | 7\% |  | 10\% | 3\% | 6\% |  | 17\% | 8\% | 3\% | 6\% | 9\% |
| 2 | 4 | - | - | 4 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
|  | 4\% |  |  | 11\% |  |  | 4\% | 4\% | 6\% | 4\% | 3\% |
| 3 - Neither | 12 | - | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
|  | 11\% |  | 6\% | 14\% | 25\% | 24\% | 12\% | 12\% | 3\% | 8\% | 18\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | I |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 25 | - | 14 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 13 | 18 | 7 |
|  | 24\% |  | 27\% | 20\% | 25\% | 29\% | 12\% | 12\% | 38\% | 25\% | 21\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | GH |  |  |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 57 | 3 | 29 | 18 | 7 | 10 | 13 | 17 | 17 | 40 | 17 |
|  | 54\% | 100\% | 57\% | 51\% | 44\% | 48\% | 54\% | 65\% | 50\% | 56\% | 50\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| воттом 2 вох | 11 | - | 5 | 5 | 1 | - | 5 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 4 |
|  | 10\% |  | 10\% | 14\% | 6\% |  | 21\% | 12\% | 9\% | 10\% | 12\% |
| TOP 2 box | 82 |  | 43 | 25 | 11 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 30 | 58 | 24 |
|  | 78\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ \mathrm{CDE} \end{gathered}$ | 84\% | 71\% | 69\% | 76\% | 67\% | 77\% | 88\% | 82\% | 71\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  | - 91\%* |  |  |  | $368 *$ |  |
| MEAN | 4.2 | 5.0 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.0 |
| MEDIAN | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 4.5 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q8. Satisfaction: Trade Routes website


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q8. Satisfaction: Mail or fax

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | YEARS IN EXISTENCE |  |  |  | Language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 106 | 2 | 57 | 35 | 12 | 17 | 27 | 25 | 37 | 64 | 42 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1- Very Dissatisfied | 7 | - | 3 | 4 | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
|  | 7\% |  | 5\% | 11\% |  | 6\% | 7\% | 4\% | 8\% | 6\% | 7\% |
| 2 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 |
|  | 1\% |  |  | 3\% |  |  |  | 4\% |  |  | 2\% |
| 3 - Neither | 19 | - | 11 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 7 |
|  | 18\% |  | 19\% | 17\% | 17\% | 18\% | 15\% | 24\% | 16\% | 19\% | 17\% |
| 4 | 40 | 1 | 18 | 15 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 8 | 17 | 22 | 18 |
|  | 38\% | 50\% | 32\% | 43\% | 50\% | 24\% | 41\% | 32\% | 46\% | 34\% | 43\% |
| 5 - Very Satisfied |  | 1 |  |  | 3 | 8 | 10 |  | 9 | 24 | 9 |
|  | 31\% | 50\% | $39 \%$ | 20\% | 25\% | 47\% | 37\% | 24\% | 24\% | 38\% | 21\% |
| Don't Know | 6 | - | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
|  | 6\% |  | 5\% | 6\% | 8\% | 6\% |  | 12\% | 5\% | 3\% | 10\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 8 | - | 3 | 5 | - | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
|  | 8\% |  | 5\% | 14\% |  | 6\% | 7\% | 8\% | 8\% | 6\% | 10\% |
| TOP 2 box | 73 | 2 | 40 | 22 | 9 | 12 | 21 | 14 | 26 | 46 | 27 |
|  | 69\% | $100 \%$ | 70\% | 63\% | 75\% | 71\% | 78\% | 56\% | 70\% | 72\% | 64\% |
| CHI-SQUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE | <------------------8.92-----------------> ${ }_{29}$ |  |  |  |  | <------------------8.92------------------> |  |  |  | <------4.16*------> |  |
| MEAN | 3.9 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.8 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q9. Agreement: Trade Routes staff were knowledgeable and competent

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | YEARS In Existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 192 | 7 | 98 | 64 | 22 | 41 | 44 | 48 | 59 | 123 | 69 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Strongly disagree | , | - | 3 | 4 | - | - | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
|  | 4\% |  | 3\% | 6\% |  |  | 5\% | 6\% | 3\% | 4\% | 3\% |
| 2 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 2 | - | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | 6 | - |
|  | 3\% | 14\% | 3\% | 3\% |  | 5\% | 5\% | 4\% |  | 5\% |  |
| 3 - Neither | 19 | - | 12 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 13 | 6 |
|  | 10\% |  | 12\% | 8\% | 9\% | 7\% | 11\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 9\% |
| 4 | 57 | 1 | 29 | 20 | 7 | 9 | 13 | 18 | 17 | 38 | 19 |
|  | 30\% | 14\% | 30\% | 31\% | 32\% | 22\% | 30\% | 38\% | 29\% | 31\% | 28\% |
| 5 - Strongly agree | 103 | 5 | 51 | 33 | 13 | 27 | 22 | 20 | 34 | 61 | 42 |
|  | 54\% | 71\% | 52\% | 52\% | 59\% | 66\% | 50\% | 42\% | 58\% | 50\% | 61\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | H |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | 9 | 1 | 7 | - | 1 | 3 | - | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
|  | 5\% | 14\% | 7\% |  | 5\% | 7\% |  | 10\% | 2\% | 4\% | 6\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 13 | 1 | 6 | 6 | - | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 11 | 2 |
|  | 7\% | 14\% | 6\% | $9 \%$ |  | 5\% | 9\% | 10\% | 3\% | 9\% | 3\% |
| TOP 2 box | 160 | 6 | 80 | 53 | 20 | 36 | 35 | 38 | 51 | 99 | 61 |
|  | 83\% | 86\% | 82\% | 83\% | 91\% | 88\% | 80\% | 79\% | 86\% | 80\% | 88\% |
| CHI-SQUARE |  | ----- | -----8. | --- | ----- | <----- | ---10. | ----- | - | <--------4 | -------> |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEAN | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.4 |
| MEDIAN | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q9. Agreement: Trade Routes staff were courteous


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q9. Agreement: Service was provided in a timely manner


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q9. Agreement: You were treated fairly

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | Language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | EnGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 187 | 6 | 99 | 60 | 21 | 40 | 42 | 47 | 58 | 121 | 66 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Strongly disagree | 7 | - | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
|  | 4\% |  | 2\% | 7\% | 5\% | 2\% | 2\% | 6\% | 3\% | 4\% | 3\% |
| 2 | 6 | - | 4 | 2 | - | - | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
|  | 3\% |  | 4\% | 3\% |  |  | 7\% | 4\% | 2\% | 3\% | 3\% |
| 3 - Neither | 21 | - | 11 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 9 |
|  | 11\% |  | 11\% | 10\% | 19\% | 8\% | 14\% | 11\% | 12\% | 10\% | 14\% |
| 4 | 57 | 1 | 29 | 17 | 10 | 13 | 5 | 13 | 26 | 38 | 19 |
|  | 30\% | 17\% | 29\% | 28\% | 48\% | 32\% | 12\% | 28\% | 45\% | 31\% | 29\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | G |  |  | G |  |  |
| 5 - Strongly agree | 96 | , | 53 | 31 | ${ }^{6}$ | 23 | 27 | 24 | 22 | 62 | 34 |
|  | 51\% | 83\% | 54\% | 52\% | 29\% | 58\% | 64\% | 51\% | 38\% | 51\% | 52\% |
| N/A | 14 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 7 |
|  | 7\% | 33\% | 6\% | 7\% | 10\% | 10\% | 5\% | 13\% | 3\% | 6\% | 11\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 13 | - | 6 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 4 |
|  | 7\% |  | 6\% | 10\% | 5\% | 2\% | 10\% | 11\% | 5\% | 7\% | 6\% |
| TOP 2 box | 153 | 6 | 82 | 48 | 16 | 36 | 32 | 37 | 48 | 100 | 53 |
|  | 82\% | 100\% | 83\% | 80\% | 76\% | 90\% | 76\% | 79\% | 83\% | 83\% | 80\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE | 50\%* |  |  |  |  | 9 908* |  |  |  | 6\%* |  |
| MEAN | 4.2 | 4.8 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| MEDIAN | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q9. Agreement: You were able to get through to Trade Routes staff without difficulty

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | Language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LeSS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | English | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| тоtal | 187 | 7 | 98 | 61 | 21 | 40 | 41 | 48 | 58 | 121 | 66 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Strongly disagree | 10 | - | 6 | 4 | - | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 |
|  | 5\% |  | 6\% | 7\% |  | 2\% | 7\% | 6\% | 5\% | $4 \%$ | 8\% |
| 2 | 21 | - | 10 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 14 | 7 |
|  | 11\% |  | 10\% | 13\% | 14\% | 12\% | 10\% | 10\% | 12\% | 12\% | 11\% |
| 3 - Neither | 23 | 1 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 10 |
|  | 12\% | 14\% | 12\% | 10\% | 19\% | 15\% | 10\% | 10\% | 14\% | 11\% | 15\% |
| 4 | 53 | 3 | 23 | 18 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 16 | 18 | 36 | 17 |
|  | 28\% | 43\% | 23\% | 30\% | 43\% | 30\% | 17\% | 33\% | 31\% | 30\% | 26\% |
| 5 - Strongly agree | 80 | 3 | 47 | 25 | 5 | 16 | 23 | 19 | 22 | 53 | 27 |
|  | 43\% | 43\% | 48\% | 41\% | 24\% | 40\% | 56\% | 40\% | 38\% | 44\% | 41\% |
|  |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | 14 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 7 |
|  | 7\% | 14\% | 7\% | 5\% | 10\% | 10\% | 7\% | 10\% | 3\% | 6\% | 11\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 31 | - | 16 | 12 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 19 | 12 |
|  | 17\% |  | 16\% | 20\% | 14\% | 15\% | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% | 16\% | 18\% |
| TOP 2 box | 133 | 6 | 70 | 43 | 14 | 28 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 89 | 44 |
|  | 71\% | 86\% | 71\% | 70\% | 67\% | 70\% | 73\% | 73\% | 69\% | 74\% | 67\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE | 3.94 .3 34\%* 3.9 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26\% |  |
| MEAN |  |  |  |  |  | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.8 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q9. Agreement: You received service in the official language of your choice (i.e. English or French)

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | ( $)^{\text {) }}$ | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| TOTAL | 191 | 7 | 102 | 60 | 21 | 40 | 44 | 49 | 58 | 122 | 69 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Strongly disagree | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | - |
|  | 1\% |  |  | $2 \%$ |  |  |  |  | 2\% | 1\% |  |
| 2 | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | - |
|  | 1\% |  | 1\% |  |  |  | 2\% |  |  | 1\% |  |
| 3 - Neither | 4 | - | 1 | 3 | - | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
|  | 2\% |  | 1\% | 5\% |  |  | 5\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 3\% |
| 4 | 25 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 12 | 13 |
|  | 13\% | 29\% | 6\% | 20\% | 24\% | 12\% | 11\% | 16\% | 12\% | 10\% | 19\% |
| 5 - Strongly agree | 160 | 5 | 94 | 44 | 16 | 35 | 36 | 40 | 49 | 106 | 54 |
|  | 84\% | 71\% | 92\% | 73\% | 76\% | 88\% | 82\% | 82\% | 84\% | 87\% | 78\% |
| N/A | 10 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | - | 4 | 2 | 6 | 4 |
|  | 5\% | 14\% | 3\% | 7\% | 10\% | 10\% |  | 8\% | 3\% | 5\% | 6\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | - |
|  | 1\% |  | 1\% | 2\% |  |  | 2\% |  | 2\% | 2\% |  |
| TOP 2 box | 185 | 7 | 100 | 56 | 21 | 40 | 41 | 48 | 56 | 118 | 67 |
|  | 97\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ D \end{gathered}$ | 98\% | 93\% | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ \mathrm{D} \end{array}$ | 100\% | 93\% | 98\% | 97\% | 97\% | 97\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  | $4.948 .7{ }^{25 \% *}$ |  |  |  | <-------4.59-------> |  |
| MEAN | 4.8 | 4.7 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 4.8 |  |  |  | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.8 |
| median | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q9. Agreement: You were informed of everything you had to do in order to get the service

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (c) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 188 | ${ }^{6}$ | 98 | 61 | 22 | 41 | 43 | 47 | 57 | 120 | 68 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Strongly disagree | 8 | - | 3 | 5 | - | - | 2 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 2 |
|  | 4\% |  | 3\% | 8\% |  |  | 5\% | 6\% | 5\% | 5\% | 3\% |
| 2 | 5 | - | 4 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | - |
|  | 3\% |  | 4\% |  | 5\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | $4 \%$ | 4\% |  |
| 3 - Neither | 24 | - | 13 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 18 | 6 |
|  | 13\% |  | 13\% | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | 14\% | 15\% | 9\% | 15\% | 9\% |
| 4 | 52 | 1 | 24 | 19 | 8 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 17 | 32 | 20 |
|  | 28\% | 17\% | 24\% | 31\% | 36\% | 29\% | 23\% | 28\% | 30\% | 27\% | 29\% |
| 5 - Strongly agree | 99 | 5 | 54 | 29 | 10 | 22 | 24 | 23 | 30 | 59 | 40 |
|  | 53\% | 83\% | 55\% | 48\% | 45\% | 54\% | 56\% | 49\% | 53\% | 49\% | 59\% |
|  |  | DE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | 13 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 5 |
|  | 7\% | 33\% | 7\% | 5\% | 5\% | 7\% | 2\% | 13\% | 5\% | 7\% | 7\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 13 | - | 7 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 2 |
|  | 7\% |  | 7\% | 8\% | 5\% | 2\% | 7\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 3\% |
| TOP 2 box | 151 | 6 | 78 | 48 | 18 | 34 | 34 | 36 | 47 | 91 | 60 |
|  | 80\% | 100\% | 80\% | 79\% | 82\% | 83\% | 79\% | 77\% | 82\% | 76\% | 88\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | J |
| CHI-SQUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEAN | 4.2 | 4.8 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 4.4 |
| MEDIAN | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q9. Agreement: The information you received was clear and easy to understand

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 193 | ${ }^{6}$ | 101 | 63 | 22 | 41 | 44 | 49 | 59 | 121 | 72 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Strongly disagree | 8 | - | 4 | 4 | - | - | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
|  | 4\% |  | 4\% | 6\% |  |  | 2\% | $4 \%$ | 8\% | 4\% | 4\% |
| 2 | 17 | - | 11 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 6 |
|  | 9\% |  | 11\% | 6\% | $9 \%$ | 5\% | 18\% | 6\% | 7\% | 9\% | 8\% |
| 3 - Neither | 34 | - | 16 | 15 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 24 | 10 |
|  | 18\% |  | 16\% | 24\% | 14\% | 24\% | 11\% | 18\% | 17\% | 20\% | 14\% |
| 4 | 56 | 1 | 27 | 18 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 18 | 17 | 36 | 20 |
|  | 29\% | 17\% | 27\% | 29\% | 45\% | 24\% | 25\% | 37\% | 29\% | 30\% | 28\% |
| 5 - Strongly agree | 78 | 5 | 43 | 22 | 7 | 19 | 19 | 17 | 23 | 45 | 33 |
|  | 40\% | $\begin{aligned} & 83 \% \\ & \text { CDE } \end{aligned}$ | 43\% | 35\% | 32\% | 46\% | 43\% | 35\% | 39\% | 37\% | 46\% |
| N/A | 8 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | - | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
|  | 4\% | 33\% | 4\% | 2\% | 5\% | 7\% |  | 8\% | 2\% | 6\% | 1\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 25 | - | 15 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 9 | 16 | 9 |
|  | 13\% |  | 15\% | 13\% | $9 \%$ | 5\% | 20\% | 10\% | 15\% | 13\% | 12\% |
| TOP 2 box | 134 | 6 | 70 | 40 | 17 | 29 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 81 | 53 |
|  | 69\% | 100\% | 69\% | 63\% | 77\% | 71\% | 68\% | 71\% | 68\% | 67\% | 74\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE | 59\%* |  |  |  |  | 76\%* |  |  |  | 23\% |  |
| MEAN | 3.9 | 4.8 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 4.0 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q9. Agreement: Trade Routes staff went the extra mile to make sure you got what you needed

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | English | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 190 | 6 | 99 | 63 | 21 | 42 | 43 | 48 | 57 | 121 | 69 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Strongly disagree | 16 | - | 10 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 11 | 5 |
|  | 8\% |  | 10\% | 8\% | 5\% | 7\% | 7\% | 8\% | 11\% | $9 \%$ | 7\% |
| 2 | 16 | - | 8 | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }^{2}$ | 3 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 4 |
|  | 8\% |  | 8\% | 10\% | 10\% | 7\% | 19\% | 6\% | 4\% | 10\% | 6\% |
| 3 - Neither | 37 | 1 | 15 | 14 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 16 | 17 | 20 |
|  | 19\% | 17\% | 15\% | 22\% | 33\% | 14\% | 9\% | 23\% | 28\% | 14\% | 29\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | G |  | J |
| 4 |  | 3 | 25 | 17 | 4 | 13 | 9 | 12 | 15 | 30 | 19 |
|  | 26\% | 50\% | 25\% | 27\% | 19\% | 31\% | 21\% | 25\% | 26\% | 25\% | 28\% |
| 5 - Strongly agree | 72 | 2 | 41 | 21 | 7 | 17 | 19 | 18 | 18 | 51 | 21 |
| S Strongly agree | 38\% | 33\% | 41\% | 33\% | 33\% | 40\% | 44\% | 38\% | 32\% | 42\% | 30\% |
| N/A | 11 |  | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 4 |
|  | 6\% | 33\% | 6\% | 2\% | 10\% | 5\% | 2\% | 10\% | 5\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 32 | - | 18 | 11 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 23 | 9 |
|  | 17\% |  | 18\% | 17\% | 14\% | 14\% | 26\% | 15\% | 14\% | 19\% | 13\% |
| TOP 2 box | 121 | 5 | 66 | 38 | 11 | 30 | 28 | 30 | 33 | 81 | 40 |
|  | 64\% | 83\% | 67\% | 60\% | 52\% | 71\% | 65\% | 62\% | 58\% | 67\% | 58\% |
| Chi-square |  | ------- | ----7 |  |  |  | ---15. | -- |  | <--------7. | 2-------> |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  | 76 |  |  | 90 |  |
| mean | 3.8 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.8 | $3.8$ | 3.6 | 3.8 | 3.7 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q10. How satisfied were you with the overall quality of service you received when using the Trade Routes program during the last 12 months?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q11. In the end, did you get what you needed?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Yes | 93 | 6 | 50 | 27 | 9 | 18 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 62 | 31 |
|  | 46\% | 75\% | 48\% | 42\% | 39\% | 41\% | 55\% | 47\% | 43\% | 48\% | 42\% |
| No | 23 | 1 | 11 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 11 | 12 |
|  | 11\% | 12\% | 10\% | 16\% | 4\% | 7\% | 14\% | 15\% | 10\% | 9\% | 16\% |
| You got part of what you | 75 | - | 39 | 23 | 13 | 20 | 13 | 18 | 24 | 47 | 28 |
| needed | 37\% |  | 37\% | 36\% | 57\% | 45\% | 30\% | 34\% | 40\% | 37\% | 38\% |
| Don't Know | 10 | 1 | 5 | 4 | - | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 2 |
|  | 5\% | 12\% | 5\% | 6\% |  | 7\% | 2\% | 4\% | 7\% | 6\% | 3\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q12. Which of the following offices is responsible for the Market Entry Support service you received?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LeSS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 82 | 3 | 49 | 21 | 8 | 19 | 20 | 22 | 21 | 58 | 24 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Headquarters | 24 | 1 | 13 | 6 | 4 | 6 |  | 3 | 9 | 20 | 4 |
|  | 29\% | 33\% | 27\% | 29\% | 50\% | 32\% | 30\% | 14\% | 43\% | 34\% | 17\% |
| Montreal | 24 | 1 | 11 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 21 |
|  | 29\% | 33\% | 22\% | 38\% | 38\% | 21\% | 35\% | 23\% | 38\% | 5\% | 88\% |
| Toronto | 18 | - | 13 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 18 | - |
|  | 22\% |  | 27\% | 14\% | 25\% | 16\% | 30\% | 23\% | 19\% | 31\% |  |
| Vancouver | 13 | - | 7 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 13 | - |
|  | 16\% |  | 14\% | 24\% | 12\% | 32\% | 10\% | 14\% | 10\% | 22\% |  |
| St. John's | 7 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | - |
|  | 9\% | 33\% | 8\% | 5\% | 12\% |  | 5\% | $9 \%$ | 19\% | 12\% |  |
| Winnipeg | 5 | - | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 2 | 3 | 5 | - |
|  | 6\% |  | 6\% | 5\% | 12\% |  |  | $9 \%$ | 14\% | 9\% |  |
| Moncton | 3 | - | 2 | - | 1 | - | - | 2 | 1 | 3 | - |
|  | 4\% |  | $4 \%$ |  | 12\% |  |  | $9 \%$ | 5\% | 5\% |  |
| Don't Know | 9 | - | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | - | 7 | 2 |
|  | 11\% |  | 12\% | 10\% | 12\% | 16\% | 10\% | 18\% |  | 12\% | 8\% |
| CHI-SQUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q13. In which of the following areas did you need support or assistance?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q14. Did you participate in any of the following types of initiatives or events?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | YEARS IN EXISTENCE |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 82 | 3 | 49 | 21 | 8 | 19 | 20 | 22 | 21 | 58 | 24 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| International trade show | 39 | - | 23 | 11 | 5 | 7 | 15 | 9 | 8 | 25 | 14 |
|  | 48\% |  | 47\% | 52\% | 62\% | 37\% | FHI | 41\% | 38\% | 43\% | 58\% |
| Information session | 38 | - | 25 | 9 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 24 | 14 |
|  | 46\% |  | 51\% | 43\% | 50\% | 42\% | 50\% | 45\% | 48\% | 41\% | 58\% |
| Networking event | 23 | - | 14 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 16 | 7 |
|  | 28\% |  | 29\% | 29\% | 38\% | 21\% | 30\% | 23\% | 38\% | 28\% | 29\% |
| Trade mission (organized | 21 | 1 | 12 | 7 | - | 6 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 17 | 4 |
| by Trade Routes) | 26\% | 33\% | 24\% | 33\% |  | 32\% | 20\% | 32\% | 19\% | 29\% | 17\% |
| Incoming trade mission | 15 | - | 9 | 6 | - | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 2 |
|  | 18\% |  | 18\% | 29\% |  | 16\% | 20\% | 18\% | 19\% | 22\% | 8\% |
| Matchmaking event | $10$ | - | 8 |  | - | 1 | 3 |  | 2 | 9 | 1 |
|  | 12\% |  | 16\% | 10\% |  | 5\% | 15\% | 18\% | 10\% | 16\% | 4\% |
| Training session | 5 | - | 4 | - | 1 | - | - |  | 2 | 5 | - |
|  | 6\% |  | 8\% |  | 12\% |  |  | 14\% | 10\% | 9\% |  |
| Pre-market training | 4 | - | 3 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
|  | 5\% |  | 6\% |  | 12\% |  | 5\% | 5\% | 10\% | 5\% | 4\% |
| No, did not participate in any of these | 11 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 3 |
|  | 13\% | $67 \%$ | 8\% | 19\% | 12\% | 11\% | 15\% | 9\% | 19\% | 14\% | 12\% |
| Don't Know | 3 | - | 3 | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 3 | - |
|  | 4\% |  | 6\% |  |  | 5\% |  | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% |  |
| CHI-SQUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q15. Satisfaction: The knowledge and competence of the staff

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | Language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 77 | 3 | 44 | 21 | 8 | 15 | 20 | 21 | 21 | 54 | 23 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2 | 2 | - | 2 | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - |
|  | 3\% |  | 5\% |  |  |  | 10\% |  |  | 4\% |  |
| 3 - Neither | 8 | - | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 1 |
|  | 10\% |  | 11\% | 10\% | 12\% | 7\% | 15\% | 10\% | 10\% | 13\% | 4\% |
| 4 | 26 | - | 15 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 16 | 10 |
|  | 34\% |  | 34\% | 38\% | 38\% | 40\% | 30\% | 29\% | 38\% | 30\% | 43\% |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 41 | 3 | 22 | 11 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 13 | 11 | 29 | 12 |
|  | 53\% | $100 \%$ | 50\% | 52\% | 50\% | 53\% | 45\% | 62\% | 52\% | $54 \%$ | 52\% |
| N/A | 5 | - | 5 | - | - | 4 | - | 1 | - | 4 | 1 |
|  | 6\% |  | 11\% |  |  | 27\% |  | 5\% |  | 7\% | 4\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 2 | - | 2 | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - |
|  | 3\% |  | 5\% |  |  |  | 10\% |  |  | 4\% |  |
| TOP 2 box | 67 | 3 | 37 | 19 | 7 | 14 | 15 | 19 | 19 | 45 | 22 |
|  | 87\% | 100\% | 84\% | 90\% | 88\% | 93\% | 75\% | 90\% | 90\% | 83\% | 96\% |
| CHI-SQUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNificance |  |  | 2\%* |  |  | 17\%* |  |  |  | 43\%* |  |
| MEAN | 4.4 | 5.0 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.5 |
| MEDIAN | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q15. Satisfaction: The ease of access to the service


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q15. Satisfaction: The timeliness of the service

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | Language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | тOTAL | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LeSS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 77 | 3 | 44 | 21 | 8 | 15 | 20 | 21 | 21 | 54 | 23 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Very Dissatisfied | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | - |
|  | 3\% |  | 2\% | 5\% |  |  |  | 5\% | 5\% | 4\% |  |
| 2 | 5 | - | 4 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
|  | 6\% |  | 9\% | 5\% |  |  | 5\% | 10\% | 10\% | 6\% | $9 \%$ |
| 3 - Neither | 12 | - | 6 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 5 | - | 3 | 10 | 2 |
|  | 16\% |  | 14\% | 24\% | 12\% | 27\% | 25\% |  | 14\% | 19\% | $9 \%$ |
| 4 | 31 | - | 18 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 21 | 10 |
|  | 40\% |  | 41\% | 43\% | 50\% | 40\% | 35\% | 48\% | 38\% | 39\% | 43\% |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 27 | 3 | 15 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 18 | 9 |
|  | 35\% | 100\% | 34\% | 24\% | 38\% | 33\% | 35\% | 38\% | 33\% | 33\% | 39\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | 5 | - | 5 | - | - | 4 | - | 1 | - | 4 | 1 |
|  | 6\% |  | 11\% |  |  | 27\% |  | 5\% |  | 7\% | 4\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 7 | - | 5 | 2 | - | - | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 |
|  | 9\% |  | 11\% | 10\% |  |  | 5\% | 14\% | 14\% | $9 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| TOP 2 box | 58 | 3 | 33 | 14 | 7 | 11 | 14 | 18 | 15 | 39 | 19 |
|  | 75\% | 100\% | 75\% | 67\% | 88\% | 73\% | 70\% | 86\% | 71\% | 72\% | 83\% |
|  |  | CD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chi-square |  | ------ | -----9. | -------- | -----> | - | ------9. | 5------- | - | <--------2. | 33-------> |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mean | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 4.1 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q15. Satisfaction: The accuracy of the information you received

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 77 | 3 | 44 | 21 | 8 | 15 | 20 | 21 | 21 | 54 | 23 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2 | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | - |
|  | 1\% |  | 2\% |  |  |  | 5\% |  |  | 2\% |  |
| 3 - Neither | 11 | - | 6 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 1 |
|  | 14\% |  | 14\% | 19\% | 12\% | 20\% | 20\% | 10\% | 10\% | 19\% | 4\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | к |  |
| 4 | 30 | - | 15 | 11 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 13 | 18 | 12 |
|  | 39\% |  | 34\% | 52\% | 50\% | 33\% | 30\% | 29\% | 62\% | 33\% | 52\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | GH |  |  |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 35 | 3 | 22 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 13 | 6 | 25 | 10 |
|  | 45\% | 100\% | 50\% | 29\% | 38\% | 47\% | 45\% | 62\% | 29\% | 46\% | 43\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  | I |  |  |  |
| N/A | 5 | - | 5 | - | - | 4 | - | 1 | - | 4 | 1 |
|  | 6\% |  | 11\% |  |  | 27\% |  | 5\% |  | 7\% | 4\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | - |
|  | 1\% |  | 2\% |  |  |  | 5\% |  |  | 2\% |  |
| TOP 2 box | 65 | 3 | 37 | 17 | 7 | 12 | 15 | 19 | 19 | 43 | 22 |
|  | 84\% | 100\% | 84\% | 81\% | 88\% | 80\% | 75\% | 90\% | 90\% | 80\% | 96\% |
|  |  | CD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | J |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE | <------------------7.77-----------------> |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62\%* |  |
| MEAN | 4.3 | 5.0 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.4 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Client
Q15. Satisfaction: The events/initiatives in which you took part.

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (c) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 70 | 2 | 40 | 19 | 8 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 16 | 49 | 21 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Very Dissatisfied | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | - |
|  | 1\% |  | 2\% |  |  | 6\% |  |  |  | 2\% |  |
| 2 | 4 | - | 4 | - | - | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | 3 | 1 |
|  | 6\% |  | 10\% |  |  | 6\% | 11\% |  | 6\% | 6\% | 5\% |
| 3 - Neither | 9 | - | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 |
|  | 13\% |  | 10\% | 21\% | 12\% | 12\% | 17\% | 10\% | 12\% | 14\% | 10\% |
| 4 | 25 | 1 | 14 | 7 | 3 |  | 3 | 8 | 8 | 17 | 8 |
|  | 36\% | 50\% | 35\% | 37\% | 38\% | 38\% | 17\% | 40\% | 50\% | 35\% | 38\% |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 31 | 1 | 17 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 21 | 10 |
|  | 44\% | 50\% | 42\% | 42\% | 50\% | 38\% | 56\% | 50\% | 31\% | 43\% | 48\% |
| N/A | 12 | 1 | 9 | 2 | - | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 3 |
|  | 17\% | 50\% | 22\% | 11\% |  | 19\% | 11\% | 10\% | 31\% | 18\% | 14\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 5 | - | 5 | - | - | 2 | 2 | - | 1 | 4 | 1 |
|  | 7\% |  | 12\% |  |  | 12\% | 11\% |  | 6\% | 8\% | 5\% |
| top 2 box | 56 | 2 | 31 | 15 | 7 | 12 | 13 | 18 | 13 | 38 | 18 |
|  | 80\% | $100 \%$ | 78\% | 79\% | 88\% | 75\% | 72\% | 90\% | 81\% | 78\% | 86\% |
| CHI-SQUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE | 5\%* |  |  |  |  | 39\%* |  |  |  | 7\%* |  |
| MEAN | 4.2 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.3 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q16. Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of service you received regarding Trade Routes' Market Entry Support service during the last 12 months?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q17. During the past 12 months, were there any problems with the service you received regarding Trade Routes' Market Entry Support service?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q18. What problem(s) did you encounter?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 10 | - | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 2 |
|  | 100 |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Timeliness of service | 5 | - | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | 4 | 5 | - |
|  | 50\% |  | 50\% | 33\% | $\underset{\mathrm{CD}}{100 \%}$ |  | 33\% |  | 80\% | 62\% |  |
| Lack of/incomplete | 4 | - | 3 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| information | 40\% |  | 50\% |  | 100\% | 100\% | 33\% |  | 40\% | 38\% | 50\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | c | GI |  |  |  |  |  |
| Difficulty accessing/ | 3 | - | 3 | - | - | - | 2 | - | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| contacting Cultural | 30\% |  | 50\% |  |  |  | 67\% |  | 20\% | 25\% | 50\% |
| Trade Commissioner |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Received inconsistent | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| information | 20\% |  | 17\% | 33\% |  |  | 33\% |  | 20\% | 12\% | 50\% |
| Lack of courtesy/ | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | - |
| responsiveness | 10\% |  | 17\% |  |  |  | 33\% |  |  | 12\% |  |
| Other | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | - |
|  | 20\% |  | 17\% | 33\% |  |  |  | 100\% | 20\% | 25\% |  |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q19. Which of the following offices did you deal with for the In-Market Assistance service?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 56 | 3 | 24 | 20 | 9 | 12 | 11 | 15 | 18 | 37 | 19 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| New York | 18 | - | 10 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 14 | 4 |
|  | 32\% |  | 42\% | 25\% | 33\% | 17\% | 36\% | 33\% | 39\% | 38\% | 21\% |
| Shanghai | 15 | - | 7 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 6 |
|  | 27\% |  | 29\% | 35\% | 11\% | 25\% | 45\% | 27\% | 17\% | 24\% | 32\% |
| Los Angeles | 14 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 4 |
|  | 25\% | 33\% | 25\% | 25\% | 22\% | 42\% | 18\% | 27\% | 17\% | 27\% | 21\% |
| London | 13 | - | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | - | 4 | 6 | 10 | 3 |
|  | 23\% |  | 21\% | 20\% | 44\% | 25\% |  | 27\% | 33\% | 27\% | 16\% |
| Paris | 9 | - | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 |
|  | 16\% |  | 21\% | 10\% | 22\% | 8\% | 27\% | 13\% | 17\% | 5\% | 37\% |
| Don't Know | 14 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 4 |
|  | 25\% | 67\% | 17\% | 25\% | 33\% | 33\% | 9\% | 33\% | 22\% | 27\% | 21\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q20. In which of the following areas did you need support or assistance?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 56 | 3 | 24 | 20 | 9 | 12 | 11 | 15 | 18 | 37 | 19 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Networking opportunities | 37 | 2 | 15 | 14 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 11 | 27 | 10 |
|  | 66\% | 67\% | 62\% | 70\% | 67\% | 83\% | 73\% | 53\% | 61\% | 73\% | 53\% |
| Information on local organizations | 30 | 1 | 12 | 13 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 20 | 10 |
|  | 54\% | 33\% | 50\% | 65\% | 44\% | 58\% | 64\% | 40\% | 56\% | 54\% | 53\% |
| Market access issues/ advocacy | 28 | 2 | 13 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 22 | 6 |
|  | 50\% | 67\% | 54\% | 40\% | 56\% | $75 \%$ | 45\% | 40\% | 44\% | 59\% | 32\% |
| Visit information | 26 | 1 | 9 | 12 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 19 | 7 |
|  | 46\% | 33\% | 38\% | 60\% | 44\% | 67\% | 45\% | 27\% | 50\% | 51\% | 37\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | н |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market research | 18 | - | 8 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 13 | 5 |
|  | 32\% |  | 33\% | 25\% | 56\% | 42\% | 27\% | 33\% | 28\% | 35\% | 26\% |
| Other | 2 | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | $4 \%$ |  | $4 \%$ |  | 11\% |  |  | 7\% | 6\% | 3\% | 5\% |
| Don't Know | 2 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | 4\% | 33\% |  |  | 11\% |  |  | 7\% | 6\% | 3\% | 5\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q21. Did you participate in any of the following types of initiatives or events?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q22. Satisfaction: The knowledge and competence of the staff

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 54 | 1 | 24 | 20 | 9 | 12 | 11 | 14 | 17 | 36 | 18 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Very Dissatisfied | 3 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
|  | 6\% |  | $8 \%$ | 5\% |  |  | $9 \%$ | 7\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| 2 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 |
|  | 4\% |  | 4\% | 5\% |  | 8\% | 9\% |  |  | 3\% | 6\% |
| 3 - Neither | 6 | - | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
|  | 11\% |  | 12\% | 10\% | 11\% | 8\% | 18\% | 7\% | 12\% | 8\% | 17\% |
| 4 | 20 | - | 5 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 10 |
|  | 37\% |  | 21\% | 40\% | 78\% | 42\% | 27\% | 43\% | 35\% | $28 \%$ | 56\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | CD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 23 | 1 | 13 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 20 | 3 |
|  | 43\% | 100\% | 54\% | 40\% | 11\% | 42\% | 36\% | 43\% | 47\% | $56 \%$ | 17\% |
|  |  | CDE | E |  |  |  |  |  |  | K |  |
| N/A | 2 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | $4 \%$ | 200\% |  |  |  |  |  | 7\% | 6\% | 3\% | 6\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 5 | - | 3 | 2 | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
|  | $9 \%$ |  | 12\% | 10\% |  | 8\% | 18\% | 7\% | 6\% | 8\% | 11\% |
| TOP 2 box | 43 | 1 | 18 | 16 | 8 | 10 | 7 | 12 | 14 | 30 | 13 |
|  | 80\% | 100\% | 75\% | 80\% | 89\% | 83\% | 64\% | 86\% | 82\% | 83\% | 72\% |
|  |  | CD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE | 50\%* |  |  |  |  | 58\%* ${ }^{\text {5\% }}$ |  |  |  | 90\%* |  |
| MEAN | 4.1 | 5.0 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.7 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Client
Q22. Satisfaction: The ease of access to the service


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q22. Satisfaction: The timeliness of the service


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Client
Q22. Satisfaction: The accuracy of the information you received

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 54 | 1 | 24 | 20 | 9 | 12 | 11 | 14 | 17 | 36 | 18 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Very Dissatisfied | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 |
|  | 2\% |  | $4 \%$ |  |  |  |  | 7\% |  |  | 6\% |
| 2 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | - |
|  | 4\% |  | $4 \%$ | 5\% |  |  | $9 \%$ |  | 6\% | 6\% |  |
| 3 - Neither | 10 | - | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 4 |
|  | 19\% |  | 17\% | 20\% | 22\% | 8\% | 18\% | 29\% | 18\% | 17\% | 22\% |
| 4 | 16 | - | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 9 |
|  | 30\% |  | 17\% | 30\% | 67\% | 42\% | 36\% | 14\% | 29\% | 19\% | 50\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | c |  |  |  |  |  | J |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 25 | 1 | 14 | 9 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 21 | 4 |
|  | $46 \%$ | 100\% | 58\% | 45\% | 11\% | 50\% | 36\% | 50\% | 47\% | 58\% | 22\% |
|  |  | CDE | E | E |  |  |  |  |  | K |  |
| N/A | 2 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | $4 \%$ | 200\% |  |  |  |  |  | 7\% | 6\% | 3\% | 6\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 3 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
|  | 6\% |  | 8\% | 5\% |  |  | 9\% | 7\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| TOP 2 box | 41 | 1 | 18 | 15 | 7 | 11 | 8 | 9 | 13 | 28 | 13 |
|  | 76\% | $100 \%$ | 75\% | 75\% | 78\% | 92\% | 73\% | 64\% | 76\% | 78\% | 72\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHI-SQUARESIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEAN | 4.1 | 5.0 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 4.4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 3.8 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 |

## Canadian Heritage－Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey－Client Version

Q22．Satisfaction：The events／initiatives in which you took part．

|  | \＃employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1－5 | 6－25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6－10 | 11－20 | ＞20 | English | FRENCH |
|  | （A） | （B） | （c） | （D） | （E） | （F） | （G） | （H） | （1） | （J） | （K） |
| total | $\begin{array}{r} 47 \\ 100 \end{array}$ | r ${ }^{1}$ | 22 100 | 16 100 | 8 100 | 9 100 | 11 100 | 12 100 | 15 100 | 32 100 | 15 100 |
| 1 －Very Dissatisfied | 2\％ | － | 5\％ | － | － | － | － | 8\％ | － | － | 1 $7 \%$ |
| 3 －Neither | 19\％ | － | 23\％ | 12\％ | 25\％ | 11\％ | \％${ }_{\text {2 }}$ | 33\％ | 13\％ | 25\％${ }^{8}$ | 7\％ |
| 4 | 13 $28 \%$ | － | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ 18 \% \end{array}$ | 38\％ | 38\％ | 4 $44 \%$ | 4 $36 \%$ | 17\％ | 20\％ | 25\％ | 33\％ |
| 5 －Very Satisfied | 24 $51 \%$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 100 \frac{1}{8} \\ \text { CDE } \end{array}$ | 12 | 50\％ | 3 $38 \%$ | 4 $44 \%$ | 45\％ | 42\％ | 10 $67 \%$ | 16 $50 \%$ | 53\％${ }^{8}$ |
| N／A | r98 | 200\％ | 98 | 25\％ | 12\％ | 33\％ | － | 25\％ | 20\％ | 5 $16 \%$ | 4 $27 \%$ |
| воттом 2 вох | 2\％ | － | 518 | － | － | － | － | 1 $8 \%$ | － | － | 7\％ |
| TOP 2 box | 37 $79 \%$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 100 \% \\ \mathrm{C} \end{array}$ | 16 $73 \%$ | 14 $88 \%$ | 75\％${ }^{6}$ | 89\％ | 82\％${ }^{9}$ | \％${ }^{7}$ | 13 $87 \%$ | 24 $75 \%$ | 13 $87 \%$ |
| CHI－SQUARE SIGNIFICANCE |  | －ーーーーーー | $\begin{array}{r} --4 . \\ 3 \% \end{array}$ |  |  | ＜－－－－－－－－－ | －－7． | *---- | --> | $\text { <-------4. } 62$ | －－－－－－－＞ |
| MEAN | 4.3 | 5.0 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 4.3 | $3.8$ | 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.3 |
| MEDIAN | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | $4.0$ | $5.0$ | 4.5 | 5.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q23. Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of service you received regarding Trade Routes' In-Market Assistance service during the last 12 months?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q24. During the past 12 months, were there any problems with the service you received regarding Trade Routes' In-Market Assistance service?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q25. What problem(s) did you encounter?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q26. In which of the following areas did you need support or assistance through the Contributions program?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LeSS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 113 | 1 | 58 | 38 | 15 | 23 | 22 | 29 | 39 | 70 | 43 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| International market | 105 | 1 | 53 | 37 | 13 | 20 | 21 | 27 | 37 | 63 | 42 |
| development | 93\% | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ C \end{array}$ | 91\% | 97\% | 87\% | 87\% | 95\% | 93\% | 95\% | 90\% | 98\% |
| Export preparedness | 35 | - | 18 | 13 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 14 | 27 | 8 |
|  | 31\% |  | 31\% | 34\% | 27\% | 26\% | 36\% | 24\% | 36\% | 39\% | 19\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | к |  |
| Don't Know | 3 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 3 | - |
|  | 3\% |  | 3\% |  | 7\% | 4\% |  | 3\% | 3\% | 4\% |  |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Client
Q27. Did you participate in any of the following types of activities or events

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | YEARS IN EXISTENCE |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ======= | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | ( $)^{\text {) }}$ | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 113 | 1 | 58 | 38 | 15 | 23 | 22 | 29 | 39 | 70 | 43 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Attending international | 82 | - | 41 | 31 | 10 | 19 | 17 | 20 | 26 | 51 | 31 |
| trade shows/visits to new markets | 73\% |  | 71\% | 82\% | 67\% | 83\% | 77\% | 69\% | 67\% | 73\% | 72\% |
| Incoming and outgoing trade/buyers missions | 39 | 1 | 15 | 15 | 7 |  | 6 | 12 | 16 | 28 | 11 |
|  | 35\% | 100\% | 26\% | 39\% | 47\% | 22\% | 27\% | 41\% | 41\% | 40\% | 26\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Development of new | 38 | - | 19 | 14 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 13 | 28 | 10 |
| alliances and financial | 34\% |  | 33\% | 37\% | 27\% | 13\% | 41\% | 45\% | 33\% | 40\% | 23\% |
| partnering |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | F | F |  |  |
| Development of marketing strategies | 38 | - | 21 | 13 |  | 6 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 30 | 8 |
|  | 34\% |  | 36\% | 34\% | 27\% | 26\% | 45\% | 34\% | 31\% | 43\% | 19\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | к |  |
| Providing market | 37 | - | 18 | 14 |  | 5 | 9 | 9 | 14 | 29 | 8 |
| information and market services | 33\% |  | 31\% | 37\% | 33\% | 22\% | 41\% | 31\% | 36\% | 41\% | 19\% |
| Providing strategic support at key trade shows | 35 | - | 16 | 16 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 13 | 24 | 11 |
|  | 31\% |  | 28\% | 42\% | 20\% | 30\% | 32\% | 28\% | 33\% | 34\% | 26\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| innovative advertising <br> tools and approaches | 33 | - | 20 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 11 | 19 | 14 |
|  | 29\% |  | 34\% | 21\% | 33\% | 30\% | 36\% | 24\% | 28\% | 27\% | 33\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conducting business networking at international events | 29 | - | 14 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 23 | 6 |
|  | 26\% |  | 24\% | 26\% | 33\% | 17\% | 36\% | 24\% | 26\% | 33\% | 14\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | K |  |
| Professional development in international business | 28 | - | 11 | 13 | \% | 2 | 4 | 7 | 15 | 19 | 9 |
|  | 25\% |  | 19\% | 34\% | 27\% | $9 \%$ | 18\% | 24\% | 38\% | 27\% | 21\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  |
| First-hand, online exposure to markets outside Canada | 28 | - | 14 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 14 | 22 | 6 |
|  | 25\% |  | 24\% | 24\% | 33\% | 13\% | 27\% | 17\% | $36 \%$ $F$ | 31\% | 14\% |
| Developing innovative inmarket tools | 17 | - |  | 6 | 3 | - | 3 | 7 | 7 | 15 | 2 |
|  | 15\% |  | 14\% | 16\% | 20\% |  | 14\% | 24\% | 18\% | 21\% | 5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | к |  |
| Undertaking feasibility studies | 7 | - | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 2 |
|  | 6\% |  | 5\% | 8\% | 7\% | 4\% | 5\% | 3\% | 10\% | 7\% | 5\% |
| Other | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | 1 |
|  | 1\% |  |  | 3\% |  |  |  |  | 3\% |  | 2\% |
| in any of these | 45 | 1 | 23 | 15 | 6 | 11 | 8 | 11 | 15 | 25 | 20 |
|  | 40\% | 100\% | 40\% | 39\% | 40\% | 48\% | 36\% | 38\% | 38\% | 36\% | 47\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q27. Did you participate in any of the following types of activities or events


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Client
Q28. Satisfaction: The clarity of the information you received.

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 111 | 1 | 57 | 37 | 15 | 22 | 22 | 28 | 39 | 68 | 43 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Very Dissatisfied | 6 | - | 5 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
|  | 5\% |  | $9 \%$ | 3\% |  |  | 5\% | 14\% | 3\% | 4\% | 7\% |
| 2 | 7 | - | 5 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 2 |
|  | 6\% |  | $9 \%$ | 3\% | 7\% |  | 5\% | 4\% | 13\% | 7\% | 5\% |
| 3 - Neither | 13 | - | 2 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 6 |
|  | 12\% |  | 4\% | 19\% | 27\% | 23\% | 5\% | 11\% | 10\% | 10\% | 14\% |
| 4 | 49 | - | 26 | 16 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 17 | 31 | 18 |
|  | 44\% |  | 46\% | 43\% | 47\% | 45\% | 45\% | 43\% | 44\% | 46\% | 42\% |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 36 | 1 | 19 | 12 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 12 | 22 | 14 |
|  | 32\% | $100 \%$ | 33\% | 32\% | 20\% | 32\% | 41\% | 29\% | 31\% | 32\% | 33\% |
| N/A | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | 2 | - |
|  | 2\% |  | 2\% | 3\% |  | 5\% |  | 4\% |  | 3\% |  |
| воттом 2 вох | 13 | - | 10 | 2 | 1 | - | 2 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 5 |
|  | 12\% |  | 18\% | 5\% | 7\% |  | $9 \%$ | 18\% | 15\% | 12\% | 12\% |
| TOP 2 box | 85 | 1 | 45 | 28 | 10 | 17 | 19 | 20 | 29 | 53 | 32 |
|  | 77\% | 100\% | 79\% | 76\% | 67\% | 77\% | 86\% | 71\% | 74\% | 78\% | 74\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Significance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9\%* |  |
| MEAN | 3.9 | 5.0 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q28. Satisfaction: The ease-of-use of the application process


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

|  | total | \# employees |  |  |  | YEARS IN EXISTENCE |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (c) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 108 | 1 | 56 | 35 | 15 | 22 | 22 | 27 | 37 | 68 | 40 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Very Dissatisfied | 13 | - | 7 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 6 |
|  | 12\% |  | 12\% | 6\% | 27\% | 14\% | 9\% | 15\% | 11\% | 10\% | 15\% |
| 2 | 17 | - | 11 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 15 | 2 |
|  | 16\% |  | 20\% | 11\% | 13\% | 9\% | 5\% | 26\% | 19\% | 22\% | 5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | G |  | к |  |
| 3 - Neither | 23 | - | 8 | 13 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 12 | 11 |
|  | 21\% |  | 14\% | 37\% | 13\% | 27\% | 27\% | 15\% | 19\% | 18\% | 28\% |
|  |  |  |  | CE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 31 | - | 17 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 20 | 11 |
|  | 29\% |  | 30\% | 26\% | 33\% | 27\% | 36\% | 30\% | 24\% | 29\% | 28\% |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 24 | 1 | 13 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 14 | 10 |
|  | 22\% | 100\% | 23\% | 20\% | 13\% | 23\% | 23\% | 15\% | 27\% | 21\% | 25\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | 5 | - | 2 | 3 | - | 1 | - | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
|  | 5\% |  | 4\% | 9\% |  | 5\% |  | 7\% | 5\% | 3\% | 8\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 30 | - | 18 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 11 | 11 | 22 | 8 |
|  | 28\% |  | 32\% | 17\% | 40\% | 23\% | 14\% | 41\% | 30\% | 32\% | 20\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | G |  |  |  |
| TOP 2 box | 55 | 1 | 30 | 16 | 7 | 11 | 13 | 12 | 19 | 34 | 21 |
|  | 51\% | 100\% | 54\% | 46\% | 47\% | 50\% | 59\% | 44\% | 51\% | 50\% | 52\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  | 76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \%* |
| MEAN | 3.3 | 5.0 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 2.9 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.4 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 105 | 1 | 53 | 36 | 14 | 20 | 22 | 25 | 38 | 65 | 40 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Very Dissatisfied | 41 | - | 20 | 11 | 10 | 8 | 6 | 11 | 16 | 26 | 15 |
|  | 39\% |  | 38\% | 31\% | $\begin{gathered} 71 \% \\ C D \end{gathered}$ | 40\% | 27\% | 44\% | 42\% | 40\% | 38\% |
| 2 | 20 | - | 10 | 8 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 17 | 3 |
|  | 19\% |  | 19\% | 22\% | 14\% | 25\% | 18\% | 20\% | 16\% | 26\% | 8\% |
| 3 - Neither | 16 | - | 8 | 8 | - | 1 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9 |
|  | 15\% |  | 15\% | 22\% |  | 5\% | 18\% | 20\% | 16\% | 11\% | 22\% |
| 4 | 20 | - | 11 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 8 |
|  | 19\% |  | 21\% | 22\% | 7\% | 25\% | 27\% | 12\% | 16\% | 18\% | 20\% |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 8 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 |
|  | 8\% | 100\% | $8 \%$ | 3\% | 7\% | 5\% | $9 \%$ | 4\% | 11\% | 5\% | 12\% |
| N/A | 8 | - | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | - | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
|  | 8\% |  | $9 \%$ | 6\% | 7\% | 15\% |  | 16\% | 3\% | 8\% | $8 \%$ |
| воттом 2 вох | 61 | - | 30 | 19 | 12 | 13 | 10 | 16 | 22 | 43 | 18 |
|  | 58\% |  | 57\% | 53\% | 86\% | 65\% | 45\% | 64\% | 58\% | 66\% | 45\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | CD |  |  |  |  | к |  |
| TOP 2 box | 28 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 10 | 15 | 13 |
|  | 27\% | 100\% | 28\% | 25\% | 14\% | 30\% | $36 \%$ | 16\% | 26\% | $23 \%$ | 32\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  | 94 |  |
| mean | 2.4 | 5.0 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 2.3 | 2.7 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.6 |
| MEDIAN | 2.0 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q28. Satisfaction: The reporting requirements are reasonable and adequately explained

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LeSS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ====== | FRENCH FRE |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 107 | 1 | 55 | 37 | 14 | 19 | 22 | 27 | 39 | 66 | 41 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Very Dissatisfied | 5 | - | 2 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
|  | 5\% |  | 4\% | 5\% | 7\% |  |  | 11\% | 5\% | 3\% | 7\% |
| 2 | 12 | - | 8 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |
|  | 11\% |  | 15\% | 5\% | 14\% | 5\% | 23\% | 11\% | 8\% | 9\% | 15\% |
| 3 - Neither | 19 | - | 12 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 6 |
|  | 18\% |  | 22\% | 11\% | 21\% | 21\% | 9\% | 19\% | 21\% | 20\% | 15\% |
| 4 | 50 | - | 24 | 20 | 6 | 8 | 11 | 13 | 18 | 30 | 20 |
|  | 47\% |  | 44\% | 54\% | 43\% | 42\% | 50\% | 48\% | 46\% | 45\% | 49\% |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | $21$ |  | 9 | 9 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 15 | 6 |
|  | $20 \%$ | $100 \%$ | 16\% | 24\% | 14\% | 32\% | 18\% | 11\% | 21\% | 23\% | 15\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | 6 | - | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | - | 2 | - | 4 | 2 |
|  | 6\% |  | 5\% | 3\% | 7\% | 21\% |  | 7\% |  | 6\% | 5\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 17 | - | 10 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 9 |
|  | 16\% |  | 18\% | 11\% | 21\% | 5\% | 23\% | 22\% | 13\% | 12\% | 22\% |
| TOP 2 box | 71 | 1 | 33 | 29 | 8 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 26 | 45 | 26 |
|  | 66\% | $100 \%$ | 60\% | 78\% | 57\% | 74\% | 68\% | 59\% | 67\% | 68\% | 63\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  | 53\%* |  |  |  | 43\%* |  |
| MEAN | 3.7 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.5 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q28. Satisfaction: The promptness in obtaining answers from $\mathbf{H Q}$ staff.

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | тOTAL | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 104 | 1 | 54 | 34 | 14 | 21 | 21 | 26 | 36 | 66 | 38 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Very Dissatisfied | 8 | - |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 |
|  | 8\% |  | $9 \%$ | 6\% | 7\% | 10\% | 5\% | 15\% | 3\% | 6\% | 11\% |
| 2 | 12 | - | 6 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 5 |
|  | 12\% |  | 11\% | 12\% | 14\% | 5\% | 10\% | 15\% | 14\% | 11\% | 13\% |
| 3 - Neither | 13 | - | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 5 |
|  | 12\% |  | 9\% | 12\% | 29\% | 19\% | 5\% | 8\% | 17\% | 12\% | 13\% |
| 4 | 34 | - | 19 | 11 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 21 | 13 |
|  | 33\% |  | 35\% | 32\% | 29\% | 29\% | 48\% | 31\% | 28\% | 32\% | 34\% |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 37 | 1 | 19 | 13 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 14 | 26 | 11 |
|  | 36\% | 100\% | 35\% | 38\% | 21\% | 38\% | 33\% | 31\% | 39\% | 39\% | 29\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | 9 | - | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  | $9 \%$ |  | 7\% | 12\% | 7\% | 10\% | 5\% | 12\% | 8\% | 6\% | 13\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 20 | - | 11 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 11 | 9 |
|  | 19\% |  | 20\% | 18\% | 21\% | 14\% | 14\% | 31\% | 17\% | 17\% | 24\% |
| TOP 2 box | 71 | 1 | 38 | 24 | 7 | 14 | 17 | 16 | 24 | 47 | 24 |
|  | 68\% | $100 \%$ | 70\% | 71\% | 50\% | 67\% | 81\% | 62\% | 67\% | 71\% | 63\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE | <------------------6.6----------------->>-12\%** |  |  |  |  | 36\%* |  |  |  | <--------1.56-------> |  |
| MEAN | 3.8 | 5.0 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.6 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q28. Satisfaction: The knowledge and competence of the staff.

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | YEARS IN EXISTENCE |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 107 | 1 | 54 | 36 | 15 | 22 | 22 | 25 | 38 | 65 | 42 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Very Dissatisfied | 3 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 2 | - | 3 | - |
|  | 3\% |  | 4\% | 3\% |  |  | 5\% | 8\% |  | 5\% |  |
| 2 | 3 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
|  | 3\% |  | 4\% | 3\% |  |  | 5\% | 4\% | 3\% | $3 \%$ | 2\% |
| 3 - Neither | 15 | - | 5 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 9 |
|  | 14\% |  | 9\% | 19\% | 20\% | 18\% | 5\% | 12\% | 18\% | 9\% | 21\% |
| 4 | 35 | - | 15 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 25 | 10 |
|  | 33\% |  | 28\% | 31\% | 60\% | 32\% | 36\% | 32\% | 32\% | $38 \%$ | 24\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | CD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 51 | 1 | 30 | 16 | 3 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 18 | 29 | 22 |
|  | 48\% | 100\% | 56\% | 44\% | 20\% | 50\% | 50\% | $44 \%$ | 47\% | 45\% | 52\% |
|  |  | CDE | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | 6 | - | 4 | 2 | - | 1 | - | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
|  | 6\% |  | 7\% | 6\% |  | 5\% |  | 16\% | 3\% | 8\% | 2\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 6 | - | 4 | 2 | - | - | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
|  | 6\% |  | 7\% | 6\% |  |  | $9 \%$ | 12\% | 3\% | 8\% | 2\% |
| top 2 box | 86 | 1 | 45 | 27 | 12 | 18 | 19 | 19 | 30 | 54 | 32 |
|  | 80\% | 100\% | 83\% | 75\% | 80\% | 82\% | 86\% | 76\% | 79\% | 83\% | 76\% |
|  |  | CD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chi-square | <------------------11.28------------------> <------------------7.83-----------------> <-------6.69-------> |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  | 20\%* |  |  |  | 85\%* |  |
| MEAN |  |  |  |  |  | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.3 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q28. Satisfaction: The courteousness of the staff

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | тOTAL | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 108 | 1 | 55 | 36 | 15 | 22 | 22 | 25 | 39 | 67 | 41 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Very Dissatisfied | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | - |
|  | 1\% |  | 2\% |  |  |  |  | 4\% |  | 1\% |  |
| 2 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | - |
|  | 2\% |  | 2\% | 3\% |  |  |  | 4\% | 3\% | 3\% |  |
| 3 - Neither | 5 | - | 2 | 2 | 1 | - | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
|  | 5\% |  | 4\% | 6\% | 7\% |  | 9\% | 8\% | 3\% | 4\% | 5\% |
| 4 | 26 | - | 11 | 11 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 19 | 7 |
|  | 24\% |  | 20\% | 31\% | 27\% | 14\% | 32\% | 24\% | 26\% | 28\% | 17\% |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 74 |  | 40 | 22 | 10 | 19 | 13 | 15 | 27 | 42 | 32 |
|  | 69\% | 100\% | 73\% | 61\% | 67\% | 86\% | 59\% | 60\% | 69\% | 63\% | 78\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  | GH |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | 5 | - | 3 | 2 | - | 1 | - | 4 | - | 3 | 2 |
|  | 5\% |  | 5\% | 6\% |  | 5\% |  | 16\% |  | 4\% | 5\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 3 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | 2 | 1 | 3 | - |
|  | 3\% |  | 4\% | 3\% |  |  |  | 8\% | 3\% | 4\% |  |
| TOP 2 box | 100 | 1 | 51 | 33 | 14 | 22 | 20 | 21 | 37 | 61 | 39 |
|  | 93\% | 100\% | 93\% | 92\% | 93\% | 100\% | 91\% | 84\% | 95\% | 91\% | 95\% |
|  |  | c |  |  |  | н |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  | 47\%* |  |  |  | 60\%* |  |
| MEAN | 4.6 | 5.0 | 4.6 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.9 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 4.5 | 4.7 |
| MEDIAN | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q29. Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of service you received regarding Trade Routes' Contributions Program service during the last 12 months?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LeSS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 110 | 1 | 56 | 38 | 14 | 22 | 22 | 27 | 39 | 69 | 41 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Very Dissatisfied | 10 | - | 5 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 |
|  | 9\% |  | $9 \%$ | 8\% | 14\% | 9\% | 9\% | 11\% | 8\% | 7\% | 12\% |
| 2 | 19 | - | 9 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 10 |
|  | 17\% |  | 16\% | 18\% | 21\% | 27\% | 18\% | 15\% | 13\% | 13\% | 24\% |
| 3 - Neither | 12 | - | 3 | 6 | 3 | 2 | - | 3 | 7 | 9 | 3 |
|  | 11\% |  | 5\% | 16\% | 21\% | 9\% |  | 11\% | 18\% | 13\% | 7\% |
| 4 | 38 | - | 21 | 13 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 12 | 24 | 14 |
|  | 35\% |  | 38\% | 34\% | 29\% | 32\% | 45\% | 33\% | 31\% | 35\% | 34\% |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 31 | 1 | 18 | 9 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 12 | 22 | 9 |
|  | 28\% | 100\% | 32\% | 24\% | 14\% | 23\% | 27\% | 30\% | 31\% | $32 \%$ | 22\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | 3 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 2 |
|  | 3\% |  | 4\% |  | 7\% | 5\% |  | 7\% |  | 1\% | 5\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 29 | - | 14 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 14 | 15 |
|  | 26\% |  | 25\% | 26\% | 36\% | 36\% | 27\% | 26\% | 21\% | 20\% | 37\% |
| TOP 2 box | 69 | 1 | 39 | 22 | 6 | 12 | 16 | 17 | 24 | 46 | 23 |
|  | 63\% | 100\% | 70\% | 58\% | 43\% | 55\% | 73\% | 63\% | 62\% | 67\% | 56\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chi-square |  | - | 8 | ------- | -----> | <--- | -7. | ------- | ------> | <--------4. | 9-- |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63 |  |
| MEAN | 3.6 | 5.0 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.3 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q30. During the past 12 months, were there any problems with the service you received regarding Trade Routes' Contributions Program service?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q31. What problem(s) did you encounter?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q32. What type of research information did you need?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q33. Satisfaction: The relevance and usefulness of the research to you/your organization.

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| TOTAL | 29 | 1 | 17 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 21 | 8 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Very Dissatisfied | 3 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | 2 | - | 1 | 2 | 1 |
|  | 10\% |  | 12\% | 12\% |  |  | 33\% |  | 14\% | 10\% | 12\% |
| 2 | 4 | - | 3 | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | 2 | 2 |
|  | 14\% |  | 18\% | 12\% |  | 17\% | 33\% |  | 14\% | 10\% | 25\% |
| 3 - Neither | 3 | - | 2 | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 10\% |  | 12\% | 12\% |  | 17\% |  | 10\% | 14\% | 5\% | 25\% |
| 4 | 12 | - | 6 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 2 |
|  | 41\% |  | 35\% | 50\% | 67\% | 50\% | 17\% | 40\% | 57\% | 48\% | 25\% |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 7 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | - | 6 | 1 |
|  | 24\% | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ \mathrm{CDE} \end{gathered}$ | 24\% | 12\% | 33\% | 17\% | 17\% | 50\% |  | 29\% | 12\% |
| N/A | 3 | 1 | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 1 | 2 | 1 |
|  | 10\% | 100\% | 12\% |  |  | 33\% |  |  | 14\% | 10\% | 12\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 7 | - | 5 | 2 | - | 1 | 4 | - | 2 | 4 | 3 |
|  | 24\% |  | 29\% | 25\% |  | 17\% | 67\% |  | 29\% | 19\% | 38\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |
| TOP 2 box | 19 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 16 | 3 |
|  | 66\% | 100\% | 59\% | 62\% | 100\% | 67\% | 33\% | 90\% | 57\% | 76\% | 38\% |
|  |  | CD |  |  | CD |  |  | G |  | K |  |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEAN | 3.6 | 5.0 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 4.3 | 3.7 | 2.5 | 4.4 | 3.1 | 3.8 | 3.0 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q33. Satisfaction: The comprehensiveness of the research

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | YEARS In Existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | English | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 28 | 1 | 16 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 20 | 8 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Very Dissatisfied | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 1 | 1 |
|  | 7\% |  | 6\% | 12\% |  |  | 33\% |  |  | 5\% | 12\% |
| 2 | 5 | - | 4 | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | - | 2 | 3 | 2 |
|  | 18\% |  | 25\% | 12\% |  | 17\% | 33\% |  | 29\% | 15\% | 25\% |
| 3 - Neither | 8 | - | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | - | 3 | 3 | 6 | 2 |
|  | 29\% |  | 25\% | 38\% | 33\% | 33\% |  | 33\% | 43\% | 30\% | 25\% |
| 4 | 7 | - | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | - | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
|  | 25\% |  | 19\% | 25\% | 67\% | 50\% |  | 22\% | 29\% | 25\% | 25\% |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 | - | - | 2 | 4 | - | 5 | 1 |
|  | 21\% | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ \mathrm{CD} \end{array}$ | 25\% | 12\% |  |  | 33\% | 44\% |  | 25\% | 12\% |
| N/A | 4 | 1 | 3 | - | - | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
|  | 14\% | $100 \%$ c | 19\% |  |  | 33\% |  | 11\% | 14\% | 15\% | 12\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 7 | - | 5 | 2 | - | 1 | 4 | - | 2 | 4 | 3 |
|  | 25\% |  | 31\% | 25\% |  | 17\% | 67\% |  | 29\% | 20\% | 38\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |
| TOP 2 box | $13$ |  |  |  | 2 | 3 |  | 6 | 2 | 10 | 3 |
|  | 46\% | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ C D \end{array}$ | 44\% | 38\% | 67\% | 50\% | 33\% | 67\% | 29\% | 50\% | 38\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE | <-----------------9.03---------------->> 30 --- |  |  |  |  | 95\%* |  |  |  | <-------1.24-------> |  |
| MEAN | 3.4 | 5.0 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| MEDIAN | 3.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Client
Q33. Satisfaction: The clarity and ease of understanding the research.


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Client
Q33. Satisfaction: The length of the reports and documents.

|  | \# Employees |  |  |  |  | YEARS IN EXISTENCE |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5-==== | -== | $=====$ $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | = $=$ = $=$ | ======== ENGLISH | $======$ FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 26 | 1 | 14 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 18 | 8 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Very Dissatisfied | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 |
|  | $4 \%$ |  |  | 12\% |  |  | 20\% |  |  |  | 12\% |
| 2 | 2 | - | 2 | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | 1 | 1 |
|  | $8 \%$ |  | 14\% |  |  |  | 40\% |  |  | 6\% | 12\% |
| 3 - Neither | 8 | - | 6 | 2 | - | 2 | - | 3 | 3 | 6 | 2 |
|  | 31\% |  | 43\% | 25\% |  | 40\% |  | 33\% | 43\% | 33\% | 25\% |
| 4 | 9 | - |  |  |  |  | - | 3 | 4 | 6 | 3 |
|  | 35\% |  | 7\% | $62 \%$ | $100 \%$ | 40\% |  | 33\% | 57\% | 33\% | 38\% |
|  |  |  |  | c | CD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 - Very Satisfied |  | 1 | 5 | - | - | 1 | 2 | 3 | - | 5 | 1 |
|  | 23\% | 100\% | 36\% |  |  | 20\% | 40\% | 33\% |  | 28\% | 12\% |
| N/A | 6 | 1 | 5 | - | - | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
|  | 23\% | 100\% | 36\% |  |  | 60\% | 20\% | 11\% | 14\% | 28\% | 12\% |
|  |  | c |  |  |  | н |  |  |  |  |  |
| воттом 2 вох | 3 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | 3 | - | - | 1 | 2 |
|  | 12\% |  | 14\% | 12\% |  |  | 60\% |  |  | 6\% | 25\% |
| TOP 2 box | 15 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 4 |
|  | 58\% | 100\% | 43\% | 62\% | 100\% | 60\% | 40\% | 67\% | 57\% | 61\% | 50\% |
|  |  | CD |  |  | CD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chi-square |  | ---- | ---20. | ---- | -> | <----- | ----20 | 1-- | -> | <-------3. | 31-------> |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  | 95 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mean | 3.7 | 5.0 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 3.2 |
| median | 4.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q34. Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of service you received regarding Trade Routes' Research service during the last 12 months?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | YEARS IN EXISTENCE |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | тOTAL | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LeSS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 32 | 2 | 19 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 23 | 9 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2 | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | 6\% |  |  | 25\% |  |  |  | 10\% | 12\% | 4\% | 11\% |
| 3 - Neither | 11 | - | 9 | 2 | - | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 3 |
|  | 34\% |  | 47\% | 25\% |  | 25\% | 67\% | 20\% | 38\% | 35\% | 33\% |
| 4 | 13 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 4 |
|  | 41\% | 50\% | 26\% | 50\% | 100\% | 50\% | 17\% | 50\% | 38\% | 39\% | 44\% |
| 5 - Very Satisfied | 4 | - | 4 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | - | 4 | - |
|  | 12\% |  | 21\% |  |  | 12\% | 17\% | 20\% |  | 17\% |  |
| Don't Know | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | 6\% | 50\% | 5\% |  |  | 12\% |  |  | 12\% | 4\% | 11\% |
| воттом 2 вох | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | 6\% |  |  | 25\% |  |  |  | 10\% | 12\% | 4\% | 11\% |
| TOP 2 box | 17 | 1 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 13 | 4 |
|  | 53\% | 50\% | 47\% | 50\% | 100\% | 62\% | 33\% | 70\% | 38\% | 57\% | 44\% |
| CHI-SQUARESIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MEAN | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 3.4 |
| MEDIAN | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q35. During the past 12 months, were there any problems with the service you received regarding Trade Routes' Research service?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 32 | ${ }^{2}$ | 19 | 8 | 3 | 8 | ${ }^{6}$ | 10 | 8 | 23 | 9 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Yes | 4 | - | 2 | 2 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
|  | 12\% |  | 11\% | 25\% |  | 25\% |  | 10\% | 12\% | 13\% | 11\% |
| No | 23 | 1 | 13 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 17 | 6 |
|  | 72\% | 50\% | 68\% | 75\% | 100\% | 50\% | 67\% | 90\% | 75\% | 74\% | 67\% |
| Don't Know | 5 | 1 | 4 | - | - | 2 | 2 | - | 1 | 3 |  |
|  | 16\% | 50\% | 21\% |  |  | 25\% | 33\% |  | 12\% | 13\% | 22\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q36. What problem(s) did you encounter?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (c) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| TOTAL | 4 | - | 2 | 2 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
|  | 100 |  | 100 | 100 |  | 100 |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Difficulty accessing research | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 1 |
|  | 50\% |  | 50\% | 50\% |  | 50\% |  | 100\% |  | 33\% | 100\% |
| Difficulty accessing/ contacting staff | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | 50\% |  |  | 100\% |  |  |  | 100\% | 100\% | 33\% | 100\% |
| Information lacked relevance | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | - |
|  | 25\% |  | 50\% |  |  | 50\% |  |  |  | 33\% |  |
| Lack of courtesy/ responsiveness | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | - |
|  | 25\% |  | 50\% |  |  | 50\% |  |  |  | 33\% |  |
| CHI-SQUARE SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q37 All things considered, how would you rate the overall value or usefulness of the Trade Routes program to your organization?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | YEARS In Existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | English | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1 - Not useful at all | 7 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
|  | 3\% | 12\% | 3\% | 3\% | 4\% |  | 2\% | 4\% | 7\% | 2\% | 5\% |
| 2 | 9 | - | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | - | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  | 4\% |  | 4\% | 5\% | 9\% | 7\% | 7\% |  | 5\% | 3\% | 7\% |
| 3 | 14 | - | 7 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 6 |
|  | 7\% |  | 7\% | 8\% | 9\% | 9\% | 5\% | 8\% | 7\% | 6\% | 8\% |
| 4 | 39 | 3 | 17 | 14 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 14 | 8 | 25 | 14 |
|  | 19\% | 38\% | 16\% | 22\% | 22\% | 20\% | 18\% | 26\% | 13\% | 20\% | 19\% |
| 5 - Very useful | 123 | 4 | 67 | 39 | 12 | 23 | 30 | 31 | 39 | 81 | 42 |
|  | 61\% | 50\% | 64\% | 61\% | 52\% | 52\% | 68\% | 58\% | 65\% | 63\% | 58\% |
| Don't Know | 9 | - | 7 | 1 | 1 | 5 | - | 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 |
|  | 4\% |  | 7\% | 2\% | 4\% | 11\% |  | 4\% | 3\% | 5\% | $3 \%$ |
| воттом 2 вох | 16 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 9 |
|  | 8\% | 12\% | 7\% | 8\% | 13\% | 7\% | 9\% | 4\% | 12\% | 5\% | 12\% |
| TOP 2 box | 162 | 7 | 84 | 53 | 17 | 32 | 38 | 45 | 47 | 106 | 56 |
|  | 81\% | 88\% | 80\% | 83\% | 74\% | 73\% | 86\% | 85\% | 78\% | 83\% | 77\% |
| CHI-SQUARE |  | -- | --6. |  |  |  | -11. |  |  | -------3. | ------ |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  | 48 |  |  | $48$ | * |
| MEAN | 4.4 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.2 |
| MEDIAN | 5.0 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q38. Impact: Improving your export readiness.

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 171 | 6 | 91 | 54 | 19 | 34 | 42 | 45 | 50 | 115 | 56 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| No impact | 22 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 12 | 10 |
|  | 13\% | 33\% | 11\% | 11\% | 21\% | 15\% | 7\% | 11\% | 18\% | 10\% | 18\% |
| Minor impact | 28 | 1 | 16 | 7 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 19 | 9 |
|  | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | 13\% | 21\% | 26\% | 10\% | 16\% | 16\% | 17\% | 16\% |
| Moderate impact |  | 2 | 30 | 20 | 6 | 10 | 18 | 13 | 17 | 36 | 22 |
|  | $34 \%$ | 33\% | 33\% | 37\% | 32\% | 29\% | 43\% | 29\% | 34\% | 31\% | 39\% |
| Major impact |  |  | 35 | 21 |  |  | 17 | 20 | 16 | 48 | 15 |
|  | 37\% | 17\% | 38\% | 39\% | 26\% | 29\% | 40\% | 44\% | 32\% | 42\% | 27\% |
| N/A | 30 | 2 | 14 | 10 | 4 | 10 | 2 | 8 | 10 | 13 | 17 |
|  | 18\% | 33\% | 15\% | 19\% | 21\% | 29\% | 5\% | 18\% | 20\% | 11\% | 30\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {G }}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {G }}$ | G |  | J |
| CHI-SQUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q38. Impact: Helping you develop international market(s)


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q38. Impact: Building networks/partnerships/contacts

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 190 | 7 | 98 | 62 | 22 | 39 | 44 | 50 | 57 | 123 | 67 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| No impact | 15 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 7 |
|  | 8\% | 14\% | 8\% | 6\% | 9\% | 8\% | 7\% | 8\% | 9\% | 7\% | 10\% |
| Minor impact | 19 | - | 11 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 12 | 7 |
|  | 10\% |  | 11\% | 10\% | $9 \%$ | 18\% | 5\% | $4 \%$ | 14\% | 10\% | 10\% |
| Moderate impact | 53 | 1 | 24 | 20 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 19 | 17 | 33 | 20 |
|  | 28\% | 14\% | 24\% | 32\% | 36\% | 21\% | 20\% | 38\% | 30\% | 27\% | 30\% |
| Major impact | 103 | 5 | 55 | 32 | 10 | 21 | 30 | 25 | 27 | 70 | 33 |
|  | 54\% | 71\% | 56\% | 52\% | 45\% | 54\% | 68\% | 50\% | 47\% | 57\% | 49\% |
| N/A | 11 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 5 | - | 3 | 3 | 5 | 6 |
|  | 6\% | 14\% | 7\% | 3\% | 5\% | 13\% |  | 6\% | 5\% | 4\% | 9\% |
| CHI-Square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q38. Impact: Providing strategic advice on doing business in one or more international markets

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | Language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 169 | ${ }^{6}$ | 87 | 54 | 21 | 34 | 41 | 43 | 51 | 111 | 58 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| No impact | 29 | 1 | 16 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 16 | 13 |
|  | 17\% | 17\% | 18\% | 17\% | 14\% | 12\% | 10\% | 16\% | 27\% | 14\% | 22\% |
| Minor impact | 39 | - | 16 | 14 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 11 | 23 | 16 |
|  | 23\% |  | 18\% | 26\% | 43\% | 24\% | 20\% | 28\% | 22\% | 21\% | 28\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Moderate impact | 60 | 2 | 31 | 21 | 6 | 9 | 19 | 16 | 16 | 40 | 20 |
|  | 36\% | 33\% | 36\% | 39\% | 29\% | 26\% | 46\% | 37\% | 31\% | 36\% | 34\% |
| Major impact | 41 | 3 | 24 | 10 | 3 | 13 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 32 | 9 |
|  | 24\% | 50\% | 28\% | 19\% | 14\% | 38\% | 24\% | 19\% | 20\% | 29\% | 16\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | K |  |
| N/A | 32 | 2 | 18 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 10 | 9 | 17 | 15 |
|  | 19\% | 33\% | 21\% | 19\% | 10\% | 29\% | 7\% | 23\% | 18\% | 15\% | 26\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | G |  | G |  |  |  |
| CHI-SQUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q38. Impact: Skills development for you/your staff in international business.

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (c) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| TOTAL | 166 | 7 | 84 | 54 | 20 | 31 | 42 | 44 | 49 | 106 | 60 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| No impact | 31 | 1 | 17 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 14 | 19 | 12 |
|  | 19\% | 14\% | 20\% | 13\% | 30\% | 23\% | 7\% | 16\% | $29 \%$ $G$ | 18\% | 20\% |
| Minor impact | 46 | 1 | 23 | 17 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 10 | 28 | 18 |
|  | 28\% | 14\% | 27\% | 31\% | 25\% | 26\% | 29\% | 36\% | 20\% | 26\% | 30\% |
| Moderate impact | 56 | 4 | 29 | 16 | 7 | 11 | 17 | 13 | 15 | 36 | 20 |
|  | 34\% | 57\% | 35\% | 30\% | 35\% | 35\% | 40\% | 30\% | 31\% | 34\% | 33\% |
| Major impact | 33 | 1 | 15 | 14 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 23 | 10 |
|  | 20\% | 14\% | 18\% | 26\% | 10\% | 16\% | 24\% | 18\% | 20\% | 22\% | 17\% |
| N/A | 35 | 1 | 21 | 10 | 3 | 13 | 2 | 9 | 11 | 22 | 13 |
|  | 21\% | 14\% | 25\% | 19\% | 15\% | 42\% | 5\% | 20\% | 22\% | 21\% | 22\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHI-SQUARE SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q38. Impact: Helping you make informed decisions about where to invest and/or export

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | YEARS In EXISTENCE |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | English | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| TOTAL | 167 | 6 | 87 | 53 | 20 | 34 | 41 | 41 | 51 | 106 | 61 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| No impact | 37 | 1 | 19 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 14 | 20 | 17 |
|  | 22\% | 17\% | 22\% | 19\% | 35\% | 21\% | 15\% | 24\% | 27\% | 19\% | 28\% |
| Minor impact | 35 | - | 19 | 12 | 4 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 10 | 21 | 14 |
|  | 21\% |  | 22\% | 23\% | 20\% | 29\% | 22\% | 15\% | 20\% | 20\% | 23\% |
| Moderate impact | 58 | 4 | 28 | 19 | 7 | 7 | 17 | 16 | 18 | 38 | 20 |
|  | 35\% | 67\% | 32\% | 36\% | 35\% | 21\% | 41\% | 39\% | 35\% | 36\% | 33\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |
| Major impact | 37 | 1 | 21 | 12 | 2 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 27 | 10 |
|  | 22\% | 17\% | 24\% | 23\% | 10\% | 29\% | 22\% | 22\% | 18\% | 25\% | 16\% |
| N/A | 34 | 2 | 18 | 11 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 12 | 9 | 22 | 12 |
|  | 20\% | 33\% | 21\% | 21\% | 15\% | $29 \%$ | 7\% | $29 \%$ | 18\% | 21\% | 20\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q38. Impact: First-hand/on-line exposure to markets and their business practices


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q39. Resulted in outcomes: Increased exports of products/services


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q39. Resulted in outcomes: Diversified/expanded markets for products/services


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q39. Resulted in outcomes: Increased trade-related networks/connections


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q39. Resulted in outcomes: Better/increased understanding of international markets


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q40. How would you rate the importance of these outcome(s) to your business? Increased exports of products/ services


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q40. How would you rate the importance of these outcome(s) to your business? Diversified/expanded markets for products/services


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q40. How would you rate the importance of these outcome(s) to your business? Increased trade-related networks/ connections

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | YEARS IN EXISTENCE |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | ( $)$ | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| TOTAL | 145 | ${ }^{6}$ | 70 | 53 | 15 | 31 | 38 | 38 | 38 | 101 | 44 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Not Very Important | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 |
|  | 1\% |  | 1\% | 2\% |  | 3\% | 3\% |  |  | 1\% | 2\% |
| Moderately Important | 33 | 2 | 11 | 15 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 18 | 15 |
|  | 23\% | 33\% | 16\% | 28\% | 33\% | 19\% | 26\% | 26\% | 18\% | 18\% | 34\% |
| Very Important | $110$ |  | 58 | $37$ | 10 | 24 | 27 | 28 | 31 | 82 | 28 |
|  | $76 \%$ | 67\% | 83\% | 70\% | 67\% | 77\% | 71\% | 74\% | 82\% | 81\% | 64\% |
| CHI-SQUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q40. How would you rate the importance of these outcome(s) to your business? Better/increased understanding of international markets

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | YEARS IN EXISTENCE |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (c) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| TOTAL | 144 | 5 | 74 | 51 | 13 | 30 | 39 | 40 | 35 | 96 | 48 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Not Very Important | 6 | - | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
|  | 4\% |  | 4\% | 4\% | 8\% | 7\% | 3\% | 5\% | 3\% | 2\% | 8\% |
| Moderately Important | 43 | 1 | 18 | 19 | 5 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 7 | 23 | 20 |
|  | 30\% | 20\% | 24\% | 37\% | 38\% | 33\% | 31\% | 35\% | 20\% | 24\% | 42\% |
| Very Important | $95$ |  | 53 |  | 7 | 18 | 26 | 24 | 27 | 71 | 24 |
|  | 66\% | 80\% | 72\% | 59\% | 54\% | 60\% | 67\% | 60\% | 77\% | 748 | 50\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q41. How likely is it that your organization will use the Trade Routes program in future?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q42. Market Entry Support service - do you think any of these positions should be relocated?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q43. Which positions should be relocated, and what cities should they be moved to?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q44. In addition to these Trade Commissioners, do you think the number of Cultural Trade Commissioners across Canada should be expanded?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | English | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Yes | 73 | 3 | 36 | 26 | 8 | 16 | 18 | 17 | 22 | 52 | 21 |
|  | 36\% | 38\% | 34\% | 41\% | 35\% | 36\% | 41\% | 32\% | 37\% | 41\% | 29\% |
| No | 57 | 2 | 28 | 20 | 7 | 13 | 11 | 14 | 19 | 30 | 27 |
|  | 28\% | 25\% | 27\% | 31\% | 30\% | 30\% | 25\% | 26\% | 32\% | 23\% | 37\% |
| Don't Know | 71 |  | 41 | 18 | 8 | 15 | 15 | 22 | 19 | 46 | 25 |
|  | 35\% | 38\% | 39\% | 28\% | 35\% | 34\% | 34\% | 42\% | 32\% | 36\% | 34\% |
| CHI-SQUARE |  | - | ------2 | ---- |  |  | --1. | -- |  | <--------4. |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  | 10 |  |  |  | . | - |  | 91 |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version



## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q46. In-Market Assistance service. Do you think any of these positions should be relocated?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | YEARS IN EXISTENCE |  |  |  | Language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Yes | 30 | 2 | 13 | 10 | 5 | 13 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 20 | 10 |
|  | 15\% | 25\% | 12\% | 16\% | 22\% | $30 \%$ HI | 14\% | 13\% | 7\% | 16\% | 14\% |
| No | 84 | 4 | 42 | 26 | 12 | 14 | 14 | 26 | 30 | 57 | 27 |
|  | 42\% | 50\% | 40\% | 41\% | 52\% | 32\% | 32\% | 49\% | 50\% | 45\% | 37\% |
| Don't Know | 87 | 2 | 50 | 28 | 6 | 17 | 24 | 20 | 26 | 51 | 36 |
|  | 43\% | 25\% | 48\% | 44\% | 26\% | 39\% | 55\% | 38\% | 43\% | 40\% | 49\% |
| CHI-Square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q47. Which positions should be relocated, and what cities should they be moved to?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q48. Do you think the number of Cultural Trade Development Officers should be expanded?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q49. In which location(s) should this expansion occur?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | тOTAL | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 115 | 7 | 58 | 39 | 10 | 25 | 24 | 31 | 35 | 74 | 41 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Germany (Berlin) | 76 | 5 | 39 | 24 | 7 | 17 | 15 | 20 | 24 | 48 | 28 |
|  | 66\% | 71\% | 67\% | 62\% | 70\% | 68\% | 62\% | 65\% | 69\% | 65\% | 68\% |
| Japan (Tokyo) | 59 | 4 | 31 | 20 | 4 | 13 | 12 | 16 | 18 | 35 | 24 |
|  | 51\% | 57\% | 53\% | 51\% | 40\% | 52\% | 50\% | 52\% | 51\% | 47\% | 59\% |
| Brazil (Sao Paulo) | 49 | ${ }^{4}$ | 19 | 17 | 9 | 11 | 7 | 9 | 22 | 27 | 22 |
|  | 43\% | 57\% | 33\% | 44\% | 90\% | 44\% | 29\% | 29\% | 63\% | 36\% | 54\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | CD |  |  |  | GH |  |  |
| India (Mumbai) | 39 | 3 | 15 | 16 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 12 | 27 | 12 |
|  | 34\% | 43\% | 26\% | 41\% | 50\% | 40\% | 29\% | 32\% | 34\% | 36\% | 29\% |
| Korea (Seoul) | 30 | 2 | 9 | 14 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 | 13 | 18 | 12 |
|  | 26\% | 29\% | 16\% | $36 \%$ | $\stackrel{50 \%}{\text { c }}$ | 24\% | 21\% | 19\% | 37\% | 24\% | 29\% |
| Boston | 26 | 2 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 14 | 12 |
|  | 23\% | 29\% | 19\% | 28\% | 20\% | 20\% | 21\% | 16\% | 31\% | 19\% | 29\% |
| Argentina (Bueno Aires) | 25 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 12 | 13 |
|  | 22\% | 14\% | 10\% | 31\% | 50\% | 12\% | 17\% | 19\% | 34\% | 16\% | 32\% |
| Chicago | 24 | 1 | 14 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 18 | 6 |
|  | 21\% | 14\% | 24\% | 13\% | 40\% | 28\% | 17\% | 13\% | 26\% | 24\% | 15\% |
| South Africa | 23 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 18 | 5 |
|  | 20\% | 43\% | 10\% | 28\% | 30\% | 16\% | 17\% | 10\% | 34\% | 24\% | 12\% |
| Miami | 21 | 1 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 7 |
|  | 18\% | 14\% | 19\% | 15\% | 30\% | 28\% | 12\% | 13\% | 20\% | 19\% | 17\% |
| Chile (Santiago) | 14 | - | 5 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 8 | 6 |
|  | 12\% |  | $9 \%$ | 15\% | 30\% | 12\% | $4 \%$ | 6\% | 23\% | 11\% | 15\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | GH |  |  |
| Dallas | 13 | - | 9 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 2 |
|  | 11\% |  | 16\% | 8\% | 10\% | 16\% | $4 \%$ | 13\% | 11\% | 15\% | 5\% |
| Europe (other) | 5 | - | 3 | 2 | - | 1 | 2 | - | 2 | 4 | 1 |
|  | $4 \%$ |  | 5\% | 5\% |  | 4\% | $8 \%$ |  | 6\% | 5\% | 2\% |
| Asia (other) | 4 | - | 2 | 2 | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | 3 | 1 |
|  | 3\% |  | 3\% | 5\% |  | 4\% | $8 \%$ | 3\% |  | 4\% | 2\% |
| Australia (Sydney) |  | - | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 1 |
|  | 3\% |  | 3\% |  | 10\% | 4\% | $4 \%$ | 3\% |  | 3\% | 2\% |
| Other | 3 | - | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | - | - | 2 | 3 | - |
|  | 3\% |  | 2\% | 5\% |  | 4\% |  |  | 6\% | 4\% |  |

Upper case letters indicate significance at the $95 \%$ level

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Client
Q49. In which location(s) should this expansion occur?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q50. Contributions Program - Are there any changes to the Contributions program that you would like to see carried out?

|  | \# Employees |  |  |  |  | YEARS IN EXISTENCE |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | ====== | $===$ $6-25$ | $===$ $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | = $=$ = $=$ | ======== ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Earlier notification of | 146 |  | 75 | 46 | 19 | 33 | 35 | 33 | 45 | 94 | 52 |
| approval or rejection | 73\% | 75\% | 71\% | 72\% | 83\% | 75\% | 80\% | 62\% | 75\% | 73\% | 71\% |
| Online applications | 99 | 1 | 51 | 31 | 16 | 26 | 18 | 24 | 31 | 66 | 33 |
|  | 49\% | 12\% | 49\% | 48\% | $70 \%$ B | 59\% | 41\% | 45\% | 52\% | 52\% | 45\% |
| Notification of approval-in-principle | 86 | 4 | 44 | 28 | 10 | 19 | 18 | 23 | 26 | 63 | 23 |
|  | 43\% | 50\% | 42\% | 44\% | 43\% | 43\% | 41\% | 43\% | 43\% | 49\% | 32\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | K |  |
| More than one / more | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| flexible deadlines | 3\% | 12\% | 2\% | 3\% | 4\% | 2\% | 2\% | 4\% | 3\% | 3\% | 3\% |
| Increase financial support offered |  | - | 1 | 3 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
|  | 3\% |  | 1\% | 5\% | 9\% |  | 2\% | 2\% | 7\% | 4\% | 1\% |
| Update technology / methods offered | 4 | - | 3 | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | 2\% |  | 3\% | 2\% |  | 2\% |  | 2\% | 3\% | $2 \%$ | 3\% |
| Application process must be streamlined | 4 | - | 2 | 2 | - | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
|  | 2\% |  | 2\% | 3\% |  |  | 2\% | 4\% | 2\% | 2\% | 1\% |
| Improve knowledge / support of staff | 3 | - | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 3 |
|  | 1\% |  | 1\% | 3\% |  | 2\% |  | 2\% | 2\% |  | 4\% |
| Increase long-term support offered | 2 | - | 2 | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | 1\% |  | 2\% |  |  | 2\% |  |  | 2\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Clearer guidelines for application/approval | 2 | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | - |
|  | 1\% |  | 1\% |  | 4\% |  |  | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |  |
| other | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 |
|  | 1\% |  | 1\% | 2\% |  | 2\% | 2\% |  |  | 1\% | 1\% |
| No, no changes | 4 | - | 3 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
|  | 2\% |  | 3\% | 2\% |  |  | 2\% | 2\% | 3\% | 2\% | 1\% |
| Don't Know | 27 | 2 | 16 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 21 | 6 |
|  | 13\% | 25\% | 15\% | 9\% | 9\% | 14\% | $9 \%$ | 23\% | 8\% | 16\% | 8\% |
| CHI-SQUARE SIGNIFICANCE |  | ----- | ----23 | --- | --- | <--------- | ----23. | 63------ | -----> | <-------12. | 52--- |
|  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | $2 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q51. Research service. Are there any other research activities that you would like to see carried out?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | тоtal | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Yes | 44 | 1 | 26 | 11 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 10 | 18 | 31 | 13 |
|  | 22\% | 12\% | 25\% | 17\% | 26\% | 25\% | 11\% | 19\% | 30\% | $24 \%$ | 18\% |
| No | 55 | 3 | 21 | 21 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 18 | 17 | 34 | 21 |
| No | 27\% | 38\% | 20\% | 33\% | 39\% | 20\% | 25\% | 34\% | 28\% | 27\% | 29\% |
| Don't Know | 102 | 4 | 58 | 32 | 8 | 24 | 28 | 25 | 25 | 63 | 39 |
|  | 51\% | 50\% | 55\% | 50\% | 35\% | 55\% | 64\% | 47\% | 42\% | 49\% | 53\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |  |  |  |  |
| Chi-square |  |  | --7. | ------- | -----> | <---- | --8 | - | -----> | <-------1. | 2 |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  | 71 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 43 |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q52. What research activities?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | YEARS IN EXISTENCE |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | English | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 44 | 1 | 26 | 11 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 10 | 18 | 31 | 13 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Market reports by cultural sectors | 31 | 1 | 17 | 10 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 7 | 14 | 22 | 9 |
|  | 70\% | 100\% | 65\% | 91\% | 50\% | 73\% | 40\% | 70\% | 78\% | 71\% | 69\% |
| Improving access to research on Trade Routes website | 24 | 1 | 16 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 15 | 9 |
|  | 55\% | 100\% | 62\% | 36\% | 50\% | 64\% | 60\% | 40\% | 56\% | 48\% | 69\% |
| Increasing market studies correspond to priority markets | 23 | - | 15 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 18 | 5 |
|  | 52\% |  | 58\% | 55\% | 33\% | 45\% | 80\% | 40\% | 56\% | 58\% | 38\% |
| Increasing awareness of available studies | 22 | - | 13 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 16 | 6 |
|  | 50\% |  | 50\% | 64\% | 33\% | 36\% | 80\% | 50\% | 50\% | 52\% | 46\% |
| Updating available material/data | 21 | - | 14 | ${ }^{4}$ | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 13 | 8 |
|  | 48\% |  | 54\% | 36\% | 50\% | 45\% | 40\% | 20\% | 67\% | 42\% | 62\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H |  |  |
| Market reports by regions | 19 | 1 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 5 |
|  | 43\% | 100\% | 50\% | 36\% | 17\% | 55\% | 40\% | 40\% | 39\% | 45\% | 38\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Succinct fact sheets | 16 | 1 | 11 | 4 | - | 3 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 14 | 2 |
|  | 36\% | 100\% | 42\% | 36\% |  | 27\% | 80\% | 10\% | 44\% | 45\% | 15\% |
|  |  | CD |  |  |  |  | FH |  | H | к |  |
| More market reports | 14 | 1 | 12 | 1 | - | 5 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 4 |
|  | 32\% | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ C D \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 46 \% \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $9 \%$ |  | 45\% | 40\% | 20\% | 28\% | 32\% | 31\% |
| Summary sheets of market reports | 12 | 1 | 11 | - | - | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 10 | ${ }^{2}$ |
|  | 27\% | 100\% | 42\% |  |  | 18\% | 60\% | 20\% | 28\% | 32\% | 15\% |
|  |  | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Developing shorter reports | 11 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 3 |
|  | 25\% | 100\% | 19\% | 27\% | 33\% | 18\% | 60\% | 20\% | 22\% | 26\% | 23\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | 10 | - | 8 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 1 |
|  | 23\% |  | 31\% | 9\% | 17\% | 27\% | 20\% | 30\% | 17\% | 29\% | 8\% |
| CHI-SQUARE SIGNIFICANCE |  | ------ | ----23. | ------- | -----> | <-------- | -14 | -- | --> | <--------6. | -> |
|  |  |  | 6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q53. Do you think that Trade Routes should expand its investment initiatives within the program for those sub-sectors where investment is relevant?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q54. If you could offer one suggestion to improve the quality of service you received from the Trade Routes program, what would that be?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | Language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Faster approvals | 41 | 1 | 22 | 13 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 11 | 16 | 24 | 17 |
|  | 20\% | 12\% | 21\% | 20\% | 22\% | 18\% | 14\% | 21\% | 27\% | 19\% | 23\% |
| Increased funding / grants | 22 | - | 8 | 11 |  | 4 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 12 | 10 |
|  | 11\% |  | 8\% | 17\% | 13\% | $9 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $9 \%$ | 15\% | 9\% | 14\% |
| More / better communication | 10 | 1 | 6 | 3 | - | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 3 |
|  | 5\% | 12\% | 6\% | 5\% |  | 7\% | 2\% | 8\% | 3\% | 5\% | 4\% |
| Improve the application process | , | - | 5 | 2 | , | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 2 |
|  | 4\% |  | 5\% | 3\% | 4\% | 5\% | 2\% | 4\% | 5\% | 5\% | 3\% |
| Better understanding of the industry | 6 | - | 2 | 4 | - | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
|  | 3\% |  | 2\% | 6\% |  | 5\% | 2\% | 4\% | 2\% | 4\% | 1\% |
| More support from overseas reps, etc. | 5 | - | 4 | 1 | - | - | 4 | - | 1 | 4 | 1 |
|  | 2\% |  | 4\% | 2\% |  |  | $9 \%$ |  | 2\% | 3\% | 1\% |
| More deadlines / more flexible deadlines | 4 | - | 1 | 3 | - | - | - | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
|  | 2\% |  | 1\% | 5\% |  |  |  | 6\% | 2\% | 2\% | 3\% |
| More / clearer information | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 3 | 1 |
|  | 2\% | 12\% | 1\% | 2\% | 4\% | 2\% | 2\% |  | 3\% | 2\% | 1\% |
| other | 38 | 1 | 20 | 10 | 7 | 11 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 20 | 18 |
|  | 19\% | 12\% | 19\% | 16\% | 30\% | 25\% | 18\% | 17\% | 17\% | 16\% | 25\% |
| Don't Know | 63 | 4 | 36 | 16 | 6 | 13 | 18 | 17 | 15 | 45 | 18 |
|  | 31\% | 50\% | 34\% | 25\% | 26\% | 30\% | 41\% | 32\% | 25\% | 35\% | 25\% |
| CHI-SQUARE <br> SIGNIFICANCE |  | ----- | ---26. | - | -----> | <-------- | ----27. | 47--- | ------> | <-------7 | 64-- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q55. Excluding yourself, how many full-time employees work for your organization in Canada? Please include part-time employees as full-time equivalents

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | EnGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| None/no one | 8 | 8 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
|  | 4\% | 100\% |  |  |  | 2\% | 2\% | 6\% | 5\% | 4\% | 4\% |
| 1-5 | 105 | - | 105 | - | - | 24$55 \%$ | $\begin{array}{rr}30 & 28 \\ 68 \% & 53 \%\end{array}$ |  | 23$38 \%$ | $\begin{array}{rr}78 & 27 \\ 61 \% & 37 \%\end{array}$ |  |
|  | 52\% |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6-25 | 64 | - | - | 64 | - |  | 127\% | 15$28 \%$ | 25 | 33$26 \%$ | 31$42 \%$ |
|  | 32\% |  |  | 100\% |  | $27 \%$ |  |  | 42\% |  |  |
| 26-49 | 11 | - | - | - | 11$48 \%$ | 11\% | 2\% | 248 | 3$5 \%$ | 3\% | 10\% |
|  | 5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50-99 | 4 | - | - | - | 4 | 2 | - |  | 2\% | 2\% | 2$3 \%$ |
|  | 2\% |  |  |  | 17\% | 5\% |  | 2\% |  |  |  |
| 100 or more | 8 | - | - | - | 8 | - | - | 6\% | 8\% | 5\% | 2$3 \%$ |
|  | 4\% |  |  |  | 35\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Don't Know | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2\% | - | - | 118 |
|  | *\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHI-SQUARE SIGNIFICANCE |  | ---------------------600-- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q56. How long has your business or organization been in existence?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LeSS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ======== | F===== FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| TOTAL | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Less than 2 years | 7 | - | 6 | 1 | - | 7 | - | - | - | 6 | 1 |
|  | 3\% |  | 6\% | 2\% |  | 16\% |  |  |  | 5\% | 1\% |
| 2-5 years | 37 | 1 | 18 | 11 | 7 | 37 | - | - | - | 24 | 13 |
|  | 18\% | 12\% | 17\% | 17\% | 30\% | 84\% |  |  |  | 19\% | 18\% |
| 6-10 years | 44 | 1 |  |  | 1 | - | 44 | - | - | 26 | 18 |
|  | 22\% | 12\% | 29\% | 19\% | 4\% |  | 100\% |  |  | 20\% | 25\% |
| 11-20 years | 53 | 3 | 28 | 15 | 6 | - | - | 53 | - | 36 | 17 |
|  | 26\% | 38\% | 27\% | 23\% | 26\% |  |  | 100\% |  | 28\% | 23\% |
| More than 20 years | 60 | 3 | 23 | 25 | 9 | - | - | - | 60 | 36 | 24 |
|  | 30\% | 38\% | 22\% | 39\% | 39\% |  |  |  | 100\% | 28\% | 33\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

Q57. In which province/territory are you located? If you are located in more than one province, please identify the location of your main office.

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | Language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| National Capital Region | 4 | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | 3 | 4 | - |
|  | 2\% |  | 2\% | 2\% | 4\% |  | 2\% |  | 5\% | 3\% |  |
| Newfoundland and | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | - |
| Labrador | 2\% | 12\% | 1\% | 5\% |  |  | 2\% | 2\% | 5\% | 4\% |  |
| Nova Scotia | 8 | - | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 8 | - |
|  | 4\% |  | 5\% | 3\% | 4\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 8\% | 6\% |  |
| Prince Edward Island | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | - |
|  | *\% |  | 1\% |  |  |  |  | 2\% |  | 1\% |  |
| New Brunswick | 3 | - | 3 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
|  | 1\% |  | 3\% |  |  |  | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 1\% |
| Quebec | 78 | 3 | 30 | 33 | 11 | 18 | 17 | 19 | 24 | و | 69 |
|  | 39\% | 38\% | 29\% | 52\% | 48\% | 41\% | 39\% | 36\% | 40\% | 7\% | 95\% |
| Ontario | 59 298 | $\stackrel{1}{12 \%}$ | 38 $36 \%$ | 14 $22 \%$ | 26\% ${ }^{6}$ | 10 $23 \%$ | 16 $36 \%$ | 15 288 | 18 $30 \%$ | 56 $44 \%$ | 3 |
|  |  |  | 36\% |  |  |  | 36\% |  |  | 44\% | $4 \%$ |
| Manitoba | 5 | - | 3 | 2 | - | 3 | - | - | 2 | 5 | - |
|  | 2\% |  | 3\% | 3\% |  | 7\% |  |  | 3\% | 4\% |  |
| Saskatchewan | 2 | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | 2 | - |
|  | 1\% |  | 2\% |  |  |  |  | 4\% |  | 2\% |  |
| Alberta | 5 | - | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | - | 1 | 1 | 5 | - |
|  | 2\% |  | 3\% | 2\% | 4\% | 7\% |  | 2\% | 2\% | 4\% |  |
| British Columbia | 30 | 2 | 17 | 8 | 3 | 9 | 7 | 11 | 3 | 30 | - |
|  | 15\% | 25\% | 16\% | 12\% | 13\% | 20\% | 16\% | 21\% | 5\% | 23\% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | I |  | I |  |  |  |
| Yukon | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | - |
|  | *\% | 12\% |  |  |  |  |  | 2\% |  | 1\% |  |
| CHI-SqUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q58. What has been the approximate value of your organization's annual revenues from the export of its products or services over the past two years?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q59. Are you a member of any of the following groups?


## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Client Version

CLIENT
Q60. What is your first official language?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LESS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 201 | 8 | 105 | 64 | 23 | 44 | 44 | 53 | 60 | 128 | 73 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| English | 128 | 5 | 78 | 33 | 12 | 30 | 26 | 36 | 36 | 128 | - |
|  | 64\% | 62\% | $\begin{gathered} 74 \% \\ \mathrm{DE} \end{gathered}$ | 52\% | 52\% | 68\% | 59\% | 68\% | 60\% | 100\% |  |
| French | 73 | 3 | 27 | 31 | 11 | 14 | 18 | 17 | 24 | - | 73 |
|  | 36\% | 38\% | 26\% | 48\% | 48\% | 32\% | 41\% | 32\% | 40\% |  | 100\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Non Client Version
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Table 258 Page $34 \ldots \ldots . . .258$. What has been the approximate value of your organization's annual revenues from the export of its products or services over the past two years?
Table $\mathbf{2} 59$ Page $35 \ldots . .$. . 259 . Are you a member of any of the following groups?
Table 960 Page $36 \ldots . . . .960$. What is your first official language?
non Client
Q1. Which of the following best describes the organization you work for?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LeSS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | EnGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 532 | 88 | 233 | 148 | 59 | 118 | 117 | 143 | 150 | 333 | 199 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| For-profit company | 254 | 16 | 101 | 100 | 35 | 57 | 63 | 74 | 60 | 159 | 95 |
|  | 48\% | 18\% | 43\% | $68 \%$ | 59\% | 48\% | 54\% | 52\% | 40\% | 48\% | 48\% |
| Individual entrepreneur | 146 | 61 | 71 | 11 | 2 | 48 | 39 | 37 | 20 | 103 | 43 |
| (i.e. self-employed) | 27\% | 69\% | 30\% | 7\% | 3\% | 41\% | 33\% | 26\% | 13\% | 31\% | 22\% |
|  |  | CDE | DE |  |  | HI | I | I |  | к |  |
| Not-for-profit | 71 | 4 | 37 | 21 | 9 |  | 7 | 19 | 39 | 26 | 45 |
| corporation | 13\% | 5\% | 16\% | 14\% | 15\% | 5\% | 6\% | 13\% | 26\% | 8\% | 23\% |
|  |  |  | B | B | B |  |  | FG | FGH |  | J |
| Not-for profit | 37 | 5 | 19 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 16 | 26 | 11 |
| association | 7\% | 6\% | 8\% | 5\% | 10\% | 4\% | 7\% | 6\% | 11\% | 8\% | 6\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  |
| National/provincial/ | 14 | - | 4 | 6 | 3 | - | - | 2 | 10 | 12 | 2 |
| territorial/municipal | 3\% |  | 2\% | 4\% | 5\% |  |  | 1\% | 7\% | 4\% | 1\% |
| association |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H | к |  |
| Academic institution or | 8 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | - | 2 | 5 | 7 | 1 |
| Chamber of Commerce | 2\% | 1\% | *\% | 1\% | 7\% | 1\% |  | 1\% | 3\% | 2\% | 1\% |
| Other | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
|  | *\% |  |  | 1\% |  | 1\% |  |  |  |  | 1\% |
| Don't Know | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 |
|  | *\% | 1\% |  |  |  |  |  | 1\% |  |  | 1\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Q2. In which area of the arts and cultural sector are you involved?


Comparison Groups: BCDE/FGHI/JK
Independent z -Test for Percentages
Upper case letters indicate significance at the $95 \%$ level.
"*" Denotes Chi-Square where at least one cell has an expected value of less than 1
or more than $20 \%$ of the cells have an expected value of less than 5 .
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Q3. Familiar: Overall Trade Routes Program

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | тOtal | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LeSS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 532 | 88 | 233 | 148 | 59 | 118 | 117 | 143 | 150 | 333 | 199 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Not at all | 170 | 37 | 61 | 51 | 21 | 33 | 38 | 51 | 47 | 111 | 59 |
|  | 32\% | $42 \%$ C | 26\% | 34\% | 36\% | 28\% | 32\% | 36\% | 31\% | 33\% | 30\% |
| Only a little | 207 | 34 | 99 | 56 | 16 | 59 | 46 | 44 | 56 | 111 | 96 |
|  | 39\% | 39\% | 42\% | 38\% | 27\% | 50\% | 39\% | 31\% | 37\% | 33\% | 48\% |
|  |  |  | E |  |  | HI |  |  |  |  |  |
| Moderately familiar | 130 | 12 | 62 | 35 | 19 | 25 | 28 | 37 | 39 | 92 | 38 |
|  | 24\% | 14\% | 27\% | 24\% | 32\% | 21\% | 24\% | 26\% | 26\% | 28\% | 19\% |
|  |  |  | B | B | B |  |  |  |  | к |  |
| Very familiar | 25 | 5 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 8 | 19 | 6 |
|  | 5\% | 6\% | 5\% | $4 \%$ | 5\% | 1\% | 4\% | 8\% | 5\% | 6\% | 3\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | F |  |  |
| CHI-SQUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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non Client
Q3. Familiar: Market Entry Support
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non Client
Q3. Familiar: In-Market Assistance

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 532 | 88 | 233 | 148 | 59 | 118 | 117 | 143 | 150 | 333 | 199 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Not at all | 259 | 58 | 97 | 74 | 29 | 60 | 50 | 74 | 72 | 166 | 93 |
|  | 49\% | ${ }^{66 \%}$ | 42\% | 50\% | 49\% | 51\% | 43\% | 52\% | 48\% | 50\% | 47\% |
| Only a little | 180 | 21 | 94 | 49 | 14 | 42 | 48 | 40 | 50 | 107 | 73 |
|  | 34\% | 24\% | 40\% | 33\% | 24\% | 36\% | 41\% | 28\% | 33\% | 32\% | 37\% |
|  |  |  | BE |  |  |  | H |  |  |  |  |
| Moderately familiar | 81 | 8 | 36 | 22 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 25 | 24 | 52 | 29 |
|  | 15\% | 9\% | 15\% | 15\% | 24\% | 13\% | 14\% | 17\% | 16\% | 16\% | 15\% |
| Very familiar | 12 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 |
|  | 2\% | 1\% | 3\% | 2\% | 3\% | 1\% | 3\% | 3\% | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| CHI-SQUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Non Client Version

non Client
Q3. Familiar: Contributions
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## NON CLIENT

Q3. Familiar: Research

non Client
Q4. During the last 12 months, has your organization used the Trade Routes program?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 532 | 88 | 233 | 148 | 59 | 118 | 117 | 143 | 150 | 333 | 199 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| No | 502 | 86 | 225 | 140 | 48 | 113 | 112 | 135 | 140 | 315 | 187 |
|  | 94\% | 98\% | 97\% | 95\% | 81\% | 96\% | 96\% | 94\% | 93\% | 95\% | 94\% |
| Don't Know | 30 | 2 | 8 | 8 | 11 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 18 | 12 |
| Don't Know | 6\% | 2\% | 3\% | 5\% | 19\% | 4\% | 4\% | 6\% | 7\% | 5\% | 6\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | BCD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHI-Square |  |  | ----23. | ---- | ----> | <----- | --1 | 9-------- | -----> | <--------. 0 | --------> |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4\% |  |
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NC1. Prior to this research, were you aware of the Trade Routes program?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| тоtal | 532 | 88 | 233 | 148 | 59 | 118 | 117 | 143 | 150 | 333 | 199 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Yes | 334 | 50 | 163 | 85 | 33 | 72 | 75 | 92 | 93 | 196 | 138 |
|  | 63\% | 57\% | 70\% | 57\% | 56\% | 61\% | 64\% | 64\% | 62\% | 59\% | 69\% |
|  |  |  | bDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | J |
| No | 186 | 37 | 66 | 59 | 23 | 44 | 41 | 47 | 52 | 130 | 56 |
|  | 35\% | 42\% | 28\% | 40\% | 39\% | 37\% | 35\% | 33\% | 35\% | 39\% | 28\% |
|  |  | c |  | c |  |  |  |  |  | к |  |
| Don't Know | 12 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 5 |
|  | 2\% | 1\% | 2\% | 3\% | 5\% | 2\% | 1\% | 3\% | 3\% | 2\% | 3\% |
| Chi-square |  |  | ----11. | ------- | -----> | <----- | --2 | -- | -----> | <--------6 | 1- |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## non CLIENT

NC2. Has your organization used the Trade Routes program in the past?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | EnGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (c) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| тоtal | 334 | 50 | 163 | 85 | 33 | 72 | 75 | 92 | 93 | 196 | 138 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Yes | 96 | 14 | 51 | 19 | 12 | 10 | 24 | 37 | 25 | 68 | 28 |
|  | 29\% | 28\% | 31\% | 22\% | 36\% | 14\% | 32\% | 40\% | 27\% | 35\% | 20\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | F | F | к |  |
| No | 214 | 32 | 103 | 63 | 16 | 58 | 48 | 48 | 60 | 112 | 102 |
|  | 64\% | 64\% | 63\% | 74\% | 48\% | 81\% | 64\% | 52\% | 65\% | 57\% | 74\% |
|  |  |  |  | E |  | GHI |  |  |  |  | J |
| Don't Know | 24 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 16 | 8 |
|  | 7\% | 8\% | 6\% | 4\% | 15\% | 6\% | 4\% | 8\% | 9\% | 8\% | 6\% |
| Chi-square | $\begin{array}{cc} \text { <-----------------10.28------------------> <-------------------16.7------------------------------10.03 } 99 \% & 99 \% \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

NC3. How long did you use the Trade Routes program?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 120 | 18 | 60 | 22 | 17 | 14 | 27 | 44 | 33 | 84 | 36 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Less than 2 years | 66 | 11 | 32 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 15 | 20 | 19 | 44 | 22 |
|  | 55\% | 61\% | 53\% | 59\% | 47\% | 79\% | 56\% | 45\% | 58\% | 52\% | 61\% |
| 2 years | 15 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 5 |
|  | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% | 9\% | 24\% | 7\% | 15\% | 7\% | 21\% | 12\% | 14\% |
| 3 years | 23 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 4 | 18 | 5 |
|  | 19\% | 22\% | 18\% | 18\% | 24\% | 7\% | 19\% | 30\% | 12\% | 21\% | 14\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |
| 4 years | 11 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 9 | 2 |
|  | 9\% | 6\% | 12\% | 9\% | 6\% | 7\% | 11\% | 11\% | 6\% | 11\% | 6\% |
| 5 years | 5 | - | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
|  | 4\% |  | 5\% | 5\% |  |  |  | 7\% | 3\% | 4\% | 6\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 120 | 18 | 60 | 22 | 17 | 14 | 27 | 44 | 33 | 84 | 36 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Received all the assistance we needed | 30 | 4 | 16 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 7 | 26 | 4 |
|  | 25\% | 22\% | 27\% | 14\% | 35\% | 29\% | 22\% | 27\% | 21\% | 31\% | 11\% |
| Not satisfied with service | 16 | 1 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 14 | 2 |
|  | 13\% | 6\% | 15\% | 18\% | 12\% | 14\% | 7\% | 11\% | 21\% | 17\% | 6\% |
| Inappropriate for current level of export/ services | 14 | 3 | 7 | 4 | - | 1 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 9 | 5 |
|  | 12\% | 17\% | 12\% | 18\% |  | 7\% | 11\% | 16\% | $9 \%$ | 11\% | 14\% |
| Trade Routes declined our proposal / funding | 14 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 5 |
|  | 12\% | 11\% | 7\% | 18\% | 18\% | 7\% | 11\% | 9\% | 18\% | 11\% | 14\% |
| No longer considering exporting | 10 | 3 | 7 | - | - | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
|  | 8\% | 17\% | 12\% |  |  | 7\% | 19\% | 5\% | 6\% | 4\% | 19\% |
| Missed deadline/deadline was inconvenient | 8 | - | 6 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 6 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
|  | 7\% |  | 10\% | 5\% | 6\% |  |  | 14\% | 6\% | 5\% | 11\% |
| Unaware of program | 6 | - | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
|  | 5\% |  | 5\% | 9\% | 6\% | 7\% | 7\% | 5\% | 3\% | 4\% | 8\% |
| In process of reorganizing company | 4 | 1 | 3 | - | - | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
|  | 3\% | 6\% | 5\% |  |  |  | 7\% | 2\% | 3\% | 4\% | 3\% |
| Other | 4 | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | - | 2 | 2 | - | 1 | 3 |
|  | 3\% | 6\% | 3\% |  | 6\% |  | 7\% | 5\% |  | 1\% | 8\% |
| Don't Know | 19 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 15 | 4 |
|  | 16\% | 17\% | 13\% | 18\% | 18\% | 29\% | 11\% | 14\% | 15\% | 18\% | 11\% |
| CHI-SQUARE SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

NC5. Do you have any comments or feedback you would like to share about the Trade Routes program?

non Client
Q37 All things considered, how would you rate the overall value or usefulness of the Trade Routes program to your organization?
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Q38. Impact: Improving your export readiness.


## NON CLIENT

Q38. Impact: Helping you develop international market(s).
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Q38. Impact: Building networks/partnerships/contacts

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | тоtal | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| тOTAL | 104 | 15 | 53 | 21 | 14 | 12 | 23 | 39 | 29 | 71 | 33 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| No impact | 15 | - | 9 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 10 | 5 |
|  | 14\% |  | 17\% | 19\% | 7\% | 17\% | 4\% | 15\% | 17\% | 14\% | 15\% |
| Minor impact | 17 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 14 | 3 |
|  | 16\% | 20\% | 15\% | 19\% | 14\% | 17\% | 17\% | 21\% | 10\% | 20\% | 9\% |
| Moderate impact | 38 | 8 | 20 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 11 | 13 | 26 | 12 |
|  | 37\% | 53\% | 38\% | 29\% | 29\% | 50\% | 35\% | 28\% | 45\% | 37\% | 36\% |
| Major impact | 34 | 4 | 16 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 10 | 14 | 8 | 21 | 13 |
|  | 33\% | 27\% | 30\% | 33\% | 50\% | 17\% | 43\% | 36\% | 28\% | 30\% | 39\% |
| N/A | 16 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 13 | 3 |
|  | 15\% | 20\% | 13\% | 5\% | 21\% | 17\% | 17\% | 13\% | 14\% | 18\% | 9\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Q38. Impact: Providing strategic advice on doing business in one or more international markets.

non Client
Q38. Impact: Skills development for you/your staff in international business.


## NON CLIENT

Q38. Impact: Helping you make informed decisions about where to invest and/or export.


Q38. Impact: First-hand/on-line exposure to markets and their business practices.


## non CLIENT

Q39. Resulted in outcomes: Increased exports of products/services

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | English | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (c) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 86 | 12 | 44 | 20 | 10 | 9 | 18 | 34 | 25 | 62 | 24 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Yes | 49 | 5 | 25 | 14 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 24 | 11 | 34 | 15 |
|  | 57\% | 42\% | 57\% | 70\% | 50\% | 67\% | 44\% | 71\% | 44\% | 55\% | 62\% |
| No | 37 | 7 | 19 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 10 | 10 | 14 | 28 | 9 |
|  | 43\% | 58\% | 43\% | 30\% | 50\% | 33\% | 56\% | 29\% | 56\% | 45\% | 38\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | н |  |  |
| N/A | 34 | 6 | 16 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 22 | 12 |
|  | 40\% | 50\% | 36\% | 10\% | 70\% | 56\% | 50\% | 29\% | 32\% | 35\% | 50\% |
|  |  | D | D |  | CD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Q39. Resulted in outcomes: Diversified/expanded markets for products/services

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 87 | 12 | 46 | 18 | 11 | 9 | 20 | 31 | 27 | 60 | 27 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Yes | 52 | 3 | 31 | 11 | 7 | 4 | 13 | 22 | 13 | 35 | 17 |
|  | 60\% | 25\% | 67\% | 61\% | 64\% | 44\% | 65\% | 71\% | 48\% | 58\% | 63\% |
| No | 35 | 9 | 15 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 14 | 25 | 10 |
|  | 40\% | 75\% | 33\% | 39\% | 36\% | 56\% | 35\% | 29\% | 52\% | 42\% | 37\% |
|  |  | CDE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | 33 | 6 | 14 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 13 | 6 | 24 | 9 |
|  | 38\% | 50\% | 30\% | 22\% | 55\% | 56\% | 35\% | 42\% | 22\% | 40\% | 33\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Non Client Version

Q39. Resulted in outcomes: Increased trade-related networks/connections

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | Language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LeSS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 95 | 13 | 50 | 19 | 13 | 11 | 21 | 35 | 28 | 67 | 28 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Yes | 70 | 8 | 36 | 16 | 10 | 7 | 17 | 28 | 18 | 49 | 21 |
|  | 74\% | 62\% | 72\% | 84\% | 77\% | 64\% | 81\% | 80\% | 64\% | 73\% | 75\% |
| No | 25 | 5 | 14 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 18 | 7 |
|  | 26\% | 38\% | 28\% | 16\% | 23\% | 36\% | 19\% | 20\% | 36\% | 27\% | 25\% |
| N/A | 25 | 5 | 10 |  | 4 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 17 | 8 |
|  | 26\% | 38\% | 20\% | 16\% | 31\% | 27\% | 29\% | 26\% | 18\% | 25\% | 29\% |
| Chi-square | <--------------------3.94 $31 \%$ - |  |  |  |  | -39\% |  |  |  | 5\% |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## non CLIENT

Q39. Resulted in outcomes: Better/increased understanding of international markets

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | Language |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (c) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 91 | 14 | 48 | 17 | 12 | 11 | 22 | 29 | 29 | 62 | 29 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Yes | 63 | 11 | 32 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 17 | 20 | 19 | 42 | 21 |
|  | 69\% | 79\% | 67\% | 65\% | 75\% | 64\% | 77\% | 69\% | 66\% | 68\% | 72\% |
| No | 28 | 3 | 16 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 20 | 8 |
|  | 31\% | 21\% | 33\% | 35\% | 25\% | 36\% | 23\% | 31\% | 34\% | 32\% | 28\% |
| N/A | 29 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 15 | 4 | 22 | 7 |
|  | 32\% | 29\% | 25\% | 29\% | 42\% | 27\% | 23\% | 52\% | 14\% | 35\% | 24\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHI-SQUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Q40. How would you rate the importance of these outcome(s) to your business? Increased exports of products/ services

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LeSS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 49 | 5 | 25 | 14 | 5 | ${ }^{6}$ | 8 | 24 | 11 | 34 | 15 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Not Very Important | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1 | 1 |
|  | 4\% |  |  | 14\% |  |  |  |  | 18\% | 3\% | 7\% |
| Moderately Important | 13 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 5 |
|  | 27\% | 20\% | 20\% | 43\% | 20\% | 33\% | 25\% | 21\% | 36\% | 24\% | 33\% |
| Very Important | 34 | 4 | 20 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 19 | 5 | 25 | 9 |
|  | 69\% | 80\% | 80\% | 43\% | 80\% | 67\% | 75\% | 79\% | 45\% | 74\% | 60\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHI-SQUARE SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Q40. How would you rate the importance of these outcome(s) to your business? Diversified/expanded markets for products/services


Q40. How would you rate the importance of these outcome(s) to your business? Increased trade-related networks/ connections

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LeSS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 70 | 8 | 36 | 16 | 10 | 7 | 17 | 28 | 18 | 49 | 21 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Not Very Important | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 4\% | 12\% | 3\% | 6\% |  | 14\% |  | 4\% | 6\% | 2\% | 10\% |
| Moderately Important | 25 | 3 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 16 | 9 |
|  | 36\% | 38\% | 33\% | 44\% | 30\% | 29\% | 41\% | 32\% | 39\% | 33\% | 43\% |
| Very Important | 42 | 4 | 23 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 10 | 18 | 10 | 32 | 10 |
|  | 60\% | 50\% | 64\% | 50\% | 70\% | 57\% | 59\% | 64\% | 56\% | 65\% | 48\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Q40. How would you rate the importance of these outcome(s) to your business? Better/increased understanding of international markets

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR LeSS | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 63 | 11 | 32 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 17 | 20 | 19 | 42 | 21 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Not Very Important | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
|  | $8 \%$ | 9\% | 6\% | $9 \%$ | 11\% |  | 12\% | 5\% | 11\% | 2\% | 19\% |
| Moderately Important | 25 | 6 | 10 | ${ }^{6}$ | 3 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 11 | 15 | 10 |
|  | 40\% | 55\% | 31\% | 55\% | 33\% | 29\% | 41\% | 25\% | 58\% | 36\% | 48\% |
| Very Important | 33 | 4 | 20 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 14 | 6 | 26 | 7 |
|  | 52\% | 36\% | 62\% | 36\% | 56\% | 71\% | 47\% | 70\% | 32\% | 62\% | 33\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE | 8\%* |  |  |  |  | <-----------------7.48----------------->> 418 |  |  |  | 94\%* |  |

Q41. How likely is it that your organization will use the Trade Routes program in future?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | YEARS IN EXISTENCE |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | тоtal | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| TOTAL | 120 | 18 | 60 | 22 | 17 | 14 | 27 | 44 | 33 | 84 | 36 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Very likely | 56 | 8 | 29 | 10 | 8 | 6 | 12 | 24 | 13 | 37 | 19 |
|  | 47\% | 44\% | 48\% | 45\% | 47\% | 43\% | 44\% | 55\% | 39\% | 44\% | 53\% |
| Moderately likely | 33 | 3 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 13 | 25 | 8 |
|  | 28\% | 17\% | 30\% | 32\% | 24\% | 29\% | 19\% | 25\% | 39\% | 30\% | 22\% |
| Not very likely | 10 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 2 |
|  | 8\% | 22\% | 3\% | 5\% | 18\% | 7\% | 15\% | 2\% | 12\% | 10\% | 6\% |
| Not at all likely | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
|  | 3\% | 6\% | 2\% | $9 \%$ |  | 7\% | 4\% | 2\% | 3\% | 4\% | 3\% |
| Don't Know | 17 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 11 | 6 |
|  | 14\% | 11\% | 17\% | $9 \%$ | 12\% | 14\% | 19\% | 16\% | 6\% | 13\% | 17\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Q55. Excluding yourself, how many full-time employees work for your organization in Canada? Please include part-time employees as full-time equivalents.


Q56. How long has your business or organization been in existence?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | Years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | English | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 532 | 88 | 233 | 148 | 59 | 118 | 117 | 143 | 150 | 333 | 199 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Less than 2 years | 24 | 4 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 24 | - | - | - | 18 | 6 |
|  | 5\% | 5\% | 6 ${ }_{\text {E }}$ | 3\% | 2\% | 20\% |  |  |  | 5\% | 3\% |
| 2-5 years | 94 | 32 | 36 | 18 | 7 | 94 | - | - | - | 51 | 43 |
|  | 18\% | $36 \%$ | 15\% | 12\% | 12\% | 80\% |  |  |  | 15\% | 22\% |
| 6-10 years | 117 | 22 | 60 | 27 | 8 | - | 117 | - | - | 70 | 47 |
|  | 22\% | 25\% | $\begin{gathered} 26 \% \\ E \end{gathered}$ | 18\% | 14\% |  | 100\% |  |  | 21\% | 24\% |
| 11-20 years | 143 | 20 | 62 | 48 | 13 | - | - | 143 | - | 100 | 43 |
|  | 27\% | 23\% | 27\% | 32\% | 22\% |  |  | 100\% |  | 30\% | 22\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | к |  |
| More than 20 years | 150 | 9 | 60 | 50 | 30 | - | - | - | 150 | 93 | 57 |
|  | 28\% | 10\% | 26\% | 34\% | 51\% |  |  |  | 100\% | 28\% | 29\% |
|  |  |  | B | B | BCD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Don't Know | 4 | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 3 |
|  | 1\% | 1\% |  | 1\% |  |  |  |  |  | *\% | 2\% |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Q57. In which province/territory are you located? If you are located in more than one province, please identify the location of your main office.


Q58. What has been the approximate value of your organization's annual revenues from the export of its products or services over the past two years?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (1) | (J) | (K) |
| total | 532 | 88 | 233 | 148 | 59 | 118 | 117 | 143 | 150 | 333 | 199 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| None | 79 | 23 | 36 | 16 | 4 | 22 | 11 | 17 | 29 | 44 | 35 |
|  | 15\% | $26 \%$ | 15\% | 11\% | 7\% | 19\% | $9 \%$ | 12\% | 19\% | 13\% | 18\% |
|  |  | CDE | E |  |  | G |  |  | G |  |  |
| Under \$ $\mathbf{2 5 , 0 0 0}$ | 111 | 32 | 55 | 21 | , | 39 | 28 | 22 | 21 | 61 | 50 |
|  | 21\% | $36 \%$ | 24\% | 14\% | 5\% | 33\% | 24\% | 15\% | 14\% | 18\% | 25\% |
|  |  | CDE | DE | E |  | HI | I |  |  |  |  |
| \$25,000 to \$50,000 | 40 | 13 | 21 | 6 | - | 11 | 8 | 13 | 8 | 23 | 17 |
|  | 8\% | 15\% | $9 \%$ | 4\% |  | $9 \%$ | 7\% | $9 \%$ | 5\% | 7\% | 9\% |
|  |  | D | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$51,000 to \$100,000 | 65 | 10 | 35 | 19 | 1 | 13 | 15 | 19 | 18 | 51 | 14 |
|  | 12\% |  | 15\% | 13\% | 2\% | 11\% | 13\% | 13\% | 12\% | 15\% | 7\% |
|  |  | E | E | E |  |  |  |  |  | к |  |
| \$101,000 to \$250,000 |  | 3 | 27 |  | 1 | 9 | 16 | 14 | 10 | 35 | 14 |
|  | 9\% | 3\% | 12\% | 12\% | 2\% | 8\% | 14\% | 10\% | 7\% | 11\% | 7\% |
|  |  |  | BE | BE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$251,000 to \$500,000 | 38 | 1 | 20 | 13 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 14 | 14 | 22 | 16 |
|  | 7\% | 1\% | 9\% | 9\% | 7\% | 4\% | 4\% | 10\% | 9\% | 7\% | 8\% |
|  |  |  | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| More than \$500,000 | 100 | 4 | 17 | 39 | 39 | 12 | 20 | 28 | 39 | 63 | 37 |
|  | 19\% | 5\% | 7\% | 26\% | 66\% | 10\% | 17\% | 20\% | 26\% | 19\% | 19\% |
|  |  |  |  | BC | BCD |  |  | F | F |  |  |
| Don't Know | 50 | 2 | 22 | 16 | 7 | 7 | 14 | 16 | 11 | 34 | 16 |
|  | 9\% | 2\% | 9\% | 11\% | 12\% | 6\% | 12\% | 11\% | 7\% | 10\% | 8\% |
|  |  |  | B | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chi-square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## non CLIENT

Q59. Are you a member of any of the following groups?

|  | \# employees |  |  |  |  | years in existence |  |  |  | LANGUAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | total | NONE | 1-5 | 6-25 | $26+$ | 5 OR Less | 6-10 | 11-20 | >20 | ENGLISH | FRENCH |
|  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) | (F) | (G) | (H) | (I) | (J) | (K) |
| тоtal | 532 | 88 | 233 | 148 | 59 | 118 | 117 | 143 | 150 | 333 | 199 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Woman | 197 | 46 | 91 | 46 | 13 | 42 | 42 | 54 | 58 | 134 | 63 |
|  | 37\% $\begin{array}{r}\text { 52\% } \\ \\ \text { CDE }\end{array}$ |  |  | 31\% | 22\% | 36\% | 36\% | 38\% | 39\% | 40\% ${ }_{\text {K }}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Youth (18-30 years of age) | 42 |  | 24 | 10 | 4 | 18 | 11 | 8 | 5 | 8\% | 17 |
|  | 8\% | 5\% | 10\% | 7\% | 7\% | 15\% | 9 |  | 3\% |  | 9\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | HI |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Official language minority community | 29$5 \%$ | 3\% | 15$6 \%$ | 4\% | 8\% | 6 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 11 | 18 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 5\% | 3\% | 4\% | 9\% | 3\% | 9\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | G |  |  |
| Aboriginal person | 4\% | 3\% | 11$5 \%$ | 3\% | 2\% | 8 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 18 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 7\% | 2\% | 2\% | 4\% | $5 \%$K |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No | 272 | 38$43 \%$ | 104$45 \%$ | 90 | 39 | 52 | 64 | 77 | 77 | 166 | 106 |
|  |  |  |  | 61\% | 66\% | 44\% | 55\% | 54\% | 51\% | 50\% | 53\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | вС |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Don't Know | 13 | - | 7$3 \%$ | 2$1 \%$ | 2\% | 2\% | 3\% | 2\% | 4$3 \%$ | 6 | 4\% |
|  | 2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2\% |  |
| ChI-SQUARE SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Canadian Heritage - Trade Routes Client Satisfaction Survey - Non Client Version

Q60. What is your first official language?



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Note: Not all current clients that had used a specific service rated that service. To ensure that the response burden was not too onerous, clients that had used more than two Trade Routes services were only asked to complete the survey modules for two of the services they had used.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ To avoid repetition, only online versions of these materials are included in the appendix. The mail-out versions of these materials were included on a project CD and submitted to the Department of Canadian Heritage.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Participants were given a description of each service (similar to that provided in the report introduction).

[^3]:    ${ }^{5} 56$ of the 65 who had used this service completed this module.

[^4]:    ${ }^{6} 113$ of the 129 who had used this service completed this module.

[^5]:    ${ }^{7} 32$ of the 38 who had used this service completed this module.

[^6]:    ${ }^{8}$ With the understanding that there is always a possibility that the file might be rejected in its final approval stages.

[^7]:    ${ }^{9}$ Participants were given a description of each service.

[^8]:    ${ }^{10}$ There will be a link to the following descriptive note if respondents want to know more about the national Survey Registration System:

    The Registration System has been created by the survey research industry to allow potential respondents to verify that a survey is legitimate, get information about the survey industry or register a complaint. The Registration System's toll-free phone number is 1-800-554-9996.

[^9]:    ${ }^{11}$ Short descriptions would be accessible here for all services (by clicking on the service name) as reminder for those who want it (pulled from Q3)

[^10]:    ${ }^{12}$ Short description would be accessible here as reminder for those who want it (pulled from question 3)

[^11]:    ${ }^{13}$ Short description would be accessible here as reminder for those who want it (pulled from question 3)

[^12]:    ${ }^{14}$ Short description would be accessible here as reminder for those who want it (pulled from question 3)

