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FOREWARD

This volume is the first of six volumes reporting results from a national survey research project designed to obtain information about consumer satisfaction, dissatisfaction and complaining behaviour in Canada. Volumes 2 and 3 present results from analysis of data obtained by the Durables and Services questionnaires respectively. Volume 4 focuses on consumer satisfaction and complaining behaviour in special populations and in special problem areas. Volume 5 provides a discussion of the conceptual. framework and research design employed in the study. A review of the relevant literature resulted in the annotated bibliography contained in Volume 6.
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### 1.1 INTRODUCTION

An important problem facing policy makers is how best to measure market performance. Economists have traditionally used criteria such as the existence of monopoly forces, entry barriers and externalities in production and consumption. In recent years, the measurement of consumer satisfaction and complaint behaviour has assumed a major role in the assessment of market performance. This type of research is highly useful to marketing practitioners who view the satisfaction of consumer needs as the principal goal of marketing activity . True, consumer attitudes towards products and services may lack some of the preciseness and objectivity of the economist's measures. However, by providing a source of consumer opinion in the marketplace, studies on consumer satisfaction and dissatisfaction can provide valuable information to both policymakers and producers.

The vast number of food and clothing products on the market and the central role of these items in everyday life mean that the correct allocation of limited manpower and financial resources to individual problem areas is particularly important for policymakers concerned with these types of goods. Thus, policymakers are increasingly concerned to obtain reliable descriptive data on the frequency of consumer dissatisfaction across a comprehensive
set of products and services, on sources of dissatisfaction, and on consumers' responses to unsatisfactory consumption experiences. Such data are also likely to be of interest to the manufacturers and distributors of products and services. Levels of consumer satisfaction can be compared across brands and product categories. And as a supplement to the more traditional market signals which consumers use to communicate with producers, consumer satisfaction data may stimulate voluntary action on the part of producers to correct the causes of dissatisfaction with products and services.

This volume deals with consumer satisfaction, dissatisfaction and complaining behaviour with a comprehensive set of food and clothing products. The study focuses on the postpurchase evaluation of food and clothing items leading to feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, on recurring reasons for dissatisfaction, and on alternative courses of action available to the dissatisfied consumer.

### 2.1 AN OVERVIEW OF CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION WITH FOOD \& CLOTHING PRODUCTS

One of the distinctive features of this study is its ability to report on the full range of consumer goods within the framework of consumer market activity. Levels of satisfaction/dissatisfaction are viewed in conjunction with levels of consumer purchases - the proportion of the consumer population that buys the product, and the frequency with which they buy the product. This helps to place a clearer perspective on the assessment of consumer satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

The first section of results summarizes responses denoting purchase levels; relative purchase frequency; and satisfaction/ dissatisfaction for all product categories within each of the four major Food \& Clothing sections. By working through a set of product categories and thinking about purchase/use, frequency and satisfactory or unsatisfactory experiences, the respondent is providing useful information of a type that is not available through volunteered complaint data. This approach also obtains information on positive as well as negative purchase and use experiences, while placing that information in the light of relative market activity.

Satisfaction/dissatisfaction is reported first on the 4 -point CS/D scale for the entire sample population. Then, in the following section, the CS/D score is reported as a summary
of all individual respondents' average scores. Finally, a profile of consumers based on their individual satisfaction scores is presented in an attempt to identify significant characteristics of the generally satisfied or dissatisfied consumer.

### 2.1.1 PURCHASE: FREQUENCY: SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION

Table 1 is presented in four sub-tables corresponding to each of the sections of the Food \& Clothing questionnaire. Each of the subtables is identical in format.

Table 1 summarizes responses denoting the frequency of use and level of satisfaction and dissatisfaction for each of the product categories. The percentage of subjects purchasing each product category during the past year is first listed, followed by the percentage of purchasers buying the product "often" as opposed to "sometimes." Next, the relative frequency with which purchasers checked each of four satisfaction/dissatisfaction scale responses is reported. The final columns in Table 1 summarize the percentages of satisfied and dissatisfied subjects in each category. The four-point CS/D scale ranges from "Almost Always Satisfied" to "Almost Always Dissatisfied".

The type of information presented in Table 1 is not available either from volunteered complaint data or from studies
which ask consumers to recall a single unsatisfactory experience. The problem of "big ticket" bias has been identified with both of these approaches and the suggestion is that recurring causes of dissatisfaction with less important items such as food products may not be brought up to the attention of business leaders, consumer interest groups or policymakers.

### 2.1.1.1 TABLE I (FI) FOOD PRODUCTS

Table I (FI) presents the purchase frequency and satisfaction/dissatisfaction data for the 26 categories of food products. The percentage of subjects who reported that they had purchased one or more items within a category covers a wide range, ranging from $10.4 \%$ of respondents who reported having purchased "baby foods, baby juices, infant formula' to $99.5 \%$ of respondents having bought "milk, cheese, yogurt, etc.". However, the purchase incidences in the sample for nearly all the food products are concentrated at the high end of the range, with only 7 out of 26 categories purchased by less than $80 \%$ of the sample, and only 3 categories having less than a $50 \%$ purchase incidence.

There is a somewhat greater variation in the rates of purchase of the various food categories among the purchasing
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[^0]population. These rates, as reflected by the percent of purchasers reporting that they buy the item frequently, vary from a low 12.1\% of purchasers for "take out foods" to a high once again for "milk, cheese, yogurt, etc." with 91.9\% of purchasers buying these dairy products frequently. It must be noted, however, that the nature of the product holds implications for purchase rate levels that may not relate directly to the relative levels of use of that product. For example, a highly perishable product (i.e. dairy products) and a staple pantry product (i.e. macaroni \& noodle products) may have similarily high rates of usage while showing a marked difference in reported rates of purchase. These inherent food product differences should be considered when one is reviewing the rank by frequency of purchase.

Consumers are generally quite satisfied with food products. Twenty out of the 26 food products categories receive a rating on the 'satisfied' end of the scale from over $90 \%$ of the sample. Only one category, namely "take-out foods" is considered, on the whole, as unsatisfactory by over $20 \%$ of the sample.

The two categories with the highest percentage of dissatisfied purchasers were "take-out foods" and "restaurant meals with $20.6 \%$ and $19.2 \%$ of consumers reporting dissatisfaction
respectively. Several explanations may be applicable. First, the purchase in these cases often involves a complete meal rather than an individual food product which may serve as the component of a meal. The product is therefore more complex and there are, potentially, more "parts" which could be deficient. Both financially and psychically, the importance of the purchase to the consumer is likely to be greater. The consumer is, therefore, likely to be more sensitive to performance. Secondly, consumer expectations for meals eaten away-from-home may be higher than for individual food products since such activity is frequently regarded as a "treat". If expectations are inflated or illformed due to a relative lack of prior purchase experience, consumers may be more prone to dissatisfaction. A third explanation centers on the fact that purchases of meals away-from-home involve the purchase of a service as well as the purchase of the food. The food is prepared and delivered not by the consumer but by service personnel. Since quality control along these two dimensions has frequently presented a problem for service operations in the catering business, it would not be surprising if some of the dissatisfaction of purchasers of away-from-home meals stemmed from deficiencies in service performance rather than in the quality of the food.
"Cooked, canned or processed meat, poultry, fish dinners" registered the third highest percentage of dissatisfied pur-
chasers (15.6\%). Once again, the fact that processed dinners constitute complete meals rather than components of meals raises their importance to the consumer. For some consumers, expectations may also be inflated due to a lack of prior purchasing experience. They may not expect to have to make a tradeoff in terms of product quality for the convenience and time saved by a processed dinner.

Among the ten food categories registering the highest percentages of dissatisfied consumers, no fewer than five categories include fresh foods. The percent of purchasers registering dissatisfaction with "fresh fruits and vegetables" and "fresh/ frozen meats" is $14.3 \%$ and $13.9 \%$ respectively. In the context of efforts to increase consumption of fresh rather than processed foods, particularly fresh fruits and vegetables, the discovery of widespread dissatisfaction with fresh foods represents a significant finding. Consumer dissatisfaction with fresh foods may be explained in several ways. First, there is more quality variation with fresh foods than with processed foods. Thus, the consumer needs to have some advance notion of when fresh food will be consumed when buying it. Second, it is important for the purchaser of fresh foods, particularly fruits and vegetables, to understand degrees of ripeness and to have knowledge of correct storage and preparation techniques. Third, fresh foods are subject to wide and frequent price fluctuations on a seasonal basis and as availability dictates.

The categories which seem to receive the highest ranking in percent of respondents being generally satisfied are the staple pantry products. The five highest-ranked categories for satisfaction are:
"syrup, molasses, honey..."
"pickles, mustard, ketchup..."
"flour, cornmeal, rice"
"macaroni \& noodle products"
"sugar, salt, spices, seasonings..."
All of these product categories are basically non-perishable. They also tend to be relatively homogeneous and generic in nature with a fairly low level of product differentiation. They are all purchased by a high proportion of the population, but are not purchased as frequently as many other food products - apparently due to their long pantry-life.

The category "baby food, baby juices, infant formula" ranks highest in terms of the percent of purchasers who report that they are "almost always dissatisfied". This percent value is $4.6 \%$ (column 7). Consumers of these products probably have extremely high performance standards and since a mother's self image may be involved, are likely to be rather strict judges of product quality. Consequently, nearly five out of every one hundred purchasers register extreme dissatisfaction with infant foods and beverages.

Information on the rate of use of products permits the number of consumers expressing dissatisfaction with the category to be considered in relation to the total number of respondents reporting usage of the category within the recall period. For example, specialty, dietetic, and gourmet foods ranked twentyfifth in terms of percentage of respondents who had purchased, but ranked tenth in terms of percentage of dissatisfied purchasers. Specialty foods would probably not figure on conventional complaint lists as a problem in the food products area because the absolute number of purchasers is relatively small. Although the number of users is itself of significance to consumer protection agencies, this example helps to pinpoint the weaknesses of setting policy priorities on the basis of volunteered complaint data.

In summary, the greatest frequency of dissatisfaction is paradoxically found at the two ends of the processing spectrum with those fresh foods which have not been processed, and with those products involving the highest degree of processing which amount to complete meals. The least dissatisfaction is evident for those standard food products which leave the meal preparation functions to the consumer and which are processed to the extent that freshness is not a problem. The results reported in this study closely parallel those reported in the Bloomington study. ${ }^{1}$
$l_{\text {A }}$ study on consumer satisfaction and complaining behaviour conducted by Ralph L. Day in Bloomington, Indiana during the fall of 1976.

Thus "product satisfaction may be primarily the result of product simplicity, ease of storage and preservation of freshness, or some other product specific factor which lends itself to low variability in product quality. ${ }^{2}$

FOOD PRODUCTS - CONCLUSIONS

1. Generally this sector represents a high level of market activity and a high overall level of consumer satisfaction.
2. Product categories registering dissatisfaction among the greatest percentage of category purchasers are the food away-from-home and prepared convenience food categories.
3. Fresh/frozen meats and fresh fruit/vegetables also rank fairly high in dissatisfied purchasers.
4. Staple pantry products appear to offer a generally high satisfactory consumption experience.
5. Infant foods and beverages seem to register extreme dissatisfaction among a relatively high proportion of purchasers of that category.
[^1]
### 2.1.1.2 HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES

Table 1 (FII) presents the purchase, frequency and satisfaction/dissatisfaction data for 17 categories of products classified as Household and Family Supplies. The percent of respondents purchasing products from the household and family supplies categories ranges from a high of $99.5 \%$ of respondents buying "laundry and dishwashing detergents..." to a low purchase incidence of $43.2 \%$ for "home canning and freezing supplies." Generally speaking, however, these products tend to be purchased by a high proportion of respondents, with only 5 categories being purchased by less than $80 \%$ of the sample and only 2 categories having a purchasing population of less than $50 \%$ of the sample (namely "home canning and freezing supplies" and "insect spray, rat poison, traps, mothballs...").

The percent of purchasers who indicate that they buy the items frequently ranges from a high of $85.0 \%$ for "toilet tissue, facial tissue, paper towels" to a low of $10.2 \%$ for "insect spray, rat poison, etc." The purchase rates in this section tend to be lower overall than the rates for food products - indicating in part the difference in the length of product use cycles and product shelf lives across the two sections. Ten out of 17 household and family supplies products are bought frequently by less than $50 \%$ of the purchasing population.
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* $\mathrm{N}=1041$

Consumers are generally satisfied with household and family supplies. None of the product categories receives a 'dissatisfied' rating from more than $10 \%$ of the sample.

The most unsatisfactory product categories appear to be "magazines and newspapers" (9.4\% dissatisfied), "light bulbs, fuses, batteries, extension cords" (8.9\% dissatisfied), and "air fresheners, disinfectants, drain openers..." (7.7\% dissatisfied). Extreme dissatisfaction is never registered by a proportion higher than $1.8 \%$ of purchasers for any one category.

In turn, overall satisfaction ratings are high. The total percent of purchasers satisfied (i.e. respondents checking either 'almost always satisfied' or 'usually satisfied') registers over 95\% for 10 out of 17 product categories. Satisfied consumers tend to check 'almost always satisfied'. It seems that while the products are, on the whole, satisfactory, there are no 'dramatic' cases of consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction. One product category, namely "tobacco products, smokers' supplies" receives an 'almost always satisfied' score from over $60 \%$ of purchasers (61.0\%). Nine categories receive such a score from $51.3 \%$ to $58.0 \%$ of purchasers.

Considering the fairly standard simple nature of products in the household and family supplies sector, these results are not surprising. Overall expectations and interest levels for such products would tend not to be dramatically high. In areas where product delivery may be slightly more complicated, dissatisfaction tends to be higher.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Generally; consumers are satisfied with Household and Family Supplies.
2. CS/D scores tend not to be very extreme at either end of the satisfaction/dissatisfaction scale.
3. Unsatisfactory experiences are registered more often by purchasers of "magazines and newspapers", light bulbs, fuses, batteries, etc.", and "air fresheners, disinfectants, etc.". Product performance/delivery may be slightly more complicated with these categories than with most other household and family supplies and may account, in part, for higher dissatisfaction.
4. Among generally high satisfaction scores, the "tobacco and smokers' supplies" products appear to register very high satisfaction among the largest share of purchasers.

### 2.1.1.3 PERSONAL \& HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS

Table 1 (FIII) summarizes the purchase, frequency and satisfaction/dissatisfaction results for 20 categories of Personal and Health Care products. The proportion of respondents indicating a purchase from the Personal and Health Care product categories ranges from a low of $10.4 \%$ for "family planning products (non-prescription)" to a high of 98.9 f for "toothpaste, dental supplies, mouthwash": Overall purchase incidences are fairly high, with 8 out of 20 categories being purchased by over $80 \%$ of respondents, and 15 out of 20 categories registering a buying population of over $50 \%$ of respondents.

Purchase frequency varies widely from a high of $79.6 \%$ of purchasers buying "toothpaste, dental supplies, and mouthwash" frequently to only $7.5 \%$ of purchasers buying "thermometers, enemas and other medical supplies" frequently. Only 7 out of 20 personal and health care products are bought frequently by more than $50 \%$ of purchasers. Again, the length of the product use cycle must be considered when examining purchase frequency ratings. Products with a low purchase frequency may last a relatively long time before replacement is required.

Satisfaction ratings continue to be high again in this section. Fifteen out of 20 product categories record a total

TABLE 1 (FIII)
REGION:
NATIONAL
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: PERSONAL AND HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS (PHC) III

| CATEGORY <br> 1. | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents* | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency | SATISFIED |  | DISSA | FIED | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  |
|  |  | Frequently | Rating | Almost | Usually | Often | Almost | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Toilet/Bath Soap, Bath 0il, Powder | 98.8 | 74.2 | 2 | $\frac{\text { Always }}{54.0}$ | 43.4 | 2.1 | $\frac{\text { Always }}{0.5}$ | 97.4 | 4 | 2.6 | 17 |
| 2. Toothpaste, Dental Supplies, Mouthwash | 98.9 | 79.6 | 1 | 59.3 | 38.1 | 1.8 | 0.8 | 97.4 | 4 | 2.6 | 17 |
| 3. Shampoo, Other Hair- Care Supplies | 95.2 | 69.6 | 4 | 47.0 | 45.2 | 6.0 | 1.8 | 92.2 | 17 | 7.8 | 4 |
| 4. Hair Dyes, Streaking, Colouring Products | 24.2 | 30.6 | 10 | 44.8 | 46.8 | 7.2 | 1. 2 | 91.6 | 19 | 8.4 | 2 |
| 5. Deodorants, Antiperspirants | 90,5 | 61.3 | 5 | 47.8 | 44.4 | 6.6 | 1.3 | 92.2 | 17 | 7.9 | 3 |
| 6. Feminine Hygiene Products | 66.3 | 73.8 | 3 | 56.3 | 40.9 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 97.2 | 6 | 2.7 | 16 |
| 7. Shaving Creams, Lathers | 56.9 | 50.6 | 7 | 58.8 | 39, 3 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 98.1 | 1 | 1.9 | 20 |
| 8. Blade Razors, Blades, Nail Files, Clippers | 77.2 | 40.5 | 8 | 53.9 | 42.8 | 2.5 | 0.8 | 96.7 | 8 | 3.3 | 14 |
| 9. Hair Brushes, Combs, Nets, Beauty Supplies | 78.1 | 20.7 | 16 | 51.4 | 46.5 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 97.9 | 2 | 2.1 | 19 |
| 10. Cosmetics, Creams Suntan Lotions | 84.3 | 29.1 | 11 | 47.2 | 47.8 | 4.7 | 0.3 | 95.0 | 15 | 5.0 | 7 |
| 11. First Aid Supplies, Liniment, 0intment | 81.3 | 17.2 | 18 | 52.2 | 45.6 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 97.8 | 3 | 5.4 | 6 |
| 12. Vitamins, Tonics, Dietary Suppliments | 55.5 | 26.5 | 13 | 51.8 | 44.2 | 3.3 | 0.7 | 96.0 | 9 | 4.0 | 13 |
| 13. $\begin{gathered}\text { Laxatives, Heartburn, } \\ \text { Indigestion Remedies }\end{gathered}$ | 53.2 | 18.0 | 17 | 50.5 | 45.3 | 4.0 | 0.2 | 95.8 | 10 | 4.2 | 12 |
| 14. Hay Fever, Cold and Cough Remedies | 74.0 | 17.0 | 19 | 39.5 | 49.4 | 9.2 | 1.8 | 88.9 | 20 | 11.0 | 1 |
| 15. Aspirin, Other Nonprescription Pain Relievers | 88.5 | 22.1 | 15 | 52.7 | 44.3 | 2.4 | 0.6 | 97.0 | 7 | 3.0 | 15 |
| 16. Eyecare Products | 12.1 | 24.0 | 14 | 52.8 | 42.7 | 4.0 | 0.5 | 95.5 | 13 | 4.5 | 8 |
| 17. Babycare Products | 19.0 | 52.6 | 6 | 52.6 | 42.9 | 4.0 | 0.5 | 95.5 | 13 | 4.5 | 8 |
| 18. Family Planning Products (nonprescription) | 10.4 | 27.0 | 12 | 55.6 | 38.0 | 3.7 | 2.7 | 93.6 | 16 | 6.4 | 5 |
| 19. Thermometers, Enemas, Other Medical Supplies | 22.5 | 7.5 | 20 | 55.1 | 40.6 | 3.4 | 0.9 | 95.7 | 11 | 4.3 | 11 |
| 20. Prescription Drugs \& Medical-Supplies | 87.5 | 31.0 | 9 | 53.4 | 42.1 | 3.2 | 1.2 | 95.6 | 12 | 4.4 | 10 |

${ }^{*} \mathrm{~N}=1041$
satisfaction score for over $95 \%$ of purchasers of the category. The percentage reporting "almost always satisfied" is highest for "toothpaste, dental supplies and mouthwash" at 59.3\%, and is over $50 \%$ for 15 categories.

Total dissatisfaction ratings are highest for "hay fever, cold and cough remedies" with $11.0 \%$ of purchasers indicating that they are either "often" or "almost always" dissatisfied with these products.

The high rate of dissatisfaction could be associated with product performance expectations inflated by advertising for these products. Also, the overall negative experience of a cold or hay fever may tend to predispose the consumer to a negative evaluation of any product associated with the illness.

The next grouping of unsatisfactory products relates to hair care, with both "hair dyes, streaking and colouring products" and "shampoo, other hair care products" registering dissatisfaction among 8.4\% and $7.8 \%$ of purchasers respectively. "Deodorants and anti-perspirants" receive unsatisfactory ratings from a total of $7.9 \%$ of purchasers.

Hair care products and personal deodorant/antiperspirant products include an element of "social performance" in addition
to their basic functional purpose. Social performance relates to one's self image, or one's attempts to gain the attention or approval of others regarding a purchase. When social performance is important to the consumer, evaluation of the product tends to be far more emotionally-charged and volatile. Since expectations either about the product or about the opinions of significant others may be disconfirmed after consumption, the probability of dissatisfaction may be higher than in cases where expectations about the item alone are considered.

Extremes of dissatisfaction, where purchasers indicate that they are "almost always" dissatisfied, are recorded among 3.5\% of "first aid supplies" purchasers, and among 2.7\% of "non-prescription family planning products" purchasers.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Consumers have bought most categories of Personal and Health Care products during the past year. Frequency of purchase within the recall period does not tend to be very high, however, for most of the product categories.
2. Consumers are generally satisfied with Personal and Health Care products. Over 95\% of purchasers in 15 out of 20 categories are satisfied with the products.
3. Dissatisfaction is relatively high among purchasers of "hay fever, cold and cough remedies".
4. Products evaluated primarily on the basis of social performance, such as hair care products and personal deodorants, also tend to have a relatively high proportion of dissatisfied users.
5. CS/D scores do not tend to the extremes of either satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Two categories register extreme dissatisfaction among more than $2 \%$ of users - namely, "first aid supplies" and "family planning products".

### 2.1.1.4 CLOTHES, SHOES \& ACCESSORIES

Data on purchase, frequency and satisfaction/dissatisfaction for 14 categories of Clothes, Shoes and Accessories is presented in Table 1 (FIV). A high proportion of respondents said they had purchased items from most of the categories during the past year, but as would be expected, purchase frequency levels are much lower in the Clothes, Shoes \& Accessories section than in previous food, household and personal product sections. Less than $10 \%$ of purchasers of "mens/womens fur coats/hats", "mens/ womens hats, gloves, belts, ties", "rainwear, umbrellas", and "jewelry, watches and optical frames", report making such purchases frequently. Among purchasers, the categories of highest purchase

TABLE I (FIV) REGION: NATIONAL
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING

SECTION: CLOTHES, SHOES AND ACCESSORIES (CSA) IV

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents* | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency | SA | ISFIED | DISSAT |  |  | SIED | DISSA | SFIED |
|  | Purchased | Frequently | Rating |  | Usually | Oft |  | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Mens ${ }^{\text {T }}$ Clothes | 84.5 | 21.7 | 7 | 37.5 | 52.8 | 8.7 | 1.0. | 90.3 | 11 | 9.7 | 4 |
| 2. Mens Shoes and Boots | 74.5 | 14.2 | 9 | 38.0 | 55.5 | 5.8 | 0.7 | 93.5 | 4 | 6.5 | 9 |
| 3. Womens Clothes | 92.3 | 35.4 | 4 | 36.6 | 51.7 | 10.1 | 1.6 | 88.3 | 12 | 11.7 | 3 |
| 4. Womens ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Shoes and Boots | 88.2 | 20.0 | 3 | 38.2 | 52.7 | 7.9 | 1.2 | 90.9 | 10 | 9.1 | 5 |
| 5. Mens/Womens Fur Coats Hats. | 10.3 | 7.8 | 12 | 56.1 | 42.1 | 1.8 | - | 98.1 | 1 | 1.8 | 14 |
| 6. Mens/Womens Hats, Gloves Belts, Ties, etc. | 68.4 | 8.9 | 11 | 42.3 | 54.2 | 3.3 | 0.1 | 96.5 | 3 | 3.4 | 12 |
| 7. Childrens Clothes | 56.3 | 45.6 | 2 | 35.4 | 51.6 | 10.9 | 2.0 | 87.0 | 13 | 12.9 | 2 |
| 8. Childrens Shoes and | 49.3 | 43.8 | 3 | 34.3 | 52.0 | 11.9 | 1.8 | 86.3 | 14 | 13.7 | 1 |
| 9. Infants Clothes | 16.0 | 46.9 | 1 | 43.0 | 50.3 | 5.5 | 1.2 | 93.3 | 7 | 6.7 | 8 |
| 10. Beachwear | 44.1 | 12.0 | 10 | 39.2 | 54.5 | 5.9 | 0.4 | 93.7 | 5 | 6.3 | 11 |
| 11. Workclothes, Uniforms | 29.8 | 24.8 | 6 | 42.1 | 51.1 | 6.8 | $-$ | 93.2 | 8 | 6.8 | 7 |
| 12. Rainwear, Umbrellas | 35.2 | 4.5 | 14 | 41.9 | 51.0 | 6.3 | 0.8 | 92.9 | 9 | 7.1 | 6 |
| 13. Jewelry, Watches, Optical Frames | 63.0 | 7.1 | 13 | 41.5 | 52.1 | 5.6 | 0.8 | 93.6 | 6 | 6.4 | 10 |
| 14. Fabrics, Patterns, Sewing Supplies | 56.9 | 32.0 | 5 | 45.4 | 51.4 | 3.0 | 0.2 | 96.8 | 2 | 3.2 | 13 |

frequency are, not surprisingly, "infant's clothes" (46.9\% of purchasers buying frequently), "childrens' clothes" (45.6\%) and "childrens' shoes and boots" (43.8\%).

In general, a high proportion of purchasers are satisfied with clothes, shoes and accessories. Over $90 \%$ of purchasers indicate that they are either "almost always" or "usually" satisfied with products in 11 out of 14 categories. Of the satisfied responses, slightly more tend to fall into the "usually satisfied" rather than the "almost always satisfied" group. These results parallel those reported in other studies. For example, Hughes $(1977)^{3}$ indicates that about $80 \%$ of consumers were completely satisfied with their clothing purchases. In another study, Best and Andreasen (1976) ${ }^{4}$ report that $83.4 \%$ of subjects were completely or partially satisfied with their clothing purchases while $13.9 \%$ experienced some degree of dissatisfaction.

[^2]Three categories with more than $10 \%$ of their purchasers falling into either of the dissatisfied groups are "childrens' shoes and boots" (13.7\% dissatisfied), "childrens' clothes" (12.9\% dissatisfied), and "womens' clothes" (11.7\% dissatisfied). Two percent of purchasers of childrens' clothes indicate that they are "almost always dissatisfied". In the case of childrens' apparel, expectations about "wear and tear" of items may be unrealistically high. Also since clothing and shoe items tend to be "non-standard" products, rates of dissatisfaction may be higher as a function of increased levels of choice and uncertainty associated with these products.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Most consumers have bought clothes, shoes and accessories in the past year, but a relatively low proportion of consumers buy these items frequently.
2. Frequent purchases are more common in the childrens/infants clothes and shoes categories.
3. Generally consumers are satisfied with clothes, shoes and accessories purchases.
4. Childrens/infants clothes and shoes and "womens' clothes" tend to register more dissatisfaction in general than other types of clothing products.

## 2. 2 SUMMARY OF INDIVIDUAL SATISFACTION SCORES

Previous sections have focused on individual food and clothing product categories. Indicators of product satisfaction were determined by the relative proportion of consumers rating the product category as satisfactory/dissatisfactory on a fourpoint scale. In this section, the unit of analysis shifts from the product category to the individual respondent. That is, rather than aggregating total respondents' score to come up with a product satisfaction score, the scores an individual gives to each category will be aggregated to come up with an individual satisfaction score or "mean satisfaction score" (MSS).

MSS scores and patterns over the range of food and clothing products may be used as a basis for assessing the performance of the consumer goods marketing system. An extended discussion of this issue is available elsewhere. ${ }^{5}$ The total MSS score for Food and Clothing provides useful information for evaluating the overall level of consumer satisfaction in this product sector. By deriving an MSS for each of the four sections, the general

[^3]level of satisfaction among individuals can be measured within particular sections are compared across sections.

### 2.2.1 DEVELOPMENT OF 'MEAN SATISFACTION SCORES' (MSS)

The four-point satisfaction/dissatisfaction scale was used to derive the individual satisfaction score, labeled the mean satisfaction score (MSS). All food and clothing products were rated on the four-point scale with numerical weights and verbal anchors as follows:

```
1 - "almost always satisfied"
    2 - "usually satisfied"
    3 - "Often dissatisfied"
    4 - "almost always dissatisfied"
```

An individual satisfaction score was computed for each respondent by counting the number of times each of the four points on the scale was checked, multiplying total response for each point by weight assigned to that particular point, and dividing by the number of product categories which were rated on the scale. The formula for calculating the individual satisfaction score for respondent "i" is:

$$
\operatorname{MSS}_{i}=W_{1}\left(N_{1}\right)+W_{2}\left(N_{2}\right)+W_{3}\left(N_{3}\right)+W_{4}\left(N_{4}\right)
$$

where;
$W$ = weights assigned to each scale point
from 1 to 4
$N_{1}=$ number of responses "i" gave as "l"
("almost always satisfied")
$N_{2}=$ number of responses "i" gave as "2"
("usually satisfied")
$N_{3}=$ number of responses "i" gave as "3"
("often dissatisfied")
$N_{4}=$ number of responses "i" gave as "4"
("almost always dissatisfied")
$\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{Ni}}=\underset{\text { respondent }}{ }$ total number of responses given by

A mean satisfaction score was computed for each of the four product sections, as well as for the entire Food \& clothing sector. Each respondent was assigned to one of six half-point intervals covering the four-point CS/D scale, beginning with the 1.00 to 1.49 interval and ending with the 3.49 to 4.00 interval. The MSS scores could range from 1.00 (meaning a respondent was "almost always satisfied" with every product purchased) to 4.00 (where a respondent would have checked the "almost always dissatisfied" response for each purchase made). The distribution of respondents' MSS within the general satisfaction range (l.00 to 2.49) and within the overall dissatisfaction range (2.50 to 4.00) is used to analyze the overall level of satisfaction among respondents for each section.

### 2.2.2 MEAN SATISFACTION SCORES FOR FOOD AND CLOTHING PRODUCTS

Table 2 shows the distribution of respondents' mean satisfaction scores for each of the four sections of the Food \& Clothing survey as well as the distribution of the total mean scores across all sections of the survey. Some of the totals shown in Table 2 differ from the total number of respondents in the sample due to missing data. The results have been split at the midpoint (2.50) to show 'total satisfied' versus 'total dissatisfied'.

The individual satisfaction scores across the entire range of Food \& Clothing products tend to be very high, with $99.1 \%$ of respondents falling into the satisfaction group. In the Bloomington study, the corresponding figure was $96.5 \%$. The percent of respondents' MSS scores in the 'satisfied' range for each of the subsections may be compared to the Bloomington results:

| Canadian |
| :--- |
| Study |

Food Products
Household \& Family Supplies Personal \& Health Care Products Clothes, Shoes \& Accessories
98.8\%
98.9\%
98.7\%
95.0\%

Bloomington Study
85.4\% 95.8\%
$94.7 \%$
94.3\%

Therefore, while almost every respondent may have had one or more occasions to report extreme dissatisfaction with a product category, the overwhelming majority of scores, on average, are in the satisfied range. This suggests a generally positive experience with the Food \& Clothing product sector.

## TABLE 2 (F)

CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD AND CLOTHING MEAN SATISFACTION SCORES

| SATISFACTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CATEGORY | $1.00-1.49$ |  | 1.50-1.99 |  | $2.00-2.49$ |  | TOTAL |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | $\stackrel{\%}{\sim}$ | $N$ | \% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| I FOOD PRODUCTS | 493 | 47.4 | 390 | 37.5 | 145 | 13.9 | 1028 | 28.8 |
| II HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES | 514 | 49.4 | 269 | 25.9 | 246 | 23.6 | 1029 | 98.9 |
| III PERSONAL \& HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS | 512 | 49.2 | 256 | 24.6 | 259 | 24.9 | 1027 | 98.7 |
| IV CLOTHES, SHOES \& ACCESSORIES | 358 | 34.8 | 239 | 23.2 | 380 | 37.0 | 977 | 95.0 |
| TOTAL FOOD \& CLOTHING | 485 | 46.6 | 416 | 40.0 | 131 | 12.5 | 1032 | 99.1 |


| DISSATISFACTION |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CATEGORY |

$\mathrm{N}=1041$
NOTE: Total section score is a sum of the mean case scores; it is not to be interpreted as a columnar average.

The one section which tends to have slightly higher proportion of generally dissatisfied consumers is the clothes, Shoes and Accessories section.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The MSS score for the Food \& Clothing sector shows that the overwhelming majority of consumers are generally satisfied.
2. Five percent of purchasers of Clothes, Shoes and Accessories are generally dissatisfied with their purchases.
2.2.3 PROFILE OF CONSUMERS BY INDIVIDUAT SATISFACTION SCORES

The mean satisfaction score across the entire range of food and clothing products provides a summary measure of each individual's level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction. In this section, MSS is related to the set of demographic variables in order to determine whether or not it is feasible to differentiate the generally satisfied from the dissatisfied consumer in the area of food and clothing.

Table 3 summarizes the relationship between MSS and demographics. Individuals' MSS were classified into two categories satisfied and dissatisfied. To determine whether any of the relationships were significant, the chi-square test was used.

TABLE 3 (F)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD $\mathfrak{q}_{\text {- }}$ - CLOTHING mean satisfaction scores and demographics

SECTION: SUMMARY

$N=1047$

The following variables were significant at the . 05 level: whether the respondent owns/rents his home, and employment status. In these cases, it appears that the more dissatisfied respondents in the Food and Clothing sector tend to be renters rather than home-owners, and that they tend to be unemployed. The latter result is not surprising, given the essential nature of food and clothing products and the problems of the unemployed in providing these essentials.

While other demographic variables are not significantly related to dissatisfaction with food \& clothing products, there is a weak tendency for the dissatisfied to be male, single, under 25 or over 65, one-two person households, lower income, lower education, and self as main wage earner.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Dissatisfaction with food \& clothing products is significantly associated with two demographic variables: own/rent and employment status. The dissatisfied respondent tends to be a renter, and tends to be unemployed.
2. None of the other demographic variables are significantly related to MSS for Food \& Clothing.

### 3.1 REPORTED INSTANCES OF CONSUMER DISSATISFACTION

To this point, the emphasis has been on the incidence and frequency of consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction across a comprehensive set of Food and Clothing products. This section focuses on specific reported instances of high or intense dissatisfaction. Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not during the past year, they had had one or more experiences, in purchasing or consuming food and clothing products, with which they were highly dissatisfied. They were then asked to think back over all the unsatisfactory experiences with these products, and to indicate the product category which they felt was the single most unsatisfactory experience of all.

Thus, the survey questionnaire measures whether a highly unsatisfactory experience occurred, how often such highly unsatisfactory experiences occurred, and finally, the product category which was associated with the most unsatisfactory experience.

These probes were obtained for each of the four product sections of the Food \& Clothing questionnaire.

### 3.1.2 THE EXTENT OF CONSUMER DISSATISFACTION WITH FOOD \& CLOTHING, PRODUCTS

The proportion of respondents reporting at least one highly
unsatisfactory experience in the past year and the reported number of such experiences are presented in Table 4.. In order to present these figures in the perspective of purchase incidence and frequency, an "index of market activity" is included for each of the four sections. This index is derived from the average number of purchasers per category in any given section expressed as an index of the total number of respondents for the survey. This helps to place some perspective on the percent of the population which is active in any given product sector. The higher the index of market activity, the higher the probability or the opportunity exists for an unsatisfactory experience. The highest percentage of highly dissatisfied respondents is found in the Food Products section where $35.5 \%$ of the subjects reported extreme dissatisfaction with one or more categories in the section. Clothes, Shoes and Accessories is the next highest with 19.9\% of respondents reporting high dissatisfaction. Household and Family Supplies had $16.0 \%$ and Personal and Health Care Products reported only 9.4\% of respondents highly dissatisfied.

The relatively large proportion of highly dissatisfied Consumers of Food Products may be explained in part by the high Index of Market Purchase Activity at 81. Also, levels of dissatisfaction with various food products were already seen to be fairly high in Table 1 (FI). In the section of Clothes, Shoes

TABLE 4 ( $F$ )
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD AND CLOTHING
SUMMARY OF DISSATISFACTION ${ }^{1}$

| SECTION |  | INDEX OF MARKET PURCHASE 2 ACTIVITY ${ }^{2}$ | PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS REPORTING DISSATISFACTION WITH ONE OR MORE ITEMS \% | TIMES DISSATISFIED |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | FOOD PRODUCTS | 81 | 35.5 | 10.1\% | 17.3\% | $4.3 \%$ | 3.7\% |
| II | HOUSEHOLD AND FAMILY SUPPLIES | 83 | 16.0 | 6.3 | 6.9 | 1.6 | 1.0 |
| II | PERSONAL AND HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS | 64 | 9.4 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 0.7 | 0.4 |
| IV | CLOTHES, SHOES AND ACCESSORIES | 55 | 19.9 | 9.3 | 8.5 | 0.9 | 0.7 |

dURING THE PAST YEAR
INDEX OF MARKET PURCHASE ACTIVITY = AVERAGE NO. OF PURCHASERS PER CATEGORY
$=1041$
and Accessories, where the Index of Market Purchase Activity is the lowest at 55 , the fairly high proportion of dissatisfied respondents is somewhat more serious. In the case of Household and Family Supplies, where the market activity levels are the highest at 83 , a relatively low proportion of respondents are highly dissatisfied.

The frequency of occurrence of highly unsatisfactory experiences reflects both the frequency of purchase and overall levels of dissatisfaction. As indicated on Table 4, the greatest Concentration of dissatisfied respondents for both the Personal and Health Care Products and Clothes, Shoes and Accessories sections is in the low frequency (probably single occurrence) interval. The other two sections, Food Products and Household and Family Supplies, have the largest proportion of their unsatisfied respondents in the second interval where the respondent was highly dissatisfied from 3 to 9 times in the recall period of one year. The relatively higher rates of purchases in these two product sections obviously has a direct bearing on the frequency of reported dissatisfaction. Highly unsatisfactory experiences tend to occur more frequently with Food Products than with any of the other categories, with $3.7 \%$ of respondents reporting that they were highly dissatisfied with food products twenty or more times in the past year.

### 3.2 PRODUCT CATEGORIE:S CITED AS UNSATISFACTORY

To identify specific instances of extreme dissatisfaction and to organize the subsequent analysis of reasons for dissatisfaction and actions taken, subjects who had reported high dissatisfaction were asked to indicate the one product category per section which was the most unsatisfactory of all.

In the next section, the absolute number of reports of each category as the most unsatisfactory item will be expressed as a percentage of all purchasers of that item. In order to place these reports in context, they will be reviewed as a percentage of all respondents and rank ordered accordingly.

### 3.2.1 CONSUMFR PURCHASES \& REPORTED INSTANCES OF DISSATISFACTION

In each of the next four sections, the results of analysis covering the number of purchasers of each product category who cite that category as the most unsatisfactory consumption experience will be presented. The number of purchasers citing the item as unsatisfactory will then be expressed as a percentage of all purchasers of that category.

### 3.2.1.1 FOOD PRODUCTS - Table 5 (FI)

As indicated on Table 5 (FI), the number of purchasers citing a specific food product category as the single most unsatisfactory purchase experience in the past year is the highest, at 77, for "fresh or frozen meats". This category also has the highest percentage of its purchasers, 7.7\%, citing the category as most unsatisfactory, The high and growing proportion of the grocery dollar spent on meats may in part explain the level of intense dissatisfaction with this category.

The next most frequently cited category, both in actual numbers and according to the proportion of purchasers, is the "fresh fruits and vegetables" category. This category also consumes a fairly high proportion of the grocery dollar, is highly perishable, and tends to vary widely in quality and price from season to season and from store to store.

The two food away-from-home categories, which ranked first and second in terms of percent of purchasers indicating overall dissatisfaction (Table 1 (FI)), are substantially lower in the proportion of purchasers citing the category as the single most unsatisfactory purchase experience. While many consumers can recall one or more unsatisfactory experiences with food away from home, they do not tend to place these experiences at the

TABLE 5 (FI)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTIIING
ITEMS CITED AS THE MOST UNSATISFACTORY
PURCHASE EXPERIENCE BY PURCHASERS
SECTION: FOOD PRODUCTS

same level of concern or seriousness as they do with some other food products.

Items cited most infrequently as the most unsatisfactory seem to correspond quite closely to the types of staple products which rated the highest in satisfaction in Table l (FI).

Other items which are most unsatisfactory for a relatively high percentage of purchasers are: "cooked, canned, processed meats, poultry, fish, etc.", 3.9\%; and "baby foods, baby juices, infant formula", 3.7\%.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Both in terms of total respondents and in percent of purchasers citing the category as most unsatisfactory, the categories "fresh/frozen meat" and "fresh fruits and vegetables" are the food products ranked as most dissatisfactory.
2. Food away from home does not appear to be as serious a consumer problem when consumers are asked to cite the single most unsatisfactory experience.
3. Staple products continue to be associated with higher overall levels of satisfaction.
4. According to percent of purchasers citing the category as most unsatisfactory, "processed meats, etc." and "infant
foods, etc." rank relatively high on the list of highly dissatisfactory product categories.
```
3.2.1.2 HOUSEHOLD & FAMILY SUPPLIES - Table 5 (FII)
```

Consistent with the relatively low percentage of respondents reporting highly unsatisfactory experiences with Household and Family Supplies, the number and percent of purchasers citing this type of product as the single most unsatisfactory experience is also quite low.

The number of purchasers (28), and the percent of purchasers (2.8\%), citing "light bulbs, fuses, household batteries and power cells, extension cords" as the most unsatisfactory purchase, is the highest of all products in the section.

The next highest categories, both in numbers of respondents and percent of purchasers, are "laundry and dishwashing detergents" (18 purchasers, 1.7\% of purchasers), and "floor wax, furniture wax, silver and metal polishes, other polishes, rug shampoos" (15 purchasers, 1.7\% of purchasers).

## CONCLUSIONS

1. There are relatively few serious problems in the Household

## TABLE 5 (FII)

CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTIHNG ITEMS CITED AS THE MOST UNSATISFACTORY PURCHASE EXPERIENCE BY PURCHASERS

SECTION: HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES

| CATEGORY/ITEM | NO. OF PURCHASERS | PURCHASERS CITING EACH ITEM AS THE MOST UNSATISFACTORY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | NO | \% |
| 1. Alumi num foil, waxed paper, plastic food wrap and bags, tinfoil bakeware plastic storage containers | $\text { re, } 1017$ | 12 | 1.2 |
| 2. Laundry and dishwashing detergents and soaps | 1034 | 18 | 1.7 |
| 3. Bleaches, bluing, presoaks, starch, fabric softeners | 941 | 8 | 0.9 |
| 4. Household cleaners and soaps, scouring powder | 1007 | 5 | 0.5 |
| 5. Floor wax, furniture wax, silver and metal polishes, other polishes, rug shampoos | 881 | 15 | 1.7 |
| 6. Air fresheners, deodorizers, disinfectants, drain openers, toilet borl cleaners | 939 | 7 | 0.7 |
| 7. Rubber gloves, sponges, scouring pads, mops, broons, scrub brushes | 915 | 11 | 1.2 |
| 8. Toilet tissues, facial tissucs, paper towels, napkins, paper plates and cups | 1033 | 5 | 0.5 |
| 9. Home canning and freezing supplies | 449 | 4 | 0.9 |
| 10. Insect sprays or powders, rat poison, rat traps, mothballs | 468 | 5 | 1.1 |
| 11. Plant food, fertilizer, yard and garden supplies | 711 | 5 | 0.7 |
| 12. Light bulbs, fuses, household batteries and power cells, extension cords | 993 | 28 | 2.8 |
| 13. Writing paper, envelopes, pencils, pens, school supplies | . 935 | 5 | 0.5 |
| 14. Gift wrapping, holiday decorations, greeting cards, party supplies and favours | , 974 | 5 | 0.5 |
| 15. Magazines and newspapers | 972 | 13 | 1.3 |
| 16. Tobacco products and smokers' supplies | 567 | 4 | 0.7 |
| 17. Photographic film, flashbulbs | 802 | 13 | 1.6 |

and Family Supplies section.
2. The most serious problems appear to be with home electrical supplies, laundry/dish detergents, and floor care products.

### 3.2.1.3 PERSONAL \& HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS - Table 5 (FIII)

This section is also relatively low in the number and percent of purchasers having extremely unsatisfactory purchase experiences. It is interesting to note the effects as the relative purchase incidence and purchase frequency of items changes. In this section, an item can have relatively few people citing an unsatisfactory purchase experience, but because of a low number of total purchasers of the item, these few dissatisfied people can represent a fairly large proportion of the total purchasers. This item might rank low in terms of percent of total respondents reporting dissatisfaction, but could rank fairly high in terms of percent of purchasers of the category reporting dissatisfaction.

According to the number of purchasers reporting a product as the most unsatisfactory, the following rank the highest: "prescription drugs and medical supplies", 14; "deodorants and anti-perspirants", ll; "hay fever, cough, cold and sore throat remedies", 10. When 'considering the percentage of purchasers citing the product as the most unsatisfactory, the categories

TABLE 5 (FIII)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTIIING ITEMS CITED AS THE MOST UNSATISFACIORY PURCHASE EXPERIENCE BY PURCHASERS

SECTION: PERSONAL \& IIEALTH CARE PRODUCTS

| CATEGORY/ITEM | NO. 0 F PURCHASERS | PURCHASERS CITING EACH ITEM AS THE MOST UNSATISFACTORY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | NO | \% |
| Toilet soap, bath oil, bath powlers, and soaps | 1028 | 6 | 0.6 |
| Toothpaste, dental and denture supplies, mouthwash | 1028 | 4 | 0.4 |

- Shampoos, hair dressings, cream 991 rinses, conditioners, home permanent kits

4. Hair dyes, hair streaking and colouring products
5. Deodorants and antiperspirants
6. Feminine hygiene products (such as sanitary napkins, tampons, sprays and douches)
7. Shaving creams and lathers591
8. Blade razors and blades, nail 804 files and clippers
9. Hair brushes, combs and nets, other beauty supplies
10. Women's or men's cosmetics, perfumes, face and skin creams, lotions and suntan lotions
11. First aid supplies, liniments, ointments and powders
12. Vitamins, tonics and dietary supplements
13. Laxatives, heartburn and 554 indigestion remedies
14. Hay fever, cold, cough and sore 770 throat remedies
15. Aspirin, aspirin substitutes, 921 and other non-prescription pain relievers
16. Eye care products, contact 199 lens solutions
17. Babycare products (oils, powders, 197 creams, disposable diapers, etc.)
18. Family planning products (nonprescription contraceptives)
19. Fever thermometers, enemas, other 234 non-prescription medical supplies
20. Prescription drugs and medical 908 supplies
ranking the highest are: "hair dyes, hair streaking and colouring products", 1.6\%; "prescription drugs and medical supplies", 1.5\%; "babycare products", l.5\%.

Although the dissatisfactory set of categories such as hair colouring products or babycare products is not large given the size of the purchasing sample, these items rank very high in terms of the percent of the buyers that are dissatisfied. Problems with these products could be just as serióus as those related to categories associated with higher levels of market activity and visibility. However, since the absolute number of purchasers is not very high, the severity of these problems may be understated on the basis of conventional complaint data.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. The number of purchasers and the percent of purchasers reporting dissatisfactory experiences in this section lead to different rankings of problem categories.
2. The highest number of purchasers citing the item as most unsatisfactory are found in the categories "prescription drugs and medical supplies", "deodorants and anti-perspirants" and "hay fever, cough and cold remedies".
3. The largest percentages of purchasers reporting the item as most unsatisfactory are from the categories "hair dyes,
hair streaking and colouring products", "prescription drugs and medical supplies" and "babycare products".

### 3.2.1.4 CLOTHES, SHOES AND ACCESSORIES - Table 5 (FIV)

The clothing sector appears to have a comparatively higher level of extremely unsatisfactory experiences, both in the number and percent of purchasers, relative to the other sections of the Food \& Clothing study. While the Food Products section also reveals high numbers of respondents citing items as unsatisfactory, the higher level of market activity evidenced by increased rates of purchase helps to account in part for the high levels. In the case of Clothes, Shoes and Accessories, the market activity levels are substantially lower. This suggests higher relative rates of unsatisfactory experiences per purchaser. Clothes, Shoes and Accessories tend to involve more expensive purchases and tend to foster higher social performance expectations on the part of the consumer.

Within the Clothes, shoes and Accessories section, the greatest number of purchasers citing the items as the most unsatisfactory purchase is associated with women's clothing (52). The next two highest categories in terms of the number of people reporting the category as the most unsatisfactory are the

TABLE 5 (FIV)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTIING
Items cited as the most unsatisfactory púrchase experience by purchasers

SECTION: CLOTHES, SHOLS \& ACCESSORIES

| CATEGORY/ITEM | NO. OF <br> PURCHASERS |
| :--- | :--- |

1. Men's suits, jackets, coats, pants, shirts, pajanas, underwear, bathrobes, hosiery 879
2. Men's shoes, boots and slippers 775 77510
3. Women's suits, coats, jackets, dresses, skirts, blouses, slacks, shorts, halters, underwear, night-

960
52 wear, bathrobes, hosiery
4. Women's shoes, boots and slippers

918
23
5. Men's and wonen's fur coats, hats, and other fur goods

107
6. Men's and women's hats, gloves, belts, ties and other accessories

706
3
3.3
1.3

- Children's coats, jackets, snowsuits, dresses, skirts, slecpivear, underwear, shirts, pants, hosiery 587

41
8. Children's shoes, boots and slippers
9. Infant's clothing, diapers, and footwear
10. Beachwear, swimsuits, bathing caps 459
11. Work clothes, uniforms 309
12. Rainwear, umbrellas 366
13. Fine jewelry, costume jewelry, watches, optical frames

656

592
children's clothing (4I) and men's clothing (29) categories.

When the number dissatisfied is viewed as a percentage of purchasers, the children's clothing category ranks the highest, with $6.9 \%$ of purchasers citing a purchase of children's clothing as the most unsatisfactory item purchased. The frequency of purchase of children's clothing is higher than the frequency of purchase of adult's clothing which may offer more opportunities for dissatisfaction. However, given the durability performance standards as well as social performance standards for children's clothes, high levels of reported dissatisfaction appear more likely.

## COIJCLUSIONS

1. The most unsatisfactory categories center around the general clothing categories, ranked in terms of the number of reporters as women's, children's and men's clothes.
2. The highest percentage of purchasers citing an item as most unsatisfactory is found in the children's clothing category.
3.2.2 THE MOST UNSATISFACTORY FOOD AND CLOTHING CATEGORIES

Table 6 presents the responses to the single most unsatisfactory item purchased ranked according to the percent of total

TABLE 6 ( $F$ )

## CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD AND CLOTHING

FIVE MOST UNSATISFACTORY ITEMS/SERVICES BY SECTION


* $\mathrm{N}=1041$
respondents reporting each item. A summary of the top five most unsatisfactory items in each section are presented. The table indicates the order of items within each section based on the absolute number of purchasers reporting rather than the percent of purchasers reporting. This table enables the reader to place the unsatisfactory items in perspective based on reported instances of dissatisfaction across the total sample of respondents.

The Food Products section receives the highest share of response overall followed by Clothes, Shoes and Accessories, then Household and Family Supplies, and lastly, Personal and Health Care Products. This order is the same as the order of percent of respondents reporting one or more instances of extreme dissatisfaction (Table 4).

The top portion of Table 6 lists the five food categories cited most often as the most unsatisfactory. Four of these five categories also appeared in Table 1 (FI) with the highest percentages of dissatisfied purchasers. The remaining category dairy products - ranked twelfth in terms of percentage of dissatisfied customers but fourth among the most unsatisfactory product experiences. This apparent disparity stems from the fact that Table 1 (FI) is concerned with all purchase experiences during the past year, while Table 6 is concerned solely with intensely
unsatisfactory experiences. While the vast majority of dairy product purchases may have proved to be satisfactory, there may have been a few instances of noticeably unsatisfactory performance. The absolute number of such instances is likely to be higher for a product category such as dairy foods with the highest percentage of purchasers stating that they buy "often" as opposed to "sometimes." By chance, the more frequently a product is used, the more likely it is that the consumer may encounter an unsatisfactory item. Moreover, frequency of use results in the consumer having relatively clear expectations about the quality and performance of a product - such that digressions from this norm are readily apparent and liable to lead to dissatisfaction. Quality deterioration can occur rapidly with dairy products and is clearly noticeable when it has occurred. The fact that dairy products constituted one of the top five categories listed in the top portion of Table 6 reinforces the notion that consumer dissatisfaction is particularly likely to occur with fresh foods.

Looking at Table 6 as a whole, the "fresh/frozen meats" category receives the highest share of single most unsatisfactory experiences reported. The next categories are "fresh fruits and vegetables", "women's clothes" and "children's clothes". Overall, categories from both the Household and Family Supplies and the Personal and Health Care Products sections rank relatively far down the scale.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Relating the 'most unsatisfactory product' response to the total sample highlights Food Products and Clothes, Shoes \& Accessories as the sections with the highest number of respondents indicating serious problems.
2. The other two sections have significantly fewer respondents citing a most unsatisfactory item.
3. Individual categories of fresh/frozen meats, fresh produce, and women's and children's clothes occupy the largest share of the most unsatisfactory experiences.

### 3.3 PROFILES OF CONSUMERS RIPORTING DISSATISFACTION

In order to profile the reporters of dissatisfaction, the response indicating whether or not a subject had one or more experiences with which (s) he was highly dissatisfied was used to split the sample into "reporters" or "non-reporters" of high dissatisfaction. To qualify as a reporter of dissatisfaction, a respondent had to indicate, in at least one of the four Food \& Clothing sections, that (s) he had one or more experiences with which (s) he was highly dissatisfied. The total number of respondents classified as reporters of dissatisfaction amounts to 475, comprising $45.6 \%$ of the sample. This variable was then
crosstabulated against the demographic variables in order to determine if there were any significant characteristics separating the reporters vs. non-reporters of dissatisfaction. The results are shown on Table 7. It appears that the following demographics are significantly related to reporters of dissatisfaction at the . 05 level of significance: marital status, age, number of residents in the home, income, and education of the respondent. The results indicate that reporters of high dissatisfaction with food and clothing products tend to be married, $25-44$ years of age, household size of 3-4 people, middle to upper income, and college-educated.

This profile does not correspond to the profile of the consumer with a mean satisfaction score (MSS) in the 'dissatisfied' range (Table 3). The significant variables in the case of reporters of dissatisfaction were not significant in the case of MSS. However, it must be remembered that while MSS measures a general, overall level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction based primarily on frequency of responses over the 4 point scale, the reporters/non-reporters question measures the occurrence of the single "most unsatisfactory" experience. Thus, a consumer who is generally satisfied may quite easily have had a single highly unsatisfactory experience and vice versa. It is somewhat surprising, however, that there appears to be no demographic overlap

TABLE - 7 (F)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS REPORTING DISSATISFACTION ${ }^{1}$

VS. RESPONDENTS REPORTING NO DISSATISFACTION
SECTION: SIMMARY

| DEMOGRAPHICS | REPORTING/NOT REPORTING DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |  |  | SIGNIFICANCE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | REPORTING |  | NOT-REPORTING |  | TOTAL |  |  |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \%. | N | \% |  |  |
| SEX: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MALE | 75 | 15.8 | 93 | 16.4 | 168 | 16.1 | CIIISQ | $=0.038$ |
| FENALE | 400 | 84.2 | 473 | 83.6 | 873 | 83.9 | df $=1$ | SIG $=0.85$ |
|  | 475 |  | 566 |  | 1041 | 00.0 |  |  |
| MARITAL STATUS: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SINGLE | 36 | 7.6 | 43 | 7.6 | 79 | 7.6 | CHISQ | $=11.95$ |
| MARRIf.D | 397 | 83.8 | 434 | 76.7 | 831 | 79.9 | df 2 | SIG $=0.003$ |
| SEPARATED, DIVORCFD, WIDOUED |  | 83.8 | , | 76.7 | 83 | 79.9 |  | SIG $=0.003$ |
|  | 41. | 8.6 | 89 | 15.7 | 130 | 12.5 |  |  |
|  | 474 |  | 566 |  | 1040 | 00.0 |  |  |
| $\overline{\text { AGE: }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNDER 25 | 54 | 11.4 | 52 | 9.2 | 106 | 10.2 | CHISQ | $=25.29$ |
| 25-44 | 234 | 49.4 | 221 | 39.2 | 455 | 43.8 | $d f=3$ | SIG $=0.00$ |
| 45-64 | 147 | 31.0 | 191 | 33.9 | 338 | 32.6 |  |  |
| OVER 65 | 39 | 8.2 | 100 | 17.7 | 139 | 13. 4 |  |  |
| NO. OF RESIDENTS: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ONE-TWO | 139 | 29.4 | 210 | 37.3 | 349 | 33.7 | CIIISQ | $=11.18$ |
| THREE-FOUR | 232 | 49.0 | 220 | 39.1 | 452 | 43.6 | $d f=2$ | SIG $=0.004$ |
| FIVE OR MORE | 102 | 21.6 | 137 | 27.6 | 235 | 22.7 |  |  |
| OWN/RENL MOME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OHN | 352 | 74.1 | 403 | 71.6 | 755 | 72.8 | $d f=1$ | $S I G=0.40$ |
| RENT | 123 | 25.9 | 160 | 28. 4 | 283 | 27.2 |  | SIG $=0.40$ |
|  | 475 |  | 563 |  | 1038 | 0\%.0 |  |  |


| INCOME: 475 563 . 4038 . 100 |  |  |  |  | 1038 _100.0 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNDER \$10,000 | 82 | 19.7 | 147 | 30.8 | 229 | 25.6 | ClISO | 17.1 |  |
| \$10,000 - \$24,999 | 214 | 51.3 | 222 | 46.4 | 436 | 48.7 | dfo3 | SIG $=$ | 0.0007 |
| OVER \$25,000 | 121 | 29.0 | 109 | 22.8 | 230 | 25.7 |  |  |  |



| GRADESCHOOL OR | ESS 55 | 11.7 | 133 | 23.8 | 188 | 18.3 | CHISQ $=31.746$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HIGII SCHOOL | 236 | 50.3 | 279 | 49.8 | 515 | 50.0 |  |  |
| SOME COLLEGE OR | MORE 78 | 38.0 | 148 | 26.4 | 326 | 317 |  |  |
|  |  | 469 560 1029 100.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EMPLOIMENT: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FULL TIME | 123 | 26.1 | 126 | 22.3 | 249 | 24.1 | CHISQ $=5.47{ }^{\circ}$ |  |
| PART TIME | 62 | 13.2 | 57 | 10.1 | 119 | 11.5 | df=2 | SIG $=0.0651$ |
| NOT EMPLOYED | 286 | 60.7 | 381 | 67.6 | 667 | 61.4 |  |  |
| 471 - $564 \ldots 1035$ 100.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAIN WAGE EARNER: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SELF | 126 | 27.6 | 184 | 34.1 | 310 | 31.1 | $\text { CHISQ }=6.627$ |  |
| SPOUSE | 305 | 66.7 | 317 | 58.8 | 622 | 62.5 |  |  |
| OTHER | 26 | 5.7 | 38 | 7.1 | 64 | 6.4 |  |  |
|  | 457 |  | 539 |  | 996 | 100.0 |  |  |

'Respondents reporting dissatisfaction': those respondents who reported 'yes' when asked if they had had one or more experiences in which they had been highly dissatisfied, over the period of recall.

| N Reporting $=$ | 475 |
| :--- | ---: |
| N Not Reporting $=$ | 45.6 |
| $\frac{566}{1041}$ | $\frac{54.4}{100.0}$ |

acorss the two measures.

## CONCLUSION

1. Reporters of at least one highly unsatisfactory food and/or clothing experience over the past year tend to be married, 25 to 44 years old, from a $3-4$ person household, middle to upper income, and college educated.

### 4.1 REASONS FOR CONSUMER DISSATISFACTION

Respondents who reported a highly dissatisfactory experience with a particular food and/or clothing product were asked to consider an exhaustive list of reasons for their dissatisfaction. Respondents could check as many reasons from the list as they felt applied to their particular experience. Multiple mentions occurred, but the average number of reasons cited did not exceed 2.5 in any one section. Respondents were also asked to indicate the one single most important reason in contributing to dissatisfaction with the particular product.

The major reasons for consumer dissatisfaction are presented in Table 8. The table is split into 4 sub-tables, one for each section of the Food \& Clothing survey. The 'aided' list of

TABLE 8 (FI)
REGION: NATIONAL
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD AND CLOTHING
MAJOR REASONS FOR CONSUMER DISSATISFACTION
SECTION: FOOD PRODUCTS (FP) I

| REASONS | FREQUENCY OF MENTION |  |  |  | PERCENT OF DISSATIFIED CASES MENTIONING EACH REASON |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ALL REASONS |  | MOST IMPORTANT REASON |  |  |
|  | NO. OF MENTIONS | SHARE OF MENTIONS | NO. OF MENTIONS | SHARE OF MENTIONS |  |
| 1. The product was spoiled, had a defect, or was damaged | 174 | 22.3 | 105 | 28.5 | 47.2 |
| 2. The quality was poorer than I expected' | 253 | 32.5 | 167 | 45.3 | 68.6 |
| 3. The amount I got was less than it was supposed to be | 35 | 4.5 | 12 | 3.3 | 9.5 |
| 4. The product did not correspond to the general impression created by an advertisement | 86 | 11.0 | 23 | 6.2 | 23.3 |
| 5. A salesperson made false or misleading claims about the product | 6 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.3 | 1.6 |
| 6. The package was misleading | 45 | 5.8 | 11 | 3.0 | 12.2 |
| 7. The product was not delivered when promised | 5 | 0.6 | - | - | 1.4 |
| 8. A different item than the one I bought was delivered | 6 | 0.8 | 2 | 0.5 | 1.6 |
| 9. The instructions for using or taking care of the product were unclear or incomplete | 8 | 1.0 | - | - | 2.2 |
| 10. The product was unsafe or harmful to the person using it | 28 | 3.6 | 12 | 3.3 | 7.6 |
| 11. The "special discount price" I paid was as high or higher than the regular price of other sellers | 31 | 4.0 | 8 | 2.1 | 8.4 |
| 12. An advertised "special" was out of stock when I went to the store to buy it | 50 | 6.4 | 8 | 2.1 | 13.6 |
| 13. I was charged a higher price than the one that was advertised | 11 | 1.4 | 1 | 0.3 | 3.0 |
| 14. The store was unwilling to provide a refund or exchange | 5 | 0.6 | - | - | 1.4 |
| 15. Other reasons not listed above | 37 | 4.7 | 19 | 5.1 | 10.0 |

reasons is identical across the first 3 sections, and differs slightly in the Clothes, Shoes \& Accessories section to accommodate significant product differences.

The average number of reasons indicated per section is presented in Table 9.
4.1.1 FOOD PRODUCTS - Table 8 (FI)

The food products section shows considerably more reasons cited for dissatisfaction than any of the other sections.

Reasons focusing on product quality account for the largest share of reasons for consumer dissatisfaction with food products. In particular, two reasons "The product was spoiled, had a defect, or was damaged", and "The quality was poorer than I expected" account for over $50 \%$ of all reason mentions and over $70 \%$ of those reasons considered as the most important. The latter reason, "...quality poorer than I expected", has a 32.5\% share of mentions for all reasons and a $45.3 \%$ share of mentions as the most important reason. A total of $68.6 \%$ of dissatisfied cases mentioned this particular reason. It is not surprising that these reasons are so common in the case of food products especially when the items of greatest dissatisfaction are meats and produce.

The next most frequently cited reason for dissatisfaction with food products is that"The product did not correspond to the general impression created by an advertisement." This reason receives an $11.0 \%$ share of total reason mentions, but declines to a $6.2 \%$ share of the most important reasons. Food products are a highly advertised product category, both in terms of national multi-media advertising and local retail newspaper advertising, so the high level of dissatisfaction stemming from advertising is not surprising. This reason was mentioned by almost onequarter of the dissatisfied cases.

Other reasons associated with dissatisfaction with food products are:
"An advertised 'special' was out of stock when I
went to the store to buy it." (6.4\% of total
mentions)
"The package was misleading." (5.8\% of total
mentions)

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Consumer dissatisfaction with food products tends to be explained frequently by reasons relating to poor product quality.
2. Advertising claims give rise to dissatisfaction when the product does not live up to such claims, or when an advertised
special is out of stock.
3. More consumers were dissatisfied with product quality/performance than because of marketing practices such as selling techniques and advertising claims.
4.1.2 HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES - Table 8 (FII)

The reasons most frequently mentioned with regard to unsatisfactory Household and Family Supplies products also center around inherent product quality problems (32.7\%) and discrepancies between product performance and impressions created by advertising (22.1\%).

The most frequently cited reason was that "The quality was poorer than I expected", with a $32.7 \%$ share of total mentions and $41.3 \%$ of mentions as the most important reason. The third most frequently mentioned reason is that "The product was spoiled, had a defect, or was damaged." This reason accounted for a $12.8 \%$ share of total mentions and a $13.8 \%$ share of most important reason mentions. Together, these two reasons which focus on inherent product quality problems are mentioned by almost 85\% of dissatisfied respondents, and are considered as the most important factor contributing to dissatisfaction by over 55\% of dissatisfied respondents. The reader is reminded, however, that there is no consistent application of objective standards

for quality across the set of consumers purchasing these products.

The claim that a product does not live up to expectations created by advertising and/or packaging is another problem area leading to dissatisfaction with Household and Family Supplies. For example, "The product did not correspond to a general impression created by an advertisements" was mentioned by $41.3 \%$ of dissatisfied cases, receiving a $22.1 \%$ share of total mentions and a substantial $18.0 \%$ share of reasons considered to be most important. A further discrepancy between perceived product performance and pre-purchase expectations is expressed in the statement "The package was misleading." This was the fourth most frequently cited reason for dissatisfaction receiving $6.4 \%$ of total mentions. However, it is not named frequently as the most important reason. In the latter case, its share of mentions drops to $1.8 \%$.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Perceived product quality continues to be a major reason for consumer dissatisfaction in the case of Household and Family Supplies.
2. Discrepancies between perceived product performance and advertising claims or packaging impressions also represent
a considerable share of the reasons for dissatisfaction in this section.
3. Perceptions of product quality vary widely across consumers so that projections of overall deficiency in product quality must be made in a guarded fashion.

### 4.1.3 PERSONAL \& HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS - Table 8 (FIII)

Overall, there are comparatively fewer reasons for dissatisfaction listed in this section than in the other sections, which appears reasonable given the relatively low number of dissatisfied cases. Product quality, discrepancies between the product and impressions created by advertising/packaging, and product safety appear to be the general concerns of respondents dissatisfied with Personal and Health Care products.

Problems related to product quality and advertising impressions are both of high concern in this segment. The reasons "The quality was poorer than I expected" and "The product did not correspond the the general impression created by an advertisement" each represent $28.2 \%$ of total reasons mentioned. However, the former takes a greater share of the reasons named as most important by a share of $31.6 \%$ versus $26.5 \%$.

TABLE 8 (FIII)
REGION: NATIONAL
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD AND CLOTHING
MAJOR REASONS FOR CONSUMER DISSATISFACTION
SECTION: PERSONAL AND HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS (PHC) III


The relatively higher level of concern arising from charges that the product fell short of advertising claims in this section of Personal Care products is logical when one considers the 'social performance' dimension of such products. The advertising claims related to such items as deodorants and hair care products are, for the most part, social performance claims which would tend to inflate consumer expectations thereby increasing the likelihood that such expectations would be disconfirmed on the basis of perceived product performance.

In the area of product safety, the statement "The product was unsafe or harmful to the person using it" is a frequently cited reason, one which is named often as most important. This result is expected given the nature of the products in the personal and health care sector. The potential for problems arising from general misuse, unexpected allergic reactions, selfadministered non-prescription drugs, and even prescription drugs is high. The fact that this reason is named as the most important by $14.3 \%$ of dissatisfied users indicates that product safety is a significant source of dissatisfaction with Personal and Health Care products.

Other reasons which receive a relatively high share of total mentions are "The package was misleading" (6.6\% of total
mentions), and "The product was spoiled, had a defect, or was damaged (5.0\% of total mentions, $6.1 \%$ of most important reason mentions).

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Perceived product quality being poorer than expected is the most frequently cited reason and is named as the most important reason for dissatisfaction with Personal and Health Care products.
2. Perceived product performance failing to match expectations set by advertising is also a key reason in this section due in part to the social performance aspects of personal care products.
3. Product safety is a relatively important reason for dissatisfaction and may stem from such problems as product misuse and self-administration of health care products.
4.1.4 CLOTHES, SHOES \& ACCESSORIES - Table 8 (FIV)

In the case of Clothes, Shoes and Accessories, the most frequently cited reason and the reason most respondents named as the most important cause of their dissatisfactory experience is "The quality was poorer than I expected." Other reasons

TABLE 8 (FIV)
REGION: NATIONAL
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD AND CLOTHING
MAJOR REASONS FOR CONSUMER DISSATISFACTION
SECTION: CLOTHES, SHOES, AND ACCESSORIES (CSA) IV

frequently mentioned focus on other quality aspects, advertising claims (especially related to product longevity), and retail practices vis a vis refunds and exchanges.

In the area of perceived product quality, the primary reason cited is "The quality was poorer than I expected." This reason received $32.8 \%$ of total mentions and $47.3 \%$ of mentions as the most important reason. The other quality related reason, "The product was spoiled, had a defect, or was damaged", had a 10.4\% share of total mentions and $9.2 \%$ of most important reason mentions. Together, these two reasons were mentioned by virtually all dissatisfied cases (multiple mentions included). Quality is the single most important concern of consumers when buying clothes, shoes and accessories.

It should be noted that the generalized list of reasons for dissatisfaction contained in the survey questionnaire does not permit a comprehensive appraisal of consumer satisfaction with clothing at the "attribute" level. Even though consumers indicated that a high fraction of overall dissatisfaction was attributable to problems arising from product quality, it is not clear how much priority consumers assign to factors such as clothing comfort and quality relative to other considerations including style and price. The results reported in this study, however, reinforce
conventional wisdom that a great many consumers have experienced dissatisfaction with key "physical features" or performance characteristics in the case of clothing and footwear. For example, Best and Andreasen (1976) ${ }^{6}$ report that, of the consumers indicating dissatisfaction in their study, approximately 28\% said that they had experienced non-price-related problems (mainly product performance) compared to $6 \%$ who indicated pricerelated problems. Further research in this area will have to focus on other more specific clothing concerns including product longevity, ease of care, appearance, comfort, availability of styles/assortments, availability of sizes, fabric performance and quality of construction.

The next most significant area of concern is directed toward advertising claims and product performance. The reasons "The product did not correspond to the general impression created by an advertisement" and "The product did not perform as well or last as long as advertising claims led me to believe" account for $6.7 \%$ and $18.1 \%$ respectively of total reasons mentioned. Together they assume a $19.9 \%$ share of the reasons considered most important by dissatisfied respondents. In the case of

[^4]the first advertising-related reason, the results are not surprising given the large advertising budgets for various types of clothing and footwear products. The latter reason, relating specifically to the durability and longevity of the product, may be attributable to the high proportion of respondents concerned with children's clothing where durability would be a key issue.

A final reason which accounts for $4.6 \%$ of total mentions concerns the retailer. Some dissatisfied consumers claimed "The store was unwilling to provide a refund or exchange." This type of problem may be fairly common in the retail clothing sector - particularly with respect to the small, single outlet retailer.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Product quality overshadows other reasons for dissatisfaction with Clothes, Shoes and Accessories.
2. Advertising claims, particularly those emphasizing longevity, which are not fulfilled in terms of product performance, constitute the second largest group of reasons for dissatisfaction.
3. Retail practices come into play in the Clothes, Shoes and

Accessories sector, where problems with refunds and exchanges cause consumer dissatisfaction.

### 4.2 THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION

Table 9 summarizes by section the total number of reasons for dissatisfaction, the total number of respondents citing reasons, and finally, the average number of reasons for dissatisfaction.

The total number of reasons per section should be compared to the number of subjects citing reasons in the section. Thus, although the Food Products section has the most reason mentions, it also has the most respondents, and does not have the highest average number of reasons cited per respondent.

The highest average number of reasons given for dissatisfaction is the Clothes, Shoes and Accessories section, with each subject citing an average of 2.32 reasons for dissatisfaction. It must be kept in mind that this section did have an aided recall list of 17 reasons where the other sections had a list of 15 reasons - thereby increasing slightly the opportunity to mention a reason in the case of Clothes, Shoes and Accessories.

## TABLE 9 (F)

CONSUNER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
AVERAGE NUMBER OF REASONS CITED FOR DISSATISFACTION

| SECTION | TOTAL REASON MENTIONS | TOTAL RESPONDENTS CITING REASONS | AVERAGE NO. OF REASONS CITED |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. FOOD PRODUCTS | 780 | 370 | 2.11 |
| II. HOUSEHOLD \& FANILY SUPPLIES | 312 | 167 | 1.87 |
| III. PERSONAL $\varepsilon_{i}$ HEALTII CARE PRODUCTS | 181 | 98 | 1.85 |
| IV. CLOTIES, SHOES $F_{1}$ ACCESSORIES | 481 | 207 | 2.32 |

Respondents dissatisfied with items in the Food Products section cited an average of 2.11 reasons. In Household and Family Supplies, the average number of reasons is 1.87 and with Personal and Health Care Products, the average number is 1.85.

### 5.1 CONSEQUENCES OF THE UNSATISFACTORY PURCHASE/ CONSUMPTION EXPERIENCE

In order to guide the policymaker in prioritizing consumer product categories which require more focused attention, supplementary information on the consequences of unsatisfactory purchase/ consumption experiences is provided. While 2 subjective reports of consumer dissatisfaction form the basis for CS/D analysis in this study, a more objective measure of the incurrance of financial loss and/or physical injury helps to pinpoint areas of serious concern.

The purpose of this section is to present financial loss and physical injury consequences as reported by dissatisfied consumers. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had suffered any financial loss due to the purchase/consumption experience which they had reported as the most unsatisfactory. The amount of financial loss was then reported. Then, subjects were asked whether they had experienced any physical injury due to the same unsatisfactory experience, and whether
hospitalization was required.

### 5.1.1 THE EXTENT OF FINANCIAL LOSS/PHYSICAL INJURY ASSOCIATED WITH UNSATISFACTORY PURCHASE/CONSUMPTION EXPERIENCES

Table 10 presents a summary of financial and physical consequences for all four sections of the Food \& Clothing survey. The first column indicates the number reporting dissatisfaction. This represents the eligible set for financial loss andor physical injury. The second and third columns refer to the percent of dissatisfied respondents reporting financial loss associated with their most unsatisfactory purchase/consumption experience, and the corresponding absolute number of the same subjects. Using the total number experiencing financial loss as a base of $100.0 \%$, a distribution of respondents according to the amount of their financial loss is presented in columns four through seven. This distribution is expressed in absolute numbers as well as in the interval's share of the total.

The last three columns, 8 through 10, indicate the percent of dissatisfied respondents reporting physical injury, the corresponding number reporting physical injury and finally, the number reporting that hospitalization was required.

TABLE 10 (F)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
FINANCIAL LOSS \& PHYSICAL INJURY ARISING FROM

## UNSATISFACTORY PURCHASE EXPERIENCES

| UNSATISFACTORY PURCHASE EXPERIENCES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SECTION | NO. REPORTING DISSATISFACTION | PERCENT OF DISSATISFIED RESPONDENTS | NO. REPORTING ASSOCIATED FINANCIAL LOSS | DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO AMOUNT OF FINANCIAL LOSS REPORTED |  |  |  | PERCENT OF <br> DISSATISFIED RESPONOENTS REPORTING ASSOCIATED PHYSICAL INJURY | NO. REPORTING ASSOCIATED PHYSICAL INJURY | NO. REPORTING SUBSEQUENT hOSPITALIZATION |
|  | WITH ONE OR MORE ITEMS | REPORTING ASSOCIATED FINANCIAL LOSS |  |  | $\$ 25-\$ 99$ | $\$ 100-\$ 499$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { over } \\ & \$ 500 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FOOD PRODUCTS | 370 | 18.1 | $\begin{gathered} 67 \\ 100.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52 \\ & 78.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 16.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 . \\ & 1.5 \end{aligned}$ | 5.7 | 21 | 6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { II } \\ & \text { HOUSEHOLD } \\ & \text { \& FAMILY } \\ & \text { SUPPLIES } \end{aligned}$ | 167 | 22.8 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 15.8 \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 3.6 | 6 | 1 |
| $\overline{\text { III }}$ HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS | 98 | 27.6 | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ 100.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & 80.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 16.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 4.0 \end{aligned}$ |  | 16.3 | 16 | - |
| IV <br> CLOTHES, SHOES \& ACCESSORIES | 207 | 22.2 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & 55.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17 \\ & 37.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 4.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2.2 \end{aligned}$ | 2.9 | 6 | - |

SUMMARY

NOTE: Figures under Distribution of Respondents may not add to Total No. Reporting Financial Loss due to non-response.

FINANCIAL LOSS

On the basis of the percent of dissatisfied respondents reporting financial loss, the Personal and Health Care Products section has the highest share, with $27.6 \%$ of dissatisfied cases indicating that they had suffered loss. However, when this number is expressed in absolute terms, the section has the fewest cases of financial loss, with 27 reporters. Therefore, it seems that, while dissatisfactory experiences occur less frequently with these products, they tend to be accompanied by financial consequence more often.

Conversely, The Food Products section has the lowest percent of dissatisfied cases reporting financial loss (18.1\%) but the highest absolute number reporting loss (67). In 78.8\% of these cases, however, the loss was reported as being less than $\$ 25$., as might be expected in the case of food products. For these items, it seems that financial loss tends to occur among a relatively smaller proportion of dissatisfied cases simply because refund and exchange procedures involving the retailer tend to be more straightforward with these types of products. Also, there may be a tendency not to recall or report financial loss with food products because the dollar amount is relatively low per item, and because consumers expect to absorb a certain amount of the cost of 'spoilage' associated with
these items.

Even a cursory glance at the distribution of financial loss indicates that the losses associated with Food Products, Household and Family Supplies and Personal and Health Care Products are concentrated at the low end of the scale, under $\$ 25.00$. Approximately $80 \%$ of such cases are in this interval for all three product sections. The losses associated with Clothes, Shoes and Accessories tend to be higher, given the higher per unit cost of these items. The distribution of such losses puts $44.4 \%$ of cases over $\$ 25.00$, and $6.6 \%$ of losses over $\$ 100.00$. PHYSICAL INJURY

Personal and Health Care Products tend to have the highest percent of dissatisfactory experiences resulting in physical injury with $16.3 \%$ suffering injury. The actual number of cases. is 16 . Given that a significant reason for dissatisfaction within this category was related to the statement "The product was unsafe or harmful to the person using it", these results are consistent.

The absolute number of cases reporting physical injury is highest with respect to the Food Products section, where 21
respondents, or $5.7 \%$ of dissatisfied cases, reported physical injury. Of these, 6 cases reported that hospitalization was also required. Although details are not available, such physical injury probably takes the form of choking, food poisoning, consumption of out-of-date or spoiled foods, etc.

Injuries arising from Household and Family Supplies and from Clothes, Shoes and Accessories were reported by 6 respondents in each section, representing $3.6 \%$ and $2.9 \%$ of dissatisfied cases respectively.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Personal and Health Care Products appear to have the highest share of dissatisfied cases reporting consequences of either financial loss or physical injury.
2. Food Products tends to produce the largest absolute number of respondents experiencing loss/injury.
3. The financial loss associated with Clothes, Shoes and Accessories is relatively high, with slightly less than half of reported losses in this section amounting to more than \$25.

### 5.2 PRODUCT CATEGORIES MOST OFTEN ASSOCIATED WITH FINANCIAL LOSS/PHYSICAL INJURY

Financial loss and physical injury consequences seem to be problems that are rather product-specific. The association of financial loss and/or physical injury with particular products is presented in Tables 11 and 12. An effort is made to explain the financial loss/physical injury in any given section as the cumulative share of loss/injury associated with specific products in the section. In some cases, however, a large share of total loss/injury is explained.by very few items.

The same format is used to present the results in Tables 11 and 12. The items which are most frequently cited in relation to the incidence of financial loss/physical injury appear down the left-hand side of the table. An arbitrary cut-off point in the list was made to preclude subsequent items which would add only a relatively low incremental number of respondents to the list. The first column shows the number of respondents reporting loss/injury associated with a specific item. The second column indicates the percentage of respondents experiencing loss/injury with each specific item over the total number of respondents experiencing financial loss or physical injury in the section. The final column is a cumulative percentage of respondents reporting loss/injury by item, that is, an expression of the

## TABLE 11 (F)

CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
ITEMS MOST OFTEN RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCIAL LOSS
ITEMS ASSOCIATED WITH $\quad$ RESPONDENTS EXPERIENCING FINANCIAL LOSS BY ITEM
FINANCIAL LOSS
I. FOOD PRODUCTS

1. Fresh/frozen meats 13
2. Cooked, canned, or processed meat, poultry 8 or fish dishes
3. Fresh fruits $\&$

8 vegetables
4. Milk, cheese, yogurt \& other dairy products

13

7
II. HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES

1. Lightbulbs, fuses, household batteries, extension 7 cords
2. Photographic film,flash- 5 bulbs
3. Bleaches, starch, fabric 3 softeners, bluing, presoaks
4. Home canning \& freezing
supplies
5. Magazines \& newspapers

3

IIt. PERSONAL \& henlti CARE Pronucts

1. Prescription drugs, medical supplies 6 lotions, suntan lotion 5
22.2
22.2
2. Cosmetics, perfumes, creams,
18.5
40.7
iv. Clothes, shoes \&

ACCESSORIFS

1. Womens clothes
26.1
26.1
2. Mens clothes 7
15.241 .3
3. Womens footwear 7
15.2
56.5
4. Childrens clothes 7
15.2
71.7
${ }^{*} N=$ all respondents experiencing financial. loss with items in the section
total percentage of loss/injury explained by the associated list of items.

### 5.2.1 FINANCIAL LOSS

Table ll helps to emphasize the fact that a fairly large share of respondents experiencing financial loss tend to cite the same, few items with respect to the loss. In other words, a relatively short list of product categories explains a relatively large share of the occurrences of financial loss within the sample.

In the case of Food Products, over $50 \%$ of financial loss experiences may be traced to only 4 out of 26 possible product categories. Three out of four of these items are perishable commodities which represent a significant share of the grocery dollar. "Fresh/Frozen meats" alone represents one-fifth of the cases where financial loss was reported.

Five items in the Household and Family Supplies section explain almost $60 \%$ of financial loss. Again, almost $20 \%$ or onefifth of total cases can be explained by one product category, namely "light bulbs, fuses, household batteries, extension cords".

Two product categories account for a large share of cases in the Personal and Health Care products section. These are "prescription drugs, medical supplies" and "cosmetics, perfumes, creams, lotions, suntan lotion". In the case of relatively expensive prescription drugs, a respondent may determine that the performance of the product(s) is substantially below pre-purchase expectations, especially if the drugs didn't cure the problem. The reasons for financial loss in the case of cosmetics may be explained by perceived low 'social performance' or could reflect the costs of experimentation with an array of new products, different brands, etc., in this product class.

The Clothes, Shoes and Accessories section accounts for a relatively high share of cases of financial loss. "Women's footwear", in particular, appears to produce a large number of financial loss cases. Given that expenditures on a single item of clothing, especially adult clothing, can be substantial, the potential for financial loss, whether real or perceived, is high. Over one-quarter of all respondents reporting financial loss in this section ascribe that loss to the purchase of women's clothes. Since one of the key reasons for dissatisfaction in this section was the difficulty in obtaining refunds or exchanges, financial loss associated with clothing purchases is consistent.

CONCLUSIONS

1. A handful of product categories tend to explain a large share of the total cases of financial loss.
2. "Fresh/frozen meats", "prescription drugs, medical supplies", and "women's clothes" represent single categories which account for over $20 \%$ of total financial loss within their product sections.

### 5.2.2 PHYSICAL INJURY

Consistent with the results for financial loss, it appears that only a very few categories represent a substantial share of the cases where physical injury occurs. Table 12 presents the list of items most often associated with physical injury. Caution is warranted in the interpretation of this table, however, since the numbers and the bases are quite small. As such, the results may not be freely generalizable.

Many of the physical injury cases associated with Food Products seem to revolve around two items - "fresh/frozen meats" ( 3 cases, $15.0 \%$ of total cases) and "fresh/frozen fish" (3 cases, 15.0\% of total cases). Injuries from meats and fish probably can be attributed to either consumption of "bad" products, or

to swallowing bones although, in this study, such conjectures are entirely speculative.

In the Household and Family Supplies section, only one category is cited in more than one case - "bleaches, bluing and presoaks" were identified in 2 cases of physical injury. The harsh chemicals used in these products probably explains the occurrence of physical injury.

A wider range of products is linked to physical injury in the Personal and Health Care Products section. The two categories which are responsible for a slightly higher number of cases are "cosmetics, cream and lotions" and "prescription drugs and medical supplies". Allergic reactions or problems from misuse through self-administration may be the reasons for these cases of physical injury.

Finally, the single category which received more than one mention in the area of Clothes, Sroes and Accessories was "women's footwear".

CONCLUSIONS

1. A few items appear to explain a substantial share of the physical injury cases.
2. In the Personal and Health Care Products section, a wider range of products are associated with physical injury.

### 6.1 CONSUMER RESPONSE TO UNSATISFACTORY PURCHASE/ CONSUMPTION EXPERIENCES

This chapter examines the behaviour patterns of dissatisfied consumers - the results are based on questions which asked whether the consumer took any action, either personal or direct, subsequent to the single purchase/consumption experience which the consumer reported earlier in the questionnaire as the most unsatisfactory one. If the consumer indicated that (s)he did. in fact take some form of action, the respondent was asked to check a list of personal and/or direct actions taken. Personal actions involve either a conscious change in buying behaviour or attempts to inform friends and family about the product. Direct actions are more resolution-oriented since they seek to remedy the specific unsatisfactory situation through refund, replacement, or complaining. Complaints can be directed to the manufacturer, retailer, or to third parties such as consumer/industry associations, Better Business Bureau, government, etc. Respondents were permitted to check as many actions as they felt explained their own post-dissatisfaction behaviour.

Respondents who indicated that they did not take any form
of action following an unsatisfactory purchase/consumption experience, were asked to check one of four reasons which best explained why they took no action. Respondents who checked one or more 'direct' actions, were then asked to indicate on a fourpoint scale, how satisfied they were with the way their complaint was handled.

In this section of the report, an effort is made to summarize the types of actions taken over the entire survey as well as within each of the four sections. Next, the average number of actions taken by type of action (personal or direct) for each section will be presented. This will be followed by profiles of consumers who take some form of action, and consumers who take direct action. Finally, the incidence of 'no action' and the reasons for the 'no action' response will be presented and briefly discussed.

### 6.1.1 A SUMMARY OF CONSUMER ACTIONS - FOOD \& CLOTHING

Across all four sections of the Food and Clothing survey, there were 475 respondents who indicated that they were highly dissatisfied at least once during the recall period. A summary of all the actions taken in response to dissatisfaction with food and/or clothing products is presented in Table 13.

TABLE 13 (F)
REGION: NATIONAL
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD AND CLOTHING CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR IN RESPONSE TO DISSATISFACTORY PURCHASE EXPERIENCE
... SUINARARY OF ACTIONS....

| RESPONSE/TYPE OF ACTION TAKEN | FREQUENCY OF SPECIFIC ACTION TAKEN |  |  | PERCENT OF DISSATISFIED CASES TAKING SPECIFIC ACTIONS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. PERSONAL ACTION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO. OF } \\ & \text { MENTIONS } \end{aligned}$ | SHARE OF PERSONAL ACTIONS | SHARE OF TOTAL ACTIONS |  |
| 1. I decided not to buy that brand of the product | 235 | 35.5 | 22.3 | 49.5 |
| 2. I decided to quit using that kind of product | 119 | 17.9 | 11.3 | 25.0 |
| 3. I decided to stop shopping at the store where I bought the product | 85 | 12.8 | 8.1 | 17.9 |
| 4. I warned my famity and friends about the brand, product or store | 185 | 27.9 | 17.5 | 38.9 |
| 5. Other personal action not listed above | 39 | 5.9 | 3.6 | .8.2 |


| A. TOTAL PERSONAL ACTION | 663 | 100\% | 62.8\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B. DIRECT ACTION | NO. OF MENTIONS | SHARE OF DIRECT ACTIONS | SHARE OF TOTAL ACTIONS |  |
| 1. I returned the product to the seller for a replacement or refund | 186 | 47.4 | 17.6 | 39.0 |
| 2. I contacted the store to complain | 137 | 34.9 | 13.0 | 28.8 |
| 3. I contacted the manufacturer to complain | 32 | 8.2 | 3.0 | 6.7 |
| 4. I contacted the manufacturers ${ }^{1}$ industry association to complain | 4 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.8 |
| 5. I contacted the Better Business Bureau to | 6 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 1.3 |
| 6. I contacted a governmental agency or a public official to complain | 11 | 2.8 | 1.0 | 2.3 = |
| 7. I contacted a private consumer advocate or consumer organization to complain | 3 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.6 |
| 8. I contacted a lawyer, went to Small Claims <br> Court, ar otherwise took legal action  | 2 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| 9. Other direct action not listed above | 11 | 2.8 | 1.0 | 2.3 |


| B. TOTAL DIRECT ACTION | 392 | $100 \%$ | $37.2 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A\&B | TOTAL ACTION SUMMARY | 1055 | $\ldots$ | $100.0 \%$ |

[^5]$N$ unduplicated dissatisfied $=475$

Column 1 indicates the total number of mentions for each type of action; column 2 reports the absolute number of mentions as a share of either personal or direct actions; and column 3 expresses the same number as a share of total actions. The last column shows the percent of dissatisfied cases who indicated that they had taken the specific action.

It seems that when consumers are dissatisfied with Food and Clothing products, they tend to take personal action more often than direct action. Almost two-thirds (62.8\%) of total actions mentioned were of the personal variety. The most popular post-dissatisfaction response appears to be brand-switching, "I decided not to buy that brand of the product again." This action was taken by one half of all dissatisfied cases, and represents $22.3 \%$ of all actions taken. The next most frequently cited actions were "I warned my family and friends about the brand, product or store" and "I returned the product to the seller for a replacement or refund." These actions each accounted for about $17 \%$ of total action mentions. Other actions which received a high share of mentions were "I contacted the store to complain" (137 mentions; 13.0\% of total mentions) and "I decided to quit using that kind of product" (119 mentions; 11.3\% of total mentions).

The types of actions most often taken by dissatisfied consumers of food and clothing reflect the general nature of the industry and the market. Brand switching is the simplest and perhaps most effective response to dissatisfaction. The availability of numerous brand substitutes in the food and grocery market allows and indeed encourages this type of action. Returning the product to the seller is also a simple, direct action in the food, grocery, and even clothing industries. And, when the behavioural response involves word-of-mouth warning to family and friends about a product, there may be a multiplier effect wherein those warned of the bad experience will change their buying behaviour without having directly experienced dissatisfaction with the product.

Direct actions such as contacting industry associations, Better Business Bureau, government, consumer organization or legal counsel combined represent only $2.5 \%$ of total actions. In this sector, resolutions of consumer problems apparently are more easily obtained through changing buying behaviour or through dealing directly with the seller or manufacturer. Thus, the more far-reaching, public responses do not seem to be employed except in the case of a 'last resort'. Consumers evidently believe that a single incident involving a small ticket item is not 'worth' the time and effort needed to achieve corrective
action by means of third party intervention.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Consumers of Food and Clothing products are "practical" in their approach to complaining behaviour and in general tend to take personal action twice as often as direct action.
2. Brand-switching is the most popular action taken.
3. Warning family and friends about the unsatisfactory experience and returning the product to the seller are the second most popular action alternatives.
4. Public action, involving third party intervention, is very infrequently used in cases involving food and/or clothing products.
6.1.2 A SUMMARY OF CONSUMER ACTIONS - FOOD PRODUCTS

Table 14 (FI) summarizes all actions taken by dissatisfied consumers in the Food Products section. Personal actions and direct actions split 60:40 among those dissatisfied with Food Products.

The three actions taken most frequently in this section are "I decided not to buy that brand of the product again" (99 mentions; 19.6\% of total mentions); "I returned the product to the seller for a replacement or refund" (97 mentions; 19.2\% of total mentions); and "I warned my family and friends about the brand, product or store" (93 mentions; 18.4\% of total mentions).

As suggested by two of the three responses cited above, personal actions accounted for the majority of total actions. Consumers appeared to be more likely to switch brands within the product category (19.6\% of total mentions) rather than to drop the product category or switch stores. Of equal significance was the frequency with which consumers reported warning family or friends through word of mouth, not surprisingly since food is a common subject in everyday conversation. It is important to note that neither business firms nor consumer protection agencies would be directly aware of these types of personal actions. As previously stated, assessing consumer dissatisfaction levels on the basis of direct actions alone can lead to severe underestimates of dissatisfaction.

Direct or public actions accounted for a minority of 39.2\% of total actions. These actions principally involved complaining to the retailer ( $14.7 \%$ of total mentions) and seeking

TABLE 14 (FI)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD AND CLOTHING CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR IN RESPONSE TO DISSATISFACTORY PURCHASE EXPERIENCE SECTION: FOOD PRODUCTS (FP) I

| RESPONSE/TYPE OF ACTION TAKEN | FREQUENCY OF SPECIFIC ACTION TAKEN |  |  | PERCENT OF DISSATISFIED CASES*TAKING SPECIFIC ACTIONS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. PERSONAL ACTION | NO. OF MENTIONS | SHARE OF PERSONAL ACTIONS | SHARE OF TOTAL ACTIONS |  |
| .1. I decided not to buy that brand of the product | 99 | 32.2 | 19.6 | 26.8 |
| 2. I decided to quit using that kind of product | 56 | 18.3 | 11.1 | 15.1 |
| 3. I decided to stop shopping at the store where 1 bought the product | 44 | 14.3 | 8.7 | 11.9 |
| 4. I warned my family and friends about the brand, product or store | 93 | 30.3 | 18.4 | 25.1 |
| 5. Other personal action not listed above | 15 | 4.9 | 3.0 | 4.1 |


| A. TOTAL PERSONAL ACTION | 307 | 100\% | 60.8\% | 83.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B. DIRECT ACTION | NO. OF MENTIONS | SHARE OF DIRECT ACTIONS | SHARE OF TOTAL ACTIONS |  |
| 1. I returned the product to the seller for a replacement or refund | 97 | 49.0 | 19.2 | 26.2 |
| 2. I contacted the store to complain | 74 | 37.4 | 14.7 | 20.0 |
| 3. I contacted the manufacturer to complain | 10 | 5.1 | 2.0 | 2.7 |
| 4. I contacted the manufacturers industry association to complain | 2 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| 5. I contacted the Better Business Bureau to complain | 3 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| 6. I contacted a governmental agency or a public official to complain | 6 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 1.6 |
| 7. I contacted a private consumer advocate or consumer organization to complain | 2 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| 8. I contacted a lawyer, went to Small Claims Court, or otherwise took legal action | $\emptyset$ | $\emptyset$ | $\varnothing$ | $\varnothing$ |
| 9. Other direct action not listed above | 4 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 1.1 |


*N dissatisfied $=\mathbf{3 7 0}$
redress from the place of purchase in the form of a refund or replacement (19.2\% of total mentions). Few consumers reported contacting the manufacturer. Two explanations are possible. First, consumers who are dissatisfied initially approach the retailer and, if satisfied, have no need to pursue their complaints with the manufacturer. Since the retailer is generally more accessible than the manufacturer, the former tends to provide a faster settlement of the problem. Second, a substantial percentage of the unsatisfactory experiences reported occurred with fresh food products which are often not labeled with a manufacturer name. In the case of these and private brand processed foods carried by major supermarket chains, the consumer's principal form of recourse must lie with the retailer.

Just as few direct actions involved complaints to the manufacturer, there were correspondingly few approaches made to consumer organizations, government agencies, and lawyers (2.6\% of total actions). The degree of financial loss involved in an unsatisfactory experience with a food product is relatively low compared to an automobile, for example. Consequently, consumers are unlikely to invest substantial time, effort and money in pursuing complaints related to food products beyond the food retailer.

1. Three types of actions overshadow all others in cases involving food products: namely, brand switching, warning family and friends, and returning the product to the seller.
2. Actions directed toward the retailer account for a large share of total actions (over $40 \%$ ).
3. Public action is quite infrequent.
6.1.3 A SUMMARY OF CONSUMER ACTIONS - HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES

Table 14 (FII) summarizes consumer behaviour in response to unsatisfactory experiences with Household and Family Supplies. Total actions split about 70:30 in this section, with personal actions accounting for the larger share.

The single most frequently cited action in this section is, "I decided not to buy that brand of the product again" (43 mentions; 29.7\% of total mentions). Since the list of products included in this section are fairly homogeneous, the availability of satisfactory substitutes enables the dissatisfied consumer to switch quite easily to a competing brand. Items in this section are characterized by relatively few significant product differences and there tends to be a fairly high degree of product

TABLE 14 (FII)
REGION: NATIONAL

## CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD AND CLOTHING

 CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR IN RESPONSE TO DISSATISFACTORY PURCHASE EXPERIENCE.SECTION: HOUSEHOLD AND FAMILY SUPPLIES (HFS) II

| RESPONSE/TYPE OF ACTION TAKEN | FREQUENCY OF SPECIFIC ACTION TAKEN |  |  | PERCENT OF DISSATISFIED CASES* TAKING SPECIFIC ACTIONS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. PERSONAL ACTION | NO. OF MENTIONS | SHARE OF PERSONAL ACTIONS | SHARE OF TOTAL ACTIONS |  |
| 1. I decided not to buy that brand of the product again | 43 | 41.3 | 29.7 | 25.7 |
| 2. I decided to quit using that kind of product | 23 | 22.1 | 15.9 | 13.8 |
| 3. I decided to stop shopping at the store where I bought the product | 3 | 2.9 | 2.1 | 1.8 |
| 4. I warned my famity and friends about the brand, product or store | 28 | 27.0 | 19.3 | 16.8 |
| 5. Other personal action not listed above | 7 | 6.7 | 4.8 | 4.2 |
| A. TOTAL PERSONAL ACTION | 104 | 100\% | 71.7 \% | 62.3 |
| B. DIRECT ACTION | NO. $O F$ MENTIONS | SHARE OF DIRECT ACTIONS | SHARE OF TOTAL ACTIONS |  |
| 1. I returned the product to the seller for a replacement or refund | 15 | 36.5 | 10.3 | 9.0 |
| 2. I contacted the store to complain | 11 | 26.8 | 7.6 | 6.6 |
| 3. I contacted the manufacturer to complain | 9 | 22.0 | 6.2 | 5.4 |
| 4. I contacted the manufacturers' industry association to complain | 1 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| 5. I contacted the Better Business Bureau to complain | 1 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| 6. I contacted a governmental agency or a public official to complain | 2 | 4.9 | 1.4 | 1.2 |
| 7. I contacted a private consumer advocate or consumer organization to complain | 1 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| 8. I contacted a lawyer, went to Small Claims Court, or otherwise took legal action | $\emptyset$ |  | 0 | $\emptyset$ |
| 9. Other direct action not listed above | 1 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| B. TOTAL DIRECT ACTION | 41 | 100\% | 28.3 \% | 24.6 |
| A\&B TOTAL ACTION SUMMARY | 145 | -- | 100 | -- |

and brand proliferation. These factors tend to encourage brand switching, product-form switching, and dropping products altogether. Product-form switching refers to the alternative "I decided to quit using that kind of product" which was the third most frequently cited action. This may entail switching,for example, from powder laundry detergents to liquid compounds. Or, the consumer may stop using a product altogether. This response seems most likely in cases where the product, in any form, is not a complete necessity (i.e. air fresheners, deodorizers, plant food, magazines, etc.).

The second most frequently reported action is "I warned my family and friends about the brand, product or store", with 28 mentions representing 19.3\% of total mentions.

The post-purchase role of the retailer appears to be less important in terms of complaining behaviour in the case of Household and Family Supplies compared to Food Products. Together, the three actions specifically focusing on the retailer account for $20.0 \%$ of total actions in this section vs. $42.6 \%$ for Food Products. In fact, the share of mentions for responses concerned with contacting the manufacturer to complain (6.2\%) is almost as large as the share related to contacting the retailer to complain (7.6\%).

Public action totals a modest $3.5 \%$ share of all actions taken to resolve problems with Household and Family Supplies.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Personal actions are frequently taken in this section, accounting for over $70 \%$ of total actions mentioned.
2. Brand and product switching is a common type of action taken to resolve problems with Household and Family Supplies.
3. This section has the highest share of public actions in the Food and Clothing Survey - but at $3.5 \%$ of total mentions, it is still rather insignificant.
6.1.4 A SUMMARY OF CONSUMER ACTIONS - PERSONAL \& HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS

Table 14 (FIII) summarizes the total actions taken by consumers dissatisfied with Personal and Health Care Products. Respondents who took action in this section were far more likely to take personal action than direct. Personal actions account for $83.5 \%$ of total actions mentioned, whereas direct actions account for only $16.5 \%$ of the total.

Two specific actions, namely brand-switching and product switching/dropping, together account for almost $60 \%$ of total

| RESPONSE/TYPE OF ACTION TAKEN | FREQUENCY OF SPECIFIC ACTION TAKEN |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { PERCENT OF DISSATISFIED } \\ \text { CASES }{ }^{\star} \text { TAKING } \\ \text { SPECIFIC ACTIONS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. PERSONAL ACTION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO. OF } \\ & \text { MENTIONS } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | SHARE OF PERSONAL ACTIONS | SHARE OF TOTAL ACTIONS |  |
| 1. I decided not to buy that brand of the product | 37 | 40.7 | 34.0 | 37.8 |
| 2. I decided to quit using that kind of product | 28 | 30.8 | 25.7 | 28.6 |
| 3. I decided to stop shopping at the store where I bought the product | 3 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 3.1 |
| 4. I warned my family and friends about the brand, product or store | 19 | 20.9 | 17.4 | 19.4 |
| 5. Other personal action not listed above | 4 | 4.3 | 3.7 | 4.1 |
| A. TOTAL PERSONAL ACTION | 91 | 100\% | 83.5 \% | 92.9 |
| B. DIRECT ACTION | NO. OF MENTIONS | SHARE OF DIRECT ACTIONS | SHARE OF TOTAL ACTIONS |  |
| 1. I returned the product to the seller for a replacement or refund | 7 | 38.9 | 6.4 | 7.1 |
| 2. I contacted the store to complain | 4 | 22.2 | 3.7 | 4.1 |
| 3. I contacted the manufacturer to complain | 4 | 22.2 | 3.7 | 4.1 |
| 4. I contacted the manufacturers industry association to complain | _- | -- | -- | -- |
| 5. I contacted the Better Business Bureau to complain | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 6. I contacted a governmental agency or a public official to complain | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 7. I contacted a private consumer advocate or consumer organization to complain | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 8. I contacted a Tawyer, went to Small Claims Court, or otherwise took legal action | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 9. Other direct action not listed above | 3 | 16.7 | 2.7 | 3.1 |
| B. TOTAL DIRECT ACTION | 18 | 100\% | 16.5\% | 18.4 |
| A\&B TOTAL ACTION SUMMARY | 109 | -- | 100\% | -- |

actions. The largest share, $34.0 \%$, is expressed by the alternative "I decided not to buy that brand of the product again", while the second most preferred action "I decided to quit using that kind of product" has a $25.7 \%$ share of total mentions. In this section, consumers also tend to switch brands, product forms, and products. Again, the reasons behind such switching behaviour include brand and product proliferation, alternative forms of a product, or the ability to drop a product that may not be a necessity.

The share of actions directed toward retailers in this section is relatively small, accounting for $12.9 \%$ of total actions.

Public action involving a third party is virtually nonexistent among the set of actions reported by consumers of Personal and Health Care products.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Personal action is taken four times as often as direct action in cases involving Personal and Health Care products.
2. Brand and product switching/dropping accounts for over $60 \%$ of all actions in this section.
3. Public action is non-existent in this section.
6.1.5 A SUMMARY OF CONSUMER ACTIONS - CLOTHES, SHOES
\& ACCESSORIES

A summary of actions taken by dissatisfied consumers in the case of Clothes, Shoes and Accessories is presented in Table 14 (FIV). Actions in this section split more evenly between personal and direct, with $54.4 \%$ of all actions taken labeled as personal and $45.6 \%$ of responses in the direct action category.

The single most frequently mentioned response is a direct action, "I returned the product to the seller for a replacement or refund". This action was mentioned 67 times for a $22.6 \%$ share of the total and is one of three actions which are directed toward the retailer. The other two are "I decided to stop shopping at the store where I bought the product" and "I contacted the store to complain". Together, these three actions account for $50.6 \%$ of all actions mentioned in this section. It is important to note that this represents the strongest tendency across all sections to take action that is directed toward the place of purchase. This tendency is explained in part by the type of products included in the section. Since, consumers may not relate to clothes and shoes on a brand basis as much as they do

TABLE 14 (FIV) REGION: NATIONAL
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD AND CLOTHING CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR IN RESPONSE TO DISSATISFACTORY PURCHASE EXPERIENCE SECTION: CLOTHING, SHOES AND ACCESSORIES (CSA) IV

| RESPONSE/TYPE OF ACTION TAKEN | FREQUENCY OF SPECIFIC ACTION TAKEN |  |  | PERCENT OF DISSATISFIED CASES ${ }^{\star}$ TAKING SPECIFIC ACTIONS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. PERSONAL ACTION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO. OF } \\ & \text { MENTIONS } \end{aligned}$ | SHARE OF PERSONAL ACTIONS | SHARE OF TOTAL ACTIONS |  |
| 1. I decided not to buy that brand of the product again | 56 | 34.7 | 18.9 | 27.0 |
| 2. I decided to quit using that kind of product | 12 | 7.5 | 4.1 | 5.8 |
| 3. I decided to stop shopping at the store where I bought the product | 35 | 21.7 | 11.8 | 17.0 |
| 4. I warned my family and friends about the brand, product or store | 45 | 28.0 | 15.2 | 21.8 |
| 5. Other personal action not listed above | 13 | 8.1 | 4.4 | 6.3 |
| A. TOTAL PERSONAL ACTION | 161 | 100\% | 54.4. | 77.8 |
| B. DIRECT ACTION | No. OF MENTIONS | SHARE OF DIRECT ACTIONS | SHARE OF TOTAL ACTIONS |  |
| 1. I returned the product to the seller for a replacement or refund | 67 | 49.6 | 22.6 | 32.4 |
| 2. I contacted the store to complain | 48 | 35.5 | 16.2 | 23.2 |
| 3. I contacted the manufacturer to complain | 9 | 6.7 | 3.0 | 4.3 |
| 4. I contacted the manufacturers industry association to complain | 1 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| 5. I contacted the Better Business Bureau to complain | 2 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 1.0 |
| 6. I contacted a governmental agency or a public official to complain | 3 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 1.5 |
| 7. I contacted a private consumer advocate or consumer organization to complain | -- | -- | - | - |
| 8. I contacted a lawyer, went to Small Claims Court, or otherwise took legal action | 2 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 1.0 |
| 9. Other direct action not listed above | 3 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 1.5 |
| B. TOTAL DIRECT ACTION | 135 | 100\% | 45.6 \% | 65.2 |
| A\&B TOTAL ACTION SUMMARY | 296 | - | 100\% | - |

* $N$ dissatisfied $=207$
for other food and clothing items, brand-switching is a less commonly-used option. Also, clothing purchases typically represent a significant economic outlay. If the item leads to dissatisfaction, specific immediate action tends to be taken to correct the situation. Given the economic costs involved as well as the social performance dimensions associated with these products, the action taken is often public in nature. Since most stores, especially large chains, have some kind of refund or credit policy for apparel purchases, the retailer would be the most frequently contacted source for a resolution of the problem and the most often blamed if the solution is not satisfactory.

Public action involving a third party is not very significant in this section, accounting for only $2.5 \%$ of total actions taken. The results discussed above can be compared to those reported in the Best and Andreasen (1976) study mentioned earlier. In that study, $7.0 \%$ said that they changed shopping patterns, $26.0 \%$ replied that they voiced their problem to the seller and $1.0 \%$ reported that they voiced their problem elsewhere.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Personal and direct actions are fairly equal in this section.
2. Retailer-directed actions are the most prevalent in the clothing sector.
3. Almost 42 percent of consumers either contact the retail outlet to seek a replacement/refund or to complainror contact the manufacturer to complain.

### 6.2 THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF ACTIONS TAKEN

The average number of actions taken over the entire survey by dissatisfied consumers is 2.3 actions per subject. (Table 15). There is only small variation across the sections, ranging from a low of 2.14 actions for Personal and Health Care Products to a high average number of 2.47 for Clothes, Shoes and Accessories.

Respondents tend to take a slightly higher average number of personal actions than direct actions - even with a higher relative number of direct actions listed in the questionnaire (9 direct actions listed vs. 5 personal).

The average number of personal actions taken ranges from 1.73 to 1.98 and the average number of direct actions taken ranges from 1.20 to 1.46 .
6.3 PROFILE OF CONSUMERS WHO TAKE SOME FORM OF ACTION

Although there are numerous studies which describe the

## TABLE 15

CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY
average number of actions taken subsequent to CONSUMER DISSATISFACTION

| SECTION |  | PERSONAL ACTION |  |  | DIRECT ACTION |  |  | TOTAL ACTION |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ACTION MENTIONS | ACTION <br> TAKERS | AVG. NO. OF ACTIONS | ACTION MENTIONS | ACTION <br> TAKERS | AVG. NO. OF ACTIONS | ACTION MENTIONS | ACTION <br> TAKERS | AVG. <br> NO.OF <br> ACTIONS |
| 1. | FOOD PRODUCTS | 307 | 165 | 1.86 | 198 | 146 | 1.36 | 505 | 218 | 2.32 |
| II. | HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES | 104 | 60 | 1.73 | 41 | 28 | 1.46 | 145 | 66 | 2.20 |
| III. | PERSONAL AND health care PRODUCTS | 91 | 46 | 1.98 | 18 | 15 | 1.20 | 109 | 51 | 2.14 |
| IV. | CLOTHES, SHOES AND ACCESSORIES | 161 | 88 | 1.83 | 135 | 96 | 1.41 | 296 | 120 | 2.47 |

consumer who takes direct, public action, ${ }^{7}$ there is no clear picture of the consumer who simply 'takes action', including personal and/or direct responses. It is widely recognized that personal actions may have very serious implications for the manufacturer and retailer in terms of sales. For example, brandswitching behaviour can directly impact on market share and could alert the manufacturer to problems. Efforts to profile the action-taker can provide valuable information to manufacturers, retailers and policy makers.

Table 16 profiles the consumer who takes action vs. the consumer who takes no action. In order to qualify, a respondent had to indicate that he took some action in response to dissatisfaction at least once during the recall period.

Demographic variables that appear to be significantly related at the . 05 confidence level to action-taking behaviour are: marital status, age, income, education, employment, and whether the respondent is the main wage earner in the household. The action-taking consumer seems to be more likely to be married, 24-44 years of age, in the upper income bracket

[^6]TABLE 16

## CONSURER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY

demographic profile of consuners taking action FOLLOWING A DISSATISFACTORY PURCHASE EXPERIENCE

SECTION:

| DEHOGRAPHICS | ACTION-TAKING BEHAVIOUR |  |  |  |  |  | SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ACTION |  | NO ACTION |  | TOTAL |  |  |  |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | $\%$ |  |  |  |
| SEX: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MALE | 42 | 13.9 | 126 | 17.1 | 168 | 16.1 | CHISQ | $=1.41$ |  |
| Female | 261 | 86.1 | 612 | 82.9 | 873 | 83.9 | $\mathrm{df}=1$ | SIG $=$ | =0.2353 |
|  | 303 |  | 738 |  | 1041 | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| MARITAL STATUS: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SINGLE | 20 | 6.6 | 59 | 8.0 | 79 | 7.6 | CHISQ | $=15.0$ |  |
| Married | 263 | 86.8 | 568 | 77.1 | 831 | 79.9 | $\mathrm{df}=2$ | SIG $=$ | 0.0006 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DIVORCED, WIDOVED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20 | 6.6 | 110 | 14.9 | 130 | 12.5 |  |  |  |
|  | 303 |  | 737 |  | 1040 | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| AGE: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNDER 25 | 33 | 10.9 | 73 | 9.9 | 106 | 10.2 | CHISQ | $=29.26$ |  |
| 25-44 | 157 | 52.0 | 298 | 40.5 | 455 | 43.8 | $d f=3$ | SIG $=$ | 0.000 |
| 45-64 | 97 | 32.1 | 241 | 32.7 | 338 | 32.6 |  |  |  |
| OVER 65 | 15 | 5.0 | 124 | -16.8 | 139 | 13.4 |  |  |  |
|  | 302 |  | 736 |  | 1038 | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| NO. OF RESIDENTS: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ONE-TWO | 89 | 29.6 | 260 | 35.4 | 349 | 33.7 | CHISQ | $=3.86$ |  |
| THREE-FOUR | 144 | 47.8 | 308 | 41.9 | 452 | 43.6 | $d f=2$ | SIG $=$ | 0.1449 |
| FIVE OR MORE | 68 | 22.6 | 167 | 22.7 | 235 | 22.7 |  |  |  |
|  | 301 |  | 735 |  | 1036 | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| OWN/RENT HOME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OWN | 215 | 71.0 | 540 | 73.5 | 755 | 72.8 | CHISQ | $=0.562$ | 205 |
| RENT | 88 | 29.0 | $\underline{195}$ | 26.5 | 283 | 27.2 | df E -1 | SIG $=-0$ | 0.1449 |
| INCOME:---103 - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNDER $\$ 10,000$ | 46 | 17.3 | 183 | 29.1 | 229 | 25.6 |  |  |  |
| \$10,000-\$24,999 | 131 | 49.2 | 305 | 48.5 | 436 | 48.7 | $\mathrm{df}=3$ | SIG $=$ | 0.0001 |
| OVER \$25,000 | 89 | 33.5 | 141. | 22.4 | 230 | 25.7 |  |  |  |
|  | 266 |  | 629 |  | 895 | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| EDUCATION(SELF): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GRADESSCHOOL OR LESS | 22 | 7.4 | 165 | 22.6 | 187 | 18.3 | $d f=2$ | $\text { SIG }=$ | 0.0000 |
| HIGH SCHOOL | 148 | 49.4 | 367 | 50.3 | 515 | 50.0 |  |  |  |
| SOME COLLEGE OR MORE | 129 | 43.1 | 197 | 27.0 | 326 | 31.7 |  |  |  |
|  | 299 |  | 729 |  | 1022 | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| EHPLOYMENT: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FULL TIME | 85 | 28.4 | 164 | 22.3 | 249 | 24.1 | CHISQ $=$ | $=5.91$ |  |
| PAR'T TIME NOT EMPLOYED | 38 | 12.7 | 81 | 11.0 | 119 | 11.5 | $\mathrm{df}=2$ | SIG $=$ | 0.052 |
| NOT EMPLOYED | 176 | 58.9 | 491 | 66.7 | 667 | 64.4 |  |  |  |
| MAIN WAGE EAMNER: - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SELP | 81 | 27.6 | 229 | 32.6 | 310 | 31.1 | CHISQ $=$ | $=10.280$ |  |
| SPOUSE | 202 | 69.0 | 420 | 59.7 | 622 | 62.5 | $d f=2$ | SIG $=$ | 0.0059 |
| O'TIIER | 10 | 3.4 | 54 | 7.7 | 64 | 6.4 |  |  |  |

[^7]of over $\$ 25,000$, has a higher education including some college or more, is more likely to be employed full-time or part-time, and reports the spouse ${ }^{8}$ as the main wage earner.

This profile does correspond rather closely to the one associated with the complainer described in earlier studies. This suggests that those who complain publicly are the same types of people as those who take any available form of action, either personal or direct action. In other words, regardless of the form of action taken, an 'action-taker' may be identified on the basis of a distinct set of demographic characteristics.

It is interesting to note that the 'no action takers' appear to be single or separated/divorced/widowed, over 65 or under 25, with lower incomes and education, and perhaps unemployed. It is obvious that the silent majority includes some consumers who are dissatisfied but not acting to resolve their problems. Failure to take action when dissatisfied may be attributable to a lack of knowledge about ways to obtain redress. These types of problems are especially prevalent among special populations

[^8]such as the elderly or the economically disadvantaged and are of immediate concern to policy makers and consumer advocates.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. 'Action takers' profiled in this study have similar demographic characteristics to those described in earlier studies on complaining behaviour. These types of consumers tend to be more efficient in achieving resolution of their purchase problems.
2. The 'action taker' tends to be married, 25-44 years old, upper income and education, is likely employed but still reports the spouse as main wage earner.
3. The 'no action' consumer tends to be single, at either extreme of the age scale, and has lower income and education.
6.4 PROFILE OF CONSUMERS WHO TAKE DIRECT ACTION

Table 17 profiles the consumer who takes some form of direct action vs. the consumer who does not take any direct action. In order to qualify for direct action, a respondent had to indicate that direct action was taken at least once during the past year following an unsatisfactory food and/or clothing purchase. The direct action taker is the typical 'complainer' and the profile can be compared to the characteristics identified

## TABLE 17

## CONSURER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY

demographic profile of consurers taking sone form of direct action following a dissatisfactory purchase experience

SECTION:


[^9]in previous studies on the topic.

It is apparent that the profile of the direct actiontaker is very similar to the action-taker described in Table 16. The significant variables are: marital status, age, income, education, employment status, and main wage earner. The relationships are also the same in that the direct action taker appears to be married, over twenty-five years of age, upper income and education, employed full-time or part-time and typically reports that the spouse is the main wage earner.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Consumers who tend to take direct action are the same as consumers identified as taking personal and/or direct action.
2. Characteristics of the direct action-taker correspond closely to those identified in previous research.
6.5.1 THE 'NO-ACTION' RESPONSE

Table 18A and $18 B$ show the general incidence of 'no action' across all four sections of the Food and Clothing survey. The percent of dissatisfied respondents who did not take any action, personal or direct, following an unsatisfactory purchase experience is reported in Table 18A. Table l8B reveals the

TABLE 18 (F)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD AND CLOTHING
ANALYSIS OF CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR: ANALYSIS OF 'NO ACTION'

| SECTION | INCIDENCE OF DISSATISFACTION |  | INCIDENCE OF 'NO ACTION' |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% OF RESPONDENTS | N | \% OF DISSATISFIED RESPONDENIS |
| I FOOD PROUUCTS | 370 | 35.5 | 151 | 40.8 |
| II HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES | 167 | 16.0 | 101 | 60.4 |
| III PERSOLAAL \& HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS | 98 | 9.4 | 47 | 48.0 |
| IV CLOTHES, SHOES ACCESSORIES | 207 | 19.9 | 86 | 41.5 |
| TOTAL | 842 | -- | 385 | 45.7 |

18B

| REASONS |  | SECTION |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| THE ONE SINGLE REASON WHICH BEST EXPLAINS WHY YOU DID NOT DO ANYTHING | I. FOOD PRODUCTS | II. HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES | III. PERSONAL \& HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS | IV. CLOTHES,SHOES \& ACCESSORIES |  | TOTAL |
| 1. I DIDN'T THINK IT WAS WORTH THE TIME AND EFFORT | 68 (44.4\%) | 44 (43.6\%) | 16 (34.0\%) | 31 (35.6\%) | 159 | (41.0\%) |
| 2. I WANTED TO DO SOMETHING, BUT NEVER GOT AROUND TO IT | 16 (10.5\%) | 16 (15.8\%) | 6 (12.8\%) | 14 (16.1\%) | 52 | (13.4\%) |
| 3. IVIDR' T THINK ANYTHING I COULD DO WOULD MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE | 58 (37.9\%) | 37 (36.6\%) | 22 (46.8\%) | 38 (43.7\%) | 155 | (39.9\%) |
| 4. I DIDFT T KMOW WHAT TO DO OR WHERE | 11 ( 7.2\%) | 4 ( 4.0\%) | 3 ( 6.4\%) | 4 ( 4.6\%) | 22 | ( $5.7 \%$ ) |
| TOTAL | 153 (100.0\%) | 101 (100.0\%) | 47 (100.0\%) | 87 (100.0\%) | 388 | (100.0\%) |

distribution of responses across four reasons cited for taking no action.

Across the entire Food and Clothing survey, $45.7 \%$ of the dissatisfied respondents did not take any action. This percentage ranges from a low of $40.8 \%$ of dissatisfied respondents taking no action in the Food Products section to a high of $60.4 \%$ subjects taking no action when dissatisfied with Household and Family Supplies. In the section covering Personal and Health Care products, $48.0 \%$ of dissatisfied respondents took no action, whereas 4.15\% of those dissatisfied with Clothes, Shoes and Accessories reported taking no action. In the Best and Andreasen (1976) study ${ }^{9}$ cited earlier, the corresponding rate for "no action" was 65.8\%

### 6.5.2 REASONS FOR TAKING NO ACTION WHEN DISSATISFIED

The reason given most frequently for taking no action was that "I didn't think it was worth the time and effort". This reason was cited most often in both the Food Products section (44.4\% of all respondents taking no action), and the Household and Family Supplies section (43.6\% of respondents taking no action). This reason probably reflects the relatively low per unit cost of most of these purchases, and suggests that consumers

[^10]are pragmatic to the extent that they compare relative costs and benefits when determining how much time and effort to expend resolving a purchase problem. In other words, the problem may not be judged important enough to warrant the effort.

The second most frequently mentioned reason for taking no action also reflects the relatively low level of importance many consumers seem to attach to most non-durable items. This reason was "I didn't think anything I could do would make any difference." It was cited by $39.9 \%$ of those taking no action. In the case of a defective food product, this reaction probably relates not so much to a belief that manufacturers and retailers are unresponsive, but rather to the impossibility of correcting the quality of the dissatisfactory item. However, there is some indication of a general level of pessimism about the complaint process, especially in the areas of Personal and Health Care Products and Clothes, Shoes and Accessories where this reason was mentioned by the largest percentage of respondents.

The third most frequently cited reason was that "I wanted to do something but never got around to it" (13.4\% of total taking no action).

Finally, the fourth reason, mentioned by a small proportion of those taking no action was "I didn't know what to do or where
to get help" (5.7\% of total taking no action).

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Almost half of all consumers dissatisfied with products in the non-durables sector do not take any action to resolve their problems.
2. The notions that action-taking would not be worth the time and effort or that it would not make any difference were the main reasons for non-action. These reasons reflect, both a general pessimism about the system and an unwillingness to expend effort based on the relatively low degree of importance attached to the purchase of a single nondurable item.
7.1 CONSUMER SATISFACTION WITH THE COMPLAINT PROCESS

Consumers who indicated that they took at least one form of direct action in a section were then asked to report how satisfied they were with the way their complaint was handled. Respondents checked a point on a four-point scale which ranged from 'Very Satisfied' to 'Very Dissatisfied'. Direct action included such items as complaining to the seller or manufacturer, seeking a refund or replacement, or contacting a third party to intervene.

An average score was then calculated for each individual, based on responses to the four-point scale for each of the four sections of the questionnaire. This score was calculated in the same manner as the mean satisfaction score (see section 2.2.1) and is labeled the "final satisfaction score" or FSS. This average score measures, for the individual, the average level of satisfaction with the complaint-handling system for all non-durables. Individuals were then classified into two intervals - generally satisfied and generally not satisfied with the way their complaints were handled. The groups were then profiled demographically to see if there were any characteristics associated with the satisfied/dissatisfied on the basis of complaint handling.
7.1.1 SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION WITH COMPLAINT-HANDLING

Table 19 summarizes the satisfaction/dissatisfaction scores given by respondents who took direct action. They are an assessment of how satisfied these subjects were with the way their complaint was handled.

Overall, the largest group, 37.8\%, were 'very satisfied' with the way their complaint(s) was handled. At the same time, a significant l8.1\% of direct action-takers were left feeling 'very dissatisfied' after taking some form of publị or direct

TABLE 19 ( F )
CONSUMER SATISFACTION DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD AND CLOTHING
MEASURE OF FINAL SATISFACTION AMONG DISSATISFIED CONSUMERS WHO TOOK DIRECT ACTION

| SECTION | MEASURE OF FINAL SATISFACTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | VERY SATISFIED |  | SOMEWHAT SATISFIED |  | SOMEWHAT OISSATISFIED |  | VERY OISSATISFIED |  | TOTAL |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| I FOOD PRODUCTS | 61 | 41.2 | 45 | 30.4 | 22 | 14.9 | 20 | 13.5 | 148 | 100.0 |
| II HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES | 6 | 21.4 | 6 | 21.4 | 10 | 35.7 | 6 | 21.4 | 28 | 100.0 |
| III PERSONAL \& HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS | 6 | 37.5 | 4 | 25.0 | 2 | 12.5 | 4 | 25.0 | 16 | 100.0 |
| IV CLOTHES, SHOES AND ACCESSORIES | 36 | 37.5 | 22 | 22.9 | 16 | 16.7 | 22 | 22.9 | 96 | 100.0 |
| total | 109 | 37.8 | 77 | 26.7 | 50 | 17.4 | 52 | 18.1 | 288 | 100.0 |

action.

The most effective complaint-handling system appears to be with Food Products. The total satisfied was $71.6 \%$ of all subjects taking direct action, and only $13.5 \%$ of these consumers reported that they were 'very dissatisfied' with the way their complaint was handled. In the case of Food Products, the cost to the retailer and manufacturer of providing a refund or replacement to a dissatisfied consumer is negligible in the context of the total number of unit sales of the product or in the context of the value of future sales to a consumer whose brand loyalty or store loyalty can be sustained. For this reason, supermarkets typically offer "satisfaction guaranteed" with a fair refund and replacement policy. Also, the importance in both financial and psychic terms of a food product purchase to a consumer is rather low, relative to that of an automobile, which suggests that a dissatisfied consumer is likely to be more readily satisfied with the resolution of a complaint.

The percentage of respondents in the Household and Family Supplies section who were, on the whole, dissatisfied with the way their complaints were handled was $57.1 \%$. This is the largest dissatisfied group of all four sections of the Food and Clothing survey. This section has the highest share of its direct action
takers contacting the manufacturer to complain (22.2\% of all direct actions). The results suggest that this may be a less effective method of resolving consumer dissatisfaction.

The Personal and Health Care products section has the highest relative share of 'very dissatisfied' cases, with $25.0 \%$ of respondents indicating strong dissatisfaction with the com-plaint-handling system in this sector.

Satisfaction with the complaint handling process in the Clothes, Shoes and Accessories section tends to be, on average, moderate, with $60.4 \%$ of direct action takers feeling generally satisfied.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Consumers are generally satisfied with the complaint handling process with Food and Clothing products.
2. It appears that consumers are most satisfied with complaint handling in the Food Products sector, and least satisfied in the Household and Family Supplies section.
3. The most extreme level of dissatisfaction with complaint handling appears to be in the Personal and Health Care products section.

### 7.2 PROFILE OF CONSUMERS ON SATISFACTION WITH COMPLAINT HANDIING

The total score for each individual on the level of satisfaction with complaint-handling was tested against the demographic variables to determine if there were any systematic differences between the generally satisfied and dissatisfied.

There are no significant relationships between demographic variables and the final satisfaction score.

This is an interesting finding. It indicates that the 'system' for complaints about non-durables treats all those who use it equally. Once someone decides to take direct action, the probability of satisfaction with the process is not determined by any particular demographic characteristics.

## CONCLUSION

1. There are no significant relationships between demographic variables and satisfaction with complaint handling.

TABLE 20
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY
FINAL SATISFACTION SCORE BY DEMOGRAPHICS
SECTION:

| DEMOGRAPHICS | FINAL SATISFACTION SCORE |  |  |  |  |  | SIGNIFICANCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SATISFACTION |  | DISSATISFACTION |  |  | TOTAL |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |  |
| SEX: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HALE | 18 | 12.8 | 10 | 12.3 | 28 | 12.5 | CHISQ $=0.014$ |
| FEMALE | 123 | 87.2 | 71 | 87.7 | 194 | 87.4 | $\mathrm{d}=1 \quad \mathrm{SIG}=0.90$ |
|  | 141 |  | 81 |  | 222 | 100.0 |  |
| MRITAL STATUS: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SINGLE | 4 | 2.8 | 6 | 7.4 | 10 | 4.5 | CHISQ $=7.65$ |
| MARRIED | 124 | 87.9 | 74 | 91.4 | 198 | 89.2 | $\mathrm{df}=2 \mathrm{SIG}=0.022$ |
| SEPARATED, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DIVORCED, <br> HIDONED | 13 | 9.2 | 1 | 1.2 | 14 | 6.3 |  |
|  | 141 |  | 81 |  | 222 | 100.0 |  |
| ĂGE: --- - - - - - - - - - - - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNDER 25 | 12 | 8.6 | 8 | 9.9. | 20 | 9.0 | CHISQ $=0.47$ |
| 25-44 | 67 | 47.9 | 41 | 50.6 | 108 | 48.9 | $\mathrm{df}=3 \quad$ SIG $=0.925$ |
| 45-64 | 54 | 38.6 | 29 | 35.8 | 83 | 37.6 |  |
| OVER 65 | 7 | 5.0 | 3 | 3.7 | 10 | 4.5 |  |
|  | 140 |  | 81 |  | 221 | 100. 0 |  |
| NO. OF RESIDENTS: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ONE-TVO | 37 | 26.4 | 27 | 33.8 | 64 | 29.1 | CHISQ $=1.97$ |
| THREEE-FOUR | 69 | 49.3 | 32 | 40.0 | 101 | 45.9 | $\mathrm{df}=2 \quad$ SIG $=0.37$ |
| FIVE OR HORE | 34 | 24.3 | 21 | 26.3 | 55 | 25.0 |  |
|  | 140 |  | 80 |  | 220 | 100.0 |  |
| OWN/RENT HONE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UbiN | 106 | 75.2 | 60 | 74.1 | 166 | $74: 8$ | CHISQ $=0.0005$ |
| RENT | 35 | 24.8 | 21 | 25.9 | 56 | 25.2 | df $=1 \quad$ SIG. $=0.98$ |
|  | 141 |  | 81 |  | 222 | 100.0 |  |
| INCOME: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WADER \$10,000 | 21 | 17.4 | 11 | 15.1 | 32 | 16.5 | CHISQ $=0.345$ |
| \$10,000- \$24,999 | 58 | 47.9 | 38. | 52.1 | 96 | 49.5 | $\mathrm{df}=2 \quad$ SIG $=0.84$ |
| OVER $\$ 25,000$ | 42 | . 34.7 | 24. | 32.9 | 66 | 34.0 |  |
|  | 121 |  | 73 |  | 194 | 100 - |  |
| EDUCATION(STIT): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GRADESCHOOI. OR LESS | 11 | $7: 9$ | 4 | 5.0 | 15 | 6.8 | CHISQ $=4.38$ |
| HIGH SCHOOL | 75 | 54.0 | 34 | 42.5 | 109 | 49.8 | $\mathrm{df}=2 \quad \mathrm{SIG}=0.1116$ |
| SOME COLLEGE OR MORE | 53 | 38.1 | 42 | 52.5 | 95 | 43.4 |  |
|  | 139 |  | 80 |  | 219 | 100.0 |  |
| EMPLOYMENT: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FULL TIME | 46 | 33.1 | 17 | 21.3 | 63 | 28.8 | CHISQ $=5.53$ |
| PART TIME | 20 | 14.4 | 8 | 10.0 | 28 | 12.8 | $\mathrm{df}=2 \quad \mathrm{SIG}=0.063$ |
| NU'T EMPLOYED | 73 | 52.5 | 55 | 68.8 | 128 | 58.4 |  |
|  | 139 |  | 80 |  | 219 | 100.0 |  |
| MAIN WAGE EARNER: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SELF | 43 | 31.4 | 15 | 19.0 | 58 | 26.8 | $\text { CHISQ }=5.822$ |
| syouse | 89 | 65.0 | 63 | 79.7 | 152 | 70.4 | $d f=2 \quad \text { SIG }=0.0544$ |
| OTHER | 5 | 3.6 | 1 | 1.3 |  | 2.8 |  |
| 137 |  |  | 79 |  | 216 | 100.0 |  |

### 8.1 CONCLUSION

The results of this study revealed widely varying relationships between the percentage of respondents reporting purchase of a product and the percentage of users experiencing dissatisfaction with the item. On the basis of average satisfaction scores, Clothes, Shoes and Accessories ranked highest according to ratings of dissatisfaction whereas Household and Family Supplies ranked lowest. Mean satisfaction scores computed for all subjects in each of the four sections showed that the percent of respondents who fell into the dissatisfaction range in each section were: Food Products (1.2\%); Household and Family Supplies (1.1\%); Personal and Health Care Products (1.3\%); and Clothes, Shoes and Accessories (5.0\%). Consumer characteristics which seemed to be important in explaining satisfaction and dissatisfaction varied depending upon whether the profile reflected consumers whose average satisfaction scores placed them in the "dissatisfied range" or was based on those consumers who reported being' highly dissatisfied with one or more of the categories.

When consumers were asked whether or not they had been highly dissatisfied with one or more categories during the recall period, several items emerged as significant problems to purchasers. In the Food Products section, the categories cited
frequently were: restaurant and take-out meals, fresh/frozen meats, and fresh fruits and vegetables. In the case of Household and Family Supplies, the items named often were: home electrical supplies, laundry/dish detergents, and floor care products. In the Personal and Health Care section , the categories mentioned frequently included: prescription drugs and medical supplies, deodorants and anti-perspirants, hair colouring products, and babycare products. Finally, in the case of Clothing; Shoes and Accessories, the categories cited frequently were: womens' clothes and childrens' clothes.

Personal and Health Care Products tend to have the highest share of dissatisfied consumers reporting financial loss as a consequence of their purchase (27.6\%). Most losses, however, were reported to be less than $\$ 25$. per experience. The financial loss associated with Clothes, Shoes and Accessories was relatively high, with about $44 \%$ of losses over $\$ 25$. and approximately $7 \%$ over $\$ 100$. Three categories which appeared to be responsible for frequent instances of financial loss were fresh/frozen meats, clothing items including womens' footwear and prescription drugs and medical supplies.

In a small handful of cases, physical injury was reported in conjunction with dissatisfactory consumption experiences.

Personal and Health Care products tended to have the highest share of dissatisfied cases indicating the occurrence of physical injury. Over the entire Food and Clothing survey, the categories cited in connection with physical injury included fresh/frozen meats, bleaches, bluing and pre-soaks, prescription drugs and medical supplies, and womens' footwear.

Reasons for consumer dissatisfaction appeared to center around product quality issues rather than marketing practices al.though the patterns varied substantially across the four sections. The single reason which was cited most frequently as the cause of dissatisfaction was related to the quality of the item being poorer than was expected. The results indicated that some reasons for dissatisfaction may be fairly unique to specific types of products.

In about 54.3\% of all reported instances of dissatisfaction across the entire Food and Clothing survey, some form of private and/or direct action was taken. Overall, almost two-thirds (62.8\%) of the actions taken were private in nature such as decisions to switch brands or warning others about the unsatisfactory experience. The balance (37.2\%) were direct or public actions aimed primarily toward the seller including requests for replacement or refund. Demographic characteristics which
were found to be related to consumers' "propensity to complain" included: marital status, age, income education and employment status. The "action taker" tended to be married, 25 to 44 years old, upper income and education and is likely employed, but still reports the spouse as the main wage earner in the household. In the Food and Clothing Survey, the majority of the respondents were female (83.9\%). The demographics of the sample which completed the Food \& Clothing questionnaire are shown in Appendix A.

This study found that consumers were generally satisfied with the complaint handling process in regard to Food and Clothing products. Highest overall levels of "final satisfaction" were recorded in the Food Products sector. The most extreme dissatisfaction in relation to complaint handling appears to be in the Personal and Health Care products section.

This portion of the report has focused on analysis of consumer satisfaction, dissatisfaction and complaining behaviour at the national level. The balance of this volume briefly examines levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction at the regional level.

### 1.1 INTRODUCTION

So far, this volume has dealt with consumer satisfaction, dissatisfaction and complaining behaviour from an aggregate perspective, that is, all analyses have been conducted at the national level. The problem with restricting one's appraisal to the national results is that idiosyncratic differences which may exist at the regional level are not detected. Measuring consumer satisfaction and dissatisfaction on a regional basis permits the researcher to compare the results reported in one region with those obtained in another. In addition, it allows the analyst to compare regional findings with those reported at the national level. To the extent that significant differences or patterns in consumer dissatisfaction are identified in particular regions, policy makers are able to sharpen their allocation of limited manpower and financial resources to increase the overall effectiveness of consumer protection programming.

In this section of the report, an effort is made to compare levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction across several regions of Canada. Also, a comparison of the degree to which consumers in various parts of the country are satisfied with the complaint handling process will be reported. Although it would be interesting to compare recurring reasons for dissatisfaction
and alternative actions taken by dissatisfied consumers across regions, such results are not currently available. It is expected that these findings will be reported in the near future.

### 2.1 HIGHLIGHTS OF REGIONAL CS/D SCORES

The purpose of this section is to present, by region, results on purchase incidence; relative purchase frequency; and levels of satisfaction/dissatisfaction for all product categories within each of the four sections of the Food and Clothing survey. Table 1 (FI) to (FIV) is replicated for each of the nine regional subsamples, according to the data obtained from respondents in each subsample.

Highlights of regional satisfaction/dissatisfaction scores, and the relationship between regional scores and national scores will be presented and briefly discussed. The figures on purchase incidence and frequency are also included in the tables, but will not be addressed in the text.

The discussion on CS/D scores is based on the regional versions of Table 1 (FI to FIV), and on the summary of the relationship of such scores to the national results in Table 2 ( $F$ to FIV). For an explanation on the format of Table 1 , please refer to Part 1, Section 2.1.1 of this report.

### 2.2 REGIONAL CS/D SCORES VS. NATIONAL CS/D SCORES

Table 1 presents all the regional results on purchase incidence and frequency, and the distribution of respondents' satisfaction scores on the four-point CS/D scale, for all four sections of the Food and Clothing survey. This discussion focuses on columns 7 and 9 , namely the total percent of purchasers satisfied and total percent dissatisfied. The relationship between regional $C S / D$ and national $C S / D$ is expressed in terms of the product category scores that vary by more than one percentage point from the corresponding national scores. A region is assessed by the number of categories that have a higher than national percentage of respondents in the satisfied range, the number of categories that have a lower percentage of satisfied respondents, and the number of categories that have, within one percentage point, the same proportion of satisfied purchasers as the national base.

Table 2 (F) summarizes, for all 77 categories of food and clothing products, the regional CS/D scores in relation to the national CS/D scores. In general, it appears that Alberta and Quebec (excluding Montreal) produced more respondents in the satisfied range than the national average. In contrast, the percent of respondents in the satisfied range is lower than
national for a majority of categories in the Vancouver and Ontario (excluding Toronto) subsamples. Toronto and the Atlantic subgroups report results that are most consistent with the national picture.

It is interesting to note that this pattern of relationships tends to remain more or less stable across all four subsections of the Food and Clothing survey. This suggests that the reasons for the differences may relate as much to regional attitudes as to actual differences in product performance and selling practices across regions. For example, some marketers believe that consumers in Atlantic Canada are somewhat more homogeneous in terms of their attitudes and perceptions than is the case for consumers residing in other regions of the country.

```
2.2.1 FOOD PRODUCTS - Table 1,2 (FI)
```

The two regions which report a substantial number of food product categories with lower rates of satisfaction than national are Vancouver and Ontario (excluding Toronto). Both areas report 16 out of 26 categories with lower levels of satisfaction than the national. In Vancouver, these categories include both food-away-from-home items; baby foods; pet foods; processed meat/ prepared dinners; and fresh/frozen meat. In Ontario, the categories
are centered around relatively unprocessed items, including fresh/frozen meat, poultry, fish and dairy products; and fresh bread and baked goods.

The Atlantic provinces' scores tend to correspond rather closely to national scores, except where fresh fruit and vegetables are concerned. In this category, respondents from the Atlantic region are much less satisfied than the national sample.

The Toronto sample also reports similar scores to the national, except in the two categories related to food away from home. Torontonians in the sample appear to be less satisfied with restaurants and take-out foods.

Alberta and Quebec (excluding Montreal) seem to be generally more satisfied with food products than the national sample. The type of data collected in this study does not permit the researcher to determine whether such variations could be attributed to underlying cultural differences or to measurable differences in system performance from region to region.

### 2.2.2 HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES - Table 2 (FII)

Vancouver and Ontario (excluding Toronto) register more dissatisfaction in 13 and 12 categories respectively out of 17


#### Abstract

categories of Household and Family Supplies. It seems that magazines and newspapers are particularly unsatisfactory in Vancouver, and in fact, in the rest of $B C$ as well.


Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta report no categories that have a higher than national proportion of dissatisfied cases, while the atlantic region and Toronto have only one and two such categories respectively.
2.2.3 PERSONAL \& HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS - Table 2 (FIII)

Vancouver and Ontario (excluding Toronto) continue to report substantially more categories with higher dissatisfaction than the national. Out of 20 Personal and Health Care product categories, the Vancouver sample reports 14 categories with a higher than national proportion of dissatisfied cases. The Ontario sample reports 16 such categories.

Alberta, Atlantic, Toronto and Quebec (excluding Montreal) regions all have three or less product categories with higher than national rates of dissatisfaction.
2.2.4 CLOTHES, SHOES \& ACCESSORIES - Table 2 (FIV)

Two regions, Vancouver and Ontario (Excluding Toronto), have a higher than national proportion of the sample dissatisfied with almost every category of Clothes, Shoes and Accessories. Vancouver reports 11 out of 14 categories, and Ontario reports 12 out of 14 categories, where more respondents tend to register dissatisfaction. Clothing items in particular tend to elicit a dissatisfaction response from a higher proportion of respondents in each of these two regions.

All other regions, with the exception of British Columbia and Manitoba/Saskatchewan, report only 2 categories that are more dissatisfactory than national. Alberta and Quebec are more satisfied in 12 and 17 categories respectively.

### 3.1 HIGHLIGHTS OF REGIONAL MSS SCORES

The mean satisfaction score is calculated within regional subsamples using the method described in Part 1 , Section 2.2.1. The distribution of mean satisfaction scores by region is shown as a total summary in Table 3 , or by region for each of the four sections in Table 3 (FMSSI to FMSS4).

The summary of regional MSS scores extends from $97.2 \%$ of respondents in the satisfaction range to $100 \%$ in the satisfaction range on a section by section basis. The national score is $99.2 \%$ satisfied. These figures indicate the proportion of respondents whose mean satisfaction scores determined over all of the categories in any section placed them in the satisfaction range of the CS/D scale.

### 3.1.1 FOOD PRODUCTS - Table 3 (FI)

MSS scores on Food Products range from 97.2\% satisfied in Ontario to $100.0 \%$ satisfied in Manitoba/Saskatchewan and British Columbia (excluding Vancouver). The aggregate national score is 98.8\% in the satisfied range.

It should be noted that the Vancouver results of $99.2 \%$ satisfied exceeds the national proportion of satisfied cases. Yet, the Vancouver sample fell far more frequently into the dissatisfied range on the four-point CS/D scale. (See Table 2 (FI).) The distribution of MSS scores in the satisfied range indicates that, by and large, very few people are consistertly dissatisfied. Therefore, the instances of dissatisfaction must be well distributed across all members of the Vancouver sample.
3.1.2 HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES - Table 3 (FII)

On a national basis, the MSS score on Household and Family Supplies is the highest of all the Food \& Clothing survey sections, with 98.9\% of respondents in the satisfied range.

On a regional basis, the percentage of respondents in the satisfied interval ranges from a low in Ontario (excluding Toronto) of $95.4 \%$ to a high of $100.0 \%$ in the Atlantic, Alberta and British Columbia (excluding Vancouver). Toronto has 98.l\% of its sample in the satisfied range, and all other regions report over $99.0 \%$ of their samples in the satisfied range.
3.1.3 PERSONAL \& HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS - Table 3 (FIII)

The distribution of the national sample's MSS scores places 98.7\% of the sample in the satisfied interval for Personal and Health Care products.

The regional distributions of cases in the satisfied group range from $95.3 \%$ in Montreal to $100.0 \%$ in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia (excluding Vancouver).

```
3.1.4 CLOTHES, SHOES & ACCESSORIES - Table 3 (FIV)
```

The lowest national MSS scores appeared in the section of Clothes, Shoes \& Accessories. Five percent of respondents had average satisfaction scores in the dissatisfied interval, leaving 95\% who appear, on average, to be satisfied.

There is a substantial range of MSS scores in the regions. Ontario (excluding Toronto) registers only 89.8\% satisfied, the Atlantic region and Manitoba/Saskatchewan have less than $95 \%$ and 95.5\% of respondents satisfied. While these numbers appear to be high, they are much lower relative to other product sections of the Food and Clothing survey.

### 4.1 HIGHLIGHTS OF REGIONAL FSS SCORES

In Part l, Section 7.1.1, consumer satisfaction with the complaint handling process was reported on a national level. The measure "final satisfaction score" (FSS) was generated by a method similar to the one used in developing the "mean satisfaction score" (MSS). Respondents were classified as they fell into either the 'satisfied' or 'dissatisfied' range on the basis of this FSS score. Consumers who had taken direct action and who were, on average, satisfied with the way their complaint had been
handled, would fall into the satisfied group. Those who report that they were somewhat or very dissatisfied with the complainthandling process would be classified in the dissatisfaction range.

Table 3 is a profile of respondents by FSS score and by region. The FSS score has been reduced to two dimensions, satisfied and dissatisfied.

Based on their overall satisfaction with the complainthandling process, the regional groups that appear to be more satisfied are the Atlantic, Quebec (excluding Montreal), Toronto and British Columbia (excluding Vancouver). The regions that tend to be generally less satisfied with the way their complaints were handled are Montreal, Ontario (excluding Toronto), Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Vancouver.

### 5.1 CONCLUSIONS

The preceding analysis of consumer satisfaction and dissatisfaction at the regional level was extremely brief. The results are meant to suggest only that there appears to be widespread variation in levels of satisfaction with food and clothing products across the regions of the country. Some regions such as Vancouver and Ontario (excluding Toronto) seem to be experiencing comparatively higher rates of consumer dissatisfaction than those reported at the national level. Also, there appear to be wide differences in regional rates of satisfaction and dissatisfaction across each of the four sections of the Food and Clothing survey. There seems to be considerable variation, as well, in the level of consumer satisfaction with the complaint-handling process across each of the regions covered by the survey. Again, it is not clear whether these variations may be ascribed to cultural differences, to direct differences in system performance or to some other set of factors.

To some extent, differences in levels of consumer satisfaction between regions may be related to underlying physical differences such as topography or climate. For example, it is not clear whether consumers who reside in harsher climate areas adjust downward their expectations about the useful life of
durable products which are exposed to the elements. When no such adjustment of pre-purchase expectations takes place, it is clear that the consumer in question is more likely to experience dissatisfaction than one who does make the necessary modification. In the short run, such problems probably should be addressed through interventions such as consumer information.

Variations in rates of consumer satisfaction and dissatisfaction may in some instances, be influenced by underlying cultural differences between regions. For example, consumer dissatisfaction with micro-wave ovens appears to be substantially higher in the Province of Quebec than elsewhere in the country. It is unclear, however, whether such disenchantment reflects an underlying disapproval of the product as a cooking concept or, in fact, reflects a generalized belief about the performance characteristics of the item.

A further caveat should be mentioned with respect to the regional results reported above. Since some of the regional subsamples were rather small, differences in reported rates of consumer satisfaction and dissatisfaction may be attributed, to some extent, to sampling variation across the regions. Of course, interpretation is troubled when exror distribution tends to explain substantial degrees of dissatisfaction.

Much more focused research is needed to determine the magnitude of differences in consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction across various regions of Canada, the fundamental reasons for such differences, and the types of personal and public actions taken by dissatisfied consumers across the nation. Only then will it be possible for policy makers to allocate manpower and financial resources in a way which would serve to stabilize overall rates of consumer satisfaction throughout the country.
table 1 (FI) region: atlantic (1)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING SECTION: FOOD PRODUCTS (FP) I

| CATEGORY PURCHASE |  | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\qquad$ | \% of PurchasersbuyingFrequently | Rank by Frequency Rating | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  |
|  |  |  |  | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Fresh Bread, Rolls, Cakes, other Baked Goods | 93.6 | 59.3 |  | 46.0 | 48.7 | 4.8 | 0.5 | 94.7 |  | 5.3 |  |
| 2. Frozen Bread, Dough, Pizza, Cakes, Pie Crust | 57.4 | 17.2 |  | 30.4 | 60.0 | 6.1 | 3.5 | 90.4 |  | 9.6 |  |
| 3. Flour, Cornmeal, Rice | 25.5 | 61.1 |  | 65.3 | 32.1 | 2.1 | 0.5 | 97.4 |  | 2.6 |  |
| 4. $\underset{\substack{\text { Macaroni } \\ \text { Products }}}{\text { Nood7e }}$ | 90.1 | 52.2 |  | 66.9 | 32.6 | 0.6 | -- | 99.4 |  | 0.6 |  |
| 5. Breakfast Cereals | 84.2 | 55.3 |  | 55.0 | $-40.4$ | 3.5 | 1.2 | 95.3 |  | 4.7 |  |
| 6. Syrups, Molasses, Honey | 89.6 | 43.6 |  | 65.6 | 33.3 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 98.9 |  | 1.2 |  |
| 7. Sugar, Salt, Spices, Seasonings... | 97.0 | 77.0 |  | 70.9 | 28.6 | -- | 0.5 | 99.5 |  | 0.5 |  |
| 8. Cake/Cookie mix, Pudding, Desserts, Party Food... | 87.1 | 34.7 |  | 50.9 | 42.3 | 5.7 | 1.1 | 93.1 |  | 6.8 |  |
| 9. Margarine, Cooking 0ils, | 98.0 | 78.8 |  | 66.5 | 32.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 99.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| 10. Peanut Butter, Jams, Jellies, Spread | 92.6 | 59.4 |  | 66.7 | 30.6 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 97.3 |  | 2.7 |  |
| 11. Milk, Cheese, Yogurt, Butter, Ice Cream... Dairy | 99.5 | 89.1 |  | 61.2 | 32.3 | 4.5 | 2.0 | 93.5 |  | 6.5 |  |
| 12. Eggs \& Egg Products | 98.5 | 92.0 |  | 62.3 | 32.7 | 3.5 | 1.5 | 95.0 |  | 5.0 |  |
| 13. Non-Alcoholic Beverages (Pop; Juice...) | 96.5 | 83.6 |  | 62.6 | 34.9 | 2.6 | -- | 97.4 |  | 2.6 |  |
| 14. Canned, Frozen Fruits, Veg., Soups | 85.6 | 56.6 |  | 53.2 | 39.3 | 6.9 | 0.6 | 92.5 |  | 7.5 |  |
| 15. Cooked, Canned or Processed Meat, Poultry, Fish, Dinners | 83.7 | 30.2 |  | 36.7 | 50.9 | 10.7 | 1.8 | 87.6 |  | 12.5 |  |
| 16. Pickles, Mustard, Ketchup, Other Dressings | , 96.5 | 60.0 |  | 63.1 | 35.9 | 1.0 | -- | 99.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { 17. } & \text { Baby Food, Juices, } \\ \text { Formula } \end{array}$ | 9.4 | 68.4 |  | 63.2 | 36.8 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | --- |  |
| 18. Fresh or Frozen Meats | 97.0 | 83.2 |  | 41.3 | 45.9 | 10.7 | 2.0 | 87.2 |  | 12.7 |  |
| 19. $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fresh, Frozen, BBQ } \\ & \text { Poultry }\end{aligned}$ | 80.2 | 61.7 |  | 43.2 | 48.8 | 6.2 | 1.9 | 92.0 |  | 8.0 |  |
| 20. $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fresh or Frozen } \\ & \text { Fish/Seafood }\end{aligned}$ | 88.1 | 48.9 |  | 47.2 | 44.4 | 6.2 | 2.2 | 91.6 |  | 8.4 |  |
| 21. Fresh Fruits/Vegetables | 96.5 | 84.1 |  | 44.1 | 35.9 | 17.9 | 2.1 | 80.0 |  | 20.0 |  |
| 22. Specialty, Dietetic, Gourmet Foods | 18.8 | 15.8 |  | 36.8 | 55.3 | 2.6 | 5.3 | 92.1 |  | 8.9 |  |
| 23. Pet Food | 48.5 | 79.6 |  | 50.0 | 42.9 | 5.1 | 2.0 | 92.9 |  | 7.1 |  |
| 24. Alcoholic Beverages | 61.9 | 79.6 |  | 59.3 | 39.8 | -- | 0.8 | 99.2 |  | 0.8 |  |
| 25. Restaurant Meals | 81.7 | 10.9 |  | 23.6 | 52.1 | 21.2 | 3.0 | 75.8 |  | 24.2 |  |
| 26. Take-0ut Foods | 74.3 | 13.3 |  | 20.7 | 50.7 | 24.0 | 4.7 | 71.3 |  | 28.7 |  |

TABLE 1 (FI)
REGION: MONTREAL (2)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: FOOD PRODUCTS (FP) I

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents having Purchased | \% of Purchasers <br> buying <br> Frequently | $\qquad$ | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  |
|  |  |  |  | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Fresh Bread, Rolls, Cakes, other Baked Goods | 100.0 | 89.7 |  | 52.3 | 38.3 | 3.7 | 5.6 | 90.7 |  | 9.3 |  |
| 2. Frozen Bread, Dough, Pizza, Cakes, Pie Crust | 56.1 | 28.3 |  | 35.0 | 56.7 | 8.3 | -- | 91.7 |  | 8.3 |  |
| 3. Flour, Cornmeal, Rice | 79.5 | 52.9 |  | 55.3 | 43.5 | 1.2 | -- | 98.8 |  | 1.2 |  |
| 4. Macaroni \& Noodle Products | 94.4 | 75.2 |  | 61.0 | 36.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 97.0 |  | 3.0 |  |
| 5. Breakfast Cereals | , 81.3 | 60.9 |  | 62.1 | 33.3 | 4.6 | -- | 95.4 |  | 4.6 |  |
| 6. Syrups, Molasses, Honey | 91.6 | 40.8 |  | 60.8 | 36,1 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 96.9 |  | 3.1 |  |
| 7. Sugar, Salt, Spices, Seasonings... | 94.4 | 72.3 |  | 64.4 | 31.7 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 96.0 |  | 4.0 |  |
| 8. Cake/Cookie mix, Pudding, Desserts, Party Food... | 80.4 | 41.9 |  | 55.8 | 38.4 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 94.2 |  | 5.8 |  |
| 9. Margarine, Cooking 0ils, Shortening | 92.6 | 75.8 |  | 66.7 | 29.3 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 96.0 |  | 4.0 |  |
| 10. Peanut Butter, Jams, Jellies, Spread | 94.4 | 59.4 |  | 57.4 | 33.7 | 6.9 | 2.0 | 91.1 |  | 8.9 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11. Milk, Cheese, Yogurt, } \\ & \text { Butter, Ice Cream... } \\ & \text { Dairy } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 98.2 | 92.4 |  | 60.4 | 34.0 | 4.7 | 0.9 | 94.4 |  | 5.6 |  |
| 12. Eggs \& Egg Products | 96.3 | 85.4 |  | 54.4 | 40.8 | 3.9 | 1.0 | 95.1 |  | 4.9 |  |
| 13. Non-Alcoholic Beverages (Pop, Juice...) | 97.7 | 83.7 |  | 62.5 | 34.6 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 97.1 |  | 2.9 |  |
| 14. Canned, Frozen Fruits, | 83.2 | 56.2 |  | 43.8 | 50.6 | 3.4 | 2.2 | 94.4 |  | 5.6 |  |
| 15. Cooked, Canned or Processed Meat, Poultry, Fish, Dinners | 54.2 | 48.3 |  | 43.1 | 43.1 | 10.3 | 3.4 | 86.2 |  | 13.7 |  |
| 16. Pickles, Mustard, Ketchup, Other Dressings | , 94.4 | 50.5 |  | 61.0 | 36.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 97.0 |  | 3.0 |  |
| 17. Baby Food, Juices, Formula | 10.3 | 27.3 |  | 81.8 | 9.1 | -- | 9.1 | 90.9 |  | 9.1 |  |
| 18. Fresh or Frozen Meats | 92.5 | 85.9 |  | 42.9 | 49.0 | 5.1 | 3.1 | 91.8 |  | 8.2 |  |
| 19. Fresh, Frozen, BBQ Poultry | 89.8 | 78.1 |  | 55.2 | 36.5 | 5.2 | 3.1 | 91.7 |  | 8.3 |  |
| 20. Fresh or Frozen Fish/Seafood | 81.3 | 56.3 |  | 52.9 | 41.4 | 3.4 | 2.3 | 94.3 |  | 5.7 |  |
| 21. Fresh Frujts/Vegetables | 96.2 | 92.2 |  | 50.5 | 40.8 | 6.8 | 1.9 | 91.3 |  | 8.7 |  |
| 22. Specialty, Dietetic, Gourmet Foods | 20.6 | 22.7 |  | 54.5 | 40.9 | -- | 4.5 | 95.5 |  | 4.5 |  |
| 23. Pet Food | 25.3 | 66.7 |  | 35.7 | 60.7 | 3.6 | - | 96.4 |  | 3.6 |  |
| 24. Alcoholic Beverages | 76.6 | 29.3 |  | 60.5 | 34.6 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 95.1 |  | 5.0 |  |
| 25. Restaurant Meals | 83.2 | 25.6 |  | 41.6 | 37.1 | 15.7 | 5.6 | 78.7 |  | 21.3 |  |
| 26. Take-Out Foods | 50.5 | 16.7 |  | 35.2 | 55.6 | 5.6 | 3.7 | 90.7 |  | 9.3 |  |

TABLE 1 (FI)
REGION
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING

SECTION: FOOD PRODUCTS (FP) I

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers Rank |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency |  | SFIED | DISSATIS | IED |  | SFIED | DISSA | SFIED |
|  | Purchased | Frequently | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Fresh Bread, Rolls, Cakes, other Baked Goods | 99.1 | 88.0 |  | 55.7 | 41.5 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 97.2 |  | 2.8 |  |
| 2. Frozen Bread, Dough, Pizza, Cakes, Pie Crust | 63.3 | 13.0 |  | 32.8 | 59.7 | 6.0 | 1.5 | 92.5 |  | 7.5 |  |
| 3. Flour, Cornmeal, Rice | 89.9 | 51.0 |  | 57.1 | 40.8 | -- | 2.0 | 98.0 |  | 2.0 |  |
| 4. Macaroni \& Noodle Products | 97.2 | 66.0 |  | 64.2 | 34.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 98.1 |  | 1.8 |  |
| 5. Breakfast Cereals | 87.2 | 56.8 |  | 60.0 | 37.9 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 97.9 |  | 2.2 |  |
| 6. Syrups, Molasses, Honey | 97.2 | 45.3 |  | 63.2 | 35.8 | L | 0.9 | 99.1 |  | 0.9 |  |
| 7. Sugar, Salt, Spices, Seasonings... | 97.2 | 73.6 |  | 61.3 | 35.8 | -- | 2.8 | 97.2 |  | 2.8 |  |
| 8. Cake/Cookie mix, Pudding, Desserts, Party Food... | 83.5 | 42.9 |  | 47.3 | 50.5 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 97.8 |  | 2.2 |  |
| 9. Margarine, Cooking Dils, Shortening | 99.1 | 75.9 |  | 64.8 | 32.4 | -- | 2.8 | 97.2 |  | 2.8 |  |
| 10. Peanut Butter, Jams, Jellies, Spread | 95.4 | 56.7 |  | 57.7 | 40.4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 98.1 |  | 2.0 |  |
| 11. Milk, Cheese, Yogurt, Butter, Ice Cream... Dairy | 100.0 | 89.0 |  | 56.9 | 38.5 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 95.4 |  | 4.6 |  |
| 12. Eggs \& Egg Products | 100.0 | 83.5 |  | 50.0 | 46.3 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 96.3 |  | 3.8 |  |
| 13. Non-Alcoholic Beverages (Pop, Juice...) | 99.1 | 81.5 |  | 54.6 | 42.6 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 97.2 |  | 2.8 |  |
| 14. Canned, Frozen Fruits, Veg., Soups | 98.1 | 58.3 |  | 45.8 | 54.2 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 15. Cooked, Canned or Processed Meat, Poultry, Fish, Dinners | 60.6 | 50.0 |  | 37.9 | 48.5 | 7.6 | 6.1 | 86.4 |  | 13.7 |  |
| 16. Pickies, Mustard, Ketchup, Other Dressings | , 99.1 | 57.4 |  | 56.5 | 42.6 | -- | 0.9 | 99.1 |  | 0.9 |  |
| 17. Baby Food, Juices, Formula | 14.7 | 25.0 |  | 43.8 | 56.3 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 18. Fresh or Frozen Meats | 96.3 | 86.7 |  | 47.1 | 44.2 | 6.7 | 1.9 | 91.3 |  | 9.6 |  |
| 19. Fresh, Frozen, BBQ Poultry | 95.4 | 65.4 |  | 49.0 | 47.1 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 96.2 |  | 3.8 |  |
| 20. Fresh or Frozen <br>  Fish/Seafood | 86.2 | 43.6 |  | 37.2 | 59.6 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 96.8 |  | 3.2 |  |
| 21. Fresh Fruits/Vegetables | 100.0 | 03.6. |  | 45.9 | 46.8 | 5.5 | 1.8 | 92.7 |  | 7.3 |  |
| 22. Specialty, Dietetic, Gourmet Foods | 22.0 | 33.3 |  | 45.8 | 54.2 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 23. Pet Food | 21.1 | 43.5 |  | 43.5 | 56.5 | -- | $=$ | 100.0 |  | - |  |
| 24. Alcoholic Beverages | 89.0 | 24.7 |  | 57.7 | 42.3 | - | - | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 25. Restaurant Meals | 75.3 | 11.0 |  | 34.1 | 61.0. | 3.7 | 1.2 | 95.1 |  | 4.9 |  |
| 26. Take-Out Foods | 51.4 | 5.4 |  | 357 | 57.1 | 36 | 3.6 | 92.9 |  | 7.2 |  |

TABLE 1 (FI)
REGION: TORONTO (4)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: FOOD PRODUCTS (FP) I

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE FREQUENCY RATING |  |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\qquad$ having Purchased | \% of PurchasersbuyingFrequently | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rank by } \\ & \text { Frequency } \\ & \text { Rating } \end{aligned}$ | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SATISFIED } \\ & \hline \text { Tota } \end{aligned}$ |  | DISSATISFIED |  |
|  |  |  |  | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite |  |  | Total | Rank |
| 1. Fresh Bread, Rot1s, Cakes, other Baked Goods | 100.0 | 80.2 |  | 55.7 | 40.6 | 2.8 | 0.9 | 96.2 |  | 3.7 |  |
| 2. Frozen Bread, Dough, Pizza, Cakes, Pie Crust. | 63.8 | 28.1 |  | 35.1 | 54.4 | 8.8 | 1.8 | 89.5 |  | 10.6 |  |
| 3. Flour, Cornmeal, Rice | 92.5 | 65.3 |  | 67.0 | 31.0 | 2.0 | -- | 98 |  | 2.0 |  |
| 4. Macaroni \& Noodle Products | 94.3 | 58.0 |  | 61.0 | 37.0 | 2.0 | -- | 98.0 |  | 2.0 |  |
| 5. Breakfast Cereals | 87.8 | 61.3 |  | 58.1 | 37.6 | 3.2 | 1 | 057 |  | 43 |  |
| 6. Syrups, Molasses, Honey | 93,4 | 37,4 |  | 63,9 | 35. 1 | 1.0 |  | 99.0 |  | 10 |  |
| 7. Sugar, Salt, Spices, Seasonings... | 100.0 | 81.1 |  | 73.6 | 25.5 | 0.9 | -- | 99.1 |  | 0.9 |  |
| 8. Cake/Cookie mix, Pudding, Desserts, Party Food... | 84.9 | 47.8 |  | 52.2 | 43.3 | 4.4 | -- | 95.6 |  | 4.4 |  |
| 9. Margarine, Cooking 0ils, Shortening | 97.2 | 82.5 |  | 67.0 | 31.1 | 1.9 | -- | 98.1 |  | 1.9 |  |
| 10. Peanut Butter, Jams, Jellies, Spread | 94.3 | 61.0 |  | 61.0 | 37.0 | 2.0 | -- | 98.0 |  | 2.0 |  |
| 11. Milk, Cheese, Yogurt, Butter, Ice Cream... Dairy | 100.0 | 96.2 |  | 64.2 | 31.1 | 4.7 | -- | 95.3 |  | 4.7 |  |
| 12. Eggs \& Egg Products | 99.0 | 97.1 |  | 67.6 | 27.6 | 4.8 | - | 95.2 |  | 4.8 |  |
| 13. Non-A7coholic Beverages (Pop, Juice...) | 97.1 | 88.3 |  | 65.0 | 33.0 | 1.9 | -- | 98.1 |  | 1.9 |  |
| 14. Canned, Frozen Fruits, Veg., Soups | 87.7 | 58.1 |  | 48.4 | 45.2 | 6.5 | -- | 93.5 |  | 6.5 |  |
| 15. Cooked, Canned or Processed Meat, Poultry, Fish, Dinners | 77.4 | 30.5 |  | 40.2 | 45.1 | 12.2 | 2.4 | 85.4 |  | 14.6 |  |
| 16. Pick7es, Mustard, Ketchup, Other Dressings | , 96.2 | 54.9 |  | 67.6 | 31.4 | 1.0 | -- | 99.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| 17. Baby Food, Juices, Formula | 17.9 | 63.2 |  | 63.2 | 31.6 | -- | 5.3 |  |  | 5.3 |  |
| 18. Fresh or Frozen Meats | 100.0 | 94.3 |  | 44.3 | 44.3 | 10.4 | 0.9 | 88.7 |  | 11.3 |  |
| 19. Fresh, Frozen, BBQ Poultry | 91.5 | 72.2 |  | 51.5 | 44.3 | 4.1 | -- | 95.8 |  | 4.1 |  |
| 20. $\begin{array}{l}\text { Fresh or Frozen } \\ \text { Fish/Seafood }\end{array}$ | 91.5 | 52.6 |  | 48.5 | 46.4 | 5.2 | -- | 94.8 |  | 5.2 |  |
| 21. Fresh Fruits/Vegetables | 98.2 | 90:5 |  | 49.0 | 42.3 | 5.8 | 2.9 | 91.3 |  | 8.7 |  |
|  | 34.9 | 29.7 |  | 51.4 | 4.5.9 | 2.7 | -- | 97.3 |  | 27 |  |
| 23. Pet Food | 34.0 | 78.4 |  | 61.1 | 33.3 | 5.6 | -- | 94.4 |  | 5.6 |  |
| 24. Alcoholic Beverages | 78.3 | 38.6 |  | 56.1 | 42.7 | 1.2 | -- | 98.8 |  | 1.2 |  |
| 25. Restaurant Meals | 84.0 | 18.0 |  | 31.5 | 47.2 | 20.2 | 1.1 | 78.7 |  | 21.3 |  |
| 26. Take-Out Foods | 72.6 | 12.8 |  | 26.0 | 49.4 | 22.1 | 2.6 | 75.3 |  | 24.7 |  |

TABLE I (FI) REGION: REST OF ONTARIO (5)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING

SECTION: FOOD PRODUCTS (FP) I

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of RespondentshavingPurchased | \% of PurchasersbuyingFrequently | Rank by Frequency Rating | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  | SATISFIEDTotal Rank |  | DISSATISFIED |  |
|  |  |  |  | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite |  |  | Total | Rank |
| 1. Fresh Bread, Rolls, Cakes, other Baked Goods | 100.0 | 73.4 |  | 39.4 | 46.8 | 11.9 | 1.8 | 86.2 |  | 13.7 |  |
| 2. Frozen Bread, Dough, Pizza, Cakes, Pie Crust | 49.5 | 16.7 |  | 27.8 | 50.0 | 16.7 | 5.6 | 77.8 |  | 22.3 |  |
| 3. Flour, Cornmeal, Rice | 92.6 | 59.4 |  | 60.4 | 38.6 | 1.0 | -- | 99. |  | 1.0 |  |
| 4. Macaroni \& Noodle Products | 85.3 | 58.1 |  | 58.1 | 37.6 | 4.3 | -- | 95.7 |  | 4.3 |  |
| 5. Breakfast Cereals | 81.7 | 62.9 |  | 51.7 | 39.3 | 7.9 | 1.1 | 91.0 |  | 9.0 |  |
| 6. Syrups, Molasses, Honey | 853 | 31.2 |  | 59.1 | 32.8 |  | -- | 98.9 |  | 1.1 |  |
| 7. Sugar, Salt, Spices, Seasonings... | 98.2 | 70.1 |  | 57.0 | 39.3 | 3.7 | -- | 96.3 |  | 3.7 |  |
| 8. Cake/Cookie mix, Pudding, Desserts, Party Food... | 86.2 | 31.9 |  | 42.6 | 53.2 | 4.3 | -- | 95.7 |  | 4.3 |  |
| 9. Margarine, Cooking 0ils, Shortening | 98.2 | 78.5 |  | 55.1 | 42.1 | 2.8 | -- | 97.2 |  | 2.8 |  |
| 10. Peanut Butter, Jams, Jellies, Spread | 93.6 | 56.9 |  | 53.0 | 44.0 | 3.0 | -- | 97.0 |  | 3.0 |  |
| 11. Milk, Cheese, Yogurt, Butter, Ice Cream... Dairy | 100.0 | 93.6 |  | 51.4 | 37.6 | 10.1 | 0.9 | 89.0 |  | 11.0 |  |
| 12. Eggs \& Egg Products | 96.4 | 84.8 |  | 51.4 | 41.0 | 7.6 | -- | 92.4 |  | 7.6 |  |
| 13. Non-Alcoholic Beverages (Pop, Juice...) | 99.1 | 77.8 |  | 50.0 | 41.7 | 8.3 | -- | 91.7 |  | 8.3 |  |
| 14. Canned, Frozen Fruits, Veg., Soups | 92.7 | 60.4 |  | 41.0 | 51.0 | 7.0 | 1.0 | 92.0 |  | 8.0 |  |
| 15. Cooked, Canned or Processed Meat, Poultry, Fish, Dinners | 70.7 | 26.1 |  | 21.6 | 61.4 | 15.9 | 1.1 | 83.0 |  | 17.0 |  |
| 16. Pickles, Mustard, Ketchup, Other Dressings | , 95.4 | 59.6 |  | 51.9 | 46.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 98.1 |  | 2.0 |  |
| 17. Baby Food, Juices, Formula | 5.5 | 66.7 |  | 33.3 | 66.7 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 18. Fresh or Frozen Meats | 95.4 | 82.7 |  | 30.8 | 44.2 | 25.0 | -- | 75.0 |  | 25.0 |  |
| 19. Fresh, Frozen, BBQ Poultry | 89.0 | 64.9 |  | 36.1 | 51.5 | 10.3 | 2.1 | 87.6 |  | 12.4 |  |
| 20.Fresh or Frozen <br> Fish/Seafood | 82.6 | 43.3 |  | 37.8 | 52.2 | 10.0 | - | 90.0 |  | 10.0 |  |
| 21. Fresh Fruits/Vegetables | 97.2 | 82.1 |  | 36.8 | 50.9 | 12.3 | -- | 87.7 |  | 12.3 |  |
| 22. Specialty, Dietetic, Gourmet Foods | 26.6 | 17.2 |  | 39.3 | 50.0 | 3.6 | 7.1 | 89.3 |  | 10.7 |  |
| 23. Pet Food | 47.7 | 86.5 |  | 34.6 | 51.9 | 13.5 | -- | 86.5 |  | 13.5 |  |
| 24. Alcoholic Beverages | 68.8 | 33.3 |  | 53.3 | 37.3 | 8.0 | 1.3 | 90.7 |  | 9.3 |  |
| 25. Restaurant Meals | 77.0 | 22.6 |  | 21.4 | 69.0 | 8.3 | 1.2 | 90.5 |  | 9.5 |  |
| 26. Take-0ut Foods | 69.7 | 14.5 |  | 16.0 | 68.0 | 13.3 | 2.7 | 84.0 |  | 16.0 |  |

TABLE 1 (FI) REGION: MAN/SASK (6)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: FOOD PRODUCTS (FP) I

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/OISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency $\quad$ SA | SATISFIED | DISSATISFIED |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  |
|  | Purchased | Frequently | Rating Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Fresh Bread, Rolls, Cakes, other Baked Goods | 99.0 | 69.5 | 48.4 | 43.2 | 7.4 | 1.1 | 91.6 |  | 8.5 |  |
| 2. Frozen Bread, Dough, Pizza, Cakes, Pie Crust | 50.0 | 10.4 | 45.8 | 41.7 | 10.4 | 2.1 | 87.5 |  | 12.5 |  |
| 3. Flour, Cornmeal, Rice | 99.0 | 69.5 | 70.5 | 28.4 | 1.1 | -- | 98.9 |  | 1.1 |  |
| 4. Macaroni \& Noodle Products | 97.9 | 64.9 | 68.1 | 31.9 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 5. Breakfast Cereals | 86.5 | 67.5 | 54.2 | 42.2 | 3.6 | -- | 96.4 |  | 3.6 |  |
| 6. Syrups, Molasses, Honey | 92.7 | 31.5 | 65.2 | 32.6 | 2.2 | -- | 97.8 |  | 2.2 |  |
| 7. $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sugar, Salt, Spices, } \\ & \text { Seasonings... }\end{aligned}$ | 99.0 | 77.9 | 75.8 | 21.1 | 3.2 | -- | 96.8 |  | 3.2 |  |
| 8. Cake/Cookie mix, Pudding, Desserts, Party Food. . . | 86.5 | 43.4 | 59.0 | 36.1 | 4.8 | -- | 95.2 |  | 4.8 |  |
| 9. Margarine, Cooking Dils, Shortening | 97.9 | 79.8 | 64.9 | 33.0 | 2.1 | -- | 97.9 |  | 2.1 |  |
| 10. Peanut Butter, Jams, Jellies, Spread | 94.8 | 52.7 | 71.4 | 25.3 | 3.3 | -- | 96.7 |  | 3.3 |  |
| 11. Milk, Cheese, Yogurt, Butter, Ice Cream... Dairy | 100.0 | 92.7 | 63.5 | 32.3 | 4.2 | -- | 95.8 |  | 4.2 |  |
| 12. Eggs \& Egg Products | 85.8 | 85.9 | 68.5 | 29.3 | 2.2 | -- | 97.8 |  | 2.2 |  |
| 13. Non-Alcoholic Beverages (Pop, Juice...) | 99.0 | 83.2 | 62.1 | 35.8 | 2.1 | -- | 97.9 |  | 2.1 |  |
| 14. Canned, Frozen Fruits, Veg., Soups | 94.8 | 58.2 | 60.4 | 37.4 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 97.8 |  | 2.2 |  |
| 15. Cooked, Canned or Processed Meat, Poultry, Fish, Dinners | 84.4 | 33.3 | 44.4 | 40.7 | 12.3 | 2.5 | 85.2 |  | 14.8 |  |
| 16. Pickles, Mustard, Ketchup, Other Dressings | , 96.9 | 47.3 | 63.4 | 35.5 | 1.1 | -- | 98.9 |  | 1.1 |  |
| 17. Baby Food, Juices, Formula | 8.3 | 62.5 | 75.0 | 25.0 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 18. Fresh or Frozen Meats | 93.7 | 83.3 | 47.8 | 44,9 | 13.3 | -- | 86.7 |  | 13.3 |  |
| 19. Fresh, Frozen, BBQ Poultry | 78.2 | 53.3 | 44.0 | 45.3 | 8.0 | . 2.7 | 89.3 |  | 10.7 |  |
| 20. Fresh or Frozen Fish/Seafood | 71.9 | 31.9 | 47.8 | 44.9 | 5.8 | 1.4 | 92.8 |  | 7.2 |  |
| 21. Fresh Fruits/Vegetables | 97.9 | 89.4 | 41.9 | 43.0 | 14.0 | 1.1 | 84.9 |  | 15.1 |  |
| 22. Specialty, Dietetic, Gourmet Foods | 22.9 | 36.4 | 40.9 | 59.1 | 14.0 | 1 | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 23. Pet Food | 40.7 | 71.8 | 50.0 | 50.0 | -- | - | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 24. Alcoholic Beverages | 70.9 | 30.9 | 60.3 | 38.2 | 1.5 | -- | 98.5 |  | 1.5 |  |
| 25. Restaurant Meals | 77.1 | 13.5 | 29.7 | 55.4 | 14.9 | =- | 85.1 |  | 14.9 |  |
| 26. Take-Out Foods | 79.2 | 13.2 | 36.8 | 47.4 | 13.2 | 2.6 | 84.6 |  | 15.8 |  |

TABLE I (FI) REGION: alberta (7)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING

SECTION: FOOD PRODUCTS (FP) I

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of RespondentshavingPurchased | \% of PurchasersbuyingFrequently | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rank by } \\ & \text { Frequency } \\ & \text { Rating } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  |
|  |  |  |  | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Fresh Bread, Rolis, Cakes, other Baked Goods | 99.0 | 72.1 |  | 48.1 | 45.2 | 6.7 | -- | 93.3 |  | 6.7 |  |
| 2. Frozen Bread, Dough, Pizza, Cakes, Pie Crust | 62.9 | 16.7 |  | 36.4 | 45.5 | 16.7 | 1.5 | 81.8 |  | 18.2 |  |
| 3. Flour, Cornmeal, Rice | 97.1 | 59.8 |  | 74.8 | 23.3 | 1.9 | - | 98.1 |  | 1.9 |  |
| 4. Macaroni \& Noodle Products | 94.3 | 59.6 |  | 68.7 | 31.3 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 5. Breakfast Cereals | 84, 8 | 60.7 |  | 62.9 | 34.8 | 2.2 | -- | 97.8 |  | 2.2 |  |
| 6. Syrups, Molasses, Honey | 91.5 | 27.1 |  | 70.8 | 29.2 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| 7. Sugar, Salt, Spices, Seasonings... | 100.0 | 73.3 |  | 72.4 | 27.6 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 8. Cake/Cookie mix, Pudding, Desserts, Party Food... | 93.3 | 34.7 |  | 51.0 | 44.9 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 95.9 |  | 4.1 |  |
| 9. Margarine, Cooking 0ils, Shortening | 99.0 | 80.8 |  | 74.0 | 26.0 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 10. Peanut Butter, Jams, Jellies, Spread | 94.3 | 46.5 |  | 64.3 | 34.7 | 1.0 | -- | 99.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| 11. Milk, Cheese, Yogurt, Butter, Ice Cream... Dairy | 99.0 | 87.5 |  | 65.4 | 29.8 | 4.8 | -- | 95.2 |  | 4.8 |  |
| 12. Eggs \& Egg Products | 94.3 | 84.8 |  | 63.3 | 34.7 | 20 | - | 98.0 |  | 2.0 |  |
| 13. $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non-A1coholic Beverages } \\ & \text { (Pop; Juice...) }\end{aligned}$ | 100.0 | 79.0 |  | 66.7 | 33.3 | 2 | -- | 100.0 |  | , |  |
| 14. Canned, Frozen Fruits, Veg., Soups | 97.2 | 53.9 |  | 49.5 | 46.5 | 4.0 | -- | 96.0 |  | 4.0 |  |
| 15. Cooked, Canned or Processed Meat, Poultry, Fish, Dinners | 88.6 | 25.8 |  | 34.4 | 52.7 | 12.9 | -- | 87.1 |  | 12.9 |  |
| 16. $\quad \begin{array}{l}\text { Pickles, Mustard, Ketchup } \\ \text { Other Dressings }\end{array}$ | , 97.2 | 52.0 |  | 71.3 | 27.7 | 1.0 | -- | 99.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| 17. Baby Food, Juices, Formula | 9.5 | 60.0 |  | 40.0 | 60.0 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 18. Fresh or Frozen Meats | 96.2 | 81.2 |  | 35.0 | 53.0 | 120 | -- | 88.0 |  | 12.0 |  |
| 19. Fresh, Frozen, BBQ | 81.9 | 54.7 |  | 44.2 | 46.5 | 9.3 | -- | 90.7 |  | 9.3 |  |
| 20. Fresh or Frozen Fish/Seafood | 76.2 | 30.0 |  | 36.2 | 57.5 | 6.3 | -- | 93.8 |  | 6.3 |  |
| 21. Fresh Fruits/Vegetables | 99.0 | 93.0 |  | 45.5 | 42.6 | 11.9 |  | 88.1 |  | 11.9 |  |
| 22. Specialty, Dietetic, Gourmet Foods | 24.8 | 26.9 |  | 38.5 | 46.2 | 15.4 | -- | 84.6 |  | 15.4 |  |
| 23. Pet Food |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24. Alcoholic Beverages | 80.0 | 33.3 |  | 67.9 | 31.0 | 1.2 | $\cdots$ | 98.8 |  | 1.2 |  |
| $\frac{25 .}{} \frac{\text { Restaurant Meals }}{\text { 25. }}$ | 92.4 | 22.7 |  | 18.8 | 59.4 | 21.9 | -- | 78.1 |  | 21.9 |  |
| 26. Take-0ut Foods | 75.3 | 13.9 |  | 22.8 | 58.2 | 16.5 | 2.5 | 81.0 |  | 19.0 |  |

TABLE 1 (FI) REGION: VANCOUVER (8)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: FOOD PRODUCTS (FP) I

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREDUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/OISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  |
|  | Purchased | Frequently | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Fresh Bread, Rolis, Cakes, other Baked Goods | 95.1 | 78.6 |  | 49.6 | 45.3 | 4.3 | 0.9 | 94.9 |  | 5.2 |  |
| 2. Frozen Bread, Dough, Pizza, Cakes, Pie Crust | 51.2 | 9.5 |  | 28.6 | 61.9 | 7.9 | 1.6 | 90.5 |  | 9.5 |  |
| 3. Flour, Cornmeal, Rice | 95.1 | 64.1 |  | 61.5 | 3519 | 2.6 |  | 97.4 |  | 2.6 |  |
| 4. Macaroni \& Nood7e Products | 93.5 | 53.9 |  | 65.2 | 31.3 | 3.5 | -- | 96.5 |  | 3.5 |  |
| 5. Breakfast Cereals | 72.4 | 58.4 |  | 50.6 | 38.2 | -9-0 | 2.2 | 88.8 |  | 11.2 |  |
| 6. Syrups, Molasses, Honey | 81.3 | 35.0 |  | 66.0 | 34.0 |  | -- | $100-0$ |  |  |  |
| 7. Sugar, Salt, Spices, Seasonings... | 100.0 | 61.8 |  | 68.3 | 30.9 | 0.8 | -- | 99.2 |  | 0.8 |  |
| 8. Cake/Cookie mix, Pudding, Desserts, Party Food... | 87.0 | 33.6 |  | 42.1 | 49.5 | 8.4 | -- | 91.6 |  | 8.4 |  |
| 9. Margarine, Cooking 0ils, Shortening | 100.0 | 80.5 |  | 65.0 | 32.5 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 97.6 |  | 2.4 |  |
| 10. Peanut Butter, Jams, Jellies, Spread | 91.0 | 49.1 |  | 54.5 | 42.0 | 3.6 | -- | 96.4 |  | 3.6 |  |
| 11. Milk, Cheese, Yogurt, Butter, Ice Cream... Dairy | 98.4 | 95.0 |  | 65.8 | 29.2 | 5.0 | -- | 95.0 |  | 5.0 |  |
| 12. Eggs \& Egg Products | 100.0 | 94.3 |  | 54.9 | 38.5 | 5.7 | 0.8 | 93.4 |  | 6.5 |  |
| 13. $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non-Aīcoholic Beverages } \\ & \text { (Pop, Juice...) }\end{aligned}$ | 100.0 | 84.6 |  | 54.5 | 38.2 | 5.7 | 1.6 | 92.7 |  | 7.3 |  |
| 14. Canned, Frozen Fruits, Veg., Soups | 90.2 | 53.2 |  | 41.4 | 49.5 | 7.2 | 1.8 | 91.0 |  | 9.0 |  |
| 15. Cooked, Canned or Processed Meat, Poultry, Fish, Dinners | 79.7 | 23.5 |  | 33.7 | 40.8 | 20.4 | 5.1 | 74.5 |  | 25.5 |  |
| 16. Pickles, Mustard, Ketchup, Other Dressings | , 95.9 | 45.8 |  | 55.1 | 43.2 | 1.7 | -- | 98.3 |  | 1.7 |  |
| 17. Baby Food, Juices, Formula | 11.4 | 64.3 |  | 50.0 | 35.7 | -- | 14.3 | 85.7 |  | 14.3 |  |
| 18. Fresh or Frozen Meats | 98.4 | 91.7 |  | 37.2 | 44.6 | 14.0 | 4.1 | 81.8 |  | 18.1 |  |
| 19. $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fresh, Frozen, } B B Q \\ & \text { Poultry }\end{aligned}$ | 93.5 | 67.0 |  | 44.3 | 49.6 | 5.2 | 0.9 | 93.9 |  | 6.1 |  |
| 20. Fresh or Frozen Fish/Seafood | 82.9 | 41.2 |  | 38.2 | 53.9 | 7.8. | -- | 92.2 |  | 7.8 |  |
| 21. Fresh Fruits/Vegetables | 98.4 | 96.7 |  | 39.7. | 43.8 | 14.9 | 1.7 | 83.5 |  | 16.6 |  |
| 22. Specialty, Dietetic, Gourmet Foods | 30.9 | 15.8 |  | 28.9 | 60.5 | 10.5 | -- | 89.5 |  | 10.5 |  |
| 23. Pet Food | 54.5 | 82.1 |  | 38.8 | 41.8 | 16.4 | 3.0 | 80.6 |  | 19.4 |  |
| 24. Alcoholic Beverages | 82.1 | 37.6 | . | 57.4 | 35.6 | 6.9 | -- | 93.1 |  | 6.9 |  |
| 25. Restaurant Meals | 89.4 | 22.7 |  | 20.9 | 51.8 | 26.4 | 0.9 | 72.7 |  | 27.3 |  |
| 26. Take-Out Foods | 78.0 | 10.4 |  | 21.9 | 47.9 | 24.0 | 6.3 | 69.8 |  | 30.3 |  |

TABLE I (FI) REGION: REST OF B.C. (9)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING

SECTION: FOOD PRODUCTS (FP) I

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents having Purchased | \% of Purchasers buying Frequently | Rank by Frequency Rating | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  |
|  |  |  |  | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Fresh Bread, Rotls, Cakes, other Baked Goods | 96.4 | 65.0 |  | 47.5 | 47.5 | 5.0 | -- | 95.0 |  | 5.0 |  |
| 2. Frozen Bread, Dough, Pizza, Cakes, Pie Crust | 98.8 | 16.7 |  | 16.7 | 55.6 | 25.0 | 2.8 | 72.2 |  | 27.8 |  |
| 3. Flour, Cornmeal, Rice | 94.0 | 64.1 |  | 73.1 | 26.9 | -- | -- | 100. 0 |  | -- |  |
| 4. Macaroni \& Noodle Products | 89.2 | 58.1 |  | 67.6 | 31.1 | 1.4 | -- | 98.6 |  | 1.4 |  |
| 5. Breakfast Cereals | 81.9 | 55.9 |  | 52.9 | 41.2 | 5,9 | -- | 94.1 |  | 5,1 |  |
| 6. Syrups, Molasses, Honey | 90.4 | 44.0 |  | 72.0 | 26.7 | 1.3 | -- | 98.7 |  | 1.3 |  |
| 7. $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sugar, Salt, Spices, } \\ & \text { Seasonings... }\end{aligned}$ | 96.4 | 70.0 |  | 71.2 | 26.2 | 2.5 | -- | 97.5 |  | 2.5 |  |
| 8. Cake/Cookie mix, Pudding, Desserts, Party Food... | 88.0 | 35.6 |  | 49.3 | 47.9 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 97.3 |  | 2.8 |  |
| 9. Margarine, Cooking Oils, Shortening | 97.6 | 97.7 |  | 69.1 | 29.6 | 1.2 | -- | 98.8 |  | 1.2 |  |
| 10. Peanut Butter, Jams, Jellies, Spread | 86.8 | 50.7 |  | 52.1 | 45.2 | 2.7 | -- | 97.3 |  | 2.7 |  |
| 11. $\begin{array}{l}\text { Milk, Cheese, Yogurt, } \\ \text { Butter, Ice Cream... } \\ \text { Dairy }\end{array}$ | 100.0 | 94.0 |  | 57.3 | 36.6 | 4.9 | 1.2 | 93.9 |  | 6.1 |  |
| 12. Eggs \& Egg Products | 92.8 | 88.3 |  | 5.3 .2 | 35.1 | 10.4 | 1.3 | 88,3 |  | 11.7 |  |
| 13. Non-A1coholic Beverages (Pop, Juice...) | 96.4 | 72.5 |  | 62.0 | 38.0 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 14. Canned, Frozen Fruits, Veg., Soups | 90.4 | 57.3 |  | 54.7 | $38.7{ }^{\text { }}$ | 5.3 | 1.3 | 93.3 |  | 6.6 |  |
| 15. Cooked, Canned or Processed Meat, Poultry, Fish, Dinners | 75.9 | 25.4 |  | 26.6 | 56.3 | 15.6 | 1.6 | 82.8 |  | 17.2 |  |
| 16. Pickles, Mustard, Ketchup, Other Dressings | , 98.8 | 46.3 |  | 66.7 | 30.9 | 2.5 | -- | 97.5 |  | 2.5 |  |
| 17. Baby Food, Juices, Formula | 6.0 | 30.0 |  | 80.0 | -- | -- | 20.0 | 80.0 |  | 20.0 |  |
| 18. Fresh or Frozen Meats | 96.4 | 71.2 |  | 32.5 | 51.2 | 15.0 | 1.2 | 83.7 |  | 16.2 |  |
| 19. Fresh, Frozen, BBQ Poultry | 86.7 | 58.3 |  | 47.2 | 50.0 | 2.8 | 1.2 | 97.2 |  | 2.8 |  |
| 20. Fresh or Frozen Fish/Seafood | 73.5 | 29.5 |  | 36.1 | 54.1 | 9.8 | -- | 90.2 |  | 9.8 |  |
| 21. Fresh Fruits/Vegetables | 96.4 | 86.2 |  | 31.3 | 42.5 | 25.0 | 1.2 | 73.7 |  | 26.2 |  |
| 22. Specialty, Dietetic, Gourmet Foods | 25.3 | 23.8 |  | 57.1 | 38.1 | 4.8 | -- | 95.2 |  | 4.8 |  |
| 23. Pet Food | 61.5 | 70.6 |  | 56.9 | 37.3 | 5.9 | $=$ | 94.1 |  | 5.9 |  |
| 24. Alcoholic Beverages | 78.3 | 24.6 |  | 52.3 | 47.7 | - | -- | 100.0 |  | $=$ |  |
| 25. Restaurant Meals | 92.3 | 15.6 |  | 23.4 | 57.1 | 19.5 | -- | 80.5 |  | 19.5 |  |
| 26. Take-Out Foods | 75.9 | 6.3 |  | 17.5 | 65.1 | 17.5 | $=$ | 82.5 |  | 17.5 |  |

TABLE 1 (FII) REGION: ATLANTIC (I)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: HOUSEHOLO \& FAMILY SUPPLIES (HFS) II

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency |  | SFIED | DISSATI | IED |  | SFIED | DISSA | SFIED |
|  | Purchased | Frequently | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Aluminum Foil, Food Wrap, Food Storage Containers... | 97.5 | 58.4 |  | 55.3 | 43.1 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 98.5 |  | 1.5 |  |
| 2. Laundry \& DishWashing Detergents/ Soap | 97.5 | 86.9 |  | 56.0 | 41.5 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 97.5 |  | 2.5 |  |
| 3. Bleaches, Bluing, Pre-Soaks, Softener | 90.1 | 47.8 |  | 51.6 | 46.7 | 1.6 | -- | 98.4 |  | 1.6 |  |
| 4. Household Cleaners and Soaps | 98.5 | 66.3 |  | 54.8 | 44.2 | 1.0 | -- | 99.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| 5. Floor/Furn Wax, Polishes, Rug Shampoo | 89.6 | 33.7 |  | 52.2 | 41.1 | 6.7 | -- | 93.3 |  | 6.7 |  |
| 6. Air Fresheners, DisInfectants, Drain Openers, etc-- | 93.1 | 36.2 |  | 51.1 | 44.7 | 3.7 | 0.5 | 95.7 |  | 4.3 |  |
| 7. Rubber G1oves, Sponges, Mops, Brooms, Brushes | 88.1 | 21.9 |  | 51.1 | 43.8 | 4.5 | 0.6 | 94.9 |  | 5.1 |  |
| 8. Toilet Tissue, Facial Tissue, Paper Towels... | 100.0 | 87.1 |  | 58.4 | 41.6 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 9. Home Canning \& Freezing Supplies | 29.7 | 18.3 |  | 70.0 | 30.0 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 10. Insect Spray, Rat Poison, Traps, Mothballs | 36.6 | 5.4 |  | 51.4 | 43.2 | 5.4 | -- | 94.6 |  | 5.4 |  |
| 11. Plant Food, Fertilizer Yard/Garden Supplies | 52.5 | 9.4 |  | 53.8 | 43.4 | 2.8 | -- | 97.2 |  | 2.8 |  |
| 12. Light Bulbs, Fuses, Batteries, Extension Cords | s 94.6 | 25.1 |  | 52.9 | 41.9 | 4.2 | 1.0 | 94.8 |  | 5.2 |  |
| 13. Stationary, School Supplies | 91.6 | 40.0 |  | 56.2 | 41.6 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 97.8 |  | 2.1 |  |
| 14. Giftwrap, Holiday Decorations, Cards, Party Supplies | 96.5 | 22.1 |  | 56.4 | 40.0 | 3.1 | 0.5 | 96.4 |  | 3.6 |  |
| 15. Magazines \& Newspapers | 94.1 | 64.7 |  | 50.0 | 45.3 | 4.2 | 0.5 | 95.3 |  | 4.7 |  |
| 16. Tobacco Products, Smokers' Supplies | 56.4 | 85.1 |  | 63.2 | 34.2 | 0.9 | 1.8 | 97.4 |  | 2.7 |  |
| 17. Photographic Film Flashbulbs | 74.8 | 25.8 |  | 49.3 | 40.0 | 10.0 | 0.7 | 89.3 |  | 10.7 |  |

CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING

## PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING

SECTION: HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES (HFS) II

| $\overline{\text { CATEGORY }}$ \% | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of Respondents } \\ \text { having } \\ \text { Purchased } \end{gathered}$ | \% of Purchasers  <br> buying Rank by <br> Frequency <br> Frequently Rating |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  | Total RATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  |
|  |  |  |  | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite |  |  | Total | Rank |
| 1. Aluminum Foil, Food Wrap, Food Storage Containers... | 97.2 | 57.7 |  | 51.9 | 43.3 | 4.8 | -- | 95.2 |  | 4.8 |  |
| 2. Laundry \& Dish- Washing Detergents/ Soap | 99.1 | 84.0 |  | 54.7 | 40.6 | 4.7 | -- | 95.3 |  | 4.7 |  |
| 3. Bleaches, Bluing, Pre-Soaks, Softener | 91.6 | 58.2 |  | 50.0 | 46.9 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 96.9 |  | 3.0 |  |
| 4. Household Cleaners and Soaps | 92.6 | 60.6 |  | 51.0 | 48.0 | 1.0 | -- | 99.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| 5. Floor/Furn Wax, Polishes, Rug Shampoo | 77.6 | 30.1 |  | 50.6 | 44.6 | 4.8 | -- | 95.2 |  | 4.8 |  |
| 6. Air Fresheners, DisInfectants, Drain Openers, etc-- | 86.9 | 30.1 |  | 47.3 | 43.0 | 8.6 | 1.1 | 90.3 |  | 9.7 |  |
| 7. Rubber Gloves, Sponges, Mops, Brooms, Brushes | 84.1 | 20.0 |  | 46.7 | 47.8 | 4.4 | 1.1 | 94.4 |  | 5.5 |  |
|  | 99.1 | 87.7 |  | 52.8 | 44.3 | 2.8 | - | 97.2 |  | 2.8 |  |
| 9. Home Canning \& Freezing Supplies | 25.2 | 25.9 |  | 40.7 | 55.6 | 3.7 | -- | 96.3 |  | 3.7 |  |
| 10.Insect Spray, Rat  <br> Poison, Traps, Mothbal1s | 28.0 | 13.3 |  | 36.7 | 53.3 | 10.0 | -- | 90.0 |  | 10.0 |  |
| 11. Plant Food, Fertilizer <br> Yard/Garden Supplies | 53.3 | 14.0 |  | 45.6 | 47.4 | 7.0 | -- | 93.0 |  | 7.0 |  |
| 12. Light Bulbs, Fuses, Batteries, Extension Cords | S 97.2 | 15.4 |  | 51.0 | 42.3 | 5.8 | 1.0 | 94.3 |  | 6.8 |  |
| 13. Stationary, School Supplies | 81.3 | 32.2 |  | 58.6 | 35.6 | 5.7 | -- | 94.3 |  | 5.7 |  |
| 14. Giftwrap, Holiday Decorations, Cards, Party Supplies | 89.7 | 17.7 | - | 61.5 | 35.4 | 3.1 | -- | 96.9 |  | 3.1 |  |
| 15. Magazines \& Newspapers | 89.8 | 56.3 |  | 54.2 | 40.6 | 4.2 | 1.0 | 94.8 |  | 5.2 |  |
| 16. Tobacco Products, Smokers ' Supplies | 61.7 | 80.3 |  | 69.7 | 28.8 | 1.5 | -- | 98.5 |  | 1.5 |  |
| 17. Photographic Film. Flashbulbs | 80.4 | 18.6 |  | 59.8 | 39.5 | 4.7 | -- | 95.3 |  | 4.7 |  |

REGION: REST OF QUEBEC (3)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES (HFS) II

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE |  | SATISFACTION/OISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers Rank |  |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying Frequency |  | SFIED | DISSATIS | FIED |  | SFIED | DISSA | SFIED |
|  | Purchased | Frequently Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Aluminum Foil, Food Wrap, Food Storage Containers... | 97.3 | 53.8 | 53.8 | 44.3 | 1.9 | -- | 98.1 |  | 1.9 |  |
| 2. Laundry \& Dish Washing Detergents/ Soap | 100.0 | 84.4 | 49.5 | 46.8 | 3.7 | -- | 96.3 |  | 3.7 |  |
| 3. Bleaches, Bluing, Pre-Soaks, Softener | 89.0 | 47.4 | 47.4 | 50.5 | 2.1 | -- | 97.9 |  | 2.1 |  |
| 4. Household Cleaners and Soaps | 98.1 | 60.7 | 46.7 | 52.3 | 0.9 | -- | 99.1 |  | 0.9 |  |
| 5. Floor/Furn Wax, Polishes, Rug Shampoo | 79.8 | 28.7 | 46.0 | 49.4 | 3.4 | 1.1 | 95.4 |  | 4.5 |  |
| 6. Air Fresheners, DisInfectants, Drain Openers, etc-- | 94.5 | 34.0 | 40.8 | 49.5 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 90.3 |  | 9.8 |  |
| 7. Rubber Gloves, Sponges, Mops, Brooms, Brushes | 88.0 | 14.6 | 46.9 | 49.0 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 95.8 |  | 4.1 |  |
| 8. Toilet Tissue, Facial Tissue, Paper Towels... | 100.0 | 84.4 | 51.4 | 47.7 | 0.9 | -- | 99.1 |  | 0.9 |  |
| 9. Home Canning \& Freezing Supplies | 44.0 | 12.5 | 56.3 | 43.8 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 10. Insect Spray, Rat Poison, Traps, Mothballs | 56.0 | 9.8 | 41.0 | 52.5 | 4.9 | 1.6 | 93.4 |  | 6.5 |  |
| 11. Plant Food, Fertilizer Yard/Garden Supplies | 64.2 | 14.3 | 51.4 | 44.3 | 2.9 | 1.4 | 95.7 |  | 4.3 |  |
| 12. Light Bulbs, Fuses, Batteries, Extension Cords | $5 \quad 98.2$ | 29.9 | 42.1 | 47.7 | 5.6 | 4.7 | 89.7 |  | 10.3 |  |
| 13. Stationary, School Supplies | 85.3 | 38.7 | 59.1 | 40.9 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 14. Giftwrap, Holiday Decorations, Cards, Party Supplies | 90.8 | 20.2 | 48.5 | 50.5 | 1.0 | -- | 99.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| 15. Magazines \& Newspapers | 02.7 | 48. 5 | 45.5 | 43.6 | 9.9 | 10 | 89.1 |  | 10.9 |  |
| 16. Tobacco Products, Smokers Supplies | 67.8 | 81.1 | 51.4 | 47.3 | Q. | . 1.4 | 98.6 |  | 1.4 |  |
| 17. Photographic Film Flashbulbs | 68.8 | 20.0 | 54.7 | 42.7 | 2.7 | -- | 97.3 |  | -- |  |

TABLE 1 (FII) REGION: TORONTO (4)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING

SECTION: HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES (HFS) II

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency |  | SFIED | DISSATIS | IED |  | SFIED | DISSA | SFIED |
|  | Purchased | Frequentiy | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Aluminum Foil, Food Wrap, Food Storage Containers... | 98.1 | 51.9 |  | 69.2 | 27.9 | 2.9 | -- | 97.1 |  | 2.9 |  |
| 2. Laundry \& DishWashing Detergents/ Soap | 100.0 | 72.6 |  | 61.3 | 34.9 | 2.8 | 0.9 | 96.2 |  | 3.7 |  |
| .3. Bleaches, Bluing, Pre-Soaks, Softener | 98.1 | 47.1 |  | 58.7 | 40.4 | 1.0 | -- | 99.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| 4. Household Cleaners and Soaps | 99.1 | 56.2 |  | 58.1 | 39.0 | 2.9 | -- | 97.1 |  | 2.9 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5. Floor/Furn Wax, } \\ & \text { Polishes, Rug } \\ & \text { Shampoo } \end{aligned}$ | 89.6 | 27.4 |  | 50.5 | 42.1 | 5.3 | 2.1 | 92.6 |  | 7.4 |  |
| 6. Air Fresheners, DisInfectants, Drain Openers, etc-- | 94.3 | 25.0 |  | 47.0 | 47.0 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 94.0 |  | 6.0 |  |
| 7. Rubber Gloves, Sponges, Mops, Brooms, Brushes | 90.6 | 17.7 |  | 50.0 | 43.8 | 5.2 | 1.0 | 93.8 |  | 62 |  |
| 8. Toilet Tissue, Facial Tissue, Paper Towels... | 100.0 | 74.5 |  | 57.5 | 38.7 | 3.8 | -- | 96.2 |  | 3.8 |  |
| 9. Home Canning \& Freezing Supplies | 34.9 | 18.9 |  | 54.1 | 43.2 | 2.7 | -- | 97.3 |  | 2.7 |  |
| 10. Insect Spray, Rat Poison, Traps, Mothballs | 59.4 | 3.2 |  | 56.5 | 37.1 | 6.5 | -- | 93.5 |  | 6.5 |  |
| 11. Plant Food, Fertilizer Yard/Garden Supplies | 73.6 | 5.1 |  | 52.6 | 43.6 | 3.8 | -- | 96.2 |  | 3.8 |  |
| 12. Light Bulbs, Fuses, Batteries, Extension Cords | s 98.1 | 13.5 |  | 47.1 | 46.2 | 6.7 | -- | 93.3 |  | 6.7 |  |
| 13. Stationary, School Supplies | 92.5 | 28.6 |  | 60.2 | 37.8 | 2.0 | -- | 98.0 |  | 2.0 |  |
| 14. Giftwrap, Holiday Decorations, Cards, Party Supplies | 94.3 | 21.0 |  | 62.0 | 34.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 96.0 |  | 4.0 |  |
| 15. Magazines \& Newspapers | 95,3 | 54.3 |  | 46.5 | 43.6 | 9. | - | 90.1 |  | 9 |  |
| 16. Tobacco Products, Smokers' Supplies | 44.3 | 80.9 |  | 70.2 | 27.7 | 2.1 | -- | 97.9 |  | 2.1 |  |
| 17. Photographic Film Flashbulbs | 77.4 | 13.4 |  | 54.9 | 41.5 | 3.7 | -- | 96.3 |  | 3.7 |  |

table 1 (FII) REGION: REST OF ONTARIO (5)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES (HFS) II

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\qquad$ having Purchased | \% of PurchasersbuyingFrequentiy | Rank by Frequency Rating | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | SFIED | DISSATIS | IED |  | FIED | DISSA | SFIED |
|  |  |  |  | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Aluminum Foil, Food Wrap, Food Storage Containers... | 99.1 | 58.3 |  | 50.0 | 46.3 | 2.8 | 0.9 | 96.3 |  | 3.7 |  |
| 2. $\begin{aligned} & \text { Laundry \& Dish- } \\ & \text { Washing Detergents/ } \\ & \text { Soap }\end{aligned}$ | 99.1 | 85.2 |  | 44.9 | 47.7 | 5.6 | 1.9 | 92.5 |  | 7.5 |  |
|  | 90.8 | 58.6 |  | 38.4 | 56.6 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 95.0 |  | 5.0 |  |
| 4. Household Cleaners and Soaps | 98.2 | 63.6 |  | 43.8 | 48.6 | 5.7 | 1.9 | 92.4 |  | 7.6 |  |
| 5. Floor/Furn Wax, Polishes, Rug Shampoo | 82.6 | 37.8 |  | 34.4 | 53.3 | 10.0 | 2.2 | 87.8 |  | 12.2 |  |
| 6. Air Fresheners, DisInfectants, Drain Openers, etc-- | 89.9 | 36.7 |  | 34.7 | 58.2 | 6.1 | 1.0 | 92.9 |  | 7.1 |  |
| 7. Rubber G7oves, Sponges, Mops, Brooms, Brushes | 90.9 | 21.2 |  | 33.3 | 57.6 | 9.1 | -- | 90.9 |  | 9.1 |  |
|  | 99.1 | 85.2 |  | 46.3 | 49.1 | 3.7 | 0.9 | 95.4 |  | 4.6 |  |
| 9. Home Canning \& Freezing Supplies | 55.0 | 20.0 |  | 53.3 | 46.7 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 10. Insect Spray, Rat | 61.4 | 10.4 |  | 31.3 | 65.7 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 97.0 |  | 3.0 |  |
| 11. Plant Food, Fertilizer Yard/Garden Supplies | 73.4 | 26.2 |  | 40.0 | 57.5 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 97.5 |  | 2.4 |  |
| 12. Light Bulbs, Fuses, Batteries, Extension Cords | S 93.6 | 33.3 |  | 31.4 | 53.9 | 11.8 | 2.9 | 85.3 |  | 14.7 |  |
| 13. Stationary, School | 86.2 | 33.0 |  | 44.7 | 43.6 | 11.7 | -- | 88.3 |  | 11.7 |  |
| 14. Giftwrap, Holiday Decorations, Cards, Party Supplies | 89.9 | 36.7 |  | 38.8 | 51.0 | 10.2 | -- | 89.8 |  | 10.2 |  |
| 15. Magazines \& Newspapers | 95.4 | 67.3 |  | 42.3 | 45.2 | 10.6 | 1.9 | 87.5 |  | 12.5 |  |
| 16. Tobacco Products, Smokers Supplies | 45.8 | 84.0 |  | 52.0 | 40.0 | 8.0 | --- | 92.0 |  | 8.0 |  |
| 17. $\begin{array}{l}\text { Photographic Film } \\ \text { Flashbulbs }\end{array}$ | 76.2 | 26.5 |  | 34.9 | 55.4 | 8.4 | 1.2 | 90.4 |  | 9.6 |  |

TABLE 1 (FII) REGION: MAN/SASK (6)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES (HFS) II

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency |  | SFIED | DISSATI | FIED |  | SFIED | DISS | SFIED |
|  | Purchased | Frequently | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Aluminum Foil, Food Wrap, Food Storage Containers... | 96.9 | 59.1 |  | 64.5 | 34.4 | 1.1 | -- | 98.9 |  | 1.1 |  |
| 2. Laundry \& DishWashing Detergents/ Soap | 97.9 | 86.2 |  | 59.6 | 37.2 | 3.2 | -- | 96.8 |  | 3.2 |  |
| 3. Bleaches, Bluing, Pre-Soaks, Softener | 89.6 | 62.8 |  | 64.0 | 33.7 | 2.3 | -- | 97.7 |  | 2.3 |  |
| 4. Household Cleaners and Soaps | 95.8 | 65.2 |  | 57.6 | 39.1 | 3.3 | -- | 96.7 |  | 3.3 |  |
| 5. Floor/Furn Wax, Polishes, Rug Shampoo | 84.4 | 32.1 |  | 48.1 | 48.1 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 96.3 |  | 3.7 |  |
| 6. Air Fresheners, DisInfectants, Drain Openers, etc-- | 90.6 | 35.6 |  | 52.9 | 40.2 | 6.9 | -- | 93.1 |  | 6.9 |  |
| 7. Rubber Gloves, Sponges, Mops, Brooms, Brushes | 83.3 | 21.2 |  | 53.7 | 45.0 | -- | 1.2 | 98.7 |  | 1.2 |  |
|  | 96.9 | 91.4 |  | 62.4 | 37.6 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 9. Home Canning \& Freezing Supplies | 51.1 | 32.7 |  | 53.1 | 46.9 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 10. $\quad$ Insect Spray, Rat | 56.2 | 18.5 |  | 50.0 | 44.4 | 5.6 | -- | 94.4 |  | 5.6 |  |
| 11. Plant/Food, Fertilizer Yard/Garden Supplies | 69.8 | 16.4 |  | 53.7 | 43.3 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 97.0 |  | 3.0 |  |
| 12. Light Bulbs, Fuses, Batteries, Extension Cords | S 94.8 | 40.7 |  | 52.7 | 37.4 | 7.7 | 2.2 | 90.1 |  | 9.9 |  |
| 13. Stationary, School Supplies | 90.7 | 46.0 |  | 60.9 | 37.9 | 1.1 | -- | 98.9 |  | 1.1 |  |
| 14. Giftwrap, Holiday Decorations, Cards, Party Supplies | 94.8 | 29.7 |  | 52.7 | 44.0 | 3.3 | -- | 96.7 |  | 3.3 |  |
| 15. Magazines \& Newspapers | 95.9 | 75.0 |  | 54.3 | 42.4 | 3.3 | -- | 96.7 |  | 3.3 |  |
| 16. Tobacco Products, | 59.4 | 82.5 |  | 61.4 | 38.6 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 17. Photographic Film | 81.2 | 28.2 |  | 56.4 | 39.7 | 3.8 | -- | 96.2 |  | 3.8 |  |

table 1 (FII) REGION: alberta (7)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES (HFS) II

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  |
|  | Purchased | Frequently | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. ATuminum Foil, Food Wrap, Food Storage Containers... | 96.2 | 58.4 |  | 63.4 | 34.7 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 98.0 |  | 2.0 |  |
| 2. Laundry \& DishSoap | 100.0 | 86.7 |  | 58.1 | 41.0 | 1.0 | -- | 99.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| 3. Bleaches, Bluing, Pre-Soaks, Softener | 95.2 | 44.0 |  | 62.0 | 35.0 | 3.0 | -- | 97.0 |  | 3.0 |  |
| 4. Household Cleaners and Soaps | 96.2 | 56.4 |  | 54.5 | 45.5 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 5. Floor/Furn Wax, Polishes, Rug Shampoo | 81.9 | 24.4 |  | 48.8 | 48.8 | 2.3 | -- | 97.7 |  | 2.3 |  |
| 6. Air Fresheners, DisInfectants, Drain Openers, etc-- | 93.3 | 27.6 |  | 44.9 | 49.0 | 5.1 | 1.0 | 93.9 |  | 6.1 |  |
| 7. Rubber Gloves, Sponges, Mops, Brooms, Brushes | 85.7 | 20.0 |  | 53.3 | 42.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 95.6 |  | 4.4 |  |
| 8. Toilet Tissue, Facial Tissue, Paper Towels... | 100.0 | 82.9 |  | 68.6 | 31.4 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 9. Home Canning \& Freezing Supplies | 56.2 | 25.4 |  | 66.1 | 33.9 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 10. Insect Spray, Rat Poison, Traps, Mothballs | 40.0 | 14.3 |  | 52.4 | 40.5 | 7.1 | -- | 92.9 |  | 7.1 |  |
| 11. Plant Food, Fertilizer Yard/Garden Supplies | 78.1 | 14.6 |  | 53.7 | 46.3 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 12. Light Bulbs, Fuses, Batteries, Extension Cords | s 93.3 | 20.4 |  | 55.1 | 37.8 | 7.1 | -- | 92.9 |  | 7.1 |  |
| 13. Stationary, School Supplies | 93.2 | 32.7 |  | 67.3 | 30.6 | 2.0 | -- | 98.0 |  | 2.0 |  |
|  | 94.3 | 22.2 |  | 65.3 | 33.7 | 1.0 | -- | 99.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| 15. Magazines \& Newspapers | 91.4 | 59.4 |  | 48.4 | 45.3 | 5.3 | 1.1 | 93.7 |  | 6.4 |  |
| 16. Tobacco Products, Smokers' Supplies | 61.9 | 69.2 |  | 67.7 | 32.3 | 52 | 1 | 100.0 |  | 6, |  |
| 17. Photographic Film Flashbulbs | 81.0 | 17.6 |  | 56.5 | 40.0 | 3.5 | -- | 96.5 |  | 3.5 |  |

TABLE 1 (FII) REGION: VANCOUVER (8)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES (HFS) II

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by |  | \% OF PURCH | ERS |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency |  | SFIED | DISSATI | IED |  | SFIED | DISSA | SFIED |
|  | Purchased | Frequently | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Aluminum Foil, Food Wrap, Food Storage Containers... | 98.4 | ${ }_{5} 53.7$ |  | 55.4 | 39.7 | 5.0 | -- | 95.0 |  | 5.0 |  |
| 2. Laundry \& DishWashing Detergents/ Soap. | 100.0 | 78.0 |  | 46.3 | 53.7 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 3. Bleaches, Bluing, Pre-Soaks, Softener | 86.4 | 50.9 |  | 46.2 | 48.1 | 4.8 | 1.0 | 94.2 |  | 5.8 |  |
| 4. Household Cleaners and Soaps | 95.9 | 55.1 |  | 47.5 | 47.5 | 5.1 | -- | 94.9 |  | 5.1 |  |
| 5. Floor/Furn Wax, Polishes, Rug Shampoo | 87.0 | 23.4 |  | 40.2 | 50.5 | 7.5 | 1.9 | 90.7 |  | 9.4 |  |
| 6. Air Fresheners, DisInfectants, Drain Openers, etc-- | 81.3 | 26.0 |  | 39.0 | 48.0 | 12.0 | 1.0 | 87.0 |  | 13.0 |  |
| 7. Rubber Gloves, Sponges, Mops, Brooms, Brushes | 94.3 | 20.7 |  | 44.0 | 43.1 | 11.2 | 1.7 | 87.1 |  | 12.9 |  |
| 8. Toilet Tissue, Facial Tissue, Paper Towels... | 99.2 | 85.2 |  | 54.9 | 38.5 | 5.7 | 0.8 | 93.4 |  | 6.5 |  |
| 9. Home Canning \& Freezing Supplies | 44.7 | 18.2 |  | 49.1 | 37.3 | 3.6 | -- | 96.4 |  | 3.6 |  |
| 10. Insect Spray, Rat Poison, Traps, Mothbal1s | 30.1 | 10.8 |  | 40.5 | 48.6 | 8.1 | 2.7 | 89.2 |  | 10.8 |  |
| $\qquad$ | 80.5 | 17.2 |  | 40.4 | 54.5 | 5.1 | -- | 94.9 |  | 5.1 |  |
| 12. Light Bulbs, Fuses, | $5 \quad 94.3$ | 22.4 |  | 45.7 | 43.1 | 8.6 | 2.6 | 88.8 |  | 11.2 |  |
| 13. Stationary, School Supplies | 92.7 | 35.1 |  | 53.5 | 43.9 | 2.6 | -- | 97.4 |  | 2.6 |  |
|  | 95.1 | 18.8 |  | 50.9 | 46.6 | 2.6 | -- | 97.4 |  | 2.6 |  |
| 15. Magazines \& Newspapers | 94.3 | 54.7 |  | 35.3 | 48.3 | 15.5 | 0.9 | 83.6 |  | 16.4 |  |
| 16. Tobacco Products, Smokers' Supplies | 45.5 | 71.4 |  | 53.6 | 41.1 | 5.4 | -- | 94.6 |  | 5.4 |  |
| 17. Photographic Film Flashbulbs | 78.0 | 17.7 |  | 46.9 | 47.9 | 2.1 | 3.1 | 94.8 |  | 5.2 |  |

TABLE I (FII) REGION: REST OF B.C. (9)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES (HFS) II

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency |  | SFIED | DISSATIS | FIED | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  |
|  | Purchased | Frequently | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Aluminum Foil, Food Wrap, Food Storage Containers... | 98.8 | 58.5 |  | 63.4 | 34.1 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 97.6 |  | 2.4 |  |
| 2. Laundry \& DishWashing Detergents/ Soap | 100.0 | 89.2 |  | 53.0 | 42.2 | 3.6 | 1.2 | 95.2 |  | 4.8 |  |
| 3. Bleaches, Bluing, Pre-Soaks, Softener | 81.9 | 55.9 |  | 55.9 | 42.6 | 1.5 | -- | 98.5 |  | 1.5 |  |
| 4. Household Cleaners and Soaps | 94.0 | 59.0 |  | 54.5 | 44.2 | 1.3 | -- | 98.7 |  | 1.3 |  |
| 5. Floor/Furn Wax, Polishes, Rug Shampoo | 84.4 | 24.3 |  | 44.9 | 52.2 | 2.9 | -- | 97.1 |  | 2.9 |  |
| 6. Air Fresheners, DisInfectants, Drain Openers, etc-- | 85.5 | 31.0 |  | 33.8 | 56.3 | 8.5 | 1.4 | 90.1 |  | 9.9 |  |
| 7. Rubber Gloves, Sponges, Mops, Brooms, Brushes | 83.1 | 30.4 |  | 43.5 | 53.6 | 2.9 | -- | 97.1 |  | 2.9 |  |
| 8. Toilet Tissue, Facial Tissue, Paper Towels... | 97.6 | 85.2 |  | 53.1 | 44.4 | 2.5 | -- | 97.5 |  | 2.5 |  |
| 9. Home Canning \& Freezing Supplies | 65.1 | 27.8 |  | 42.6 | 44.4 | 11.1 | 1.9 | 87.0 |  | 13.0 |  |
| 10.Insect Spray, Rat <br> Poison, Traps, Mothballs | 47.0 | 12.8 |  | 38.5 | 59.0 | 2.6 | -- | 97.4 |  | 2.6 |  |
| 11. Plant Food, Fertilizer Yard/Garden Supplies | 85.6 | 16.9 |  | 49.3 | 45.1 | 5.6 | -- | 94.4 |  | 5.6 |  |
| 12. Light Bulbs, Fuses, Batteries, Extension Cords | $5 \quad 95.2$ | 25.3 |  | 38.5 | 48.7 | 10.3 | 2.6 | 87.2 |  | 12.9 |  |
| 13. Stationary, School Supplies | 93.9 | 37.2 |  | 63.6 | 36.4 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 14. Giftwrap, Holiday <br> Decorations, Cards,  <br> Party Supplies  | 94.0 | 24.4 |  | 57.1 | 40.3 | 2.6 | -- | 97.4 |  | 2.6 |  |
| 15. Magazines \& Newspapers | 90.3 | 62.7 |  | 42.7 | 36 - | 173 | 4.0 | 78.7 |  | 21.3 |  |
| 16. Tobacco Products, Smokers' Supplies | 45.7 | 81.6 |  | 57.9 | 39.5 | 2.6 | .-- | 97.4 |  | 2.6 |  |
| 17. Photographic Film Flashbulbs | 78.3 | 26.2 |  | 55.4 | 40.0 | 4.6 | -- | 95.4 |  | 4.6 |  |

TABLE 1 (FIII) REGION: ATLANTIC (1)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/OISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: PERSONAL AND HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS (PHC) III

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency |  | SFIED | DISSATI | IED |  | SFIED | DISSA | SFIED |
|  | Purchased | Frequentiy | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Toilet/Bath Soap, Bath 0il, Powder | 98.0 | 77.3 |  | 59.1 | 39.4 | 1.5 | -- | 98.5 |  | 1.5 |  |
| 2. Toothpaste, Dental Supplies, Mouthwash | 99.0 | 83.5 |  | 62.0 | 36.5 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 98.5 |  | 1.5 |  |
| 3. Shampoo, Other Hair- Care Supplies | 96.0 | 67.0 |  | 46.4 | 45.4 | 5.7 | 2.6 | 91.8 |  | 8.3 |  |
| 4. Hair Dyes, Streaking, Colouring Products | 16.8 | 31.4 |  | 38.2 | 52.9 | 8.8 | -- | 91.2 |  | 8.8 |  |
| 5. Deodorants, Antiperspirants | 92.1 | 67.2 |  | 47.8 | 45.7 | 5.9 | 0.5 | 93.5 |  | 6.4 |  |
| 6. Feminine Hygiene Products | 62.4 | 73.0 |  | 57.1 | 41.3 | 1.6 | -- | 98.4 |  | 1.6 |  |
| 7. Shaving Creams, Lathers | 60.4 | 51.6 |  | 57.9 | 41.3 | 0.8 | -- | 99.2 |  | 0.8 |  |
| 8. BTade Razors, Blades, Nail Files, Clippers | 78.7 | 47.8 |  | 55.3 | 40.9 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 96.2 |  | 3.8 |  |
| 9. Hair Brushes, Combs, Nets, Beauty Supplies | 80.2 | 18.5 |  | 55.6 | 43.1 | 1.2 | -- | 98.7 |  | 1.2 |  |
| 10. $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cosmetics, Creams } \\ & \text { Suntan Lotions }\end{aligned}$ | 79.7 | 26.1 |  | 48.4 | 46.0 | 5.6 | -- | 94.4 |  | 5.6 |  |
| 11. First Aid Supplies, Liniment, Ointment | 79.2 | 15.6 |  | 54.4 | 43.8 | 1.9 | -- | 98.1 |  | 1.9 |  |
| 12. $\begin{array}{l}\text { Vitamins, Tonics, } \\ \text { Dietary Suppliments }\end{array}$ | 43.6 | 19.3 |  | 54.5 | 42.0 | 3.4 | -- | 96.6 |  | 3.4 |  |
| 13. Laxatives, Heartburn, Indigestion Remedies | 55.0 | 22.5 |  | 55.9 | 40.5 | 3.6 | -- | 96.4 |  | 3.6 |  |
| 14. Hay Fever, Cold and Cough Remedies | 70.8 | 10.5 |  | 43.4 | 45.5 | 9.8 | 1.4 | 88.8 |  | 11.2 |  |
| 15. Aspirin, Other Nonpre- scription Pain Relievers | 94.1 | 21.6 |  | 54.7 | 42.6 | 2.6 | -- | 97.4 |  | 2.6 |  |
| 16. Eyecare Products | 19.3 | 15.4 |  | 43.6 | 53.8 | -- | 2.6 | 97.4 |  | 2.6 |  |
| 17. Babycare Products | 16.8 | 61.8 |  | 50.0 | 44.1 | 5.9 | -- | 94.1 |  | 5.9 |  |
| 18. Family Planning Products (nonprescription) | 7.9 | 31.3 |  | 50.0 | 43.8 | - | 6.3 | 93.8 |  | 6.3 |  |
| 19. Thermometers, Enemas, Other Medical Supplies | 18.8 | 7.9 |  | 60.5 | 36.8 | 2.6 | -- | 97.4 |  | 2.6 |  |
| 20. Prescription Drugs \& Medical Supplies | 87.6 | 32.8 | . | 53.1 | 42.9 | 2.8 | 1.1 | 96.0 |  | 4.0 |  |

TABLE 1 (FIII) REGION: MONTREAL (2).
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: PERSONAL AND HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS (PHC) III

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of RespondentshavingPurchased | $\qquad$ | Rank by Frequency Rating | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  | SATISFIED |  | $\begin{array}{lr} \hline \text { DISSATISFIED } \\ \hline \text { Total } & \text { Rank } \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank |  |  |
| 1. Toilet/Bath Soap, Bath Oil, Powder | 99.1 | 78.3 |  | 56.6 | 38.7 | 1.9 | 2.8 | 95.3 |  | 4.7 |  |
| 2. Toothpaste, Dental Supplies, Mouthwash | 99.1 | 80.2 |  | 55.7 | 40.6 | 0.9 | 2.8 | 96.2 |  | 3.7 |  |
| 3. Shampoo, Other HairCare Supplies | 97.2 | 68.3 |  | 46.2 | 41.3 | 6.7 | 5.8 | 87.5 |  | 12.5 |  |
| 4. Hair Dyes, Streaking, Colouring Products | 31.8 | 35.3 |  | 41.2 | 44.1 | 8.8 | 5.9 | 85.3 |  | 14.7 |  |
| 5. Deodorants, Antiperspirants | 90.7 | 58.8 |  | 51.5 | 37.1 | 6.2 | 5.2 | 88.7 |  | 11.4 |  |
| 6. Feminine Hygiene Products | 72.9 | 76.9 |  | 53.8 | 44.9 | -- | 1.3 | 98.7 |  | 1.3 |  |
| 7. Shaving Creams, Lathers | 55.1 | 55-9 |  | 55.9 | 42.4 | -- | 1.7 | 98.3 |  | 17 |  |
| 8. Blade Razors, Blades, Nail Files, Clippers | 77.6 | 45.8 |  | 44.6 | 50.6 | 3.6 | 1.2 | 95.2 |  | 4.8 |  |
| .9. Hair Brushes, Combs, Nets, Beauty Supplies | 69.2 | 23.0 |  | 47.3 | 51.4 | 1.4 | -- | 98.6 |  | 1.4 |  |
| 10. Cosmetics, Creams Suntan Lotions | 79.4 | 35.3 |  | 48.2 | 45.9 | 4.7 | 1.2 | 94.1 |  | 5.9 |  |
| 11. First Aid Supplies, Liniment, Dintment | 79.4 | 20.0 |  | 51.8 | 44.7 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 96.5 |  | 3.6 |  |
| 12. Vitamins, Tonics, Dietary Suppliments | 40.2 | 25.6 |  | 51.2 | 46.5 | -- | 2.3 | 97.7 |  | 2.3 |  |
| 13. Laxatives, Heartburn, Indigestion Remedies | 50.5 | 11.1 |  | 48.1 | 48.1 | 3.7 | -- | 96.3 |  | 3.7 |  |
| 14. Hay Fever, Cold and Cough Remedies | 85.0 | 12.1 |  | 39.6 | 47.3 | 8.8 | 4.4 | 86.8 |  | 13.2 |  |
| 15. Aspirin, Other Nonprescription Pain Relievers | 83.2 | 12.4 |  | 50.6 | 44.9 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 95.5 |  | 4.4 |  |
| 16. Eyecare Products | 19.6 | 42.9 |  | 57.1 | 42.9 | - |  | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| 17. Babycare Products | 14.0 | 73.3 |  | 46.7 | 53.3 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| 18. Family Planning Products (nonprescription) | 8.4 | 22.2 |  | 55.6 | 33.3 | 11.1 | -- | 88.9 |  | 11.1 |  |
| 19. Thermometers, Enemas, Other Medical Supplies | 77.6 | 26.5 |  | 47.0 | 49.4 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 96.4 |  | 3.6 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 1 (FIII) REGION: REST OF QUEBEC (3)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: PERSONAL AND HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS (PHC) III

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency |  | SFIED | DISSATIS | IED |  | SFIED | DISS | SFIED |
|  | Purchased | Frequently | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Toilet/Bath Soap, Bath Oil, Powder | 98.2 | 73.8 |  | 45.8 | 52.3 | 1.9 | -- | 98.1 |  | 1.9 |  |
| 2. Toothpaste, Dental Supplies, Mouthwash | 99.1 | 77.8 |  | 50.9 | 47.2 | 1.9 | -- | 98.1 |  | 1.9 |  |
| 3. Shampoo, Other Hair- Care Supplies | 94.5 | 65.0 |  | 42.7 | 50.5 | 4.9 | 1.9 | 93.2 |  | 6.8 |  |
| 4. Hair Dyes, Streaking, Colouring Products | 34.9 | 31.6 |  | 55.3 | 36.8 | 7.9 | -- | 92.1 |  | 7.9 |  |
| 5. Deodorants, Antiperspirants | 84.4 | 48.9 |  | 46.2 | 44.0 | 8.8 | 1.1 | 90.1 |  | 9.9 |  |
| 6. Feminine Hygiene Products | 68.8 | 72.0 |  | 52.0 | 46.7 | -- | 1.3 | 98.7 |  | 1.3 |  |
| 7. Shaving Creams, Lathers | 52.3 | 33.3 |  | 56.1 | 42.1 | -- | 1.8 | 98.2 |  | 1.8 |  |
| 8. Blade Razors, Blades, Nail Files, Clippers | 81.7 | 37.1 |  | 50.6 | 47.2 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 97.8 |  | 2.2 |  |
| 9. Hair Brushes, Combs, Nets, Beauty Supplies | 86.2 | 20.2 |  | 50.0 | 47.9 | 2.1 | -- | 97.9 |  | 2.1 |  |
| 10. Cosmetics, Creams Suntan Lotions | 82.6 | 25.6 |  | 43.3 | 52.2 | 4.4 | -- | 95.6 |  | 4.4 |  |
| 11. First Aid Supplies, Liniment, Ointment | 92.7 | 16.8 |  | 47.5 | 51.5 | 1.0 | -- | 99.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
|  | 49.5 | 25.9 |  | 42.6 | 50.0 | 5.6 | 1.9 | 92.6 |  | 7.5 |  |
| 13. Laxatives, Heartburn, Indigestion Remedies | 58.7 | 12.5 |  | 48.4 | 45.3 | 6.3 | -- | 93.8 |  | 6.3 |  |
| 14. Hay Fever, Cold and Cough Remedies | 87.2 | 17.9 |  | 42.1 | 54.7 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 96.8 |  | 3.2 |  |
| 15. Aspirin, Other Nonprescription Pain Relievers | 89.0 | 25.8 |  | 46.9 | 52.1 | -- | 1.0 | 99.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| 16. Eyecare Products | 22.0 | 25.0 |  | 50.0 | 45.8 | 4.2 | - | 95.8 |  | 4.2 |  |
| 17. Babycare Products | 25.7 | 46.4 |  | 44.4 | 55.6 | , | $=$ | 100.0 |  | , |  |
| 18. Family Planning Products (nonprescription) | 8.3 |  |  | 66.7 | 33.3 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 19. Thermometers, Enemas, Other Medical Supplies | 23.8 | 3.8 |  | 53.8 | 42.3 | 3.8 | -- | 96.2 |  | 3.8 |  |
|  <br> Medical Supplies | 84.4 | 35.9 |  | 47.8 | 50.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 97.8 |  | 2.2 |  |

TABLE 1 (FIII)
REGION: TORONTO (4)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: PERSONAL AND HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS (PHC) III

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency |  | SFIED | DISSATIS | FIED |  | SFIED | DISS | SFIED |
|  | Purchased | Frequently | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat. | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Toilet/Bath Soap, Bath Oil, Powder | 100.0 | 75.5 |  | 67.0 | 31.1 | 1.9 | -- | 98.1 |  | 1.9 |  |
| 2. Toothpaste, Dental Supplies, Mouthwash | 99.1 | 80.0 |  | 71.4 | 26.7 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 98.1 |  | 2.0 |  |
| 3. Shampoo, Other Hair- Care Supplies | 95.3 | 77.? |  | 60.4 | 37.6 | 2.0 | -- | 98.0 |  | 2.0 |  |
| 4. Hair Dyes, Streaking, Colouring Products | 20.7 | 22.7 |  | 45.5 | 45.5 | 9.1 | -- | 91.0 |  | 9.1 |  |
| 5. Deodorants, Antiperspirants | 92.5 | 62.2 |  | 59.2 | 37.8 | 3.1 | -- | 96.9 |  | 3.1 |  |
| 6. Feminine Hygiene Products | 68.9 | 76.7 |  | 63.0 | 35.6 | 1.4 | -- | 98.6 |  | 1.4 |  |
| 7. Shaving Creams, Lathers | 68.0 | 62.5 |  | 70.8 | 26.4 | 2.8 | -- | 97.2 |  | 2.8 |  |
| 8. Blade Razors, Blades, Nail Files, Clippers | 84.9 | 43.3 |  | 64.4 | 32.2 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 96.7 |  | 3.3 |  |
| 9. Hair Brushes, Combs, Nets, Beauty Supplies | 80.2 | 17.6 |  | 58.8 | 38.8 | 2.4 | -- | 97.6 |  | 2.4 |  |
| 10. Cosmetics, Creams Suntan Lotions | 90.6 | 31.3 |  | 58.3 | 40.6 | 1.0 | -- | 99.0 |  | 1.0 |  |
| 11. First Aid Supplies, | 85.9 | 14.3 |  | 60.4 | 38.5 | 1.1 | -- | 98.9 |  | 1.1 |  |
| 12. Vitamins, Tonics, Dietary Suppliments | 66.1 | - 25.7 |  | 65.7 | 31.4 | 2.9 | -- | 97.1 |  | 2.9 |  |
| 13. Laxatives, Heartburn, Indigestion Remedies | 53.8 | 21.1 |  | 57.9 | 38.6 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 96.5 |  | 3.6 |  |
| 14. Hay Fever, Cold and Cough Remedies | 66.9 | 14.1 |  | 50.7 | 42.3 | 5.6 | 1.4 | 93.0 |  | 7.0 |  |
| 15. Aspirin, Other Nonprescription Pain Relievers | 93.4 | 24.2 |  | 60.6 | 37.4 | 2.0 | -- | 98.0 |  | 2.0 |  |
| 16. Eyecare Products | 15.1 | 18.8 |  | 625 | 31.3 | 6.3 | - | 03.8 |  | 6.3 |  |
| 17. Babycare Products | 29.2 | 54.8 |  | 74.2 | 22.6 | 3.2 | -- | 96.8 |  | 3.2 |  |
| 18. Family Planning Products (nomprescription) | 17.0 | 22.2 |  | 88.9 | 11.1 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 19. Thermometers, Enemas, Other Medical Supplies | 32.1 | 11.8 |  | 58.8 | 32.4 | 5.9 | 2.9 | 91.2 |  | 8.8 |  |
| 20. Prescription Drugs \& Medical Supplies | 91.5 | 24.7 |  | 63.9 | 33.0 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 66.9 |  | 3.1 |  |



TABLE 1 (FIII)
REGION:
MAN/SASK (6)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: PERSONAL AND HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS (PHC) III

| CATEG0RY | PIURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency |  | SFIED | DISSATI | FIED |  | SFIED | DISSA | SFIED |
|  | Purchased | Frequently | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Toilet/Bath Soap, Bath 0il, Powder | 97.9 | 74.5 |  | 54.3 | 40.4 | 4.3 | 1.1 | 94.7 |  | 5.4 |  |
| 2. Toothpaste, Dental Supplies, Mouthwash | 98.9 | 78.9 |  | 62.1 | 35.8 | 2.1 | -- | 97.9 |  | 2.1 |  |
| 3. Shampoo, Other Hair- Care Supplies | 92.7 | 77.5 |  | 50.6 | 47.2 | 2.2 | -- | 97.8 |  | 2.2 |  |
| 4. Hair Dyes, Streaking, Colouring Products | 21.9 | 28.6 |  | 52.4 | 38.1 | 9.5 | -- | 90.5 |  | 9.5 |  |
| 5. Deodorants, Antiperspirants | 92.7 | 75.3 |  | 52.8 | 38.2 | 9.0 | -- | 91.0 |  | 9.0 |  |
| 6. Feminine Hygiene Products | 66.7 | 81.3 |  | 64.1 | 34.4 | 1.6 | -- | 98.4 |  | 1.6 |  |
| 7. Shaving Creams, Lathers | 50.0 | 50.0 |  | 52.1 | 45.8 | 2.1 | -- | 97.9 |  | 21 |  |
| 8. Blade Razors, Blades, Nail Files, Clippers | 74.0 | 33.8 |  | 52.1 | 47.9 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 9. Hair Brushes, Combs, Nets, Beauty Supplies | 84.4 | 28.4 |  | 51.9 | 48.1 | -- | -- | 100.0 | - | -- |  |
| 10. Cosmetics, Creams Suntan Lotions | 90.7 | 32.2 |  | 47.1 | 50.6 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 97.7 |  | 2.2 |  |
| 11. First Aid Supplies, Liniment, Ointment | 82.3 | 22.8 |  | 57.0 | 43.0 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
|  | 60.4 | 29.3 |  | 50.0 | 44.8 | 5.2 | -- | 94.8 |  | 5.2 |  |
| 13. Laxatives, Heartburn, Indigestion Remedies | 53.1 | 23.5 |  | 56.9 | 41.2 | 2.0 | -- | 98.0 |  | 2.0 |  |
| 14. Hay Fever, Cold and Cough Remedies | 77.0 | 17.6 |  | 42.5 | 46.6 | 11.0 | -- | 89.0 |  | 11.0 |  |
| 15. Aspirin, Other Nonprescription Pain Relievers | 85.4 | 26.8 |  | 51.2 | 43.9 | 4.9 | -- | 95.1 |  | 4.9 |  |
| 16. Eyecare Products | 20.9 | 30.0 |  | 50.0 | 45.0 | 5.0 | -- | 95.0 |  | 5.0 |  |
| 17. Babycare Products | 21.8 | 38.1 |  | 52.4 | 47.6 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | - |  |
| 18. Family Planning Products (nonprescription) | 13.6 | 53.8 |  | 46.2 | 53.8 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 19. Thermometers, Enemas, Other Medical Supplies | 19.8 | 10.5 |  | 68.4 | 31.6 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 20. Prescription Drugs \& Medical Supplies | 88.6 | 32.9 |  | 57.6 | 41.2 | 1.2 | -- | 98.8 |  | 1.2 |  |

TABLE 1 (FIII)
REGION:
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING

## SECTION: PERSONAL AND HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS (PHC) III

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency |  | SFIED | DISSATI | IED |  | SFIED | DISSA | SFIED |
|  | Purchased | Frequently | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Toilet/Bath Soap, Bath 0il; Powder | 99.0 | 64.4 |  | 50.0 | 48.1 | 1.9 | -- | 98.1 |  | 1.9 |  |
| 2. Toothpaste, Dental Supplies, Mouthwash | 98.1 | 72.8 |  | 63.4 | 36.6 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 3. Shampoo, Other HairCare Supplies | 96.2 | 65.3 |  | 49.5 | 44.6 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 94.1 |  | 6.0 |  |
| 4. Hair Dyes, Streaking, Colouring Products | 25.7 | 44.4 |  | 44.4 | 48.1 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 92.6 |  | 7.4 |  |
| 5. Deodorants, Antiperspirants | 87.6 | 57.6 |  | 54.3 | 44.6 | 1.1 | $\because$ | 98.9 |  | 1.1 |  |
| 6. Feminine Hygiene | 64.7 | 73.5 |  | 62.7 | 37.3 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 7. Shaving Creams, Lathers | 61.0 | 40.6 |  | 62.5 | 37.5 | -- | - | 100.0 |  | - |  |
| 8. Blade Razors, Blades, Nail Files, Clippers | 78.1 | 31.7 |  | 62.2 | 36.6 | 1.2 | -- | 98.8 |  | 1.2 |  |
| 9. Hair Brushes, Combs, Nets, Beauty Supplies | 79.1 | 15.7 |  | 61.0 | 37.8 | 1.2 | -- | 98.8 |  | 1.2 |  |
| 10. Cosmetics, Creams Suntan Lotions | 88.6 | 25.8 |  | 46.2 | 49.5 | 4.3 | -- | 95.7 |  | 4.3 |  |
| 11. First Aid Supplies, Liniment, Ointment | 78.1 | 13.4 |  | 59.8 | 39.0 | 1.2 | -- | 98.8 |  | 1.2 |  |
| 12. Vitamins, Tonics, Dietary Suppliments | 64.8 | 25.0 |  | 51.5 | 47.1 | 1.5 | -- | 98.5 |  | 1.5 |  |
| 13. Laxatives, Heartburn, <br> Indigestion Remedies | 54.3 | 19.3 |  | 52.6 | 43.9 | 3.5 | -- | 96.5 |  | 3.5 |  |
| 14. Hay Fever, Cold and Cough Remedies | 68.6 | 23.6 |  | 40.3 | 48.6 | 9.7 | 1.4 | 88.9 |  | 11.1 |  |
| 15. Aspirin, Other Nonpre- scription Pain Relievers | 79.6 | 23.4 |  | 55.3 | 42.6 | 2.1 | -- | 97.9 |  | 2.1 |  |
| 16. Eyecare Products | 19.0 | 30.0 |  | 60.0 | 25.0 | 15.0 | -- | 85.0 |  | 15.0 |  |
| 17. Babycare Products | 16.2 | 47.1 |  | 58.8 | 31.2 | $=$ | -- | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| 18. Family Planning Products $\qquad$ | 9.6 | 30.0 |  | 50.0 | 50.0 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 19. Thermometers, Enemas, Other Medical Supplies | 19.1 | 15.0 |  | 65.0 | 35.0 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
|  <br> Medical Supplies | 86.7 | 25.3 |  | 60.0 | 38.9 | 1.1 | -- | 98.9 |  | 1.1 |  |

TABLE 1 (FIII) REGION: VANCOUVER (8)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING SECTION: PERSONAL AND HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS (PHC) III

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency |  | SFIED | DISSATI | FIED |  | SFIED | DISSA | SFIED |
|  | Purchased | Frequently | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Toilet/Bath Soap, Bath 0i1, Powder | 99.2 | 73.0 |  | 52.5 | 45.9 | 1.6 | -- | 98.4 |  | 1.6 |  |
| 2. Toothpaste, Dental Supplies, Mouthwash | 100.0 | 78.9 |  | 55.3 | 42.3 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 97.6 |  | 2.4 |  |
| 3. Shampoo, Other Hair- Care Supplies | 94.3 | 68.1 |  | 44.0 | 46.6 | 7.8 | 1.7 | 90.5 |  | 9.5 |  |
| 4. Hair Dyes, Streaking, Colouring Products | 17.1 | 23.8 |  | 30.0 | 60.0 | 10.0 | -- | 90.0 |  | 10.0 |  |
| 5. Deodorants, Antiperspirants | 86.2 | 44.3 |  | 34.0 | 50.9 | 10.4 | 4.7 | 84.9 |  | 15.1 |  |
| 6. $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feminine } \\ & \text { Products }\end{aligned}$ | 69.1 | 63.5 |  | 48.2 | 43.5 | 4.7 | 3.5 | 91.8 |  | 8.2 |  |
| 7. Shaving Creams, Lathers | 49.6 | 41.0 |  | 62.3 | 34.4 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 96.7 |  | 3.2 |  |
| 8. Blade Razors, BTades, Nail Files, Clippers | 69.9 | 34.9 |  | 57.0 | 39.5 | 3.5 | -- | 96.5 |  | 3.5 |  |
| 9. Hair Brushes, Combs, Nets, Beauty Supplies | 73.9 | 19.8 | : | 51.6 | 42.9 | 4.4 | 1.1 | 94.5 |  | 5.5 |  |
| 10. Cosmetics, Creams Suntan Lotions | 81.3 | 28.0 |  | 40.0 | 53.0 | 7.0 | -- | 93.0 |  | 7.0 |  |
| 11. First Aid Supplies, Liniment, Dintment | 73.2 | 10.0 |  | 47.8 | 48.9 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 96.7 |  | 3.3 |  |
| 12. $\quad \begin{array}{l}\text { Vitamins, Tonics, } \\ \text { Dietary Suppliments }\end{array}$ | 59.3 | 24.7 |  | 46.6 | 46.6 | 5.5 | 1.4 | 93.2 |  | 6.9 |  |
| 13. Laxatives, Heartburn, Indigestion Remedies | 43.9 | 11.1 |  | 40.7 | 53.7 | 5.6 | -- | 94.4 |  | 5.6 |  |
| 14. Hay Fever, Cold and Cough Remedies | 63.4 | 20.5 |  | 26.9 | 51.3 | 16.7 | 5.1 | 78.2 |  | 21.8. |  |
| 15. Aspirin, Other Nonpre- scription Pain Relievers | 82.1 | 17.8 |  | 45.5 | 51.5 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 97.0 |  | 3.0 |  |
| 16. Eyecare Products | 19.5 | 29.2 |  | 41.7 | 50.0 | 8.3 | -- | 91.7 |  | 8.3 |  |
| 17. Babycare Products | 22.0 | 51.9 |  | 33.3 | 48.1 | 14.8 | 3.7 | 81.5 |  | 18.5 |  |
| 18. Family Planning Products (nonprescription) | 13.0 | 12.5 |  | 31.3 | 50.0 | 12.5 | 6.3 | 81.3 |  | 18.8 |  |
| 19. Thermometers, Enemas, Other Medical Supplies | 22.8 | 3.6 |  | 50.0 | 50.0 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
|  <br> Medical Supplies | 90.2 | 29.7 |  | 50.0 | 41.1 | 7.1 | 1.8 | 91.1 |  | 8.9 |  |

TABLE I (FIII)
REGION: REST OF B.C.(9)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: PERSONAL AND HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS (PHC) III

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE. | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% of PurchasersbuyingFrequently | Rank by Frequency Rating | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | \% of RespondentshavingPurchased |  |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  | $\xrightarrow[\text { Total }]{\text { SATISFIED }}$ Rank |  | DISSATISFIED |  |
|  |  |  |  | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite |  |  | Total | Rank |
| 1. Toilet/Bath Soap, Bath 0il, Powder | 98.8 | 74.4 |  | 52.4 | 47.6 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| 2. Toothpaste, Denta1 Supplies, Mouthwash | 96.4 | 83.7 |  | 62.5 | 32.5 | 3.7 | 1.2 | 95.0 |  | 4.9 |  |
| 3. Shampoo, Other HairCare Supplies | 95.2 | 73.4 |  | 46.8 | 41.8 | 11.4 | -- | 88.6 |  | 11.4 |  |
| 4. Hair Dyes, Streaking, Colouring Products | 28.9 | 20.8 |  | 50.0 | 50.0 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 5. Deodorants, Antiperspirants | 95.2 | 72.2 |  | 48.1 | 41.8 | 10.1 | -- | 89.9 |  | 10.1 |  |
| 6. Feminine Hygiene Products | 62.7 | 71.2 |  | 67.3 | 30.8 | 1.9 | -- | 98.1 |  | 1.9 |  |
| 7. Shaving Creams, Lathers | 53.0 | 61.4 |  | 56.8 | 43.2 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 8. Blade Razors, Blades, Nail Files, Clippers | 77.1 | 34.4 |  | 51.6 | 45.4 | 3.1 | -- | 96.9 |  | 3.1 |  |
| 9. Hair Brushes, Combs, Nets, Beauty Supplies | 77.1 | 23.4 |  | 46.9 | 51.6 | 1.6 | -- | 98.4 |  | 1.6 |  |
| 10. Cosmetics, Creams Suntan Lotions | 90.3 | 32.0 |  | 48.0 | 46.7 | 5.3 | -- | 94.7 |  | 5.3 |  |
| 11. First Aid Supplies, Liniment, Ointment | 80.8 | 17.9 |  | 43.3 | 55.2 | 1.5 | -- | 98.5 |  | 1.5 |  |
| 12. $\quad$ Vitamins, Tonics, Dietary Suppliments | 71.1 | 32.2 |  | 47.5 | 52.5 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 13. Laxatives, Heartburn, Indigestion Remedies | 57.8 | 20.8 |  | 39.6 | 58.3 | 2.1 | -- | 97.9 |  | 2.1 |  |
| 14. Hay Fever, Cold and Cough Remedies | 75.9 | 22.2 |  | 39.7 | 50.8 | 9.5 | -- | 90.5 |  | 9.5 |  |
| 15. Aspirin, Other Nonprescription Pain Relievers | 86.8 | 20.8 |  | 53.5 | 42.3 | 2.8 | 1.4 | 95.8 |  | 4.2 |  |
| 16. Eyecare Products | 18.1 | 6.7 |  | 80.0 | 20.0 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 17. Babycare Products | 9.6 | 50.0 |  | 75.0 | 12.5 | 12.5 | -- | 87.5 |  | 12.5 |  |
| 18. $\begin{aligned} & \text { Family Planning Products } \\ & \text { (nonprescription) }\end{aligned}$ | 7.2 | 28.6 |  | 66.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 | -- | 83.3 |  | 16.7 |  |
| 19. Thermometers, Enemas, Other Medical Supplies | 19.3 | 6.3 |  | 50.0 | 50.0 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 20. $\begin{array}{c}\text { Prescription Drugs \& } \\ \text { Medical Supplies }\end{array}$ | 92.8 | 28.6 |  | 50.6 | 42.9 | 3.9 | 2.6 | 93.5 |  | 6.5 |  |

TABLE 1 (FIV) REGION: ATLANTIC (1)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING
PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING
SECTION: CLOTHES, SHOES AND ACCESSORIES (CSA) IV

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | $\frac{\text { TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION }}{\% \text { OF PURCHASERS }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents having Purchased | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of Purchasers } \\ \text { buying } \\ \text { Frequently } \end{gathered}$ | Rank by Frequency Rating | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | SFIED | DISSATIS | FIED | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  |
|  |  |  |  | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Mens ' Clothes | 82.7 | 1 |  |  | 49.7 | 8.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Mens' Shoes and Boots | 75.2 | 9.9 |  | 39.5 | 52.0 | 7.2 | 1.3 | 91.4 |  | 8.5 |  |
| 3. Womens Clothes | 93.1 | 35.1 |  | 39.4 | 50.0 | 9.6 | 1.1 | 89.4 |  | 10.7 |  |
| 4. Womens' Shoes and Boots | 88.1 | 15.7 |  | 45.2 | 45.8 | 8.5 | 0.6 | 91.0 |  | 9.1 |  |
| 5. Mens/Womens Fur Coats Hats. . | 7.9 | 6.3 |  | 43.8 | 50.0 | 6.3 | -- | 93.8 |  | 6.3 |  |
| 6. Mens/Womens Hats, Gloves Belts, Ties, etc. | 67.3 | 6.6 |  | 42.6 | 55.1 | 2.2 | - | 97.8 |  | 22 |  |
| 7. Childrens ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Clothes | 57.9 | 39.3 |  | 41.0 | 46.2 | 11.1 | 1.7 | 87.2 |  | 128 |  |
| 8. Childrens Shoes and Boots | 52.5 | 35.8 |  | 38.7 | 48.1 | 11.3 | 1.9 | 86.8 |  | 13.2 |  |
| 9. Infants Clothes | 16.8 | 44.1 |  | 61.8 | 35.3 | 2.9 | -- | 97.1 |  | 29 |  |
| 10. Beachwear | 37.6 | 6.6 |  | 36.8 | 52.2 | 3.9 | -- | 96.1 |  | 3.9 |  |
| 11. Workclothes, Uniforms | 33.1 | 18.8 |  | 43.3 | 52.2 | 4.5 | - | 95.5 |  | 4.5 |  |
| 12. Rainwear, Umbrelias | 29.7 | 5.0 |  | 41.7 | 55.0 | 3.3 |  | 967 |  | 3.3 |  |
| 13. Jewelry, Watches, Optical Frames | 62.9 | 7.1 |  | 48.8 | 46.5 | 4.7 |  | 953 |  | 4.7 |  |
| 14. Fabrics, Patterns, Sewing Supplies | 48.0 | 33.0 |  | 49.5 | 50.5 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |

TABLE $I$ (FIV)
REGION: MONTREAL (2)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING

## SECTION: CLOTHES, SHOES AND ACCESSORIES (CSA) IV

| CATEGORY |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

TABLE 1 (FIV) REGION: REST OF QUEBEC (3)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING

## SECTION: CLOTHES, SHOES AND ACCESSORIES (CSA) IV

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency |  | SFIED | DISSATI | IED |  | SFIED | DISSA | SFIED |
|  | Purchased | Frequently | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Tota 1 | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Mens' Clothes | 85.4 | 29.0 |  | 37.6 | 57.0 | 4.3 | 11 | 94.6 |  | 5.4 |  |
| 2. Mens ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Shoes and Boots | 78.0 | 18.8 |  | 39.3 | 58.3 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 97.6 |  | 2.4 |  |
| 3. Womens ${ }^{1}$ Clothes | 70.8 | 34.3 |  | 38.4 | 55.6 | 5.1 | $1-2$ | 93.9 |  | 6.1 |  |
| 4. Homens ${ }^{\text {² }}$ Shoes and Boots | 97.2 | 22.1 |  | 43.2 | 54.7 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 070 |  | 2.2 |  |
| 5. Mens/Womens Fur Coats Hats. . | 18.3 | 10.0. |  | 70.0 | 30-0 |  |  | 100 |  | 2.2 |  |
| 6. Mens/Womens Hats, Gloves Belts, Ties, etc. | . 64.2 | 11.4 |  | 51.4 | 45.7 | 2.9 | - | 97.1 |  | 2.9 |  |
| 7. Childrens ${ }^{\text {I }}$ Clothes | .68.8 | 38.7 |  | 44.0 | 52.0 | 4.0 | $=$ | 96.0 |  | 4.0 |  |
| 8. Childrens' Shoes and Boots | 49.6 | 48.1 |  | 48.1 | 48.1 | 3.7 | - | 96.3 |  | 3.7 |  |
| 9. Infants Clothes | 20.2 | 40.9 |  | 40.9 | 59.1 | $\cdots$ | -- | 100.0 |  | 3 |  |
| 10. Beachwear | 49.5 | 13.0 |  | 38.9 | 57.4 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 96.3 |  | 3.8 |  |
| 11. Workclothes, Uniforms | 28.4 | 25.8 |  | 41.9 | 48.4 | 9.7 | -- | 90.3 |  | 9.7 |  |
| 12. Rainwear, Umbrellas | 40.3 | 2.3 |  | 4.3 .2 | 52.3 | 4.5 | -- | 95.5 |  | 4.5 |  |
| 13. Jewelry, Watches, Optical Frames | 59.7 | 6.2 |  | 38.5 | 53.8 | 7.7 | -- | 92.3 |  | 7.7 |  |
| 14. Fabrics, Patterns, Sewing Supplies | 62.4 | 39.7 |  | 39.7 | 58.8 | 1.5 | -- | 98.5 |  | 1.5 |  |

TABLE I (FIV)
REGION: TORONTO (4)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING SECTION: CLOTHES, SHOES AND ACCESSORIES (CSA) IV

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency |  | SFIED | DISSATIS | FIED |  | FIED | DISSA | SFIED |
|  | Purchased | Frequent 1 y | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Tota 7 | Rank |
| 1. Mens ' Clothes | 86.8 | 13.0 |  | 41.9 | 51.6 | 6.5 |  | \%3. |  | 6.5 |  |
| 2. Mens' Shoes and Boots | 72.7 | 7.8 |  | 48.7 | 47.4 | 3.9 | -- | 96.1 |  | 3.9 |  |
| 3. Womens' Clothes | 87.7 | 33.3 |  | 43.0 | 49.5 | 7.5 | -- | 92.5 |  | 7.5 |  |
| 4. Womens Shoes and Boots | 88.6 | 18.1 |  | 37.2 | 54,3 | 8.5 | - | 91.5 |  | 8.5 |  |
| 5. Mens/Womens Fur Coats Hats.. | 14.2 | 13.3 |  | 66.7 | 33.3 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 6. Mens/Womens Hats, Gloves Belts, Ties, etc. | 81.1 | 10.5 |  | 45.3 | 51.2 | 3.5 | -- | 96.5 |  | 3.5 |  |
| 7. Childrens Clothes | 52.4 | 39.7 |  | 36.5 | 60.3 | 3.2 | - | 96.8 |  | $=$ |  |
| 8. Childrens Shoes and Boots | 53.8 | 43.9 |  | 36.8 | 45.6 | 15.8 | 1.8 | 82.5 |  | 17.6 |  |
| 9. Infants ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Clothes | 25.5 | 48.1 |  | 51.9 | 30.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 92.6 |  | 7.4 |  |
| 10. Beachwear | 46.2 | 10.2 |  | 51.0 | 46.9 | 2.0 | -- | 98.0 |  | 2.0 |  |
| 11. Workclothes, Uniforms | 22.6 | 29.2 |  | 50.0 | 45.8 | 4.2 | - | 95.8 |  | 4.2 |  |
| 12. Rainwear, Umbrellas | 43.4 | 6.5 |  | 52.2 | 41.3 | 6.5 | - | 23.5 |  | 6.5 |  |
| 13. JeweTry, Watches, Optical Frames | 55.6 | 5.1 |  | 39.0 | 57.6 | 3.4 | $=$ | 96.6 |  | 3.4 |  |
| 14. Fabrics, Patterns, Sewing Supplies | 54.7 | 20.7 |  | 37.9 | 55.2 | 5.2 | 1.7 | 93.1 |  | 6.9 |  |

TABLE 1 (FIV)
REGION: REST OF ONTARIO
(5)

CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING SECTION: CLOTHES, SHOES AND ACCESSORIES (CSA) IV

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents having Purchased | $\%$ of PurchasersbuyingFrequently |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | SFIED | DISSATI | IED |  | SFIED | DISSA | SFIED |
|  |  |  |  | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Mens ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Clothes | 76.1 | 28.9 |  | 28.9 | 55.4 | 13.3 | 2.4 | 84.3 |  | 15.7 |  |
| 2. Mens ${ }^{\text {S }}$ Shoes and Boots | 67.0 | 23.3 |  | 21.9 | 67.1 | 11.0 | -- | 89.0 |  | 11.0 |  |
| 3. Womens ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Clothes | 90.8 | 40.4 |  | 24.2 | 55.6 | 17.2 | 3.0 | 79.8 |  | 20.2 |  |
| 4. Homens' Shoes and Boots | 85.4 | 29.0 |  | 24.7 | 55.9 | 15.1 | 4.3 | 80.6 |  | 19.4 |  |
| 5. Mens/Womens Fur Coats Hats. . | 10.1 | 18.2 |  | 45.5 | 45.5 | 9.1 | -- | 90.9 |  | 9.1 |  |
| 6. Mens/Womens Hats, Gloves Belts, Ties, etc. | . 73.4 | 11.2 |  | 32.5 | 58.7 | 8.7 | -- | 91.2 |  | 8.7 |  |
| 7. Childrens' Clothes | 54.2 | 55.9 |  | 16.9 | 49,2 | 25.4 | 8.5 | 66.1 |  | 33.9 |  |
| 8. Childrens ${ }^{\top}$ Shoes and Boots | 45.8 | 50.0 |  | 14.0 | 66.0 | 18.0 | 2.0 | 80.0 |  | 20.0 |  |
| 9. Infants ${ }^{\text {1 }}$ Clothes | 11.0 | 50.0 |  | 8.3 | 83.3 | 8.3 | -- | 91.6 |  | 8.3 |  |
| 10. Beachwear | 39.4 | 18.6 |  | 27.9 | 55.8 | 14.0 | 2.3 | 83.7 | - | 16.3 |  |
| 11. Workclothes, Uniforms | 25.6 | 28.6 |  | 35.7 | 57. 1 | 7.1 | -- | 92.9 |  | 7.1 |  |
| 12. Rainwear, Umbrellas | 43.1 | 10.6 |  | 23.4 | 70.2 | 4.3 | 2.1 | 93.6 |  | 6.4 |  |
| 13. Jewelry, Watches, Optical Frames | 67.0 | 9.6 |  | 27.4 | 60.3 | 8.2 | 4.1 | 87.7 |  | 12.3 |  |
| 14. Fabrics, Patterns, Sewing Supplies | 55.0 | 51.7 |  | 43.3 | 51.7 | 5,0 | -- | 95.0 |  | 5.0 |  |

TABLE 1 (FIV) REGION: MAN/SASK (6)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING SECTION: CLOTHES, SHOES AND ACCESSORIES (CSA) IV


TABLE 1 (FIV)
REGION:
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING SECTION: CLOTHES, SHOES AND ACCESSORIES (CSA) IV

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency |  | SFIED | DISSATIS | FIED |  | SFIED | DISSA | SFIED |
|  | Purchased | Frequently | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Mens' Clothes | 90.5 | 22.1 |  | 42.1 | 52.6 | 5.3 | -- | 94.7 |  | 5.3 |  |
| 2. Mens Shoes and Boots | 79.1 | 10.8 |  | 39.0 | 61.0 | -- | - | 100.0 |  | -- |  |
| 3. Womens' Clothes | 94.3 | 40.4 |  | 40.4 | 51.5 | 7.1 | 1.0 | 91.9 |  | 8.1 |  |
| 4. Womens ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Shoes and Boots | 93.3 | 16.3 |  | 35.7 | 57.1 | 7.1 | $=$ | 92.9 |  | 7.1 |  |
| 5. Mens/Womens Fur Coats Hats. | 10.5 | -- |  | 36.4 | 63.6 | - |  | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| 6. Mens/Womens Hats, Gloves Belts, Ties, etc. | . 70.5 | 4.1 |  | 44.6 | 65.4 | -- | - | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| 7. Childrens ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Clothes | 50.5 | 56.6 |  | 39.6 | 50.9 | 9.4 | - | 00.6 |  | 9.4 |  |
| 8. Childrens Shoes and Boots | 47,6 | 40.0 |  | 28.0 | 60.0 | 12.0 | -- | 88.0 |  | 12.0 |  |
| 9. Infants Clothes | 11.4 | 50.0 |  | 50.0 | 41.7 | 8.3 | - | 91.7 |  | 8.3 |  |
| 10. Beachwear | 35.3 | 18.9 |  | 37.8 | 59.5 | 2.7 | -- | 07.3 |  | 2.7 |  |
| 11. Workclothes, Uniforms | 35.3 | 35.1 |  | 45.9 | 48.6 | 5.4 | $=$ | 94.6 |  | 54 |  |
| 12. Rainwear, Umbrellas | 19.0 | -- |  | 45,0 | 55.0 | - | $=$ | 10n.0 |  | - |  |
| 13. Jewelry, Watches, Optical Frames | 68.6 | 8.3 |  | 38.9 | 52.8 | 6.9 | 1.4 | 91.7 |  | 8.3 |  |
| 14. Fabrics, Patterns, <br> Sewing Supplies | 56.1 | 33.9 |  | 49.2 | 49.2 | 1.7 | -- | 08.3 |  | 1.7 |  |

## TABLE 1 (FIV) REGION: VANCOUVER (8)

CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING SECTION: CLOTHES, SHOES AND ACCESSORIES (CSA) IV

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents | \% of Purchasers | Rank by | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  | having | buying | Frequency |  | SFIED | DISSATIS | FIED |  | SFIED | DISSA | SFIED |
|  | Purchased | Frequently | Rating | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Mens ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Clothes | 82.2 | 19.8 |  | 26.7 | 59.4 | 11.9 | 2.0 | 86.1 |  | 13.9 |  |
| 2. Mens ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Shoes and Boots | 71.6 | 13.5 |  | 29.5 | 61.4 | 8.0 | 1.1 | 90.9 |  | 2.1 |  |
| 3. Womens' Clothes | 91.1 | 33.0 |  | 27.7 | 58.0 | 11.6 | 2.7 | 85.7 |  | 14.3 |  |
| 4. Womens ${ }^{1}$ Shoes and Boots | 85.4 | 20.0 |  | 29.8 | 54.8 | 13.5 | 1.9 | 84.6 |  | 15.4 |  |
| 5. Mens/Womens Fur Coats Hats. | 4.1 | -- |  | 60.0 | 40.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  | 15 |  |
| 6. Mens/Womens Hats, Gloves Belts, Ties, etc. | 64.2 | 3.8 |  | 36.7 | 60.8 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 97.5 |  | 2.6 |  |
| 7. Childrens ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Clothes | 56.1 | 44.9 |  | 31.9 | 50.7 | 16.1 | 3.2 | 82.6 |  | 17.4 |  |
| 8. Childrens Shoes and Boots | 50.4 | 48.4 |  | 20.0 | 51.6 | 16.1 | 32 | 80.6 |  | 10.3 |  |
| 9. Infants ${ }^{\text {1 }}$ Clothes | 17.1 | 66.7 |  | 23.8 | 610 | 14.3 | - | 85.7 |  | 11.3 |  |
| 10. Beachwear | 51.3 | 6.3 |  | 270 | 65.1 | 70 | - | 92.1 |  | 7.9 |  |
| 11. WorkcTothes, Uniforms | 26.9 | 18.2 |  | 33.3 | 51.5 | 15.2 | $=$ | 84.8 |  | 15.2 |  |
| 12. Rainwear, Umbrellas | 52.8 | 1.5 |  | 35.4 | 46.2 | 15.4 | 3.1 | 81.5 |  | 18.5 |  |
| 13. Jewelry, Watches, Optical Frames | 63.4 | 3.8 |  | 44.9 | 53.8 | 1.3 | -- | 98.7 |  | 1.3 |  |
| 14. Fabrics, Patterns, Sewing Supplies | 62.6 | 20.8 |  | 50.0 | 43.6 | 64 | -- | 93.6 |  | 6.4 |  |

TABLE 1 (FIV)
REGION: REST OF B.C. (9)
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING PURCHASE; FREQUENCY RATING; SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING

SECTION: CLOTHES, SHOES AND ACCESSORIES (CSA) IV

| CATEGORY | PURCHASE | FREQUENCY RATING |  | SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION RATING |  |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of Respondents having Purchased | ```% of Purchasers buying Frequently``` | Rank by Frequency Rating | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  | \% OF PURCHASERS |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISF1ED |  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  |
|  |  |  |  | Quite | Somewhat | Somewhat | Quite | Total | Rank | Total | Rank |
| 1. Mens' Clothes | 89.2 | 23.0 |  | 41.9 | 47.3 | 10.8 | -- | 89.2 |  | 10.8 |  |
| 2. Mens ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Shoes and Boots | 71.0 | 15.3 |  | 40.7 | 55.9 | 3.4 | -- | 96.6 |  | 3.4 |  |
| 3. Womens ' Clothes | 95.1 | 35.4 |  | 34.2 | 45.6 | 16.5 | 3.8 | 79.7 |  | 20.3 |  |
| 4. Womens ${ }^{\prime}$ Shoes and Boots | 89.2 | 20.0 |  | 35.6 | 60.3 | 2.2 | 1.4 | 95.9 |  | 4.1 |  |
| 5. Mens/Womens Fur Coats Hats. | 4.8 | . |  | 50.0 | 50.0 | -- | -- | 100.0 |  | - |  |
| 6. Mens/Womens Hats, Gloves Belts, Ties, etc. | 54.2 | 11.1 |  | 40.9 | 52.3 | 6.8 | - | 93.2 |  | 6.8 |  |
| 7. Childrens ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Clothes | 42.2 | 51.4 |  | 17.1 | 52.4 | 25.7 | 5.7 | 68.6 |  | 31.4 |  |
| 8. Childrens Shoes and Boots | 36.2 | 46.7 |  | 30.0 | 63.3 | 6.7 | - | 93.3 |  | 6.7 |  |
| 9. Infants ${ }^{1}$ Clothes | 10.8 | 33.3 |  | 33.3 | 55.6 | 11.1 | - | 88.9 |  | 11.1 |  |
| 10. Beachwear | 40.9 | 17.6 |  | 41.2 | 38.2 | 20.6 | - | 79.4 |  | 20.6 |  |
| 11. Workclothes, Uniforms | 38.5 | 25.0 |  | 34.4 | 62.5 | 3.1 | -- | 96.9 |  | 3.1 |  |
| 12. Rainwear, Umbrellas | 19.3 | 6.3 |  | 46.7 | 53.3 | -- | $=$ | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| 13. Jewelry, Watches, Optical Frames | 74.7 | 12.9 |  | 40.3 | 48.4 | 11.3 | -- | 88.7 |  | 11.3 |  |
| 14. Fabrics, Patterns, Sewing Supplies | 60.2 | 38.0 |  | 44.0 | 56.0 |  |  | 1000 |  |  |  |

## TABLE 2 <br> (F)

CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION: FOOD \& CLOTHING REGIONAL CS/D SCORES VS. NATIONAL

SUMMARY TABLE, AL工 SECTIONS

| REGION | CS/D SCORE |  | VS. NATIO | NATIONAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MORE SAT'D | LESS | SAT ${ }^{\text {' }}$ | SAME |
|  | \# of categories | \# Of | categories | \# of categories |
| ATLANTIC | 33 |  | 10 | 34 |
| MONTREAL | 25 |  | 28 | 24 |
| REST OF QUEBEC | 47 |  | 8 | 22 |
| TORONTO | 35 |  | 8 | 34 |
| REST OF ONTARIO | 11. |  | 56 | 10 |
| MAN./SASK. | 39 |  | 13 | 25 |
| ALBERTA | 54 |  | 7 | 16 |
| VANCOUVER | 8 |  | 54 | 15 |
| REST OF B.C. | 32 |  | 27 | 18 |

TOTAL NO. OF CATEGORIES: 77

## TABLE 2 (FI)

## CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING REGIONAL CS/D SCORES VS. NATIONAL SCORES SECTION: FOOD PRODUCTS



MORE SAT'D: positive difference of more than $1.0 \%$ point in total satisfied.
LESS SAT'D: negative difference of more than $1.0 \%$ point in total satisfied.
SAME: less than $1.0 \%$ point difference from national.
TOTAL NO. OF CATEGORIES: 26

CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING REGIONAI CS/D SCORES VS. NATIONAI SCORES SECTION: HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES

| REGION | CS/D SCO | SCORES VS. | NATIONAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MORE SAT ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | LESS SAT ${ }^{\text {D }}$ | SAME |
|  | \#of categories | s \#of categories | \#of categories |


| ATLANTIC | 8 | 1 | 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MONTREAL | 5 | 7 | 5 |
| REST OF QUEBEC | 9 | 3 | 5 |
| TORONTO | 4 | 2 | 11 |
| REST OF ONTARIO | 3 | 12 | 2 |
| MAN./SASK. | 9 | - | 8 |
| ALBERTA | 13 | 13 | 4 |
| VANCOUVER | 1 | 6 | 3 |
| REST OF B.C. | 7 | - | 4 |

MORE SAT'D: positive difference of more than $1.0 \%$ point in total satisfied.
LESS SAT'D: negative difference of more than $1.0 \%$ point in total satisfied.
SAME: less than $1.0 \%$ point difference from national.

TOTAL NO. OF CATEGORIES: 17

## TABLE 2 (FIII)

## CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING REGIONAL CS/D SCORES VS. NATIONAL SCORES SECTION: PERSONAL \& HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS

| REGION | CS/D S | CORES VS. | NATIONAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MORE SAT'D | LESS SAT'D | SAME |
|  | \#of categorie | \# \#of categories | \#of categories |
| ATLANTIC | 9 | 1 | 10 |
| MONTREAL | 5 | 9 | 6 |
| REST OF QUEBEC | 8 | 3 | 9 |
| TORONTO | 10 | 2 | 8 |
| REST OF ONTARIO | 4 | 16 | - |
| MAN. /SASK. | 11 | 5 | 4 |
| ALBERTA | 12 | 1 | 7 |
| VANCOUVER | 2 | 14 | 4 |
| REST OF B.C. | 9 | 7 | 4 |

MORE SAT'D: positive difference of more than $1.0 \%$ point in total satisfied.
LESS SAT'D: negative difference of more than $1.0 \%$ point in total satisfied.
SAME: less than $1.0 \%$ point difference from national.

TOTAL NO. OF CATEGORIES: 20

# CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING REGIONAL CS/D SCORES VS. NATIONAL SCORES SECTION: CLOTHES, SHOES \& ACCESSORIES 

| REGION | CS/D SCORES VS. |  | NATIONAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MORE SAT'D | LESS SAT'D | SAME |
|  | \#of categories | \#of categories | \#of categories |
| ATLANTIC | 8 | 2 | 4 |
| MONTREAL | 8 | 2 | 4 |
| REST OF QUEBEC | 11. | 2 | 1 |
| TORONTO | 8 | 2 | 4 |
| REST OF ONTARIO | - | 12 | 2 |
| MAN. /SASK. | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| ALBERTA | 12 | 2 | - |
| VANCOUVER | 2 | 11 | 1 |
| REST OF B.C. | 7 | 7 | - |

[^11]TABLE 3
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING REGIONAL MEAN SATISFACTION SCORES

SECTION: SUMMARY

| SATISFACTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REGION | 1.00-1.49 |  | 1.50-1.99 |  | $2.00-2.49$ |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| ATLANTIC (202) | 96 | 47.5 | 86 | 42.6 | 19 | 9.4 | 201 | 99.5 |
| MONTREAL (107) | 50 | 46.7 | 41 | 38.3 | 14 | 13.1 | 105 | 98.2 |
| REST OF quebec (109) | 54 | 49.5 | 44 | 40.4 | 10 | 9.2 | 108 | 99.1 |
| TORONTO (106) | 60 | 56.6 | 35 | 33.0 | 10 | 9.4 | 105 | 99.1 |
| REST OF ONTARIO (109) | 39 | 35.8 | 43 | 39.5 | 24 | 22.0 | 106 | 97.2 |
| MAN./SASK. (96) | 49 | 51.0 | 39 | 40.6 | 8 | 8.3 | 96 | 100.0 |
| ALBERTA (105) | 55 | 52.4 | 38 | 36.2 | 12 | 11.4 | 105 | 100.0 |
| VANCOUVER | 47 | 38.2 | 49 | 39.8 | 26 | 21.1 | 122 | 99.2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { REST OF B.C. } \\ & (83) \end{aligned}$ | 34 | 41.0 | 41 | 49.4 | 8 | 9.6 | 83 | 100.0 |
| DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REGION | 2.50 | $-2.99$ | 3.00 | - 3.49 | 3.50 | - 4.00 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTA } \\ & \text { DISSATI } \end{aligned}$ | FACTION |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| ATLANTIC | 1 | 0.5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 0.5 |
| MONTREAL | 1 | 0.9 | 1 | 0.9 | -- | -- | 2 | 1.8 |
| REST OF QUEBEC | 1 | 0.9 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 0.9 |
| TORONTO | - | -- | 1 | 0.9 | -- | -- | 1 | 0.9 |
| REST OF ONTARIO | 2 | 1.9 | -- | -- | 1 | 0.9 | 3 | 2.8 |
| MAN. /SASK. | - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | - | -- |
| ALBERTA | - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | - | -- |
| VANCOUVER | 1 | 0.8 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 0.8 |
| REST OF B.C. | - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | - | -- |

TABLE 3
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY : FOOD \& CLOTHING REGIONAL MEAN SATISFACTION SCORES

SECTION: FOOD PRODUCTS (FMSSI)

| SATISFACTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REGION | 1.00-1.49 |  | 1.50-1.99 |  | $2.00-2.49$ |  |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% |  | N | \% | N | \% |
| ATLANTIC (202) | 93 | 46.3 | 80 | 39.8 | 25 |  | 12.4 | 98 | 98.5 |
| MONTREAL (107) | 55 | 51.4 | 37 | 34.6 | 13 |  | 12.1 | 105 | 98.1 |
| REST OF QUEBEC (109) | 55 | 50.5 | 40 | 36.7 | 12 |  | 11.0 | 107 | 98.2 |
| TORONTO (106) | 58 | 54.7 | 34 | 32.1 | 13 |  | 12.3 | 105 | 99.1 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { REST OF ONTARIO } \\ (109) \end{gathered}$ | 42 | 38.5 | 35 | 32.1 | 29 |  | 26.6 | 106 | 97.2 |
| MAN./SASK. (96) | 46 | 47.9 | 42 | 43.8 | 8 |  | 8.3 | 96 | 100.0 |
| ALBERTA (105) | 54 | 51.4 | 38 | 36.2 | 13 |  | 12.4 | 105 | 100.0 |
| VANCOUVER (123) | 52 | 42.3 | 48 | 39.0 | 22 |  | 17.9 | 122 | 99.2 |
| $\underset{(83)}{\text { REST OF B.C. }}$ | 37 | 44.6 | 36 | 43.4 | 10 |  | 12.0 | 83 | 100.0 |


|  |  | DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REGION | $2.50-2.99$ | $3.00-3.49$ | $3.50-4.00$ | TOTAL |  |
|  | $N$ | $\%$ | $N$ | $\%$ | $N$ |
|  | $N$ | $\%$ | $N$ | $N$ | $\%$ |


| ATLANTIC | 3 | 1.5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3 | 1.5 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MONTREAL | - | -- | -- | -- | 2 | 1.9 | 2 | 1.9 |
| REST OF QUEBEC | 1 | 0.9 | 1 | 0.9 | -- | -- | 2 | 1.8 |
| TORONTO | - | -- | 1 | 0.9 | -- | -- | 1 | 0.9 |
| REST OF ONTARIO | 3 | 2.8 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3 | 2.8 |
| MAN. /SASK. | - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ALBERTA | - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| VANCOUVER | 1 | 0.8 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 0.8 |
| REST OF B.C. | - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

MISSING VALUES: ATLANTIC (1)

TABLE 3
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING REGIONAL MEAN SATISFACTION SCORES

SECTION: HOUSEHOLD \& FAMILY SUPPLIES (FMSS2)

| SATISFACTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REGION | 1.00-1.49 |  | 1.50-1.99 |  | $2.00-2.49$ |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | $\frac{\mathrm{N}}{}$ | \% |
| ATLANTIC (202) | 109 | 54.0 | 40 | 19.8 | 53 | 26.2 | 202 | 100.0 |
| MONTREAL (107) | 54 | 50.5 | 24 | 25.2 | 25 | 23.4 | 106 | 99.1 |
| REST OF QUEBEC (109) | 49 | 45.0 | 44 | 40.4 | 15 | 13.8 | 108 | 99.1 |
| TORONTO (106) | 56 | 52.8 | 27 | 25.5 | 21 | 19.8 | 104 | 98.1 |
| REST OF ONTARIO (109) | 38 | 34.9 | 31 | 28.4 | 35 | 32.1 | 104 | 95.4 |
| MAN./SASK. (96) | 53 | 55.8 | 24 | 26.3 | 17 | 17.9 | 95 | 99.0 |
| Alberta (105) | 63 | 60.0 | 22 | 21.0 | 20 | 19.0 | 105 | 100.0 |
| VANCOUVER (123) | 52 | 42.3 | 32 | 26.0 | 38 | 30.9 | 122 | 99.2 |
| REST OF B.C. (83) | 39 | 47.0 | 22 | 26.5 | 22 | 26.5 | 83 | 100.0 |
| DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REGION | 2.50 | -2.99 | 3.00 | - 3.49 | 3.50 | - 4.00 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { TOTI } \\ \text { DISSAT } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | ACTION |
|  | N | \% | N | $\%$ | N | \% | N | \% |
| ATLANTIC | - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| MONTREAL | 1 | 0.9 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 0.9 |
| REST OF QUEBEC | 1 | 0.9 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 0.9 |
| TORONTO | 1 | 0.9 | 1 | 0.9 | -- | -- | 2 | 1.8 |
| REST OF ONTARIO | 4 | 3.7 | -- | -- | i | 0.9 | 5 | 4.6 |
| MAN. /SASK. | 1 | 1.0 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 1.0 |
| alberta | - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| VANCOUVER | 1 | 0.8 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 0.8 |
| REST OF B.C. | - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

MISSING VALUES: MAN/SASK (1)

TABLE 3
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING regional mean satisfaction scores

SECTION: PERSONAL \& HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS (FMSS3)

| SATISFACTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REGION | 1.00-1.49 |  | 1.50-1.99 |  | $2.00-2.49$ |  | TOTAL SATISFACTION |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| ATLANTIC (202) | 102 | 50.5 | 44 | 21.8 | 55 | 27.2 | 201 | 99.5 |
| MONTREAL (107) | 48 | 44.9 | 26 | 24.3 | 28 | 26.2 | 102 | 95.3 |
| REST OF QUEBEC (109) | 49 | 45.0 | 33 | 30.3 | 26 | 23.9 | 108 | 99.1 |
| TORONTO (106) | 64 | 60.4 | 23 | 21.7 | 18 | 17.0 | 105 | 99.1 |
| REST OF ONTARIO (109) | 46 | 42.2 | 31 | 28.4 | 28 | 25.7 | 105 | 96.3 |
| MAN./SASK. (96) | 49 | 51.0 | 22 | 22.9 | 25 | 26.0 | 96 | 100.0 |
| ALBERTA (105) | 57 | 54.3 | 26 | 24.8 | 22 | 21.0 | 105 | 100.0 |
| VANCOUVER (123) | 56 | 45.5 | 26 | 21.1 | 39 | 31.7 | 121 | 98.4 |
| REST OF B.C. (83) | 40 | 48.2 | 25 | 30.1 | 18 | 21.7 | 83 | 100.0 |
| DISSATISFACTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REGION | 2.50 | -2.99 | 3.00 | - 3.49 | 3.50 | - 4.00 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { TOTI } \\ \text { DISSATI } \end{array}$ | ACTION |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Atlantic | 1 | 0.5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 0.5 |
| MONTREAL | 3 | 2.8 | 1 | 0.9 | 1 | 0.9 | 5 | 4.7 |
| REST OF QUEBEC | 1 | 0.9 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 0.9 |
| TORONTO | -- | -- | 1 | 0.9 | -- | -- | 1 | 0.9 |
| REST OF ONTARIO | 3 | 2.8 | -- | -- | 1 | 0.9 | 4 | 3.7 |
| MAN. /SASK. | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Alberta | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| VANCOUVER | 1 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.8 | -- | -- | 2 | 1.6 |
| REST OF B.C. | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

TABLE 3
CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING regional mean satisfaction scores

SECTION: CLOTHES, SHOES \& ACCESSORIES (FMSS4)



MISSING VALUES: ATLANTIC (5); MONTREAL (1); REST OF QUEBEC (3); TORONTO (1); REST OF ONTARIO (2); MAN/SASK (1)

## TABLE 4

CONSUMER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION STUDY: FOOD \& CLOTHING REGIONAL FINAL SATISFACTION SCORES

| REGION | FINAL SATISFACTION SCORE |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SATISFIED |  | DISSATISFIED |  | TOTAL |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| ATLANTIC | 37 | 26.2 | 15 | 18.5 | 52 | 23.4 |
| MONTREAL | 9 | 6.4 | 8 | 9.9 | 17 | 7.7 |
| REST OF QUEBEC | 13 | 9.2 | 7 | 8.6 | 20 | 9.0 |
| TORONTO | 14 | 9.9 | 4 | 4.9 | 18 | 8.1 |
| REST OF ONTARIO | 12 | 8.5 | 9 | 11.1 | 21 | 9.5 |
| , /SASK | 6 | 4.3 | 8 | 9.9 | 14 | 6.3 |
| ALBERTA | 13 | 9.2 | 13 | 16.0 | 26 | 11.7 |
| VANCOUVER | 20 | 14.2 | 12 | 14.8 | 32 | 14.4 |
| REST OF B.C. | 17 | 12.1 | 5 | 6.2 | 22 | 9.9 |
| TOTAL | 141 | 100.0 | 81 | 100.0 | 222 | 100.0 |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { CHISQ }= & 10.535 \\
{ }^{O_{F}}= & 8 \\
\text { SIG }= & 0.2295
\end{array}
$$

APPENDIX A
DEMOGRAPHIC BREANDONN OF SAMPLE: FOOD \& CLOTHING



[^0]:    $* N=1041$

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Leigh, Thomas 7. and Ralph L. Day, "Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaint Behavior with Nondurable Products", in Ralph L. Day and H. Keith Hunt (eds.), New Dimensions of Consumer Satisfaction and Complaining Behavior, Division of Research, Indiana University, 1979, p. 171.

[^2]:    $3^{3}$ Hughes, Donald A. "An Investigation of the Relation of Selected Factors to Consumer Satisfaction," in H. Keith Hunt (ed.), Conceptualization and Measurement of Consumer Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Marketing Science Institute, 1977).
    ${ }^{4}$ Best, Arthur and Alan R. Andreasen, "Talking Back to Business: Voiced and Unvoiced Consumer Complaints," Working Paper, Center for the Study of Responsive Law, Washington, D.C., 1976.

[^3]:    ${ }^{5}$ Day, Ralph $L . ~ a n d ~ M u z a f f e r ~ B o d u r, ~ " A n a l y s i s ~ o f ~ A v e r a g e ~ S a t i s-~$ faction Scores of Individuals Over Product Categories," in Ralph L. Day and H. Keith Hunt (ed.), New Dimensions of Consumer Satisfaction and Complaining Behavior, Division of Research, Indiana University, 1979.

[^4]:    ${ }^{6}$ Ibid, Best and Andreasen (1976)

[^5]:    * $N$ for percent of dissatisfied cases is the unduplicated total of dissatisfied respondents across all four sections of the questionnaire.

[^6]:    ${ }^{7}$ See Volume 5 for a more complete discussion and for references

[^7]:    $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \quad \text { TAKING ACTION } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { TAKING NO ACTION }\end{aligned}=$
    ${ }^{1}$ Includes respondents who did not report a highly unsatisfactory purchase experience.

[^8]:    $8_{\text {Since a }}$ majority of the respondents who completed the Food and Clothing survey were women, the "spouse" in this instance refers to the husband.

[^9]:    $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} \quad \text { TAKING DIRECT ACTION } \\ & \mathrm{N}\end{aligned} \mathrm{TAKING}^{1}=$
    ${ }^{1}$ Includes respondents who did not report a highly unsatisfactory purchase experience.

[^10]:    ${ }^{9}$ Ibid, Best and Andreasen (1976)

[^11]:    MORE SAT'D: positive difference of more than $1.0 \%$ point in total satisfied.
    LESS SAT'D: negative difference of more than $1.0 \%$ point in total satisfied.
    SAME: less than $1.0 \%$ point difference from national.

    TOTAL NO. OF CATEGORIES: 14

