2021-22 Annual Tracking Study

Final report

Prepared for: Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français.

Canada

Copyright

This public opinion research report presents the results of a survey conducted by Ipsos on behalf of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada. The research was conducted with 2,923 Canadians by telephone, 3,010 Canadians online, and 1,950 telephone surveys across 15 selected municipalities by telephone, between January 17th, 2022, and March 29th, 2022.

Cette publication est aussi disponible en français sous le titre : **Étude de suivi annuelle de 2021-22**.

This publication may be reproduced for non-commercial purposes only. Prior written permission must be obtained from Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada. For more information on this report, please contact Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada at IRCC.COMMPOR-ROPCOMM.IRCC@cic.gc.ca or at:

> Communications Branch
> Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada
> Jean Edmonds Tower South
> 365 Laurier Ave W
> Ottawa ON K1A 1L1

Catalogue Number: Ci4-183/1-2022E-PDF
International Standard Book Number (ISBN): 978-0-660-44949-4

Related publications (registration number: POR 072-21):
Catalogue Number: Ci4-183/1-2022F-PDF (Final Report, French)
ISBN: 978-0-660-44950-0

© His Majesty the King in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2022

Political neutrality statement

I hereby certify as Senior Officer of Ipsos that the deliverables fully comply with the Government of Canada political neutrality requirements outlined in the Communications Policy of the Government of Canada and Procedures for Planning and Contracting Public Opinion Research. Specifically, the deliverables do not include information on electoral voting intentions, political party preferences, standings with the electorate, or ratings of the performance of a political party or its leaders.

Mike Colledge
President
Ipsos Public Affairs

Table of Contents

Executive summary

Ipsos Public Affairs is pleased to present this report to Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada.

Background

Since 1994, when it was established as a new department bringing together immigration services and citizenship registration, Immigration, Refugee and Citizenship Canada (IRCC) has played several key roles: admitting immigrants, foreign students, visitors and temporary workers; resettling refugees; helping immigrants adapt to Canadian society and become Canadian citizens; and managing access to Canada.

IRCC conducts an ongoing research program to help the Department develop a better understanding of Canadian attitudes toward the issues surrounding citizenship and immigration. By gauging and analyzing the opinions of newcomers, immigrants and the broader public, the Department gains insights into important policy areas related to the mandate of the Department and related services.

Research objectives

This year's study explored views of members of the Canadian general population, including newcomers and Indigenous Peoples, in the context of COVID-19. More specifically, the research objectives of this study included the following:

- Measuring perceptions of the resumption of immigration to Canada after borders reopened;
- Measuring perceptions of the number of immigrants coming to Canada;
- Measuring perceptions of the impact of immigration and refugees on Canada;
- Measuring perceptions of Canada's immigration system and priorities;
- Measuring perceptions of the settlement and integration of immigrants and refugees;
- Compare differences between online and telephone survey results.

Attitudes of Canadians on issues such as immigration, settlement, integration, and citizenship as well as IRCC services are of key importance to IRCC's policies and programs. By gauging and exploring attitudes about key elements of the Department's mandate, this research supports IRCC in ensuring high quality policy options, program design; encouraging and effectively managing citizen-focused services; managing organizational and strategic risks proactively; and gathering and using relevant information on program results.

 The value of this contract, including HST, is $249,981.07.

Methodology

To meet the research objectives, Ipsos conducted a national telephone survey, a national online survey, and a targeted telephone survey to selected municipalities across the country. The 15-minute national telephone survey was conducted among a nationwide sample of n=2,923 Canadian adults between February 15th and March 29th, 2022. The telephone survey sample was a probability sample generated through random digit dialing obtaining an overall margin of error of ±1.8 percentage points (calculated at

a 95% confidence interval). The 15-minute national online survey was conducted among 3,010 respondents between March 1st and 24th, 2022. As the online survey used non-probability sampling, a margin of error cannot be calculated. Respondents were offered the survey in the official language of their choice.

Ipsos also conducted an 11-minute telephone survey with a random sample of 1,950 individuals across 15 selected municipalities (with 100 to 150 surveys completed per municipality) between January 17th and February 5th, 2022. The sample of members of the general population aged 18+ was a probability sample generated through random digit dialing. The margins of error for each municipality are between ±7.9 and ±9.8 percentage points, depending on sample size (calculated at a 95% confidence interval).

A full quantitative methodology report, including all information about the execution of the fieldwork that is needed to replicate the research initiative, may be found in Appendix 1. The quantitative survey research instruments and a set of tabulated results from the quantitative surveys are provided under a separate cover.

Should you have any questions or comments, please contact:

Martin Hrobsky
Senior Vice President
Ipsos Public Affairs
Telephone: 416-324-2017
Email: Martin.Hrobsky@Ipsos.com

Daniel Kunasingam
Senior Research Manager
Ipsos Public Affairs
Telephone: 416-324-2298
Email: Daniel.Kunasingam@Ipsos.com

Appendix 1 – Quantitative methodology

Telephone survey (National)

Ipsos conducted a 15-minute telephone survey among a nationwide sample of n=2,923 Canadian adults between February 15th and March 29th, 2022. The sample is a probability sample generated through random digit dialing. For respondents contacted on a landline, respondents within households were selected at random, by using the "birthday method" of identifying and interviewing the member of the household (aged 18+) who had their birthday last.

Respondents contacted on a cellphone were also random digit dialed and needed to be 18+ to participate. Wireless samples were selected on a provincial and community level (where possible) from a database containing all possible numbers in 1000-blocks of area codes and exchanges dedicated to wireless numbers.

Within the total sample of 2,923 Canadians for this survey, 1,060 respondents were contacted on their landlines, while the other 1,863 respondents were contacted on their cellphones. The margin of error for a telephone survey of 2,923 respondents is ±1.8%, using a confidence interval of 95% (19 times out of 20). The final questionnaire used was provided by IRCC to ensure adequate tracking of previous research results conducted by the department.

Telephone sample weighting

The tables below indicate the unweighted and weighted distributions of the telephone sample. The sample was stratified by region, with quotas used to ensure appropriate representation. Weighting was applied to the sample to ensure that the final data reflects the adult population of Canada by region, age and gender according to the 2016 Census.

Please note, the totals below may not add up to 2,923 due to some respondents' refusal to provide socioeconomic information.

Weighted and unweighted telephone sample: Region (Variable included in the weighting scheme)

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
British Columbia/Territories	357	401
Alberta	315	330
Saskatchewan	145	87
Manitoba	155	102
Ontario	909	1119
Quebec	641	685
New Brunswick	98	64
Prince Edward Island	95	12
Nova Scotia	111	78
Newfoundland and Labrador	97	44

Weighted and unweighted telephone sample: Gender (Variable included in the weighting scheme)

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
Male	1418	1408
Female	1457	1490

Weighted and unweighted telephone sample: Age (Variable included in the weighting scheme)

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
18-24	166	320
25-34	355	480
35-44	470	472
45-54	479	524
55-64	587	510
65+	866	617

Weighted and unweighted telephone sample: Education

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
High school or less	452	470
Some post-secondary	238	247
Trade school or college	865	832
University	1353	1361

Weighted and unweighted telephone sample: Income

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
Under $40K	511	501
$40K to under $60K	402	376
$60K to under $100K	716	718
$100K or more	1020	1072

Weighted and unweighted telephone sample: Country of birth

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
Born in Canada	2312	2237
Born outside of Canada	610	685

Statistics presented in the table above show minimal differences between the final unweighted and weighted samples. However, those 18 to 34 years old are underrepresented, resulting in a higher unweighted to weighted ratio.

Call dispositions

The following table provides the call dispositions and response rate calculation, as per the former MRIA's empirical method of calculating response rates for telephone surveys.

	Landline	Cellphone	Total
Total Numbers Attempted	63579	90956	154535
Invalid (NIS, fax/modem, business/non-res.)	42313	56679	98992
Total **unresolved units** (Busy, no answer, answering machine)	10207	17445	27652
Total **in-scope - non-responding units**	9126	13480	22606
Language problem	319	332	651
Illness, incapable, deaf	98	29	127
Household refusal	8589	12960	21549
Qualified respondent break-off	120	159	279
Total **in-scope - responding units**	1099	2456	3555
Over quota	39	10	49
No one 18+	0	583	583
Occupation Disqualified	0	0	0
Completed interviews	1060	1863	2923

The response rate, calculated as the number of **in-scope – responding units** divided by the sum of **unresolved units**, **in-scope – non-responding units**, and **in-scope – responding units**, was 5.38% for landline numbers, 7.36% for cellphone numbers, and 6.61% for all telephone numbers. The total response rate of 6.61% for a telephone survey of the Canadian general population with up to 8 call-backs per household is typical.

Non-response analysis

As with any probability sample, there exists within the current sample the possibility of non-response bias. In particular, this survey would not include members of the population who do not have access to a telephone (either landline or cellphone) or who are not capable of responding to a survey in either English or French. In addition, some groups within the population are systemically less likely to answer surveys.

The table below compares the unweighted sample to the 2016 Census results by region, age, gender, education, income and country of birth. The comparison between the two samples for the three variables used in the weighting scheme (using interlocking weights for region with age and region with gender) shows underrepresentation of younger Canadians (18 to 34 years of age). However, this discrepancy is small enough that it can be corrected through weighting without affecting the quality of the final results. As the regional distribution was set through hard quotas, the weighting is correcting for the selected quota targets, rather than non-response.

Telephone sample population comparison: Region (Variable included in the weighting scheme)

	Unweighted percentage	Census 2016 proportions (adults)
British Columbia/Territories	12%	14%
Alberta	11%	11%
Saskatchewan	5%	3%
Manitoba	5%	4%
Ontario	31%	38%
Quebec	22%	24%
New Brunswick	3%	2%
Prince Edward Island	3%	0.4%
Nova Scotia	4%	3%
Newfoundland and Labrador	3%	2%

Telephone sample population comparison: Gender (Variable included in the weighting scheme)

	Unweighted percentage	Census 2016 proportions (adults)
Male	49%	49%
Female	50%	51%

Telephone sample population comparison: Age (Variable included in the weighting scheme)

	Unweighted percentage	Census 2016 proportions (adults)
18-24	6%	11%
25-34	12%	16%
35-44	16%	16%
45-54	16%	18%
55-64	20%	18%
65+	30%	21%

Telephone sample population comparison: Education

	Unweighted percentage	Census 2016 proportions (adults)
High school or less	24%	43%
Trade school or college	30%	35%
University or higher	46%	22%

Telephone sample population comparison: Income

	Unweighted percentage	Census 2016 proportions (adults)
Under $40K	17%	26%
$40K to under $60K	14%	16%
$60K to under $100K	24%	25%
$100K or more	35%	32%

Telephone sample population comparison: Country of birth

	Unweighted percentage	Census 2016 proportions (adults)
Born in Canada	79%	78%
Born outside of Canada	21%	22%

This comparison between the unweighted sample distribution and the actual population figures for variables not included in the weighting scheme shows that the final sample obtained was mostly representative of the general population for this survey. However, there are noticeable differences in education levels between the sample and the Canadian adult population, with the telephone sample being more educated than Census figures show. The largest gap was for the university educated stratum, with 46% of the sample having obtained a university degree, compared to 22% among Canadian adults. Education is a variable that could be considered in future weighting schemes for national surveys to correct for this imbalance. Income distributions for the sample are very close to those measured in the 2016 Census, except who have a household income of under $40K (17% vs 26%). The country of birth distribution matches the 2016 Census.

Online sample (National)

The online sample of 3,010 respondents was drawn from two online panels: the Ipsos iSay panel and the Maru panel. As this is a non-probability sample, a margin of error cannot be calculated. Respondents to the online survey were invited to participate via email, with a unique URL link to the survey provided to them. This link could only be used once, with respondents being allowed to take pause during completion and return to complete it at a later time. Survey questionnaires took 15 minutes to complete on average. All surveys were completed between March 1st and 24th, 2022.

Incentives and quality control measures

Respondents to Ipsos' and Maru online surveys are offered a number of innovative incentive programs in the forms of a point-based system where participants can redeem points for various items. We do not reward our panelists using cash payments.

Extensive quality-control procedures are in place within IIS (*Ipsos Interactive Services*, who manage our panel and Maru, who manages their own panel) to ensure that the survey inputs (sample and questionnaire design) allow for high-quality survey outputs (survey data). These processes span the life cycle of a panelist and are in place for all Ipsos online surveys. Panel experts are constantly monitoring and reviewing the performance of our quality measures and updating and integrating new ones as respondents' behaviors and the online landscape evolve.

- Panelists are who they say they are
- Double Opt-In approach to confirm identity
- Country validation via Geo-IP
- Mismatch between device settings and geolocation
- Anonymous proxy detection
- Detection of robots via Captcha code
- Detection of "5 minutes" emails (temporary email addresses)
- Detection of data anomalies and patterns
- Maintenance of Ipsos blacklist
- RealAnswer™- detection of pasted and robot answers

They have not participated recently in similar surveys

- Strict panel usage rules to avoid interviewing the same people too often and prevent them from becoming too used to a type of survey or product category
- Duplicate devices identification through digital Fingerprinting (RelevantID®) and web/flashcookie

They complete surveys seriously

- Survey taking behavior: speeding, straight lining, open-ends quality evaluation
- Panelists' history monitored across surveys and used for panel purge removing "bad" or inactive respondents

They can only take the survey once

- Duplicate emails identification
- Duplicate devices identification through digital fingerprinting (RelevantID®) and web/flashcookie
- Duplicate contact details identification

Online sample weighting

The tables below indicate the unweighted and weighted distributions of the online sample. The sample was stratified by region, with soft quotas also set for gender and age to ensure appropriate representation across categories. Weighting was applied to the sample to ensure that the final data reflects the adult population of Canada by region, age and gender according to the 2016 Census.

Please note, the totals below may not add up to 3,010 due to some respondents' refusal to provide socioeconomic information.

Weighted and unweighted online sample: Region (Variable included in the weighting scheme)

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
British Columbia/Territories	371	416
Alberta	328	338
Saskatchewan	116	90
Manitoba	150	106
ON	1085	1152
QC	679	703
Atlantic Canada	281	205

Weighted and unweighted online sample: Gender (Variable included in the weighting scheme)

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
Male	1376	1452
Female	1607	1537

Weighted and unweighted online sample: Age (Variable included in the weighting scheme)

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
18-24	287	330
25-34	501	494
35-44	498	486
45-54	545	539
55-64	530	525
65+	649	635

Weighted and unweighted online sample: Education

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
High school or less	463	457
Some post-secondary	259	264
Trade school or college	933	921
University	1308	1321

Weighted and unweighted online sample: Income

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
Under $40K	592	585
$40K to under $60K	455	445
$60K to under $100K	768	771
$100K or more	783	794

Weighted and unweighted online sample: Country of birth

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
Born in Canada	2507	2487
Born outside of Canada	492	509

Statistics presented in the tables above show minimal differences between the final unweighted and weighted samples, with the exception of region where weighting is correcting for selected quota targets.

Email statistics

The table below presents general statistics regarding the response rate for the email phase of research.

	Total
Total Email Invitations Issued	27450
Invalid (incomplete/incorrect email address, email invitation bounce backs)	0
Total **unresolved units** (no response at all)	23452
Total **in-scope - non-responding units**	395
Qualified respondent break-off (incomplete)	395
Total **in-scope - responding units**	3526
Over quota	477
Other disqualified	39
Completed questionnaires	3010

The response rate, calculated as the number of **in-scope – responding units** divided by the sum of **unresolved units**, **in-scope – non-responding units**, and **in-scope – responding units**, was 12.88%. This response rate is within normal ranges for a survey of the Canadian adult population.

Non-response analysis

As with any non-probability sample there exists within the current sample the possibility of non-response bias. In particular, this survey would not include members of the population who do not have access to a computer with an Internet connection (either at home or at work) or who are not capable of responding to a survey in either English or French. In addition, some groups within the population are systemically less likely to answer surveys.

The tables below compare the unweighted sample to the 2016 Census results by region, age, gender, education, income and country of birth. Overall, the sample is highly representative of the national adult population, except for a few gaps which are described below.

Online sample population comparison: Region (Variable included in the weighting scheme)

	Unweighted percentage	Census 2016 proportions (adults)
British Columbia/Territories	12%	14%
Alberta	11%	11%
Saskatchewan	4%	3%
Manitoba	5%	4%
ON	36%	38%
QC	23%	24%
Atlantic Canada	9%	7%

Online sample population comparison: Gender (Variable included in the weighting scheme)

	Unweighted percentage	Census 2016 proportions (adults)
Male	46%	49%
Female	53%	51%

Online sample population comparison: Age (Variable included in the weighting scheme)

	Unweighted percentage	Census 2016 proportions (adults)
18-24	10%	11%
25-34	17%	16%
35-44	17%	16%
45-54	18%	18%
55-64	18%	18%
65+	22%	21%

Online sample population comparison: Education

	Unweighted percentage	Census 2016 proportions (adults)
High school or less	24%	43%
Trade school or college	31%	35%
University or higher	43%	22%

Online sample population comparison: Income

	Unweighted percentage	Census 2016 proportions (adults)
Under $40K	20%	26%
$40K to under $60K	15%	16%
$60K to under $100K	26%	25%
$100K or more	26%	32%

Online sample population comparison: Country of birth

	Unweighted percentage	Census 2016 proportions (adults)
Born in Canada	83%	78%
Born outside of Canada	16%	22%

The comparison for the variables used in the weighting scheme shows minimal gaps. As the regional distribution was set through hard quotas, the weighting is correcting for the selected quota targets, rather than non-response. The largest observable gaps between the unweighted sample and Census 2016 data relates to education levels, as observed with the phone sample as well. We find that the unweighted sample tends to overrepresent more educated Canadians, underrepresent Canadians who have a household income of under $40K and $100,000 and above, as well as immigrants.

Comparison of phone and online samples by socioeconomic information not used in weighting (National)

The tables below show a comparison between the weighted telephone and online samples for education and income levels, as well as country of birth, which were not included in the weighting scheme. Considering that no quotas were set for any of these three variables during fieldwork, the similarities between the two samples are notable, though there is an 8-point gap in those who report a household income of $100,000 and above, and a 6-point difference in the share of respondents born outside of Canada.

Telephone and online sample comparison: Education
The breakdown for education shown here is slightly different from that shown in tables above in order to match the data description used for Census 2016.

	Weighted phone sample	Weighted online sample
High school or less	25%	25%
Trade school or college	28%	31%
University	47%	44%

Telephone and online sample comparison: Income

	Weighted phone sample	Weighted online sample
Under $40K	17%	19%
$40K to under $60K	14%	15%
$60K to under $100K	24%	26%
$100K or more	35%	27%

Telephone and online sample comparison: Country of birth

	Weighted phone sample	Weighted online sample
Born in Canada	77%	83%
Born outside of Canada	23%	17%

Municipal telephone survey

Ipsos conducted an 11-minute telephone survey targeting 15 specific municipalities, with a random sample of 1,950 individuals selected from members of the general population (aged 18 or older) residing in these municipalities, between January 17th and February 5th, 2022. The sample is a probability sample generated through random digit dialing.

For respondents contacted on a landline, respondents within households were selected at random, by using the "birthday method" of identifying and interviewing the member of the household (aged 18+) who had their birthday last.

Respondents contacted on a cellphone were also random digit dialed and needed to be 18+ to participate. Wireless samples were selected on a municipality level from a database containing all possible numbers in 1000-blocks of area codes and exchanges dedicated to wireless numbers.

Within the total sample of 1,950 for this survey, 656 respondents were contacted on their landlines, while the other 1294 respondents were contacted on their cellphones. The margins of error for each municipality using a confidence interval of 95% (19 times out of 20) are shown in the table below. The final questionnaire used was provided by IRCC to ensure adequate tracking of previous research results conducted by the department.

Sample sizes and margins of error for each Municipality

Municipality	Landline	Cellphone	Total	Margins of error
Halifax, NS	51	99	150	±7.9%
North Bay, ON	46	84	130	±8.5%
Sudbury, ON	46	84	130	±8.5%
Timmins, ON	46	84	130	±8.5%
Sault Ste. Marie, ON	46	84	130	±8.5%
Thunder Bay, ON	46	84	130	±8.5%
Cornwall, ON	46	84	130	±8.5%
Brandon, MB	46	84	130	±8.5%
Altona/Rhineland, MB (includes Plum Coulee and Gretna)	35	65	100	±9.8%
Moose Jaw, SK	46	84	130	±8.5%
Red Deer, AB	46	84	130	±8.5%
Vernon, BC	46	84	130	±8.5%
West Kootenay, BC (Trail, Castlegar, Rossland, Nelson)	46	84	130	±8.5%
Whitehorse, YT	49	91	140	±8.2%
Yellowknife, NWT	15	115	130	±8.5%

Call dispositions

The following table provides the call dispositions and response rate calculation, as per the former MRIA's empirical method of calculating response rates for telephone surveys.

	Landline	Cellphone	Total
Total Numbers Attempted	13361	115642	129003
Invalid (NIS, fax/modem, business/non-res.)	5090	82477	87567
Total **unresolved units** (Busy, no answer, answering machine)	2622	16032	18654
Total **in-scope - non-responding units**	4743	13640	18383
Language problem	99	169	268
Illness, incapable, deaf	47	45	92
Household refusal	4517	13295	17812
Qualified respondent break-off	80	131	211
Total **in-scope - responding units**	668	1870	2538
Over quota	4	0	4
No one 18+	8	576	584
Occupation Disqualified	0	0	0
Completed interviews	656	1294	1950

The response rate, calculated as the number of **in-scope – responding units** divided by the sum of **unresolved units**, **in-scope – non-responding units**, and **in-scope – responding units**, was 8.32% for landline numbers, 5.93% for cellphone numbers, and 6.41% for all telephone numbers. The total response rate of 6.41% for a telephone survey of the Canadian general population with up to 8 call-backs per household is typical.

Municipal sample weighting

The tables below indicate the unweighted and weighted distributions of the municipal sample. The sample was stratified by municipality. Weighting was applied to the samples from 13 of the 15 municipalities to ensure that the final data reflects their adult population by age according to 2016 Census profiles. Weighting was not applied to the samples for two municipalities (Altona/Rhineland and West Kootenay) due to a lack of available census data.

Halifax: Weighted and unweighted municipal sample: Age

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
18 to 34	20	44
35 to 54	52	51
55+	78	55

North Bay: Weighted and unweighted municipal sample: Age

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
18 to 34	14	35
35 to 54	47	41
55+	69	54

Sudbury: Weighted and unweighted municipal sample: Age

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
18 to 34	25	34
35 to 54	39	43
55+	66	53

Timmins: Weighted and unweighted municipal sample: Age

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
18 to 34	25	35
35 to 54	37	46
55+	68	50

Sault Ste. Marie: Weighted and unweighted municipal sample: Age

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
18 to 34	21	31
35 to 54	45	39
55+	64	60

Thunder Bay: Weighted and unweighted municipal sample: Age

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
18 to 34	26	33
35 to 54	35	40
55+	69	56

Cornwall: Weighted and unweighted municipal sample: Age

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
18 to 34	25	31
35 to 54	29	37
55+	76	62

Brandon: Weighted and unweighted municipal sample: Age

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
18 to 34	20	43
35 to 54	32	43
55+	78	44

Moose Jaw: Weighted and unweighted municipal sample: Age

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
18 to 34	18	35
35 to 54	40	40
55+	72	55

Red Deer: Weighted and unweighted municipal sample: Age

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
18 to 34	23	44
35 to 54	45	46
55+	62	41

Vernon: Weighted and unweighted municipal sample: Age

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
18 to 34	23	28
35 to 54	29	39
55+	78	63

Yellowknife: Weighted and unweighted municipal sample: Age

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
18 to 34	19	47
35 to 54	43	54
55+	68	30

Whitehorse: Weighted and unweighted municipal sample: Age

	Unweighted sample size	Weighted sample size
18 to 34	7	21
35 to 54	44	63
55+	89	56

Appendix 2 – Quantitative instruments

English and French quantitative instruments are provided under separate cover.