An initial evaluation of COSP renewable converters

IC

AN INITIAL EVALUATION OF COSP RENEWABLE CONVERTERS

Prepared for:

Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada

Prepared by:

DECISION RESEARCH LIMITED

226 Oxford Street

Winnipeg, Manitoba

Industry Canada
Library - LKC
JUIN 13 2017
Industrie Canada
Bibliothèque - BCS

Principal Investigators:

C. Dennis Anderson, Ph.D.

Perry Kent, M.B.A.

March, 1983

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS
LIBRARY
JAN 7 1985
BIBLIOTHÈQUE
MINISTÈRE DE LA CONSOMMATION
ET DES CORPORATIONS

"The views presented in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of or positions of the Department of CCAC Les points de vues exprimés dans cette étude sont ceux de l'auteur et il ne reflètant pas nécessairement la position du Ministère."

PORT
HD
9574
.C22
I5
1983
c. 2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the financial assistance of Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada through funds received from the office of Energy Research and Development. Many members of this Department were particularly supportive of this research. We would like to thank Ms. Wendy Hurst of the Consumer Research and Evaluation Branch for her encouragement and advice throughout this project. Our appreciation is also extended to Mr. Dennis Orchard of Energy Mines and Resources Canada who, as COSP Director, was a source of excellent guidance for our work. His assistant, Ms. Leslie Scott, provided valued assistance in generating the samples for this study and we thank her. We are also grateful to Mr. Ned Ellis for his expertice in the area of wood heating.

The production of this report benefitted from the diligence of research assistants Mr. Richard Settle and Mr. Leigh Quesnel. Special thanks is due to Ms. Susan Harder for her magic on the word processor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS continued

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES, continued

LIST OF TABLES, continued

LIST OF FIGURES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The present research was designed to study Canada Oil Substitution Program (COSP) adopters who have selected the renewables conversion option. The study was carried out in the period November, 1982 to January, 1983 approximately two years after COSP was first announced.

Detailed questionnaires (see Appendix A) were mailed to five regions of Canada to renewable converters, that is, those who had changed from oil to wood and/or propane for home heating. Responses were obtained from 428 wood users and 198 propane users in all Canadian provinces (usable response rate of 40%).

The specific objectives of the study are as follows:

(1) To provide an initial or baseline survey of renewables adopters.

(2) To gain an understanding of the renewables conversion decision process and any barriers that impede choice of renewable options.

(3) To determine the role of the COSP financial incentive in stimulating this decision process.

(4) To determine the extent of oil displacement achieved by conversions to wood or propane.

(5) To explore for segment differences; ie., to determine whether COSP impact varies for different demographic or socio-economic groups.

(6) To recommend further research in the renewables conversion area.

A selected list of key findings are discussed in the paragraphs below.

The perceived economic benefit was clearly the primary motivator behind the adoption and use of wood heating. All monetary motives,

particularly those specifically relating to the economies of wood, were strongly indicated by wood users. The motives for propane conversions were not as clearly defined. Cost considerations, while important, were not cited as frequently by propane users as they were by wood users. The availability of a COSP grant seems to have stimulated propane conversions, as did the presence of an oil system which was in poor working condition. Of interest is the finding that close to half (48%) of the propane sample agreed that they converted to propane because the fuel they wanted was not available where they live. This, in conjunction with other findings, suggests that propane may be a temporary fuel choice for many individuals, to be used only until natural gas becomes available.

An attempt was made to quantify the amount of oil displaced by conversions to wood and propane. Estimates were based only on subjects who were reasonably sure of their oil usage quantities and who maintained records regarding oil use. Since a large portion of the wood sample (68%) still use oil for part of their home heating requirements, two estimates were required for the wood group; one estimate for <u>total</u> off-oil converters and another for partial off-oil converters. Calculations based on self-reports of oil volumes displaced indicated that the typical <u>total</u> off oil wood user displaced 814 gallons of oil per year, while the comparable displacement figure for the <u>partial</u> off oil wood user was 658 gallons of oil per year. When these self-reported oil displacement estimates wre compared to estimates derived from self-reported post-conversion wood use (i.e., cords used, which were converted to gallons of fuel oil equivalents), the validity of the former were demonstrated. That is, oil displace-

ment figures derived from reported wood use were within 6% of the displacement figures reported by respondents.

It can be concluded, therefore, that from 650 to 800 gallons of heating oil per year have been saved for the average Canadian household that converts from oil to wood for space heating.

While a majority of the propane group use a secondary fuel in conjunction with propane for home heating, only a small percentage still use oil. Therefore, the displacement estimate was confined to total off-oil propane users and was found to be 825 gallons of oil per year. This estimate is quite similar to that which was obtained for total off-oil wood users.

An attempt was made to determine the impact of the COSP incentive in stimulating renewable conversions. Subjects were asked if they would have converted systems if the COSP grant was not available. Only 13% of the wood sample stated that they probably or definitely would not have converted without COSP. In a 1981 study of gas and electric converters, 22% stated that they probably or definitely would not have converted without COSP. The results obtained for the propane sample on this measure are similar to the gas and electric converter findings (21% state they probably or definitely would not have converted were it not for COSP).

In the 1981 gas/electric study, 6 out of 10 subjects stated that they converted sooner because of COSP. The present study indicates that only 4 in 10 wood and propane converters converted sooner because of COSP. These results suggest that COSP may not be a sufficient condition for conversions to take place, particularly among wood users. On the one hand, COSP may be superfluous: the vast

majority of subjects claim they would have converted without COSP. Perhaps COSP money might be better directed elsewhere. However, National Energy Program (NEP) objectives for off-oil conversions appear to be on target and would probably be 10-20% below target without the COSP grant. Furthermore, these conclusions are based on findings from renewable converters, a segment who may be particularly non-impacted by COSP (i.e., wood users change systems for the clear economic benefit of converting).

It should also be noted that these longitudinal conclusions are based on two distinctly different populations, sampled at different times (ie. gas/electric converters, 1980/81 vs renewable converters, 1982/83). Once again it is quite plausible that the renewables group is unique.

On a more positive note, research evidence suggests that low income subjects are significantly more impacted by COSP than are higher income respondents. COSP allows lower income families to make the capital investment required for off-oil conversions and, therefore, appears to be an essential stimulus.

Results obtained in 1981 suggested that COSP would be a major factor in precipitating conversion decisions among the conversion resistant segment of oil users. It seems essential, therefore, that the oil-resistant segment be studied in the near future to discern the importance of COSP as a conversion stimulus. Also, the conversion motives of gas and electric and renewables converters should be monitored over time before any firm conclusions can be made about the possible diminishing impact of COSP.

The study produced a number of other specific findings, includ-

ing:

- 86% of wood users and 59% of propane users utilize a supplementary fuel for home heating.
- Oil and electricity are the most frequently cited supplementary fuels among wood users; while, for propane users, wood and electricity are frequently mentioned.
- Only 32% of wood users and 31% of propane users agreed that the fear of future oil shortages was a motive for converting.
- 92% of wood users experienced heating cost decreases since conversion. In contrast, only 45% of the propane group cited heating cost decreases, with 21% actually claiming cost increases.
- Almost all (92%) wood users expect to save enough on their heating bills to payback their investment; 51% of propane users anticipate an eventual payback.
- In the wood group, space heaters were used more frequently than wood furnaces (52% vs 31%). Circulating stoves were the most frequently mentioned types of space heater, while forced air and combination furnaces were the most frequently mentioned type of wood furnace.
- On average, 6 cords of wood per year were used by space heater users and 7 cords per year by furnace users.
- Heavy users of wood (i.e., those subjects who use wood for a large percentage of their home heating requirements) were more likely than light users to agree with all cost conversion motives specifically related to wood.
- Heavy users of wood tended to be less educated and to have a lower income than light users of wood.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Canadian Oil Substitution Program (COSP) is designed to stimulate homeowners to switch from oil to non-oil space heating fuels. A survey by Decision Research Ltd. conducted in October through December 1981* focused on COSP converters who selected the natural gas or electric conversion options. A variety of measures were obtained from this population, including an identification of barriers to converting off-oil, primary motivations for converting and the role which the COSP incentive played in the decision to convert. The focus for the present research is COSP converters who selected the renewables option, in particular homeowners who switched from oil to wood and/or propane heating.

1.1 Study Objectives

The objective of the research is to conduct an initial survey of COSP renewables converters similar to that which was done in the 1981 COSP gas and electric converter study. The primary focus of the study will be past oil users who have selected the wood home heating option. Homeowners who have converted from oil to propane-fueled systems will also be examined. The specific objectives of the study are as follows:

(1) To provide an initial or baseline survey of renewables adopters.

(2) To gain an understanding of the renewables conversion decision process and any barriers that impede choice of renewable options.

---

* See "An Initial Evaluation of the Canada Oil Substitution Program: Converter and Nonconverter Profiles," prepared by Decision Research Ltd. for Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada, April, 1982.

(3) To determine the role of the COSP financial incentive in stimulating this decision process.

(4) To determine the extent of oil displacement achieved by conversions to wood or propane.

(5) To recommend further research in the renewable conversions area.

(6) To explore for segment (demographic and socio-economic differences in COSP's impact.

Effective management of the COSP initiative requires that its administrators become informed about a number of dimensions of Canadian householders' responses to the program. The present research was designed to provide this knowledge in the area of renewable conversions. Specifically, the key research questions were:

- How important a factor was the COSP incentive in the conversion decision process for recent wood and propane converters? What is the importance of the COSP incentive relative to other conversion motives?
- What proportion of recent renewable converters would not have converted were it not for the COSP incentive?
- What proportion of recent renewable converters would have converted even without the COSP incentive?
- Why was wood or propane selected as a primary home heating fuel as opposed to other fuel forms?
- Approximately what quantity of oil was displaced by homeowners switching to wood or propane heating?
- What types of equipment and quantities of wood are used by homeowners who converted to wood heating?

1.2 Methods

The sample for this research was selected from the total population of renewable converters (wood and propane). These individuals were accessed from Energy Mines and Resources COSP application files, which served as a frame for the research.

The research instrument selected for the study was a mail-out,

mail-back questionnaire. This methodology was utilized in the 1981-82 gas/electric converter study and proved to be an efficient and effective data generation mechanism.

In December, 1982, detailed questionnaires (see Appendix A) were mailed to wood and propane converters in five regions across Canada:

(1) The Maritimes

(2) Quebec

(3) Ontario

(4) The Prairies

(5) British Columbia

Only homeowners living in single family dwellings were sent questionnaires. As of the end of August, 1982, approximately 68,000 converters had selected wood or propane as their replacement fuel for oil. Table 1.2.1 shows the approximate total number of wood and propane conversions broken down by region.

Table 1.2.1 Approximate Number of Wood and Propane Conversions by Region (as of August 30, 1982)

Region	Approximate Number of Conversions	
	Wood	Propane
B.C.	5,400	330
Prairies	2,300	675
Ontario	16,000	2,500
Quebec	16,000	300
Maritimes	23,000	400
Total	62,700	4,205

Table 1.2.1 indicates that wood conversions outnumber propane conversions by a ratio of almost 16 to 1. For this reason the sample was stratified to include proportionately more propane converters in order to achieve sufficient responses from this group for analysis purposes.

A total of 1565 questionnaires were sent to wood and propane converters, with 651 being returned to the researchers (response rate 41.6%). However, 25 questionnaires were inadequately filled out and/or were sent by homeowners using a fuel other than wood or propane. Therefore, 626 questionnaires were processed, representing a usable response rate of 40%. Response rates by region and fuel type are as follows:

Region	Sample	Usable Responses	Response Rate
Maritimes:			
Wood	188	89	47.3%
Propane	125	36	28.8%
Quebec:			
Wood	188	89	47.3%
Propane	125	41	32.8%
Ontario:			
Wood	188	70	37.2%
Propane	125	37	29.6%
Prairies:			
Wood	188	89	47.3%
Propane	125	52	41.6%
B.C.:			
Wood	188	86	45.7%
Propane	125	30	24.0%
Total:			
Wood	940	428*	45.5%
Propane	625	198*	31.7%
Total Study	1565	626	40.0%

* Note: Five wood users and three propane users returned their questionnaires without specifying their region.

As indicated, in all regions a higher response rate was obtained for wood than for propane: 46% of the wood sample and 32% of the propane sample returned questionnaires. A response rate of 40% from each group was anticipated. A possible explanation for this differential rate of return is that a portion of the propane sample may have, since the time of COSP application, switched to wood as their major heating fuel. The decision to include a respondent in the wood group was based on a survey question asking "Which fuel is your primary home heating fuel?" Any subject selected from files of propane converters who reported using wood for 50% or more of home heating requirements was defined as a wood user for classification purposes. It should be noted that close to 30% of the propane sample cited wood as a supplementary fuel used for home heating.

1.3 Report Organization

This report begins with a summary, in Section 2, of the general characteristics of respondents, categorized as wood and propane users. Results are then discussed in six additional sections:

- 3. Conversion Motives
- 4. Conversion and Oil Displacement Details
- 5. Wood Specific Measures
- 6. COSP Specific Measures
- 7. Conversion Decision Process
- 8. Distributional Effects

Summary tables of frequencies, means, percentages, and relationships are included in these sections to highlight the major findings. The concluding sections contain a list of summary observations and recommendations for ongoing research.

Appendices include the questionnaire (Appendix A) and the complete tabulation of the frequenices of all responses broken down by region and by the propane/wood users distinction (Appendix B). The reader who is interested in frequency tabulations for specific measures is encouraged to consult these appended tables, which are arranged in the same order as, and keyed to, questionnaire items.

1.4 Sample Representativeness

Subject responses were compared to Statistics Canada data on several demographic and housing characteristic measures. These measures included the following:

- income
- age
- number of persons in household
- home type

Table 1.4.1 compares the wood group with Statistics Canada data on the distribution of income by region. This comparison is repeated in Table 1.4.2 with the propane group. Tables 1.4.1 and 1.4.2 indicate that for both the wood and propane groups, no significant differences are evidenced when compared with Statistics Canada income data for Canada as a whole. However, some differences are noted when regional breakdowns are examined. Wood users are under-represented in high income groups in Ontario and the Prairies. With propane users a similar finding can be noted in Ontario. The reader should, however, exert caution when interpreting differences in the propane group due to the small sample sizes present in this segment's regional breakdowns.

Table 1.4.1

Percentage Distribution of Income By Region --
Statistics Canada vs. Survey Results for Wood Group

Income[1] Category	Canada[3]		Maritimes[3]		Quebec[3]		Ontario[4]		Prairies[4]		B.C.[3]	
	Stats Cda.	Wood Group	Stats Cda.	Wood Group	Stats Cda.	Wood Group	Stats Cda.	Wood Group	Stats Cda.	Wood Group	Stats Cda.	Wood Group
	%		%		%		%		%		%	
less than $11,000[2]	16.4	15.1	22.6	16.7	19.1	21.0	13.5	12.1	17.6	16.5	12.5	8.5
$11,000 - $14,999[2]	8.2	11.9	13.5	15.6	8.1	7.4	7.6	16.7	8.2	11.8	6.8	8.5
$15,000 - $19,999	12.9	12.6	16.8	14.4	15.5	16.0	11.0	13.6	12.0	12.9	10.7	6.1
$20,000 - $24,999	13.5	16.6	15.7	16.7	14.0	13.6	14.0	13.6	12.1	18.8	10.8	19.5
$25,000 - $29,999	13.9	12.9	10.4	6.7	13.0	11.1	15.7	12.1	13.2	18.8	14.6	15.9
$30,000 - $34,999	11.0	10.9	8.4	8.9	9.7	11.1	12.1	10.6	11.2	9.4	12.4	14.6
$35,000 and over	24.1	20.1	12.6	21.1	20.7	19.8	26.2	21.2	25.6	11.8	32.1	26.8
		(n=404)		(n=90)		(n=81)		(n=66)		(n=85)		(n=82)

[1] Source: Statistics Canada; Income Distribution by Size in Canada, Preliminary Estimates 1980; Catalogue #13-206, Table 1, Page 14 estimates for "Families"

[2] Income categories are based on Statistics Canada breakdowns. Categories for the wood group vary as follows: less than $10,000; $10,000-14,999. All remaining categories are similar.

[3] Not significantly different at P less than .05

[4] Significantly different at P less than .05

Table 1.4.2

Percentage Distribution of Income By Region --
Statistics Canada vs. Survey Results for Propane Group

Income[1] Category	Canada[3]		Maritimes[3]		Quebec[3]		Ontario[4]		Prairies[4]		B.C.[3]	
	Stats Cda.	Wood Group	Stats Cda.	Wood Group	Stats Cda.	Wood Group	Stats Cda.	Wood Group	Stats Cda.	Wood Group	Stats Cda.	Wood Group
	%		%		%		%		%		%	
less than $11,000[2]	16.4	14.0	22.6	17.6	19.1	12.5	13.5	17.6	17.6	8.9	12.5	12.5
$11,000 - $14,999[2]	8.2	11.8	13.5	17.6	8.1	2.5	7.6	11.8	8.2	13.3	6.8	16.7
$15,000 - $19,999	12.9	14.6	16.8	17.6	15.5	22.5	11.0	14.7	12.0	11.1	10.7	4.2
$20,000 - $24,999	13.5	15.2	15.7	14.7	14.0	10.0	14.0	20.6	12.1	11.1	10.8	25.0
$25,000 - $29,999	13.9	10.7	10.4	5.9	13.0	15.0	15.7	11.8	13.2	13.3	14.6	4.2
$30,000 - $34,999	11.0	9.6	8.4	8.8	9.7	7.5	12.1	14.7	11.2	4.4	12.4	16.7
$35,000 and over	24.1	24.1	12.6	17.7	20.7	30.0	26.2	8.8	25.6	37.8	32.1	20.9
		(n=177)		(n=34)		(n=40)		(n=34)		(n=45)		(n=24)

[1] Source: Statistics Canada; Income Distribution by Size in Canada, Preliminary Estimates 1980; Catalogue #13-206, Table 1, Page 14 estimates for "Families"

[2] Income categories are based on Statistics Canada breakdowns. Categories for the propane group vary as follows: less than $10,000; $10,000-14,999. All remaining categories are similar.

[3] Not significantly different at P less than .05

[4] Significantly different at p less than .05

Table 1.4.3 compares Statistics Canada projections for age of household heads with wood and propane users. For both male and female wood users as well as male propane users, no significant age differences are noted when compared to Statistics Canada data. Female propane users are, however, shown to be older in comparison to Statistics Canada data.

Table 1.4.4 compares Statistics Canada data for the number of persons per single detached home with data from wood and propane users. No significant differences are noted with the propane group; however wood users tend to have larger families in comparison to Statistics Canada information (3.6 persons per household for the wood group vs. 3.3 persons per single detached home for Statistics Canada).

Finally, Table 1.4.5 examines the ratio of single detached homes to mobile homes for Statistics Canada data vs. survey results. As shown by the Statistics Canada information, single detached homes outnumber mobile homes by almost 23 to 1. However, mobile homes are much more heavily represented in the wood and propane sample groups. This is particularly true in B.C. where the ratio of single detached homes to mobile homes is only 3.1 to 1 for wood users and 1.6 to 1 for propane users.

Table 1.4.3

Distribution of Households by Age of Head: Statistics Canada Projection vs. Survey Results

Age Category	Statistics Canada Projections[1]	Sample Group			
		Wood Users		Propane Users	
		Male[2]	Female[2]	Male[2]	Female[3]
	%	%	%	%	%
		n=392	n=169	n=172	n=57
under 25 years	7.4	4.3	7.7	3.5	7.0
25 - 34	25.4	31.6	27.2	25.0	19.3
35 - 44	21.3	26.3	26.6	18.0	15.8
45 - 54	14.7	15.1	19.5	18.0	15.8
55 - 64	13.9	14.5	12.4	21.5	28.1
over 65 years	17.2	8.2	6.5	14.0	14.0

1. Source: Statistics Canada; Household and Family Projections 1976-2001
December 1981; Catalogue #91-522
Table 5, Page 79, Series A projections for 1981

2. Not significantly different from Statistics Canada Projections at $P < .05$

3. Significantly different from Statistics Canada Projections at $P < .05$

Table 1.4.4

Number of Persons per Single Detached Home:
Statistics Canada Data vs. Survey Results

Persons per single detached home (owned)	Wood[3] Users (n=364)	Statistics[1] Canada Data	Propane[2] Users (n=145)
1	4.1	9.7%	6.9
2	20.1	27.3%	35.9
3	21.2	19.0%	15.2
4	31.9	24.0%	22.1
5	14.8	12.4%	13.8
6	5.8	4.9%	3.4
7	0.5	1.5%	2.1
8+	1.7	1.2%	0.7
average	3.6 persons	3.3 persons	3.2 persons

1. Source: Statistics Canada; Catalogue #93-914, Table 14

2. Not significantly different from Statistics Canada at P less than .05

3. Significantly different from Statistics Canada data at P less than .05

Table 1.4.5

Ratio of Single Detached Homes to Mobile Homes by Region:
Statistics Canada Data vs. Survey Results

Sample Group: Measures	Canada	Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.
Statistics Canada:						
single detached homes	4,735,390	482,745	954,460	1,690,955	973,470	622,370
mobile homes	206,700	33,310	35,935	23,495	61,620	50,335
ratio single/mobile	22.9	14.5	26.6	72.0	15.8	12.4
Wood Users:						
single detached homes	367	86	79	63	77	62
mobile homes	39	3	4	3	9	20
ratio single/mobile	9.4 to 1	28.7	19.8	21.0	8.6	3.1
Propane Users:						
single detached homes	147	28	35	29	41	14
mobile homes	34	8	1	5	11	9
ratio single/mobile	4.3	3.5	3.5	5.8	3.7	1.6

2. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS: WOOD VS PROPANE USERS

The purpose of this section is to provide a summary of the characteristics of the two sample groups, wood and propane users. This will provide a useful prelude to the more detailed analysis in subsequent sections of the report. It should be noted at this time that the wood-propane distinction is being made for conveneince of presentation only.

Appendix A contains a copy of the survey questionnaire and Appendix B contains detailed tables listing the frequency distribution of responses by region for each category of questions. These detailed tabulations are provided to accommodate individuals interested in specific survey findings. The present section summarizes selected measures which describe general characteristics of the consumer groups surveyed.

2.1 Home Characteristics

Table 2.1.1 summarizes physical aspects of the homes occupied by each respondent group. As indicated:

- Propane users are twice as likely as wood users to live in mobile homes (18% vs 9%)
- Propane users tend to live in homes that are older and smaller than wood users
- Insulation levels in all areas of the home are approximately equivalent for wood and propane users
- Generally, the probability of having insulation decreases in the following order: ceilings, walls, basements.

Based on the detailed tabulations in Appendix B (B59 - B62), it is evident that there are several regional differences in these home characteristics. British Columbia respondents are more likely to live in mobile homes (wood users 23%; propane users 36%) and in homes

that are newer (for both groups more than 10 years below the aggregate average home age).

Table 2.1.2 summarizes the insulation intentions and program (CHIP, ENER$AVE) status among respondent groups. This table indicates that:

- About one-half of wood and propane users intend to insulate (21% to 23% within a year or so and a further 26% to 28% say they will insulate, but don't know when).
- Program awareness is high (91% to 93%) for CHIP but quite low for ENER$AVE (50%).
- About 40% (38% wood users; 41% propane users) have applied for CHIP and an additional one-fifth of the subjects plan to apply (21% wood; 15% propane).
- A significant portion of both sample groups say they don't know if they are eligible for CHIP (propane, 32%; wood, 31%).
- 12% of subjects in both groups have applied for ENER$AVE and approximately one-quarter intend to apply (wood users, 26%; propane users, 22%).

Once again, regional differences may be noted, as indicated in the detailed region-by-region tabulations in Appendix B (B62 - B64). For example, subjects in British Columbia are more likely to state they do <u>not</u> plan to add insulation (wood users, 61.6%; propane users, 75.0%).

Table 2.1.1 Summary of Home Characteristics

Home Characteristics	Wood Users	Propane Users
Home Type:	(n=426)	(n=195)
. single family	87%	76%
. mobile home	9%	18%
. other	4%	6%
Age of Home:	(n=422)	(n=196)
. mean	32 years	37 years
. median	22 years	30 years
No. of Rooms:	(n=424)	(n=191)
. mean	7.1 rooms	6.7 rooms
. median	6.9 rooms	6.3 rooms
Size (square footage)	(n=422)	(n=192)
. 800 and under	14%	25%
. 801 - 1000	21%	23%
. 1001 - 1200	23%	19%
. 1201 - 1500	20%	15%
. more than 1500	23%	18%
Insulation Levels:		
. basement	(n=337)	(n=140)
- no insulation	33%	34%
- poorly insulated	13%	21%
- moderately insulated	35%	25%
- very well insulated	19%	20%
. walls	(n=414)	(n=185)
- no insulation	6%	2%
- poorly insulated	14%	22%
- moderately insulated	54%	47%
- very well insulated	27%	29%
. ceiling/attic	(n=415)	(n=189)
- no insulation	3%	3%
- poorly insulated	8%	11%
- moderately insulated	39%	39%
- very well insulated	50%	47%

Table 2.1.2 Summary of Insulation Intentions and Status Re: CHIP and ENER$AVE Programs

Measure	Wood Users	Propane Users
Intend to add insulation?	(n=411)	(n=184)
• yes, in a specified time	23%	21%
• yes, but don't know when	28%	26%
• no	49%	54%
Aware of CHIP?	(n=407)	(n=183)
• yes	91%	93%
Eligible for CHIP?	(n=382)	(n=173)
• yes	45%	49%
• don't know	31%	32%
Applied for CHIP?	(n=400)	(n=182)
• yes	38%	41%
Plan to apply for CHIP?	(n=418)	(n=183)
• yes	21%	15%
Aware of ENER$AVE?	(n=408)	(n=179)
• yes	50%	50%
Applied for ENER$AVE?	(n=399)	(n=175)
• yes	12%	12%
Plan to apply for ENER$AVE?	(n=324)	(n=150)
• yes	26%	22%

2.2 Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics

Table 2.2.1 summarizes various personal characteristics of the respondent groups. Males were much more likely than females to fill out the questionnaire, particularly in the propane user subgroup (wood - male=58%, female=11%, male and female=31%; propane - male=58%, female=11%, male and female=19%). The greater rate of male-female returns in the wood group could reflect the increased effort required by the entire family when heating with wood.

The questionnaire was structured to allow separate responses by males and females on most demographic measures. This was done in order to accommodate couples who chose to fill out the questionnaire together. On the question concerning subject age, wood users of both sexes tend to be younger than propane users. For example, 62% of wood users are under 45 years of age while only 42-46% of propane users are in this age group. Furthermore, almost twice as many propane users are over 65 years (14% vs. 7-8%).

These age differences are further manifested in that wood users have more people living in their home (3.6 persons vs. 3.3 persons) than do propane users. On the basis of modes (most frequently occurring response) wood-using families have four household members while propane users have two. As expected, therefore, wood users are more likely to have children under 18 years of age living in their home than are propane users (31%-33% vs. 20%-26%).

Table 2.2.1 also summarizes education and total family income and indicates that the two groups are highly comparable on these measures.

Table 2.2.1 Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics

Measure	Wood Users	Propane Users
Sex of Respondent:	(n=380)	(n=173)
. male	58%	68%
. female	11%	13%
. male and female	31%	19%
Male Age:	(n=393)	(n=172)
. under 25	4%	4%
. 25 - 34	32%	25%
. 35 - 44	26%	18%
. 45 - 54	15%	18%
. 55 - 64	15%	22%
. 65 or over	8%	14%
Female Age:	(n=169)	(n=57)
. under 25	8%	7%
. 25 - 34	27%	19%
. 35 - 44	27%	16%
. 45 - 54	20%	16%
. 55 - 64	12%	28%
. 64 or over	7%	14%
No. of Persons in Household:	(n=421)	(n=191)
. mean	3.6	3.3
. median	3.6	2.9
. mode	4.0	2.0
% of Households with Children at home: (multiple responses possible)	(n=429)	(n=197)
. under 6 years	32%	26%
. 6 - 12 years	33%	20%
. 13 - 18 years	31%	21%
Male Education:	(n=386)	(n=169)
. some or no high school	46%	44%
. completed high school	24%	24%
. some com. col/university	16%	21%
. completed university	14%	10%
Female Education:	(n=168)	(n=65)
. some or no high school	35%	42%
. completed high school	39%	37%
. some com. col/university	17%	19%
. completed university	9%	3%
Income Before Taxes:	(n=404)	(n=178)
. under $15,000	27%	26%
. $15,000 - 29,999	42%	41%
. over $30,000	31%	34%

2.3 Heating System Characteristics

Table 2.3.1 summarizes fuel usage details and supplementary fuels used by wood and propane users. As indicated, propane users are much more likely than wood users to use one fuel as their sole source for home heating: 86% of wood users use some form of supplementary heat, while only 59% of propane users do likewise.

The type of supplementary fuel utilized by the two groups also varies greatly. A large proportion of wood users still utilize oil for some part of their home heating needs. Of these wood users who heat with a supplementary fuel, 82% use oil (in other words, 68% of the total wood sample still use oil). In contrast, only 8% of the propane group who use a supplementary fuel utilize oil for heating. Electricity is a popular supplementary heat source in both groups: 22% of wood users and 47% of propane users utilize this fuel form. Wood is also frequently used (44%) by the propane group as a supplementary fuel. A very small percentage of both groups use natural gas as a supplementary form of heating.

When electricity is used as a supplementary fuel, it generally contributes only a small percentage of the total home heating needs. 68% of the wood group and 78% of the propane group use electricity for less than 20% of their home heating requirements.

Oil is used for a larger percentage of home heat. Of wood users who use oil for supplementary heating, 29% indicate that oil contributes 30-50% of their space heating needs. Propane is not reported here as only a small number of propane users (n=10) still use oil for part of their home heating requirements.

When wood is used as a supplementary fuel, it also contributes a

fairly large percentage of space heating needs: 53% of the propane sample who use wood as a supplementary fuel form use wood for 20-50% of their space heating requirements.

Table 2.3.1: Heating System Characteristics

Measure		Wood Users	Propane Users
Home Heating System Characteristics			
		n=427	n=194
Percent of heating needs provided by fuel.			
	less than 40%	9.1%	3.1%
	40-49%	5.9%	1.5%
	50-59%	3.3%	3.6%
	60-69%	5.6%	6.2%
	70-79%	14.1%	8.2%
	80-89%	21.8%	13.9%
	90-99%	28.3%	22.7%
	100%	11.9%	40.7%
		n=415	n=121
Is a supplementary fuel used	% yes	86.0%	59.3%
		n=357	n=121
Type of supplementary fuel used (% totals greater than 100% as multiple responses allowed)	oil	81.8%	8.3%
	electricity	22.4%	47.1%
	wood	n/a	43.8%
	propane	5.0%	n/a
	natural gas	1.4%	1.0%
		n=292	n=10
Percent of home heating needs accounted for by oil as a supplementary fuel	less than 10%	16.8%	10.0%
	10-19%	37.7%	20.0%
	20-29%	16.4%	30.0%
	30-50%	29.1%	40.0%
		n=80	n=57
Percent of home heating needs accounted by electricity as a supplementary fuel	less than 10%	33.8%	45.6%
	10-19%	33.8%	26.3%
	20-29%	13.8%	14.0%
	30-50%	18.8%	14.0%
			n=53
Percent of home heating needs accounted by wood as a supplementary fuel	less than 10%		13.2%
	10-19%	N/A	34.0%
	20-29%		26.4%
	30-50%		26.4%

3. CONVERSION MOTIVES: WOOD VS PROPANE USERS

3.1 Reasons for Converting

Subjects were presented with a series of possible conversion motives. A 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1=strongly agree to 5=strongly disagree, was utilized to measure respondents' degree of agreement or disagreement with each possible motive (detailed regional breakdowns for the various conversion motives can be found in Appendix B, pages B8 - B26). Table 3.1 displays a summary of the percentage of subjects who strongly agreed or agreed with each statement. Where possible, comparisons are made with gas and electric converters from the 1981 COSP study conducted by Decision Research Ltd. (this study was referenced and briefly discussed in the methodology section of this report).

Table 3.1: Percentage of Wood and Propane Users Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Various Conversion Motives

Measure (Conversion Motive)	Wood Users	Propane Users	1981 Study* Natural Gas	Electricity
High heating costs with old system	94%	68%	78%	
Fear of future oil costs	93%	79%	88%	
Potential lower costs with new system	93%	52%	88%	56%
Fuel will be cheapest in future	80%	45%	70%	77%
Availability of COSP	79%	86%	85%	
Dissatisfaction with old system	32%	55%	n/a	
Fear of future oil shortages	32%	31%	50%	
Previous system in poor condition/broken down	15%	64%	n/a	

* based on the 1981 Gas/Electric COSP Study conducted by Decision Research Ltd. Where possible results are broken down separately for gas and electric converters.

As Table 3.1 indicates, monetary considerations are by far the dominant conversion motive for wood users. Wood users rank high heating costs with their old system (oil) as their primary reason for conversion (94% agreed or strongly agreed). The fear of future oil costs (93%) and the potential for lower costs with a new system (93%) are also frequently cited. These results are quite similar to those obtained in the 1981 gas/electric study.

While cost considerations are of importance to the propane segment, they are not as strong a conversion motive as for the wood user segment. Furthermore, propane users seem to differentiate between the high cost of oil and the potential savings attributable to propane. For example, 79% of propane users agreed or strongly agreed that the fear of future oil costs (ranked 2nd) and high heating costs with the old system (68%, ranked 3rd) were reasons for converting. However, only 52% of propane users cite, as reasons for conversion, potential lower heating costs with a new system (ranked 6th) and a belief that propane would be the cheapest fuel in the future (45%, ranked 7th).

Availability of COSP was ranked first as a conversion motive by propane users (86% agreement or strong agreement). While approximately the same percentage of wood users agreed that COSP was a reason for conversion (79%), the COSP grant ranked fifth as a conversion motive due to the importance wood users place on cost considerations.

Of interest is the large percentage (64%) of propane users who agreed or strongly agreed that their previous oil system was in poor condition or had broken down. In comparison, only 15% of wood users stated that this was a motive for converting.

Neither group seems to believe that Canada will face shortages of oil in the future. Only 32% of wood users and 31% of propane users agreed or strongly agreed that potential oil shortages were a motive for conversion. It is interesting to note that in the 1981 study 50% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that fear of future oil shortages was a reason for their converting. The emergence of an oil glut in 1982 and its intense media coverage is the likely reason for this decreased fear of oil shortages.

3.2 Fuel Characteristics as a Conversion Motive

Subjects were presented with a series of fuel characteristics and were asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with each characteristic as a conversion motive (5-point Likert scaling). Results are displayed in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Percentage of Wood and Propane Users Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with Various Fuel Characteristics as a Conversion Motive

Measure	Wood Users	Propane Users
fuel easily accessible	90%	84%
enjoy "atmosphere" of fuel	86%	69%
fuel provides comfortable heat	76%	58%
enjoy the outdoor activiites associated with fuel	72%	25%
desire a guaranteed fuel supply	70%	68%
the heating equipment needed cost the least	60%	45%
fuel is cleanest environmentally	31%	69%
fuel is cleanest in the home	21%	76%
the fuel is safest to operate	21%	42%
the fuel desired for conversion was not available	11%	48%

Table 3.2 indicates that fuel availability was an important consideration to both sample groups: 90% of wood users and 84% of propane users agreed or strongly agreed that accessibility was a conversion motive. (Note that respondents are expected to recall their motives at the time the conversion decision was made).

Wood users also enjoyed the atmosphere provided by wood heat (86% agreement) and tended to agree that the fuel provides the most comfortable heat (76%). Furthermore, almost three-quarters (72%) agreed that they enjoyed the outdoor activities associated with wood.

The final measure presented in Table 3.2 is of particular interest. A large portion of the propane group (48%) agreed or strongly agreed that the fuel they wanted for home heating was not available where they lived. In contrast, only 11% of wood users agreed that wood was not their first choice as a conversion fuel.

3.3. Fuel Cost Perceptions

Subjects were asked to indicate which fuel types they believed were the most or least expensive for home heating. These results are shown in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3 Fuel Cost Perceptions

Fuel Type Thought to be most/least Expensive	Wood Users		Propane Users	
	Most	Least	Most	Least
natural gas	3%	10%	1%	50%
oil	55%	1%	38%	3%
electricity	36%	2%	51%	1%
wood	1%	85%	3%	31%
propane	5%	2%	7%	16%

Table 3.3 indicates that the vast majority of wood users (85%) believe that wood is the least expensive fuel for home heating. On the other hand, 50% of the propane sample chose natural gas and a further 31% chose wood as the least expensive fuel; only 16% of the propane group selected propane as the least expensive home heating fuel.

3.4 Comments

Cost considerations were clearly the dominant motive for conversions to wood. All monetary measures, particularly those relating to the economies of wood, were strongly indicated by wood users.

The motives for propane conversions were not as clearly defined. Cost measures were not cited as frequently by propane users as they were by the wood group. However, the availability of a COSP grant seems to have stimulated propane conversions, as did the presence of a previous oil system which was in poor working condition.

For many subjects in the propane group, it is possible that propane was selected on a temporary basis, i.e., to be used only until natural gas became available. Further evidence for this can be seen by the following breakdown:

Propane Subgroup	Percent indicating Natural Gas is Least Expensive Fuel*
Desired Conversion Fuel Not Available	
. strongly agreed or agreed	64%
. strongly disagreed or disagreed	36%

* difference significant at a probability of less than .01

The above breakdown shows that those propane users who agreed that their desired fuel choice was not available are much more likely to believe that natural gas is the most economical fuel for home heating.

4. CONVERSION AND OIL DISPLACEMENT DETAILS

The purpose of this section is to summarize the monetary details associated with conversions to propane and wood. In addition, an attempt will be made to quantify the amount of oil displaced by the two groups. Regional details are presented in Appendix B, pages B35 to B42.

4.1 Cost Experiences

Table 4.1.1 summarizes cost details experienced by the respondent groups. As can be seen, propane users spent substantially more on their annual heating bills than did wood users ($898 vs $546). The total cost of conversion was also higher for propane users, as was the size of the COSP grant received.

A vast majority of wood users (92%) expect to save enough on their heating bills to payback their investment. Estimated payback time is on the order of 2-3 years. Only 51% of propane users expected a payback on their investment, and those who do anticipate a payback time approximately double that of wood users (5-6 years).

Almost all wood users (92%) have experienced cost decreases since conversion. Of those experiencing cost decreases, the following breakdown is evidenced:

		% citing
costs have decreased by ...	20% or less	6%
...	21 - 40%	12%
...	41 - 60%	25%
...	61 - 80%	27%
...	81 - 100%	30%

Table 4.1.1 Conversion Cost Details

Measure	Wood Users	Propane Users
Yearly cost of heating after conversion:	(n=379)	(n=179)
. mean	$546	$898
. median	$451	$800
Cost of converting system:	(n=402)	(n=189)
. mean	$1292	$1602
. median	$1200	$1250
Size of COSP grant:	(n=354)	(n=186)
. mean	$551	$579
. median	$540	$575
Does subject expect a payback on investment?	(n=402)	(n=186)
% yes	92%	51%
Expected number of years for payback	(n=362)	(n=81)
. mean	3.1 years	6.1 years
. median	2.4 years	5.1 years
. mode	2.0 years	3.0 years
Cost changes after conversion:	(n=344)	(n=155)
. costs have increased	4%	21%
. costs are the same	4%	34%
. costs have decreased	92%	45%

As is obvious from the cost breakdown, many wood users have experienced dramatic declines in their home heating costs. What is not known, however, is how many of these wood users included the less obvious costs of wood heating in their cost estimates (subject's time, gas, equipment, etc.).

Only 45% of propane users indicated that their costs have declined since conversion, with 21% actually experiencing a cost increase. The percentage cost increase or decrease for the propane group is shown below:

Percentage Change	Cost Increase	Cost Decrease
	(n=31)	(n=67)
20% or less	32%	48%
21 - 40%	32%	33%
41 - 60%	23%	14%
61 - 80%	6%	5%
80% or more	6%	1%

The above analysis shows that 81% of cost decreases have been less than 40%, the majority of these being less than 20%. Cost increases are also skewed towards the lower end of the range. However, 12% of the increases are 60% or more.

It is interesting to note that when conversion motives are cross-tabulated with cost change experiences, significant differences arise between those propane users who reported cost increases and those who reported cost decreases. These differences are shown in Table 4.1.2.

Table 4.1.2 shows that fear of future oil shortages was much more evident with propane users who have experienced cost increases. In addition, the cost increase group was more likely to agree that their desired fuel for conversion was not available and less likely

to state that they converted due to monetary considerations. It should be noted that these conversion motives were stated retrospective to changing to propane and that actual cost experiences could have influenced their opinions.

Table 4.1.2: Conversion Motives - Propane Cost Increases vs Decreases (% strongly agreed or agreed)

Conversion Motive*	Cost Experience	
	$ have decreased	$ have increased
	(n=68)	(n=30)
fear of future oil shortages	22%	57%
high heating costs with old system	91%	39%
fear of future oil costs	92%	33%
lower costs with new fuel	88%	20%
equipment costs are low	54%	37%
desired fuel not available	49%	62%

* all differences significant at p less than .05

4.2 Oil Displacement Details

Subjects were asked to estimate the amount of oil they used before converting and the amount they used after converting. Two groups can therefore be identified:

(1) Total Off-Oil Converters

(2) Partial Off-Oil Converters

For each of these two groups an oil displacement figure can be calculated. In question here is whether or not subjects can accurately recall oil usage. Therefore, two other types of questions were asked: How accurate does the subject believe his estimates are, and were/are records kept concerning oil use and cost. Results from these sets of questions indicated that 48% of wood users and 45% of propane users were "quite sure" or "certain" of their pre-conversion oil usage estimates. In addition, 61% of both groups indicated that they kept records concerning the amount and cost of oil used before converting. Estimates of current oil usage are more certain with 54% of wood users being "quite sure" or "certain" and 68% of this group maintaining records. (It should be noted that only a small percentage of the propane group still uses oil for part of their heating needs).

By using the questions discussed above, four oil displacement estimates can be derived:

Estimate 1: Raw displacement scores for total and partial converters (called Aggregate)

Estimate 2: Scores based only on those subjects who maintain records (called Records Kept). For partial converters, records must be kept both before and after conversion

Estimate 3: Scores based only on those subjects who were "quite sure" or "certain" of their estimates (called Certain)

Estimate 4: Scores based only on those subjects who meet both the estimate 2 and estimate 3 criteria (called All Criteria Met).

Table 4.2.1 describes these estimates for partial and total wood converters. Using mean (average) values and the most rigorous Estimate 4 criterion, it is estimated that partial off-oil wood users displaced 658 gallons per year and total off-oil wood users displaced 814 gallons per year.

Similar analysis for propane users is shown in Table 4.2.2. Results show that based on mean (average) figures, propane users have displaced 825 gallons of oil annually. This displacement estimate is very similar to that which was obtained for total off-oil wood users.

When the oil displacement estimates are put in relation to the dollar values of COSP grant received, we find that approximately 1.4 gallons of fuel oil are displaced for each dollar of COSP (1.39 gal./dollar for wood users; 1.42 gal./dollar for propane users). For partial wood converters, this figure is reduced somewhat to 1.26 gallons per dollar of COSP. It should be remembered, however, that these calculations only take into consideration the amount of oil displaced in one year: the more accurate conception is displacment each year in the future.

Another way to conceptualize the amount of oil displacement is to calculate the percentage of oil displaced. This calculation is only meaningful for the wood group, as 68% of wood users still use oil for part of their home heating needs. The percentage of oil displacement would be based on the following calculation:

$$\left[\begin{pmatrix}\text{number of wood subjects}\\ \text{using oil before converting}\end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix}\text{mean amount}\\ \text{of oil used}\end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix}\text{number of wood subjects}\\ \text{using oil after converting}\end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix}\text{mean amount}\\ \text{of oil used}\end{pmatrix}\right] \div$$

Total amount of oil used before converting

Figures necessary for the above calculation can be obtained by referring to Appendix tables B40 and B41. When the calculation is completed we find that wood users have displaced 76% of the oil they used before converting.

Table 4.2.1 Oil Displacement Estimates: Wood Users

Measure		Estimate 1 "Aggregate"	Estimate 2 "Records Kept"	Estimate 3 "Certain"	Estimate 4 "All Criteria Met"
Amount of oil displaced (in gal)	1) Partial Converters	n=251	n=138	n=95	n=72
	mean	520 gal	565 gal	642 gal	658 gal
	median	500 gal	500 gal	600 gal	600 gal
	2) Total Converters	n=139	n=71	n=53	n=40
	mean	813 gal	841 gal	866 gal	814 gal
	median	701 gal	750 gal	756 gal	737 gal
Size of COSP Grant Received	1) Partial Converters				
	mean	$548	$536	$534	$523
	median	$540	$500	$510	$500
	2) Total Converters				
	mean	$557	$557	$543	$572
	median	$500	$606	$605	$650
Gallons of oil displaced per dollar of COSP (based on means)	1) Partial Converters	.95 gal	1.05 gal	1.20 gal	1.26 gal
	2) Total Converters	1.46 gal	1.46 gal	1.59 gal	1.42 gal

Table 4.2.2 Oil Displacement Estimates: Propane Users

Measure		Estimate 1 "Aggregate"	Estimate 2 "Records Kept"	Estimate 3 "Certain"	Estimate 4 "All Criteria Met"
		n=145	n=93	n=71	n=57
Amount of oil displaced (in gal)	mean	883 gal	934 gal	784 gal	825 gal
	median	801 gal	802 gal	799 gal	800 gal
Size of COSP Grant Received	mean	$548	$597	$599	$592
	median	$600	$600	$600	$600
Gallons of oil displaced per dollar of COSP (based on means)	mean	1.51 gal	1.56 gal	1.31 gal	1.39 gal
	median	1.33 gal	1.33 gal	1.33 gal	1.33 gal

5. WOOD SPECIFIC MEASURES

A variety of measures were included in the questionnaire to probe in greater detail the wood user segment. These measures will be discussed below. Detailed regional breakdowns can be found in Appendix B, pages B43 to B53.

5.1 Usage Patterns and Costs

The costs associated with purchasing a cord of wood vary considerably from province to province. The average amounts paid per cord are shown in Table 5.1.1.

face cords ??

Table 5.1.1 Cost of Wood per Cord by Region

Measure	For Those Who Buy Some or All of Their Wood Supply $ per Cord					
	Canada	Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.
mean	$43	$50	$34	$52	$35	$36
median	$40	$50	$30	$46	$23	$25

Table 5.1.1 indicates that for Canada as a whole the mean price paid for one cord of wood is $43. However, subjects from Ontario and the Maritimes reported paying considerably more for their wood; approximately $50 per cord. In contrast, respondents from Quebec, the Prairies, and B.C. paid about 30% less on average, or approximately $35 per cord.

It should be noted at this time that a fairly large percentage of respondents indicated that they paid no money for the wood they use. Average costs reported in Table 5.1.1 do not include these respondents. The percentage of subjects who report paying nothing

for their wood is shown in Table 5.1.2.

Table 5.1.2 Percentage of Respondents Who Pay Zero Dollars for Wood by Region

Region	Sample Size	Percentage of Respondents Who Pay Zero Dollars for Wood
Maritimes	83	16%
Quebec	84	8%
Ontario	59	29%
Prairies	67	51%
B.C.	69	38%
Canada	362	27%

Table 5.1.2 indicates that in aggregate, 27% of wood users report paying nothing for the wood they use for home heating. However, this figure varies considerably on a regional basis. Over half (51%) of Prairie respondents and 38% of B.C. subjects indicate that the wood they use is "free". In contrast only 16% of Maritime subjects and 8% of Quebec wood users make this claim.

The number of cords used on a yearly basis also varies regionally. These results are shown in Table 5.1.3.

Table 5.1.3 Approximate Number of Cords Used Annually by Region

Region	Sample Size	Number of Cords Used Per Year (Median)
Maritimes	80	5.1
Quebec	76	6.5
Ontario	57	5.9
Prairies	73	5.5
B.C.	73	4.3
Canada	363	5.4

Table 5.1.3 indicates that, as expected, B.C. subjects report using the least amount of wood; approximately 4.3 cords per year. Quebecers, with 6.5 cords per year, use the greatest quantity of

wood. In the other three regions of Canada wood usage averages between 5 and 6 cords per year.

5.2 Wood Acquisition Behavior

Subjects were asked a variety of questions pertaining to the acquisition of wood. These measures include:

- percentage of wood cut by subjects
- location where wood is obtained
- type of wood burned most frequently
- condition of wood burned most frequently
- length of time wood is stored before use
- whether or not wood used is cut to length, split and piled.

Tabulations of the above measures are shown broken down by region in Table 5.2.1.

Table 5.2.1 highlights some interesting regional differences in terms of wood acquisition behavior. First, subjects from the Prairies and B.C. are most likely to cut all of their wood requirements. 84% of Prairie respondents and 75% of B.C. respondents cut 100% of their wood. In contrast, only 35% of Quebecers cut all their wood.

Next, one half of Canadian wood users (51%) obtain their wood at their own woodlot or that of a friend or relative. Subjects from the Prairies are most likely to use these types of woodlots (70%). However, almost half (49%) of respondents from B.C. obtain most of their wood from crown or provincial land.

Finally, approximately three-quarters of Maritime and Quebec wood users and two-thirds of Ontario wood users most commonly utilize hardwood to heat their home. In contrast, subjects from the Prairies

Table 5.2.1 Summary of Wood Acquisition Measures by Region

Measure	Region					
	Canada	Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.
Percentage of wood cut by subject:	n=417	n=85	n=86	n=69	n=88	n=85
none	15%	20%	29%	13%	5%	5%
less than 25%	8%	14%	12%	12%	2%	2%
25-49%	6%	6%	13%	3%	2%	4%
50-74%	7%	7%	8%	10%	5%	7%
75-99%	5%	8%	4%	6%	2%	6%
100%	59%	45%	35%	57%	84%	75%
Type of woodlot where wood is obtained:	n=409	n=85	n=87	n=66	n=89	n=84
subject's woodlot	33%	30%	24%	44%	51%	16%
friend/relative's woodlot	18%	19%	20%	24%	19%	10%
private/retail	6%	5%	16%	5%	2%	4%
crown/provincial land	25%	28%	14%	15%	18%	49%
combination	12%	9%	14%	9%	10%	19%
other	6%	9%	13%	3%	--	4%
Type of wood most commonly used:	n=421	n=86	n=87	n=65	n=89	n=84
hardwood	52%	73%	79%	66%	25%	19%
softwood	24%	17%	6%	13%	40%	43%
combination	23%	8%	8%	17%	34%	37%
don't know	1%	1%	7%	4%	1%	1%

CONTINUED

Table 5.2.1 CONTINUED

Measure	Region					
	Canada	Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.
Condition of wood burned most frequently:	n=424	n=87	n=88	n=70	n=89	n=85
green	5%	7%	2%	6%	2%	6%
seasoned	87%	86%	92%	86%	87%	86%
combination	7%	6%	5%	4%	11%	8%
don't know	1%	1%	1%	4%	--	--
Length of time wood is stored before use:	n=416	n=86	n=86	n=69	n=87	n=83
3 months	19%	22%	12%	19%	24%	17%
3-6 months	26%	41%	22%	19%	15%	34%
6-12 months	39%	35%	50%	39%	32%	36%
1 year	15%	1%	16%	22%	29%	10%
don't know	1%	1%	3%	1%	--	4%
Is stored wood:	n=383	n=74	n=79	n=68	n=76	n=83
cut to length? (% yes)	95%	97%	93%	100%	91%	98%
split? (% yes)	88%	92%	88%	87%	74%	94%
piled? (% yes)	90%	91%	77%	93%	96%	95%

and B.C. are much more likely to use softwood, or hardwood and softwood in combination.

Other highlights from Table 5.2.1 include:

- The vast majority of wood users from all regions generally burn seasoned (87%) as opposed to green wood
- From 75%-88% of wood users store their wood for at least 3 months before burning it.
- Approximately 90% of the subjects have their wood cut to length, split and piled before use.

5.3 Factors Affecting Wood Costs

As previously mentioned, the price paid per cord of wood varies considerably from province to province. Other factors, however, may also effect the price of wood. These factors include:

- quantity of wood used per year
- percentage of wood cut by subject
- location where wood is obtained
- type of wood burned most frequently

How costs are affected by these factors is shown in Table 5.3.1.

Table 5.3.1 shows that wood costs are negatively related to wood usage (on the basis of cost per cord). Subjects using 3 cords per year or less pay $50 per cord for their wood, whereas subjects using 7 cords or more per year spend $30 per cord on average.

Subjects who cut a large percentage of their wood also spend less per cord. When wood users cut none of their own wood, they spend approximately twice as much per cord as those users who cut 100% of their wood ($56 vs $27).

Finally, subjects who have their own woodlot or who use crown land spend about $8 less per cord compared to subjects who purchase wood from retail establishments ($35-$37 vs $44 per cord).

Table 5.3.1 Factors Affecting Wood Costs

(For those who don't get all their wood free)

Factor		Mean Cost per Cord
1. Quantity of Wood Used per year:	2 cords or less	$50
	3 cords	$50
	4 cords	$42
	5 cords	$45
	6 cords	$36
	7 cords	$30
2. Percentage of Wood Cut by Subject:	none	$56
	less than 25%	$61
	25 - 49%	$46
	50 - 74%	$49
	75 - 99%	$44
	100%	$27
3. Location Where Wood is Obtained:	subject's woodlot	$37
	friend/relative's woodlot	$43
	retail woodlot	$44
	crown land	$35
4. Type of Wood Burned Most Frequently:	hardwood	$48
	softwood	$29

5.4 Equipment Details

Wood users were asked to describe the general type of wood system they use, as well as the specific type of heating equipment utilized. These results are displayed in Table 5.4.1.

Table 5.4.1 shows that space heaters are used more frequently than wood furnaces (52% vs. 31%). Among individuals who use space heaters, circulating stoves are the most popular (36%), followed by radiant stoves (21%). Combination furnaces are the most popular with wood furnace users (38%), closely followed by forced air systems (37%). Wood boilers are used by 11% of furnace users, as are wood-burning add-ons.

Table 5.4.1 Equipment Details

Measure	Wood Group
General Type of System*	(n=420)
. wood space heater	52%
. wood furnace	31%
. other	17%
Specific Type of Equipment Used**	(n=218)
1) Space Heater	
. circulating stoves	36%
. radiant stoves	21%
. wood burning add-ons	5%
2) Wood furnace	
. forced air	37%
. combination furnace	38%
. wood boiler	11%
. wood burning add-ons	11%

* Single Response only

** Multiple Response

Several other wood measures to be examined are more meaningful if they are broken down by the general type of system used (ie. space heaters vs furnaces). These results are shown in Table 5.4.2.

Table 5.4.2 Wood Specific Measures: Space Heaters vs Furnaces

Measure	Space Heater Users	Furnace Users
Percent of heating needs provided by wood	(n=218)	(n=130)
. less than 50%	21%	6%
. 50 - 79%	22%	23%
. 80 - 99%	49%	56%
. 100%	8%	15%
Who installed the heating system?		
. subject himself	66%	30%
. a dealer	16%	25%
. a contractor	10%	42%
. other	8%	3%
Was the system inspected after installation?		
. % yes	51%	56%
Approximate number of cords used in past year		
. mean	6 cords	7 cords
. mode	4 cords	5 cords
. median	5 cords	6 cords

Results highlighted in Table 5.4.2 indicate that:

- Wood accounts for a greater portion of the total heating requirements in homes using wood furnaces. 71% of homes with furnaces use wood for 80% or more of their heating needs compared to 57% for space heater homes.

- Households with furnaces use about one more cord of wood per year than do space heated homes (7 vs. 6 cords).

- A majority (66%) of space heater users installed the equipment by themselves. In contrast, 67% of furnace users had a contractor or dealer install the system.

- Just over half of both groups (51% to 56%) had their system inspected after installation.

- Space heater users who buy wood pay $47 per cord on average and furnace users who buy wood pay $42 per cord. It should be noted that approximately 35% of both groups state they pay nothing for the wood they use. These subjects are not included in the cost per cord figures.

5.5 Comparing the Wood Usage and Oil Displacement Estimates

An interesting exercise at this point is to reconcile the wood usage estimates with the oil displacement figures calculated earlier. Logically, if the estimates are valid the two figures should be similar in terms of heat values. Therefore, the first step would be to assign heat values per cord of wood used. These values were provided to the researchers by the government energy office in Winnipeg and are shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Fuel Wood Comparison with Fuel Oil (Assumptions)

---

* Best Heat Values:

One cord of air-dried wood is equal to 120 to 150 gallons of No. 2 domestic fuel oil.

* Middle Heat Values:

One cord of air-dried wood is equal to 90 to 120 gallons of No. 2 domestic fuel oil.

* Lowest Heat Values:

One cord of air-dried wood is equal to 70 to 90 gallons of No. 2 domestic fuel oil.

* Calculations based on the following:

1. Seasoned fuelwood containing 20% moisture content.
2. Domestic #2 heating oil containing 166,200 BTU's per gallon.
3. Oil burning efficiency considered 65%; wood burning efficiency 50%. (Depending on the type of stove or furnace used, the efficiency will vary considerably).

Figure 1 shows that the equivalent fuel oil heat value obtained from a cord of wood ranges from a high of 150 to a low of 70 gallons of fuel oil equivalent. For purposes of calculating equivalent fuel oil displacement from respondents' stated mix of wood usage (% softwood, % hardwood), it is assumed that "softwood" has a 70 gallon fuel oil equivalent and that "hardwood" has a 150 gallon fuel oil equivalent. If we assume that the low heat values primarily comprise softwood and the high values hardwood, an estimate of gallons of fuel oil per cord of wood can be calculated.

Using subjects assigned to the "All Criteria Met" estimate (i.e., those subjects who are either "quite sure" or "certain" of their estimates and keep records), the following calculations can be made:

1) Partial Converters (n=72)

- oil displaced = 658 gal (mean, see Table 4.2.1)
- cords used = 5.8 cords (mean, see Table 5.1.2)
- type of wood burned = 50% hardwood, 22% softwood, 28% combination (assume 28% combination = 14% hardwood, 14% softwood)

Calculation of gallons equivalent of fuel oil:
= 5.8 [(50% + 14%) 150 + (22% + 14%) 70)]
hardwood softwood
= 5.8 [96 + 25.2]
= 5.8 [121.2]
= 703 gallons equivalent of fuel oil

2) Total converters (n=40)

- oil displaced = 814 gal (mean, see Table 4.2.1)
- cords used = 6.5 cords (mean, see Table 5.1.2)
- type of wood burned = 62% hardwood, 5% softwood, 32% combination (assume 32% combination = 16% hardwood, 16% softwood)

Calculation of gallons equivalent of fuel oil:
= 6.5 [(62% + 16%) 150 + (5% + 16%) 70]
hardwood softwood
= 6.5 [117 + 14.7]
= 6.5 [131.7]
= 856 gallons equivalent of fuel oil

Figure 2 summarizes the above calculations.

Figure 2: Oil Displacement Estimate vs Displacement Estimate based on Wood Usage

Wood Group	Oil Displacement Estimate "All Criteria Met"*	Estimate Based on Wood Usage
Partial Converters	658 gal	703 gal
Total Converters	814 gal	856 gal

* These are subjects who are either "quite sure" or "certain of their oil use estimates and who state that they "kept records" of their oil usage.

Figure 2 shows that estimates based on wood usage are quite close to those based on the "All Criteria Met" estimates. For both partial and total converters, the wood usage estimates are about 6% larger than the "All Criteria Met" estimates. It would seem, therefore, that the survey approach utilized (i.e., a mail questionnaire) appears to have generated an accurate estimate of oil displacement. While the only completely precise way to obtain displacement estimates would be to examine subjects' records directly, it seems safe to say that the estimates obtained are accurate within 10 percent.

5.6 Wood Use Experiences

Wood users were asked to state their degree of agreement or disagreement with a variety of experiences related to wood use. These results are presented in Table 5.6.1, which documents the high degree of satisfaction wood users have experienced with their heating system. There was almost unanimous disagreement with the various difficulties or problems presented. The most serious difficulty documented, with 10% agreement, concerned the inconvenience of gathering wood. The high degree of satisfaction was evidenced by 84% agreement that the system works as well or better than expected, 60% agreement that heating costs have declined more than expected and 93% agreement that heating costs have declined since conversion.

Table 5.6.1 Wood Use Experiences: Percent of Agreement or Disagreement

Wood Use Experience	% Strong Agree or Agree	% Strongly Disagree or Disagree
have had difficulty obtaining wood	4%	92%
had problems with the installation	2%	94%
had problems with system operation	4%	93%
had difficulty with cleaning and maintenance	5%	92%
have had heating costs decrease	93%	5%
have found acquiring wood was inconvenient	10%	79%
have had problems with indoor air quality or ventilation	7%	83%
have used more wood than expected	20%	66%
have saved more money than expected	60%	16%
have found the system heats more of the home than expected	60%	17%
have found that the system works as well or better than expected	84%	5%

5.7 Wood Use Relationships

This section will describe differences between individuals who use wood for a high percentage of their home heating needs (heavy users) and those who use wood for a lower percentage (light users).

Three general categories of differences will be discussed:

(1) Conversion Motives

(2) COSP Specific Measures

(3) Demographics

5.7.1 Conversion Motives

Heavy users of wood were more likely to agree with all cost related conversion motives specifically related to wood. These relationships are shown in Table 5.7.1. Note that for the two fuel specific conversion motives, "wood provides the lowest heating costs" and "wood will be the cheapest fuel in the future," significant differences arose between light and heavy users. However, with conversion motives pertaining to the high cost of oil there were no differences (i.e., the vast majority of both heavy and light users agreed or strongly agreed with these reasons for converting).

Table 5.7.1 **Relationship Between Conversion Motives and Percent of Home Heating Provided by Wood

Conversion Motive	Percent of Home Heating Provided by Wood			
	50 or less	50-79%	80-99%	100%
Fuel provides lowest heating costs:				
number in subgroup	35	72	166	34
mean score for subgroup*	2.06	1.43	1.44	1.32
mean score for sample		1.45		
difference (sample-subgroup)	-.61	+.02	+.01	+.13
Fuel will be cheapest in the future:				
number in subgroup	35	70	167	35
mean score for subgroup*	2.40	1.87	1.76	1.57
mean score for sample		1.84		
difference (sample-subgroup)	-.76	-.03	+.08	+.27

* Conversion Motive Score: 1 = strongly agree
2 = agree
3 = neither
4 = disagree
5 = strongly disagree

** all relationships significant at p less than .01

5.7.3 COSP Related Measures

Based on the COSP measure "Would you have converted if COSP was not available," COSP is seen to have had more of an impact on subjects who used wood for a lower percentage of their heating needs. This relationship is shown below.

Percent of heating accounted by wood	COSP Measure*		
	Number in subgroup	Mean Score* for subgroup	Sample mean	Difference (sample-subgroup)
less than 50%	36	1.75		-.17
50 - 79%	70	1.70	1.57	-.12
80 - 99%	163	1.53		+.04
100%	135	1.35		+.22

* based on the measure "Would you have converted if COSP was not available"
1 = definitely would convert
2 = probably would convert
3 = probably would not convert
4 = definitely would not convert

The above relationship indicates that the greater the percentage of home heating accounted for by wood, the more likely it is subjects would have converted without COSP. Given the large cost decreases associated with wood use, this trend makes intuitive sense.

5.7.3 Demographics

Several demographic measures were found to be related to the percentage of wood used for heating. These are shown in Table 5.7.3.

Table 5.7.3 Relationship Between Selected Demographic Measures and Percent of Heating Needs Provided by Wood

Demographic Measure	*Percent of Heating Accounted by Wood			
	Number in Subgroup	*Mean Score for Subgroup	Sample Mean	Difference (Sample-subgroup mean
Education Level - Males[1]				
elementary school	70	8.84		-.57
some high school	100	8.64		-.37
high school grad	89	8.60	8.27	-.33
community college	35	8.17		+.10
some university	26	7.15		+1.12
university grad	54	6.91		+1.36
Family Income (after taxes)[2]				
under $15,000	102	8.76		-.45
$15,000 - 24,999	117	8.53	8.31	-.22
$25,000 - 34,999	95	7.72		+.59
$35,000 or more	78	8.10		+.21

[1] Significant at a proability of less than .01

[2] Significant at a probability of less than .05

* based on the measure "what percentage of your home heating needs are provided by wood".

1 = less than 10%
2 = 10 - 19%
3 = 20 - 29%
4 = 30 - 39%
5 = 40 - 49%
6 = 50 - 59%
7 = 60 - 69%
8 = 70 - 79%
9 = 80 - 89%
10 = 90 - 99%
11 = 100%

Table 5.7.3 indicates that male subjects with lower educational levels tended to use wood for a higher percentage of their home heating needs. Therefore, heavy wood use was negatively related to education. With female subjects (not shown) the direction of the relationship was similar, but not statistically significant.

Total family income after taxes was also negatively related to heavy wood use. Perhaps lower income households use wood out of economic necessity.

6. COSP SPECIFIC MEASURES

In order to ascertain the role that COSP played in the decision to convert, subjects were asked (1) would they have converted off oil heating without COSP, (2) would they have converted off oil heating sooner than they would have otherwise because of COSP and (3) how essential was the COSP grant; in other words, could the subject have afforded to convert without COSP. Each of these measures will be dealt with in turn.

6.1 Likelihood of Converting Without COSP

Subjects were asked if they would have converted systems if the COSP grant were not available. These results are shown in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1 Likelihood of Converting if COSP Had Not Been Available

Subjects	Definitely Would	Probably Would	Probably Would Not	Definitely Would Not
Wood Users:				
Maritimes	59%	33%	7%	1%
Quebec	57%	25%	17%	1%
Ontario	52%	25%	14%	8%
Prairies	59%	32%	9%	-
B.C.	55%	35%	8%	3%
Total Sample	57%	30%	11%	2%
Propane Users:				
Maritimes	68%	21%	12%	-
Quebec	47%	23%	28%	3%
Ontario	53%	24%	15%	9%
Prairies	40%	40%	17%	2%
B.C.	42%	42%	13%	4%
Total Sample	50%	30%	17%	4%
1981 Gas/Electric Study:				
Total Sample	45%	33%	17%	5%

Table 6.1 indicates that 87% of wood users and 80% of propane users definitely or probably would have converted if COSP had not been available. Regional responses are relatively stable, with subjects from Ontario and Quebec generally being the most likely to state that they probably or definitely would not have converted without COSP.

Results obtained for the propane group are very similar to those obtained in the 1981 gas/electric study. In both cases about 21% of the subjects stated that they probably or definitely would not have converted without COSP. COSP seems to have had its smallest impact on wood users, with only 13% of this group stating that they probably or definitely would not have converted without COSP.

These results are, on the surface, quite surprising. It was hypothesized in the 1981 gas/electric study that the proportion of subjects reporting that COSP "caused" them to convert would increase over time. This did not materialize: in the case of propane converters no change has been noted in COSP's impact, and in the case of wood users COSP's impact has declined. However, because of the economic recession, it could be that a conversion resistant segment remained large due to financial constraints. Additionally, the economic rationale of converting to wood suggests that potential cost savings, rather than the availability of COSP, was the primary motive stimulating off-oil conversions.

6.2 COSP as a Conversion Catalyst

Subjects were asked if they converted sooner because of COSP. These results are shown in Table 6.2.

Table 6.2 Respondent agreement or disagreement with the statement "Because the COSP grant was available, I converted my heating system sooner than I would have otherwise."

Subjects	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Wood Users:					
Maritimes	22%	17%	17%	28%	15%
Quebec	26%	21%	7%	26%	21%
Ontario	12%	30%	23%	23%	12%
Prairies	17%	18%	23%	23%	20%
B.C.	24%	22%	24%	15%	15%
Total Sample	20%	21%	19%	23%	17%
Propane Users:					
Maritimes	9%	9%	24%	35%	24%
Quebec	33%	20%	18%	15%	15%
Ontario	3%	26%	34%	29%	9%
Prairies	12%	31%	19%	27%	12%
B.C.	4%	29%	38%	21%	8%
Total Sample	13%	23%	25%	25%	13%
1981 Gas/Electric Study:					
Total Sample	28%	33%	15%	16%	8%

In the report on the 1981 gas/electric study, it was stated that COSP appeared to serve as a catalyst to off-oil conversion: a majority (61%) of gas/electric converters surveyed in 1981 agreed or strongly agreed that they had converted sooner because of COSP. This catalytic function decreased in the present study: only 36% of propane users and 41% of wood users agreed that they had converted sooner because of COSP.

6.3 How Essential Was COSP

The final indicator of COSP's impact is shown in Table 6.3

Table 6.3 How Essential was COSP?

Measure	Wood Users	Propane Users
The grant was essential, I could not have afforded to convert without COSP	18%	12%
The grant was helpful, but I could have afforded to convert without COSP	78%	83%
The grant was completely unnecessary in my case	3%	4%

Table 6.3 shows that only 18% of wood users and 12% of propane users stated that the COSP grant was essential. The vast majority of both groups (78% wood; 83% propane) indicated that the grant was helpful but that they could have afforded to convert without COSP.

In summary, these findings suggest that COSP is not a sufficient condition for conversions to take place. A large majority of wood and propane converters would have switched off oil heating without COSP. Furthermore, COSP as a catalytic stimulus to conversions seems to be decreasing over time: in the present study only about 4 converters out of 10 appeared to have converted sooner because of COSP, compared to 6 out of 10 in the 1981 gas/electric study. The fact that different fuel choices (wood and propane) are involved in the present study may also explain the decrease in apparent COSP impact from that observed in the 1981 gas/electric study.

6.4 Sources of COSP Awareness

Propane and wood users were presented with twelve possible sources of information about the COSP grant. Respondents were asked to indicate if they received any COSP information from each of these sources and to indicate which source provided the most useful information. These results are displayed in Table 6.4 (see column labeled "exposure").

Table 6.4 Relative Importance of COSP Information Among Propane and Wood Users

Information Source	Exposure* % obtaining info from this source		Effectiveness** % citing source as best source of info	
	Wood	Propane	Wood	Propane
Friends/Relatives	55%	44%	17%	9%
Newspaper ads	52%	67%	10%	17%
Magazines	50%	59%	8%	9%
Retail Sales People	48%	33%	20%	10%
Info from government energy offices	45%	49%	24%	31%
TV ads	33%	45%	5%	4%
Radio ads	27%	39%	1%	1%
Contractor Visits	22%	26%	5%	11%
Utility Mailings	21%	23%	5%	3%
Contractor Mailings	10%	12%	2%	1%
Visits with government energy offices	6%	8%	2%	2%
Utility Visits	5%	12%	1%	2%

* Multiple Responses Occur
** Multiple Responses Do Not Occur

As indicated, both groups frequently cited print media as a source of COSP information (50%-67% exposure score). Also frequently indicated were friends and relatives (44%-55% exposure) and information from government energy offices (45%-49% exposure). Wood converters obtained information about COSP 48% of the time from retail sales people, while propane users received information from this source only 33% of the time. Electronic media sources were indicated less often by both groups than were print media sources (27%-45% exposure). With the exception of contractor visits (22%-26% exposure) and mailings from utilities (21%-23% exposure) other potential sources of COSP information were cited infrequently. These results are similar to those obtained for gas/electric converters in the 1981 study. In 1981, print media sources were by far the most frequently cited source of COSP awareness.

The right half of Table 6.4 contains an "effectiveness score," defined as the percentage of respondents citing a single information source as the most useful source of COSP information. On this basis, government energy offices were chosen by both groups (wood 24%; propane 31%) as the single most useful source of information. Other sources of information considered most useful were friends and relatives (cited 17% by wood users; 9% by propane users), retail sales people (20% wood; 10% propane) and newspaper ads (10% wood; 17% propane). Contractor visits were also cited fairly frequently (11%) as the most useful information source for propane users. This probably reflects the fact that propane users generally had their system installed by contractors while wood users installed their equipment themselves.

A final measure of information source importance can be obtained by comparing the exposure score to the effectiveness score for a particular source. This measure, called the decisive impact of a source, is defined as follows,

$$\text{Decisive Impact} = \frac{\%\text{ citing source as "best" (ie. as providing the most useful information)}}{\%\text{ obtaining information from (reporting exposure to) a source}}$$

The decisive impact figures for propane and wood converters are presented in Table 6.4.1.

Table 6.4.1 Decisive Impact for Various Sources of COSP Information

Information Source	Decisive Impact	
	Wood	Propane
Friends/Relatives	.31	.20
Newspaper ads	.19	.25
Magazines	.16	.15
Retail Sales People	.42	.30
Information from govt energy offices	.53	.63
TV ads	.15	.09
Radio ads	.04	.03
Contractor Visits	.23	.42
Utility Mailings	.24	.13
Contractor Mailings	.20	.08
Visits with govt energy offices	.33	.25
Utility Visits	.20	.17

When examining Table 6.4.1 it should be noted that the higher the decisive impact ratio, the more "effective" was the information from a consumer utility standpoint. For both groups direct sources of COSP information were most effective. Information from government energy offices (.63, propane; .53, wood), retail sales people (.30, propane; .42, wood), and visits with government energy offices (.33, wood; .25, propane) all score high on this measure. In contrast,

media such as TV and radio have a low decisive impact score. Table 6.4.2 summarizes these exposure-effectiveness groupings.

Table 6.4.2 Exposure-Effectiveness Comparison

Exposure Effectiveness Category	Source of COSP Information
high exposure - high effectiveness	retail sales people, information from govt. energy offices
high exposure - medium effectiveness	print media
medium exposure - high effectiveness	visits with contractors and government energy offices
medium exposure - low effectiveness	radio, TV
low exposure - medium effectiveness	utility and contractor mailings

7. CONVERSION DECISION PROCESS

This section will discuss various aspects of the conversion decision process. Topics to be examined include:

- experience with oil heating
- length of time a heating system change was considered
- household member most responsible for various decisions
- sources of information about conversion.

7.1 Oil Experience and Conversion Deliberation Time

Wood and propane users were asked to indicate the length of time they had used oil before converting and to state for how long they had considered changing systems. These results are shown in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1: Conversion Details

Measure	Wood Users	Propane Users
How long was oil used before converting?	(n=405)	(n=187)
less than 1 year	17%	12%
1 - 3 years	24%	16%
4 - 6 years	14%	14%
7 - 10 years	11%	12%
more than 10 years	34%	47%
For how long did the subject consider changing systems?	(n=402)	(n=187)
less than 1 month	10%	9%
1 - 3 months	16%	20%
4 - 6 months	14%	21%
7 - 12 months	21%	15%
1 - 2 years	32%	27%
3 years or more	7%	8%

Table 7.1 indicates that the majority of both groups had considerable experience with oil heating: 59% of wood users and 73% of propane users heated their homes with oil for 4 or more years before converting. Almost one-half (47%) of the propane sample had used oil for more than 10 years.

The two groups are also similar in terms of conversion deliberation time. A majority of wood users (61%) and propane users (65%) changed systems within one year of first considering a change.

7.2 Family Decision Process

The two sample groups were asked to state which member of the household was most responsible for making various decisions concerning a change of heating systems. These results are shown in Table 7.2.

Table 7.2 Family Decision Process

Household Member Most Responsible for Decision	Decision			
	Initially suggesting change	Obtaining info about alternative systems	Making the final decision to convert	Deciding on the type of system
Wood Group:	(n=402)	(n=393)	(n=399)	(n=395)
male household head	50%	59%	41%	52%
female household head	6%	9%	4%	3%
joint decision	43%	28%	55%	43%
outside influence	1%	4%	—	3%
Propane Group:	(n=191)	(n=187)	(n=191)	(n=189)
male household head	57%	64%	53%	59%
female household head	11%	15%	9%	9%
joint decision	28%	14%	37%	27%
outside influence	5%	7%	1%	6%

Table 7.2 indicates that for both groups, a majority of households relied on the male head of the home to make decisions about changing systems. Joint decisions were also common, particularly in the wood group. This could reflect the increased effort required by all family members when heating with wood.

7.3 Sources of Conversion Information

The two fuel groups were asked to indicate if they received information about converting from each of several possible sources. They were then asked to indicate which source was the most influential in the conversion decision. These results are shown in Tables 7.3.1 and 7.3.2 respectively.

Table 7.3.1 Sources of Conversion Information

Information Source	Wood Group		Propane Group	
	% obtaining info	Rank	% obtaining info	Rank
personal experience	93%	1	86%	1
friends/relatives	75%	2	60%	4
government supplied information	75%	2	72%	2
retail salespeople	70%	4	65%	3
magazine/newspaper articles	68%	5	58%	6
newspaper ads	67%	6	57%	7
TV, radio ads	61%	7	54%	9
OEM supplied information	56%	8	55%	8
utility supplied information	47%	9	53%	10
private heating contractor	46%	10	60%	4

Table 7.3.2 Most Influential Source of Conversion Information

Information Source	Percent Cited Most Influential	
	Wood Group	Propane Group
personal experience	42%	34%
friends or relatives	25%	17%
government supplied information	12%	10%
magazine/newspaper articles	6%	4%
retail sales people	5%	7%
OEM supplied information	4%	8%
private heating contractors	3%	9%
newspaper ads	1%	4%
radio, TV ads	1%	2%
utility supplied information	1%	6%

Tables 7.3.1 and 7.3.2 indicate that personal sources of information (e.g., personal experience, friends and relatives) were used most frequently by both groups as an information source about conversion. These sources were also cited as the most influential sources of information. Government supplied information was mentioned by 12% of wood users and 10% of propane users as the most influential source of conversion information.

8. DISTRIBUTIONAL EFFECTS

In order to further examine the role of COSP in the conversion process, the three COSP impact measures were cross-tabulated with a variety of demographic and housing characteristic measures. The objective here was to discover if COSP has any differential distributional effects. Table 8.1 summarizes the results of this exercise and indicates that with the exception of income, no significant differences were found with regards to COSP's distributional effects.

8.1 Subject Income vs. COSP Impact Measures

Two measures of COSP impact were found to be significantly related to respondent's income. In Table 8.2, the likelihood of converting heating systems without COSP is broken down by respondent income. As indicated, subjects with an annual income of less than $15,000 are significantly more likely to state that they would not have converted without COSP (19%) than are respondents who earn more than $15,000 per year (11%).

On a similar measure of COSP impact, respondents were asked if they could have afforded to convert without COSP. As was reported earlier, only 18% of wood users and 13% of propane indicated that the COSP grant was essential. However, Table 8.3 shows that significantly more lower income subjects state that COSP was essential to their decision to convert. Table 8.3 indicates that for subjects who earn less than $15,000 per year, 29% of wood users and 33% of propane users state that COSP was essential.

Table 8.1

COSP Measures: Distributional Effects

Measure	COSP Measure		
	Conversion Probability Without COSP	COSP as a Catalyst	Financially COSP was Essential
A. Demographics:			
1. Regionally	N/S	N/S	N/S
2. Subject age	N/S	N/S	N/S
3. Subject education	N/S	N/S	N/S
4. Subject income			
- wood users	$P < .10$	N/S	$P < .05$
- propane users	N/S	N/S	$P < .01$
B. House Characteristics:			
1. Type of home	N/S	N/S	N/S
2. Age of home	N/S	N/S	N/S
3. Size of home	N/S	N/S	N/S
4. Insulation level	N/S	N/S	N/S

Table 8.2

Likelihood of Converting Without COSP by Income

Income Category	Probably or Definitely Would NOT Have Converted Without COSP			
	Sample Size	Frequency	Percent	
			Raw*	Regrouped**
Wood Users:				
under $15,000	102	19	18.6%	18.6%
$15,000 - 24,999	111	12	10.8%	
$25,000 - 34,999	87	10	11.5%	10.9%
$35,000 and over	77	8	10.4%	
TOTAL	377	49	13.0%	13.0%
Propane Users:			Raw*	
under $15,000	41	11	26.8%	
$15,000 - 24,999	53	9	17.0%	
$25,000 - 34,999	34	7	20.6%	
$35,000 and over	41	11	26.8%	
TOTAL	169	38	22.5%	

* Not significantly related to income

** Significant at P less than .10

Table 8.3

Importance of COSP by Income: "The grant was essential, I could not have afforded to convert without COSP

Income Category	The COSP Grant was ESSENTIAL		
	Sample Size	Frequency	Percent
Wood Users:*			
under $15,000	101	29	28.7%
$15,000 - 24,999	111	19	17.1%
$25,000 - 34,999	87	9	10.3%
$35,000 and over	77	11	14.3%
TOTAL	376	68	18.1%
Propane Users:**			
under $15,000	39	13	33.3%
$15,000 - 24,999	53	8	15.1%
$25,000 - 34,999	34	1	2.9%
$35,000 and over	12	-	-
TOTAL	167	22	13.2%

* Significantly related to income at P less than .05

** Significantly related to income at P less than .01

8.2 Subject Income vs. Conversion Motives

COSP has been shown to have had a greater impact with lower income respondents. However, it is not known if low and high income subjects differ in their motives for converting. Table 8.4 supplies the answer to this question by showing the percentage of wood and propane users who agreed or strongly agreed with various conversion motives broken down by yearly income.

Table 8.4 shows that significant differences arise when the conversion motives of low and high income subjects are compared. For example, significantly more low income than high income respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they converted systems because their new fuel would be cheapest in the future. Similarly, 63% of low income propane users as compared to only 39% of high income propane users agreed or strongly agreed that the potential for lower heating costs with a new system was a conversion motive. Finally, 92% of low income propane users vs. 78% of high income propane users agreed or strongly agreed that fear of future oil costs was a conversion motive. It would seem, therefore, that while economic considerations are the dominant conversion motive for most respondents, the desire for heating fuel economy is a more acute conversion motive for lower income subjects.

8.3 Subject Income vs. COSP Information Source Preferences

It was hypothesized that low and high income respondents may differ in the information sources they utilize to obtain COSP information. Table 8.5 shows the exposure scores (percent of subjects obtaining information from a particular source) and decisive impact

Table 8.4

Percentage of Wood and Propane Users who Agreed or Stongly Agreed with Various Conversion Motives by Income

Conversion Motive	Wood Users			Propane Users		
	Low* Income	Medium Income	High Income	Low* Income	Medium Income	High Income
	(n=97)	(n=196)	(n=77)	(n=40)	(n=85)	(n=41)
Potential lower costs with new system	96%	92%	90%	(c) 63%	55%	39%
High heating costs with old system	93%	94%	95%	68%	71%	69%
Fear of future oil costs	93%	95%	92%	(b) 92%	78%	78%
New fuel will be cheapest in future	(a) 88%	79%	70%	(b) 53%	48%	35%
Availability of COSP	81%	78%	76%	(b) 95%	82%	83%
Dissatisfaction with old system	38%	31%	30%	56%	56%	50%
Fear of future oil shortages	39%	29%	28%	(c) 37%	30%	23%
Previous system in poor condition	17%	12%	14%	61%	63%	61%

* Low Income = less than $15,000
Medium Income = $15,000 - 34,999
High Income = $35,000 and over

a = significant at P < .01
b = significant at P < .05
c = significant at P < .10

scores (percent of subjects citing a particular source as the best source of information : exposure) for low and high income subjects.

Several interesting conclusions can be obtained from Table 8.5. First, the exposure scores for print media (newspapers, magazines) are greater for high income subjects than lower income subjects. However, the reverse of this is true for electronic media (radio, TV). Lower income respondents are more likely to be exposed to COSP information through electronic media than are higher income respondents.

Next, 53% of high income subjects were exposed to COSP information through government energy offices, while only 39% of low income subjects utilized this source. However, 63% of low income subjects who did utilize government energy offices cited this source as the single best source of COSP information (decisive impact score). It would seem therefore, that it would be advisable to increase the awareness of lower income groups of the existance of these government offices.

Table 8.5

Information Source Preferences for Low vs. High Income Groups

SOURCE	EXPOSURE		DECISIVE IMPACT	
	* Low Income	** High Income	Low Income	High Income
Friends	56	53	49	26
Newspaper	49	64	18	26
Magazines	47	69	17	14
Sales people	43	47	36	46
Government Offices	39	53	63	43
TV ads	37	29	36	10
Radio ads	30	26	12	0
Utility mail	17	23	7	77
Contractor visits	16	29	14	14

* low income = less than $15,000 per year

** high income = more than $35,000 per year

9. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ONGOING RESEARCH

Results obtained which measured the impact of COSP on off-oil conversions were somewhat surprising. Only 13% of wood users and 21% of propane users state that they definitely or probably would not have converted without COSP. In the 1981 gas/electric study 22% of the sample agreed with this statement. Furthermore, in the present study only 4 out of 10 subjects agreed that they converted sooner because of COSP; in the 1981 gas/electric study 6 out of 10 stated that COSP was a conversion catalyst. A possible conclusion, therefore, is that COSP's impact as both a conversion stimulus and catalyst has decreased over time. However, it must be noted that these longitudinal conclusions are based on two distinctly different populations, sampled at different times. It could very well be that the current renewables sample is unique; in fact, particularly with wood users, there is evidence to suggest the two samples are markedly different. In particular, we should note the wood group's clear economic rationale for converting off oil.

It seems important, therefore, that additional research be carried out. For example, oil users should be sampled directly. In the 1981 study (which included an oil user sample) it was found that COSP would indeed be a major motive for conversion. It could be that COSP remains a primary conversion stimulus among this oil user segment, and further research should have as its primary goal the discovery of this information.

In addition, gas and electric converters should be monitored in the near future. The clear economic benefits of wood heating are not

nearly as obvious for natural gas and electric home heating, especially in light of stabilizing or declining oil prices. The impact of COSP must, therefore, be determined for gas and electric converters in order to discern any trend over time. Renewable converters should be re-examined at a later date, probably one or two years hence.

A final potential direction for on-going research involves the partial off-oil converter group. A majority of wood users (68%) still use oil for a portion of their home heating requirements. As world oil prices decline, the cost advantages of using wood will also be reduced. Of concern here is by how much will the economic benefits of wood heat have to be reduced before partial off-oil wood users begin to use more oil for their home heating requirements. Sensitivity research should be carried out to obtain the answer to this important question.

10. MANAGEMENT CONCERNS AND IMPLICATIONS

It has been shown that COSP has its greatest segment impact on lower income subjects. This would seem to be a desirable distributional effect, and could lead to the conclusion that COSP is a necessary "requirement" before lower income groups will convert off oil heating. However, the grant may be superfluous with higher income households. These individuals have both the motivation and monetary means to convert systems without the COSP grant. In other words COSP may serve as merely a bonus to higher income groups. Therefore, it may be desirable to give differential consideration to low income families. Perhaps COSP eligibility could be tied in some way to annual family income.

Of some concern to COSP management has been the advisability of allowing COSP for conversions to wood. It has been suggested that COSP grants to wood users have been going to individuals who utilize wood for merely aesthetic purposes. In other words, wood conversions may result in minimal oil displacement. However, the research evidence strongly suggests that this is not the case. Oil displacement calculations for wood and propane users were quite comparable (on the order of 800 gallons per year for total off-oil converters). Even where oil is still used as supplementary heat by wood users (in 68% of wood conversions), annual oil displacement has been estimated to be about 650 gallons. Therefore, substantial oil displacement is resulting from wood conversions, and wood is indeed a viable option.

Finally, from a promotional standpoint, COSP management should stress the economic benefits and rapid paybacks associated with con-

versions (particularly to wood). For all converters, especially low income families, the economy of converting is by far the dominant motive. In addition, an effort should be made to make lower income families more aware of Government Energy Offices for example, the regional Conservation and Renewable Energy Offices (CREO). Though lower income groups are less exposed to government energy office sources than higher income groups, those low income earners who do contact these facilities are significantly influenced; they frequently cite CREO as the single most useful source of information utilized in their conversion decision process.

11. SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS

This section will summarize, in point form, the key observations noted in the study.

- Wood users tended to be younger than propane users. 62% of wood users were under 45 years of age as opposed to 42-46% of propane users.
- Wood and propane users were highly comparable in terms of education and total family income.
- 86% of wood users and 59% of propane users utilized a supplementary fuel for home heating.
- 68% of the total wood sample still used oil for some part of their heating needs. In contrast, less than 5% of the propane group still used oil for part of their heating needs.
- In the propane group, 47% cited electricity and 44% cited wood as a supplementary fuel form. Electricity tended to contribute a smaller percentage of heating requirements, while wood tended to contribute a higher percentage.
- Monetary conversion motives were by far the most frequently cited reason for converting by the wood group. This was particularly true with motives specifically referring to the economies of wood.
- The availability of COSP ranked first as a conversion motive among propane users.
- Conversion motives specifically referring to the economies of propane were not frequently cited by the propane group as a conversion motive.
- 64% of propane users agreed or strongly agreed that a motive for converting was the existence of a heating system in poor condition. In contrast, only 15% of the wood group agreed with this motive.
- Only 32% of wood users and 31% of propane users cited fear of future oil shortages as a conversion motive. In 1981, 50% of gas/electric converters agreed that potential oil shortages was a conversion motive.
- 48% of propane users agreed that they switched to propane because the fuel they wanted for home heating was not available in their location. Only 11% of wood users agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

- For many subjects in the propane group, it appeared as if propane was selected as a fuel on a temporary basis to be used only until natural gas became available. 64% of propane users who agreed or strongly agreed that propane was not their first choice for home heating cited natural gas as the least expensive form of heating.

- Propane users spent substantially more on their annual heating bills than did wood users ($896 per year vs $546).

- 92% of wood users expected to save enough on their heating bills to pay back their investment. In contrast, only 51% of propane users expected a payback.

- On average, wood users expected a payback in three years; for propane users the expected payback time was six years.

- 92% of wood users experienced heating cost decreases since conversion. In contrast, only 45% of the propane group cited cost decreases, with 21% of propane users actually citing cost increases.

- On average, wood users who converted completely off-oil displaced 814 gallons of oil; propane users displaced 825 gallons. For wood users who still used oil for part of their heating requirements, the displacement figure was 658 gallons.

- For Canada as a whole the mean price paid for one cord of wood is $43. However, subjects from Ontario and the Maritimes pay about $50 per cord, while respondents from Quebec, the Prairies and B.C. pay about $35 per cord.

- B.C. subjects report using the least amount of wood; approximately 4.3 cords per year. Quebecers use the greatest quantity of wood, with about 6.5 cords per year. In the other three regions of Canada wood usage averages between 5 and 6 cords per year.

- Wood costs are negatively related to wood usage. Subjects using three cords per year or less pay $50 per cord, whereas subjects using seven cords of wood per year spend $30 per cord.

- When a wood user cuts none of their own wood, they spend approximately twice as much per cord as those individuals who cut 100% of their own wood ($56 vs $27).

- Subjects who have their own woodlot or use crown land purchase wood for about $8 less per cord than do subjects who buy wood from retail establishments.

- In the wood group, space heaters were used more frequently than wood furnaces (52% vs. 31%). Circulating stoves were

the most frequently mentioned type of space heater while forced air and combination furnaces were the most frequently mentioned type of wood furnace.

- Furnace users tended to use wood for a larger percentage of home heating requirements than did space heater users.

- 66% of space heater users installed the equipment themselves. In contrast, 67% of furnace users had a contractor or dealer install their system.

- A majority of wood users cut 100% of their wood requirements themselves.

- A vast majority of wood users used seasoned wood that was cut to length, split and piled.

- 64% of furnace users and 48% of space heater users stored their wood for 6 months or more before burning it.

- When estimates of cords used per year are used to calculate gallons of fuel oil equivalent, the resulting figures are within 6% of the oil displacement estimates provided by the respondents themselves, at least in the case of those respondents who were confident about their oil displacement estimates and who kept records of oil use.

- Heavy users of wood were more likely than light users to agree with all cost conversion motives specifically related to wood.

- Heavy users of wood tended to be less educated and to have a lower income than light users of wood.

- Only 13% of wood users and 21% of propane users stated that they probably or definitely would not have converted without COSP.

- Approximately 4 out of 10 subjects in the present study stated that they converted sooner than they would have otherwise because of COSP. In the 1981 study, 6 out of 10 gas/electric converters stated that they converted sooner because of COSP.

- Low income subjects were significantly more likely to state that they would NOT have converted without COSP than were higher income respondents.

- Print media are the most frequently cited source of exposure to COSP information. In terms of effectiveness, information about COSP from government energy offices and retail sales people were cited most frequently as the best sources of information.

DECISION RESEARCH LTD.

226 Oxford Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada
R3M 3J6

Dear Sir or Madam:

PLEASE READ THIS LETTER CAREFULLY.

THE STUDY

The enclosed questionnaire is part of a study my firm is conducting for Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada. The study is being conducted among a small group of Canadians in order to obtain their opinions on energy issues in Canada and their views on the energy used for heating their homes. Yours is one of a few households selected in your area, so your response is very important to the success of this study.

YOUR HELP

Please complete and return the enclosed questionnaire in the prepaid return envelope provided. The questionnaire must be completed by one or both adult heads of the household.

Please return the questionnaire this week. It won't take long -- most of the questions can be answered with a simple check mark ( ).

Please be assured that your responses will be treated confidentially and will only be used to group with responses of other study participants. Under no circumstances will your individual responses be reported.

A TOKEN OF APPRECIATION

To thank you for your assistance in completing the enclosed questionnaire, I will include your name in a draw for a $200 cash prize. You will find a draw entry form at the end of the enclosed questionnaire. You may mail this entry form separately if you prefer not to have your name attached to your responses. Please complete and return your questionnaire as soon as possible.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours truly,

Perry Kent

Perry Kent
Research Project Manager

PK:sh

encl.

TB/CT - REG. B 3505-5

SURVEY OF HOME HEATING HABITS

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. The person completing this questionnaire should be the adult who has the greatest knowledge concerning their home heating system. If two adult members of the house have equal knowledge concerning the way the home is heated, they may want to complete the questionnaire together.

2. Please complete all questions in the order that they appear in the questionnaire. Most questions can be answered with a simple check mark.

3. Please complete the draw entry form on the last page so that you will be eligible to win the $200 cash prize. The entry form can be mailed separately if you prefer not to have your name attached to the questionnaire.

4. Please return the completed questionnaire as soon as possible, using the self-addressed, stamped envelope that we have provided.

5. Please indicate who is completing this questionnaire (check one)

_____ adult male(s) _____ adult female(s) _____ both male & female

(NOTE: QUESTIONS ARE PRINTED ON BOTH FRONT AND REVERSE SIDES OF THE PAGE)

* *

SECTION 1: GENERAL ENERGY VIEWS

Over the last few years a great deal of discussion has centered around the topic of energy and the possibility of energy shortages in Canada.

1. For each of the energy related statements listed below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

(FOR EACH STATEMENT CHECK ONE RESPONSE)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A. The possibility of energy shortages is one of the most serious problems facing Canadians today . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
B. In times of serious energy shortages, energy conservation actions taken by individuals can make important contributions to reducing the crisis	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
C. Individual Canadians are very likely to make voluntary efforts to cut down on their use of energy	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
D. In comparison to others I do more than my share to save energy	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

CONTINUE ON REVERSE

SECTION 2: ABOUT THE FUELS YOU USE TO HEAT YOUR HOME

1. Which of the following fuels are you using to heat your home during this heating season? (Please check all fuels that apply)

Oil	[ ]	Natural Gas	[ ]	Electricity	[ ]
Wood	[ ]	Propane	[ ]	Solar	[ ]

Other, (specify) _____

2. Now, we would like to know which of the above fuels is your PRIMARY FUEL and which, if any, are your SECONDARY FUELS. We define PRIMARY and SECONDARY as follows:

a) PRIMARY FUEL = the fuel that you expect will provide the largest proportion of your home heating needs this season

(i) My PRIMARY FUEL is: _____

(ii) How long have you used this as your PRIMARY FUEL? _____

(iii) Approximately what percentage of your home heating needs are provided by this PRIMARY HEATING FUEL?

less than 40% [ ]	60-69% [ ]	90-99% [ ]
40-49% . . . [ ]	70-79% [ ]	100% . [ ]
50-59% . . . [ ]	80-89% [ ]	

b) SECONDARY FUELS = any fuels that provide some part of your home heating needs this season

(i) Please list your SECONDARY FUELS and indicate as best you can what percentage of your heating needs is provided by each of these SECONDARY FUELS

Secondary Fuels (if any)	Percentage Contribution to home heating needs
1) _____	_____%
2) _____	_____%
3) _____	_____%

Now, we would like to know a little bit about your PRIMARY heating system.

3. a) In what condition is your PRIMARY home heating system?

EXCELLENT CONDITION: "I expect many years of trouble-free operation" . . . . . [ ]

GOOD CONDITION: "With some minor repairs or servicing, the system should work well for many years" . . . . . [ ]

FAIR CONDITION: "The system is in need of major repairs or servicing within a few years" . . . . . [ ]

POOR CONDITION: "The system should be replaced within the next year" . . . . . [ ]

b) How satisfied are you with your PRIMARY heating system?

Very Satisfied . . . . . [ ]
Satisfied . . . . . [ ]
Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied . . . [ ]
Dissatisfied . . . . . [ ]
Very Dissatisfied . . . . . [ ]

4. Have you converted or made any alterations to the fuels or system of heating in your present home during the past 3 years? (BE SURE TO FOLLOW THE ARROW THAT CORRESPONDS TO YOUR ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION).

NO, I have not converted or altered the system of heating in my present home in the past 3 years . . . . . [ ] → SKIP TO SECTION 3 IN THE MIDDLE OF PAGE 6

Yes, I have converted or altered my system of heating in the past 3 years or I am in the process of changing it right now . . . . [ ] → CONTINUE TO QUESTION 5 ON NEXT PAGE

5. Presented below are some reasons people might give for converting heating systems. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement listed below.

I CONVERTED MY HEATING SYSTEM BECAUSE ...	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A. ... I was afraid of future shortages of oil for home heating	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
B. ... my heating costs were too high with my previous system	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
C. ... my previous heating system was in poor working condition or had broken down	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
D. ... I was concerned about the future cost of oil	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
E. ... I could apply for a government grant to help cover the costs of conversion	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
F. ... I was dissatisfied with my old system	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
G. ... the fuel I changed to gives me the lowest heating costs relative to other fuels at current prices	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
H. ... I expect the fuel I changed to will be the cheapest form of heating in the future	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
I. ... the heating equipment needed for the fuel I changed to costs the least to buy and install relative to equipment for other fuels	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
J. ... the fuel I wanted to have for heating was not available where I live	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
K. ... the fuel I changed to is easily accessible to me	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
L. ... the fuel I changed to is the safest to operate	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
M. ... the fuel I changed to provides the cleanest form of heating in the home	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
N. ... the fuel I changed to provides the least pollution to the environment	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
O. ... I enjoy the "atmosphere" provided by the fuel I changed to	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
P. ... the fuel I changed to provides the most comfortable heat	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Q. ... I wanted a fuel that had a guaranteed supply	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
R. ... I enjoy the outdoor activities associated with the fuel I changed to	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Please indicate any other reasons you may have had for converting your home heating system. _____

_____

_____

CONTINUE ON REVERSE

6. Of the fuels listed below, which do you think would be the most expensive to heat your home? Which fuel do you think would be the least expensive to heat your home? (In both cases assume that the heating equipment is already installed and that this is the only fuel used for home heating).

	Most Expensive (check only one)	Least Expensive (check only one)
Natural gas	[ ]	[ ]
Oil	[ ]	[ ]
Electricity	[ ]	[ ]
Wood	[ ]	[ ]
Propane	[ ]	[ ]

7. When you were first considering changing your heating system, who in your household was most responsible for ...

	Male Head of Household	Female Head of Household	Both Male and Female (Joint Decision)	Someone Outside your family
... initially suggesting the change	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... obtaining information about the types and costs of alternative heating systems available ...	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... making the final decision to go ahead and change systems ..	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... deciding on the exact type of heating equipment to purchase	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... actually installing your new system	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

8. You may have obtained information about changing heating systems from many different sources. We would like to know how influential these sources were in your decision to convert. For each source listed below, please indicate if the source was Very Influential, Somewhat Influential or Not Influential At All in your decision to convert. If you received NO information from a particular source, please check the column titled "No information Received".

	Very Influential	Somewhat Influential	Not Influential At All	No Information Received
A. friends or relatives ...	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
B. magazine/newspaper article	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
C. newspaper ads	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
D. radio and/or TV ads ...	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
E. retail salespeople	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
F. my own personal knowledge or experience	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
G. private heating contractor	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
H. information supplied by equipment manufacturers .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
I. information supplied by the government	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
J. information supplied by utility companies	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

9. Of the information sources listed above, which source was the MOST INFLUENTIAL in your decision to convert heating systems? Please indicate by giving the letter that corresponds to the information source in question 8.

Most influential source _____ (letter, A,B,C etc.)

CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

Now, some questions about your heating costs.

10. On an annual basis, about how much does it cost to heat your home?

$_____ dollars per year

11. Please check the response that best describes your heating cost experiences since you converted your system. (Answer either "a" OR "b" below)

a) "I think my annual heating costs are the same now as before I converted my heating system . . . . . [ ]

b) "My heating costs have (check one: increased [ ] or decreased [ ]) by":

1 - 5%	[ ]	36 - 40%	[ ]	71 - 75%	[ ]
6 - 10%	[ ]	41 - 45%	[ ]	76 - 80%	[ ]
11 - 15%	[ ]	46 - 50%	[ ]	81 - 85%	[ ]
16 - 20%	[ ]	51 - 55%	[ ]	86 - 90%	[ ]
21 - 25%	[ ]	56 - 60%	[ ]	91 - 95%	[ ]
26 - 30%	[ ]	61 - 65%	[ ]	96 - 100%	[ ]
31 - 35%	[ ]	66 - 70%	[ ]		

12. a) In total, how much did it cost to convert your heating system?

$_____ (include all equipment and installation costs)

b) Was the cost of conversion more, the same or less than you expected to pay?

more than I expected to pay . . . . . [ ]
the same as I expected to pay . . . . [ ]
less than I expected to pay . . . . . [ ]

c) Did you receive a grant or loan from the government or a utility to help pay for these conversion costs?

No [ ] Yes [ ] If yes, how much money, if any, did you receive from each of the following sources:

$ _____ (federal grant or loan)
$ _____ (provincial grant or loan)
$ _____ (utility grant or loan)
$ _____ (other, please specify)_____

13. Over time, do you expect to save enough money on your heating bills to pay back the money you actually spent to have your heating system converted?

No [ ] Yes [ ] If yes, how many years do you think it will take? _____

14. For approximately how long did you seriously consider changing heating systems before you actually converted?

less than 1 month . . .	[ ]	7 - 12 months	[ ]
1 - 3 months	[ ]	1 - 2 years	[ ]
4 - 6 months	[ ]	3 years or more	[ ]

15. Before you changed heating systems, for how long a period of time did you use oil to heat this home?

I have never used oil to heat this home . . . . . [ ]
I used oil in this home: for less than 1 year . . . . [ ]
for 1 - 3 years . . . . . [ ]
for 4 - 6 years . . . . . [ ]
for 7 - 10 years . . . . . [ ]
for more than 10 years . . . [ ]

16. BEFORE you changed heating systems, about how much oil did you use to heat this home in an average year? (Please estimate as accurately as you can)

in gallons _____ per year OR liters _____ per year

(If it is easier for you to estimate oil usage in tanks, drums, etc. used per year please do so. Be sure, however, to indicate the size of your tank or drum in gallons or liters) _____

CONTINUE ON REVERSE

17. Please indicate how accurate you believe your oil usage estimate given in question 16 is:

I am not at all sure my estimate is accurate [ ]
I am fairly sure my estimate is accurate . . [ ]
I am quite sure my estimate is accurate . . [ ]
I am certain my estimate is accurate . . . . [ ]

18. Did you keep records of the amount and cost of the oil you used before converting? Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't Know [ ]

19. Do you currently use oil to meet any of your home heating needs?

Yes [ ] ⟹ CONTINUE TO QUESTION 20, BELOW
No [ ] ⟹ SKIP TO SECTION 3, IN THE MIDDLE OF THIS PAGE

20. About how much oil do you currently use to heat your home in an average year? (Please estimate as accurately as you can)

in gallons _____ per year OR liters _____ per year

(If it is easier for you to estimate oil usage in tanks, drums, etc. used per year please do so. Be sure, however, to indicate the size of your tank or drum in gallons or liters)_____

_____

21. Please indicate how accurate you believe your oil usage estimate given in question 20 is.

"I believe my estimate given in question 20 is accurate within,

I am not at all sure my estimate is accurate [ ]
I am fairly sure my estimate is accurate . . [ ]
I am quite sure my estimate is accurate . . . [ ]
I am certain my estimate is accurate . . . . [ ]

22. Do you keep records of the amount and cost of the oil you currently use for home heating? Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't Know [ ]

SECTION 3: ABOUT WOOD HEATING

1. Do you use a wood fueled heating system for any of your home heating requirements?

Yes [ ] ⟹ CONTINUE TO QUESTION 2, BELOW
No [ ] ⟹ SKIP TO SECTION 4, ON PAGE 10

2. Approximately what percentage of your heating needs are provided by wood heating?

less than 10% . . . [ ]	40 - 49% . . . [ ]	80 - 89% . . . . . [ ]
10 - 19% . . . [ ]	50 - 59% . . . [ ]	90 - 99% . . . . . [ ]
20 - 29% . . . [ ]	60 - 69% . . . [ ]	100% . . . . . [ ]
30 - 39% . . . [ ]	70 - 79% . . . [ ]	

3. In total, how many years experience have you had using wood for heating in this or any other home? _____

4. There are two general categories of wood fueled home heating systems. Which of the systems mentioned below best describes the wood system in your present home? (Check all applicable categories)

wood space heaters . . . . . [ ]
wood furnaces (central wood heating system) . . [ ]
other, please specify _____

CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

5. What specific type of wood heating equipment do you use to heat your present home? (Check all applicable categories)

forced air wood furnace . . . . . [ ]
wood boiler. . . . . [ ]
combination furnace (wood and another fuel) . . [ ]
wood burning add-ons . . . . . [ ], how many? ____
radiant stoves (radiant cables) . . . . . [ ], how many? ____
circulating stoves . . . . . [ ], how many? ____
fireplace inserts . . . . . [ ], how many? ____
other, please specify _____

6. a) What type of fuel do you use in your present wood heating system?

wood only . . . . . [ ]
wood-oil combination . . . . . [ ]
wood-electric combination . . . . . [ ]
wood-natural gas combination . . . . . [ ]
other combination, please specify _____

b) If you have a combination system, is the non-wood fuel designed to come on automatically? Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. Where in your home is your wood heating equipment located? (Check all rooms that apply in "a"). In "b" please indicate which rooms in your home are mostly heated by your wood system (Check all rooms that apply)

a) Wood Equipment Location

basement . . . . . [ ]
recreation room . . . [ ]
living room . . . . . [ ]
kitchen . . . . . [ ]
bathroom(s) . . . . . [ ]
bedroom(s) . . . . . [ ]
other, please specify _____

b) Rooms Mostly Heated by Wood

basement . . . . . [ ]
recreation room . . . [ ]
living room . . . . . [ ]
kitchen . . . . . [ ]
bathroom(s) . . . . . [ ]
bedroom(s) . . . . . [ ]
other, please specify _____

8. For those rooms not heated by wood, are they ...

... left unheated . . . . . [ ]
... heated by another means . [ ], please specify (eg. electric space heaters, etc.) _____

9. When you bought your wood heating system, who installed it in your home?

I installed it myself . . . [ ]
a dealer installed it . . . [ ]
a contractor installed it . [ ]
it came with the house . . . [ ]
other, please specify _____

10. In what month and year did you purchase your wood heating equipment? In what month and year was it installed? In what month and year did you start to use the system?

	Wood equipment purchased	Wood equipment installed	Wood system in use
Month			
Year			

11. a) In which month of the year does your use of wood heat begin? _____

b) In which month does it end? _____

12. During a typical day, when do you use your wood heating system? (Check all applicable categories)

in the morning . . . . . [ ]
in the afternoon . . . . [ ]
in the evening . . . . . [ ]
at night . . . . . [ ]

13. When the installation of your wood heating system was completed, did you have it inspected? Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't Know [ ]

CONTINUE ON REVERSE

14. Do you use wood heating for cooking purposes?

No . . [ ]
Yes . [ ], if yes, is wood your most frequently used fuel? Yes [ ] No [ ]

15. Do you use wood for water heating in your home? No [ ] Yes [ ]

16. Please indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements.

SINCE I PURCHASED MY WOOD HEATING SYSTEM ...	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
... I have had difficulty obtaining wood	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... I have had problems with the installation	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... I have had problems with the operation of the system .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... I have had difficulty with cleaning and maintaining the wood system	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... I have had my heating costs decrease	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... I have found that acquiring wood was inconvenient.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... I have had problems with the indoor air quality or ventilation	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... I have used more wood than I expected to use	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... I have saved more money on heating than I expected to . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... I have found that the system heats more of my home than I expected it to heat	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... I have found that the system works as well or better than I expected	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

17. During the past year, approximately how many cords of wood did you use to heat your home (a cord of wood is 4 ft. high x 4 ft. wide x 8 ft. long)

_____ cords per year

(If you prefer to use a unit of measurement other than cords, please do so. Be sure to specify the unit.) _____
_____ wood used per year

18. If you have used wood heating for one year or more, do you expect to use more wood, less wood, or about the same amount of wood this year than last year? (Check only one category)

This is the first year I will use wood to heat my home . . . . [ ]
I expect to use more wood this year than I used last year . . . [ ]
I expect to use less wood this year than I used last year . . . [ ]
I expect to use about the same amount of wood this year as I used last year . . . . . [ ]

CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

19. Approximately how much money do you pay for one cord of wood? (in dollars)

$ _____ per cord

(If you prefer to use a unit of measurement other than cords, please do so. Be sure to specify the dimensions of the unit, and how much you pay for a unit of this size)

"I pay $_____ for _____amount of wood" (give dimensions_____)

20. Other than for wood itself, have you had to incur or do you expect to incur any additional costs because you use wood to heat your home? (e.g. purchasing a chain saw, renting a truck for transporting wood, gas costs, etc.)

No . . . [ ]
Yes . . [ ], If yes, what are these costs and about how much will they be annually? _____

21. Do you keep records of the cost of operating your wood system?

Yes, I keep detailed records . . . . . [ ]
No, but I know how much I spend . . . . [ ]
No, and I don't really know how much my wood system costs me to operate . . [ ]

22. What percentage of wood used in your heating system did you cut yourself?

none . . . . . [ ] 50 to 74% . . . . [ ] don't know . . . [ ]
less than 25% . . [ ] 75 to 99% . . . . [ ]
25 - 49% . . . . . [ ] 100% . . . . . [ ]

23. Which of the following best describes where you usually get the wood you cut yourself?

your own woodlot . . . . . [ ]
a friend or relative's woodlot . . . . . [ ]
a private, retail woodlot [ ]
crown or provincial land . . . . . [ ]
I don't cut any of my own wood . . [ ]
other, please specify _____

24. How do you usually transport the wood you cut yourself?

with a vehicle I own . . . . . [ ]
with a friend/relative's vehicle [ ]
rented trailer or vehicle . . . . [ ]
I don't transport any of my wood [ ]
other, please specify _____

25. a) How many miles/km do you usually go one way to collect wood?

_____ miles OR _____ kilometers

b) How many of these trips do you make per year? _____ trips per year

26. What kind of wood do you burn most often in your heating system?

hardwood; (oak, elm, birch, etc.) [ ]
softwood; (pine, spruce, etc.) [ ]
don't know . . . . . [ ]
other, please specify _____

27. Which best describes the condition of the wood you burn most often?

green (unseasoned) . . . [ ]
seasoned (air dried) . . [ ]
don't know . . . . . [ ]
other, please specify _____

28. How long do you usually store wood before burning it?

less than 3 months . [ ]
3 - 6 months . . . . [ ]
6 - 12 months . . [ ]
more than 1 year . [ ]
don't know . . . [ ]

29. Is the wood that you store typically ...

... cut to length needed?	yes [ ]	no [ ]	don't know [ ]
... split?	yes [ ]	no [ ]	don't know [ ]
... piled?	yes [ ]	no [ ]	don't know [ ]

CONTINUE ON REVERSE

SECTION 4: ABOUT THE C.O.S.P. GRANT

We would now like to ask you a few questions concerning the Canada Oil Substitution Program (COSP). This is a Federal Government program that gives homeowners who have oil-fired heating a grant to help cover the costs of converting their system from oil to another fuel type.

1. After you changed your home heating system, did you apply for a COSP grant? (BE SURE TO FOLLOW THE ARROW THAT CORRESPONDS TO YOUR ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION)

   No [ ] ⟶ SKIP TO SECTION 5 IN THE MIDDLE OF THE NEXT PAGE
   Yes [ ] ⟶ CONTINUE TO QUESTION 2, BELOW

2. When did you first hear or read about the COSP grant?

   Sometime before I decided to change heating systems . . . . . [ ]

   Sometime after I decided to change heating system . . . . . [ ]

   At about the same time that I decided to change heating systems [ ]

3. a) Would you have converted your home heating system if the COSP grant was not available? (Read all categories and check one only)

   I definitely would have converted even if the COSP grant was not available . . . . . [ ]

   I probably would have converted even if the COSP grant was not available . . . . . [ ]

   I probably would NOT have converted if the COSP grant was not available . . . . . [ ]

   I definitely would NOT have converted if the COSP grant was not available . . . . . [ ]

3. b) Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with the following statement. "Because the COSP grant was available I converted my home heating system sooner than I would have otherwise."

   Strongly Agree . . . . . [ ]
   Agree . . . . . [ ]
   Neither Agree nor Disagree . [ ]
   Disagree . . . . . [ ]
   Strongly Disagree . . . . . [ ]

3. c) Check the response that best matches your opinion regarding the COSP grant. (Read all categories and check one only)

   "The grant was ESSENTIAL, I could NOT have afforded to convert without COSP" . . . . . [ ]

   "The grant was HELPFUL, but I could have afforded to convert without COSP" . . . . . [ ]

   "The grant was COMPLETELY UNNECESSARY in my case" . . . . . [ ]

CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

4. You may have heard of the COSP grant from many different sources. For each of the sources listed below, please indicate "YES" if you have obtained information from that source or "NO" if you have not obtained information from that source.

	YES	NO
A. Magazine or newspaper stories about COSP	[ ]	[ ]
B. Radio ads mentioning COSP	[ ]	[ ]
C. T.V. ads mentioning COSP	[ ]	[ ]
D. Newspaper ads mentioning COSP	[ ]	[ ]
E. Information about COSP from government energy offices	[ ]	[ ]
F. Direct mailings about COSP from utilities	[ ]	[ ]
G. Direct mailings about COSP from private heating contractors	[ ]	[ ]
H. Personal visits with utilities	[ ]	[ ]
I. Personal visits with private heating contractors	[ ]	[ ]
J. Personal visits with people in government energy offices	[ ]	[ ]
K. Retail sales people	[ ]	[ ]
L. Friends or relatives	[ ]	[ ]

5. Of the sources you checked "YES" in question 4, which source gave you the most useful information about COSP? Please indicate by giving the letter that corresponds to your most useful source of information.

Most useful source _____ (letter)

SECTION 5: DEMOGRAPHIC AND HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

We would now like to ask you a few questions about yourself and the home in which you live. These questions are for the purpose of statistical classification.

1. In what kind of home do you live?

Single family home [ ]
Duplex, semi-detached [ ]
Apartment or condominium [ ]
Mobile home [ ]
Other, please specify _____

2. Do you own or rent your home? own [ ] rent [ ]

3. Approximately how old is your home? _____ years

4. How many rooms are in your home? _____ rooms

5. What is the approximate size of your home?

500 square feet or less [ ]
501 to 800 square feet [ ]
801 to 1000 square feet [ ]
1001 to 1200 square feet [ ]
1201 to 1500 square feet [ ]
1501 to 2000 square feet [ ]
More than 2000 square feet [ ]

CONTINUE ON REVERSE

6. Now, a few questions about home insulation.

   a. Please indicate whether each of the following parts of your home are insulated. (Check one response only).

	Not Insulated	Poorly Insulated	Moderately Well Insulated	Very Well Insulated
Basement	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Walls	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Ceiling or attic . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

   b. Do you plan to add insulation to your home?

YES, I plan to add insulation in 1 - 6 months . . . . . [ ]
YES, I plan to add insulation in 7 - 12 months . . . . . [ ]
YES, I plan to add insulation in more than 1 year . . . [ ]
YES, I may insulate but I don't know when . . . . . [ ]
NO, I do not plan to insulate . . . . . [ ]

7. There are several home insulation programs available from the federal government. Please indicate whether you are aware of, plan to use or have used either of the two programs described below.

   a. The Canadian Home Insulation Program (CHIP): CHIP is a grant from the federal government for insulating older homes.

Are you aware of CHIP? . . . . YES [ ] NO [ ]

Are you eligible for CHIP? . . YES [ ] NO [ ] DON'T KNOW [ ]

Have you applied for CHIP? . . YES [ ] NO [ ]

If you have not applied, do you plan to apply for CHIP? . YES [ ] NO [ ]

   b. ENER$AVE for home insulation: This program provides a free computerized analysis of home insulation requirements and provides recommendations on the best ways to invest money in home insulation.

Are you aware of ENER$AVE? . . . . YES [ ] NO [ ]

Have you applied for ENER$AVE? . . YES [ ] NO [ ]

If you have not applied, do you plan to apply for ENER$AVE? . . YES [ ] NO [ ]

8. Where do you live?

City _____ Province _____ Postal Code _____

9. Please indicate the age of the person(s) completing this questionnaire.

	Male	Female
Under 25 years	[ ]	[ ]
25 to 34 years	[ ]	[ ]
35 to 45 years	[ ]	[ ]
46 to 54 years	[ ]	[ ]
55 to 64 years	[ ]	[ ]
Over 65 years	[ ]	[ ]

10. Including yourself, other adults and any children, how many persons currently live in your home? _____ number of persons

11. If children are present in your home, how many are in each of the following age groups?

	Number of Children in age group
under 6 years old	_____
6 to 12 years old	_____
13 to 18 years old	_____

CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

12. What is the level of education completed by the person(s) completing this questionnaire?

	Male	Female
Elementary school	[ ]	[ ]
Some high school	[ ]	[ ]
High school graduate	[ ]	[ ]
Community college	[ ]	[ ]
Some university	[ ]	[ ]
University graduate	[ ]	[ ]

13. What is the occupation of the person(s) completing this questionnaire?

	Male	Female
Professional	[ ]	[ ]
Managerial/Executive	[ ]	[ ]
Sales	[ ]	[ ]
Clerical	[ ]	[ ]
Skilled labour	[ ]	[ ]
Unskilled labour	[ ]	[ ]
Farmer/Farm worker	[ ]	[ ]
Student	[ ]	[ ]
Homemaker	[ ]	[ ]
Unemployed	[ ]	[ ]
Retired	[ ]	[ ]
Other, please specify	_____	_____

14. Please indicate the total income of your household in the past year before taxes?

under $10,000	[ ]	$30,000 to 34,999	[ ]
$10,000 to 14,999	[ ]	$35,000 to 39,999	[ ]
$15,000 to 19,999	[ ]	$40,000 to 49,999	[ ]
$20,000 to 24,999	[ ]	$50,000 or more	[ ]
$25,000 to 29,999	[ ]		

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION. PLEASE FILL OUT THE DRAW ENTRY FORM BELOW

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

DRAW ENTRY FORM

Please complete this entry form to ensure that your name will be included in the draw for the $200 cash prize. All those returning completed questionnaires within TWO WEEKS will have their names included in the draw. You may mail this entry form separately if you prefer not to have your name attached to your responses.

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____
(street, etc.)

_____
(city) (province)

_____ _____
(postal code) (phone)

R.G. Cooper et Associés Consultant Inc.

411 Chemin Fletchers
Beaconsfield, Quebec, Canada

Monsieur ou Madame:

Priere de lire attentivement cette lettre.

L'etude

Le questionnaire ci-joint fait partie d'une etude menee par mon entreprise pour "Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada". Cette etude est conduite sur un petit groupe de Canadiens et cherche a m'informer de leurs opinions sur les problemes energetiques au Canada ainsi que sur le type de combustible utilise pour chauffer leur maison. Vous faites partie d'un petit nombre de gens dans votre region a qui l'on a demande de remplir ce questionnaire. Vos reponses seront donc tres importantes pour le succes de l'etude.

Votre contribution

Veuillez bien remplir le questionnaire et nous l'expedier dans l'enveloppe affranchie ci-incluse. Ce questionnaire doit etre rempli par l'un ou l'autre des chefs de famille (ou par les deux). S'il vous plait renvoyez-nous le questionnaire cette semaine. Il prend tres peu de temps a remplir puisque vous n'avez qu'a cocher ( ) la majorite des reponses.

Soyez assure que vos reponses resteront confidentielles et que l'on ne s'en servira que pour ajouter aux reponses des autres gens qui participeront a cette etude. En aucun cas nous ne rendrons compte a qui que ce soit des reponses individuelles a ce questionnaire.

Temoignage de mon appreciation

Pour vous remercier d'avoir rempli le questionnaire, je mettrai votre nom dans un tirage pour $200.00. Vous trouverez un formulaire a la fin du questionnaire sur lequel vous devez inscrire votre nom et adresse. Ce formulaire est pour le tirage seulement et vous pouvez nous l'expedier separement du questionnaire si vous ne voulez pas que votre nom reste attache a vos reponses. Veuillez nous renvoyer le questionnaire des que possible.

Dans l'attente de votre reponse et cordialement votre.

Perry Kent

Perry Kent
Directeur du programme de recherche

PK:sh

SONDAGE SUR LES HABITUDES DE CHAUFFAGE A DOMICILE

INSTRUCTIONS A SUIVRE POUR REMPLIR LE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. L'individu qui remplit ce questionnaire devrait etre l'adulte qui a la meilleure connaissance du systeme de chauffage de la maison. S'il y a deux adultes chez vous qui ont la meme connaissance, ils voudront peut-etre le remplir ensemble.

2. Vous etes prie de repondre aux questions dans l'ordre ou elles sont presentees. Pour la plupart des questions, vous n'aurez qu'a cocher ( ) votre reponse.

3. Completez le formulaire a la derniere page qui vous permettra de participer a un tirage pour $200. Vous pouvez nous renvoyer ce formulaire separe du questionnaire si vous ne voulez pas que votre nom accompagne vos reponses.

4. Renvoyez-nous le questionnaire aussitot que possible dans l'enveloppe timbree incluse.

5. Veuillez indiquer qui remplit ce questionnaire en cochant ( ) la reponse dans l'espace pourvue.

   adulte(s) male(s) _____ un adulte male et une adulte femelle _____
   adulte(s) femelle(s) _____

(Notez bien qu'il y a des questions sur les deux cotes de chaque page)

* *

SECTION 1: OPINIONS GENERALES SUR L'ENERGIE

Depuis quelques annees on a beaucoup discute au sujet de l'energie et sur la possibilite d'une penurie d'energie au Canada.

1. Pour chacun des enonces suivants concernant l'energie, indiquez combien vous etes d'accord ou pas d'accord.

   (NE COCHEZ QU'UNE REPONSE POUR CHAQUE ENONCE.)

	Tout a fait d'accord	D'accord	Pas d'opinion	Pas d'accord	Pas d'accord du tout
A. La possibilite d'un manque d'energie est un des plus serieux problemes qui se posent au Canadien aujourd'hui .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
B. Durant une crise energetique l'economie d'energie par chaque individu peut apporter une importante contribution pour reduire la crise	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
C. Certains Canadiens feront probablement des efforts volontaires pour se servir de moins d'energie	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
D. Je fais plus que ma part en comparaison aux autres personnes pour economiser l'energie	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

SUITE AU VERSO

SECTION 2: LES COMBUSTIBLES UTILISES POUR CHAUFFER VOTRE MAISON

1. Lequel des combustibles suivants utilisez vous pour chauffer votre maison cette saison? (Cochez chaque combustible que vous utilisez).

Mazout [ ] Gaz naturel [ ] Electricite [ ]
bois [ ] Propane [ ] Solaire [ ]
Autre (precisez) _____

2. Maintenant, nous aimerions savoir lequel des combustibles ci-dessus est votre combustible PRINCIPAL et lesquels, si c'est le cas, sont vos combustibles SECONDAIRES. Nous definissons PRINCIPAL et SECONDAIRE ci-dessous:

a) Combustible PRINCIPAL: le combustible avec lequel vous vous attendez a repondre a la plus grande partie de vos besoins de chauffage cette saison

i) Mon combustible PRINCIPAL est: _____

ii) Depuis combien de temps l'utilisez vous comme combustible PRINCIPAL?

_____

iii) Environ quel pourcentage de vos besoins de chauffage sont satisfaits par ce combustible PRINCIPAL?

moins de 40%	[ ]	60 a 69%	[ ]	90 a 99%	[ ]
40 a 49%	[ ]	70 a 79%	[ ]	100%	[ ]
50 a 59%	[ ]	80 a 89%	[ ]		

b) Combustible SECONDAIRE: tout combustible qui a satisfait une partie de vos besoins de chauffage cette saison.

i) Pouvez vous faire une liste de vos combustibles SECONDAIRES et indiquer, en faisant pour le mieux, quel pourcentage de vos besoins de chauffage sont satisfaits par chacun de ces combustibles SECONDAIRES.

Combustibles SECONDAIRES (s'il y en a)	Contribution (en %) aux besoins de chauffage de votre maison
1) _____	_____ %
2) _____	_____ %
3) _____	_____ %

Nous aimerions maintenant connaitre quelques reseignements supplementaires sur votre systeme de chauffage principal.

3a) Dans quel etat est votre systeme de chauffage principal?

EN PARFAIT ETAT: "Je m'attends a plusieurs annees de service sans probleme . . . . . [ ]

EN BON ETAT: "Avec quelques petites reparations ou revisions le systeme devrait bien marcher pendant plusieurs annees . [ ]

EN ASSEZ BON ETAT: "Le systeme aura besoin de reparation ou revision majeure d'ici quelques annees . . . . . [ ]

EN MAUVAIS ETAT: "Le systeme devrait etre remplace d'ici un an . . . . . [ ]

b) Dans quelle mesure etes vous satisfait de votre systeme de chauffage principal?

Tres satisfait [ ]
Satisfait [ ]
Indifferent [ ]
Decu [ ]
Tres decu [ ]

PASSEZ A LA PROCHAINE PAGE

4. Avez vous converti ou apportez quelques changements aux combustibles ou au systeme de chauffage lui-meme dans votre maison actuelle durant les trois dernieres annees? (Assurez vous de passer a la bonne question apres votre reponse)

Non, je n'ai pas converti ou change mon systeme de chauffage dans ma maison actuelle ces trois dernieres annees.	PASSEZ A LA SECTION 3 MILIEU DE LA PAGE 7
Oui, j'ai converti ou change mon systeme de chauffage dans le trois dernieres annees ou je suis en train de le changer maintenant.	CONTINUEZ A LA QUESTION 5

5. Vous trouverez, ci-dessous quelques raisons que donnent les gens pour lesquelles ils remplacent leur systeme. Indiquez jusqu'a quel point vous etes d'accord (ou pas d'accord) avec chacun des enonces enumeres:

J'AI REMPLACE MON SYSTEME DE CHAUFFAGE PARCE QUE	Tout a fait d'accord	D'accord	Pas d'opinion	Pas d'accord	Pas d'accord du tout
A. ... J'avais peur que l'huile a chauffage vienne a manquer a l'avenir	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
B. ... le cout du chauffage etait trop eleve avec le systeme que j'avais	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
C. ... le systeme de chauffage que j'avais ne fonctionnait pas bien ou pas du tout . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
D. ... j'avais peur que le cout de l'huile a chauffage soit trop eleve a l'avenir . . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
E. ... Je pouvais faire une demande pour une subvention du gouvernement pour m'aider a remplacer le systeme	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
F. ... j'etais decu avec mon ancien systeme	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
G. ... le combustible que j'utilise maintenant m'apporte les couts de chauffage les plus faibles compares aux autres combustibles (a prix courant)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
H. ... je m'attends a ce que le combustible pour lequel j'ai change soit le plus economique dans les annees a venir	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
I. ... l'appareil de chauffage necessaire pour le combustible que j'utilise maintenant est le plus economique a l'achat et a l'installation compare aux autres appareils . . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
J. ... le combustible que je voulais obtenir pour le chauffage n'etait pas disponible a l'endroit ou j'habite	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

CONTINUEZ AU VERSOS

J'AI REMPLACE MON SYSTEME DE CHAUFFAGE PARCE QUE	Tout a fait d'accord	D'accord	Pas d'opinion	Pas d'accord	Pas d'accord du tout
K. ... le combustible pour lequel j'ai change m'est accessible facilement . . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
L. ... le combustible pour lequel j'ai change est celui qui est le moins dangereux a utiliser . . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
M. ... le combustible pour lequel j'ai change est celui qui chauffe ma maison le plus proprement	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
N. ... le combustible pour lequel j'ai change est celui qui pollue le moins l'environnement	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
O. ... j'apprecie "l'atmosphere" fournie par le combustible pour lequel j'ai change .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
P. ... le combustible pour lequel j'ai change fournit la chaleur la plus agreable	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Q. ... Je desirais un combustible dont l'offre soit garantie	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
R. ... j'apprecie les activites a l'exterieur associees au combustible pour lequel j'ai change	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Veuillez indiquer s'il y a d'autres raisons pour lesquelles vous avez remplace votre systeme _____

6. Parmi les combustibles ci-dessous, lequel pensez vous serait le plus couteux pour chauffer votre maison? Lequel serait le moins couteux pour chauffer votre maison? (Dans chacun des cas supposez que le systeme est deja installe et que ce combustible est le seul employe pour le chauffage de votre maison?

	le plus couteux (cochez une case seulement)	le moins couteux (cochez une case seulement)
Gaz naturel	[ ]	[ ]
Petrole	[ ]	[ ]
Electricite	[ ]	[ ]
bois	[ ]	[ ]
Propane	[ ]	[ ]

7. Quand vous avez commence a considerer l'hypothese d'un changement de systeme de chauffage qui, chez vous, fut le plus responsable pour:

	Pere de famille	Mere de famille	Decision jointe	Quelqu'un exterieur a la famille
. avoir initiallement suggere le changement . . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
. avoir obtenu les informations concernant les differents systemes de chauffage disponibles et leurs couts . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
. avoir pris la decision finalle de changer de systeme	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
. avoir decide du type exact de systeme a acheter . . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
. avoir reellement installe le nouveau systeme	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

PASSEZ A LA PROCHAINE PAGE

8. Vous avez pu obtenir des informations concernant le changement de systeme de chauffage de differentes sources. Nous aimerions savoir quelle influence ont eu ces sources sur votre decision de changer de systeme. Pour chacune des sources ci-dessous, indiquez si cette source fut tres influente, quelque peu influente ou pas du tout influente dans votre decision de changer. Si vous n'avez recu aucune information d'une source particuliere cochez la colonne intitulee "Aucune information recue".

	Tres influente	Quelque peu influente	Pas influente du tout	Aucune information recue
A. d'amis ou parents . . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
B. article de journal ou de magasine	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
C. publicite de journal .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
D. publicite a la radio ou a la television . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
E. vendeur detaillant . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
F. mon experience personnelle et mes connaissances .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
G. un entrepreneur de chauffage prive	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
H. informations fournies par des fabricants d'equipement	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
I. informations fournies par le gouvernement . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
J. informations fournies par les services publiques	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

9. Parmi les sources d'information citees ci-dessus quelle source fut la plus influente dans votre decision de changer de systeme? Pouvez vous indiquer la lettre correspondant a la source d'information a la question 8.

Source la plus influente _____ (lettre A, B, C, etc.)

Maintenant voici quelques questions concernant vos couts de chauffage.

10. Environ a combien se monte votre cout de chauffage par an? $_____par an

11. Pouvez vous indiquer la reponse qui correspond le mieux a l'evolution du cout de votre chauffage depuis que vous avez change de systeme? (Repondez "a" ou "b" ci-dessous)

a) "je pense que mes couts de chauffage sont les memes maintenant qu'avant de changer de systeme" . . . . . [ ]

b) Mon cout de chauffage a augmente [ ] ou diminue [ ] (cochez une seule reponse)

1 a 5% [ ]	36 a 40% [ ]	71 a 75% [ ]
6 a 10% [ ]	41 a 45% [ ]	76 a 80% [ ]
11 a 15% [ ]	46 a 50% [ ]	81 a 85% [ ]
16 a 20% [ ]	51 a 55% [ ]	86 a 90% [ ]
21 a 25% [ ]	56 a 60% [ ]	91 a 95% [ ]
26 a 30% [ ]	61 a 65% [ ]	96 a 100% [ ]
31 a 35% [ ]	66 a 70% [ ]	

12.a) Au total combien cela vous a-t-il coute de changer votre systeme de chauffage?

$ _____ (comprenant tous le couts d'equipement et d'installation)

b) Est ce que le cout de conversion fut superieur, inferieur ou egal a celui auquel vous vous attendiez?

- superieur a mes previsions [ ]
- egal a mes previsions [ ]
- inferieur a mes previsions [ ]

c) Avez vous recu une subvention ou un pret du gouvernement ou des services publiques pour vous aider a supporter ces couts de conversion?

non [ ] oui [ ] si oui, combien avez vous recu de chacune des sources suivantes:

$_____ subvention ou pret federal
$_____ subvention ou pret provincial
$_____ subvention ou pret d'un service publique
$_____ autre, precisez

13. Pensez vous e'pargner suffisamment sur vos couts de chauffage avec votre nouveau systeme pour vous rembourser ce que vous avez depense pour votre nouvelle installation?

non [ ] ouj [ ] si oui, combien d'annees pensez vous que cela vous prendra? _____

14. Indiquez depuis environ combien de temps vous consideriez serieusement changer de systeme de chauffage avant de l'avoir effectivement change?

Moins d'un mois [ ] 4 a 6 mois [ ] 1 a 2 ans [ ]
1 a 3 mois [ ] 7 a 12 mois [ ] 3 ans et plus [ ]

15. Avant de changer votre systeme de chauffage vous avez utilise le mazout pour chauffer cette maison pendant combien de temps?

- Je n'ai jamais utilise le mazout pour chauffer cette maison [ ]
- J'ai utilise le mazout dans cette maison
  pendant moins d'une annee . . . . . [ ]
  pendant 1 a 3 ans . . . . . [ ]
  pendant 4 a 6 ans . . . . . [ ]
  pendant 7 a 10 ans . . . . . [ ]
  pendant plus de 10 ans . . . . . [ ]

16. Avant de remplacer votre systeme de chauffage, environ combien de mazout utilisiez vous pour chauffer votre maison annuellement? (estimez aussi precisement que vous le pouvez)

en gallons _____ par annee OU en litres _____ par annee

(s'il est plus facile pour vous d'estimer la quantite de mazout consommee par annee en citernes, en bidons ou autres, utilisez cette mesure sans cependant oublier d'en indiquer la correspondance en gallons ou en litres).

17. Veuillez indiquer la precision avec laquelle vous avez estime votre consommation de mazout a la question 16:

- je ne suis pas du tout sur que mon estimation est exacte . . . [ ]
- je suis moyennement sur que mon estimation est exacte . . . . [ ]
- je suis presque sur que mon estimation est exacte . . . . . [ ]
- je suis certain que mon estimation est exacte . . . . . [ ]

18. Avez vous conserve les renseignements concernant la quantite et le cout du mazout avant que vous ne changiez de systeme de chauffage?

oui [ ] non [ ] je ne sais pas [ ]

19. Utilisez-vous couramment le mazout pour repondre a n'importe quel besoin de chauffage chez vous?

oui [ ] CONTINUEZ A LA QUESTION 20, CI DESSOUS
non [ ] PASSEZ A LA SECTION 3 AU MILIEU DE LA PAGE

20. Quelle est environ la quantite de mazout que vous utilisez pour chauffer votre maison sur une annee? (estimez aussi precisement que vous le pouvez)

en gallons _____ par annee OU en litres _____ par annee

(s'il est plus facile pour vous d'estimer la quantite de mazout consommee sur une annee en citernes, en bidons, ou autres, utilisez cette mesure sans cependant oublier d'en indiquer la correspondance en gallons ou en litres)

21. Veuillez indiquer la precision avec laquelle vous avez estime votre consommation de mazout a la question 20.

. je ne suis pas du tout sur que mon estimation est exacte . . . [ ]
. je suis moyennement sur que mon estimation est exacte . . . . [ ]
. je suis presque sur que mon estimation est exacte . . . . . [ ]
. je suis certain que mon estimation est exacte . . . . . [ ]

22. Conservez vous les renseignements concernant la quantite et le cout du mazout actuellement utilise pour vos besoins de chauffage chez nous?

oui [ ] non [ ] je ne sais pas [ ]

SECTION 3: LE CHAUFFAGE AU BOIS

1. Utilisez vous un systeme de chauffage au bois pour certain de vos besoins de chauffage?

oui [ ] CONTINUEZ A LA QUESTION 2 CI DESSOUS
non [ ] PASSEZ A LA SECTION 4, PAGE 11

2. Environ quel pourcentage de vos besoins de chauffage sont fournis par le chauffage au bois?

moins de 10% . . . [ ]	40 - 49% . . . [ ]	80 - 89% . . . [ ]
10 - 19% . . . [ ]	50 - 59% . . . [ ]	90 - 99% . . . [ ]
20 - 29% . . . [ ]	60 - 69% . . . [ ]	100% . . . . . [ ]
30 - 39% . . . [ ]	70 - 79% . . . [ ]	

3. Au total, combien d'annees d'experience avez vous eu concernant l'utilisation du bois comme combustible dans cette maison ou une autre maison? _____

4. Il existe deux principales categories de systeme de chauffage au bois. Lequel des systemes mentionnes ci dessous correspond il le mieux au systeme de votre maison actuelle? (Verifiez toutes les categories)

. poele a bois . . . . . [ ]
. calorifere a bois
(systeme de chauffage central a bois) . . [ ]
. autre, precisez _____

5. Quel type d'appareil de chauffage au bois utilisez vous pour chauffer votre maison actuelle? (Verifiez toutes les categories)

. Calorifere a bois a air force . . . . . [ ]
. Chaudiere a bois . . . . . [ ]
. Calorifere mixte (bois et un autre combustible) . . [ ]
. Appareil d'appoint au bois . . . . . [ ] Combien? _____
. poele a rayonnement (par cables) . . . . . [ ] Combien? _____
. poele a circulation . . . . . [ ] Combien? _____
. poele-foyer . . . . . [ ] Combien? _____
. Autre (precisez) _____

_____

CONTINUEZ AU VERSOS

6a) Quel type de combustible utilisez vous pour votre systeme de chauffage au bois actuel?

. bois seulement . . . . . [ ]
. melange bois-mazout . . . . . [ ]
. melange bois-electricite . . . [ ]
. melange bois-gaz naturel . . . [ ]
. Autre melange (precisez) _____

b) si vous avez un systeme utilisant un melange est ce que l'autre combustible (autre que le bois) est designe pour intervenir dans la combustion automatiquement? oui [ ] non [ ]

7. Ou votre systeme de chauffage au bois est il installe dans votre maison? (Verifiez toutes les possibilites) Au "b", indiquez quelles pieces de votre maison sont principalement chauffees par votre systeme au bois? (Verifiez toutes les pieces).

a) emplacement du systeme de chauffage au bois	b) pieces principalement chauffees au bois
. cave . . . . . [ ]	. cave . . . . . [ ]
. salle de jeux . . . . . [ ]	. salle de jeux . . . . . [ ]
. piece de sejour . . . . . [ ]	. piece de sejour . . . . . [ ]
. cuisine . . . . . [ ]	. cuisine . . . . . [ ]
. salle(s) de bain . . . . . [ ]	. salle(s) de bain . . . . . [ ]
. chambre(s) . . . . . [ ]	. chambre(s) . . . . . [ ]
. Autre (precisez) _____	. Autre (precizes) _____

8. Les pieces non chauffees au bois sont-elles

. . . laissees non chauffees . . . . . [ ]
. . . chauffees par d'autres moyens . . . . [ ] precisez _____
(par exemple, chauffage d'appoint electrique)

9. Lors de l'achat de votre systeme de chauffage au bois qui s'est charge de l'installation dans votre maison?

. moi-meme . . . . . [ ]
. un fournisseur . . . . . [ ]
. un entrepreneur . . . . . [ ]
. deja installe dans la maison . . . [ ]
. Autre (precisez) _____

10. Quand (precisez le mois et l'annee) avez vous achete votre appareil de chauffage au bois? Quand (precisez le mois et l'annee) fut-il installe? Quand (precisez le mois et l'annee) avez vous commence a l'utiliser?

Achat de l'appareil de chauffage au bois	Installation de l'appareil de chauffage au bois	Debut de l'utilisation de l'appareil de chauffage au bois
_____	_____	_____

11a. Quand commencez vous a utiliser votre chauffage au bois (precisez le mois)?
_____

b. Quand arretez vous (precisez le mois)? _____

12. Au cours d'une journee typique quand utilisez vous votre systeme de chauffage ou bois? (Verifiez toutes les possibilites)

. le matin . . . . . [ ] le soir . . . . . [ ]
. l'apres midi . . . [ ] la nuit . . . . . [ ]

13. Quand l'installation de votre systeme de chauffage au boit fut terminee, l'avez vous fait inspecter?

oui [ ] non [ ] je ne sais pas [ ]

14. Utilisez-vous votre chauffage au bois pour faire la cuisine?

non [ ]
oui [ ] si oui, le bois est-il le combustible que vous utilisez le plus souvent? oui [ ] non [ ]

15. Utilisez vous le bois pour chauffer l'eau chez vous?

non [ ] oui [ ]

16. Veuillez indiquer jusqu'a quel point vous etes d'accord ou pas d'accord avec chacun des enonces suivants:

"Depuis que j'ai achete mon systeme de chauffage au bois . . ."

	Tout a fait d'accord	D'accord	Pas d'opinion	Pas d'accord	Pas d'accord du tout
... j'ai eu des problemes pour obtenir du bois	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... j'ai eu des difficultes avec l'installation	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... j'ai eu des problemes avec le fonctionnement du systeme . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... j'ai eu des problemes avec le nettoyage et l'entretien du systeme	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... j'ai diminue les couts de chauffage .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... j'ai eu des difficultes a obtenir du bois . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... j'ai eu des problemes avec la qualite de l'air a l'interieur et la ventilation . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... j'ai utilise plus de bois que ce que j'avais prevu	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... j'ai epargne plus d'argent sur le chauffage que ce que j'avais prevu	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... j'ai trouve que le systeme chauffe une plus grande partie de ma maison que ce que j'esperais	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
... j'ai trouve que le systeme fonctionne aussi bien ou mieux que ce que a quoi je m'attendais	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

CONTINUEZ AU VERSOS

17. Environ combien de cordes de bois avez vous utilise pour chauffer votre maison l'annee derniere? (une corde de bois mesure 1,2m (de hauteur) x 1,2m (de largeur) x 2,4m (de longueur))

_____ cordes par an

(Si vous preferez utiliser une autre mesure que la corde de bois n'oubliez pas de specifier l'unite) _____
_____bois utilise par annee

18. Si vous avez utilise le chauffage au bois depuis une annee ou plus, est ce que vous vous attendez a utiliser plus de bois, moins de bois ou environ la meme quantite cette annee que l'annee derniere? (Cochez seulement une categorie)

- C'est la premiere annee que j'utiliserai le bois pour chauffer ma maison . . . . . [ ]
- Plus de bois que l'annee derniere . . . . . [ ]
- Moins de bois que l'annee derniere . . . . . [ ]
- Environ la meme quantite que l'annee derniere . . . [ ]

19. Environ combien payez vous pour une corde de bois? (en dollars)

$_____ par corde

(Si vous preferez utiliser une autre mesure que la corde de bois, n'oubliez pas d'indiquer les dimensions de cette unite et ce que vous payez pour une unite de cette taille).

je paie $_____ pour _____ de bois (donnez les dimensions
_____

20. Mis a part le cout du bois lui-meme avez vous supporter ou pensez vous devoir supporter des frais supplementaires dus a l'utilisation du bois comme combustible pour chauffer votre maison? (exemple achat d'une scie, location d'un camion pour le transport du bois, cout de l'essence, etc.)

non [ ]
oui [ ] si oui, quels sont ces frais et environ quel montant vont-ils atteindre annuellement? _____
_____
_____

21. Conservez vous des informations concernant les couts du fonctionnement de votre systeme de chauffage au bois?

Oui, je conserve des informations detaillees . . . . . [ ]
Non, mais je sais combien je depense . . . . . [ ]
Non, et je ne sais pas exactement combien mon systeme de chauffage au bois me coute . . . . . [ ]

22. Quel pourcentage de bois utilise dans votre systeme de chauffage coupez vous vous meme?

Aucune . . . . . [ ]
moins que 25% . . [ ]
25% a 49% . . . . [ ]
50% a 74% . . . . [ ]
75% a 99% . . . . . [ ]
100% . . . . . [ ]
Je ne sais pas . . . . [ ]

23. Parmi les enonces suivants, lequel decrit-il le mieux l'endroit ou vous vous procurez generalement le bois que vous coupez vous meme?

- votre propre boise . . . . . [ ]
- le boise d'un ami ou d'un parent . . . [ ]
- le boise d'un detaillant ou d'un prive [ ]
- le terres provinciales ou federales . [ ]
- je ne coupe pas mon propre bois . . . [ ]
- Autre (precisez) _____

24. Par quel moyen transportez vous generalement le bois que vous coupez vous meme?

- Avec un vehicule qui m'appartient . . . . . [ ]
- Avec le vehicule d'un ami ou d'un parent . . [ ]
- Avec une remorque ou un vehicule loue . . . [ ]
- Je ne transporte pas mon bois . . . . . [ ]
- Autre, (precisez) _____

25a. Combien de miles/kilometres faites vous generalement pour vous procurer votre bois? (aller simple)

_____ miles OU _____ kilometres

b. Combien de voyages de cette sorte, faites vous par an? ____ voyages par an

26. Quelle sorte de bois brulez vous le plus souvent dans votre systeme de chauffage?

- bois dur (ex: chene, orme, bouleau, etc.) . . . . [ ]
- bois mou (ex: pin, epinette, etc.) . . . . . [ ]
- Je ne sais pas . . . . . [ ]
- Autre (precisez) _____

27. Quel enonce decrit-il le mieux la qualite du bois que vous brulez le plus souvent?

- vert . . . . . [ ]
- seche a l'air . . [ ]
- je ne sais pas . . [ ]
- Autre (precisez) _____

28. Pendant combien de temps stockez vous generalement le bois avant de le bruler?

- moins de 3 mois . . . . . [ ]
- 3 a 6 mois . . . . . [ ]
- 6 a 12 mois . . . . . [ ]
- plus d'une annee . . . . [ ]
- je ne sais pas . . . . . [ ]

29. Est ce que le bois que vous stockez habituellement

. est coupe a la longueur voulue	oui [ ]	non [ ]	je ne sais pas [ ]
. est fendu	oui [ ]	non [ ]	je ne sais pas [ ]
. est empile	oui [ ]	non [ ]	je ne sais pas [ ]

SECTION 4: AU SUJET DU PROGRAMME CANADIEN DE REMPLACEMENT DU PETROLE (P.C.R.P)

Nous voulons vous posez quelques questions au sujet du Programme Canadien de Remplacement du Petrole (P.C.R.P.). Le gouvernement Canadien, par l'entremise de ce programme donne aux proprietaires de maison chauffees au mazout (a l'huile) une subvention pour les aider a faire face aux couts de remplacement de leur installation alimentee au mazout par une installation alimentee par d'autres sources d'energie.

1. Apres avoir remplacer votre systeme de chauffage avez vous fait une demande de subvention aupres du P.C.R.P.? (ASSUREZ VOUS DE PASSER A LA BONNE QUESTION APRES VOTRE REPONSE)

NON [ ] PASSEZ A LA SECTION 5, PAGE 13

OUI [ ] PASSEZ A LA PROCHAINE QUESTION

2. La premiere fois que vous avez entendu ou lu au sujet du P.C.R.P. etait . .

Un peu avant de decider de remplacer mon systeme de chauffage . . . [ ]

Un peu apres avoir decider de remplacer mon systeme de chauffage . [ ]

A peu pres au moment ou je decidais de remplacer mon systeme de chauffage . . . . . [ ]

CONTINUEZ AU VERSOS

3a. Auriez-vous remplacez votre systeme de chauffage si la subvention du P.C.R.P. n'etait pas disponible? (Ne cochez q'une reponse)

J'aurais certainement remplace mon systeme de chauffage meme si la subvention du P.C.R.P. n'etait pas disponible . . . . . [ ]

J'aurais probablement remplace mon systeme meme si la subvention du P.C.R.P. n'etait pas disponible . . . . . [ ]

Je n'aurais probablement pas remplace mon systeme de chauffage si la subvention du P.C.R.P. n'etait pas disponible . . . . . [ ]

Je n'aurais certainement pas remplace mon systeme de chauffage si la subvention du P.C.R.P. n'etait pas disponible . . . . . [ ]

3b. Notez combien vous etes d'accord ou pas d'accord avec l'enonce suivant. "Parce que la subvention du P.C.R.P. etait disponible j'ai remplace mon systeme plutot que je ne l'aurais fait autrement.

Tout a fait d'accord . . . . [ ]
D'accord . . . . . [ ]
Pas d'opinion . . . . . [ ]
Pas d'accord . . . . . [ ]
Pas d'accord du tout . . . . [ ]

3c. Cochez l'enonce qui correspond le mieux a votre opinion concernant la subvention du P.C.R.P. (Lisez toutes les categories mais n'en cochez qu'une seule)

. la subvention fut essentielle, je n'aurais pas eu les moyens de convertir sans PCRP . . . . [ ]

. la subvention m'a aide mais j'aurais eu les moyens de changer de systeme sans PCRP . . . . . [ ]

. la subvention etait completement inutile dans mon cas . . . . . [ ]

4. Vous avez pu entendre parler de la subvention du P.C.R.P. par differentes sources. Pour chacune des sources ci-dessous pouvez vous indiquer "oui" si vous avez obtenu des informations de cette source et "non" si vous n'avez pas obtenu d'information de cette source.

	Oui	Non
A. Magasine ou journal parlant du PCRP	[ ]	[ ]
B. Publicite a la radio mentionnant le PCRP	[ ]	[ ]
C. Publicite a la television mentionnant le PCRP . .	[ ]	[ ]
D. Publicite dans un journal mentionnant le PCRP . .	[ ]	[ ]
E. Information sur le PCRP d'un bureau du gouvernement	[ ]	[ ]
F. Informations directement envoyees par les services publiques	[ ]	[ ]
G. Informations directement envoyees par des entrepreneurs de chauffage prives	[ ]	[ ]
H. Visites personnelles des services publiques . . .	[ ]	[ ]
I. Visites personnelles des entrepreneurs de chauffage prives	[ ]	[ ]
J. Visites personnelles d'agents du gouvernement . .	[ ]	[ ]
K. Vendeur detaillant	[ ]	[ ]
L. Amis ou parents	[ ]	[ ]

5. Parmi les sources ou vous avez repondu "oui" a la question 4, quelle source vous a procure les informations les plus utiles concernant le PCRP? Pouvez vous indiquer la lettre qui correspond a la plus utile source d'information.

La plus utile source d'information _____ (lettre)

PASSEZ A LA PROCHAINE PAGE

SECTION 5: RENSEIGNEMENTS DEMOGRAPHIQUES ET CARACTERISTIQUES PHYSIQUES DE VOTRE RESIDENCE

Nous aimerions maintenant poser quelques questions a votre sujet et au sujet de votre residence. Ces questions sont posees seulement dans le but de faire des classifications statistiques.

1. Dans quel genre de residence habitez-vous?

   Maison . . . . . [ ]
   Duplex . . . . . [ ]
   Appartement ou condominium . . . . . [ ]
   Roulotte (mobile home) . . . . . [ ]
   Autre, specifiez _____

2. Possedez vous la maison ou la louez vous?

   possede [ ] loue [ ]

3. Environ quel age a votre residence? _____ an(s)

4. Combien de chambres y a t-il dans votre maison? _____ chambres

5. Quel est la grandeur approximative de votre maison?

   500 pieds carres ou moins . . . . . [ ]
   501 a 800 pieds carres . . . . . [ ]
   801 a 1000 pieds carres . . . . . [ ]
   1001 a 1200 pieds carres . . . . . [ ]
   1201 a 1500 pieds carres . . . . . [ ]
   1501 a 2000 pieds carres . . . . . [ ]
   Plus de 2000 pieds carres . . . . . [ ]

6. Maintenant, quelques questions au sujet de l'isolation thermique de votre maison.

   a. Indiquez la qualite de l'isolation thermique des parties suivantes de votre maison.

	Pas isole	Peu isole	Pas mal isole	Tres bien isole
Le sous-sol	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Les murs	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Le plafond ou la mansarde	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

   b. Avez-vous l'intention d'ajouter de l'isolation thermique a votre maison?

   OUI, j'ai l'intention d'ajouter de l'isolation thermique d'ici 6 mois . . . . . [ ]
   OUI, j'ai l'intention d'ajouter de l'isolation thermique dans 7 a 12 mois d'ici . . . . . [ ]
   OUI, j'ai l'intention d'ajouter de l'isolation thermique mais pas avant un an d'ici . . . . . [ ]
   OUI, j'ai l'intention d'ajouter de l'isolation thermique mais je ne sais pas quand . . . . . [ ]
   NON, je n'ai pas l'intention d'ajouter de l'isolation thermique . . . . . [ ]

7. Il y a quelques programmes federaux qui viennent a l'aide de ceux qui veulent ajouter de l'isolation thermique a leur maison. Indiquez si vous etes 1) au courant de l'un ou l'autre de ces programmes 2) si vous avez l'intention de faire une demande de l'un ou l'autre de ces programme ou si vous-avez deja fait une demande aupres de l'un d'eux.

   a. Le Programme d'Isolation Thermique des Residences Canadiennes (P.I.T.R.C.) est un programme federal pour l'isolation d'anciennes maisons.

	OUI	NON	
Etes-vous au courant de ce programme?	[ ]	[ ]	
Avez-vous droit aux subventions de ce programme?	[ ]	[ ]	Je ne sais pas [ ]
Avez-vous fait une demande au P.I.T.R.C.?	[ ]	[ ]	
Si vous n'avez pas fait de demande, avez-vous l'intention d'en faire une?	[ ]	[ ]	

b. ENER$AGE pour l'isolation thermique des maisons. C'est un programme d'analyse par ordinateur pour vous aider a economiser de l'energie et de l'argent.

Etes-vous au courant du programme d'ENER$AGE . . OUI [ ] NON [ ]
Avez-vous fait une demande aupres du programme d'ENER$AGE . . . . . OUI [ ] NON [ ]
Si vous n'avez pas fait de demande, avez-vous l'intention d'en faire une . . . . . OUI [ ] NON [ ]

8. Ou demeurez-vous? Ville_____ Province_____ Code Postal_____

9. Indiquez l'age de l'individu qui remplit ce questionnaire (ou des individus qui remplissent ce questionnaire). (Cochez une categorie pour chaque adulte)

	adulte(s) male(s)	adulte(s) femelle(s)
Moin de 25 ans	[ ]	[ ]
De 25 a 34 ans	[ ]	[ ]
De 35 a 45 ans	[ ]	[ ]
De 46 a 54 ans	[ ]	[ ]
De 55 a 64 ans	[ ]	[ ]
Plus de 65 ans	[ ]	[ ]

10. Combien de gens habitent dans votre maison (y compris tous les adultes et les enfants) _____

11. Si des enfants habitent actuellement dans votre maison, combien appartiennent a chacun des groupes suivants?

	nombre d'enfants de cet age
en dessous de 6 ans	[ ]
entre 6 et 12 ans	[ ]
entre 13 et 18 ans	[ ]

12. Quel est le plus haut niveau d'etude atteint par l'adulte qui remplit (ou par les adultes qui remplissent) ce questionnaire. (Cochez une categorie pour chaque adulte)

	male(s)	Femelle(s)
Ecole primaire	[ ]	[ ]
Un peu d'ecole secondaire	[ ]	[ ]
Diplome d'etudes secondaires	[ ]	[ ]
Diplome d'etudes techniques	[ ]	[ ]
Un peu d'universite	[ ]	[ ]
Diplome de l'universite	[ ]	[ ]

13. L'occupation principale de l'adulte qui remplit ce questionnaire est:

	male	female
Profession liberale	[ ]	[ ]
Administrateur/gerant	[ ]	[ ]
Vendeur	[ ]	[ ]
Travail de bureau (employe)	[ ]	[ ]
Ouvrier specialise	[ ]	[ ]
Manoeuvre	[ ]	[ ]
Fermier/ouvrier agricole	[ ]	[ ]
Etudiant	[ ]	[ ]
Femme/homme de foyer	[ ]	[ ]
Chomeur	[ ]	[ ]
Autre (precisez)	_____	_____

14. Quel etait le revenu total (avant impot) de votre foyer l'annee derniere?

0 a $10,000 . . . . . [ ]
$10,000 a 14,999 . . . . [ ]
$15,000 a 19,999 . . . . [ ]
$20,000 a 24,999 . . . . [ ]
$25,000 a 29,999 . . . . [ ]
$30,000 a 34,999 . . . . [ ]
$35,000 a 39,999 . . . . [ ]
$40,000 a 49,999 . . . . [ ]
$50,000 et plus . . . . [ ]

GRAND MERCI DE VOTRE AIDE ET N'OUBLIEZ PAS DE REMPLIR LE FORMULAIRE CI JOINT POUR LE TIRAGE.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

FORMULAIRE DE PARTICIPATION AU TIRAGE

Veuillez remplir ce formulaire pour le tirage de $200. Le nom de tous ceux qui auront rempli et renvoye le questionnaire et ce formulaire d'ici deux semaines seront inclus dans le tirage.

NOM: _____

ADRESSE: _____
(rue, etc.)

_____
(ville) (province)

_____ _____
(code postal) (telephone)

APPENDIX B

DETAILED REGIONAL TABULATIONS

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
General Energy Views 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=89	n=87	n=69	n=89	n=86	n=425
The possibility of energy shortages is one of the most serious problems facing Canadians today	Wood: SA	11.2%	20.7%	14.5%	12.4%	12.8%	14.6%
	A	32.6%	32.2%	34.8%	28.1%	40.7%	33.9%
	N	12.4%	3.4%	8.7%	18.0%	12.8%	11.1%
	D	31.5%	31.0%	29.0%	33.7%	26.7%	30.1%
	SD	12.4%	12.6%	13.0%	7.9%	7.0%	10.4%
	Mean	3.011	2.828	2.913	2.966	2.744	2.878
(page 1, #1A)		n=36	n=43	n=37	n=53	n=25	n=195
	Propane: SA	11.1%	18.6%	10.8%	13.2%	4.0%	12.3%
	A	36.1%	39.5%	18.9%	24.5%	32.0%	30.3%
	N	16.7%	7.0%	10.8%	11.3%	20.0%	12.3%
	D	25.0%	25.6%	40.5%	43.4%	24.0%	32.8%
	SD	11.1%	9.3%	18.9%	7.5%	20.0%	12.3%
	Mean	2.889	2.674	3.378	3.075	3.240	3.026

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
General Energy Views 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=89	n=87	n=70	n=89	n=86	n=426
	Wood: SA	39.3%	57.5%	35.7%	29.2%	25.6%	37.8%
	A	55.1%	39.1%	58.6%	62.9%	72.1%	57.3%
	N	2.2%	1.1%	1.4%	3.4%	1.2%	1.9%
In times of serious energy	D	3.4%	1.1%	1.4%	3.4%	1.2%	2.1%
shortages, energy conser-	SD	-	1.1%	2.9%	1.1%	-	0.9%
vation actions taken by	Mean	1.697	1.494	1.771	1.843	1.779	1.711
individuals can make important contributions to reducing the crisis		n=36	n=43	n=36	n=52	n=25	n=193
	Propane: SA	30.6%	44.2%	22.2%	30.8%	24.0%	31.1%
(Page 1, #1B)	A	61.1%	53.5%	61.1%	57.7%	72.0%	60.1%
	N	2.8%	-	5.6%	5.8%	-	3.1%
	D	2.8%	2.3%	5.6%	3.8%	-	3.1%
	SD	2.8%	-	5.6%	1.9%	4.0%	2.6%
	Mean	1.861	1.605	2.111	1.885	1.880	1.860

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
General Energy Views 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=89	n=87	n=70	n=90	n=86	n=427
	Wood: SA	13.5%	41.4%	8.6%	6.7%	12.8%	16.9%
	A	65.2%	52.9%	65.7%	60.0%	55.8%	59.7%
	N	6.7%	2.3%	7.1%	17.8%	18.6%	10.8%
Individual Canadians are	D	12.4%	3.4%	18.6%	13.3%	11.1%	11.5%
very likely to make	SD	2.2%	-	-	2.2%	1.2%	1.2%
voluntary efforts to cut	Mean	2.247	1.678	2.357	2.444	2.326	2.204
down on their use of energy							
		n=36	n=43	n=36	n=53	n=25	n=194
	Propane: SA	11.1%	34.9%	2.8%	13.2%	8.0%	14.9%
(Page 1, #1C)	A	44.4%	58.1%	77.8%	52.8%	56.0%	57.7%
	N	27.8%	2.3%	13.9%	17.0%	20.0%	15.5%
	D	16.7%	4.7%	5.6%	15.1%	16.0%	11.3%
	SD	-	-	-	1.9%	-	0.5%
	Mean	2.500	1.767	2.222	2.396	2.440	2.247

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
General Energy Views 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=89	n=87	n=70	n=88	n=86	n=424
	Wood: SA	21.3%	31.0%	30.0%	14.8%	18.6%	22.9%
	A	43.8%	47.1%	45.7%	46.6%	50.0%	46.7%
	N	27.0%	11.5%	21.4%	30.7%	27.9%	23.8%
In comparison to others	D	7.9%	9.2%	1.4%	8.0%	3.5%	6.1%
I do more than my share	SD	-	1.1%	1.4%	-	-	0.5%
to save energy	Mean	2.213	2.023	1.986	2.318	2.163	2.146
		n=36	n=44	n=37	n=53	n=25	n=196
	Propane: SA	5.6%	34.1%	10.8%	5.7%	20.0%	14.8%
	A	33.3%	34.1%	45.9%	34.0%	48.0%	38.1%
	N	47.2%	22.7%	35.1%	49.1%	32.0%	37.8%
	D	11.1%	6.8%	8.1%	11.3%	-	8.2%
	SD	2.8%	2.3%	-	-	-	1.0%
	Mean	2.722	2.091	2.405	2.660	2.120	2.423

Measure		Wood Users	Propane Users
Home Heating System Characteristics			
		n=427	n=194
Percent of heating needs provided by fuel.			
	less than 40%	9.1%	3.1%
	40-49%	5.9%	1.5%
	50-59%	3.3%	3.6%
(Page 2, #2A)	60-69%	5.6%	6.2%
	70-79%	14.1%	8.2%
	80-89%	21.8%	13.9%
	90-99%	28.3%	22.7%
	100%	11.9%	40.7%
Is a supplementary fuel used		n=415	n=115
(Page 2, #2B)	% yes	86.0%	59.3%
		n=357	n=110
Type of Supplementary Fuel Used (% totals greater than 100% as multiple responses allowed)	oil	81.8%	9.1%
	electricity	22.4%	51.8%
	wood	n/a	50.1%
	propane	5.0%	n/a
(Page 2, #2B)	natural gas	1.4%	1.8%
		n=292	n=10
Percent of home heating needs accounted for by oil as a supplementary fuel (Page 2, #2B)	less than 10%	16.8%	
	10-19%	37.7%	N/A
	20-29%	16.4%	
	30-50%	29.1%	
		n=80	n=57
Percent of home heating needs accounted by electricity as a supplementary fuel (Page 2, #2B)	less than 10%	33.8%	46.6%
	10-19%	33.8%	26.3%
	20-29%	13.8%	14.0%
	30-50%	18.8%	14.0%
			n=57
Percent of home heating needs accounted by wood as a supplementary fuel (Page 2, #2B)	less than 10%		13.2%
	10-19%	N/A	34.0%
	20-29%		26.4%
	30-50%		26.4%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Heating System Characteristics							
		n=89	n=89	n=70	n=89	n=86	n=427
	Wood:						
	excellent	68.5%	85.4%	85.7%	73.0%	81.4%	78.5%
	good	28.1%	13.5%	12.9%	23.6%	17.4%	19.4%
	fair	3.4%	1.1%	1.4%	3.4%	1.2%	2.1%
Condition of current heating system	poor	-	-	-	-	-	-
		n=36	n=41	n=37	n=52	n=25	n=193
	Propane:						
(Page 2, #3A)	excellent	88.9%	87.8%	91.9%	88.5%	80.0%	88.1%
	good	5.6%	12.2%	8.1%	9.6%	16.0%	9.8%
	fair	2.8%	-	-	-	4.0%	1.0%
	poor	2.8%	-	-	1.9%	-	1.0%
							2.0%
		n=89	n=89	n=70	n=88	n=86	n=426
	Wood:						
	very satisfied	55.1%	65.2%	65.7%	60.2%	76.7%	64.8%
	satisfied	38.2%	36.2%	28.6%	36.4%	19.8%	31.0%
	neither	4.5%	2.2%	4.3%	2.3%	2.3%	3.1%
Satisfaction with current heating system	dissatisfied	2.2%	-	1.4%	1.1%	1.2%	1.2%
	very dissatisfied	-	-	-	-	-	-
		n=36	n=44	n=37	n=53	n=25	n=196
	Propane:						
(Page 2, #3B)	very satisfied	44.4%	51.2%	45.9%	37.7%	36.0%	43.4%
	satisfied	36.1%	48.8%	37.8%	49.1%	48.0%	43.9%
	neither	11.1%	-	8.1%	9.4%	12.0%	7.7%
	dissatisfied	2.8%	-	8.1%	3.8%	4.0%	4.1%
	very dissatisfied	5.6%	-	-	-	-	1.0%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=83	n=71	n=62	n=79	n=81	n=381
	Wood: SA	8.4%	5.6%	9.7%	7.6%	6.2%	7.3%
	A	21.7%	21.1%	22.6%	22.8%	32.1%	24.4%
	N	22.9%	15.5%	27.4%	26.6%	27.2%	23.9%
	D	42.2%	39.4%	32.3%	34.2%	27.2%	34.9%
	SD	4.8%	18.3%	8.1%	8.9%	7.4%	9.4%
Fear of future oil shortages for home heating	Mean	3.133	3.437	3.065	3.139	2.975	3.147
		n=31	n=36	n=33	n=48	n=25	n=171
	Propane: SA	-	2.8%	9.1%	2.1%	8.0%	4.1%
	A	32.1%	16.7%	27.3%	25.0%	32.0%	26.3%
	N	21.4%	22.2%	18.2%	22.9%	24.0%	21.6%
(page 3, #5A)	D	35.7%	30.6%	30.3%	39.6%	32.0%	33.9%
	SD	10.7%	27.8%	15.2%	10.4%	4.0%	14.0%
	Mean	3.250	3.639	3.152	3.313	2.920	3.275

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=85	n=74	n=65	n=83	n=82	n=394
	Wood: SA	57.6%	59.5%	53.8%	63.9%	62.2%	59.6%
	A	37.6%	32.4%	43.1%	28.9%	31.7%	34.5%
	N	2.4%	1.4%	1.5%	7.2%	3.7%	3.3%
	D	2.4%	5.4%	-	-	1.2%	1.8%
	SD	-	1.4%	1.5%	-	1.2%	0.8%
Heating costs were too high with previous system	Mean	1.494	1.568	1.523	1.434	1.476	1.495
		n=30	n=40	n=33	n=49	n=25	n=178
	Propane: SA	26.7%	32.5%	9.1%	30.6%	16.0%	24.2%
	A	53.3%	50.0%	48.5%	34.7%	32.0%	43.8%
	N	6.7%	-	15.2%	16.3%	40.0%	14.0%
(page 3, #5b)	D	6.7%	15.0%	24.2%	12.2%	12.0%	14.0%
	SD	6.7%	2.5%	3.0%	6.1%	-	3.9%
	Mean	2.133	2.050	2.636	2.286	2.480	2.298

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=84	n=72	n=63	n=81	n=80	n=383
	Wood: SA	7.1%	9.7%	4.8%	3.7%	6.3%	6.3%
	A	10.7%	8.3%	9.5%	8.6%	5.0%	8.4%
	N	4.8%	9.7%	6.3%	12.3%	11.2%	9.1%
	D	50.0%	36.1%	49.2%	50.6%	50.0%	47.0%
	SD	27.4%	36.1%	30.2%	24.7%	27.5%	29.2%
Previous heating system was in poor working condition or had broken down	Mean	3.798	3.806	3.905	3.840	3.875	3.846
		n=33	n=38	n=33	n=50	n=23	n=178
	Propane: SA	42.4%	23.7%	33.3%	18.0%	17.4%	26.4%
	A	39.4%	18.4%	33.3%	52.0%	39.1%	37.1%
	N	-	5.3%	3.0%	6.0%	13.0%	5.1%
(page 3, #5C)	D	12.1%	31.6%	21.2%	18.0%	21.7%	21.3%
	SD	6.1%	21.1%	9.1%	6.0%	8.7%	10.1%
	Mean	2.000	3.079	2.394	2.420	2.652	2.517

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=84	n=74	n=63	n=83	n=84	n=392
	Wood: SA	57.1%	52.7%	57.1%	47.0%	57.1%	54.1%
	A	33.3%	40.5%	39.7%	47.0%	35.7%	39.3%
	N	7.1%	2.7%	1.6%	3.6%	2.4%	3.6%
	D	2.4%	2.7%	1.6%	1.2%	3.6%	2.3%
	SD	-	1.4%	-	1.2%	1.2%	0.8%
Concern about the future cost of oil	Mean	1.548	1.595	1.476	1.627	1.560	1.564
		n=32	n=38	n=32	n=47	n=25	n=175
	Propane: SA	31.3%	44.7%	25.0%	14.9%	28.0%	28.0%
	A	56.3%	42.1%	56.3%	55.3%	44.0%	50.9%
	N	-	2.6%	9.4%	17.0%	20.0%	12.0%
(page 3, #5D)	D	9.4%	7.9%	9.4%	8.5%	8.0%	6.9%
	SD	3.1%	2.6%	-	4.3%	-	2.3%
	Mean	1.875	1.816	2.031	2.319	2.080	2.046

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=83	n=75	n=65	n=84	n=85	n=395
	Wood: SA	25.3%	46.7%	30.8%	14.3%	27.1%	28.4%
	A	55.4%	42.7%	43.1%	53.6%	52.9%	50.1%
	N	12.0%	2.7%	16.9%	21.4%	12.9%	13.2%
	D	6.0%	6.7%	7.7%	10.7%	2.4%	6.6%
	SD	1.2%	1.3%	1.5%	-	4.7%	1.8%
Availability of the COSP grant	Mean	2.024	1.733	2.062	2.286	2.047	2.033
		n=34	n=40	n=33	n=50	n=25	n=184
	Propane: SA	17.6%	40.0%	27.3%	24.0%	28.0%	27.7%
	A	64.7%	47.5%	57.6%	64.0%	56.0%	58.2%
	N	-	7.5%	9.1%	8.0%	16.0%	10.3%
(page 3, #5E)	D	14.7%	-	6.1%	4.0%	-	2.2%
	SD	2.9%	5.0%	-	-	-	1.6%
	Mean	2.059	1.825	1.939	1.920	1.880	1.918

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=83	n=70	n=63	n=81	n=80	n=380
	Wood: SA	15.7%	10.0%	4.8%	7.4%	17.5%	11.3%
	A	22.9%	12.9%	23.8%	22.2%	21.2%	21.1%
	N	16.9%	11.4%	22.2%	22.2%	28.7%	20.3%
	D	28.9%	42.9%	36.5%	34.6%	25.0%	32.9%
	SD	15.7%	22.9%	12.7%	13.6%	7.5%	14.5%
Dissatisfaction with old system	Mean	3.060	3.557	3.286	3.247	2.837	3.182
		n=31	n=38	n=33	n=49	n=25	n=177
	Propane: SA	25.8%	15.8%	15.2%	12.2%	24.0%	17.5%
	A	41.9%	26.3%	33.3%	38.8%	52.0%	37.3%
	N	12.9%	13.2%	15.2%	28.6%	8.0%	16.9%
(page 3, #5F)	D	9.7%	31.6%	33.3%	18.4%	16.0%	22.6%
	SD	9.7%	13.2%	3.0%	2.0%	-	5.6%
	Mean	2.355	3.000	2.758	2.592	2.160	2.616

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=84	n=74	n=63	n=84	n=83	n=392
	Wood: SA	53.6%	63.5%	54.0%	64.3%	61.4%	59.7%
	A	35.7%	23.0%	39.7%	33.3%	33.7%	32.9%
	N	7.1%	8.1%	4.8%	1.2%	1.2%	4.3%
The fuel converted	D	2.4%	4.1%	1.6%	1.2%	1.2%	2.0%
to gives the lowest	SD	1.2%	1.4%	-	-	2.4%	1.0%
heating costs relative	Mean	1.619	1.568	1.540	1.393	1.494	1.518
to other fuels at current prices							
		n=33	n=40	n=34	n=51	n=25	n=185
	Propane: SA	21.2%	27.5%	5.9%	15.7%	12.0%	17.3%
	A	33.3%	42.5%	38.2%	31.4%	28.0%	35.1%
	N	15.2%	10.0%	29.4%	29.4%	40.0%	23.8%
(page 3, #5G)	D	12.1%	17.5%	23.5%	17.6%	16.0%	17.3%
	SD	18.2%	2.5%	2.9%	5.9%	4.0%	6.5%
	Mean	2.727	2.250	2.794	2.667	2.720	2.605

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=85	n=75	n=62	n=85	n=83	n=393
	Wood: SA	34.1%	52.0%	33.9%	54.1%	41.0%	43.8%
	A	40.0%	30.7%	41.9%	34.1%	36.1%	36.1%
	N	18.8%	10.7%	22.6%	10.6%	15.7%	15.3%
	D	5.9%	5.3%	1.6%	-	6.0%	3.8%
The fuel converted to will be the cheapest form of heating in the future	SD	1.2%	1.3%	-	1.2%	1.2%	1.0%
	Mean	2.000	1.733	1.919	1.600	1.904	1.822
		n=32	n=39	n=33	n=50	n=25	n=181
	Propane: SA	21.9%	30.8%	6.1%	6.0%	12.0%	15.5%
	A	31.3%	35.9%	27.3%	32.0%	16.0%	29.8%
	N	28.1%	20.5%	48.5%	36.0%	20.0%	30.9%
(page 3, #5H)	D	9.4%	12.8%	18.2%	22.0%	52.0%	21.0%
	SD	9.4%	-	-	4.0%	-	2.8%
	Mean	2.531	2.154	2.788	2.860	3.120	2.657

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=84	n=74	n=62	n=83	n=83	n=389
	Wood: SA	20.2%	29.7%	16.1%	16.9%	27.7%	22.9%
	A	46.4%	39.2%	32.3%	28.9%	41.0%	37.5%
	N	14.3%	10.8%	25.8%	33.7%	19.3%	20.6%
	D	15.5%	18.9%	24.2%	16.9%	9.6%	16.5%
The heating equipment	SD	3.6%	1.4%	1.6%	3.6%	2.4%	2.6%
needed for the fuel	Mean	2.357	2.230	2.629	2.614	2.181	2.383
changed to costs the least to buy and install							
		n=31	n=40	n=32	n=50	n=25	n=179
	Propane: SA	16.1%	22.5%	6.3%	4.0%	12.0%	11.7%
	A	29.0%	35.0%	31.3%	34.0%	36.0%	33.5%
	N	32.3%	10.0%	28.1%	34.0%	32.0%	26.8%
(page 3, #5I)	D	12.9%	25.0%	34.4%	18.0%	20.0%	21.8%
	SD	9.7%	7.5%	-	10.0%	-	6.1%
	Mean	2.710	2.600	2.906	2.960	2.600	2.771

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=84	n=72	n=62	n=80	n=82	n=383
	Wood: SA	3.6%	2.8%	3.2%	2.5%	6.1%	3.7%
	A	7.1%	8.3%	8.1%	6.3%	6.1%	7.0%
	N	9.5%	9.7%	12.9%	12.5%	17.1%	12.3%
	D	54.8%	40.3%	45.2%	56.3%	42.7%	48.3%
	SD	25.0%	38.9%	30.6%	22.5%	28.0%	28.7%
	Mean	3.905	4.042	3.919	3.900	3.805	3.914
The fuel desired for home heating was not available		n=30	n=39	n=34	n=48	n=24	n=176
	Propane: SA	13.3%	28.2%	17.6%	16.7%	16.7%	18.8%
	A	13.3%	10.3%	47.1%	35.4%	45.8%	29.5%
	N	13.3%	5.1%	5.9%	10.4%	12.5%	9.1%
(page 3, #5J)	D	33.3%	28.2%	26.5%	27.1%	16.7%	27.3%
	SD	26.7%	28.2%	2.9%	10.4%	8.3%	15.3%
	Mean	3.467	3.179	2.500	2.792	2.542	2.909

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=85	n=74	n=65	n=83	n=83	n=394
	Wood: SA	27.1%	54.1%	29.2%	48.2%	43.4%	40.9%
	A	60.0%	32.4%	61.5%	43.4%	53.0%	49.7%
	N	8.2%	-	1.5%	8.4%	3.6%	4.6%
	D	3.5%	12.2%	7.7%	-	-	4.3%
	SD	1.2%	1.4%	-	-	-	0.5%
The fuel changed to	Mean	1.918	1.743	1.877	1.602	1.602	1.739
is easily accessible							
		n=33	n=38	n=34	n=51	n=25	n=182
	Propane: SA	27.3%	26.3%	14.7%	21.6%	20.0%	22.0%
	A	51.5%	44.7%	70.6%	68.6%	72.0%	61.5%
	N	15.2%	5.3%	14.7%	5.9%	4.0%	8.8%
(page 3, #5K)	D	3.0%	18.4%	-	2.0%	4.0%	5.5%
	SD	3.0%	5.3%	-	2.0%	-	2.2%
	Mean	2.030	2.316	2.000	1.941	1.920	2.044

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=85	n=73	n=63	n=83	n=84	n=391
	Wood: SA	5.9%	15.1%	6.3%	6.0%	9.5%	8.4%
	A	9.4%	13.7%	14.3%	15.7%	10.7%	12.5%
	N	44.7%	28.8%	49.2%	50.6%	51.2%	45.3%
	D	31.8%	35.6%	25.4%	25.3%	28.6%	29.4%
	SD	8.2%	6.8%	4.8%	2.4%	-	4.3%
The fuel changed to is safest to operate	Mean	3.271	3.055	3.079	3.024	2.988	3.087
		n=32	n=39	n=34	n=51	n=24	n=181
	Propane: SA	15.6%	17.9%	11.8%	7.8%	16.7%	13.3%
	A	18.8%	25.6%	20.6%	41.2%	29.2%	28.7%
	N	56.3%	28.2%	58.8%	35.3%	37.5%	42.0%
(page 3, #5L)	D	6.3%	23.1%	8.8%	13.7%	16.7%	13.8%
	SD	3.1%	5.1%	-	2.0%	-	2.2%
	Mean	2.625	2.718	2.647	2.608	2.542	2.630

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=85	n=74	n=65	n=83	n=84	n=394
	Wood: SA	7.1%	16.2%	10.8%	4.8%	7.1%	8.9%
	A	11.8%	14.9%	10.8%	9.6%	14.3%	12.4%
	N	28.2%	12.2%	27.7%	30.1%	39.3%	27.7%
	D	42.4%	50.0%	47.7%	50.6%	35.7%	45.2%
	SD	10.6%	6.8%	3.1%	4.8%	3.6%	5.8%
The fuel changed to provides the cleanest form of heating in the home	Mean	3.376	3.162	3.215	3.410	3.143	3.266
		n=32	n=39	n=35	n=52	n=25	n=184
	Propane: SA	25.0%	59.0%	14.3%	17.3%	28.0%	28.3%
	A	56.3%	25.6%	40.0%	67.3%	36.0%	47.3%
	N	9.4%	12.8%	28.6%	9.6%	24.0%	15.8%
(page 3, #5M)	D	6.3%	2.6%	17.1%	5.8%	8.0%	7.6%
	SD	3.1%	-	-	-	4.0%	1.1%
	Mean	2.063	1.590	2.486	2.038	2.240	2.060

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=85	n=74	n=64	n=84	n=83	n=393
	Wood: SA	7.1%	17.6%	9.4%	15.5%	8.4%	12.0%
	A	22.4%	25.7%	18.8%	19.0%	12.0%	19.3%
	N	40.0%	21.6%	37.5%	51.2%	39.8%	38.2%
	D	23.5%	32.4%	28.1%	11.9%	37.3%	26.5%
	SD	7.1%	2.7%	6.3%	2.4%	2.4%	4.1%
The fuel changed to is cleanest environmentally (least pollution)	Mean	3.012	2.770	3.031	2.667	3.133	2.913
		n=32	n=39	n=34	n=50	n=25	n=182
	Propane: SA	28.1%	50.0%	14.7%	14.0%	28.0%	26.9%
	A	50.0%	32.5%	44.1%	46.0%	40.0%	42.3%
	N	15.6%	15.0%	26.5%	36.0%	16.0%	23.1%
(page 3, #5N)	D	3.1%	2.5%	14.7%	2.0%	12.0%	6.0%
	SD	3.1%	-	-	2.0%	4.0%	1.6%
	Mean	2.031	1.744	2.412	2.320	2.240	2.132

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=85	n=73	n=66	n=84	n=84	n=395
	Wood: SA	31.8%	47.9%	30.3%	29.8%	36.9%	35.4%
	A	49.4%	43.8%	51.5%	59.5%	48.8%	50.6%
	N	16.5%	4.1%	15.2%	9.5%	10.7%	11.1%
	D	2.4%	4.1%	3.0%	1.2%	3.6%	2.8%
	SD	-	-	-	-	-	-
The fuel changed to provides enjoyable "atmosphere"	Mean	1.894	1.644	1.909	1.821	1.810	1.813
		n=31	n=39	n=35	n=51	n=25	n=182
	Propane: SA	19.4%	33.3%	22.9%	9.8%	24.0%	21.4%
	A	38.7%	55.0%	42.9%	52.9%	36.0%	47.3%
	N	32.3%	7.7%	31.4%	29.4%	32.0%	25.8%
(page 3, #50)	D	-	-	2.9%	3.9%	8.0%	2.7%
	SD	9.7%	-	-	3.9%	-	2.7%
	Mean	2.419	1.744	2.143	2.392	2.240	2.181

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=85	n=73	n=66	n=84	n=84	n=395
	Wood: SA	32.9%	46.6%	31.8%	28.6%	38.1%	35.9%
	A	43.5%	32.9%	45.5%	44.0%	38.1%	40.5%
	N	12.9%	9.6%	15.2%	21.9%	11.9%	14.2%
	D	9.4%	11.0%	7.6%	6.0%	11.9%	9.1%
	SD	1.2%	-	-	-	-	0.3%
The fuel changed to provides the most comfortable heat	Mean	2.024	1.849	1.985	2.048	1.976	1.972
		n=31	n=38	n=34	n=52	n=25	n=181
	Propane: SA	12.9%	34.2%	11.8%	11.5%	8.0%	16.6%
	A	35.5%	42.1%	44.1%	42.3%	40.0%	40.9%
	N	35.5%	23.7%	35.3%	38.5%	36.0%	33.7%
(page 3, #5P)	D	6.5%	-	8.8%	5.8%	16.0%	6.6%
	SD	9.7%	-	-	1.9%	-	2.2%
	Mean	2.645	1.895	2.412	2.442	2.600	2.370

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=84	n=73	n=66	n=85	n=84	n=396
	Wood: SA	17.9%	34.2%	28.8%	28.2%	25.0%	26.5%
	A	54.8%	27.4%	40.9%	42.4%	46.4%	43.2%
	N	19.0%	21.9%	21.2%	25.9%	23.8%	22.2%
	D	8.3%	15.1%	6.1%	3.5%	4.8%	7.3%
	SD	-	1.4%	3.0%	-	-	0.8%
Wanted a fuel with a guaranteed supply	Mean	2.179	2.219	2.136	2.047	2.083	2.162
		n=30	n=36	n=33	n=51	n=25	n=176
	Propane: SA	16.7%	27.8%	18.2%	9.8%	12.0%	16.5%
	A	56.7%	47.2%	42.4%	56.9%	48.0%	51.1%
	N	20.0%	16.7%	36.4%	21.6%	28.0%	23.9%
(page 3, #5Q)	D	3.3%	2.8%	3.0%	9.8%	12.0%	6.3%
	SD	3.3%	5.6%	-	2.0%	-	2.3%
	Mean	2.200	2.111	2.242	2.373	2.400	2.267

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Reasons for converting off oil heating 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=83	n=73	n=64	n=84	n=83	n=390
	Wood: SA	20.5%	32.9%	29.7%	32.1%	33.7%	30.0%
	A	55.4%	27.4%	42.2%	41.7%	43.4%	42.1%
	N	14.5%	26.0%	2.3%	19.0%	15.7%	19.0%
	D	6.0%	13.7%	6.3%	6.0%	4.8%	7.2%
	SD	3.6%	-	1.6%	1.2%	2.4%	1.8%
Enjoys the outdoor activities associated with the fuel changed to	Mean	2.169	2.205	2.078	2.024	1.988	2.087
		n=30	n=35	n=31	n=47	n=24	n=167
	Propane: SA	10.3%	20.0%	9.7%	4.3%	4.2%	9.6%
	A	10.3%	31.4%	12.9%	10.6%	8.3%	15.0%
	N	37.9%	37.1%	48.4%	66.0%	58.3%	50.9%
(page 3, #5R)	D	20.7%	8.6%	29.0%	14.9%	16.7%	17.4%
	SD	20.7%	2.9%	-	4.3%	12.5%	7.2%
	Mean	3.310	2.429	2.968	3.043	3.250	2.976

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Fuel Cost Perceptions							
		n=82	n=71	n=63	n=82	n=85	n=387
	Wood:						
	natural gas	1.2%	1.4%	6.3%	2.4%	2.4%	2.8%
	oil	50.0%	67.6%	60.3%	52.4%	48.2%	54.8%
	electricity	41.5%	28.2%	25.4%	36.6%	44.7%	35.9%
	wood	1.2%	2.8%	-	1.2%	-	1.3%
Fuel perceived as most expensive for home heating	propane	6.1%	-	7.9%	7.3%	4.7%	5.2%
		n=32	n=40	n=35	n=51	n=23	n=181
(Page 4, #6)	Propane:						
	natural gas	-	-	-	2.0%	-	0.6%
	oil	37.5%	60.0%	17.1%	35.3%	39.1%	38.1%
	electricity	53.1%	35.0%	62.9%	52.9%	52.2%	50.8%
	wood	-	5.0%	5.7%	3.9%	-	3.3%
	propane	9.4%	-	14.3%	5.9%	8.7%	7.2%
		n=82	n=76	n=64	n=84	n=85	n=395
	Wood:						
	natural gas	7.3%	14.5%	7.8%	7.1%	12.9%	10.1%
	oil	1.2%	1.3%	4.7%	-	-	1.3%
	electricity	3.7%	3.9	-	1.2%	1.2%	2.0%
	wood	85.4%	78.9%	87.5%	88.1%	85.9%	85.1%
Fuel perceived as least expensive for home heating	propane	2.4%	1.3%	-	3.6%	-	1.5%
		n=33	n=42	n=31	n=49	n=23	n=180
(Page 4, #6)	Propane:						
	natural gas	42.4%	57.1%	45.2%	57.1%	43.5%	50.0%
	oil	6.1%	2.4%	-	2.0%	-	2.8%
	electricity	-	2.4%	-	2.0%	-	1.1%
	wood	27.3%	23.8%	32.3%	24.5%	56.5%	30.6%
	propane	24.2%	14.3%	22.6%	14.3%	-	15.6%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Fuel Change Decision Process		n=85	n=76	n=67	n=86	n=85	n=402
	Wood:						
	male head	50.6%	59.2%	49.3%	43.0%	50.6%	50.2%
	female head	5.9%	2.6%	7.5%	5.8%	5.9%	5.5%
Household member most responsible for initially suggesting changing systems	joint decision	43.5%	36.8%	40.3%	50.0%	42.4%	43.0%
	outside influence	-	1.3%	3.0%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
		n=34	n=41	n=37	n=53	n=25	n=191
(Page 4, #7)	Propane:						
	male head	47.1%	70.7%	45.9%	60.4%	56.0%	56.5%
	female head	14.7%	4.9%	10.8%	13.2%	4.0%	10.5%
	joint decision	32.4%	22.0%	40.5%	20.8%	32.0%	28.3%
	outside influence	5.9%	2.4%	2.7%	5.7%	8.0%	4.7%
		n=82	n=72	n=65	n=82	n=86	n=393
	Wood:						
	male head	57.6%	63.9%	50.8%	62.2%	59.3%	58.8%
	female head	7.1%	5.6%	10.8%	8.5%	14.0%	9.4%
Household member most responsible for obtaining info about the types and costs of alternate systems	joint decision	27.1%	22.2%	38.5%	28.0%	25.6%	28.0%
	outside influence	8.2%	8.3%	-	1.2%	1.2%	3.8%
		n=33	n=39	n=37	n=52	n=25	n=187
(Page 4, #7)	Propane:						
	male head	60.6%	71.8%	54.1%	67.3%	68.0%	64.2%
	female head	21.2%	7.7%	27.0%	11.5%	8.0%	15.0%
	joint decision	15.2%	7.7%	13.5%	17.3%	16.0%	13.9%
	outside influence	3.0%	12.8%	5.4%	3.8%	8.0%	7.0%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Fuel Change Decision Process		n=85	n=75	n=66	n=84	n=86	n=399
	Wood:						
	male head	47.1%	36.0%	33.3%	42.9%	45.3%	41.4%
	female head	3.5%	1.3%	4.5%	4.8%	3.5%	3.5%
Household member most responsible for making the final decision to convert	joint decision	49.4%	62.7%	62.1%	52.4%	60.0%	54.9%
	outside influence	-	-	-	-	1.2%	0.3%
		n=34	n=41	n=37	n=53	n=25	n=191
(Page 4, #7)	Propane:						
	male head	38.2%	78.0%	29.7%	54.7%	68.0%	53.4%
	female head	14.7%	2.4%	13.5%	7.5%	8.0%	9.4%
	joint decision	47.1%	19.5%	54.1%	37.7%	24.0%	36.6%
	outside influence	-	-	2.7%	-	-	0.5%
		n=85	n=73	n=64	n=84	n=86	n=395
	Wood:						
	male head	56.5%	49.3%	43.8%	54.8%	52.3%	51.6%
	female head	2.4%	2.7%	1.6%	4.8%	4.7%	3.3%
Household member most responsible for deciding on the type of heating equipment to purchase	joint decision	35.3%	46.6%	51.6%	39.3%	41.9%	42.5%
	outside influence	5.9%	1.4%	3.1%	1.2%	1.2%	2.5%
		n=34	n=40	n=36	n=53	n=25	n=189
(Page 4, #7)	Propane:						
	male head	52.9%	72.5%	52.8%	58.5%	56.0%	58.7%
	female head	11.8%	2.5%	11.1%	9.4%	4.0%	8.5%
	joint decision	35.3%	20.0%	27.8%	28.3%	20.0%	26.5%
	outside influence	-	5.0%	8.3%	3.8%	20.0%	6.3%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Fuel Change Decision Process		n=85	n=71	n=65	n=83	n=86	n=393
	Wood:						
	male head	62.4%	54.9%	61.5%	60.2%	60.5%	60.1%
	female head	1.2%	1.4%	-	2.4%	2.3%	1.5%
Household member	joint decision	5.9%	19.7%	16.9%	19.3%	10.5%	14.0%
most responsible	outside influence	30.6%	23.9%	21.5%	18.1%	26.8%	24.4%
for actually installing the new heating system		n=33	n=40	n=36	n=52	n=24	n=186
	Propane:						
(Page 4, #7)	male head	33.3%	45.0%	38.9%	50.0%	50.0%	43.5%
	female head	3.0%	-	-	3.8%	-	1.6%
	joint decision	6.1%	12.5%	13.9%	7.7%	12.5%	10.2%
	outside influence	57.6%	42.5%	47.2%	38.4%	37.5%	44.6%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Influence of friends or relatives in the decision to convert (Page 4, #8A)		n=81	n=77	n=67	n=81	n=83	n=392
	Wood:						
	very infl.	16.0%	20.8%	22.4%	16.0%	14.5%	17.6%
	somewhat inf.	50.6%	40.3%	40.3%	45.7%	54.2%	46.4%
	not infl.	4.9%	14.3%	13.4%	12.3%	9.6%	10.7%
	no info received	28.4%	24.7%	23.9%	25.9%	21.7%	25.3%
		n=33	n=42	n=37	n=48	n=24	n=185
	Propane:						
	very infl.	15.2%	7.1%	5.4%	4.2%	25.0%	9.7%
	somewhat infl.	24.2%	16.7%	27.0%	43.8%	37.5%	30.3%
	not infl.	24.2%	23.8%	27.0%	12.5%	8.3%	19.5%
	no info received	36.4%	52.4%	40.5%	39.6%	29.2%	40.5%
Influence of magazine or newspaper articles in the decision to convert (Page 4, #8B)		n=78	n=77	n=64	n=82	n=85	n=398
	Wood:						
	very infl.	10.3%	10.4%	6.3%	3.7%	8.2%	7.7%
	somewhat infl.	26.9%	36.4%	43.8%	52.1%	43.5%	40.1%
	not infl.	24.4%	22.1%	18.8%	17.1%	17.6%	20.1%
	no info received	38.5%	31.2%	31.3%	28.0%	30.6%	32.1%
		n=33	n=42	n=35	n=47	n=24	n=182
	Propane:						
	very infl.	6.1%	7.1%	2.9%	2.1%	12.5%	5.5%
	somewhat infl.	27.3%	31.0%	28.6%	42.6%	29.2%	32.4%
	not infl.	24.2%	14.3%	25.7%	21.3%	12.5%	20.3%
	no info received	42.4%	47.6%	42.9%	34.0%	45.8%	41.8%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Influence of newspaper ads in the decision to convert (Page 4, #8C)		n=78	n=77	n=65	n=80	n=85	n=388
	Wood:						
	very infl.	5.1%	5.2%	7.7%	1.2%	7.1%	5.2%
	somewhat inf.	21.8%	36.4%	26.2%	36.2%	37.6%	31.7%
	not infl.	38.5%	26.0%	29.2%	28.7%	26.9%	29.6%
	no info received	34.6%	32.5%	36.9%	33.7%	29.4%	33.5%
		n=33	n=41	n=35	n=47	n=24	n=181
	Propane:						
	very infl.	6.1%	12.2%	-	4.3%	4.2%	5.5%
	somewhat infl.	18.2%	14.6%	11.4%	29.8%	29.2%	20.4%
	not infl.	30.3%	29.3%	40.0%	27.7%	20.8%	30.4%
	no info received	45.5%	43.9%	48.6%	38.3%	45.8%	43.6%
Influence of TV or radio ads in the decision to convert (Page 4, #8D)		n=77	n=77	n=63	n=80	n=83	n=383
	Wood:						
	very infl.	5.2%	1.3%	4.8%	-	-	2.1%
	somewhat infl.	23.4%	31.2%	20.6%	27.5%	28.9%	26.4%
	not infl.	37.7%	27.3%	28.6%	33.7%	33.7%	32.4%
	no info received	33.8%	40.3%	46.0%	38.7%	37.3%	39.2%
		n=33	n=41	n=35	n=46	n=24	n=180
	Propane:						
	very infl.	6.1%	4.9%	-	-	-	2.2%
	somewhat infl.	15.2%	14.6%	20.0%	19.6%	25.0%	18.3%
	not infl.	30.3%	34.1%	37.1%	41.3%	16.7%	33.9%
	no info received	48.5%	46.3%	42.9%	39.1%	58.3%	45.6%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Influence of retail sales-people in the decision to convert (Page 4, #8E)	Wood:	n=76	n=76	n=65	n=76	n=82	n=378
	very infl.	9.2%	3.9%	7.7%	2.6%	9.8%	6.9%
	somewhat inf.	19.7%	27.6%	36.9%	36.8%	39.0%	32.0%
	not infl.	38.2%	35.5%	24.6%	31.6%	24.4%	30.7%
	no info received	32.9%	32.9%	30.8%	28.9%	26.8%	30.4%
	Propane:	n=33	n=41	n=34	n=47	n=24	n=180
	very infl.	9.1%	22.0%	5.9%	6.4%	4.2%	10.0%
	somewhat infl.	30.3%	24.4%	11.8%	34.0%	16.7%	24.4%
	not infl.	36.4%	22.0%	38.2%	27.7%	29.2%	30.6%
	no info received	24.2%	31.7%	44.1%	31.9%	50.0%	35.0%
Influence of personal know-ledge or experience in the decision to convert (Page 4, #8F)	Wood:	n=82	n=77	n=65	n=83	n=85	n=395
	very infl.	56.1%	53.2%	49.2%	41.0%	47.1%	49.4%
	somewhat infl.	40.2%	32.5%	36.9%	45.8%	42.4%	39.5%
	not infl.	1.2%	5.2%	7.7%	3.6%	3.5%	4.1%
	no info received	2.4%	9.1%	6.2%	9.6%	7.1%	7.1%
	Propane:	n=34	n=42	n=35	n=47	n=25	n=184
	very infl.	44.1%	35.7%	40.0%	38.3%	44.0%	39.7%
	somewhat infl.	23.5%	33.3%	48.6%	46.8%	40.0%	39.1%
	not infl.	14.7%	9.5%	-	8.5%	-	7.1%
	no info received	17.6%	21.4%	11.4%	6.4%	16.0%	14.1%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Influence of private heating contractors in the decision to convert (Page 4, #8G)		n=78	n=77	n=64	n=78	n=83	n=383
	Wood:						
	very infl.	6.4%	2.6%	6.3%	2.6%	6.0%	4.7%
	somewhat inf.	17.9%	19.5%	17.2%	21.8%	14.5%	18.0%
	not infl.	21.8%	22.1%	18.8%	30.8%	21.7%	23.2%
	no info received	53.8%	55.8%	57.8%	44.9%	57.8%	54.0%
		n=33	n=41	n=35	n=48	n=25	n=183
	Propane:						
	very infl.	6.1%	14.6%	20.0%	6.3%	28.0%	13.7%
	somewhat infl.	18.2%	22.0%	31.4%	45.8%	12.0%	27.9%
	not infl.	39.4%	17.1%	17.1%	10.4%	12.0%	18.6%
	no info received	36.4%	46.3%	31.4%	37.5%	48.0%	39.9%
Influence of information supplied by OEM's in the decision to convert (Page 4, #8H)		n=78	n=77	n=65	n=80	n=83	n=386
	Wood:						
	very infl.	10.3%	7.8%	10.8%	2.5%	12.0%	8.5%
	somewhat infl.	26.9%	22.1%	27.7%	32.5%	28.9%	27.7%
	not infl.	17.9%	26.0%	13.8%	23.7%	18.1%	19.9%
	no info received	44.9%	44.2%	47.7%	41.2%	41.0%	43.8%
		n=33	n=42	n=35	n=47	n=24	n=182
	Propane:						
	very infl.	21.2%	11.9%	5.7%	4.3%	4.2%	9.3%
	somewhat infl.	24.2%	31.0%	37.1%	34.0%	25.0%	30.8%
	not infl.	9.1%	7.1%	25.7%	19.1%	12.5%	15.4%
	no info received	45.5%	50.0%	31.4%	42.6%	58.3%	44.5%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Influence of government supplied information (Page 4, #8I)		n=77	n=77	n=66	n=80	n=85	n=388
	Wood:						
	very infl.	15.6%	20.8%	21.2%	15.0%	18.8%	18.0%
	somewhat inf.	46.8%	41.6%	43.9%	46.2%	43.5%	44.1%
	not infl.	11.7%	15.6%	10.6%	11.2%	14.1%	12.9%
	no info received	26.0%	22.1%	24.2%	27.5%	23.5%	25.0%
		n=33	n=41	n=35	n=48	n=25	n=183
	Propane:						
	very infl.	12.1%	24.4%	8.6%	8.3%	24.0%	14.8%
	somewhat infl.	51.5%	31.7%	34.3%	56.3%	36.0%	43.2%
	not infl.	3.0%	9.8%	25.7%	20.8%	8.0%	14.2%
	no info received	33.3%	34.1%	31.4%	14.6%	32.0%	27.9%
Influence of information supplied by utilities (Page 4, #8J)		n=77	n=77	n=64	n=79	n=84	n=384
	Wood:						
	very infl.	5.2%	6.5%	4.7%	-	2.4%	3.6%
	somewhat infl.	11.7%	31.2%	15.6%	16.5%	20.2%	19.0%
	not infl.	22.1%	19.5%	14.1%	30.4%	32.1%	24.2%
	no info received	61.0%	42.9%	65.6%	53.2%	45.2%	53.1%
		n=33	n=41	n=35	n=47	n=24	n=181
	Propane:						
	very infl.	12.1%	12.2%	8.6%	2.1%	4.2%	7.7%
	somewhat infl.	12.1%	14.6%	20.0%	31.9%	16.7%	19.9%
	not infl.	27.3%	19.5%	28.6%	27.7%	25.0%	25.4%
	no info received	48.5%	53.7%	42.9%	38.3%	54.2%	47.0%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
		n=77	n=75	n=61	n=82	n=82	n=380
Information source cited as most influential in the decision to convert (Page 4, #9)	Wood:						
	friends or relatives	22.1%	30.7%	24.6%	28.0%	22.0%	25.3%
	mag/newspaper articles	3.9%	6.7%	8.2%	7.3%	4.9%	6.1%
	newspaper ads	1.3%	2.7%	-	1.2%	1.2%	1.3%
	radio/TV ads	1.3%	-	-	1.2%	2.4%	1.1%
	retail salespeople	2.6%	1.3%	4.9%	2.4%	11.0%	4.7%
	personal experience	42.9%	34.7%	49.2%	41.5%	40.2%	41.6%
	heating contractors	7.8%	1.3%	-	2.4%	1.2%	2.6%
	OEM information	5.2%	1.3%	1.6%	3.7%	8.5%	4.2%
	govt. supplied info	9.1%	20.0%	11.5%	12.2%	8.5%	12.1%
	utility supplied info	3.9%	1.3%	-	-	-	1.1%
		n=32	n=39	n=33	n=45	n=25	n=175
	Propane:						
	friends or relatives	25.0%	7.7%	18.2%	13.3%	20.0%	16.6%
	mag/newspaper articles	-	7.7%	9.1%	-	4.0%	4.0%
	newspaper ads	3.1%	5.1%	3.0%	4.4%	-	3.4%
	radio/TV ads	-	2.6%	3.0%	2.2%	-	1.7%
	retail salespeople	9.4%	10.3%	6.1%	8.9%	-	7.4%
	personal experience	34.4%	28.2%	30.3%	40.0%	40.0%	34.3%
	heating contractors	3.1%	12.8%	6.1%	8.9%	12.0%	8.6%
	OEM information	6.3%	7.7%	12.1%	6.7%	8.0%	8.0%
	govt supplied info	12.5%	10.3%	6.1%	13.3%	8.0%	10.3%
	utility supplied info	6.3%	7.7%	6.1%	2.2%	8.0%	5.7%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Conversion Details							
		n=81	n=73	n=65	n=81	n=76	n=379
	Wood:						
	mean cost	$766	$603	$543	$487	$335	$546
Annual cost of home heating after conversion (in $)	median cost	$598	$502	$501	$398	$249	$451
		n=31	n=38	n=37	n=48	n=25	n=179
	Propane:						
	mean cost	$1093	$903	$896	$913	$638	$898
(Page 5 #10)	median cost	$988	$802	$801	$998	$603	$800
		n=73	n=73	n=59	n=68	n=68	n=344
	Wood:						
	have increased	2.7%	4.1%	3.4%	4.4%	2.9%	4.1%
	are the same	4.1%	6.8%	3.4%	5.9%	-	4.1%
Have heating costs changed since conversion? to convert	have decreased	93.2%	89.0%	93.2%	89.7%	97.1%	91.9%
		n=29	n=38	n=27	n=43	n=19	n=155
	Propane:						
	have increased	23.1%	5.3%	29.6%	25.6%	26.3%	21.3%
	are the same	30.8%	28.9%	37.0%	34.9%	36.8%	33.5%
(Page 5 #11)	have decreased	46.2%	65.8%	33.3%	39.5%	36.8%	45.2%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Conversion Details							
	Wood:	n=85	n=76	n=68	n=85	n=85	n=402
Cost of converting heating system (in $)	mean	$1325	$1373	$1414	$1204	$1196	$1292
	mode	$1000	$ 800	$1800	$1000	$1000	$1000
	median	$1135	$1202	$1401	$1125	$1075	$1200
	Propane:	n=32	n=41	n=36	n=52	n=25	n=189
(Page 5 #12a)	mean	$1425	$2105	$1354	$1537	$1255	$1602
	mode	$1500	$1000	$1200	$2000	$1300	$1000
	median	$1400	$1002	$1200	$1401	$1347	$1250
	Wood:	n=84	n=76	n=68	n=86	n=85	n=402
Was the cost of conversion ...	more than expected	21.4%	28.9%	25.0%	19.8%	24.7%	23.6%
	same as expected	63.1%	67.1%	64.7%	74.4%	70.6%	68.4%
	less than expected	15.5%	3.9%	10.3%	5.8%	4.7%	8.0%
	Propane:	n=34	n=42	n=35	n=53	n=23	n=189
(Page 5 #12b)	more than expected	17.6%	31.0%	25.7%	32.1%	43.5%	29.6%
	same as expected	67.6%	54.8%	57.1%	60.4%	56.5%	59.3%
	less than expected	14.7%	14.3%	17.1%	7.5%	-	11.1%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Conversion Details							
	Wood:	n=80	n=69	n=53	n=75	n=78	n=354
	mean	$520	$588	$603	$537	$530	$551
	mode	$800	$800	$800	$800	$800	$800
Size (in $) of COSP grant received	median	$486	$625	$650	$540	$491	$540
	Propane:	n=32	n=35	n=32	n=43	n=22	n=166
	mean	$589	$557	$596	$616	$528	$579
(Page 5 #12c)	mode	$800	$800	$800	$800	$450	$800
	median	$572	$454	$600	$626	$483	$575
	Wood:	n=85	n=76	n=68	n=86	n=85	n=402
Does subject expect to save enough money on heating to payback investment	yes	88.2%	93.4%	88.2%	91.9%	95.3%	91.5%
	no	11.8%	6.6%	11.8%	8.1%	4.7%	8.5%
	Propane:	n=34	n=41	n=34	n=51	n=24	n=186
(Page 5 #13)	yes	50.0%	65.9%	50.0%	43.1%	45.8%	50.5%
	no	50.0%	34.1%	50.0%	56.9%	54.2%	49.5%
	Wood:	n=74	n=65	n=60	n=83	n=77	n=362
	mean	3.6	3.1	3.3	2.5	2.9	3.1
	mode	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
Expected number of years for payback	median	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.0	2.3	2.4
	Propane:	n=15	n=27	n=16	n=14	n=9	n=81
	mean	5.9	4.9	7.1	7.1	6.6	6.1
(Page 5 #13)	mode	3.0	5.0	3.0	10.0	3.0	3.0
	median	5.0	4.8	5.5	6.5	5.0	5.1

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Conversion Details							
		n=85	n=76	n=67	n=85	n=86	n=402
	Wood:						
	less than 1 month	12.9%	5.3%	13.4%	8.2%	9.3%	10.0%
	1 to 3 months	23.5%	10.5%	7.5%	20.0%	17.4%	16.4%
	4 to 6 months	10.6%	14.5%	14.9%	9.4%	20.9%	13.9%
	7 to 12 months	17.6%	13.2%	31.3%	22.4%	23.3%	21.1%
How long did	1 to 2 years	30.6%	47.4%	22.4%	36.5%	22.1%	31.6%
subject con-	3 years or more	4.7%	9.2%	10.4%	3.5%	7.0%	7.0%
sider changing heating system before converting?		n=34	n=40	n=35	n=52	n=24	n=187
	Propane:						
	less than 1 month	8.8%	7.5%	11.4%	5.8%	16.7%	9.1%
	1 to 3 months	14.7%	25.0%	14.3%	25.0%	12.5%	19.8%
	4 to 6 months	20.6%	20.0%	20.0%	25.0%	16.7%	20.9%
	7 to 12 months	17.6%	15.0%	14.3%	11.5%	16.7%	15.0%
(Page 5 #14)	1 to 2 years	32.4%	25.0%	31.4%	26.9%	20.8%	27.3%
	3 years or more	5.9%	7.5%	8.6%	5.8%	16.7	8.0%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Conversion Details							
		n=85	n=77	n=68	n=86	n=86	n=405
	Wood:						
	less than 1 year	18.8%	9.1%	13.3%	15.2%	26.8%	16.8%
	1 to 3 years	23.5%	16.9%	23.5%	16.3%	37.2%	23.7%
	4 to 6 years	15.3%	11.7%	10.3%	19.8%	11.6%	14.1%
	7 to 10 years	9.4%	10.4%	17.6%	10.5%	8.1%	11.1%
How long was oil used before converting?	more than 10 years	32.9%	51.9%	35.3%	38.4%	16.3%	34.3%
		n=33	n=40	n=36	n=52	n=24	n=187
	Propane:						
	less than 1 year	3.0%	15.0%	11.2%	7.7%	33.4%	12.3%
	1 to 3 years	15.2%	27.5%	11.1%	9.6%	12.5%	15.5%
	4 to 6 years	24.2%	10.0%	16.7%	11.5%	8.3%	13.9%
	7 to 10 years	12.1%	5.0%	13.9%	13.5%	16.7%	11.8%
(Page 5 #15)	more than 10 years	45.5%	42.5%	47.2%	57.7%	29.2%	46.5%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Oil Displacement Details							
	Wood:	n=75	n=72	n=57	n=79	n=80	n=366
	mean	1039	851	836	882	595	839
	mode	1000	1000	800	800	500	1000
Oil used before converting	median	903	750	800	800	501	800
(in gallons)	Propane:	n=32	n=33	n=32	n=46	n=19	n=160
	mean	1055	879	836	847	594	868
(Page 5 #16)	mode	1000	800	1000	1000	350	1000
	median	904	801	898	800	500	800
	Wood:	n=81	n=73	n=61	n=82	n=83	n=383
	not at all sure	12.3%	8.2%	14.8%	6.1%	10.8%	10.2%
	fairly sure	44.4%	37.0%	41.0%	37.8%	49.4%	42.3%
How sure is the	quite sure	29.6%	28.8%	29.5%	39.0%	25.3%	30.3%
subject of the	certain	13.6%	26.0%	14.8%	17.1%	14.5%	17.2%
pre-conversion oil usage estimate	Propane:	n=33	n=37	n=32	n=50	n=21	n=175
	not at all sure	18.2%	8.1%	18.8%	20.0%	23.8%	17.7%
(Page 6 #17)	fairly sure	45.5%	27.0%	28.1%	44.0%	42.9%	37.7%
	quite sure	24.2%	32.4%	40.6%	30.0%	23.8%	30.3%
	certain	12.1%	32.4%	12.5%	6.0%	9.5%	14.3%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Oil Displacement Details							
	Wood:	n=82	n=74	n=65	n=84	n=82	n=390
Did subject keep records of the amount and cost of oil used before converting (Page 6, #18)	% yes	61.0%	59.5%	63.1%	69.0%	53.7%	61.0%
	Propane:	n=33	n=37	n=33	n=51	n=21	n=177
	% yes	63.6%	73.0%	54.5%	56.9%	57.1%	60.5%
Is oil used currently for any part of home heating needs? (Page 6, #19)	Wood:	n=82	n=72	n=64	n=84	n=84	n=390
	yes	70.7%	66.7%	78.1%	69.0%	71.4%	64.4%
	no	29.3%	33.3%	21.9%	31.0%	20.6%	35.6%
	Propane:	n=34	n=35	n=34	n=51	n=21	n=187
	yes	5.9%	8.6%	14.7%	2.0%	4.5%	6.8%
	no	94.1%	91.4%	85.3%	98.0%	95.5%	93.2%
Amount of oil used after converting (in gallons) (Page 6 #20)	Wood:	n=57	n=31	n=41	n=60	n=58	n=248
	mean	421	426	263	315	115	297
	mode	200	150	100	100	50	100
	median	300	370	200	200	71	200
	Propane:						
	mean						
	mode	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	median						

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Oil Displacement Details							
	Wood:	n=60	n=30	n=49	n=61	n=64	n=265
How sure is the subject of the post-conversion oil usage estimate	not at all sure	10.0%	6.7%	14.3%	4.9%	12.5%	9.8%
	fairly sure	38.3%	36.7%	40.8%	36.1%	28.1%	35.8%
	quite sure	36.7%	26.7%	24.5%	36.1%	37.5%	33.2%
	certain	15.0%	30.0%	20.4%	23.0%	21.9%	21.1%
	Propane:						
(Page 6 #21)	not at all sure fairly sure quite sure certain	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Wood:	n=59	n=32	n=50	n=60	n=63	n=265
Does the subject keep records of the amounts and cost of oil used now	yes	72.9%	65.6%	64.0%	65.0%	69.8%	67.9%
	no	27.1%	25.0%	30.0%	30.0%	30.2%	28.7%
	Propane:						
(Page 6 #22)	yes no	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Wood Specific Measures							
		n=88	n=85	n=66	n=88	n=83	n=415
	Wood:						
	less than 10%	1.1%	7.1%	-	2.3%	-	2.2%
	10 - 19%	2.3%	1.2%	1.5%	2.3%	3.6%	2.2%
Percentage of	20 - 29%	2.3%	3.5%	1.5%	1.1%	1.2%	1.9%
heating need	30 - 39%	2.3%	9.4%	3.0%	3.4%	-	3.6%
provided by	40 - 49%	10.2%	7.1%	4.5%	5.7%	-	5.8%
wood	50 - 59%	4.5%	5.9%	6.1%	5.7%	1.2%	4.6%
	60 - 69%	5.7%	9.4%	7.6%	4.5%	3.6%	6.0%
	70 - 79%	23.9%	11.8%	6.1%	13.6%	8.4%	13.3%
(Page 6 #2)	80 - 89%	11.4%	14.1%	25.8%	26.1%	27.7%	20.5%
	90 - 99%	19.3%	16.5%	36.4%	28.4%	39.8%	27.7%
	100%	17.0%	14.1%	7.6%	6.8%	14.5%	12.3%
		n=83	n=84	n=65	n=84	n=84	n=405
Years of experience with	Wood:						
wood heating	mean	10.1	8.1	13.6	9.8	8.5	9.9
	mode	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
(Page 6 #3)	median	3.9	3.4	3.4	2.5	3.1	3.3

Measure	Sample	Region					
		Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Wood Specific Measures							
		n=83	n=86	n=70	n=84	n=84	n=420
	Wood:						
General type of wood system used (Page 6 #4)	space heaters	51.7%	50.8%	40.8	47.0%	66.7	52.0%
	furnaces	29.8%	36.8%	35.7%	35.6%	20.2%	31.0%
	other	18.4%	12.4%	23.6%	17.3%	13.1%	16.9%
		n=86	n=85	n=67	n=90	n=84	n=417
	Wood:						
Specific type of wood heating equipment used (Page 7 #5)	forced air furnace	11.8%	18.8%	20.9%	20.0%	13.1	16.8%
	wood boiler	7.0%	4.7%	4.5%	2.2%	6.0%	4.8%
	combination furnace	17.4%	9.4%	19.4%	23.3%	1.2%	14.4%
	wood burning add-ons	4.7%	4.7%	6.0%	14.4%	7.1%	7.7%
	radiant stoves	14.0%	3.5%	11.9%	11.1%	19.0%	12.0%
	circulating stoves	26.7%	21.2%	13.4%	22.2%	27.4%	22.8%
	fireplace inserts	4.7%	11.8%	6.1%	2.3%	13.1%	7.7%
		n=86	n=87	n=69	n=89	n=85	n=420
	Wood:						
Who installed the wood heating system (Page 7 #9)	subject themself	48.8%	44.8%	56.5%	64.0%	57.6%	54.3%
	a dealer	20.9%	16.1%	23.2%	12.4%	22.4%	18.8%
	a contractor	22.1%	26.4%	17.4%	18.0%	15.3%	19.8%
	other	8.2%	12.6%	2.9%	5.6%	4.8%	7.2%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Wood Specific Measures							
		n=84	n=83	n=67	n=83	n=79	n=395
	Wood:						
When does wood heating system begin and end (average) (Page 7 #11a)	beginning month	Sep/Oct	Sep/Oct	Oct	Oct	Sep/Oct	Sep/Oct
	ending month	Apr/May	Apr/May	Apr/May	Apr/May	Apr/May	Apr/May
	approximate season length	7 mths	7 mths	6.5 mths	6.5 mths	7 mths	7 mths
		n=80	n=88	n=69	n=85	n=82	n=396
	Wood:						
Is wood heating system used in the ... equipment (Page 7 #11b)	morning	93.8%	78.4%	92.8%	95.3%	96.3	91.2%
	afternoon	92.5%	61.4%	94.0%	93.8%	91.1%	85.7%
	evening	95.2%	81.8%	98.5%	97.7%	100.0%	94.2%
	at night	90.2%	61.4%	92.5%	91.0%	89.6%	84.1%
		n=86	n=86	n=69	n=88	n=85	n=418
	Wood:						
Was the system inspected after installation (Page 7 #13)	yes	39.5%	61.6%	58.0%	35.2%	70.6%	52.9%
	no	54.7%	36.0%	39.1%	61.4%	28.2%	44.0%
	don't know	5.8%	2.3%	2.9%	3.4%	1.2%	3.1%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Wood Specific Measures 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=86	n=87	n=67	n=86	n=85	n=415
	Wood: SA	-	-	3.0%	-	2.4%	1.2%
Have had difficulty	A	2.3%	3.4%	3.0%	1.2%	3.5%	2.7%
obtaining wood	N	4.7%	-	3.0%	5.8%	7.4%	4.6%
	D	48.8%	25.3%	46.3%	45.3%	44.7%	41.7%
(Page 8 #16)	SD	44.2%	71.3%	44.8%	47.7%	40.0%	49.9%
	Mean	4.349	4.644	4.269	4.395	4.165	4.364
		n=86	n=87	n=67	n=87	n=85	n=416
	Wood: SA	-	-	-	-	-	-
Have had problems	A	1.2%	2.3%	3.0%	1.1%	3.5%	2.2%
with the installation	N	3.5%	1.1%	4.5%	6.9%	3.5%	3.8%
	D	52.3%	29.9%	53.7%	50.6%	56.5%	48.1%
(Page 8 #16)	SD	43.0%	66.7%	38.8%	41.4%	36.5%	45.9%
	Mean	4.372	4.609	4.284	4.322	4.259	4.377
		n=86	n=87	n=67	n=87	n=85	n=416
	Wood: SA	-	-	-	1.1%	-	0.2%
Have had problems	A	3.5%	5.7%	4.5%	2.3%	1.2%	3.4%
with the operation	N	2.3%	4.6%	3.0%	3.4%	2.4%	3.1%
of the wood system	D	50.0%	28.7%	58.2%	54.0%	55.3%	48.6%
	SD	44.2%	60.9%	34.3%	39.1%	41.2%	44.7%
(Page 8 #16)	Mean	4.349	4.448	4.224	4.276	4.365	4.341

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Wood Specific Measures 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=86	n=86	n=67	n=87	n=85	n=415
	Wood: SA	1.2%	1.2%	-	-	4.7%	1.4%
Have had difficulty	A	4.7%	3.5%	3.0%	2.3%	2.4%	3.1%
with cleaning and	N	5.8%	1.2%	3.0%	5.7%	3.5%	3.9%
maintaining the wood	D	52.3%	32.6%	61.2%	59.8%	51.8%	50.8%
system	SD	36.0%	61.6%	32.8%	32.2%	37.6%	40.7%
(Page 8 #16)	Mean	4.174	4.500	4.239	4.218	4.153	4.263
		n=87	n=87	n=67	n=88	n=85	n=419
	Wood: SA	51.7%	74.7%	62.7%	68.2%	68.2%	65.2%
Have had heating	A	40.2%	19.5%	32.8%	23.9%	22.4%	27.4%
costs decrease	N	2.3%	1.1%	3.0%	1.1%	2.4%	1.9%
	D	3.4%	4.6%	-	4.5%	5.9%	3.8%
(Page 8 #16)	SD	2.3%	-	1.5%	2.3%	1.2%	1.7%
	Mean	1.644	1.356	1.448	1.489	1.494	1.494
		n=86	n=86	n=65	n=87	n=85	n=413
	Wood: SA	2.3%	-	3.1%	1.1%	1.2%	1.7%
Have found that	A	11.6%	4.7%	3.1%	11.5%	9.4%	8.5%
acquiring wood was	N	11.6%	1.2%	13.8%	12.6%	17.6%	11.1%
inconvenient	D	50.0%	31.4%	55.4%	52.9%	45.9%	46.2%
	SD	24.4%	62.8%	24.6%	21.8%	25.9%	32.4%
(Page 8 #16)	Mean	3.826	4.523	3.954	3.828	3.859	3.993

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Wood Specific Measures 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=86	n=87	n=65	n=87	n=85	n=414
	Wood: SA	2.3%	4.6%	1.5%	1.1%	2.4%	2.4%
Have had problems	A	5.8%	3.4%	1.5%	8.0%	2.4%	4.3%
with indoor air quality	N	11.6%	8.0%	13.8%	10.3%	8.2%	10.1%
or ventilation using wood	D	62.8%	36.8%	53.8%	55.2%	58.8%	53.1%
	SD	17.4%	47.1%	29.2%	25.3%	28.2%	30.0%
(Page 8 #16)	Mean	3.872	4.184	4.077	3.954	4.082	4.039
		n=86	n=87	n=65	n=87	n=85	n=414
	Wood: SA	1.2%	4.6%	3.1%	2.3%	3.5%	2.9%
Have used more wood	A	18.6%	10.3%	16.9%	18.4%	20.0%	16.7%
than expected	N	14.0%	6.9%	21.5%	13.8%	17.6%	14.3%
	D	52.3%	43.7%	38.5%	52.9%	41.2%	45.9%
(Page 8 #16)	SD	14.0%	34.5%	20.0%	12.6%	17.6%	20.3%
	Mean	3.593	3.931	3.554	3.552	3.494	3.640
		n=86	n=87	n=66	n=87	n=84	n=414
	Wood: SA	10.5%	34.5%	19.7%	21.8%	19.0%	21.7%
Have saved more money	A	43.0%	28.7%	37.9%	37.9%	39.3%	37.2%
on heating than expected	N	26.7%	16.1%	33.3%	26.4%	26.2%	25.1%
	D	16.3%	18.4%	7.6%	13.8%	14.3%	14.3%
	SD	3.5%	2.3%	1.5%	-	1.2%	1.7%
(Page 8 #16)	Mean	2.593	2.253	2.333	2.322	2.393	2.370

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Wood Specific Measures 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=86	n=86	n=66	n=86	n=85	n=413
	Wood: SA	12.8%	26.7%	16.7%	18.6%	18.8%	19.6%
Have found that the	A	51.2%	37.2%	37.9%	36.0%	40.0%	40.2%
wood system heats more	N	16.3%	11.6%	30.3%	32.6%	27.1%	23.0%
of the home than expected	D	15.1%	20.9%	12.1%	11.6%	12.9%	14.5%
	SD	4.7%	3.5%	3.0%	1.2%	1.2%	2.7%
(Page 8 #16)	Mean	2.477	2.372	2.470	2.407	2.376	2.404
		n=87	n=87	n=68	n=87	n=83	n=417
	Wood: SA	18.4%	34.5%	27.9%	28.7%	27.7%	28.1%
Have found that the	A	66.7%	43.7%	52.9%	55.2%	60.2%	55.4%
wood system works as	N	4.6%	11.5%	16.2%	14.9%	12.0%	11.5%
well or better than	D	8.0%	9.2%	1.5%	1.1%	-	4.1%
expected	SD	2.3%	1.1%	1.5%	-	-	1.0%
	Mean	2.092	1.989	1.956	1.885	1.843	1.945
(Page 8 #16)							

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Wood Specific Measures							
	Wood:						
Is the wood heating system used for cooking		n=87	n=88	n=69	n=89	n=84	n=421
	yes	19.5%	13.6%	8.7%	4.5%	6.0%	10.5%
(Page 8 #14)	no	80.5%	86.4%	91.3%	95.5%	94.0%	89.5%
	Wood:						
Is the wood heating system used for water heating		n=86	n=88	n=68	n=89	n=84	n=419
	yes	19.8%	5.7%	1.5%	1.1%	8.3%	7.4%
(Page 8 #15)	no	80.2%	94.3%	98.5%	98.9%	91.7%	92.6%
	Wood:						
Approximate number of cords used for heating in the past year		n=80	n=76	n=57	n=73	n=73	n=363
	mean	5.3	8.0	7.9	6.2	4.9	6.4
	mode	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	4.0	6.0
(Page 8 #17)	median	5.1	6.5	5.9	5.5	4.3	5.4
	Wood:						
		n=86	n=82	n=68	n=83	n=79	n=401
Wood use expectations for this year as compared to last year	1st yr with wood	15.1%	20.7%	19.1%	19.3%	17.7%	18.2%
	more wood this yr	11.6%	4.9%	11.8%	13.3%	15.2%	11.2%
	less wood this yr	11.6%	7.3%	13.2%	4.8%	15.2%	10.2%
(Page 8 #18)	about the same	61.6%	67.1%	55.9%	62.7%	51.9%	60.3%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Wood Specific Measures							
	Wood:						
Price paid for one cord of wood (in $)		n=67	n=77	n=42	n=33	n=43	n=266
	mean	$50	$34	$52	$35	$36	$43
(Page 9 #19)	median	$50	$30	$46	$23	$25	$40
	Wood:	n=89	n=85	n=68	n=82	n=83	n=406
Are records re cost of operating wood system kept	yes, detailed records kept	21.4%	31.8%	17.6%	8.5%	14.5%	18.7%
(Page 9 #21)	no, but costs are known	66.7%	58.8%	63.2%	64.4%	68.7%	64.5%
	no, and costs are unknown	11.9%	9.4%	19.1%	28.0%	16.9%	16.7%
	Wood:	n=85	n=86	n=69	n=88	n=85	n=417
Percentage of wood cut by subject themselves	none	20.0%	29.1%	13.0%	4.5%	5.9%	14.6%
	less than 25%	14.1%	11.6%	11.6%	2.3%	2.4%	8.2%
	25 - 49%	5.9%	12.8%	2.9%	2.3%	3.5%	5.8%
	50 - 74%	7.1%	8.1%	10.1%	4.5%	7.1%	7.2%
(Page 9 #22)	75 - 99%	8.2%	3.5%	5.8%	2.3%	5.9%	5.0%
	100%	44.7%	34.9%	56.5%	84.1%	75.3%	59.2%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Type of woodlot where wood is obtained (Page 9 #23)	Wood:	n=85	n=87	n=66	n=89	n=84	n=409
	subject's	29.5%	24.1%	43.9%	50.6%	15.5%	32.5%
	friend/relative's	19.2%	19.5%	24.2%	19.1%	9.5%	17.8%
	private/retail	5.1%	16.1%	4.5%	2.2%	3.6%	6.4%
	crown/provincial	28.2%	13.8%	15.2%	18.0%	48.8%	25.4%
	combination	9.0%	13.8%	9.1%	10.1%	19.0%	12.0%
	other	9.0%	12.6%	3.0%	-	3.6%	5.9%
Vehicle used to transport self-cut wood (Page 9 #24)	Wood:	n=75	n=84	n=64	n=86	n=84	n=398
	subject's	56.0%	51.2%	68.8%	81.4%	69.0%	65.1%
	friend/relative's	20.0%	13.1%	10.9%	8.1%	13.1%	13.1%
	rented	5.3%	6.0%	-	-	3.6%	3.3%
	none transported	10.7%	22.6%	10.9%	3.5%	6.0%	10.8%
	other	8.0%	7.1%	9.4%	7.0%	8.3%	7.8%
Distance travelled to collect wood (in miles) (Page 9 #25)	Wood:	n=70	n=60	n=51	n=84	n=70	n=339
	mean	22.0	14.0	11.0	12.0	15.0	16.0
	mode	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	1.0
	median	7.5	7.9	4.3	4.7	9.8	7.0
Type of wood most commonly used (Page 9 #26)	Wood:	n=86	n=87	n=65	n=89	n=84	n=421
	hardwood	73.3%	79.3%	65.7%	24.7%	19.0%	51.8%
	softwood	17.4%	5.7%	12.9%	40.4%	42.9%	24.2%
	don't know	1.2%	6.9%	4.3%	1.1%	1.2%	1.2%
	combination	8.1%	8.0%	17.1%	33.7%	36.9%	22.8%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
	Wood:						
Condition of wood burned most frequently		n=87	n=88	n=70	n=89	n=85	n=424
	green	6.9%	2.3%	5.7%	2.2%	5.9%	4.5%
	seasoned	86.2%	92.0%	85.7%	86.5%	85.9%	87.3%
(Page 9 #27)	don't know	1.1%	1.1%	4.3%	-	-	1.2%
	combination	5.7%	4.5%	4.3%	11.2%	8.2%	7.1%
	Wood:						
		n=86	n=86	n=69	n=87	n=83	n=416
How long is wood stored before use	less than 3 mths	22.1%	11.6%	18.8%	24.1%	16.9%	18.8%
	3 - 6 mths	40.7%	22.1%	18.8%	14.9%	33.7%	26.0%
	6 - 12 mths	34.9%	50.0%	39.1%	32.2%	36.1%	38.9%
(Page 9 #28)	more than 1 year	1.2%	16.3%	21.7%	28.7%	9.6%	15.1%
	don't know	1.2%	-	1.4%	-	3.6%	1.2%
	Wood:						
		n=85	n=86	n=69	n=84	n=85	n=414
Is stored wood cut to length needed (% yes) (Page 9 #29)	% yes	96.5%	93.0%	100%	90.5%	97.6%	95.4%
	Wood:						
		n=77	n=81	n=62	n=69	n=82	n=383
Is stored wood split (% yes) (Page 9 #29)	% yes	92.2%	87.7%	88.6%	73.9%	93.9%	87.7%
	Wood:						
		n=74	n=79	n=68	n=76	n=83	n=383
Is stored wood piled (% yes) (Page 9 #29	% yes	90.5%	77.2%	92.6%	96.1%	95.2%	90.3%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
COSP Grant Measures							
		n=85	n=81	n=63	n=85	n=80	n=397
	Wood:						
	before converting	45.9%	56.8%	58.7%	56.5%	57.5%	54.7%
When did subject	at the same time	22.4%	21.0%	20.6%	18.8%	25.0%	21.7%
first hear or	after converting	31.8%	22.2%	20.6%	24.7%	17.5%	23.7%
read about COSP?							
		n=34	n=40	n=34	n=52	n=24	n=185
	Propane:						
	before converting	35.3%	70.0%	61.8%	67.3%	58.3%	59.5%
(Page 10 #2)	at the same time	8.8%	20.0%	17.6%	26.9%	20.8%	19.5%
	after converting	55.9%	10.0%	20.6%	5.8%	20.8%	21.1%
		n=85	n=83	n=63	n=85	n=80	n=399
	Wood:						
	definately would	58.8%	56.6%	52.4%	58.8%	55.0%	56.6%
	probably would	32.9%	25.3%	25.4%	31.8%	35.0%	30.3%
	probably would not	7.1%	16.9%	14.3%	9.4%	7.5%	10.8%
Likelihood of	definately would not	1.2%	1.2%	7.9	-	2.5%	2.3%
converting if COSP not available							
		n=34	n=40	n=34	n=52	n=24	n=186
	Propane:						
	definately would	67.6%	47.5%	52.9%	40.4%	41.7%	49.5%
(Page 10 #3a)	probably would	20.6%	22.5%	23.5%	40.4%	41.7%	29.6%
	probably would not	11.8%	27.5%	14.7%	17.3%	12.5%	17.2%
	definately would not	-	2.5%	8.8%	1.9%	4.2%	3.8%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
COSP Grant Measures 1 = Strongly Agree 5 = Strongly Disagree		n=86	n=82	n=61	n=83	n=79	n=394
	Wood: SA	22.2%	25.6%	11.5%	16.9%	24.1%	20.3%
	A	17.4%	20.7%	29.5%	18.1%	21.5%	21.1%
	N	17.4%	7.3%	23.0%	22.9%	24.1%	18.6%
"Because the COSP grant	D	27.9%	25.6%	23.0%	22.9%	15.2%	23.2%
was available, I con-	SD	15.1%	20.7%	13.1%	19.3%	15.2%	16.9%
verted my home heating	Mean	2.965	2.951	3.098	3.096	2.759	2.957
system sooner than I would have otherwise"							
		n=34	n=40	n=35	n=52	n=24	n=187
	Propane: SA	8.8%	32.5%	2.9%	11.5%	4.2%	13.4%
Have had heating	A	8.8%	20.0%	25.7%	30.8%	29.2%	23.0%
costs decrease	N	23.5%	17.5%	34.3%	19.2%	37.5%	25.1%
	D	35.3%	15.0%	28.6%	26.9%	20.8%	25.1%
(Page 10 #3b)	SD	23.5%	15.0%	8.6%	11.5%	8.3%	13.4%
	Mean	3.559	2.600	3.143	2.962	3.000	3.021

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
COSP Grant Measures							
	Wood:	n=86	n=83	n=62	n=84	n=79	n=397
"The grant was essential, I could not have afforded to convert without COSP"		17.4%	21.7%	19.4%	16.7%	17.7%	18.4%
"The grant was helpful, but I could have afforded to convert without COSP"		81.4%	73.5%	77.4%	79.8%	79.7%9	78.3%
"The grant was completely unnecessary in my case		1.2%	4.8%	3.2%	3.6%	2.5%	3.3%
	Propane:	n=34	n=40	n=34	n=53	n=24	n=185
"The grant was essential, I could not have afforded to convert without COSP"		8.8%	15.0%	8.8%	15.7%	12.5%	12.4%
"The grant was helpful, but I could have afforded to convert without COSP		88.2%	77.5	82.4%	84.3%	87.5%	83.2%
"The grant was completely unnecessary in my case		2.9%	7.5%	8.8%	-	-	4.3%

(Page 10, #3C)

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Sources used to obtain info about COSP (% yes)	Wood:	n=80	n=82	n=60	n=78	n=76	n=374
Magazine or newspaper stories		46.2%	53.7%	56.1%	44.9%	52.6%	50.3%
Radio ads		24.4%	28.0%	40.0%	26.7%	20.0%	27.4%
TV ads		34.2%	38.3%	46.6%	29.7%	18.7%	32.8%
Newspaper ads		52.6%	52.4%	59.6%	46.2%	53.8%	52.3%
Info from govt energy offices		61.0%	32.9%	50.0%	38.0%	44.7%	45.0%
Direct mailings from utilities		17.5%	22.0%	15.3%	29.9%	18.2%	20.7%
Direct mailings from heat contractors		6.4%	9.8%	8.3%	11.0%	13.2%	10.0%
Personal visits with utilities		5.1%	3.7%	-	5.6%	12.0%	5.4%
Personal visits with heat contractors		19.0%	17.1%	18.6%	31.2%	24.0%	22.2%
Personal visits with govt offices		9.0%	2.4%	5.2%	6.8%	6.7%	6.0%
Retail sales people		46.2%	41.5%	40.7%	41.9%	67.5%	47.9%
Friends or relatives		56.4%	52.4%	54.1%	61.5%	51.3%	55.0%
	Propane:	n=32	n=41	n=30	n=47	n=24	n=172
Magazine or newspaper stories		53.1%	58.5%	62.1%	54.3%	73.9%	59.0%
Radio ads		28.1%	26.8%	60.7%	48.9%	29.2%	39.1%
TV ads		34.4%	48.8%	60.0%	45.8%	30.4%	44.9%
Newspaper ads		69.7%	58.5%	69.0%	73.5%	60.9%	66.7%
Info from govt energy offices		60.6%	36.6%	60.0%	48.9%	45.8%	49.4%
Direct mailings from utilities		12.9%	19.5%	25.9%	25.5%	30.4%	22.9%
Direct mailings from heat contractors		3.2%	12.2%	13.8%	10.9%	13.0%	11.6%
Personal visits with utilities		9.7%	7.3%	17.2%	10.6%	17.4%	11.6%
Personal visits with heat contractors		9.7%	34.1%	31.0%	27.1%	26.1%	26.0%
Personal visits with govt offices		-	7.3%	10.3%	13.3%	4.3%	7.6%
Retail sales people		19.4%	46.3%	36.7%	30.4%	26.1%	32.6%
Friends or relatives		61.3%	26.8%	50.0%	43.5%	39.1%	43.6%

(Page 11, #4)

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Most useful source of COSP information							
	Wood:	n=83	n=82	n=61	n=82	n=79	n=390
Magazine or newspaper stories		3.6%	8.5%	13.1%	12.2%	3.8%	7.9%
Radio ads		-	-	4.9%	1.2%	-	1.3%
TV ads		8.4%	6.1%	6.6%	2.4%	2.5%	5.1%
Newspaper ads		7.2%	13.4%	11.5%	9.8%	8.9%	10.0%
Info from govt energy offices		32.5%	22.0%	18.0%	20.7%	22.8%	23.6%
Direct mailings from utilities		1.2%	6.1%	3.3%	9.8%	2.5%	4.6%
Direct mailings from heat contractors		2.4%	3.7%	-	2.4%	2.5%	2.3%
Personal visits with utilities		3.6%	1.2%	-	-	2.5%	1.5%
Personal visits with heat contractors		6.0%	2.4%	4.9%	7.3%	3.8%	4.9%
Personal visits with govt offices		3.6%	-	1.6%	1.2%	1.3%	1.5%
Retail sales people		16.9%	15.9%	16.4%	12.2%	38.0%	20.0%
Friends or relatives		14.5%	20.7%	19.7%	20.7%	11.4%	17.2%
	Propane:	n=32	n=38	n=33	n=47	n=25	n=176
Magazine or newspaper stories		3.1%	7.9%	24.2%	2.1%	12.0%	9.1%
Radio ads		-	-	-	4.3%	-	1.1%
TV ads		6.3%	5.3%	3.0%	4.3%	-	4.0%
Newspaper ads		18.8%	10.5%	12.1%	27.7%	8.0%	16.5%
Info from govt energy offices		50.0%	21.1%	27.3%	31.9%	28.0%	31.3%
Direct mailings from utilities		-	5.3%	-	-	8.0%	2.8%
Direct mailings from heat contractors		-	-	-	-	4.0%	0.6%
Personal visits with utilities		-	2.6%	-	2.1%	8.0%	2.3%
Personal visits with heat contractors		-	21.1%	6.1%	12.8%	12.0%	10.8%
Personal visits with govt offices		-	5.3%	6.1%	-	-	2.3%
Retail sales people		3.1%	21.1%	15.2%	6.4%	4.0%	10.2%
Friends or relatives		18.8%	-	6.1%	8.5%	16.0%	9.1%

(Page 11, #5)

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Home Characteristics							
	Wood:						
		n=88	n=89	n=70	n=88	n=86	n=426
	single dwelling	94.3%	88.8%	90.0%	87.5%	72.1%	86.6%
	mobile home	3.4%	4.5%	4.3%	10.2%	23.3%	9.2%
	other	2.2%	6.7%	5.7%	2.3%	4.7%	3.8%
Type of home							
	Propane:						
		n=36	n=42	n=37	n=53	n=25	n=195
	single dwelling	77.8%	83.3%	78.4	77.4%	56.0%	75.9%
(Page 11 #1)	mobile home	22.2%	2.4%	13.5%	20.8%	36.0%	17.9%
	other	-	14.3%	8.1%	1.9%	8.0%	6.1%
	Wood:						
		n=88	n=89	n=69	n=86	n=85	n=422
	less than 10 yrs	25.0%	14.6%	18.8%	22.1%	42.4%	24.9%
	11 to 20 yrs	27.3%	32.6%	21.7%	17.4%	24.7%	24.9%
	21 to 40 yrs	18.2%	31.5%	20.3%	34.9%	27.1%	26.5%
	more than 40 yrs	29.5%	21.3%	39.1%	25.6%	5.9%	23.7%
	mean (yrs)	36.23	30.65	42.333	31.593	19.365	31.647
Age of home							
	Propane:	n=36	n=43	n=37	n=53	n=25	n=196
	less than 10 yrs	19.4%	9.3%	18.9%	15.1%	32.0%	17.9%
(Page 11 #3)	11 to 20 yrs	13.9%	16.3%	16.2%	20.8%	40.0%	19.9%
	21 to 40 yrs	16.7%	32.6%	37.8%	32.1%	16.0%	28.6%
	more than 40 yrs	50.0%	41.9%	27.0%	32.1%	12.0%	33.7%
	mean (yrs)	46.33	45.372	36.324	32.868	21.560	37.214

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Home Characteristics							
	Wood:						
		n=86	n=88	n=69	n=89	n=86	n=422
	500 or less	3.5%	6.8%	2.9%	2.2%	1.2%	3.6%
	501 to 800	16.3%	11.4%	5.8%	10.1%	5.8%	10.2%
	801 to 1000	17.4%	21.6%	13.0%	29.2%	19.8%	20.6%
	1001 to 1200	25.6%	23.9%	27.5%	10.1%	27.9%	22.7%
	1201 to 1500	17.4%	17.0%	18.8%	22.5%	23.3%	19.7%
	1501 to 2000	12.8%	15.9%	20.3%	20.2%	10.5%	15.6%
	more than 2000	7.0%	3.4%	11.6%	5.6%	11.6%	7.6%
Size of home (in sq. ft.)							
	Propane:						
		n=36	n=41	n=37	n=52	n=24	n=192
	500 or less	8.3%	-	5.4%	3.8%	4.2%	4.2%
(Page 11 #5)	501 to 800	27.8%	31.7%	8.1%	13.5%	25.0%	20.3%
	801 to 1000	16.7%	17.1%	35.1%	23.1%	29.2%	23.4%
	1001 to 1200	13.9%	19.5%	16.2%	21.2%	16.7%	18.8%
	1201 to 1500	16.7%	9.8%	16.2%	23.1%	4.2%	15.1%
	1501 to 2000	11.1%	4.9%	2.7%	3.8%	8.3%	5.7%
	more than 2000	5.6%	17.1%	16.2%	11.5%	12.5%	12.5%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Home Insulation Questions	Wood:						
		n=63	n=87	n=57	n=70	n=57	n=337
	not	39.7%	20.7%	38.6%	48.6%	21.1%	33.2%
	poorly	11.1%	19.5%	10.5%	5.7%	10.5%	12.5%
	moderately	31.7%	33.3%	36.8%	30.0%	49.1%	35.3%
Level of Basement Insulation	very well	17.5%	26.4%	14.0%	15.7%	19.3%	19.0%
	Propane:						
		n=23	n=41	n=23	n=38	n=11	n=140
(Page 12, #6A)	not	43.5%	31.7%	17.4%	44.7%	28.6%	34.3%
	poorly	30.4%	24.4%	21.7%	7.9%	21.4%	20.7%
	moderately	21.7%	22.0%	26.1%	31.6%	21.4%	25.0%
	very well	4.3%	22.0%	34.8%	15.8%	28.6%	20.0%
	Wood:						
		n=84	n=88	n=68	n=87	n=83	n=414
	not	6.0%	5.7%	7.4%	1.1%	7.2%	5.6%
	poorly	9.5%	17.0%	14.7%	19.5%	8.4%	13.8%
	moderately	58.3%	42.0%	55.9%	55.2%	57.8%	53.6%
Level of Wall Insulation	very well	26.2%	35.2%	22.1%	24.1%	26.5%	27.1%
	Propane:						
		n=35	n=41	n=34	n=49	n=25	n=185
(Page 12, #6A)	not	-	7.3%	-	-	4.0%	2.2%
	poorly	20.0%	22.0%	8.8%	30.6%	28.0%	22.2%
	moderately	20.0%	51.2%	52.9%	49.0%	36.0%	47.0%
	very well	40.0%	19.5%	38.2%	20.4%	32.0%	28.6%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
Home Insulation Questions	Wood:						
		n=80	n=88	n=68	n=88	n=86	n=415
	not	6.3%	1.1%	1.5%	2.3%	2.3%	2.9%
	poorly	6.3%	9.1%	5.9%	11.4%	8.1%	8.2%
	moderately	32.5%	33.0%	45.6%	44.3%	39.5%	38.8%
Level of Ceiling or Attic Insulation	very well	55.0%	56.8%	47.1%	42.0%	50.0%	50.1%
	Propane:						
		n=35	n=42	n=35	n=52	n=24	n=189
(Page 12, #6A)	not	8.6%	4.8%	-	-	-	2.6%
	poorly	5.7%	16.7%	2.9%	13.5%	16.7%	11.1%
	moderately	42.9%	38.1%	28.6%	38.5%	50.0%	39.2%
	very well	42.9%	40.5%	68.6%	48.1%	33.3%	47.1%
	Wood:						
		n=85	n=82	n=67	n=87	n=86	n=411
	yes, in 1-6 mths	12.9%	8.5%	7.5%	2.3%	5.8%	7.5%
	yes, in 7-12 mths	12.9%	15.9%	11.9%	14.9%	4.7%	11.9%
	yes, in more than 1 yr	2.4%	2.4%	9.0%	3.4%	1.2%	3.4%
	yes, may insulate	25.9%	29.3%	26.9%	31.0%	26.7%	28.2%
Intention to add Insulation	no plans to ins.	45.9%	43.9%	44.8%	48.3%	61.6%	48.9%
	Propane:						
		n=33	n=43	n=32	n=51	n=24	n=184
(Page 12, #6B)	yes, in 1-6 mths	6.1%	7.0%	9.4%	11.8%	4.2%	8.2%
	yes, in 7-12 mths	15.2%	7.0%	9.4%	11.8%	-	9.2%
	yes, in more than 1 yr	9.1%	-	-	5.9%	-	3.3%
	yes, may insulate	27.3%	30.2%	21.9%	25.5%	20.8%	25.5%
	no plans to ins.	42.4%	55.8%	59.4%	45.1%	75.0%	53.8%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
CHIP Questions							
	Wood:	n=83	n=78	n=67	n=89	n=86	n=407
	% yes	90.4%	85.9%	97.0%	89.9%	91.9%	90.7%
Aware of CHIP?							
(Page 12, #7A)	Propane:	n=32	n=40	n=35	n=52	n=24	n=183
	% yes	93.8%	87.5%	94.3%	98.1%	91.7%	93.4%
	Wood:	n=80	n=68	n=64	n=86	n=81	n=382
	% yes	41.2%	47.1%	56.3%	46.5%	38.3%	45.4%
Eligible for CHIP?	don't know	32.5%	32.4%	20.3%	29.1%	37.0%	30.8%
	Propane:	n=33	n=40	n=31	n=46	n=23	n=173
(Page 12, #7A)	% yes	36.4%	55.0%	51.6	56.5	39.1	49.1%
	don't know	39.4%	35.0%	29.0%	19.6%	47.8%	32.4%
	Wood:	n=81	n=77	n=64	n=90	n=84	n=400
	% yes	45.7%	41.6%	32.9%	36.7%	31.0%	38.0%
Applied for CHIP?							
(Page 12, #7A)	Propane:	n=34	n=42	n=33	n=51	n=22	n=182
	% yes	50.0%	40.5%	45.5%	39.2%	22.7%	40.7%
	Wood:	n=89	n=89	n=64	n=90	n=84	n=418
Plan to apply for CHIP?	% yes	21.3%	22.5%	20.0%	16.7%	23.5%	20.9%
	Propane:	n=36	n=44	n=37	n=51	n=25	n=183
(Page 12, #7A)	% yes	16.7%	25.0%	8.1%	11.3%	12.0%	14.7%

Measure	Sample	Region: Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	B.C.	Total
ENER$AVE Questions							
Aware of ENER$AVE? (Page 12, #7B)	Wood:	n=80	n=87	n=68	n=87	n=83	n=408
	% yes	53.7%	59.8%	52.9%	47.1%	39.8%	50.2%
	Propane:	n=33	n=41	n=33	n=49	n=23	n=179
	% yes	54.5%	61.0%	60.6%	49.0%	47.8%	49.7%
Applied for ENER$AVE? (Page 12, #7B)	Wood:	n=81	n=80	n=64	n=88	n=83	n=399
	% yes	17.3%	22.5%	7.8%	10.2%	2.4%	12.0%
	Propane:	n=33	n=42	n=30	n=48	n=22	n=175
	% yes	0	16.7%	10.0	12.5	22.7	12.0%
Plan to apply for ENER$AVE? (Page 12, #7B)	Wood:	n=66	n=64	n=51	n=71	n=69	n=324
	% yes	27.3%	39.1%	17.6%	19.7%	24.6%	25.9%
	Propane:	n=33	n=34	n=27	n=41	n=18	n=150
	% yes	43.3%	27.3%	7.4%	7.3%	16.7%	22.0%

Demographic Measures	Wood Users		Propane Users	
Age:	Male n=393	Female n=169	Male n=172	Female n=57
under 25 years	4.3%	7.7%	3.5%	7.0%
25 to 34 years	31.8%	27.2%	25.0%	19.3%
35 to 45 years	26.2%	26.6%	18.0%	15.8%
46 to 54 years	15.0%	19.5%	18.0%	15.8%
55 to 64 years	14.5%	12.4%	21.5%	28.1%
over 65 years	8.1%	6.5%	14.0%	14.0%
(Page 12 #9)				

Number of persons in household:	n=421	n=191
mean	3.6%	3.3%
median	3.6%	2.9%
mode	4.0%	2.0%
(Page 12 #10)		

% of households with children:	n=429	n=197
under 6 years old	31.5%	25.9%
6 to 12 years old	32.6%	19.8%
13 to 18 years old	30.5%	21.3%
(Page 12 #11)		

Education level:	n=386	n=168	n=169	n=65
elementary school	19.7%	11.9%	11.8%	16.9%
some high school	26.2%	23.2%	32.5%	24.6%
high school graduate	24.1%	39.3%	24.3%	36.9%
community college	9.1%	10.1%	10.1%	6.2%
some university	6.7%	6.5%	11.2%	12.3%
university graduate	14.2%	8.9%	10.1%	3.1%

(Page 12, #12)

Demographic Measures	Wood Users		Propane Users	
Occupation	Male n=390	Female n=162	Male n=169	Female n=62
prof/managerial/exec	24.1%	15.5%	27.8%	16.1%
sales/clerical	7.2%	11.1%	4.8%	9.7%
skilled/unskilled labour	29.3%	4.3%	25.5%	4.8%
farmer/farm worker	16.9%	3.1%	18.3%	3.2%
student	.5%	1.9%	-	-
homemaker	.5%	46.3%	-	40.3%
unemployed	4.9%	4.9%	2.4%	3.2%
retired	9.7%	8.6%	14.8%	17.7%
other	6.9%	4.3%	6.5%	4.8%

(Page 12, #13)

Total Income before Taxes:	n=404	n=178
under $10,000	15.1%	14.0%
$10,000 to 14,999	11.9%	11.8%
$15,000 to 19,999	12.6%	14.6%
$20,000 to 24,999	16.6%	15.2%
$25,000 to 29,999	12.9%	10.7%
$30,000 to 34,999	10.9%	9.6%
$35,000 to 39,999	8.2%	7.3%
$40,000 to 49,999	6.9%	6.7%
$50,000 or more	5.0%	10.1%

(Page 12, #14)

INDUSTRY CANADA/INDUSTRIE CANADA
150600

LKC
HD 9574 .C22 I5 1983
An initial evaluation of COSP renewable converters

DATE DUE
DATE DE RETOUR

CARR McLEAN 38-296