

CA 2.1995-1718

C2

QUEEN
 JL
 103
 .I5
 T4
 1995

IC

700666

COMMUNICATIONS

1995 20 1-5

Industry Canada

**Testing the Effectiveness of Internal Communications
 Surrounding the Public Release of "Building a
 More Innovative Economy": Final Report**

February 6, 1995

Industry Canada
 Library Queen
JUL 09 1998
 Industrie Canada
 Bibliothèque Queen

~~Industry Canada
 Library - Jrl Tower S
MAR 26 1997
 Industrie Canada
 Bibliothèque - Édifice Jrl S~~

JOUE
 JL
 103
 .I5
 T4
 1995



Price Waterhouse



February 6, 1995

Mr. Albert Deslauriers
Industry Canada
235 Queen St., East Tower
7th floor, Room 708D
Ottawa, ON
K1A 0H5

albert
Dear Mr. Deslauriers:

Price Waterhouse is pleased to submit two (2) hard copies and one electronic copy (WP 5.2) of our Final Report on the Testing of the Effectiveness of Internal Communications Surrounding the Public Release of the "Building a More Innovative Economy" Initiative.

Should you have any questions or comments, please don't hesitate to contact me at (613) 238-8200.

Yours very truly,
PRICE WATERHOUSE

Susan Coleman-Bélanger

Susan Coleman-Bélanger
Manager

Industry Canada

Testing the Effectiveness of Internal Communications Surrounding the Public Release of "Building a More Innovative Economy": Final Report

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction	Page 1
1.1	Objective of this Assignment	Page 1
1.2	Methodology	Page 2
1.3	Structure of this Report	Page 4
2.0	Findings	Page 5
3.0	Conclusions and Recommendations	Page 22

Appendices

- Appendix A Questionnaire
- Appendix B Frequency and Cross-Tabulation Tables



Executive Summary

Introduction

On December 5, 1994 Minister John Manley officially launched the Building a More Innovative Economy Action Plan (BMIE). The plan outlines the federal government's intentions for improving the Canadian economic climate, especially with regards to marketplace growth, productivity, and employment.

A major new federal initiative, BMIE will have important impacts on the policies and activities of Industry Canada (IC), as well as many other federal departments. Accordingly, the extent to which IC staff are aware of the document and its meaning is of critical importance. A number of different methods of communication, including E-mail, briefings, and written documentation were used to convey the message within the Department.

Objective of this Assignment

In the wake of BMIE's introduction, and in an ongoing attempt to improve internal communications on major Departmental initiatives, the Communications Branch retained Price Waterhouse to conduct a survey to determine how effectively the Department had communicated information about BMIE to employees. By examining and evaluating staff awareness of the BMIE plan, lessons can be learned which will improve the communication of information about other major initiatives to employees.



Methodology

Price Waterhouse conducted a telephone survey with 510 staff across the country following the release of the BMIE Action Plan, with an overall response rate of 39%.

Typically, one can expect a response rate of between 40 and 60% for telephone surveys with employees. However, given the time of year this survey was conducted (ie. over the Christmas season), a 39% response rate over a nine-day period is satisfactory. Further, it should be noted that the sample is a reliable representation of the entire Department. In effect, responses can be considered representative of the entire population with a 98% level of confidence.

Findings

- **One-quarter of respondents (25.8%) had never heard about BMIE. (Q.1)**

While the majority of respondents had heard of BMIE, finding that one-quarter of employees still knew nothing of the Action Plan given the significance of this initiative for the future of the Department, indicates that there are significant communication "holes" to be filled.

- **The most common "first" source of BMIE information was E-mail (38.2%). (Q3)**

E-mail was chosen as the first source of BMIE information more than twice as often as any other source.

By far, the most useful source of BMIE information was also considered to be E-mail (61.8%). Other than that, there was little consensus. The other most useful sources were external media and briefing materials (each cited by approximately one in ten respondents). It is



interesting to note that external media were the second most common "first" source of information used by employees. Whether employees prefer to have the external media as a "first" source of information was not tested. However, in other internal communications studies we have conducted, most employees said they were frustrated to learn things about their department's initiatives at the same time as the general public.

- **The majority of respondents were unable to recall either a broad thrust or a specific program or activity of BMIE. (Q.3.1)**

At best, approximately one in ten respondents could name any one broad thrust. The most frequently recalled thrust was the Marketplace Climate, especially as it affects small business.

In our opinion, this is one of the key findings of this research, which clearly illustrates the challenge of ensuring that employees understand and internalize the critical elements of communicated messages.

- **There was little or no consensus among employees regarding BMIE's main purpose. (Q.3.2)**

Roughly one-quarter of respondents (27.1%) felt that improving the economy was the main purpose of the Action Plan, while a further 22% felt it served only as a government position statement. Indeed, it is important to note that a significant number of respondents saw BMIE as primarily a departmental communication device, describing it as propaganda, information for the public and a warning of future cutbacks at IC.

- **Approximately four respondents in five (82%) did not seek further information on BMIE after the December 5th E-mail announcement. (Q.4)**

This is a critical finding. Over 80% of employees did not search proactively to find out more about the Action Plan, despite the importance accorded to the Plan in the December 5th E-



mail message. In some ways this finding supports the view that employees see the Plan as no more than "propaganda". It also suggests that employees did not believe BMIE would affect their daily work, which is a typical incentive for finding additional information.

- **The vast majority of respondents had not been briefed on BMIE by their manager. (Q.7)**

In fact, only one in six respondents (17.2%) had received a briefing from their supervisor. Some potential reasons why so many managers had not briefed employees may include:

- they assumed that their immediate subordinates would handle briefing requirements;
- managers assumed that sufficient information was available and accessible;
- they assumed that information dissemination was being "handled" by other groups within the Department; or
- they gauged the level of interest on the part of employees to be negligible.
- **Of those respondents responsible for briefing staff (approximately one in six), 18% had never heard of BMIE, and over half (54.2%) had not received any briefing material. (Q.8)**

Less than half of those responsible for briefing staff had received briefing material. Of those who had received briefing material, most felt that it was appropriately detailed, with neither too much nor too little information.

- **Only half of respondents (47.7%) felt they had received all the information they expected to regarding BMIE. (Q.5)**

Despite the fact that less than one-fifth of respondents made any proactive attempt at finding more information on BMIE, only half were satisfied that they had received all the information they had expected to obtain. A significant number of respondents were unable to say what else they would have expected. These respondents typically had a vague feeling that they



should know more, but did not know what exactly. This finding suggests that employees expect to receive information and perceive that it is not their responsibility to seek it out.

- **More than one in four respondents had no interest in receiving further information about BMIE. (Q.6.1)**

There appear to be two primary reasons given for this answer. One was that respondents already felt overwhelmed by the volume of communications they received, and did not want any more. The other was scepticism regarding BMIE's relevance. These respondents felt that BMIE was too vague or that it had no bearing on their role in the Department.

- **In general, E-mail was the preferred method of receiving information from senior management, followed closely by briefings from supervisors. Video-tape and conference calls were the least popular choices. (Q.10)**

It is interesting to note that while "briefing by your manager" was generally the second highest rated method of receiving information, in the specific example of BMIE, very few (17.2%) reported having been briefed by their manager, and only an insignificant number (less than 1% of the total sample) sought more information about BMIE from their manager. This tends to indicate that while ideally staff may want to be briefed by their managers, in reality there are some significant barriers to this taking place.

- **One-quarter of respondents expected to receive detailed information on major initiatives instantly. (Q.12)**

A slightly larger percentage (31.5%) chose "within 24 hours". Hence, over half of respondents expect to get detailed information on major initiatives within 24 hours. This suggests that the communications infrastructure in place must be extremely "well-oiled" to ensure that such a swift turnaround of information can be accomplished.



- **Nearly four-fifths (77.5%) of respondents made suggestions for improving internal communications at Industry Canada. (Q.13)**

Typically, this kind of open question at the end of an interview will provoke a response from about half of the sample. The range of suggestions gathered in this survey indicate that employees have spent some time thinking about issues. Some of the major themes coming forward included: precision (prioritize, target, keep relevant); in-person contact (more meetings, briefings, coffee hours); timeliness ("tell us before the rumours", updates); and clarity (more accountability, reduce bureaucracy).

Conclusions and Recommendations

This section presents our conclusions and recommendations based on the research findings.

Conclusion A1: Communication of information appears to be uneven within the Department

BMIE is one of the largest initiatives launched since Industry Canada's creation. Despite this, one in four respondents had no knowledge of the initiative. In contrast, other employees had reviewed a copy of the document and were able to cite specific programs. Information flow is clearly not the same for all employees.

Conclusion A2: There is a significant issue regarding the role of managers in terms of internal communications

Managers play a critical role in ensuring the effective flow of internal communications within the Department. However, the information gathered through this research indicates that there is a break-down somewhere in the chain. Indeed, while nearly three-quarters (71.2%) of those surveyed state a strong preference for receiving information from their managers,



less than 20% reported having been briefed on the BMIE Action Plan by their manager. Further, one in six people responsible for briefing staff had never heard of BMIE, and over half (54.2%) had not received any briefing material.

Recommendation A: Clarify lines of communication

Research shows that the most effective communications occur when people clearly understand their responsibilities for disseminating messages and feel some sense of ownership of this responsibility.

To increase the effectiveness of communications within the Department, lines of responsibility in communications should be clarified. Each employee should know whom they are to receive information from, and in turn whom they have to brief (where applicable). Blockages can then be quickly identified. If staff have no idea who to ask, and managers are not even sure whom they should tell, information will be lost. With clear accountability, there will be smoother flows of information.

Conclusion B: There are a variety of preferences with regard to communication methods

E-mail was rated as the first and most effective source of information about the Action Plan for a significant number of respondents (38.2% of respondents' first source of information; 61.8% of respondents' most effective source of information). However, many respondents felt that they did not have access to a universal E-mail service. While some had no access to E-mail, others felt that their system was incompatible with other branches or areas.

It was clear from the diversity of responses to this group of questions that there is no one format of communicating messages which will work for all employees. Indeed, to be effective, communications within the Department must make use of more than one channel



or format. Further, the answers given by many respondents indicate that different communications media are being used in different ways. For example, while E-mail may be used as a first message regarding a new initiative or other important piece of information, further, in-depth information typically follows in a hardcopy format.

Recommendation B: Ensure multiple effective channels of communication

Providing a recognized universal e-mail system would help improve internal communication within the Department. However, at the same time, one should not consider universal E-mail access to be the single panacea to the communications challenges facing the Department. E-mail clearly has an important role to play, but must typically be used in tandem with other supports to ensure full understanding of important messages.

Conclusion C: Retention of information is low

The majority of respondents were unable to recall either a broad thrust or a specific program or activity of BMIE. Indeed, no more than one in ten respondents could name any one broad thrust.

Further, there is a sense of disconnect and cynicism among employees. The significant number of employees who did not bother to proactively look for further information about the initiative (82.4%), despite the fact that many felt they did not receive all the information they expected to obtain (52.3%), is evidence of this sense of disconnect. While not specifically applicable to the BMIE Action Plan, it is important to underline this finding because of its ramifications for communicating other initiatives. Indeed, it appears that a sense of responsibility to proactively look for important information is lacking among employees.



Recommendation C: Target the Information

Some respondents indicated little interest in BMIE because they did not believe that the Initiative would affect them or their job. Others specifically requested they be told what their role would be in the Initiative. Many respondents complained that Departmental communications in general, were irrelevant, inapplicable or misdirected.

In addition to keeping employees aware of what is happening in the department, it is important to involve them. As much as possible, attempts should be made to explain specifically how each group, sector, or job category fits in. Communications should not only inform, but should also tell the recipient why he or she needs to know.

Conclusion D: Internal communications must be more responsive

There were a number of suggestions made by respondents which merit further examination within the context of this report. These suggestions can be grouped into the following themes:

- *Multi-media* - given the varied preferences in communication, messages should be available in several formats;
- *Targeted* - information should be sent only to those who need it, or labelled so that it clearly indicates who would benefit from it;
- *Timely* - information within one day (two at the most) would satisfy the majority of respondents;
- *On-going* - the majority of employees would prefer to receive ongoing information updates;
- *Non-intrusive* - many employees felt that the volume of communication was too great. Conversely, many also indicated that little detailed information was sent to them. One suggestion was to provide an overview of data, with details of where complete



information can be found, so that employees would be able to read the information that is pertinent to them; and

- *Compartmentalized* - BMIE's larger thrusts were remembered more often than specific programs. The use of organizational themes and large, overall concepts is clearly helpful for employee recall.

Recommendation D: Track and monitor internal communications regularly

It is important to understand how and why different communication tools are being used within the Department in order to:

- improve the tools;
- ensure that employees are using all the tools at their disposal in the most effective manner possible;
- react quickly to real and perceived barriers to effective Departmental communications; and
- ensure that important messages are reaching the targeted audiences with speed and accuracy.

Ongoing research which helps the Department to understand and react to internal communications should be timely, and above all, action- and solution-oriented.

Finally, we would also suggest that the Department consider sending a brief E-mail message to all employees, reporting on the study, and thanking those who participated. The message would signal to employees that the Department is committed to improving internal communications, and that it will continue to evaluate its efforts.



1.0 Introduction

On December 5, 1994 Minister John Manley officially launched the Building a More Innovative Economy Action Plan (BMIE). The plan outlines the federal government's intentions for improving the Canadian economic climate, especially with regards to marketplace growth, productivity, and employment.

A major new federal initiative, BMIE will have important impacts on the policies and activities of Industry Canada (IC), as well as many other federal departments. Accordingly, the extent to which IC staff are aware of the document and its meaning is of critical importance. A number of different methods of communication, including E-mail, briefings, and written documentation were used to convey the message within the department.

1.1 Objective of this Assignment

In the wake of BMIE's introduction, and in an ongoing attempt to improve internal communications on major Departmental initiatives, the Communications Branch commissioned a survey to determine how effectively the Department had communicated information about BMIE to employees. Price Waterhouse was retained by the Communications Branch to conduct an employee survey. By examining and evaluating staff awareness of the BMIE plan, lessons can be learned which will improve the communication of information about other major initiatives to employees.



1.2 Methodology

Price Waterhouse conducted a telephone survey with 510 IC staff across the country following the release of the BMIE Action Plan. The major steps of the survey development and administration are summarized below:

- **Questionnaire development** - Price Waterhouse aided in the development of the survey instrument by providing feedback on the department's initial design.
- **Pre-test** - We conducted two pre-tests of the questionnaire. The first pre-test consisted of three bilingual interviews which highlighted changes to be made. A larger pre-test of 20 interviews was then conducted. Following this, the survey questionnaire was finalized. The survey questionnaire is included in **Appendix A**.
- **Sample Preparation** - Working from a departmental staff list, we pulled a random sample of IC employees to participate in the survey.
- **Conduct telephone interviews** - Interviews were conducted by the National Survey Centre staff between December 14 and 23, 1994. From a valid sample of 2300 employees, interviewers contacted just over 1300 staff members. Out of these, 510 interviews were completed (i.e. response rate of 39%).

Typically, one can expect a response rate of between 40 and 60% for telephone surveys with employees. However, given the time of year this survey was conducted (ie. over the Christmas season), a 39% response rate over a nine-day period is very satisfactory. Further, it should be noted that the sample is a reliable representation of the entire Department. In effect, responses can be considered representative of the entire population with a 98% level of confidence.

Exhibit 1, on the following page, summarizes the distribution of respondents by sector and Exhibit 2, also on the following page, provides a description of the distribution of respondents by job category.



Exhibit 1 - Population of Respondents by Sector

Sector	Number Interviewed	Percent of Total Interviews	Percent of Total Population
Regional Operations	46	9.0%	8.0
Service Industries & Small Business	33	6.5%	6.2
Manufacturing & Processing Industries	32	6.3%	6.2
Corporate Services	64	12.5%	12.4
Spectrum, Telecommunication & Information Technologies	46	9.0%	8.3
Industry & Science Policy	32	6.3%	6.4
Consumer Affairs	34	6.7%	9.3
Bureau of Competition Policy	19	3.7%	4.5
Canadian Intellectual Property Office	42	8.2%	8.1
Communication Research Centre	40	7.8%	7.3
Regions	119	23.3%	23.3
Other	3	0.6%	-
Total	510	100.0%	100.0%

Exhibit 2 - Population of Respondents by Job Category

Job Category	Number Interviewed	Percent of Total Interviews	Percentage of Total Population
Executive Group	24	4.7%	4.9%
Scientific and Professional	71	13.9%	10.9%
Administration and Foreign Services	220	43.1%	42.1%
Technical	81	15.9%	26.6%
Administrative Support	100	19.6%	14.2%
Operational	5	1.0%	1.3%
Other	9	1.8%	-
Total	510	100.0%	100.0%



1.3 Structure of this Report

This report presents the data from the interviews, and our analysis of the findings. Section 2 presents the data, categorized by survey question. Section 3 presents our conclusions and recommendations.



2.0 Findings

This section summarizes the key findings of the survey, based on telephone interviews with Industry Canada employees, and our analysis of their answers. This chapter is presented in the same order as the questionnaire. Whenever it was feasible, the answers were analyzed by sector and job category. Where relevant statistically significant differences exist between sector or job category, these have been highlighted. The raw data used in developing these tables and summaries can be found in **Appendix B**.

As a whole, the sample population is a reliable representation of the total Department with a few exceptions, their responses can be considered representative with approximately 98% statistical confidence. These few exceptions, by virtue of quotas, availability and circumstance, are groups and categories represented by very few respondents. While they have been included in the report, it is important to remember that small samples can be poor representatives of a larger population. Of particular note are:

- *Operational staff* - Only a few Operational employees participated in the survey. Among those who participated, there was generally low awareness of BMIE.
- *Administrative Support staff, the Bureau of Competition Policy and the Canadian Intellectual Property Office* - These respondents also had low awareness of BMIE, causing a number of them to be excluded from answering much of the survey.¹

Given the smaller numbers representing these divisions, we have not separated out these groups for the majority of the analyses.

¹Because of the logic of the questionnaire, an answer of "no" when asked if they had heard of BMIE caused respondents to skip a large part of the survey.



- **One-quarter of respondents (25.8%) had never heard about BMIE. (Q.1)**

While the majority of respondents had heard of BMIE, the finding that one-quarter of employees still knew nothing of the Action Plan indicates that there are significant communication "holes" to be filled. Respondents in the Manufacturing and Processing Industries were the most likely to have heard of BMIE (over 87.0%), while those in the Bureau of Competition Policy were the least likely (63.2%).

All respondents (100%) in the Executive Group were familiar with BMIE, while fewer Operational and Administrative Support staff had heard of BMIE (60% and 52%, respectively).

Table 1 - Have you heard about Building a More Innovative Economy?	Percent
Yes	74.2%
No	25.8%
Total	100.0%

- **The most common "first" source of BMIE information was E-mail (38.2%). (Q3)**

E-mail was chosen as the first source of BMIE information more than twice as often as any other source.

There were some key differences between sectors and job category. In terms of sectors, the Canadian Intellectual Property Office had the lowest mention of E-mail (about 8.0%), citing briefing material three times as often as other respondents (33.3%). By job category, the Executive Group mentioned E-mail the least (8.0%). Their most common first source was



personal involvement with, or knowing someone involved in the development of BMIE (27.0%).

By far, the most useful source of BMIE information was also considered to be E-mail (61.8%). Other than that, there was little consensus. The most useful sources were external media and briefing materials (each cited by approximately one in ten respondents). It is interesting to note that external media were the second most common "first" source of information used by employees. The newspaper was the most common type of external media mentioned (59.7%), followed by television (29%). Whether employees prefer to have the external media as a "first" source of information was not tested. However, in other internal communications studies we have conducted, most employees said they were frustrated to learn things about their department's initiatives at the same time as the general public.

Table 2 - How did you first find out about BMIE?	Percent response
E-mail	38.2 ² %
Associate DM's briefing of EXDs	1.9%
Associate DM's briefing of DGs	2.2%
Briefing by manager/supervisor	7.1%
External media	14.1%
Briefing material	11.4%
Informal meetings with colleagues	3.9%
Memo/pamphlet	2.2%
Other government documents	5.4%
Other meetings/briefings	3.5%
Involved with BMIE, or work near those involved	6.3%
Other	3.8%
Total	100.0%

²In answering "what was the first source of information?", respondents were able to choose multiple answers. Twenty-three percent of respondents chose at least one E-mail message as a first source. The numbers in Table 2 are a count of total responses, and therefore some cases have been double counted (i.e., if a respondent chose two types of E-mail) as their first source of information.



February 6, 1995

- **The majority of respondents were unable to recall either a broad thrust or a specific program or activity of BMIE. (Q.3.1)**

Respondents were asked to describe the main BMIE thrusts and activities or programs that they remembered. The majority of respondents were unable to recall either a broad thrust or a specific program or activity. At best, approximately one in ten respondents could name any one broad thrust. The most frequently recalled thrust was the Marketplace Climate, especially as it affects small business. Approximately 13% of respondents were able to name this thrust. Trade and Infrastructure were each cited by roughly 11% of respondents.

"I only remember the cuts throughout the public sector."

"I keep it on hand for later. The document isn't important. What is important is to get the gist of it, and know how it affects your job. You don't have to memorize the document."

"I know there was a paper published. I thought I had a copy somewhere...can't seem to find it..."

In our opinion, this is one of the key findings of this research, which clearly illustrates the challenge of ensuring that employees understand and internalize the critical elements of communicated messages.



What are the main thrusts and activities or programs that you remember?	Percent response
A. Marketplace Climate: To Make it Healthier	12.4%
A.1 Helping Small Business Grow Cut federal paper burden Strategic procurement Small business loans act Canada community investment plan Program simplification Canada business service centres Payroll taxes	8.7% 1.8% 0.3% 1.8% 0.0% 0.3% 1.5% 0.3%
A.2 Regulatory Reform Legislative regulatory reforms New ways to regulate Regulatory improvements in 6 sectors Standards	3.3% 0.0% 0.2% 0.0% 0.0%
A.3 Innovative Workplace Sectoral initiatives Youth internships Self-employment assistance Modernize Canada labour code	2.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.2%
B. Trade: To Expand Markets for Jobs and Growth	10.7%
B.1 Trade Policy Strengthening internal trade New focus on external trade policy	3.0% 0.7% 2.5%
B.2 Developing Globally Minded Businesses Reducing overlap Focusing on small business Building global linkages Exporter preparation Strategic prioritization & international trade plan International market development in agri-food sector	3.0% 0.0% 0.2% 0.3% 0.2% 0.3% 0.2%
B.3 Export Financing	0.2%
B.4 National Tourism Program	1.7%
C. Infrastructure: To Meet Tomorrow's Needs	10.9%
C.1 A New Direction for Transportation	0.5%
C.2 Canada Infrastructure Works 1995 and 1996	0.2%



What are the main thrusts and activities or programs that you remember?	Percent response
C.3 Energy Efficiency	0.0%
C.4 Building the Information Highway	8.3%
Telecommunications policy regulation reform	0.8%
New communications services	2.3%
Extending the CANAIRE network	0.8%
SchoolNET community access project	1.7%
<i>D. Technology: To Innovate</i>	6.9%
<i>E. Other</i>	9.9%
Restructure IC (downsizing, program review, etc.)	2.1%
DK/NR	0.7%
Total	100.0%

- **There was little or no consensus among employees regarding BMIE's main purpose. (Q.3.2)**

Roughly one-quarter of respondents (27.1%) felt that improving the economy was the main purpose of the Action Plan, while a further 22% felt it served only as a government position statement. Indeed, it is important to note that a significant number of respondents saw BMIE as primarily a departmental communication device, describing it as propaganda, information for the public and a warning of future cutbacks at IC.

"Either to inform people of what the government does to improve Canada's economy or to make it look like they're doing something!"

"Pre-propaganda to be prepared for things to come."

"... it also justifies the program review that is taking place."

"I have no idea. I know it is one of the major policies of the government. I don't think there is anything in it."



What did you think was the main purpose of BMIE?	Percent
Improve economy	27.1%
Government position statement	22.0%
Competitiveness	13.3%
Create jobs	10.6%
Efficiency	7.8%
Help private business succeed	7.3%
Other	6.9%
Increase wealth	4.1%
DK/NR	0.9%
Total	100.0%

- **Approximately four respondents in five (82%) did not seek further information on BMIE after the December 5th E-mail announcement. (Q.4)**

This is a critical finding. Over 80% of employees did not bother to search proactively to find out more about the Action Plan, despite the importance accorded to the Plan in the December 5th E-mail message. In some ways this finding supports the view that employees see the Plan as no more than "propaganda". It also suggests that employees did not believe BMIE would affect their daily work which is a typical incentive for finding out more.

For the small number of respondents who did seek further information, they usually obtained a copy of the BMIE document (39%). Other sources of further information included: the Executive Summary (17.0%), Government Source (NES) (13.6%),

External Media (9.1%), Launch Speech (6.8%), and Managers (4.6%). Of the small number of employees who sought further information, only an insignificant number turned to their managers for this information. Further, twice as many turned to external media. This finding

"Do you want me to be frank? One hears these rally round the flag statements all the time. I don't pay much attention to this public relations."



suggests a question which should be of critical concern for the department: why do employees appear to be looking everywhere but to their manager for information (when they look for it at all), particularly if senior management is depending on managers and supervisors to communicate and explain key message to employees?

Did you seek further information on BMIE following the Minister's E-mail announcement?	Percent
Yes	17.6%
No	82.4%
Total	100.0%

- **The vast majority of respondents had not been briefed on BMIE by their manager. (Q.7)**

In fact, only one in six respondents (17.2%) had received a briefing from their supervisor. Some potential reasons why so many managers had not briefed employees may include:

- they assumed that their immediate subordinates would handle briefing requirements;
- managers assumed that sufficient information was available and accessible;
- they assumed that information dissemination was being "handled" by other groups within the Department; or
- they gauged the level of interest on the part of employees to be negligible.

Have you been briefed on BMIE by your manager?	Percent
Yes	17.2%
No	82.8%
Total	100.0%



- **Of those respondents responsible for briefing staff (approximately one in six), 18% had never heard of BMIE, and over half (54.2%) have not received any briefing material. (Q.8)**

Less than half of those responsible for briefing staff had received briefing material. Of those who had received briefing material, most felt that it was appropriately detailed with neither too much nor too little information. Over 80% of briefing material recipients were satisfied with the assembly and balance between text and graphics.

Received briefing material?	Percent
Yes	45.8%
No	54.2%
Total	100.0%

Rate content of briefing material	Percent
Sufficient in detail	83.9%
Not enough detail	9.7%
Too much detail	6.5%
Total	100.0%

Printed material - balanced text and graphics?	Percent
Yes	82.8%
No	17.2%
Total	100.0%

Printed material - assembled usefully?	Percent
Yes	87.5%
No	12.5%
Total	100.0%



- **Only half of respondents (47.7%) felt they had received all the information they expected to regarding BMIE. (Q.5)**

Despite the fact that less than one-fifth of respondents made any proactive attempt at finding more information on BMIE, only half were satisfied that they had received all the information they had expected to obtain. A significant number of respondents were unable to say what else they would have expected. These respondents typically had a vague feeling that they should know more, but did not know what exactly. This finding suggests that employees expect to receive information and that it is not their responsibility to seek it out.

What information on BMIE did you expect to obtain but did not?	Percent
None	47.7%
Specific details	12.6%
Relevance to me	2.7%
Can't say	17.6%
Copy of actual text	6.7%
Overview/summary	2.3%
Other	10.3%
Total	100.0%

- **Overall, respondents were only moderately satisfied with the information they received regarding BMIE. (Q.6)**

On a scale of 1 to 5, (1 being very dissatisfied and 5 representing very satisfied), the mean and median score for response to this question was 3. As could be expected, respondents who had not heard of BMIE (18% of those responding to this question) were less satisfied (mean of

"I expected more details in terms of dollars and cents, and it was more political rhetoric."

"Never even thought about it. There are too many new initiatives for me to pay attention to what they say. Only when it becomes *fait accompli* will I look it up."

"New thinking, but I found none."



2, median of 1). Over all respondents, as many were dissatisfied with the information they received on the plan as were satisfied.

Variance in satisfaction was generally minor across job categories. However, respondents in the Executive Group were most likely to be satisfied (mean of 3.7, median of 4) and respondents in the Technical Group were least likely to be satisfied with the information that they had received (mean of 2.7, median of 3).

Satisfaction with information received on BMIE	Percent
1. Very dissatisfied	14.9%
2. Dissatisfied	15.4%
3. Moderately satisfied	36.3%
4. Satisfied	24.4%
5. Very satisfied	9.1%
Total	100.0%

- **More than one in four respondents had no interest in receiving further information about BMIE. (Q.6.1)**

There were two primary reasons given for this answer. One was that respondents already felt overwhelmed by the volume of communications they received, and did not want any more. The other was scepticism regarding BMIE's relevance. These respondents felt that BMIE was too vague or that it had no bearing on their role in the Department.

"None. I already have too much. That's the problem with this kind of stuff. They assume everybody wants to know about this, when half the people don't give a sh-!"

"I'm not interested."

"Major initiatives do not affect us. We are a special operating agency."

"It is not applicable to my work."



What additional information on BMIE would you like to have?	Percent
None	25.5%
Specific details	20.0%
Relevance to me	9.6%
Can't say	13.8%
Copy of actual text	6.2%
Overview/summary	8.1%
Updates	4.7%
To know what information is available	3.0%
Other	9.1%
Total	100.0%

- **More than half (60.1%) of respondents remembered at least one of the recent E-mail messages. (Q.9)**

Of those who remembered the recent E-mail messages, more than a quarter had chosen not to read them. Further, the respondents who had read the E-mail messages found them to be only moderately useful (mean and median of 3, on a 1 to 5 scale).

Remember recent related E-mail messages?	Percent
Yes	60.1%
No	39.9%
Total	100.0%

Did you read related E-mail messages?	Percent
Yes	72.9%
No	27.1%
Total	100.0%



Usefulness of related E-mail messages	Percent
Not at all useful	7.3%
Moderately useful	19.8%
Useful	34.0%
Fairly useful	25.3%
Very useful	13.5%
Total	100.0%

- **In general, E-mail was the preferred method of receiving information from senior management, followed closely by briefings from supervisors. Video-tape and conference calls were the least popular choices. (Q.10)**

It is interesting to note that while "briefing by your manager" was generally the second highest rated method of receiving information, in the specific example of BMIE, very few (17.2%) reported having been briefed by their manager, and only an insignificant number (less than 1%) sought more information about BMIE from their manager. This tends to indicate that while ideally staff may want to be briefed by their managers, in reality there are some significant barriers to this taking place.

It should be noted that these answers do not reflect the preferences of all participants. Some respondents indicated that some or all of these categories were inapplicable to them. They could not rate a given method, because they did not have access to it.³

³The number of staff without access in each category were: E-mail 17; Senior management briefing 8; Briefing by your manager 3; Video 19; Conference call 29.



Examining the results by job category shows some of the following patterns:

- There was minimal variance regarding E-mail and senior management briefings.
- There was a strong preference for briefings by immediate supervisor from Administrative Support (84.7% have strong preference), particularly in comparison to the Executive and Operational Groups (52.1% and 40.0%, respectively).
- The Operational Group felt very strongly about video tape, with 80% strong preference and no score below 3. By contrast, in the Executive Group only 4.3% had strong preference for video, and none rated it a 5.
- Administrative Support (63.2%) and Scientific and Professional staff (60%) were the most in favour of printed material, unlike the Technical (39.3%) and Operational (40%) Groups who were less likely to prefer this method.

How do you prefer to receive information from senior management?	
Information Source	Strong Preference*
E-mail	74.1%**
Senior management briefing	56.3%
Briefing by your manager	71.2%
Video tape	12.8%
Conference call	11.7%
Printed material	50.0%

* Rating of 4 or 5, on a 5 point scale.

** Total does not equal 100%, as multiple strong preferences were allowed.

- **Almost two-thirds (65.5%) of respondents preferred to receive on-going information on departmental initiatives. (Q.11)**

The strongest support for on-going information (from conception to post-launch) was found among respondents from the Manufacturing & Processing Industries (81.3%) and Industry



and Science Policy (87.1%) sectors, as well as the Executive Group (78.3%). In contrast, respondents in the Administrative Support Group and the Bureau of Competition Policy were the least likely to support on-going information (52.1% and 42.1% respectively).

When do you prefer information on major initiatives?	Percent
On-going	65.5%
Launch time	34.5%
Total	100.0%

- **One-quarter of respondents expected to receive detailed information on major initiatives instantly. (Q.12)**

A slightly larger percentage (31.5%) chose "within 24 hours". Hence, over half of respondents expect to get detailed information on major initiatives within 24 hours. This suggests that the communications infrastructure in place must be extremely 'well-oiled' to ensure that such a swift turnaround of information can be accomplished.

How soon after a major new initiative do expect to get detailed information?	Percent
Instantly	24.8%
Within 24 hours	31.5%
2 days	24.0%
More than 2 days	19.7%
Total	100.0%



- **Nearly four-fifths (77.5%) of respondents made suggestions for improving internal communications at Industry Canada. (Q.13)**

Typically, this kind of open question at the end of an interview will provoke a response from about half of the sample. The range of suggestions gathered in this survey indicate that employees have spent some time thinking about issues. We have included a number of quotations to help represent some of the suggested improvements.

What one thing would you like to change to improve internal communications in the Department?	Percent
Nothing (communication is fine now)	22.5%
E-mail (get it, make it compatible/universal)	4.8%
Precision (prioritize, target, keep relevant)	15.9%
Concise (too much volume, summaries)	5.7%
Horizontal Communication (other branches and Departments)	2.1%
In-Person Contact (more meetings, briefings, coffee hours)	7.2%
Drop "Headlines" from E-mail	1.3%
Senior Staff (more open, available, clear guidance)	5.4%
Specific Information ("no conceptual crap", detail strategies)	5.7%
Timeliness ("tell us before the rumours", updates)	6.7%
More Communication (increase volume, quantity, detail)	3.0%
Partnership (raise morale, create team spirit, upward feedback)	3.6%
Clarify (more accountability, reduce bureaucracy)	6.2%
Browsing Source (bulletin board, brief summary newsletter)	5.9%
Other	5.9%
Total	100.0%



"There is not enough communication in the Branch. So how can you improve it?"

"I would like senior managers to be upfront with their information. Not hide anything from staff."

"Cut out the junk on the E-mail. We get a lot of conceptual crap that we don't need."

"Some real answers. They always seem to be ambiguous statements."

"The basic information: what's going on? what is it?"

"I have learned not to expect anything from the government."



3.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

This section presents our conclusions and recommendations based on the research findings.

Conclusion A1: Communication of information appears to be uneven within the Department

BMIE is one of the largest initiatives launched since Industry Canada's creation. Despite this, one in four respondents had no knowledge of the initiative. In contrast, other employees had reviewed a copy of the document and were able to cite specific programs. Information flow is clearly not the same for all employees.

Conclusion A2: There is a significant issue regarding the role of managers in terms of internal communications

Managers play a critical role in ensuring the effective flow of internal communications within the Department. However, the information gathered through this research indicates that there is a break-down somewhere in the chain. Indeed, while nearly three-quarters (71.2%) of those surveyed state a strong preference for receiving information from their managers, less than 20% reported having been briefed on the BMIE Action Plan by their manager. Further, one in six people responsible for briefing staff had never heard of BMIE, and over half (54.2%) had not received any briefing material.

Recommendation A: Clarify lines of communication

Research shows that the most effective communications occur when people clearly understand their responsibilities for disseminating messages and feel some sense of ownership of this responsibility.



To increase the effectiveness of communications within the Department, lines of responsibility in communications should be clarified. Each employee should know whom they are to receive information from, and in turn whom they have to brief (where applicable). Blockages can then be quickly identified. If staff have no idea whom to ask, and managers are not even sure whom they should tell, information will be lost. With clear accountability, there will be smoother flows of information.

Conclusion B: There are a variety of preferences with regard to communication methods

E-mail was rated as the first and most effective source of information about the Action Plan for a significant number of respondents (38.2% of respondents' first source of information; 61.8% of respondents' most effective source of information). However, many respondents felt that they did not have access to a universal E-mail service. While some had no access to E-mail, others felt that their system was incompatible with other branches or areas.

It was clear from the diversity of responses to this group of questions that there is no one format of communicating messages which will work for all employees. Indeed, to be effective, communications within the Department must make use of more than one channel or format. Further, the answers given by many respondents indicate that different communications media are being used in different ways. For example, while E-mail may be used as a first message regarding a new initiative or other important piece of information, further, in-depth information typically follows in a hardcopy format.

Recommendation B: Ensure multiple effective channels of communication

Providing a recognized universal e-mail system would help improve internal communication within the Department. However, at the same time, one should not consider universal E-mail access to be the single panacea to the communications challenges facing the Department.



E-mail clearly has an important role to play, but must typically be used in tandem with other supports to ensure full understanding of important messages.

Conclusion C: Retention of information is low

The majority of respondents were unable to recall either a broad thrust or a specific program or activity of BMIE. Indeed, no more than one in ten respondents could name any one broad thrust.

Further, there is a sense of disconnect and cynicism among employees. The significant number of employees who did not bother to proactively look for further information about the initiative (82.4%), despite the fact that many felt they did not receive all the information they expected to obtain (52.3%), is evidence of this sense of disconnect. While not specifically applicable to the BMIE Action Plan, it is important to underline this finding because of its ramifications for communicating other initiatives. Indeed, it appears that a sense of responsibility to proactively look for important information is lacking among employees.

Recommendation C: Target the Information

Some respondents indicated little interest in BMIE because they did not believe that the Initiative would affect them or their job. Others specifically requested they be told what their role would be in the Initiative. Many respondents complained that Departmental communications in general, were irrelevant, inapplicable or misdirected.

In addition to keeping employees aware of what is happening in the department, it is important to involve them. As much as possible, attempts should be made to explain specifically how each group, sector, or job category fits in. Communications should not only inform, but should also tell the recipient why he or she needs to know.



Conclusion D: Internal communications must be more responsive

There were a number of suggestions made by respondents which merit further examination within the context of this report. These suggestions can be grouped into the following themes:

- *Multi-media* - given the varied preferences in communication, messages should be available in several formats;
- *Targeted* - information should be sent only to those who need it, or labelled so that it clearly indicates who would benefit from it;
- *Timely* - information within one day (two at the most) would satisfy the majority of respondents;
- *On-going* - the majority of employees would prefer to be kept up to date with ongoing information updates;
- *Non-intrusive* - many employees felt that the volume of communication was too great. Conversely, many also indicated that little detailed information was sent to them. One suggestion was to provide an overview of data, with details of where complete information can be found, so that employees would be able to read the information that is pertinent to them; and
- *Compartmentalized* - BMIE's larger thrusts were remembered more often than specific programs. The use of organizational themes and large, overall concepts is clearly helpful for employee recall.

Recommendation D: Track and monitor internal communications regularly

It is important to understand how and why different communication tools are being used within the Department in order to:

- improve the tools;
- ensure that employees are using all the tools at their disposal in the most effective manner possible;



- react quickly to real and perceived barriers to effective Departmental communications; and
- ensure that important messages are reaching the targeted audiences with speed and accuracy.

Ongoing research which helps the Department to understand and react to internal communications should be timely, and above all, action- and solution-oriented.

Finally, we would also suggest that the Department consider sending a brief E-mail message to all employees, reporting on the study, and thanking those who participated. The message would signal to employees that the Department is committed to improving internal communications, and that it will continue to evaluate its efforts.



APPENDIX A

Questionnaire



February 6, 1995

Appendix A - Questionnaire

May I please speak to _____

Hello, my name is _____, from Price Waterhouse. I'm calling on behalf of the Communications Branch here at Industry Canada.

Senior management is interested in knowing how effectively important messages are conveyed through the Department. We will be phoning over 500 employees. Your name has been randomly selected from the Department's employee database. Your voluntary responses are very important, as they will help management improve communications within the Department on key issues and initiatives.

Please be assured that your name will not be linked with any of the information you provide.

This should take about 10 minutes of your time. Would you like to begin?

Yes No

1. Have you heard about BUILDING A MORE INNOVATIVE ECONOMY?

Yes No

2. How did you first find out about Building a More Innovative Economy?

DO NOT READ

- 1- "E" Mail
- 2- Associate Deputy Minister's briefing of Executive Directors
- 3- Associate Deputy Minister's briefing of Directors General
- 4- A briefing by your manager/supervisor
- 5- External media (newspaper, TV etc)
- 7- Briefing material, documents
- 8- Informal meetings with Colleagues
- 9- Other(specify) _____



February 6, 1995

2B. What "E" mail documents did you read?

DO NOT READ

Y/N

- 1- Minister's Letter
- 2- Minister's Launch Speech
- 3- Deputy Minister/Associate DM Summary
- 4- Other(specify) _____

2.1 Which source did you find most useful?

- 2- "E" Mail - Minister's Letter
- 4- "E" Mail - Minister's Launch Speech
- 6- "E" Mail - DM/Assoc. DM Summary
- 8- "E" Mail - _____
- 11- Associate Deputy Minister's briefing of Executive Directors
- 13- Associate Deputy Minister's briefing of Directors General
- 15- A briefing by your manager/supervisor
- 17- External media (newspaper, TV etc)
- 20- Briefing material, documents
- 22- Informal meetings with Colleagues
- 24- Other _____

3. Do you remember any of the main thrusts of Building a More Innovative Economy or the specifics to be undertaken under each?

Yes No

3.1 What are the main thrusts and activities or programs that you remember?

3.2 What did you think was the main purpose of Building a More Innovative Economy?



February 6, 1995

4. Did you seek further information on Building a More Innovative Economy following the Minister's "E"mail announcement of December 5, 1994?

Yes No

4.1 What was the source of the information?

DO NOT READ

1- Launch Speech

2- Executive Summary

3- Your Manager

4- Other(specify) _____

4.1b. What format was the Executive Summary in?

Y/N

1. Electronic form

2. Printed form

3. Diskette

4. Other(specify) _____

5. What information on Building a More Innovative Economy did you expect to obtain but did not?

6. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means very dissatisfied and 5 means very satisfied, in general, how satisfied are you with the information provided about Building a More Innovative Economy?

1- Very Dissatisfied

2-

3- Moderately Satisfied

4-

5- Very Satisfied



February 6, 1995

6.1 What additional information on Building a More Innovative Economy would you like to have?

7. Have you been briefed on Building a More Innovative Economy by your manager?

Yes No

8. Are you responsible for providing briefing to staff?

Yes No

8.1 Did you receive briefing material (that is, all written material subsequent to the Minister's announcement)?

Yes No

8.2 Overall, was the content of the briefing material you received sufficient in detail, not enough detail, or too much detail?

1. Sufficient in detail
2. Not enough detail
3. Too much detail

8.3 If print material was your primary source of information, was the content of the briefing material ...

READ

Y/N

- _ 1- Balanced in the use of text and graphics?
- _ 2- Assembled in a manner that was useful?



9. Over the past couple of months, a number of E-mail messages have been sent out concerning initiatives from other government departments under the Jobs and Growth Agenda. Examples of these are Axworthy's Social Security Reform, Martin's two documents Framework for Economic Policy, and Creating a Healthy Fiscal Climate. Do you remember them?

Yes No

9.2 Did you read them?

Yes No

9.3 On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not at all useful and 5 is very useful, how useful do you find these types of broader government agenda E-mail messages?

- 1- Not at all useful
- 2-
- 3- Moderately useful
- 4-
- 5- Very useful

10. We are also interested in knowing how you prefer to receive important information from senior management in the Department. Please rate the following modes of communication on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means "weak preference" and 5 means "strong preference".

- 1- Weak preference
- 2-
- 3- Moderate preference
- 4-
- 5- Strong preference

11. Do you prefer to receive information about major departmental initiatives on an on-going basis, that is from conception to post-launch, or at launch time?

- 1. On-going (conception to post-launch)
- 2. Launch time



APPENDIX A

Questionnaire



Appendix A - Questionnaire

May I please speak to _____

Hello, my name is _____, from Price Waterhouse. I'm calling on behalf of the Communications Branch here at Industry Canada.

Senior management is interested in knowing how effectively important messages are conveyed through the Department. We will be phoning over 500 employees. Your name has been randomly selected from the Department's employee database. Your voluntary responses are very important, as they will help management improve communications within the Department on key issues and initiatives.

Please be assured that your name will not be linked with any of the information you provide.

This should take about 10 minutes of your time. Would you like to begin?

Yes No

1. Have you heard about BUILDING A MORE INNOVATIVE ECONOMY?

Yes No

2. How did you first find out about Building a More Innovative Economy?

DO NOT READ

- 1- "E" Mail
- 2- Associate Deputy Minister's briefing of Executive Directors
- 3- Associate Deputy Minister's briefing of Directors General
- 4- A briefing by your manager/supervisor
- 5- External media (newspaper, TV etc)
- 7- Briefing material, documents
- 8- Informal meetings with Colleagues
- 9- Other(specify) _____



February 6, 1995

2B. What "E" mail documents did you read?

DO NOT READ

Y/N

- 1- Minister's Letter
- 2- Minister's Launch Speech
- 3- Deputy Minister/Associate DM Summary
- 4- Other(specify) _____

2.1 Which source did you find most useful?

- 2- "E" Mail - Minister's Letter
- 4- "E" Mail - Minister's Launch Speech
- 6- "E" Mail - DM/Assoc. DM Summary
- 8- "E" Mail - _____
- 11- Associate Deputy Minister's briefing of Executive Directors
- 13- Associate Deputy Minister's briefing of Directors General
- 15- A briefing by your manager/supervisor
- 17- External media (newspaper, TV etc)
- _____
- 20- Briefing material, documents
- 22- Informal meetings with Colleagues
- 24- Other _____

3. Do you remember any of the main thrusts of Building a More Innovative Economy or the specifics to be undertaken under each?

Yes No

3.1 What are the main thrusts and activities or programs that you remember?

3.2 What did you think was the main purpose of Building a More Innovative Economy?



4. Did you seek further information on Building a More Innovative Economy following the Minister's "E"mail announcement of December 5, 1994?

Yes No

4.1 What was the source of the information?

DO NOT READ

1- Launch Speech

2- Executive Summary

3- Your Manager

4- Other(specify) _____

4.1b. What format was the Executive Summary in?

Y/N

1. Electronic form

2. Printed form

3. Diskette

4. Other(specify) _____

5. What information on Building a More Innovative Economy did you expect to obtain but did not?

6. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means very dissatisfied and 5 means very satisfied, in general, how satisfied are you with the information provided about Building a More Innovative Economy?

1- Very Dissatisfied

2-

3- Moderately Satisfied

4-

5- Very Satisfied



6.1 What additional information on Building a More Innovative Economy would you like to have?

7. Have you been briefed on Building a More Innovative Economy by your manager?

Yes No

8. Are you responsible for providing briefing to staff?

Yes No

8.1 Did you receive briefing material (that is, all written material subsequent to the Minister's announcement)?

Yes No

8.2 Overall, was the content of the briefing material you received sufficient in detail, not enough detail, or too much detail?

- 1. Sufficient in detail
- 2. Not enough detail
- 3. Too much detail

8.3 If print material was your primary source of information, was the content of the briefing material ...

READ

Y/N

_ 1- Balanced in the use of text and graphics?

_ 2- Assembled in a manner that was useful?



9. Over the past couple of months, a number of E-mail messages have been sent out concerning initiatives from other government departments under the Jobs and Growth Agenda. Examples of these are Axworthy's Social Security Reform, Martin's two documents Framework for Economic Policy, and Creating a Healthy Fiscal Climate. Do you remember them?

Yes No

9.2 Did you read them?

Yes No

9.3 On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not at all useful and 5 is very useful, how useful do you find these types of broader government agenda E-mail messages?

1- Not at all useful

2-

3- Moderately useful

4-

5- Very useful

10. We are also interested in knowing how you prefer to receive important information from senior management in the Department. Please rate the following modes of communication on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means "weak preference" and 5 means "strong preference".

1- Weak preference

2-

3- Moderate preference

4-

5- Strong preference

11. Do you prefer to receive information about major departmental initiatives on an on-going basis, that is from conception to post-launch, or at launch time?

1. On-going (conception to post-launch)

2. Launch time



February 6, 1995

12. How soon after a major new initiative like this do you expect to get detailed information?

READ

1. Instantly
2. Up to 24 hours
3. 2 days
4. More than 2 days

13. What is the one thing that you would like to change or do to improve internal communications in the Department?

14. What sector do you work in?

1. Regional Operations
2. Service Industries and Small Businesses
3. Manufacturing and Processing Industries
4. Corporate Services
5. Spectrum, Telecomm and Information Technologies
6. Industry and Science Policy
7. Consumer Affairs
8. Bureau of Competition Policy
9. Canadian Intellectual Property Office
10. Communication Research Centre
11. Regions
12. Other(specify) _____

Just before we finish I would like to ask you one more question that will help us categorize respondents.

15. What is your job category and level? (eg. CR 02, CO 1, AS 05, EX 01, etc.)



16. Do not ask, just enter:

Sex of Respondent: _

1. Male
2. Female

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS SURVEY



February 6, 1995

Pourrais-je parler a _____ s'il vous plaît?

Bonjour! Je m'appelle _____. Je travaille pour la société Price Waterhouse et nous effectuons un sondage pour le compte de la Direction générale des communications d'Industrie Canada.

La haute direction aimerait savoir si la transmission des messages importants se fait de façon efficace au Ministère. Pour ce faire, nous menons un sondage auprès de plus de 500 employés. Votre nom a été choisi au hasard a partir de la base de données sur les employés du Ministère. Vos réponses volontaires sont précieuses, car elles permettront a la haute direction d'améliorer les communications qui ont trait aux questions et aux initiatives importantes.

Nous vous assurons que votre nom ne sera en aucune façon associé a l'information que vous donnerez.

Le sondage devrait durer environ 10 minutes. Êtes-vous prêt(e) a commencer?

Oui Non

1. Avez-vous entendu parler de l'initiative L'INNOVATION: LA CLÉ DE L'ÉCONOMIE MODERNE?

Oui Non

2. De quelle façon en avez-vous été informé(e) la première fois?

NE PAS LIRE

- 1- Courrier électronique
- 2- Exposé du sous-ministres délégué aux directeurs executives
- 3- Exposé du sous-ministres délégué aux directeurs générales
- 4- Exposé de votre gestionnaire/surveillant
- 5- Médias externes (journaux, télévision, etc.)

-
- 7- Documents d'information
 - 8- Réunion non officielle entre collègue
 - 9- Autres - _____



February 6, 1995

2B. Quels documents de courrier électronique avez-vous lu?

NE PAS LIRE

Y/N

- 1- Lettre du ministre
- 2- Discours de lancement du ministre
- 3- Résumé du sous-ministres/sous-ministres délégué
- 4- Autres(précise) _____

2.1 Laquelle vous a semble la plus utile?

- 2- Courrier électronique - Lettre du ministre
- 4- Courrier électronique - Discours de lancement du ministre
- 6- Courrier électronique - Résumé du sous-min./sous-min. délégué
- 8- Courrier electr. - _____
- 11- Expose du sous-ministres délégué aux directeurs executives
- 13- Expose du sous-ministres délégué aux directeurs générales
- 15- Expose du votre gestionnaire/surveillant
- 17- Médias externes (journaux, télévision, etc.) _____
- 20- Documents d'information
- 22- Réunion non officielle entre collègue
- 24- Autres _____

3. Vous souvenez-vous des principaux piliers de l'initiative, ainsi que des activités ou des programmes qui seront mis en oeuvre dans le cadre de ceux-ci?

Oui Non

3.1 Quelles sont les principaux piliers et activités ou programmes que vous vous souvenez?

3.2 A votre avis, quel est le but principal de "L'innovation: la CLÉ de L'ÉCONOMIE moderne"?



4. Avez-vous cherché à en savoir plus sur "L'innovation: la CLÉ de L'ÉCONOMIE moderne" après le message électronique du ministre, le 5 décembre, 1994?

Oui Non

- 4.1 De quelle ressource vous êtes-vous servi?

NE PAS LIRE

- 1- Discours de lancement
- 2- Résumé exécutif
- 3- Votre gestionnaire
- 4- Autre - _____

- 4.1b. Sous quelle forme était le Résumé exécutif?

O/N

- 1. Format électronique
- 2. Format imprimé
- 3. Sur disquette
- 4. Autre - _____

5. Quelle information espériez-vous tirer de "L'innovation: La CLÉ de L'ÉCONOMIE moderne" et n'avez pas eue?

6. Sur une échelle de 1 à 5, où 1 signifie très insatisfait(e) et 5 signifie très satisfait(s), quel est votre degré de satisfaction, en général, avec l'information transmise en ce qui a trait au plan intitulé "L'innovation: la CLÉ de L'ÉCONOMIE moderne"?

- 1- Très insatisfait(e)
- 2-
- 3- Moyennement satisfait(e)
- 4-
- 5- Très satisfait(e)



February 6, 1995

6.1 Quelle information supplémentaire auriez-vous aimé obtenir sur le sujet de "L'innovation: la CLÉ de L'ÉCONOMIE moderne"?

7. Votre gestionnaire vous a-t-il fourni de l'information sur cette Initiative?

Oui Non

8. Êtes-vous chargé d'informer le personnel?

Oui Non

8.1 Avez-vous reçu des documents d'information (tous les documents écrits envoyés après l'annonce du ministre)?

Oui Non

8.2 En général, les documents d'information que vous avez reçus étaient-ils suffisamment détaillés, trop superficiels, trop détaillés?

1. Suffisamment détaillés
2. Trop superficiels
3. Trop détaillés

8.3 Si, pour vous informer, vous vous êtes surtout servi(e) des documents imprimés, vous ont-ils paru...

LIRE

Y/N

- _ 1- équilibrés pour ce qui est de la présentation graphique et des textes?
- _ 2- assemblés de façon efficace?



9. Au cours des derniers mois, un certain nombre de messages électroniques ont été envoyés au sujet d'initiatives lancées par d'autres ministères gouvernementaux dans le cadre du Programme de création d'emplois et de croissance; par exemple la réforme de la sécurité sociale du Canada de Lloyd Axworthy, et deux documents de Paul Martin, l'un portant sur le nouveau cadre de la politique économique, et l'autre, sur l'instauration d'un climat financier sain. Vous souvenez-vous de ces documents?

Oui Non

- 9.2 Les avez-vous lus?

Oui Non

- 9.3 Sur une échelle de 1 à 5, où 1 signifie totalement inutiles et 5 signifie très utiles, indiquez à quel point les messages électroniques sur des initiatives gouvernementales à grande échelle vous ont été utiles?

- 1- Totalement inutiles
- 2-
- 3- Moyennement utiles
- 4-
- 5- Très utiles

10. Nous aimerions savoir aussi quel média vous préférez pour la transmission des messages importants de la haute direction du Ministère. Veuillez évaluer les Médias ci-dessous, selon une échelle de 1 à 5, où 1 désigne une "faible préférence" et 5 une "forte préférence".

- 1- Faible préférence
- 2-
- 3- Modérée préférence
- 4-
- 5- Forte préférence

11. Préférez-vous recevoir de l'information sur les principales initiatives gouvernementales de façon continue, c'est-à-dire de l'élaboration à la période qui suit le lancement, ou au moment du lancement?

- 1. De façon continue
- 2. Au moment du lancement



February 6, 1995

12. A votre avis, a quel moment après le lancement d'une initiative importante comme celle-ci devriez-vous recevoir de l'information détaillée?

LIRE

1. Immédiatement après
2. Dans les 24 heures
3. Au bout de deux jours
4. Après plus de temps

13. Y a-t-il un changement ou une amélioration que vous aimeriez apporter aux communications ministérielles internes?

14. Dans quelle secteur travaillez-vous?

1. Opérations régionales
2. Industries de services et petites entreprises
3. Industries de fabrication et de transformation
4. Services généraux
5. Spectre, technologies de l'information et industrie des télécommunications
6. Politique industrielle et scientifique
7. Bureau de la consommation
8. Bureau de la politique de concurrence
9. Office de la propriété intellectuelle du Canada
10. Centre de recherche en communication
11. Les régions
12. Autre - _____

En terminant, j'aimerais vous poser quelques questions qui nous permettront de catégoriser les répondants.

15. Quelle est votre catégorie d'emploi et votre niveau? (p.ex. CR 02, CO 1, AS 05, EX 01, etc.)



16. Ne pas lire:

Sexe du Répondant: _

1. Homme
2. Femme

NOUS VOUS REMERCIONS DE VOTRE COLLABORATION.



APPENDIX B

Frequency and Cross-Tabulation Tables



Appendix B - Frequency and Cross-Tabulation Tables

Q1. Heard about BUILDING A MORE INNOVATIVE ECONOMY?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	376	73.7	74.2	74.2
No	2	131	25.7	25.8	100.0
DK/NR	8	3	.6	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 507 Missing cases 3

Q2. 1st learn- E mail- Minister's letter

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No	0	137	26.9	82.0	82.0
Yes	1	30	5.9	18.0	100.0
	.	343	67.3	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 167 Missing cases 343

Q2. 1st learn- E mail- Minister's launch speech

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	150	29.4	89.8	89.8
yes	1	17	3.3	10.2	100.0
	.	343	67.3	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 167 Missing cases 343

Q2. 1st learn- E mail- DM summary

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	114	22.4	68.3	68.3
yes	1	53	10.4	31.7	100.0
	.	343	67.3	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 167 Missing cases 343



Q2. 1st learn- E mail- other

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	110	21.6	65.9	65.9
yes	1	57	11.2	34.1	100.0
.	.	343	67.3	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 167 Missing cases 343

Q2. 1st learn- DM brief of executive director

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	415	81.4	98.1	98.1
yes	1	8	1.6	1.9	100.0
.	.	87	17.1	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 423 Missing cases 87

Q2. 1st learn- DM brief of DGs

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	414	81.2	97.9	97.9
yes	1	9	1.8	2.1	100.0
.	.	87	17.1	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 423 Missing cases 87

Q2. 1st learn- briefing by manager

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	394	77.3	93.1	93.1
yes	1	29	5.7	6.9	100.0
.	.	87	17.1	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 423 Missing cases 87



Q2. 1st learn- external media

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	365	71.6	86.3	86.3
yes	1	58	11.4	13.7	100.0
	.	87	17.1	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 423 Missing cases 87

Q2. 1st learn- briefing material

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	376	73.7	88.9	88.9
yes	1	47	9.2	11.1	100.0
	.	87	17.1	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 423 Missing cases 87

Q2. 1st learn- infomral meeting with colleagues

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	407	79.8	96.2	96.2
yes	1	16	3.1	3.8	100.0
	.	87	17.1	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 423 Missing cases 87

Q2. 1st learn- other

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	336	65.9	79.4	79.4
yes	1	87	17.1	20.6	100.0
	.	87	17.1	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 423 Missing cases 87



Q2. Specify external media

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
newspaper	1	37	7.3	64.9	64.9
television	2	14	2.7	24.6	89.5
radio	3	2	.4	3.5	93.0
other	4	4	.8	7.0	100.0
.	.	453	88.8	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 57 Missing cases 453

Q2. Specify external media

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
television	2	4	.8	80.0	80.0
radio	3	1	.2	20.0	100.0
.	.	505	99.0	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 5 Missing cases 505

Q2. Specify other source

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Other	9	13	2.5	15.5	15.5
Memo/pamphlet	10	9	1.8	10.7	26.2
Other government doc	11	22	4.3	26.2	52.4
Other meetings/brief	12	14	2.7	16.7	69.0
Involved/work with t	13	26	5.1	31.0	100.0
.	.	426	83.5	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 84 Missing cases 426

Q2.1 Best source- Minister's E-mail letter

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	8	1.6	100.0	100.0
.	.	502	98.4	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 8 Missing cases 502



Q2.1 Best source- Minister's launch speech (E-mail)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	4	.8	80.0	80.0
No	2	1	.2	20.0	100.0
.	.	505	99.0	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 5 Missing cases 505

Q2.1 Best source- DM summ (E-mail)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	14	2.7	93.3	93.3
No	2	1	.2	6.7	100.0
.	.	495	97.1	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 15 Missing cases 495

Q2.1 Best source- other E-mail

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	8	1.6	88.9	88.9
No	2	1	.2	11.1	100.0
.	.	501	98.2	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 9 Missing cases 501

Q2.1 Best source- DM brief of Executive Director

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	2	.4	66.7	66.7
No	2	1	.2	33.3	100.0
.	.	507	99.4	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 3 Missing cases 507



Q2.1 Best source- DM brief of DGs

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	1	.2	50.0	50.0
No	2	1	.2	50.0	100.0
	.	508	99.6	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 2 Missing cases 508

Q2.1 Best source- briefing by your manager

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	2	.4	66.7	66.7
No	2	1	.2	33.3	100.0
	.	507	99.4	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 3 Missing cases 507

Q2.1 Best source- external media

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	5	1.0	83.3	83.3
No	2	1	.2	16.7	100.0
	.	504	98.8	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 6 Missing cases 504

Q2.1 Best source- briefing material

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	5	1.0	83.3	83.3
No	2	1	.2	16.7	100.0
	.	504	98.8	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 6 Missing cases 504



Q2.1 Best source- informal meetings with colleagues

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	1	.2	50.0	50.0
No	2	1	.2	50.0	100.0
.	.	508	99.6	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 2 Missing cases 508

Q2.1 Best source- other

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	5	1.0	83.3	83.3
No	2	1	.2	16.7	100.0
.	.	504	98.8	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 6 Missing cases 504

Q3.1 What remember (Note: only those categories which had valid responses are displayed)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	Percent
A. Marketplace Climate	1	8	1.6	5.4	5.4
A.1 Helping Small Business	2	15	2.9	10.1	15.5
cut federal paper burden	3	3	.6	2.0	17.6
Canada Business Service Centres	8	3	.6	2.0	19.6
payroll taxes	9	1	.2	.7	20.3
A.2 Regulatory reform	10	8	1.6	5.4	25.7
B. Trade: To Expand Markets	20	13	2.5	8.8	34.5
B.1 Trade Policy	21	1	.2	.7	35.1
strengthening internal trade	22	1	.2	.7	35.8
new focus on external trade	23	3	.6	2.0	37.8
B.2 Developing Global Business	24	3	.6	2.0	39.9
B.3 Export Financing	31	1	.2	.7	40.5
B.4 National Tourism	32	2	.4	1.4	41.9
C.1 A New Direction for Transport	34	1	.2	.7	42.6
C.4 Building the Infrastructure	37	11	2.2	7.4	50.0
new communications services	39	6	1.2	4.1	54.1
extending the CANAIRE network	40	3	.6	2.0	56.1
SchoolNET community project	41	3	.6	2.0	58.1
D. Technology: To Innovate	42	11	2.2	7.4	65.5
E. Other	43	41	8.0	27.7	93.2
Internal Reorganization	44	10	2.0	6.8	100.0
.	.	362	71.0	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 148 Missing cases 362



Q3.1 What remember (Note: only those categories which had valid responses are displayed)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A. Marketplace Climate	1	25	4.9	21.9	21.9
A.1 Helping Small Business	2	12	2.4	10.5	32.5
cut federal paper burden	3	2	.4	1.8	34.2
small business loans	5	1	.2	.9	35.1
Canada Business Service Centres	8	2	.4	1.8	36.8
A.2 Regulatory reform	10	2	.4	1.8	38.6
A.3 Innovative Workp	15	3	.6	2.6	41.2
B. Trade: To Expand Makets	20	14	2.7	12.3	53.5
B.1 Trade Policy	21	3	.6	2.6	56.1
new focus on external trade	23	2	.4	1.8	57.9
B.2 Developing Global Businesses	24	3	.6	2.6	60.5
C. Infrastructure:	33	17	3.3	14.9	75.4
C.1 A New Direction for Transport	34	1	.2	.9	76.3
C.4 Building the Infrastructure	37	13	2.5	11.4	87.7
telecommunications policy	38	1	.2	.9	88.6
new communications services	39	1	.2	.9	89.5
D. Technology: To Innovate	42	6	1.2	5.3	94.7
E. Other	43	6	1.2	5.3	100.0
.	.	396	77.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Valid cases	114	Total	510	100.0	100.0
Missing cases			396		

Q3.1 What remember (Note: only those categories which had valid responses are displayed)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A. Marketplace Climate	1	16	3.1	17.0	17.0
A.1 Helping Small Businesses	2	10	2.0	10.6	27.7
cut federal paper burden	3	2	.4	2.1	29.8
small business loans	5	4	.8	4.3	34.0
Canada Business Service Centres	8	1	.2	1.1	35.1
A.2 Regulatory reform	10	1	.2	1.1	36.2
A.3 Innovative Workplace	15	3	.6	3.2	39.4
B. Trade: To Expand Markets	20	12	2.4	12.8	52.1
new focus on external trade	23	1	.2	1.1	53.2
B.2 Developing Global Businesses	24	1	.2	1.1	54.3
strategic prioritization	29	1	.2	1.1	55.3
C. Infrastructure	33	18	3.5	19.1	74.5
C.1 A New Direction for Transport	34	1	.2	1.1	75.5
C.4 Building the Infrastructure	37	7	1.4	7.4	83.0
new communications services	39	2	.4	2.1	85.1
SchoolNET community project	41	1	.2	1.1	86.2
D. Technology: To Innovate	42	6	1.2	6.4	92.6
E. Other	43	6	1.2	6.4	98.9
Internal Reorganization	44	1	.2	1.1	100.0
.	.	416	81.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Valid cases	94	Total	510	100.0	100.0
Missing cases			416		



Q3.1 What remember (Note: only those categories which had valid responses are displayed)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A. Marketplace Climate	1	8	1.6	10.8	10.8
A.1 Helping Small Business	2	8	1.6	10.8	21.6
cut federal paper burden	3	1	.2	1.4	23.0
small business loans	5	3	.6	4.1	27.0
Canada Business Service Centres	8	1	.2	1.4	28.4
payroll taxes	9	1	.2	1.4	29.7
A.2 Regulatory reform	10	4	.8	5.4	35.1
A.3 Innovative Workplace	15	1	.2	1.4	36.5
modernize Canada lab	19	1	.2	1.4	37.8
B. Trade: To Expand Markets	20	2	.4	2.7	40.5
B.1 Trade Policy	21	2	.4	2.7	43.2
new focus on external trade	23	2	.4	2.7	45.9
B.2 Developing Global Businesses	24	4	.8	5.4	51.4
building global link	27	1	.2	1.4	52.7
exporter preparation	28	1	.2	1.4	54.1
B.4 National Tourism	32	2	.4	2.7	56.8
C. Infrastructure:	33	9	1.8	12.2	68.9
C.4 Building the Infrastructure	37	7	1.4	9.5	78.4
new communications s	39	4	.8	5.4	83.8
extending the CANAIRE network	40	1	.2	1.4	85.1
SchoolNET community	41	2	.4	2.7	87.8
D. Technology: To Innovate	42	6	1.2	8.1	95.9
E. Other	43	2	.4	2.7	98.6
Internal Reorganization	44	1	.2	1.4	100.0
	.	436	85.5	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 74 Missing cases 436

Q3.1 What remember (Note: only those categories which had valid responses are displayed)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A. Marketplace Climate	1	9	1.8	16.4	16.4
A.1 Helping Small Business	2	5	1.0	9.1	25.5
strategic procurement	4	1	.2	1.8	27.3
Canada Business Service Centres	8	1	.2	1.8	29.1
A.2 Regulatory reform	10	1	.2	1.8	30.9
A.3 Innovative Workplace	15	3	.6	5.5	36.4
B. Trade: To Expand Markets	20	8	1.6	14.5	50.9
B.1 Trade Policy	21	2	.4	3.6	54.5
new focus on external trade	23	2	.4	3.6	58.2
B.2 Developing Global Businesses	24	2	.4	3.6	61.8
B.4 National Tourism	32	2	.4	3.6	65.5
C. Infrastructure:	33	8	1.6	14.5	80.0
C.4 Building the Infrastructure	37	3	.6	5.5	85.5
telecommunications policy	38	2	.4	3.6	89.1
new communications services	39	1	.2	1.8	90.9
SchoolNET community	41	1	.2	1.8	92.7
D. Technology: To Innovate	42	4	.8	7.3	100.0
	.	455	89.2	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 55 Missing cases 455



January 31, 1995

Q3.1 What remember (Note: only those categories which had valid responses are displayed)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A. Marketplace Climate	1	5	1.0	13.2	13.2
A.1 Helping Small Business	2	1	.2	2.6	15.8
cut federal paper burden	3	1	.2	2.6	18.4
small business loans	5	1	.2	2.6	21.1
program simplification	7	1	.2	2.6	23.7
A.2 Regulatory reform	10	1	.2	2.6	26.3
new ways to regulate	12	1	.2	2.6	28.9
B. Trade: To Expand Markets	20	9	1.8	23.7	52.6
B.1 Trade Policy	21	1	.2	2.6	55.3
strengthening internal trade	22	2	.4	5.3	60.5
new focus on external trade	23	2	.4	5.3	65.8
B.2 Developing Global Businesses	24	2	.4	5.3	71.1
B.4 National Tourism	32	1	.2	2.6	73.7
C. Infrastructure	33	4	.8	10.5	84.2
C.4 Building the Infrastructure	37	4	.8	10.5	94.7
D. Technology: To Innovate	42	2	.4	5.3	100.0
.	.	472	92.5	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 38 Missing cases 472

Q3.1 What remember (Note: only those categories which had valid responses are displayed)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
cut federal paper burden	3	1	.2	3.7	3.7
small business loans	5	1	.2	3.7	7.4
Canada Business Service Centres	8	1	.2	3.7	11.1
A.2 Regulatory reform	10	3	.6	11.1	22.2
A.3 Innovative Workplace	15	1	.2	3.7	25.9
B. Trade: To Expand Markets	20	2	.4	7.4	33.3
B.1 Trade Policy	21	6	1.2	22.2	55.6
strengthening internal trade	22	1	.2	3.7	59.3
C. Infrastructure	33	4	.8	14.8	74.1
C.4 Building the Infrastructure	37	1	.2	3.7	77.8
extending the CANAIRE network	40	1	.2	3.7	81.5
SchoolNET community	41	1	.2	3.7	85.2
D. Technology: To Innovate	42	2	.4	7.4	92.6
E. Other	43	1	.2	3.7	96.3
Internal Reorganization	44	1	.2	3.7	100.0
.	.	483	94.7	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 27 Missing cases 483



Q3.1 What remember (Note: only those categories which had valid responses are displayed)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A. Marketplace Climate	1	3	.6	15.0	15.0
strategic procurement	4	1	.2	5.0	20.0
program simplification	7	1	.2	5.0	25.0
B. Trade: To Expand Markets	20	4	.8	20.0	45.0
B.1 Trade Policy	21	1	.2	5.0	50.0
building global link	27	1	.2	5.0	55.0
international market	30	1	.2	5.0	60.0
B.4 National Tourism	32	1	.2	5.0	65.0
C. Infrastructure	33	3	.6	15.0	80.0
SchoolNET community	41	1	.2	5.0	85.0
E. Other	43	3	.6	15.0	100.0
	.	490	96.1	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	20	Missing cases	490		

Q3.1 What remember (Note: only those categories which had valid responses are displayed)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A.1 Helping Small Business	2	1	.2	6.7	6.7
cut federal paper burden	3	1	.2	6.7	13.3
A.3 Innovative Workplace	15	1	.2	6.7	20.0
B. Trade: To Expand Markets	20	1	.2	6.7	26.7
B.1 Trade Policy	21	1	.2	6.7	33.3
new focus on external trade	23	3	.6	20.0	53.3
B.2 Developing Global Businesses	24	2	.4	13.3	66.7
C.2 Canada Infrastructure	35	1	.2	6.7	73.3
C.4 Building the Infrastructure	37	2	.4	13.3	86.7
D. Technology: To Innovate	42	1	.2	6.7	93.3
E. Other	43	1	.2	6.7	100.0
	.	495	97.1	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	15	Missing cases	495		



Q3.1 What remember (Note: only those categories which had valid responses are displayed)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
small business loans	5	1	.2	12.5	12.5
B.1 Trade Policy	21	1	.2	12.5	25.0
strategic prioritization	29	1	.2	12.5	37.5
B.4 National Tourism	32	1	.2	12.5	50.0
C. Infrastructure	33	1	.2	12.5	62.5
C.4 Building the Infrastructure	37	1	.2	12.5	75.0
D. Technology: To Innovate	42	2	.4	25.0	100.0
.	.	502	98.4	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 8 Missing cases 502

Q3.1 What remember (Note: only those categories which had valid responses are displayed)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A.1 Helping Small Business	2	1	.2	25.0	25.0
B.2 Developing Global Businesses	24	1	.2	25.0	50.0
C. Infrastructure	33	1	.2	25.0	75.0
D. Technology: To Innovate	42	1	.2	25.0	100.0
.	.	506	99.2	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4 Missing cases 506

Q3.1 What remember (Note: only those categories which had valid responses are displayed)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A. Marketplace Climate	1	1	.2	25.0	25.0
B.4 National Tourism	32	1	.2	25.0	50.0
telecommunications policy	38	2	.4	50.0	100.0
.	.	506	99.2	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4 Missing cases 506



Q3.1 What remember (Note: only those categories which had valid responses are displayed)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
focusing on small business	26	1	.2	50.0	50.0
C.4 Building the Infrastructure	37	1	.2	50.0	100.0
.	.	508	99.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	2	Missing cases	508		

Q3.1 What remember (Note: only those categories which had valid responses are displayed)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
C. Infrastructure	33	1	.2	50.0	50.0
D. Technology: To Innovate	42	1	.2	50.0	100.0
.	.	508	99.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	2	Missing cases	508		

Q3.1 What remember (Note: only those categories which had valid responses are displayed)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SchoolNET community	41	1	.2	100.0	100.0
.	.	509	99.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1	Missing cases	509		

Q3.2 Main purpose

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Competitiveness	1	20	3.9	14.0	14.0
Improve Economy	2	41	8.0	28.7	42.7
Create Jobs	3	7	1.4	4.9	47.6
Increase Wealth	4	4	.8	2.8	50.3
Help Private Busines	5	12	2.4	8.4	58.7
Government Statement	6	40	7.8	28.0	86.7
Efficiency	7	10	2.0	7.0	93.7
Other	8	7	1.4	4.9	98.6
DK/NR	9	2	.4	1.4	100.0
.	.	367	72.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	143	Missing cases	367		



Q3.2 Main purpose

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Competitiveness	1	9	1.8	12.0	12.0
Improve Economy	2	18	3.5	24.0	36.0
Create Jobs	3	16	3.1	21.3	57.3
Increase Wealth	4	5	1.0	6.7	64.0
Help Private Busines	5	4	.8	5.3	69.3
Government Statement	6	8	1.6	10.7	80.0
Efficiency	7	7	1.4	9.3	89.3
Other	8	8	1.6	10.7	100.0
.	.	435	85.3	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 75 Missing cases 435

Q4. Seek more info on BMIE after Ministers E-Mail

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	66	12.9	17.6	17.6
No	2	308	60.4	82.4	100.0
.	.	134	26.3	Missing	
DK	7	1	.2	Missing	
NR	8	1	.2	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 374 Missing cases 136

Q4.1 Source of info- Launch Speech

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	6	1.2	100.0	100.0
.	.	504	98.8	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 6 Missing cases 504

Q4.1 Source of info- Exec Summary

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	15	2.9	100.0	100.0
.	.	495	97.1	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 15 Missing cases 495



Q4.1 Source of info- your Manager

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	4	.8	100.0	100.0
.	.	506	99.2	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4 Missing cases 506

Q4.1 Source of info- Other

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	56	11.0	100.0	100.0
.	.	454	89.0	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 56 Missing cases 454

Q4.1 Specify other source of info

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Other	4	8	1.6	14.3	14.3
Actual Text	5	32	6.3	57.1	71.4
External Media	6	4	.8	7.1	78.6
Government Source	7	12	2.4	21.4	100.0
.	.	454	89.0	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 56 Missing cases 454

Q4.1 Specify other source of info

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Other	4	1	.2	14.3	14.3
Actual Text	5	2	.4	28.6	42.9
External Media	6	4	.8	57.1	100.0
.	.	503	98.6	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 7 Missing cases 503



Q4.1.B Exec summary- electronic format

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	3	.6	25.0	25.0
No	2	9	1.8	75.0	100.0
.	.	495	97.1	Missing	
DK/NR	7	3	.6	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	12	Missing cases	498		

Q4.1.B Exec summary- printed form

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	10	2.0	83.3	83.3
No	2	2	.4	16.7	100.0
.	.	495	97.1	Missing	
DK/NR	7	3	.6	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	12	Missing cases	498		

Q5. What info did you expect?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
None	1	225	44.1	53.8	53.8
Specific Details	2	47	9.2	11.2	65.1
Relevance to me	3	6	1.2	1.4	66.5
.cant say	4	71	13.9	17.0	83.5
Actual Text	5	26	5.1	6.2	89.7
Overview	6	5	1.0	1.2	90.9
Other	7	38	7.5	9.1	100.0
.	.	92	18.0	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	418	Missing cases	92		



Q5. What info did you expect?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
None	1	2	.4	3.7	3.7
Specific Details	2	10	2.0	18.5	22.2
Relevance to me	3	6	1.2	11.1	33.3
cant say	4	13	2.5	24.1	57.4
Actual Text	5	6	1.2	11.1	68.5
Overview	6	6	1.2	11.1	79.6
Other	7	11	2.2	20.4	100.0
.	.	456	89.4	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 54 Missing cases 456

Q5. What info did you expect?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Specific Details	2	3	.6	75.0	75.0
Relevance to me	3	1	.2	25.0	100.0
.	.	506	99.2	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4 Missing cases 506

Q6. Satisfaction with info received on BMIE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Dissatisfied	1	59	11.6	14.9	14.9
-	2	61	12.0	15.4	30.2
Moderately Satisfied	3	144	28.2	36.3	66.5
-	4	97	19.0	24.4	90.9
Very Satisfied	5	36	7.1	9.1	100.0
DK	7	22	4.3	Missing	
NR	8	91	17.8	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 397 Missing cases 113



Q6.1 What addition info desired?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
None	1	132	25.9	31.3	31.3
Specific Details	2	89	17.5	21.1	52.4
Relevance to me	3	23	4.5	5.5	57.8
cant say	4	57	11.2	13.5	71.3
Actual Text	5	27	5.3	6.4	77.7
Overview	6	33	6.5	7.8	85.5
Updates	7	13	2.5	3.1	88.6
Whats available	8	15	2.9	3.6	92.2
Other	9	33	6.5	7.8	100.0
.	.	88	17.3	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 422 Missing cases 88

Q6.1 What addition info desired?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
None	1	3	.6	3.2	3.2
Specific Details	2	11	2.2	11.8	15.1
Relevance to me	3	26	5.1	28.0	43.0
cant say	4	15	2.9	16.1	59.1
Actual Text	5	5	1.0	5.4	64.5
Overview	6	9	1.8	9.7	74.2
Updates	7	8	1.6	8.6	82.8
Whats available	8	1	.2	1.1	83.9
Other	9	15	2.9	16.1	100.0
.	.	417	81.8	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 93 Missing cases 417

Q6.1 What addition info desired?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Specific Details	2	3	.6	25.0	25.0
Relevance to me	3	2	.4	16.7	41.7
cant say	4	1	.2	8.3	50.0
Actual Text	5	1	.2	8.3	58.3
Overview	6	1	.2	8.3	66.7
Updates	7	4	.8	33.3	100.0
.	.	498	97.6	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 12 Missing cases 498



Q6.1 What addition info desired?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Specific Details	2	3	.6	100.0	100.0
	.	507	99.4	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 3 Missing cases 507

Q7. Briefed on BMIE by your manager?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	86	16.9	17.2	17.2
No	2	413	81.0	82.8	100.0
DK	7	1	.2	Missing	
NR	8	10	2.0	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 499 Missing cases 11

Q8. Responsible for providing briefing to staff?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
yes	1	78	15.3	15.3	15.3
no	2	431	84.5	84.7	100.0
	7	1	.2	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 509 Missing cases 1

Q8.1 Receive briefing material?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	33	6.5	45.8	45.8
No	2	39	7.6	54.2	100.0
	.	432	84.7	Missing	
DK/NR	8	6	1.2	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 72 Missing cases 438



Q8.2 Content of briefing material

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Sufficient in detail	1	26	5.1	83.9	83.9
Not enough detail	2	3	.6	9.7	93.5
Too much detail	3	2	.4	6.5	100.0
.	.	477	93.5	Missing	
DK	7	1	.2	Missing	
NR	8	1	.2	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 31 Missing cases 479

Q8.3 Printed material- balanced text and graphics

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	24	4.7	82.8	82.8
No	2	5	1.0	17.2	100.0
.	.	477	93.5	Missing	
DK/NR	8	4	.8	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 29 Missing cases 481

Q8.3 Printed material- assembled usefully?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	28	5.5	87.5	87.5
No	2	4	.8	12.5	100.0
.	.	477	93.5	Missing	
DK/NR	7	1	.2	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 32 Missing cases 478

Q9.1 Remember recent related E mail messages?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	297	58.2	60.1	60.1
No	2	197	38.6	39.9	100.0
DK	7	14	2.7	Missing	
NR	8	2	.4	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 494 Missing cases 16



Q9.2 Did you read related E mail messages?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	212	41.6	72.9	72.9
No	2	79	15.5	27.1	100.0
.	.	213	41.8	Missing	
DK/NR	8	6	1.2	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 291 Missing cases 219

Q9.3 Usefulness of related E mail messages

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Not at all useful	1	21	4.1	7.3	7.3
-	2	57	11.2	19.8	27.1
Moderately useful	3	98	19.2	34.0	61.1
-	4	73	14.3	25.3	86.5
Very useful	5	39	7.6	13.5	100.0
.	.	213	41.8	Missing	
DK	7	7	1.4	Missing	
NR	8	2	.4	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 288 Missing cases 222

Q.10 Info preference- E mail

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Weak preference	1	31	6.1	6.1	6.1
-	2	26	5.1	5.1	11.2
Moderate preference	3	69	13.5	13.6	24.8
-	4	134	26.3	26.4	51.2
Strong preference	5	226	44.3	44.5	95.7
N/A - do not have*	7	22	4.3	4.3	100.0
DK/NR	8	2	.4	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 508 Missing cases 2

* 5 respondents refused this question completely and should be removed from all "do not have" totals



Q10. Info preference- Sr management briefings

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Weak preference	1	38	7.5	7.5	7.5
-	2	48	9.4	9.4	16.9
Moderate preference	3	131	25.7	25.7	42.6
-	4	113	22.2	22.2	64.8
Strong preference	5	166	32.5	32.6	97.4
N/A - do not have	7	13	2.5	2.6	100.0
DK/NR	8	1	.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 509 Missing cases 1

Q10. Info preference- briefing by your manager

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Weak preference	1	20	3.9	3.9	3.9
-	2	33	6.5	6.5	10.4
Moderate preference	3	91	17.8	17.9	28.3
-	4	138	27.1	27.2	55.5
Strong preference	5	218	42.7	42.9	98.4
N/A - do not have	7	8	1.6	1.6	100.0
DK/NR	8	2	.4	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 508 Missing cases 2

Q10. Info preference- video tape

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Weak preference	1	190	37.3	37.5	37.5
-	2	114	22.4	22.5	60.1
Moderate preference	3	116	22.7	22.9	83.0
-	4	44	8.6	8.7	91.7
Strong preference	5	18	3.5	3.6	95.3
N/A - do not have	7	24	4.7	4.7	100.0
DK/NR	8	4	.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 506 Missing cases 4



Q.10 Info preference- conference calls

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Weak preference	1	177	34.7	35.2	35.2
-	2	122	23.9	24.3	59.4
Moderate preference	3	115	22.5	22.9	82.3
-	4	40	7.8	8.0	90.3
Strong preference	5	15	2.9	3.0	93.2
N/A - do not have	7	34	6.7	6.8	100.0
DK/NR	8	7	1.4	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 503 Missing cases 7

Q10. Info preference- printed material

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Weak preference	1	47	9.2	9.2	9.2
-	2	59	11.6	11.6	20.8
Moderate preference	3	146	28.6	28.7	49.5
-	4	164	32.2	32.2	81.7
Strong preference	5	88	17.3	17.3	99.0
N/A - do not have	7	5	1.0	1.0	100.0
DK/NR	8	1	.2	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 509 Missing cases 1

Q10 Info preference- something else

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Weak preference	1	1	.2	.2	.2
-	2	1	.2	.2	.4
Moderate preference	3	1	.2	.2	.6
-	4	7	1.4	1.4	2.0
Strong preference	5	22	4.3	4.3	6.3
N/A - do not have	7	475	93.1	93.7	100.0
DK/NR	8	3	.6	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 507 Missing cases 3



Q10. Specify other type of communication

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Other	7	18	3.5	52.9	52.9
Personal contact	8	11	2.2	32.4	85.3
Meetings	9	5	1.0	14.7	100.0
.	.	476	93.3	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 34 Missing cases 476

Q11. How prefer info on major initiatives?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
On-going (conception	1	324	63.5	65.5	65.5
Launch time	2	171	33.5	34.5	100.0
DK	7	8	1.6	Missing	
NR	8	7	1.4	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 495 Missing cases 15

Q12. How soon expect to get detailed information

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Instantly	1	122	23.9	24.8	24.8
Up to 24 hours	2	155	30.4	31.5	56.3
2 days	3	118	23.1	24.0	80.3
More than 2 days	4	97	19.0	19.7	100.0
DK	7	10	2.0	Missing	
NR	8	8	1.6	Missing	
Total		510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 492 Missing cases 18



Q13. What one thing

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Communication is good now	1	132	25.9	27.7	27.7
E-mail	2	25	4.9	5.3	33.0
Precision	3	84	16.5	17.6	50.6
Concise	4	17	3.3	3.6	54.2
Horizontal	5	7	1.4	1.5	55.7
In-Person Contact	6	30	5.9	6.3	62.0
Drop Headlines	7	3	.6	.6	62.6
More Senior Staff	8	26	5.1	5.5	68.1
Specific Information	9	27	5.3	5.7	73.7
Timeliness	10	32	6.3	6.7	80.5
More Communication	11	13	2.5	2.7	83.2
Partnership	12	17	3.3	3.6	86.8
Clarify Communication	13	27	5.3	5.7	92.4
Browsing Source	14	12	2.4	2.5	95.0
Other	16	24	4.7	5.0	100.0
.	.	34	6.7	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 476 Missing cases 34

Q13. What one thing

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Communication is good now	1	5	1.0	3.8	3.8
E-mail	2	4	.8	3.0	6.8
Precision	3	13	2.5	9.8	16.5
Concise	4	18	3.5	13.5	30.1
Horizontal	5	6	1.2	4.5	34.6
In-Person Contact	6	14	2.7	10.5	45.1
Drop Headlines	7	5	1.0	3.8	48.9
More Senior Staff	8	7	1.4	5.3	54.1
Specific Information	9	8	1.6	6.0	60.2
Timeliness	10	9	1.8	6.8	66.9
More Communication	11	5	1.0	3.8	70.7
Partnership	12	5	1.0	3.8	74.4
Clarify Communication	13	11	2.2	8.3	82.7
Browsing Source	14	11	2.2	8.3	91.0
Other	16	12	2.4	9.0	100.0
.	.	377	73.9	Missing	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 133 Missing cases 377



Q14. What sector do you work on

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Regional Operations	1	46	9.0	9.0	9.0
Service Industries & Small Business	2	33	6.5	6.5	15.5
Manufacturing & Processing Industries	3	32	6.3	6.3	21.8
Corporate Services	4	64	12.5	12.5	34.3
Spectrum, Telecomm & Info Technologies	5	46	9.0	9.0	43.3
Industry and Science Policy	6	32	6.3	6.3	49.6
Consumer Affairs	7	34	6.7	6.7	56.3
Bureau of Competition Policy	8	19	3.7	3.7	60.0
Canadian Intellectual Property Office	9	42	8.2	8.2	68.2
Communication Research Centre	10	40	7.8	7.8	76.1
Regions	11	119	23.3	23.3	99.4
Other (specify)	12	3	.6	.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 510 Missing cases 0

Q15. Job category

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Executive group	1	24	4.7	4.8	4.8
Scientific and Professional	2	71	13.9	14.2	19.0
Admin and Foreign Services	3	220	43.1	43.9	62.9
Technical	4	81	15.9	16.2	79.0
Admin Support	5	100	19.6	20.0	99.0
Operational	6	5	1.0	1.0	100.0
DK/NR	.	9	1.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	510	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 501 Missing cases 9



INDUSTRY CANADA/INDUSTRIE CANADA



114519

QUEEN JL 103 .I5 T4 1995
Price Waterhouse
Testing the effectiveness of