Decima Research

DECIMA

REPORT TO THE MINISTRY
OF STATE FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
ON PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
#2617
JANUARY 1988

DECIMA RESEARCH One Eglinton Avenue East, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M4P3A1 (416)483-1724
A division of P.A.R.G. Public Affairs Resource Group Limited

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Decima Research is pleased to present to the Ministry of State for Science and Technology, the results of the latest study of public attitudes toward science and technology. The objectives of this research were to provide an in-depth analysis of public attitudes toward a wide variety of science and technology related issues and to be used as a vehicle to track, where possible, changes in public attitudes from the previous study carried out by Bedford Research.

II. THE PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

A. Careers in Science and Technology

The career choices that Canadians advise young people to make are to some degree reflective of Canadians' views on science and technology. While the baseline survey suggested that there was only limited support for careers in the general field of science, this most recent study points to healthy support for specific science careers.

Of the careers that respondents would advise young people to enter, computer programming (55%) tops the list, while careers in medicine (42%) are the second most recommended for young people. Law (28%), engineering (27%) and business (22%) are considered advisable career choices, although significantly less advisable than computer or medical careers. As Table 1 indicates, careers in teaching (16%) and biology (8%) are viewed as the least advisable of those tested.

Table 1

RANKING CAREER CHOICES FOR TODAY'S YOUTH

	1ST CHOICE %	2ND CHOICE %	18-24 YEARS OF AGE (TOTAL) %	HOUSEHOLD INCOME OF $40,000+ TOTAL %	TOTAL %
Computer programming	35	21	47	46	55
Medicine	21	22	36	45	42
Law	10	18	35	29	28
Engineering	12	15	28	31	27
Business	11	11	26	28	22
Teaching	7	10	18	11	16
Biology	3	5	10	7	8

In one sense, these results confirm the findings of the baseline study -- that interest in science careers is limited; however, another side of this finding emerges in this new study. There is an indication that a clear distinction is made between those aspects of

science which are identified as having the "leading edge," such as medicine or computers, and those which have a more "traditional" image, such as biology. If this is in fact the case, then it should be anticipated that people would make a distinction between "biotechnology" and "biology," having a more favourable opinion of the former. The challenge then is to present a more "leading edge" image of science careers.

Of particular concern is the fact that those 18-to-24 years of age are less likely to advise young people to enter computer or medicine careers. One explanation for this apparent lack of interest in science careers among younger Canadians may be the high degree of prestige modern society seems to have placed on business careers. Tendency to recommend a business career is most evident among those 18-to-24 years of age (26%), but steadily declines as age increases.

Although the baseline data suggested that upscale Canadians were less likely to advise a young person to embark on a science career, this most recent study is not so definitive. While those with household incomes over $40,000 are less likely to suggest a computer programming career (46%) to a young person, they are more likely to suggest medicine (45%) or engineering careers (31%). Finally on a regional basis, there seems to be a greater likelihood of those respondents in Quebec (13%) and Atlantic Canada (11%) to advise a young person to enter the biology field.

B. Perceived Linkages Between Technology and Economic Advancement

Canadians are intensely convinced of the importance of remaining competitive in the international world of high technology. All but a very small percentage (2%) of Canadians feel that it is important that Canada develop its own technology. Further, Canadians overwhelmingly agree that keeping up with the technological advances of other nations is important (96%).

Taken together, these two facts might suggest that the Canadian public sees Canada's future economic development as resting on the development, manufacturing and servicing of high technology. This, however, is not entirely the case, as many people (45%) believe that the resource sector will continue to make the greatest contribution to Canada's economy in the future. Crosstabular analysis indicates that those Canadians who believe that the greatest contribution to Canada's prosperity over the next 10 years

will come from the resource sector are just as likely to believe that it is important for Canada to develop its own technology and keep up with other nations in the race for technology as are those Canadians who feel that the greatest contribution to the country's prosperity will come from the manufacturing and service industries (Table 2).

Table 2

CANADA'S ECONOMIC FUTURE AND TECHNOLOGY

	VERY IMPORTANT TO DEVELOP OWN TECHNOLOGY %	VERY IMPORTANT TO KEEP UP TO LEADING TECHNOLOGICAL NATIONS %
GREATEST CONTRIBUTOR TO THE CANADIAN ECONOMY OVER NEXT DECADE WILL COME FROM:		
Resource sector	77	70
Manufacturing sector	77	71
Service sector	75	69

The relevance of Table 2 is that it does not appear that Canadians are either failing to realise how new technologies might enable the Canadian economy to lessen its dependence on resource development or maintaining a view that our technologies should be geared toward "smarter" resource development strategies.

Table 3

PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING INTERNATIONAL TRADE, DOMESTIC SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, AND KEEPING PACE WITH LEADING TECHNOLOGICAL NATIONS

		Somewhat/ Very Important %
1.	Ability to trade Canadian goods and services internationally	96
2.	Importance of Canada developing its own science and technology	96
3.	Importance of Canada keeping up with the leading technological nations	98

Canadians appear to be fully aware of the economic importance of international trade to the Canadian economy. When asked whether Canada's ability to sell goods and services to the world is important to our economic well-being, Canadians unanimously agree that this is important (96%). Geographically the intensity of this attitude is varied. While Ontario and British Columbia show great intensity about the importance of international trade, there is less intensity in Quebec, perhaps reflecting the emerging sense of economic self-confidence within that province. Still, over 90% of Quebec residents see Canada's ability to sell Canadian goods on the international markets as important (somewhat or very) to its economic prosperity. What is not clear is whether Canadians link the ability to sell goods and services on the international markets with advances in Canada's science and technology. The existence of this association will be analysed in the fourth section of this report.

Demographic analysis suggests that as Canadians' levels of income and education rise, so too does their belief that selling goods and services to world markets is very important to Canada's economic well-being.

Overall, Canadians continue to be aware of the economic and technological realities Canada faces -- the need to develop our own high technology, to keep pace with the technological and scientific superpowers like Japan and the United States, and the importance of selling our goods and services to the world. What Canadians may be less aware of is the symbiotic relationship that science and technology can share with the

more traditional sectors of the economy. In Decima's view, the promotion of science and high technology in Canada should be focused on the creation of linkages -- between technological advancement and long-term economic prosperity -- through natural resource industries as well as newer manufacturing or service fields.

III. CANADIAN RESEARCH IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

A. Responsibility For Research

There does not appear to be a consensus among Canadians regarding what type of research the federal government should be emphasizing. This is a departure from the baseline results where applied research (68%) was identified as of greater importance than was long-term research (22%). The fact that respondents in this most recent study feel government should place equal emphasis on applied (50%) and long-term research (49%) is partially due to the fact that the question was rephrased.[1] This type of split in opinion often belies a public which is more less guessing at what the "right answer" may be. In effect, the public can probably see benefits in conducting both types of research and feels ill-equipped to offer an informed view.

B. Conducting Long-Term and Applied Research

Given the choice of universities, federal government or industry, respondents were asked to give their opinions on which group they believe should conduct the fundamental long-term and applied research in Canada. Interestingly, respondents seem prepared to make some distinctions regarding the type of research involved. In general, people feel more comfortable with the bulk of applied research being conducted directly by those who would apply it -- businesses. With respect to conducting long-term research, considerably more people feel universities might be best suited. In neither instance do more than one-in-four feel the government should play the leading role.

The different views on who should be responsible for most of the fundamental long-term and applied research are summarized in Table 4.

[1] Instead of identifying basic research as something that "may or may not produce usable results in the near future" as the baseline survey did, Decima's survey identified it as "fundamental long-term research."

Table 4

RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONDUCTING FUNDAMENTAL LONG-TERM AND APPLIED RESEARCH*

	FUNDAMENTAL LONG-TERM RESEARCH %	APPLIED RESEARCH %
Universities	45	19
Federal government	26	19
Industry	29	61

*Question asked: There are a number of groups in the country involved in research and development. Which one of the following do you think should carry out most of the fundamental long-term research...and which should carry out most of the applied research?

The most important differences in these attitudes relate to socio-economic status and region:

- Better educated and paid respondents seem to be more resistant to government's taking a leading role in conducting research; and
- Residents of Quebec and the Atlantic region are generally more supportive of strong government involvement in research.

C. Funding Long-Term and Applied Research

Although the federal government is seen by less than a third of Canadians as the institution that should conduct most of the long-term research, over 50% of Canadians indicate that the federal government should fund most of this type of research. Provincial governments are identified by only 14% of the public as the most appropriate source of funding for this research. An almost equal number of Canadians who believe that industry should conduct the long-term research (29%) also believe that industry should fund it (32%).

There does not appear to be any strong consensus among Canadians as to who should fund applied research. While a plurality of respondents (45%) indicate industry should take responsibility for funding applied research, there is also a substantial percentage of respondents who believe most of the applied research should be funded by the federal

government (39%). Similar to the funding of long-term research, the provincial government is seen as the least likely of the three to be seen as a source of funding for applied research (15%).

Respondents' views on which group should be responsible for funding long-term and applied research are illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5

RESPONSIBILITY FOR FUNDING FUNDAMENTAL LONG-TERM AND APPLIED RESEARCH

	FUNDAMENTAL LONG-TERM RESEARCH %	APPLIED RESEARCH %
Federal government	53	39
Industry	32	45
Provincial government	14	15

Question asked: Which one of the following should fund most of the fundamental long-term research carried out in Canada? Should it be...and which group should fund most of the applied research?

Household income appears to have some bearing on which group Canadians feel should be responsible for funding research. Respondents with household incomes over $50,000 are most likely to say that the federal government (59%) should fund the long-term research and that industry (66%) should fund applied research.

D. Linkages Between The Funding and Conducting of Research

Of the respondents who state that the country's long-term research should be carried out by industry, less than half feel that industry should fund it (47%). In fact, a slight majority of respondents feel the government should fund long-term research (53%). In contrast, a majority of Canadians (56%) believe that the applied research conducted by industry should be funded by industry.

What these two points might indicate is that many respondents seem inclined to make an interesting distinction based on efficacy (who can do the most efficient job of research) and business common sense (if industry needs to apply research then they should be

involved not only in conducting it but also in paying for it). In essence, Canadians seem to be looking for a practical partnership, recognizing a role for government and industry, but also recognizing the governments' limitations on the practical side, as well as industry's funding limitations.

Table 6

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FUNDING AND CONDUCTING APPLIED AND LONG-TERM RESEARCH

KEY: I Applied Research II Long-Term Research

	CONDUCTING					
	Industry		Federal Government		University	
	I	II	I	II	I	II
	%	%	%	%	%	%
FUNDING						
Federal government	50	22	26	31	23	47
Industry	76	43	11	15	14	43
Provincial government	48	24	26	31	25	45

The above table brings to light a number of interesting points of view that Canadians seem to be making with regards to who should be funding and conducting research:

- Industry is seen by the Canadian public as the sector which should conduct most applied research (61%), a fact that is magnified if it is also funding the research (76%). Many respondents also feel that industry should be conducting much of the long-term research that it funds (43%). Given the number of respondents who believe industry should conduct research whether they fund it or not would seem to suggest that the idea of practicality and what constitutes good business sense may influence respondents' views.

  Finally, while industry is seen by less than 15% of respondents as the sector that should be funding university-conducted applied research, it is seen by 43% of respondents as the sector that should fund most university-conducted long-term research.

- Federal Government participation in research should, in many respondents' opinion, involve financial support more so than active support. While a slight majority of respondents indicate that they believe the federal government should finance long-term research (53%), less than one-in-three say the federal government should conduct such research. It would appear that the public has a genuine concern that the federal government will not use the research dollars available as efficiently as other institutions.

- Provincial Governments do not appear to be seen as the sector that should fund most of either the long-term (14%) or applied research (15%). Of those, however, who do feel provincial governments should be funding the applied research, almost a plurality (48%) indicate that industry should be conducting most of this research. Looking at long-term research, it would appear that among those respondents who believe that the provincial government should fund most of this type of research, a plurality believe that the universities should conduct this research (45%). This would suggest that concerns about government efficiency apply not only to the federal government; and

The salient point to be drawn from Table 6 with respect to governments, federal or provincial, is that the public appears leary of governments' ability to efficiently conduct research. In neither the conducting of long-term or applied research do more than one-in-three Canadians feel government should be most responsible for conducting the research they fund.

- Universities are considered to be appropriate institutions to undertake long-term research, however, few indicate they believe the universities should conduct most applied research. With respect to funding, the respondents appear to indicate that all three sectors should be funding most of the long-term research. More than one-in-four of the respondents who feel that the federal government, provincial government or industry should be responsible for funding long-term research feel that universities should be conducting it.

E. Origins of Innovations in Science and Technology

Although the universities in this country are more likely to be perceived as a producer of new developments in science and technology (40%), the combination of small and large companies is even more likely to be seen as a producer of these innovations (46%).

Neither of these facts should be surprising given the percentage of Canadians who believe universities should conduct most of the long-term research and that industry should conduct most of the applied research. That such a low percentage of respondents identify the government as the most likely producer of new innovations in technology (14%) may be a product of the fact that most Canadians are not confident in the government's ability to efficiently conduct research, as alluded to earlier.

Table 7

SECTOR MOST LIKELY TO PRODUCE INNOVATIONS
AND BREAKTHROUGHS IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

	PERCENTAGE
Small companies	22
Large companies	24
Universities	40
Government	14

IV. INCREASING THE EMPHASIS ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

A. Reasons for Increasing the Emphasis on Science and Technology

The baseline survey questioned respondents as to which government activities should, in their opinion, have the highest priority. This question helped to determine that Canadians believe that reducing unemployment should be the most important priority of government. The importance of increasing the amount of science and technology ranked far below reducing unemployment. In this study, the question was reworked so that respondents were asked whether finding solutions to a number of high priority issues -- seeking cures for diseases, helping Canadian business compete in international markets, efficient extraction of Canadian resources, and increasing employment -- were good reasons to increase the emphasis on science and technology.

No less than 90% of the public believe that solving any one of these issues is a good reason for increasing the emphasis on science and technology. Seeking cures for illness and increasing employment, however, are more likely to be seen as very good reasons to emphasize science and technology (64% and 60% respectively) than are the efficient harvesting of natural resources (49%) or helping Canadian business to compete on international markets (48%) (Table 8).

Table 8

REASONS FOR INCREASING EMPHASIS ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

	VERY GOOD REASON %	GOOD REASON %	MOST IMPORTANT REASON %
To seek new cures	64	31	34
To increase overall employment	60	35	30
To more efficiently harvest Canada's natural resources	49	43	14
To compete more effectively on international markets	48	44	21

The results suggest that Canadians see the social benefits of science and technology as being of greater interest than are the economical benefits. This does not necessarily imply that Canadians are not aware of the economic benefits that new technology can create; in fact, the data would suggest otherwise. Interest in a new drug or medical cure

is usually greater than interest in mineral extraction developments. In effect, the data are really illustrating the degree of importance respondents have placed on the above issues. With less than 10% of the respondents believing that the any one issue is a poor or only fair reason to place increased emphasis on science and technology comments that suggest Canadians are unaware of the importance of science and technology appear unfounded.

As Table 8 indicates, the most important reasons for spending money on science and technology are perceived to be developing cures for illnesses and diseases (34%) and to increase employment (30%). The lack of people who see being able to compete internationally and to efficiently harvest our natural resources as the most important reason to commit funds and time to science and technology is not indicative of the over 90% of respondents who indicate that these issues represent good reasons for increasing the emphasis on science and technology.

Even those respondents who identify Canada's ability to sell its goods and services on international markets as being very important (23%) are no more likely than the average (21%) to indicate that the most important reason to spend money on science and technology is to be more competitive on international markets. This fact lends credibility to earlier statements that suggest while respondents seem aware of the economic benefits of science and technology, they tend to show greater interest in the social benefits. Should this prove to be the case, the reality may be that trying get the public to develop an intense interest in the economic benefits, instead of the social benefits, associated with technological advancement may not be possible or perhaps even desirable.

V. THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

A. Public Awareness of Government Involvement

An overwhelming majority (85%) of Canadians say that they have not heard, seen or read of the government's involvement in the science and technology field. While this lack of awareness seems to have little effect on the respondents seeing the importance of science and technology as previously stated, it may explain why Canadians are more aware of the social benefits (most often reported in newspapers and newscasts) of science and technology.

When the 15% of respondents who claim they are aware of the government's involvement in developing science and technology were asked what they have heard, seen or read, natural resource development and conservation (18%) is cited most often, followed by space technology research (14%). Analysing this from a overall perspective suggests that only 3% of all participants in the survey appear to be aware of the government's research involvement in natural resource development and conservation, and that only 2% of respondents appear to be aware that the government is involved in research and development of space technology.

The top six research and development areas with which the public perceives the government to be involved are illustrated in Table 9.

Table 9

PERCEIVED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY CONCERNS IN WHICH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS INVOLVED (TOP SIX)

	PERCENTAGE
Natural resource development and conservation	18
Space research	14
Science and technology funding	13
Laser and computer development	13
Product development	9
Medical research	7
Have not heard of any federal government involvement in science and technology.	85

B. Assessment of Government Participation

Canadians in general feel that the federal government is doing a fair job (49%) in its support of research and development of science and technology. One-third of Canadians feel that the federal government is doing a good job (33%), while 5% of the public feel they are doing a poor job. The high percentage of respondents who say the federal government is doing a fair job may stem from the fact that most Canadians are really not aware of the government's support of science and technology. In effect, the respondents may simply be giving the government the benefit of the doubt.

Not surprisingly, those respondents who feel the government has done a poor job in this area are the group least likely to feel new innovations come from the federal government (8%). Conversely, the group indicating that the federal government has done a good job supporting scientific research is more likely to see innovations in science and technology as a government product (24%).

As government performance with respect to supporting research in science and technology improves, the number of respondents who believe the federal government should conduct most of the long-term research also rises. Alternatively, the poorer the job rating of the government, the greater the likelihood that Canadians will believe that universities should conduct the long-term research. Either of these statements would appear to shed light on the effect efficacy, mentioned earlier, and the image that doing a "good job" has on the way in which respondents may determine who should be responsible for the various forms of research.

Public knowledge of whether or not the federal government is involved with the research and development of science and technology may be linked to whether or not they see the federal government as doing a good job of supporting these activities (Table 10).

Table 10

AWARENESS AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SUPPORT
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

	POOR/ FAIR JOB %	GOOD/VERY GOOD JOB %
HEARD OF GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT...?		
Yes	74	26
No	63	34

Unfortunately, as Table 10 suggests, awareness does not necessarily imply that the government is doing a satisfactory job of supporting research in the science and technology field. In fact, the data would infer that only a quarter of the public (26%) who have heard about the government's support or involvement in the research development of science and technology have a favourable image of the job government is doing. Comparatively, slightly more than a third of the public (34%) who have not heard of any government support or involvement in scientific research or development identify the job the government is doing in this respect as good or very good. This would seem to suggest that the publicity that the federal government is receiving, with respect to this subject, is neither positive nor extensive.

The role that the federal government has been undertaking in the development of Canadian technology has not been active enough as far as most Canadians are concerned. This statement is based on the fact that the overwhelming majority (81%) of the public think that government should take a more active role in the development of Canadian technology (40% somewhat more active and 41% much more active).

A large percentage of Canadians (46%) have the impression that the federal government has neither increased nor decreased the amount of money it spends on science or technology. A very small percentage of Canadians believe the government has greatly

decreased (6%) or greatly increased (4%) the amount of money it spends on science and technology. This apparent lack of intensity among the public as to whether government funding of science and technology has increased or decreased may be a product of the fact that very few people probably know how much the government actually does spends in this regard.

As Table 11 suggests there appears to be a relationship between the public's perception of the job the government is doing supporting the research and development of science and technology, and whether or not they think the government has increased or decreased its funding of research and development.

Table 11

PUBLIC IMPRESSION OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND PERCEIVED FUNDING OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

	DECREASED %	INCREASED %
Poor job	36	20
Only fair job	21	26
Good job	15	31
Very good job	15	47

C. Stimulating Science and Technology

In attempting to discover what may stimulate science and technology, respondents were asked to determine whether they think certain initiatives would help promote science and technology in Canada. The battery of initiatives range from giving tax breaks to companies that conduct research to developing scholarships for gifted students to attend university.

On each of the five questions, no less than 80% of the public feel that such an initiative would be at least somewhat helpful in promoting science and technology. The most positively received initiative is the one that suggests providing funds to universities to acquire better equipment -- 93% of respondents feel this would somewhat (36%) or greatly (57%) promote science and technology. The least popular initiative, yet still overwhelming endorsed, is that of granting tax breaks to companies that conduct research and development (81%).

The highly positive response given to these initiatives makes it somewhat difficult to judge which is the most popular. To aid in this determination, respondents were asked which of the initiatives they feel would do the most to stimulate science and technology in Canada. As Table 12 suggests, devoting funds to universities and companies in the best position to use them (28%) and funding universities to invest in better equipment (25%) are considered to be the initiatives that would most promote science and technology. The rankings of these two initiatives are significant in that they will probably be two of the major criterion for determining the "Centres of Excellence" -- ability and need.

Table 12

RANKING GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES AIMED
AT STIMULATING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

	PERCENTAGE
Concentrating funds on those universities or companies best able to make use of them	28
Funding universities/schools to acquire more up-to-date equipment	25
Funding universities and companies to carry out specific research	17
Provide university scholarships for gifted students	16
Providing tax breaks to companies that conduct research	14

As the table indicates, the other initiatives are ranked closely together, with each being identified by about 15% of the public as the most able to stimulate science and technology.

Compared to other income groups, upper income groups are more likely to believe that tax breaks to businesses that carry out specific research would promote science and technology best. As it is often these upper income groups which are responsible for initiating research and development, given their place in society (CEOs, Presidents), the fact that this initiative is ranked last among those tested should not be overstated. Instead, the focus should be on the fact that 81% of respondents feel that tax breaks would somewhat or greatly stimulate science and technology.

D. Awareness of InnoVaction

Similar to the low percentage of people who are aware of government involvement in research and development, only 16% of the respondents indicate they have heard of InnoVaction. The percentage of respondents who claim to have heard of InnoVaction is almost equal to the percentage of respondents who indicate they have heard of the government's involvement in science and technology.

By way of comparison, it seems that those respondents who indicate they are aware of the federal government's involvement in the research and development of science and technology are only slightly more likely to have heard about the InnoVaction program than are those respondents who have not heard of the federal government's involvement in research and development (20% verses 16%).

VI. THE CANADIAN SPACE PROGRAM

A. Reasons for a Canadian Space Program

A clear consensus among the public as to why the Canadian government should be involved in a space program is not forthcoming. As Table 13 indicates, keeping up with other nations' technology is the reason most often cited (48%) by respondents. Economic benefits (37%), the ability to conduct long-term research (36%) and providing communication services are also identified as important reasons for involvement in a space program. The "top-of-mind" reason for why Canada should be involved in a space program is seen to be so that the country can remain as technologically advanced as other nations (30%).

Table 13

REASONS FOR CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN A SPACE PROGRAM

	1ST MENTION TOP-OF-MIND %	2ND MENTION %	TOTAL* %
To keep up with other nations' technology	30	18	48
To provide industrial and economic benefits	18	20	37
To do long-term research	17	20	36
To provide communication services	16	18	34
To maintain good relations with allies	7	12	19
To take part in space exploration	7	8	15
for purposes of national prestige	3	4	7

* Rows may not add up due to rounding.

Perhaps one of the more salient points to be made here is the fact that "providing industrial and economic benefits" is the second most likely reason for respondents indicating that Canada should be involved in a space program. The fact that economic benefits are cited as often as they are by respondents of this question lends support to the statement made earlier in this report suggesting that Canadians are in fact aware of the important economic benefits to be derived from new developments in science and technology.

B. Funding the Canadian Space Program

Finally, though no less important then any other issue, one-third of the Canadian public (34%) see the funding of a Canadian space program as less important than is spending money on other science and technology programs. Almost one-half (48%) of the public feel that supporting the space program is as important as are other programs. This high level of "fence sitters" may be do, in part, to Canadians' lack of familiarity with a space program.

The percentage of respondents who indicate that the Canadian government should make the space program more important than other science and technology programs is 18%, slightly greater than the percentage of people who indicate that they have heard of InnoVaction. These factors, however, do not appear to be linked. In fact, of those who indicated they have heard of InnoVaction, only 14% feel that the government's monetary involvement in a space program is more important than its financial support of other science and technology programs.

The lack of familiarity with the Canadian space program may underline the difficulty the government has in raising the public's awareness of even the leading edge of science and technology. This is not to suggest that the public does not see the importance of such programs, but more that there is a limited number of people who consistently maintain a high level of interest in the research and development of science and technology.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

While most Canadians recognize the economic importance for the future of developing science and technology, they appear to have difficulty identifying with it on a personal level. Their propensity to consider the sciences as a good career for future generations is increased when people are reminded of the specific applications (e.g. medicine, computers), rather than the general direction.

This would suggest a need to consider ways to highlight the kinds of work that those who follow science training paths are currently involved in, rather than to leave these things to the imagination of the public.

Speaking to the societal benefits which are derived from science and technology should reflect a balance of social and economic implications. While it is important to note for people that our economic competitiveness rests largely on our ability to stay up to date in these fields, the human side (e.g. medical applications) has intrinsically greater interest for people.

In addressing the economic benefits, efforts should be made to stress the direct linkages with longer term prosperity, not just in newer manufacturing or service fields, but also in natural resource industries, since these are more familiar to many Canadians.

The public believes quite strongly in a role for government in promoting scientific and technological advances, but seems to see that role more clearly in the funding of research rather than the conducting of it. Their sense of equity leads them to conclude that businesses which will benefit from applied research should naturally bear some of the research costs.

Regardless of the role which the government chooses to pursue in the future, efforts should be made to stress leadership, a vision for the future and a focus on the educational system. Where government is involved directly in research, care should be taken to avoid contributing to fears of inefficiencies or lack of cost control.

Drawing on Canadian national pride is an effective way to help boost attention and support levels around science and technology. This would be particularly helpful in the case of participation in the space program.

TECHNICAL APPENDIXES

APPENDIX

A. SURVEY OVERVIEW

Decima Research is pleased to present to The Minister of State for Science and Technology, the results for a study designed to meet the following objectives:

- To identify public awareness, attitudes and opinions toward a number of issues related to science and technology in Canada; and
- To identify changes in public attitudes toward these topic issues.

Senior Research Consultant and principal investigator for this study was Michael Sullivan who was assisted in the various phases of research and analysis by Gregory Ebel.

1. Sample Selection

The population consists of all Canadians 18 years of age and older. Male and female respondents were selected in the same proportion as the general population, on a 50/50 sex quota. A total 1,000 of interviews were completed.

Effective survey research must be based on a sample truly representative of the universe of interest. A multi-stage sampling technique was employed to gather the data for this study. The essential feature of this procedure is that individual respondents are predetermined by the selection procedure itself. That predetermination is made by careful speculation of a series of controlled choices.

The sampling technique produced a systematic random sample with probability of selection proportionate to size at the national level. The first step in the sampling procedure was the division into 11 strata or "regions" (Table A).

Table A

SAMPLE STRATA

REGIONS	PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION	PPS N
British Columbia	11.3	113
Alberta	9.2	92
Saskatchewan	4.0	40
Manitoba	4.2	42
Balance Ontario	26.7	267
Metropolitan Toronto	8.8	88
Quebec	26.5	265
New Brunswick	2.9	29
Nova Scotia	3.5	35
Prince Edward Island	.5	5
Newfoundland	2.4	24
		1,000

Table A presents the percentage of the population of Canada represented in each region, followed by the proportionate number of cases in each.

Within each of these regions, a sampling procedure was employed which is based upon mapping the linkage between the geographic location of individual telephone exchanges and Statistics Canada's fundamental building block for the census -- the enumeration area (EA).

Telephone companies divide their service regions into smaller areas served by a single switching centre. Within each switching centre area, all telephone numbers begin with the same two digits. We refer to these mutually exclusive exchange areas as NNXs (NNX representing the first three digits of a telephone number). Using census data, together with maps showing the geographic boundaries of NNXs, it is possible to determine exact population figures for each NNX and determine the appropriate number of respondents to be surveyed in each NNX.

Primary sampling units (groups of NNXs) and secondary sampling units (individual NNXs) were selected on the basis of probability proportionate to population size. Telephone numbers were then generated using a computerized random number generation program employing random start and fixed interval methods.

2. Field Procedures

The questionnaires were printed, consecutively numbered, and assembled into field packs of three interviews -- two males and one female or two females and one male. This procedure ensured that the 50/50 sex quota would be met by preselecting males and females before the interviewing began.

The interviews took place on the 5th, 6th, and 7th of January 1988. Weekday interviewing was conducted between the hours of 5:30 and 10:00 p.m. Weekend interviewing was conducted between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. The questionnaire contained 35 questions and took approximately 12 minutes to complete. Fifteen percent (15%) of all interviews were monitored while in progress for procedure and content from an extension monitor. All interviews were carefully edited as soon as they were completed to ensure that no questions were omitted and that skip-patterns were followed correctly.

Experienced telephone interviewers were used to collect the data. A briefing was held by the Field Supervisor and the Research Analyst was present to answer questions or clarify procedures. The Field Supervisor first read the questionnaire to the interviewers, thereby ensuring that pronunciation would be correct and uniform, and second, interviewer-respondent role-playing was used to illustrate skip and rotation patterns. The interviewers then had an opportunity to ask questions.

On the first evening in the field, the Research Analyst listened to the interviewers on an extension monitor. The monitor prevents the interviewer and respondent from knowing they are being listened to. This ensured that the skip and rotation patterns were followed correctly and that there were no questions causing interviewers any particular difficulty. When an error was caught, the interviewer was briefed again and the respondent was called back in order to correct the questionnaire.

3. Coding

The questionnaires were coded and the data were entered by experienced Decima personnel. The following standard procedures were followed:

- An initial briefing;
- Supervision of trained staff; and
- Verification of 15% of each coder's work.

Using the first 25% of completed questionnaires in each stratum, codes were constructed for the open-end questions by sorting and writing out the responses into independent categories. The Research Analyst checked all categories for completeness and consistency.

4. Data Processing

The entry and processing of the data were carried out on-site using Decima's Digital PDP 11/44 computer. Decima's interactive software system, designed specifically for survey analysis, has a robust data entry facility, which permits cleaning of the data, including out-of-range values and skip-pattern errors, as well as other logic errors. The fully cleaned data were then summarized into aggregate tables. Further analysis of the data included crosstabulation tables and measures of association.

5. Confidence Limits and Validation

The sample of 1,000 cases produces results which are accurate for the population of as a whole within ±3.1 percentage points 95 out of 100 times.

In order to validate the sample, we compared our data for the age category of the population with figures provided by Statistics Canada. Table B outlines the percentage of respondents in each age category for the sample and the corresponding population figures. As these figures suggest, the sample drawn for this study reflects the more general characteristics of the adult population.

Table B

SAMPLE VALIDATION

	SAMPLE (n=1,000) %	UNIVERSE [1] (N=18,759,685) %
AGE		
18-19 years of age[1]	4.1	4.1
20-24 years of age	10.6	12.0
25-29 years of age	12.1	12.5
30-34 years of age	15.3	11.7
35-39 years of age	13.4	10.8
40-44 years of age	8.6	8.6
45-49 years of age	6.0	7.0
50-54 years of age	6.9	6.6
55-59 years of age	5.3	6.4
60-64 years of age	5.1	6.0
65 years of age and older[2]	12.3	14.4

[1] Source: 1986 Census of Canada Catalogue 93-101 Age, Sex, and Marital Status p4-2 to 4-6.

[2] Added Categories 65-69,70-74,75-79,80-84,85-89,90+.

The sample is only representative of residents in the provinces who have direct dialing telephone services. Therefore, Canadians who are accessible only by a telephone servicing a large number of people, such as senior citizen homes, hospitals, and Indian Reserves, and those who have only radio-telephone service or no telephone service at all, are automatically excluded from the sample. Any further questions the reader has about sampling should be referred to the Research Consultant.

While the most sophisticated procedures have been used to collect and analyse the information presented herein, it must be remembered that surveys are not predictions. They are designed to measure public opinion within identifiable statistical limits of accuracy at specific points in time. This survey is in no way a prediction of opinion or behaviour at any future point in time.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

A. Are you 18 years of age or older and a Canadian resident?

YES (CONTINUE).....A
NO (ASK TO SPEAK TO ELIGIBLE RESPONDENT, IF STILL "NO," THANK AND TERMINATE).....B

B. Have I reached you at your home phone number?

YES (CONTINUE).....A
NO (ASK TO SPEAK TO ELIGIBLE RESPONDENT, IF STILL "NO," THANK AND TERMINATE).....B

C. Do you, or does anyone in your family or household work in the following kinds of business...a market research firm, advertising agency, public relations firm, or the news media?

YES (THANK AND TERMINATE--RECORD INCIDENCE ON CALL RECORD SHEET).....A
NO (CONTINUE).....B

Note 1: Response may not sum to 100% due to rounding throughout the Technical Appendixes.

2: (*) denotes a percentage value greater than 0 but less than 0.5 throughout the Technical Appendixes.

1. If you were to advise a young person about career choices, which one of the following would be your first choice and which would be your second choice? The careers are...(READ AND ROTATE LIST)

	1st CHOICE	2nd Choice	
COMPUTER PROGRAMMING	1	1	(55%)
LAW	2	2	(28%)
ENGINEERING	3	3	(27%)
TEACHING	4	4	(16%)
BUSINESS	5	5	(22%)
BIOLOGY	6	6	(8%)
MEDICINE	7	7	(42%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	8	8	(1%)

2. In terms of the economic contribution that each of the following is likely to make to our prosperity over the next 10 years, which is likely to make the greatest contribution? Will it be the...(ROTATE)...natural resource sector, the manufacturing sector, or the service sector? (ACCEPT ONLY ONE RESPONSE)

NATURAL RESOURCE SECTOR....1	(45%)
MANUFACTURING SECTOR.....2	(30%)
SERVICE SECTOR.....3	(24%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)....4	(1%)

3. From your point of view, would you say that Canada's ability to sell its goods and services in international markets is very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important as a factor in our economic well-being?

NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT.....1	(*)
NOT TOO IMPORTANT.....2	(3%)
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT.....3	(23%)
VERY IMPORTANT.....4	(74%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)....5	(*)

4. How important is it that Canada develop its own science and technology? Would you say it is very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important?

NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT.....1	(1%)
NOT TOO IMPORTANT.....2	(1%)
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT.....3	(22%)
VERY IMPORTANT.....4	(77%)

5. And how important would you say it is that Canada try to keep up with the leading technological nations like Japan and the United States in terms of the priority given to research and development in this country? Is it very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important?

NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT.....1	(1%)
NOT TOO IMPORTANT.....2	(3%)
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT.....3	(26%)
VERY IMPORTANT.....4	(70%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).....5	(*)

6. When you think about innovations and breakthroughs in science and technology, do you think these are more likely to come from research groups working in small companies, large companies, universities, or government. (ACCEPT ONLY ONE RESPONSE)

RESEARCH GROUPS WORKING IN SMALL COMPANIES.....1	(22%)
LARGE COMPANIES.....2	(24%)
UNIVERSITIES.....3	(40%)
GOVERNMENT.....4	(14%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).....5	(*)

7. There are a number of groups in the country involved in research and development. Which one of the following do you think should carry out most of the fundamental long-term research? Should it be...(READ AND ROTATE LIST...ACCEPT ONLY ONE RESPONSE)?

THE UNIVERSITIES.....1	(45%)
THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.....2	(26%)
INDUSTRY.....3	(29%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).....4	(*)

8. And which one should carry out most of the applied research, that is research which tries to develop new products and product improvements? Should it be...(READ AND ROTATE LIST...ACCEPT ONLY ONE RESPONSE)?

THE UNIVERSITIES.....1	(19%)
THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.....2	(19%)
INDUSTRY.....3	(61%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).....4	(*)

9. In supporting advances in technology, should the federal government put more emphasis on fundamental long-term research, or on applied research, that is research which tries to develop new product improvements? (ACCEPT ONLY ONE RESPONSE)

FUNDAMENTAL LONG-TERM RESEARCH	1	(49%)
APPLIED RESEARCH	2	(50%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	3	(1%)

10. Carrying out research and development requires the funding of projects. Which one of the following should fund most of the fundamental long-term research carried out in Canada? Should it be...(READ AND ROTATE LIST...ACCEPT ONLY ONE RESPONSE)?

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	1	(53%)
INDUSTRY	2	(32%)
PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS	3	(14%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	4	(1%)

11. And which of these groups should fund most of the applied research. Should it be...(READ AND ROTATE LIST...ACCEPT ONLY ONE RESPONSE)?

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	1	(39%)
INDUSTRY	2	(45%)
PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS	3	(15%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	4	(*)

There are a number of reasons people have put forward for why Canada should put increased emphasis on science and technology. For each of the following, could you tell me if you consider this to be a very good reason, a good reason, only a fair reason, or a poor reason. How about...(READ AND ROTATE ITEMS 12 THROUGH 15)?

12. In order to seek cures for illnesses and diseases

POOR REASON	1	(1%)
ONLY FAIR REASON	2	(4%)
GOOD REASON	3	(31%)
VERY GOOD REASON	4	(64%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	5	(*)

13. In order to enable Canadian business to compete more effectively and to continue to sell our products on international markets

POOR REASON.....1	(2%)
ONLY FAIR REASON.....2	(7%)
GOOD REASON.....3	(44%)
VERY GOOD REASON.....4	(48%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).....5	(*)

14. In order to create technologies that can be used to more efficiently mine and harvest Canada's natural resources

POOR REASON.....1	(1%)
ONLY FAIR REASON.....2	(7%)
GOOD REASON.....3	(43%)
VERY GOOD REASON.....4	(49%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).....5	(*)

15. To increase employment overall in the economy

POOR REASON.....1	(2%)
ONLY FAIR REASON.....2	(3%)
GOOD REASON.....3	(35%)
VERY GOOD REASON.....4	(60%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).....5	(*)

END OF ROTATION

16. And which one of these do you think is the most important reason for putting money and effort into science and technology? Is it...(READ AND ROTATE LIST...ACCEPT ONLY ONE RESPONSE)?

IN ORDER TO SEEK CURES FOR ILLNESSES AND DISEASES.....1	(34%)
IN ORDER TO BE ABLE TO COMPETE MORE EFFECTIVELY AND CONTINUE TO SELL OUR PRODUCTS ON INTERNATIONAL MARKETS.....2	(21%)
IN ORDER TO CREATE TECHNOLOGIES THAT CAN BE USED TO MORE EFFICIENTLY MINE AND HARVEST CANADA'S NATURAL RESOURCES.....3	(14%)
TO INCREASE EMPLOYMENT OVERALL IN THE ECONOMY.....4	(30%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).....5	(1%)

17. Have you seen, heard, or read much lately about the federal government's involvement in research and development in science and technology?

YES (GO TO Q18)	1	(15%)
NO (SKIP TO Q19)	2*	(85%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	3	(*)

IF "YES" TO Q17, ASK:

18. What have you seen, heard, or read? (PROBE...ACCEPT ONLY ONE RESPONSE...RESPONSE MUST BE AT LEAST TEN WORDS)

AIDS RESEARCH	01	(3%)
NATIONAL RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT/CONSERVATIVE	02	(18%)
SPACE RESEARCH	03	(14%)
LASER/PLANE/COMMERCIAL	04	(13%)
UNIVERSITY FUNDING	05	(2%)
TAX LAWS	06	(2%)
FUNDING - GENERAL	07	(13%)
CUTBACKS - GENERAL	08	(5%)
MEDICAL RESEARCH	09	(7%)
CONDUCTIVITY/RESEARCH	10	(3%)
ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTION	11	(2%)
FREE TRADE	12	(1%)
AUTO INDUSTRY	13	(1%)
EMPLOYMENT/BRAIN DRAIN	14	(2%)
SCIENCE/TECHNOLOGY - GENERAL	15	(4%)
OTHER RESEARCH/PRODUCTIVITY DEVELOPMENT	16	(9%)
NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	17	(2%)

19. Overall would you say that the federal government has done a very good job, a good job, only a fair job or a poor job of supporting research and development in science and technology

POOR JOB	1	(15%)
ONLY FAIR JOB	2	(49%)
GOOD JOB	3	(30%)
VERY GOOD JOB	4	(3%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	5	(3%)

20. Overall, from your point of view, should the federal government take a much more active role, a somewhat more active role, about the same level of activity as it does now, a somewhat less active role, or a much less active role than it does at present in the development of Canadian technology?

MUCH LESS ACTIVE ROLE	1	(2%)
SOMEWHAT LESS ACTIVE ROLE	2	(3%)
SAME LEVEL OF ACTIVITY AS NOW	3	(13%)
SOMEWHAT MORE ACTIVE ROLE	4	(41%)
MUCH MORE ACTIVE ROLE	5	(40%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	6	(1%)

21. Thinking about the amount of money which the federal government spends on science and technology, is it your impression that over the last year this amount has increased greatly, increased a little, stayed at about the same level, decreased a little, or decreased greatly?

DECREASED GREATLY	1	(6%)
DECREASED A LITTLE	2	(15%)
STAYED ABOUT THE SAME LEVEL	3	(46%)
INCREASED A LITTLE	4	(24%)
INCREASED GREATLY	5	(4%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	6	(6%)

If the federal government wanted to promote science and technology in Canada, for each of the following do you think it would help stimulate science and technology greatly, somewhat, not too much, or not at all. How about...(READ AND ROTATE ITEMS 22 THROUGH 26)?

22. By offering tax breaks to companies for carrying out research and development.

NOT AT ALL	1	(6%)
NOT TOO MUCH	2	(13%)
SOMEWHAT	3	(45%)
GREATLY	4	(36%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	5	(*)

23. By providing funds to schools and universities to acquire better, more up to date equipment.

NOT AT ALL.....1	(2%)
NOT TOO MUCH.....2	(5%)
SOMEWHAT.....3	(36%)
GREATLY.....4	(57%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).....5	(*)

24. By providing funds for scholarship for bright students to attend university.

NOT AT ALL.....1	(3%)
NOT TOO MUCH.....2	(9%)
SOMEWHAT.....3	(38%)
GREATLY.....4	(49%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).....5	(1%)

25. By funding universities and companies to carry out certain kinds of research.

NOT AT ALL.....1	(2%)
NOT TOO MUCH.....2	(6%)
SOMEWHAT.....3	(43%)
GREATLY.....4	(48%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).....5	(*)

26. By concentrating funds on those universities or companies that are likely to make the best use of the money provided.

NOT AT ALL.....1	(2%)
NOT TOO MUCH.....2	(8%)
SOMEWHAT.....3	(41%)
GREATLY.....4	(49%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).....5	(*)

END OF ROTATION

27. And which one of these do you think would do the most to stimulate science and technology? (READ AND ROTATE LIST...ACCEPT ONLY ONE RESPONSE)

BY OFFERING TAX BREAKS TO COMPANIES FOR CARRYING OUT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....1	(14%)
BY PROVIDING FUNDS TO SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES TO ACQUIRE BETTER, MORE UP TO DATE EQUIPMENT.....2	(25%)
BY PROVIDING FUNDS FOR SCHOLARSHIP FOR BRIGHT STUDENTS TO ATTEND UNIVERSITY.....3	(16%)
BY FUNDING UNIVERSITIES AND COMPANIES TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN KINDS OF RESEARCH.....4	(17%)
BY CONCENTRATING FUNDS ON THOSE UNIVERSITIES OR COMPANIES THAT ARE LIKELY TO MAKE THE BEST USE OF THE MONEY PROVIDED....5	(28%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).....6	(1%)

28. Have you heard of a federal government program called "InnoVaction" (IN-O-VAC-SHUN)?

YES.....1	(16%)
NO.....2	(84%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).....3	(*)

29. People have suggested a number of reasons why Canada should be involved in a space program. Which of the following is, in your opinion, the best reason and which is the second best reason for Canada being involved in such a program? These reasons are...(READ AND ROTATE LIST)

	BEST REASON	2nd BEST REASON	
FOR PURPOSES OF NATIONAL PRESTIGE	1	1	(7%)
TO KEEP UP TECHNOLOGICALLY WITH OTHER NATIONS	2	2	(48%)
TO MAINTAIN GOOD RELATIONS WITH OUR ALLIES	3	3	(19%)
TO PROVIDE INDUSTRIAL AND ECONOMIC BENEFITS	4	4	(37%)
TO DO FUNDAMENTAL LONG-TERM SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH	5	5	(36%)
TO BE PART OF SPACE EXPLORATION	6	6	(15%)
TO PROVIDE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES	7	7	(34%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	8	8	(2%)

30. As you may know, Canada does have a space program. Compared to spending money on other science and technology programs, should the federal government make the space program more important, as important, or less important as a priority?

MORE IMPORTANT.....1	(18%)
AS IMPORTANT.....2	(48%)
LESS IMPORTANT.....3	(34%)

By now you may have realized that this survey is being conducted on behalf of the Ministry of State for Science and Technology. So that we can use your responses, we would like to ask you some questions that would be used for statistical purposes only. We want to assure you that your answers will be kept confidential in two ways: first your name will not be given to the Ministry, and second, your answers will be combined with those of other participants before being given to the Ministry of State for Science and Technology.

31. What is your age, please? (IF RESPONDENT REFUSES, OFFER TO READ CATEGORIES AND HAVE HIM/HER TELL YOU WHICH CATEGORY HE/SHE FALLS INTO)

18-19 YEARS.....01	(4%)
20-24 YEARS.....02	(11%)
25-29 YEARS.....03	(12%)
30-34 YEARS.....04	(15%)
35-39 YEARS.....05	(13%)
40-44 YEARS.....06	(9%)
45-49 YEARS.....07	(6%)
50-54 YEARS.....08	(7%)
55-59 YEARS.....09	(5%)
60-64 YEARS.....10	(5%)
65 YEARS OR OLDER.....11	(12%)

---

32. Which of the following income groups includes your annual household income? (READ CHOICES)

LESS THAN $ 5,000.....01	(3%)
$ 5,000 - $ 9,999.....02	(7%)
$10,000 - $14,999.....03	(11%)
$15,000 - $19,999.....04	(12%)
$20,000 - $24,999.....05	(10%)
$25,000 - $29,999.....06	(12%)
$30,000 - $34,999.....07	(10%)
$35,000 - $39,999.....08	(8%)
$40,000 - $44,999.....09	(7%)
$45,000 - $49,999.....10Z	(5%)
$50,000 AND OVER.....11	(16%)

33.A Are you currently attending school, college, or university as a full-time student?

YES (SKIP TO Q34).....	6*	(8%)
NO (GO TO Q33.B).....	A	

IF "NO" TO Q33A, ASK:

33.B What is the highest level of schooling that you have completed?

PUBLIC/ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (GRADE 1-8).....	1	(9%)
SOME HIGH SCHOOL.....	2	(18%)
GRADUATED HIGH SCHOOL (GRADE 12 OR 13).....	3	(29%)
VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL/COLLEGE/CEGEP.....	4	(14%)
SOME UNIVERSITY.....	5	(6%)
GRADUATED UNIVERSITY.....	7	(16%)

34. Sex. (BY OBSERVATION)

MALE.....	1	(50%)
FEMALE.....	2	(50%)

35. Language (BY OBSERVATION)

ENGLISH.....	1	(75%)
FRENCH.....	2	(25%)

VERBATIM RESPONSES

Question 18

There are a number of reasons people have put forward for why Canada should continue to put money and effort into science and technology. For each of the following, could you tell me if you consider this a very good reason, a good reason, only a fair reason, or a poor reason. How about in order to be able to compete and continue sell our products on international markets.

01. AIDS Research -- About the program regarding the AIDS virus. The money being given to the cancer/heart society. / AIDS research by federal government to be started. / Improvements in medicine to cure the AIDS disease -- research hasn't come with anything concrete yet. / AIDs research.

02. Natural Resource Development/Conservation -- TV program -- David Suzuki -- minerals in Northwest Territories. Federal government funding the development of these resources. / I get Equinox magazine -- conservation of disappearing resources and the destruction of disappearing resources. / I don't remember much, but I read something about them doing more development in our natural resources.

03. Space Research -- I'm monitoring the technical part of the space program. / Space -- Soviet manner space station. / I've read about things like the Star Wars and space advancement.

04. Laser/Airplane/Communications Development -- Telecommunications -- airplane with a solar plate. / The breakthrough in the microwave flight. Still on a model but it has been tested and was successful. / Communication through a laser beam, flying a plan with a laser system. / Communications -- specifically in news on tv? / Lasers, medical breakthrough using lasers, graphics on tv?

05. University Funding -- University of Western Ontario in computer industry sponsored by government. / Underfunding to universities in areas of scientific research. / Basically the provincial and federal government getting involved in the universities financially.

06. Tax Laws -- Information available -- directed to tax law changes that will affect research in a negative way. / Tax rates fund. Grants, they should stay out of it. Give money to universities.

07. Funding -- General -- Funding of it. They backed down on some technological projects. / I heard they are funding some project but they could be funded more. / Technology has been underfunded by federal government. / Not enough it being spent on research federally, only hope

that private industry would do this. / I've known of companies and their products to benefit from government grants in research and development. / Lack of fund. / I read some articles -- I can't remember. Sorry, I think they were about how they spent their money. / I read about the withdrawal of funding for scientific research. / Federal government is funding small companies. / Canada trying to hold her own but she doesn't have the money. / Read. We are behind in development. Lack of funding.

08. Cutbacks -- General -- Mulroney cut back on technology and threatened hundreds of people would lose jobs. Later had big plan to get public support and promised technology would create jobs. / Cutbacks on research and development. / Just in the press -- the downside is cutting on NRC. / That they are cutting back on science and technology and putting into industry. / Cutbacks in government support in research and development in all areas, especially research in finding cures for diseases.

09. Medical Research -- Mostly about medical technology on how they've advanced in their research on different diseases. / Usual research -- illnesses such as cancer and AIDS.

10. Conductivity/Hydro -- Maximum conductivity -- electron flow in conductor -- hydro bills will be cheaper. / The NRC development work with super conductivity, in respect to future technology, technological parity.

11. Environment/Pollution -- Acid rain -- need to take harder stand on Americans. / Research on pollution due to recycling is not as successful as they had hoped because recycling plants are in resident areas.

12. Free Trade -- Trade -- Foreign tariffs dropped, free trade with the U.S. / Free trade -- its effects on the science and technology industry in Canada. / About free trade -- I believe that there might be a short-term loss but have a long-term gain.

13. Auto Industry -- Auto industry -- just thinking about free trade. / Auto industry -- automation -- do not agree because takes away jobs.

14. Employment/Brain Drain -- 15,000 people laid off -- half-assed attitude. A lot of highly trained specialists leave here for U.S. because pay is not good enough. / They are trying to create more employment. / I read in the paper about "a brain drain to the South"

15. Science/Technology -- General -- Well, I heard something about Flora MacDonald say something on science and technology. / I read a synopsis that it put out by the government which deals with research and development in science and technology. / I heard that the government will be increasing research in the science and technology field.

16. Other Research/Products Development -- I read about some people getting money from the government to do research in the atomic stuff. / The research thing about trying the toxins in the mussels and oysters. Trying to find out about what the toxin is. / The development in Alaska -- doing something else with the pipeline. / Drug patent laws.

17. Nothing in Particular -- Nothing that has actually swayed me. Government involvement -- the private sector should be more involved. / Yes, I have but on nothing specifically. Just brief stuff. / Because of the nature of my job I'm always reading up on all the new advancements but not specifically.

18. Other -- Its needed more and more. / Government took a lot of money from Terry Fox Fund and put it into patient services which it wasn't supposed to. / Industry, more attention on producing hydrogen. / National health and welfare publication -- listing all the grants given by federal government plus ongoing ministry publications. / Information on explicit research projects which are funded by the federal government. / What they're doing in the whole financial industry because it is where I work. Also farming. / Robarts Institute in London. People from other countries working there. / We are doing as well as we can. We need to market our products.

THE AGGREGATE TABLES

The aggregate tables are a concise version of the interview schedule, with question titles and answer descriptions "annotated" within the limited number of print characters available in the computer printout.

For each question, frequency and percentage distributions of answers given by all respondents are presented. Question numbers correspond exactly to those on the interview schedule. The latter may be consulted to see the exact wording of each question asked.

The aggregate tables contain columns entitled RESPONSES (i.e. the number of respondents giving a particular answer) and PERCENT (i.e. the percentage of those answering the question giving each particular answer). The MEAN (i.e. the arithmetic average) and the standard error[1] are also shown where appropriate.

Some questions, (e.g. "Which of these newspapers do you read?") are set up so that each respondent can give more than one answer. In such cases the sum of the percentages may legitimately exceed 100. The note below the question's title indicates the maximum number of answers allowed, "UP TO #ANS. PER INT." (i.e. up to # answers per interview).

Specific answers to a question can be reported in all tabulations related to a particular question, but excluded from computions of the mean, standard error, or any other statistics. For example, consider the following rating:

1.	EXCELLENT	7%
2.	GOOD	41%
3.	ONLY FAIR	36%
4.	POOR	3%
5.	(NO OPINION) (N/A)	13%

[1] A measure of the confidence interval about the average: 90% of the time the average response, if one could ask <u>everyone</u> in the universe the question, would be within ± (1.64 x standard error) of the reported sample mean; 95% of the time the actual average for the whole universe would be within ± (1.96 x standard error) of the reported sample mean; 99% of the time the actual average for the whole universe would be within ± (2.66 x standard error) of the reported sample mean.

The mean is calculated by using legitimate answer codes and excluding answer codes designated with "(N/A)." In the above example, a mean of 2.40 (i.e. "good to fair, leaning toward good") is reported rather than 2.74, a statistic which is mathematically correct, but cannot be interpreted.

Computed means and other statistics can be made interpretable in an alternate manner. When appropriate, response categories can be treated as if they had specific numeric values, usually the mid-point of the category. Whenever this is done, these values are reported in parenthesis in the aggregate tables. An example is presented below:

Q.34: HOUSEHOLD INCOME?

			RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	Less than $5,000	(2.9)	125	16.4
2.	$5,000-$9,999	(7.4)	154	20.3
3.	$10,000-$14,999	(12.4)	136	17.9
4.	$15,000-$19,999	(17.3)	119	15.7
5.	$20,000-$24,999	(22.2)	88	11.6
6.	$25,000-$49,999	(32.2)	122	16.1
7.	$50,000 or more	(70.1)	16	2.1
	TOTAL RESPONSES (MEAN = 15.8; S.E. = 0.42)		760	100.0

The reported mean (i.e. 15.8, interpreted as $15,800) is more meaningful than the mean of 3.43 which could be produced by an analysis of the coded values.

A perusal of the aggregate tables will acquaint the reader with descriptive quantitative measurers of opinion and behaviour derived in this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS: AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 1: ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE
<UP TO 2 ANSWERS PER INT.>

		RESPONDENTS MENTIONING	PERCENT
1. COM PROGRAMMING		550.	55.0 %
2. LAW		276.	27.6 %
3. ENGINEERING		268.	26.8 %
4. TEACHING		162.	16.2 %
5. BUSINESS		220.	22.0 %
6. BIOLOGY		79.	7.9 %
7. MEDICINE		417.	41.7 %
8. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	13.	1.3 %
		=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	(N/A)

Q. 2: GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP

		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. RESOURCE SECTOR		453.	45.3 %
2. MANUF SECTOR		296.	29.6 %
3. SERVICE SECTOR		241.	24.1 %
4. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	10.	1.0 %
		=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

Q. 3: CDA SELL INTL MARKTS

		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT		3.	0.3 %
2. NOT TOO IMPORTANT		31.	3.1 %
3. SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT		227.	22.7 %
4. VERY IMPORTANT		736.	73.6 %
5. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	3.	0.3 %
		=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.70 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.82)

Q. 4: CDA DEV OWN SCI/TECH

	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	5.	0.5 %
2. NOT TOO IMPORTANT	13.	1.3 %
3. SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	216.	21.6 %
4. VERY IMPORTANT	766.	76.6 %
	=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.74 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.85)

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 5: CDA KEEP UP WT TECH WARS	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	8.	0.8 %
2. NOT TOO IMPORTANT	28.	2.8 %
3. SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	263.	26.3 %
4. VERY IMPORTANT	700.	70.0 %
5. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	1.	0.1 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.66 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.79)

Q. 6: SCI/TECH INNOV COME FROM	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. SMALL COMPANIES	219.	21.9 %
2. LARGE COMPANIES	243.	24.3 %
3. UNIVERSITIES	400.	40.0 %
4. GOVERNMENT	135.	13.5 %
5. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	3.	0.3 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

Q. 7: WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. UNIVERSITIES	451.	45.1 %
2. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	260.	26.0 %
3. INDUSTRY	288.	28.8 %
4. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	1.	0.1 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

Q. 8: WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. UNIVERSITIES	193.	19.3 %
2. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	190.	19.0 %
3. INDUSTRY	613.	61.3 %
4. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	4.	0.4 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 9: FED GOVT SHD EMPHASIZE		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. FUND RESEARCH		487.	48.7 %
2. APPLIED RESEARCH		502.	50.2 %
3. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	11.	1.1 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

Q. 10: WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT		528.	52.8 %
2. INDUSTRY		318.	31.8 %
3. PROV GOVERNMENT		144.	14.4 %
4. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	10.	1.0 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

Q. 11: WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT		390.	39.0 %
2. INDUSTRY		453.	45.3 %
3. PROV GOVERNMENT		153.	15.3 %
4. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	4.	0.4 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

Q. 12: EMPH SCI/TECH:SEEK CURES		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. POOR REASON		11.	1.1 %
2. ONLY FAIR REASON		36.	3.6 %
3. GOOD REASON		308.	30.8 %
4. VERY GOOD REASON		644.	64.4 %
5. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	1.	0.1 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.59 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.72)

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 13: EMPH SCI/TECH:EFF COMP

	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. POOR REASON	15.	1.5 %
2. ONLY FAIR REASON	67.	6.7 %
3. GOOD REASON	435.	43.5 %
4. VERY GOOD REASON	479.	47.9 %
5. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	4.	0.4 %
	=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.38 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.46)

Q. 14: EMPH SCI/TECH:NAT RESC

	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. POOR REASON	11.	1.1 %
2. ONLY FAIR REASON	70.	7.0 %
3. GOOD REASON	431.	43.1 %
4. VERY GOOD REASON	486.	48.6 %
5. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	2.	0.2 %
	=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.39 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.47)

Q. 15: EMPH SCI/TECH:INCR EMPL

	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. POOR REASON	16.	1.6 %
2. ONLY FAIR REASON	34.	3.4 %
3. GOOD REASON	345.	34.5 %
4. VERY GOOD REASON	603.	60.3 %
5. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	2.	0.2 %
	=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.54 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.67)

Q. 16: MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH

	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. SEEK CURES	342.	34.2 %
2. COMPETE ON INT MKTS	208.	20.8 %
3. CREATE TECH FOR RESC	136.	13.6 %
4. INCREASE EMPLOYMENT	303.	30.3 %
5. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	11.	1.1 %
	=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 17: HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. YES	152.	15.2 %
2. NO	845.	84.5 %
3. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	3.	0.3 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

Q. 18: WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. AIDS RESEARCH	4.	2.6 %
2. NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	27.	17.8 %
3. SPACE RESEARCH	21.	13.8 %
4. LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	19.	12.5 %
5. UNIVERSITY FUNDING	3.	2.0 %
6. TAX LAWS	3.	2.0 %
7. FUNDING - GENERAL	20.	13.2 %
8. CUTBACKS - GENERAL	7.	4.6 %
9. MEDICAL RESEARCH	11.	7.2 %
10. CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	5.	3.3 %
11. ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	3.	2.0 %
12. FREE TRADE	2.	1.3 %
13. AUTO INDUSTRY	2.	1.3 %
14. EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	3.	2.0 %
15. SCI/TECH - GENERAL	6.	3.9 %
16. OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	13.	8.6 %
17. NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	3.	2.0 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	152.	100.0 %

Q. 19: RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. POOR JOB	152.	15.2 %
2. ONLY FAIR JOB	492.	49.2 %
3. GOOD JOB	296.	29.6 %
4. VERY GOOD JOB	34.	3.4 %
5. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	26.	2.6 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 2.22 SE= 0.02 MED= 2.18)

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 20: GOVT ROLE IN DEV CDN TCH

		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. MUCH LESS ACTIVE	(-2.0)	20.	2.0 %
2. SMWHAT LESS ACTIVE	(-1.0)	34.	3.4 %
3. SME LEVEL ACTVITY	(0.0)	125.	12.5 %
4. SMWHT MORE ACTIVE	(1.0)	408.	40.8 %
5. MUCH MORE ACTIVE	(2.0)	402.	40.2 %
6. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	11.	1.1 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 1.15 SE= 0.03 MED= 1.27)

Q. 21: AMT $ SCI/TECH PAST YEAR

		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. DECREASED GREATLY	(-2.0)	57.	5.7 %
2. DECREASED A LITTLE	(-1.0)	150.	15.0 %
3. STAYED THE SAME	(0.0)	459.	45.9 %
4. INCREASED A LITTLE	(1.0)	235.	23.5 %
5. INCREASED GREATLY	(2.0)	37.	3.7 %
6. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	62.	6.2 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 0.05 SE= 0.03 MED= 0.07)

Q. 22: PROM TECH/TAX BREAKS

		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NOT AT ALL		58.	5.8 %
2. NOT TOO MUCH		128.	12.8 %
3. SOMEWHAT		447.	44.7 %
4. GREATLY		363.	36.3 %
5. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	4.	0.4 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.12 SE= 0.03 MED= 3.20)

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 23: PROM TECH/FNDS TO SCHOOL		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NOT AT ALL		20.	2.0 %
2. NOT TOO MUCH		47.	4.7 %
3. SOMEWHAT		361.	36.1 %
4. GREATLY		569.	56.9 %
5. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	3.	0.3 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.48 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.62)

Q. 24: PROM TECH/SCHOLARSHIPS		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NOT AT ALL		29.	2.9 %
2. NOT TOO MUCH		94.	9.4 %
3. SOMEWHAT		334.	33.4 %
4. GREATLY		488.	48.8 %
5. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	5.	0.5 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.34 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.48)

Q. 25: PROM TECH/FND UNIV/COMP		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NOT AT ALL		23.	2.3 %
2. NOT TOO MUCH		61.	6.1 %
3. SOMEWHAT		432.	43.2 %
4. GREATLY		483.	48.3 %
5. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	1.	0.1 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.38 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.46)

Q. 26: PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NOT AT ALL		20.	2.0 %
2. NOT TOO MUCH		75.	7.5 %
3. SOMEWHAT		414.	41.4 %
4. GREATLY		489.	48.9 %
5. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	2.	0.2 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.37 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.48)

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 27: DO MST STIM SCI/TECH		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. OFFERING TAX BREAKS		136.	13.6 %
2. FUNDS TO SCHOOL		252.	25.2 %
3. FUNDS FOR SCHLRSHIP		156.	15.6 %
4. FUNDING UNIVERSITIES		172.	17.2 %
5. FUND THOSE BEST USE		278.	27.8 %
6. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	6.	0.6 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

Q. 28: HEARD OF INNOVACTION		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. YES		156.	15.6 %
2. NO		843.	84.3 %
3. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	1.	0.1 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

Q. 29: RSN CDA INV IN SPACE <UP TO 2 ANSWERS PER INT.>	RESPONDENTS MENTIONING	PERCENT
1. NATIONAL PRESTIGE	69.	6.9 %
2. KEEP UP TECHNOLOG	479.	47.9 %
3. MAINTAIN GOOD RELTNS	187.	18.7 %
4. PROV IND/ECO BEN	372.	37.2 %
5. FUND L T RESEARCH	360.	36.0 %
6. BE PART SPACE EXPL	146.	14.6 %
7. PROVIDE COMM SERVICE	338.	33.8 %
8. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	20.	2.0 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	(N/A)

Q. 30: PRI SPACE PROG VS OTHER		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. MORE IMPORTANT		177.	17.7 %
2. AS IMPORTANT	(0.0)	483.	48.3 %
3. LESS IMPORTANT	(-1.0)	340.	34.0 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= -0.16 SE= 0.02 MED= -0.17)

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 31: AGE

			RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1.	18 - 19 YEARS	(19.0)	41.	4.1 %
2.	20 - 24 YEARS	(22.5)	106.	10.6 %
3.	25 - 29 YEARS	(27.5)	121.	12.1 %
4.	30 - 34 YEARS	(32.5)	153.	15.3 %
5.	35 - 39 YEARS	(37.5)	134.	13.4 %
6.	40 - 44 YEARS	(42.5)	86.	8.6 %
7.	45 - 49 YEARS	(47.5)	60.	6.0 %
8.	50 - 54 YEARS	(52.5)	69.	6.9 %
9.	55 - 59 YEARS	(57.5)	53.	5.3 %
10.	60 - 64 YEARS	(62.5)	51.	5.1 %
11.	65 YEARS OR OLDER	(67.5)	123.	12.3 %
			=========	=======
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		997.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 41.28 SE= 0.48 MED= 37.89)

Q. 32: ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

			RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1.	LESS THAN $ 5,000	(2.5)	24.	2.5 %
2.	$ 5,000 - $ 9,999	(7.5)	68.	7.1 %
3.	$10,000 - $14,999	(12.5)	100.	10.5 %
4.	$15,000 - $19,999	(17.5)	113.	11.8 %
5.	$20,000 - $24,999	(22.5)	94.	9.8 %
6.	$25,000 - $29,999	(27.5)	118.	12.3 %
7.	$30,000 - $34,999	(32.5)	97.	10.1 %
8.	$35,000 - $39,999	(37.5)	80.	8.4 %
9.	$40,000 - $44,999	(42.5)	62.	6.5 %
10.	$45,000 - $49,999	(47.5)	45.	4.7 %
11.	$50,000 AND OVER	(52.5)	155.	16.2 %
			=========	=======
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		956.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 29.52 SE= 0.48 MED= 28.35)

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 33: EDUCATION	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL	93.	9.4 %
2. SOME HIGH SCHOOL	177.	17.9 %
3. GRAD HIGH SCHOOL	285.	28.8 %
4. VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP	143.	14.4 %
5. SOME UNIVERSITY	60.	6.1 %
6. AT SCHOOL	75.	7.6 %
7. GRADUATED UNIVERSITY	158.	15.9 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	991.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.76 SE= 0.06 MED= 3.29)

Q. 34: SEX	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. MALE	499.	49.9 %
2. FEMALE	501.	50.1 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

Q. 35: LANGUAGE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. ENGLISH	754.	75.4 %
2. FRENCH	246.	24.6 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

Q. 36: SAMPLE STRATA	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. B.C.	113.	11.3 %
2. ALBERTA	92.	9.2 %
3. SASKATCHEWAN	40.	4.0 %
4. MANITOBA	42.	4.2 %
5. BALANCE ONTARIO	267.	26.7 %
6. METRO	88.	8.8 %
7. QUEBEC	265.	26.5 %
8. NEW BRUNSWICK	29.	2.9 %
9. NOVA SCOTIA	35.	3.5 %
10. PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	5.	0.5 %
11. NEWFOUNDLAND	24.	2.4 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 37: REGION	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. BRITISH COLUMBIA	113.	11.3 %
2. PRAIRIES	174.	17.4 %
3. ONTARIO	355.	35.5 %
4. QUEBEC	265.	26.5 %
5. ATLANTIC	93.	9.3 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

Q. 38: COMMUNITY SIZE		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. 1,000,000 AND OVER	(262.2)	294.	29.4 %
2. 100,000 - 99,999	(42.2)	260.	26.0 %
3. 10,000 - 99,999	(4.9)	100.	10.0 %
4. UNDER 10,000/RURAL	(0.5)	346.	34.6 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 88.72 SE= 3.58 MED= 50.27)

TABLE OF CONTENTS: AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 1: ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE <UP TO 2 ANSWERS PER INT.>		RESPONDENTS MENTIONING	PERCENT
1. COM PROGRAMMING		550.	55.0 %
2. LAW		276.	27.6 %
3. ENGINEERING		268.	26.8 %
4. TEACHING		162.	16.2 %
5. BUSINESS		220.	22.0 %
6. BIOLOGY		79.	7.9 %
7. MEDICINE		417.	41.7 %
8. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	13.	1.3 %
		=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	(N/A)

Q. 2: GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. RESOURCE SECTOR		453.	45.3 %
2. MANUF SECTOR		296.	29.6 %
3. SERVICE SECTOR		241.	24.1 %
4. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	10.	1.0 %
		=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

Q. 3: CDA SELL INTL MARKTS		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT		3.	0.3 %
2. NOT TOO IMPORTANT		31.	3.1 %
3. SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT		227.	22.7 %
4. VERY IMPORTANT		736.	73.6 %
5. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	3.	0.3 %
		=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.70 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.82)

Q. 4: CDA DEV OWN SCI/TECH	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	5.	0.5 %
2. NOT TOO IMPORTANT	13.	1.3 %
3. SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	216.	21.6 %
4. VERY IMPORTANT	766.	76.6 %
	=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.74 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.85)

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 5: CDA KEEP UP WT TECH WARS	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	8.	0.8 %
2. NOT TOO IMPORTANT	28.	2.8 %
3. SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	263.	26.3 %
4. VERY IMPORTANT	700.	70.0 %
5. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	1.	0.1 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.66 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.79)

Q. 6: SCI/TECH INNOV COME FROM	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. SMALL COMPANIES	219.	21.9 %
2. LARGE COMPANIES	243.	24.3 %
3. UNIVERSITIES	400.	40.0 %
4. GOVERNMENT	135.	13.5 %
5. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	3.	0.3 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

Q. 7: WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. UNIVERSITIES	451.	45.1 %
2. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	260.	26.0 %
3. INDUSTRY	288.	28.8 %
4. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	1.	0.1 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

Q. 8: WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. UNIVERSITIES	193.	19.3 %
2. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	190.	19.0 %
3. INDUSTRY	613.	61.3 %
4. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	4.	0.4 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 9: FED GOVT SHD EMPHASIZE		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. FUND RESEARCH		487.	48.7 %
2. APPLIED RESEARCH		502.	50.2 %
3. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	11.	1.1 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

Q. 10: WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT		528.	52.8 %
2. INDUSTRY		318.	31.8 %
3. PROV GOVERNMENT		144.	14.4 %
4. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	10.	1.0 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

Q. 11: WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT		390.	39.0 %
2. INDUSTRY		453.	45.3 %
3. PROV GOVERNMENT		153.	15.3 %
4. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	4.	0.4 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

Q. 12: EMPH SCI/TECH:SEEK CURES		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. POOR/FAIR REASON		47.	4.7 %
2. GOOD REASON		308.	30.8 %
3. VERY GOOD REASON		644.	64.4 %
4. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	1.	0.1 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 2.60 SE= 0.02 MED= 2.72)

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 13: EMPH SCI/TECH:EFF COMP

	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. POOR/FAIR REASON	82.	8.2 %
2. GOOD REASON	435.	43.5 %
3. VERY GOOD REASON	479.	47.9 %
4. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	4.	0.4 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 2.40 SE= 0.02 MED= 2.46)

Q. 14: EMPH SCI/TECH:NAT RESC

	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. POOR/FAIR REASON	81.	8.1 %
2. GOOD REASON	431.	43.1 %
3. VERY GOOD REASON	486.	48.6 %
4. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	2.	0.2 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 2.41 SE= 0.02 MED= 2.47)

Q. 15: EMPH SCI/TECH:INCR EMPL

	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. POOR/FAIR REASON	50.	5.0 %
2. GOOD REASON	345.	34.5 %
3. VERY GOOD REASON	603.	60.3 %
4. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	2.	0.2 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 2.55 SE= 0.02 MED= 2.67)

Q. 16: MST IMP RSN 3 TO SCI/TCH

	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. SEEK CURES	342.	34.2 %
2. COMPETE ON INT MKTS	208.	20.8 %
3. CREATE TECH FOR RESC	136.	13.6 %
4. INCREASE EMPLOYMENT	303.	30.3 %
5. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	11.	1.1 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 17: HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. YES	152.	15.2 %
2. NO	845.	84.5 %
3. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	3.	0.3 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

Q. 18: WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. AIDS RESEARCH	4.	2.6 %
2. NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	27.	17.8 %
3. SPACE RESEARCH	21.	13.8 %
4. LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	19.	12.5 %
5. UNIVERSITY FUNDING	3.	2.0 %
6. TAX LAWS	3.	2.0 %
7. FUNDING - GENERAL	20.	13.2 %
8. CUTBACKS - GENERAL	7.	4.6 %
9. MEDICAL RESEARCH	11.	7.2 %
10. CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	5.	3.3 %
11. ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	3.	2.0 %
12. FREE TRADE	2.	1.3 %
13. AUTO INDUSTRY	2.	1.3 %
14. EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	3.	2.0 %
15. SCI/TECH - GENERAL	6.	3.9 %
16. OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	13.	8.6 %
17. NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	3.	2.0 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	152.	100.0 %

Q. 19: RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. POOR JOB	152.	15.2 %
2. ONLY FAIR JOB	492.	49.2 %
3. GOOD JOB	296.	29.6 %
4. VERY GOOD JOB	34.	3.4 %
5. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	26.	2.6 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 2.22 SE= 0.02 MED= 2.18)

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 20: GOVT ROLE IN DEV CDN TCH

		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. LESS ACTIVE	(-1.0)	54.	5.4 %
2. SME LEVEL ACTVITY	(0.0)	125.	12.5 %
3. MORE ACTIVE	(1.0)	810.	81.0 %
4. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	11.	1.1 %
		=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 0.76 SE= 0.02 MED= 0.89)

Q. 21: AMT $ SCI/TECH PAST YEAR

		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. DECREASED	(-1.0)	207.	20.7 %
2. STAYED THE SAME	(0.0)	459.	45.9 %
3. INCREASED	(1.0)	272.	27.2 %
4. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	62.	6.2 %
		=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 0.07 SE= 0.02 MED= 0.07)

Q. 22: PROM TECH/TAX BREAKS

		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NOT AT ALL		58.	5.8 %
2. NOT TOO MUCH		128.	12.8 %
3. SOMEWHAT		447.	44.7 %
4. GREATLY		363.	36.3 %
5. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	4.	0.4 %
		=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.12 SE= 0.03 MED= 3.20)

Q. 23: PROM TECH/FNDS TO SCHOOL

		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NOT AT ALL		20.	2.0 %
2. NOT TOO MUCH		47.	4.7 %
3. SOMEWHAT		361.	36.1 %
4. GREATLY		569.	56.9 %
5. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	3.	0.3 %
		=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.48 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.62)

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 24: PROM TECH/SCHOLARSHIPS	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NOT AT ALL	29.	2.9 %
2. NOT TOO MUCH	94.	9.4 %
3. SOMEWHAT	384.	38.4 %
4. GREATLY	488.	48.8 %
5. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	5.	0.5 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.34 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.48)

Q. 25: PROM TECH/FND UNIV/COMP	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NOT AT ALL	23.	2.3 %
2. NOT TOO MUCH	61.	6.1 %
3. SOMEWHAT	432.	43.2 %
4. GREATLY	483.	48.3 %
5. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	1.	0.1 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.38 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.46)

Q. 26: PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NOT AT ALL	20.	2.0 %
2. NOT TOO MUCH	75.	7.5 %
3. SOMEWHAT	414.	41.4 %
4. GREATLY	489.	48.9 %
5. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	2.	0.2 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.37 SE= 0.02 MED= 3.48)

Q. 27: DO MST STIM SCI/TECH	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. OFFERING TAX BREAKS	136.	13.6 %
2. FUNDS TO SCHOOL	252.	25.2 %
3. FUNDS FOR SCHLRSHIP	156.	15.6 %
4. FUNDING UNIVERSITIES	172.	17.2 %
5. FUND THOSE BEST USE	278.	27.8 %
6. (NO OPINION) (N/A)	6.	0.6 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 28: HEARD OF INNOVACTION		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. YES		156.	15.6 %
2. NO		843.	84.3 %
3. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	1.	0.1 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

Q. 29: RSN CDA INV IN SPACE <UP TO 2 ANSWERS PER INT.>		RESPONDENTS MENTIONING	PERCENT
1. NATIONAL PRESTIGE		69.	6.9 %
2. KEEP UP TECHNOLOG		479.	47.9 %
3. MAINTAIN GOOD RELTNS		187.	18.7 %
4. PROV IND/ECO BEN		372.	37.2 %
5. FUND L T RESEARCH		360.	36.0 %
6. BE PART SPACE EXPL		146.	14.6 %
7. PROVIDE COMM SERVICE		338.	33.8 %
8. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	20.	2.0 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	(N/A)

Q. 30: PRI SPACE PROG VS OTHER		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. MORE IMPORTANT		177.	17.7 %
2. AS IMPORTANT	(0.0)	483.	48.3 %
3. LESS IMPORTANT	(-1.0)	340.	34.0 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= -0.16 SE= 0.02 MED= -0.17)

Q. 31: AGE		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. 18 - 24 YEARS	(21.5)	147.	14.7 %
2. 25 - 34 YEARS	(30.3)	274.	27.5 %
3. 35 - 44 YEARS	(39.5)	220.	22.1 %
4. 45 - 54 YEARS	(50.2)	129.	12.9 %
5. 55 - 64 YEARS	(60.0)	104.	10.4 %
6. 65 YEARS OR OLDER	(67.5)	123.	12.3 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		997.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 41.29 SE= 0.47 MED= 38.41)

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 32: ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. LESS THAN $10,000	(6.2)	92.	9.6 %
2. $10,000 - $19,999	(15.2)	213.	22.3 %
3. $20,000 - $29,999	(24.9)	212.	22.2 %
4. $30,000 - $39,999	(34.8)	177.	18.5 %
5. $40,000 - $49,999	(44.6)	107.	11.2 %
6. $50,000 AND OVER	(52.5)	155.	16.2 %
		=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		956.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 29.45 SE= 0.48 MED= 28.05)

Q. 33: EDUCATION	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL	93.	9.4 %
2. SOME HIGH SCHOOL	177.	17.9 %
3. GRAD HIGH SCHOOL	285.	28.8 %
4. VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP	143.	14.4 %
5. SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY	218.	22.0 %
6. AT SCHOOL	75.	7.6 %
	=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	991.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 3.45 SE= 0.05 MED= 3.29)

Q. 34: SEX	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. MALE	499.	49.9 %
2. FEMALE	501.	50.1 %
	=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

Q. 35: LANGUAGE	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. ENGLISH	754.	75.4 %
2. FRENCH	246.	24.6 %
	=========	=======
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

Q. 36: SAMPLE STRATA	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. B.C.	113.	11.3 %
2. ALBERTA	92.	9.2 %

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

(Q. 36 CONT.)

3. SASKATCHEWAN	40.	4.0 %
4. MANITOBA	42.	4.2 %
5. BALANCE ONTARIO	267.	26.7 %
6. METRO	88.	8.8 %
7. QUEBEC	265.	26.5 %
8. NEW BRUNSWICK	29.	2.9 %
9. NOVA SCOTIA	35.	3.5 %
10. PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	5.	0.5 %
11. NEWFOUNDLAND	24.	2.4 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

Q. 37: REGION

	RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. BRITISH COLUMBIA	113.	11.3 %
2. PRAIRIES	174.	17.4 %
3. ONTARIO	355.	35.5 %
4. QUEBEC	265.	26.5 %
5. ATLANTIC	93.	9.3 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	1000.	100.0 %

Q. 38: COMMUNITY SIZE

		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. 1,000,000 AND OVER	(262.2)	294.	29.4 %
2. 100,000 - 99,999	(42.2)	260.	26.0 %
3. 10,000 - 99,999	(4.9)	100.	10.0 %
4. UNDER 10,000/RURAL	(0.5)	346.	34.6 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

(MEAN= 88.72 SE= 3.58 MED= 50.27)

Q. 39: Q1:M1 ADVISE RE CAREER

		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. COM PROGRAMMING		347.	34.7 %
2. LAW		104.	10.4 %
3. ENGINEERING		123.	12.3 %
4. TEACHING		67.	6.7 %
5. BUSINESS		109.	10.9 %
6. BIOLOGY		32.	3.2 %
7. MEDICINE		205.	20.5 %
8. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	13.	1.3 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

AGGREGATE RESULTS

****

Q. 40: Q1:M2 ADVISE RE CAREER		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. COM PROGRAMMING		203.	20.6 %
2. LAW		172.	17.5 %
3. ENGINEERING		145.	14.7 %
4. TEACHING		95.	9.6 %
5. BUSINESS		111.	11.3 %
6. BIOLOGY		47.	4.8 %
7. MEDICINE		212.	21.5 %
8. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	0.	0.0 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		985.	100.0 %

Q. 41: Q29:M1 RSN CDA INV SPACE		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NATIONAL PRESTIGE		30.	3.0 %
2. KEEP UP TECHNOLOG		303.	30.3 %
3. MAINTAIN GOOD RELTNS		73.	7.3 %
4. PROV IND/ECO BEN		179.	17.9 %
5. FUND L T RESEARCH		165.	16.5 %
6. BE PART SPACE EXPL		67.	6.7 %
7. PROVIDE COMM SERVICE		163.	16.3 %
8. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	20.	2.0 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		1000.	100.0 %

Q. 42: Q29:M2 RSN CDA INV SPACE		RESPONDENTS	PERCENT
1. NATIONAL PRESTIGE		40.	4.1 %
2. KEEP UP TECHNOLOG		176.	18.1 %
3. MAINTAIN GOOD RELTNS		114.	11.7 %
4. PROV IND/ECO BEN		193.	19.9 %
5. FUND L T RESEARCH		195.	20.1 %
6. BE PART SPACE EXPL		79.	8.1 %
7. PROVIDE COMM SERVICE		175.	18.0 %
8. (NO OPINION)	(N/A)	0.	0.0 %
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		972.	100.0 %

INDEX TO CROSSTABULATIONS

The index to crosstabulations indicate to the reader which questions were asked, by number and abbreviated wording, to create tables called crosstabulations. The table numbers and the pages on which each is printed are listed to assist the reader in locating particular tables.

This table of contents also provides information on the strength of association between the questions "crosstabulated" in each table. The strength of association or "statistical confidence" is indicated by symbols to the left of the table's page number. For most tables, the chi-square statistic code is presented. If only means and standard errors are reported, the strongest t-test result for any row of the table is used to determine the statistic code. The following system of symbols is used:

SYMBOL	"CONFIDENCE LEVEL"[2]
***	99%
**	95%
*	90%
+	80%
N/S	Not significant
N/A	Statistical test is not applicable
FEW	Too few respondents in a category to undertake a t-analysis

Using this table of contents, the reader may quickly locate areas of particular interest. Furthermore, by identifying those statistically significant tables, the reader may zero in on the aspects of the data which are most likely to result in meaningful findings. However, the substantive significance, political or marketing, of a crosstabulation depends on more than just its statistical significance.

[2] The reported "confidence level" indicates the probability that the association observed between questions in the crosstabulations did not occur simply as a matter of chance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX TO CROSSTABULATIONS

The special index to crosstabulations enables the reader to find particular tables in an organized manner. Referring to the variable in the right-hand column as the "dependent variable" and all other variables used in a particular tabulation as "independent variables":

- All tables using a particular question as a dependent variable are listed immediately after "THE LIST OF TABLES USING Q.### BEGINS HERE";
- All tables using a particular question as an independent variable are listed following the list of tables (if any) using the same question as an independent variable. These, too, are sorted according to the dependent variable used; and
- Three and four variable tables follow the list of two variable tables.

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

XTAB	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	SIG	PAGE
	######	THE LIST OF TABLES USING Q. 1 BEGINS HERE. ######				
275	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	1	ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE	+	129
273	16	MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH	1	ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE	+	127
274	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	1	ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE	+	128
1	31	AGE	1	ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE	N/S	1
2	32	ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME	1	ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE	***	1
3	33	EDUCATION	1	ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE	+	1
4	34	SEX	1	ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE	***	1
5	35	LANGUAGE	1	ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE	***	2
6	36	SAMPLE STRATA	1	ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE	N/A	2
7	37	REGION	1	ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE	+	2
8	38	COMMUNITY SIZE	1	ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE	*	2
	######	THE LIST OF TABLES USING Q. 2 BEGINS HERE. ######				
276	16	MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	***	130
277	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	+	131
9	31	AGE	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	***	3
10	32	ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	+	3
11	33	EDUCATION	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	***	3
12	34	SEX	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	N/S	3
13	35	LANGUAGE	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	***	4
14	36	SAMPLE STRATA	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	**	4
15	37	REGION	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	**	4

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

XTAB	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	SIG	PAGE
16	38	COMMUNITY SIZE	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	**	4
275	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	1	ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE	+	129
280	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	3	CDA SELL INTL MARKTS	N/A	134
283	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	4	CDA DEV OWN SCI/TECH	N/A	137
286	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	5	CDA KEEP UP WT TECH WARS	N/A	140
289	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	6	SCI/TECH INNOV COME FROM	*	143
292	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	***	146
295	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	8	WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?	***	149
298	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	9	FED GOVT SHD EMPHASIZE	*	152
301	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	N/S	155
304	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	11	WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?	N/S	158
374	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	12	EMPH SCI/TECH:SEEK CURES	N/S	233
376	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	13	EMPH SCI/TECH:EFF COMP	N/S	235
378	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	14	EMPH SCI/TECH:NAT RESC	N/S	237
380	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	15	EMPH SCI/TECH:INCR EMPL	*	239
382	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	16	MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH	***	241
321	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	17	HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH	N/S	175
324	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	18	WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ	N/A	182
326	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	+	185
329	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	20	GOVT ROLE IN DEV CDN TCH	N/S	188
332	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	21	AMT $ SCI/TECH PAST YEAR	N/S	191
335	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	22	PROM TECH/TAX BREAKS	N/S	194

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

XTAB	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	SIG	PAGE
338	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	23	PROM TECH/FNDS TO SCHOOL	N/S	197
341	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	24	PROM TECH/SCHOLARSHIPS	N/S	200
344	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	25	PROM TECH/FND UNIV/COMP	N/S	203
347	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	26	PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE	**	206
350	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	27	DO MST STIM SCI/TECH	N/S	209
353	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	28	HEARD OF INNOVACTION	N/S	212
356	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	29	RSN CDA INV IN SPACE	+	215
359	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	30	PRI SPACE PROG VS OTHER	N/S	218

THE LIST OF TABLES USING Q. 3 BEGINS HERE.

280	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	3	CDA SELL INTL MARKTS	N/A	134
278	16	MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH	3	CDA SELL INTL MARKTS	N/A	132
279	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	3	CDA SELL INTL MARKTS	N/A	133
17	31	AGE	3	CDA SELL INTL MARKTS	N/A	5
18	32	ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME	3	CDA SELL INTL MARKTS	N/A	5
19	33	EDUCATION	3	CDA SELL INTL MARKTS	N/A	6
20	34	SEX	3	CDA SELL INTL MARKTS	N/A	6
21	35	LANGUAGE	3	CDA SELL INTL MARKTS	N/A	6
22	36	SAMPLE STRATA	3	CDA SELL INTL MARKTS	N/A	7
23	37	REGION	3	CDA SELL INTL MARKTS	N/A	7
24	38	COMMUNITY SIZE	3	CDA SELL INTL MARKTS	N/A	8
375	3	CDA SELL INTL MARKTS	12	EMPH SCI/TECH:SEEK CURES	N/A	234
377	3	CDA SELL INTL MARKTS	13	EMPH SCI/TECH:EFF COMP	N/A	236

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

XTAB	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	SIG	PAGE
292	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	***	146
368	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	***	227
369	11	WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	***	228
290	16	MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	**	144
291	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	N/S	145
49	31	AGE	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	N/S	17
50	32	ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	***	19
51	33	EDUCATION	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	***	19
52	34	SEX	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	***	19
53	35	LANGUAGE	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	***	20
54	36	SAMPLE STRATA	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	***	20
55	37	REGION	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	***	20
56	38	COMMUNITY SIZE	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	*	20
361	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	***	220
364	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	11	WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?	***	223

THE LIST OF TABLES USING Q. 8 BEGINS HERE.

295	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	8	WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?	***	149
370	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	8	WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?	***	229
371	11	WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?	8	WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?	***	230
293	16	MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH	8	WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?	**	147
294	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	8	WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?	+	148
57	31	AGE	8	WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?	**	21

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

XTAB	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	SIG	PAGE
301	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	N/S	155
360	6	SCI/TECH INNOV COME FROM	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	***	219
361	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	***	220
362	8	WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	***	221
299	16	MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	N/S	153
300	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	+	154
73	31	AGE	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	**	25
74	32	ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	***	25
75	33	EDUCATION	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	***	25
76	34	SEX	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	***	25
77	35	LANGUAGE	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	*	26
78	36	SAMPLE STRATA	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	N/A	26
79	37	REGION	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	N/S	26
80	38	COMMUNITY SIZE	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	N/S	26
366	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	6	SCI/TECH INNOV COME FROM	***	225
368	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	***	227
370	10	WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?	8	WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?	***	229

THE LIST OF TABLES USING Q. 11 BEGINS HERE.

304	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	11	WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?	N/S	158
363	6	SCI/TECH INNOV COME FROM	11	WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?	***	222
364	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	11	WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?	***	223
365	8	WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?	11	WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?	***	224

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

XTAB	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	SIG	PAGE
129	31	AGE	17	HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH	N/S	47
130	32	ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME	17	HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH	***	47
131	33	EDUCATION	17	HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH	***	47
132	34	SEX	17	HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH	***	47
133	35	LANGUAGE	17	HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH	N/S	48
134	36	SAMPLE STRATA	17	HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH	N/A	48
135	37	REGION	17	HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH	*	48
136	38	COMMUNITY SIZE	17	HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH	***	48
372	17	HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	+	231
373	17	HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH	28	HEARD OF INNOVACTION	+	232
	######	THE LIST OF TABLES USING Q. 18 BEGINS HERE. ######				
324	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	18	WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ	N/A	182
322	16	MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH	18	WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ	N/A	176
323	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	18	WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ	N/A	179
137	31	AGE	18	WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ	N/A	49
138	32	ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME	18	WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ	N/A	53
139	33	EDUCATION	18	WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ	N/A	57
140	34	SEX	18	WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ	N/A	61
141	35	LANGUAGE	18	WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ	N/A	63
142	36	SAMPLE STRATA	18	WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ	N/A	65
143	37	REGION	18	WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ	N/A	71
144	38	COMMUNITY SIZE	18	WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ	N/A	74
	######	THE LIST OF TABLES USING Q. 19 BEGINS HERE. ######				

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

XTAB	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	SIG	PAGE
306	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	12	EMPH SCI/TECH:SEEK CURES	N/S	160
309	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	13	EMPH SCI/TECH:EFF COMP	N/S	163
312	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	14	EMPH SCI/TECH:NAT RESC	+	166
315	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	15	EMPH SCI/TECH:INCR EMPL	***	169
317	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	16	MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH	N/S	171
320	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	17	HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH	+	174
323	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	18	WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ	N/A	179
328	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	20	GOVT ROLE IN DEV CDN TCH	***	187
331	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	21	AMT $ SCI/TECH PAST YEAR	***	190
334	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	22	PROM TECH/TAX BREAKS	***	193
337	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	23	PROM TECH/FNDS TO SCHOOL	N/A	196
340	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	24	PROM TECH/SCHOLARSHIPS	*	199
343	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	25	PROM TECH/FND UNIV/COMP	N/A	202
346	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	26	PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE	N/A	205
349	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	27	DO MST STIM SCI/TECH	N/S	208
352	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	28	HEARD OF INNOVACTION	N/S	211
355	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	29	RSN CDA INV IN SPACE	N/S	214
358	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	30	PRI SPACE PROG VS OTHER	+	217

THE LIST OF TABLES USING Q. 20 BEGINS HERE.

329	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	20	GOVT ROLE IN DEV CDN TCH	N/S	188
327	16	MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH	20	GOVT ROLE IN DEV CDN TCH	N/S	186
328	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	20	GOVT ROLE IN DEV CDN TCH	***	187

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

XTAB	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	SIG	PAGE
200	38	COMMUNITY SIZE	25	PROM TECH/FND UNIV/COMP	N/S	104
	######	THE LIST OF TABLES USING Q. 26 BEGINS HERE.	######			
347	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	26	PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE	**	206
345	16	MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH	26	PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE	N/S	204
346	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	26	PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE	N/A	205
201	31	AGE	26	PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE	N/A	105
202	32	ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME	26	PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE	N/A	105
203	33	EDUCATION	26	PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE	N/A	106
204	34	SEX	26	PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE	*	106
205	35	LANGUAGE	26	PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE	***	106
206	36	SAMPLE STRATA	26	PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE	N/A	107
207	37	REGION	26	PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE	***	107
208	38	COMMUNITY SIZE	26	PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE	***	108
	######	THE LIST OF TABLES USING Q. 27 BEGINS HERE.	######			
350	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	27	DO MST STIM SCI/TECH	N/S	209
348	16	MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH	27	DO MST STIM SCI/TECH	*	207
349	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	27	DO MST STIM SCI/TECH	N/S	208
209	31	AGE	27	DO MST STIM SCI/TECH	***	109
210	32	ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME	27	DO MST STIM SCI/TECH	***	109
211	33	EDUCATION	27	DO MST STIM SCI/TECH	*	109
212	34	SEX	27	DO MST STIM SCI/TECH	N/S	109
213	35	LANGUAGE	27	DO MST STIM SCI/TECH	***	110

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

XTAB	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	SIG	PAGE
214	36	SAMPLE STRATA	27	DO MST STIM SCI/TECH	N/A	110
215	37	REGION	27	DO MST STIM SCI/TECH	***	110
216	38	COMMUNITY SIZE	27	DO MST STIM SCI/TECH	N/S	110
	######	THE LIST OF TABLES USING Q. 28 BEGINS HERE. ######				
353	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	28	HEARD OF INNOVACTION	N/S	212
351	16	MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH	28	HEARD OF INNOVACTION	N/S	210
373	17	HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH	28	HEARD OF INNOVACTION	+	232
352	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	28	HEARD OF INNOVACTION	N/S	211
217	31	AGE	28	HEARD OF INNOVACTION	N/S	111
218	32	ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME	28	HEARD OF INNOVACTION	+	111
219	33	EDUCATION	28	HEARD OF INNOVACTION	N/S	111
220	34	SEX	28	HEARD OF INNOVACTION	N/S	111
221	35	LANGUAGE	28	HEARD OF INNOVACTION	N/S	112
222	36	SAMPLE STRATA	28	HEARD OF INNOVACTION	N/A	112
223	37	REGION	28	HEARD OF INNOVACTION	**	112
224	38	COMMUNITY SIZE	28	HEARD OF INNOVACTION	+	112
	######	THE LIST OF TABLES USING Q. 29 BEGINS HERE. ######				
356	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	29	RSN CDA INV IN SPACE	+	215
354	16	MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH	29	RSN CDA INV IN SPACE	+	213
355	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	29	RSN CDA INV IN SPACE	N/S	214
225	31	AGE	29	RSN CDA INV IN SPACE	**	113
226	32	ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME	29	RSN CDA INV IN SPACE	+	113

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

THE LIST OF TABLES USING Q. 33 BEGINS HERE.

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

XTAB	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	SIG	PAGE
179	33	EDUCATION	23	PROM TECH/FNDS TO SCHOOL	N/A	94
187	33	EDUCATION	24	PROM TECH/SCHOLARSHIPS	+	98
195	33	EDUCATION	25	PROM TECH/FND UNIV/COMP	N/A	102
203	33	EDUCATION	26	PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE	N/A	106
211	33	EDUCATION	27	DO MST STIM SCI/TECH	*	109
219	33	EDUCATION	28	HEARD OF INNOVACTION	N/S	111
227	33	EDUCATION	29	RSN CDA INV IN SPACE	***	113
235	33	EDUCATION	30	PRI SPACE PROG VS OTHER	*	116
243	33	EDUCATION	39	Q1:M1 ADVISE RE CAREER	+	119
251	33	EDUCATION	40	Q1:M2 ADVISE RE CAREER	N/S	121
259	33	EDUCATION	41	Q29:M1 RSN CDA INV SPACE	***	123
267	33	EDUCATION	42	Q29:M2 RSN CDA INV SPACE	***	125
	######	THE LIST OF TABLES USING Q. 34 BEGINS HERE. ######				
4	34	SEX	1	ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE	***	1
12	34	SEX	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	N/S	3
20	34	SEX	3	CDA SELL INTL MARKTS	N/A	6
28	34	SEX	4	CDA DEV OWN SCI/TECH	N/A	10
36	34	SEX	5	CDA KEEP UP WT TECH WARS	N/A	14
44	34	SEX	6	SCI/TECH INNOV COME FROM	**	17
52	34	SEX	7	WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?	***	19
60	34	SEX	8	WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?	**	21
68	34	SEX	9	FED GOVT SHD EMPHASIZE	**	23

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

XTAB	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	SIG	PAGE
149	35	LANGUAGE	19	RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI	***	78
157	35	LANGUAGE	20	GOVT ROLE IN DEV CDN TCH	N/S	82
165	35	LANGUAGE	21	AMT $ SCI/TECH PAST YEAR	*	86
173	35	LANGUAGE	22	PROM TECH/TAX BREAKS	***	90
181	35	LANGUAGE	23	PROM TECH/FNDS TO SCHOOL	***	94
189	35	LANGUAGE	24	PROM TECH/SCHOLARSHIPS	*	98
197	35	LANGUAGE	25	PROM TECH/FND UNIV/COMP	***	102
205	35	LANGUAGE	26	PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE	***	106
213	35	LANGUAGE	27	DO MST STIM SCI/TECH	***	110
221	35	LANGUAGE	28	HEARD OF INNOVACTION	N/S	112
229	35	LANGUAGE	29	RSN CDA INV IN SPACE	***	114
237	35	LANGUAGE	30	PRI SPACE PROG VS OTHER	*	116
245	35	LANGUAGE	39	Q1:M1 ADVISE RE CAREER	***	120
253	35	LANGUAGE	40	Q1:M2 ADVISE RE CAREER	**	122
261	35	LANGUAGE	41	Q29:M1 RSN CDA INV SPACE	**	124
269	35	LANGUAGE	42	Q29:M2 RSN CDA INV SPACE	*	126
	######	THE LIST OF TABLES USING Q. 36 BEGINS HERE.	######			
6	36	SAMPLE STRATA	1	ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE	N/A	2
14	36	SAMPLE STRATA	2	GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP	**	4
22	36	SAMPLE STRATA	3	CDA SELL INTL MARKTS	N/A	7
30	36	SAMPLE STRATA	4	CDA DEV OWN SCI/TECH	N/A	11
38	36	SAMPLE STRATA	5	CDA KEEP UP WT TECH WARS	N/A	15

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

SPECIAL INDEX: CROSS-TABULATIONS

****

XTAB	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	Q#	QUESTION DESCRIPTION	SIG	PAGE
270	36	SAMPLE STRATA	42	Q29:M2 RSN CDA INV SPACE	N/A	126
271	37	REGION	42	Q29:M2 RSN CDA INV SPACE	***	126
272	38	COMMUNITY SIZE	42	Q29:M2 RSN CDA INV SPACE	*	126

CROSSTABULATIONS

Crosstabulations are designed to compare the responses to two or more questions in a tabular form. For example, knowing how the total group interviewed feels about a particular question may not be as helpful as knowing the specific reactions of the young, the middle-aged, or the elderly. Crosstabulations provide answers as to who holds what opinion.

At the bottom of each crosstabulation, the results of a statistical calculation known as chi-square are shown, if applicable. Chi-square analysis is a way of measuring the degree of statistical association between two questions. Printing these on each table, as well as in the index to crosstabulations, provides a means for the reader to determine which tables are most worthy of attention. Since "(NO OPINION)" and (N/A)[3] answers are not included in this analysis, the computation is not distorted by differences among groups in terms of their actual attitudes.

When the mean is a relevant measure in a variable included in a crosstabulation, it is computed and reported for each category of the "independent variable(s)," along with the standard error of the mean and an indication of the value of the t-statistic, which compares the mean for the one group with the mean of all other groups. (NOTE: At the option of the client, output can be supplied without these statistics, enhancing readability at the expense of some statistical detail and power. In any event, the "full statistics" output described is used as the basis for all analysis performed by Decima Research.

3 (N/A) = Not applicable.

In all these tables, data are to be read across the rows. Consider this data array:

		(1)	(2)	(3)
Men	(292)	37.0%	28.8%	34.2%
Women	(308)	29.6%	20.4%	50.0%

It is to be interpreted as follows: 37.0% of men gave answer (1), described in the page's heading, not that 37.0% of those giving answer (1) were men; and 292 men answered this particular question.

The information provided can be used to compute the actual number of respondents of a given type holding an opinion; here, 37.0% of 292 = 108, so 108 of the men interviewed chose answer (1).

Reading crosstabulations is relatively straightforward. They are akin to the way results of political polls are usually presented in newspapers and newsmagazines. There are four kinds of tables (in any particular study, one or more of these kinds of tables may not appear):

- Those reporting on one independent variable operating on one dependent variable;
- Those reporting on two or three independent variables operating, simultaneously, on one dependent variable;
- Those reporting on two or more independent variables, and their several relationships, with a particular dependent variable; and
- Those reporting only the mean and standard error of answers to one question among those belonging to a specific group as determined by another question or group of questions.

The second type is like the first, but each page reports only those respondents which specified answers to one or two "filtering" questions, answers to which are shown in the heading on each page.

TABLE 1

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 1. ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 1:
1) COM PROGRAMMING
2) LAW
3) ENGINEERING
4) TEACHING
5) BUSINESS
6) BIOLOGY
7) MEDICINE
8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	55.2	27.6	26.9	16.1	22.0	7.9	41.5	1.3
TABLE 1 IS Q. 31 X Q. 1								
AGE								
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	46.9	35.4	27.9	18.4	25.9	9.5	36.1	0.0
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	61.7	27.0	26.3	15.7	23.4	4.7	40.1	0.4
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	52.3	28.6	25.0	16.4	23.6	8.6	41.8	1.8
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	57.4	23.3	24.0	16.3	21.7	10.1	44.2	1.6
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	57.7	22.1	26.0	14.4	19.2	8.7	50.0	1.0
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	51.2	26.8	34.1	15.4	13.8	8.9	40.7	4.1
IND VAR 31								
DEP N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA								
1 WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION								
TABLE 2 IS Q. 32 X Q. 1								
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME								
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	51.1	27.2	21.7	21.7	14.1	15.2	46.7	1.1
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	59.6	24.9	23.9	18.8	20.7	8.9	38.0	2.3
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	60.8	29.7	26.9	19.8	16.0	5.7	39.2	0.9
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	58.2	27.7	27.1	13.6	24.9	7.3	40.7	0.0
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	40.2	36.4	35.5	5.6	24.3	7.5	46.7	1.9
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	50.3	23.9	28.4	14.8	31.0	6.5	43.9	0.6
IND VAR 32								
DEP N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA								
1 WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION								
TABLE 3 IS Q. 33 X Q. 1								
EDUCATION								
PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL< 93>	60.2	19.4	26.9	20.4	11.8	14.0	40.9	3.2
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	56.5	32.2	24.3	17.5	19.2	7.3	40.1	1.1
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	59.6	29.5	27.7	14.4	21.4	5.3	39.3	1.4
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	55.2	27.3	30.1	14.7	18.2	7.0	44.8	1.4
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY< 218>	49.5	22.0	28.0	15.1	29.8	9.6	44.5	0.5
AT SCHOOL < 75>	46.7	33.3	22.7	20.0	26.7	8.0	40.0	1.3
IND VAR 33								
DEP N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA								
1 WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION								
TABLE 4 IS Q. 34 X Q. 1								
SEX								
MALE < 499>	52.1	27.9	35.3	12.8	21.2	8.2	39.7	1.2
FEMALE < 501>	57.9	27.3	18.4	19.6	22.8	7.6	43.7	1.4
IND VAR 34								
DEP N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA								
1 WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION								

TABLE 5

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 1. ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 1: 1) COM PROGRAMMING 2) LAW
3) ENGINEERING 4) TEACHING
5) BUSINESS 6) BIOLOGY
7) MEDICINE 8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	55.2	27.6	26.9	16.1	22.0	7.9	41.5	1.3
TABLE 5 IS Q. 35 X Q. 1								
LANGUAGE								
ENGLISH < 754>	56.0	29.7	25.5	16.8	22.0	5.8	40.6	1.7
FRENCH < 246>	52.0	21.1	30.9	14.2	22.0	14.2	45.1	0.0
DEP N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA								
1 WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION								
TABLE 6 IS Q. 36 X Q. 1								
SAMPLE STRATA								
B.C. < 113>	62.8	25.7	26.5	15.9	24.8	5.3	36.3	0.9
ALBERTA < 92>	50.0	37.0	28.3	14.1	22.8	7.6	40.2	0.0
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	55.0	40.0	25.0	22.5	15.0	0.0	32.5	5.0
MANITOBA < 42>	61.9	19.0	28.6	14.3	16.7	9.5	40.5	4.8
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	56.9	26.2	25.8	20.2	23.6	5.6	38.6	1.5
METRO < 88>	52.3	33.0	18.2	11.4	26.1	3.4	48.9	3.4
QUEBEC < 265>	52.8	23.4	30.9	12.8	21.1	12.8	44.9	0.4
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	55.2	17.2	20.7	24.1	27.6	13.8	41.4	0.0
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	48.6	37.1	25.7	20.0	5.7	14.3	48.6	0.0
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND< 5>	40.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	0.0
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	50.0	33.3	29.2	16.7	16.7	0.0	54.2	0.0
DEP N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA								
1 WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION								
TABLE 7 IS Q. 37 X Q. 1								
REGION								
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	62.8	25.7	26.5	15.9	24.8	5.3	36.3	0.9
PRAIRIES < 174>	54.0	33.3	27.6	16.1	19.5	6.3	38.5	2.3
ONTARIO < 355>	55.8	27.9	23.9	18.0	24.2	5.1	41.1	2.0
QUEBEC < 265>	52.8	23.4	30.9	12.8	21.1	12.8	44.9	0.4
ATLANTIC < 93>	50.5	30.1	24.7	19.4	17.2	10.8	47.3	0.0
DEP N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA								
1 WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION								
TABLE 8 IS Q. 38 X Q. 1								
COMMUNITY SIZE								
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	56.1	27.6	27.6	11.2	24.5	5.1	43.5	2.0
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	53.1	28.5	27.3	20.0	22.7	8.8	37.3	1.2
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	56.0	14.0	30.0	20.0	16.0	10.0	51.0	1.0
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	55.2	30.9	24.9	16.5	21.1	9.0	40.8	0.9
DEP N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA								
1 WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION								

TABLE 9

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 2: 1) RESOURCE SECTOR 2) MANUF SECTOR
3) SERVICE SECTOR 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	45.3	29.5	24.2	1.0
TABLE 9 IS Q. 31 X Q. 2				
AGE				
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	42.9	32.7	23.8	0.7
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	40.1	30.3	29.2	0.4
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	44.1	26.4	28.6	0.9
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	43.4	27.9	27.9	0.8
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	57.7	31.7	8.7	1.9
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	53.7	29.3	14.6	2.4

HLD 31 DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
2	987	10	29.527	0.9990	-0.121	***	0.122	-0.098C	-0.126	-0.081	0.000

TABLE 10 IS Q. 32 X Q. 2				
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME				
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	57.6	23.9	18.5	0.0
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	45.1	31.5	21.6	1.9
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	47.2	27.4	25.5	0.0
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	41.8	33.9	24.3	0.0
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	46.7	23.4	29.0	0.9
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	38.7	30.3	29.7	1.3

HLD 32 DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
2	949	10	13.988	0.8265	0.087	***	0.086	0.078C	0.098	0.063	0.000

TABLE 11 IS Q. 33 X Q. 2				
EDUCATION				
PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	62.4	24.7	9.7	3.2
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	49.7	32.8	16.4	1.1
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	47.4	31.2	20.7	0.7
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	35.7	30.1	33.6	0.7
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 213>	38.1	26.1	34.9	0.9
AT SCHOOL < 75>	44.0	32.0	24.0	0.0

HLD 33 DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
2	981	10	44.916	1.0000	0.167	***	0.151	0.151C	0.195	0.126	0.000

TABLE 12 IS Q. 34 X Q. 2				
SEX				
MALE < 499>	45.1	29.9	24.0	1.0
FEMALE < 501>	45.5	29.3	24.2	1.0

HLD 34 DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
2	990	2	0.033	0.0166	-0.002		0.006	-0.003C	-0.004	-0.003	0.000

TABLE 13

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 2: 1) RESOURCE SECTOR 2) MANUF SECTOR
3) SERVICE SECTOR 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	45.3	29.5	24.2	1.0

TABLE 13 IS Q. 35 X Q. 2

LANGUAGE

ENGLISH < 754>	41.6	32.4	24.7	1.3
FRENCH < 246>	56.5	21.1	22.4	0.0

IND 35 DEP

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
2 990	2	17.195	0.9998	-0.090	***	0.132	-0.092C	-0.193	-0.123	0.000

TABLE 14 IS Q. 36 X Q. 2

SAMPLE STRATA

B.C. < 113>	40.7	34.5	23.0	1.8
ALBERTA < 92>	48.9	22.8	28.3	0.0
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	37.5	30.0	32.5	0.0
MANITOBA < 42>	38.1	35.7	23.8	2.4
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	40.3	37.5	20.6	1.1
METRO < 88>	39.8	23.9	33.0	3.4
QUEBEC < 265>	54.0	22.6	23.4	0.0
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	44.8	44.8	10.3	0.0
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	45.7	25.7	28.6	0.0
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	40.0	40.0	20.0	0.0
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	54.2	16.7	25.0	4.2

IND 36 DEP

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
2 990	20	34.829	0.9790	-0.045		0.133	-0.052C	-0.065	-0.042	0.000

TABLE 15 IS Q. 37 X Q. 2

REGION

BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	40.7	34.5	23.0	1.8
PRAIRIES < 174>	43.7	27.6	28.2	0.6
ONTARIO < 355>	40.6	34.1	23.7	1.7
QUEBEC < 265>	54.0	22.6	23.4	0.0
ATLANTIC < 93>	47.3	30.1	21.5	1.1

IND 37 DEP

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
2 990	8	16.255	0.9611	-0.056	*	0.091	-0.059C	-0.081	-0.052	0.000

TABLE 16 IS Q. 38 X Q. 2

COMMUNITY SIZE

1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	42.5	26.5	28.9	2.0
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	40.4	31.9	26.9	0.8
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	50.0	35.0	15.0	0.0
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	50.0	28.9	20.5	0.6

IND 38 DEP

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
2 990	6	15.401	0.9826	-0.093	***	0.088	-0.078C	-0.112	-0.072	0.000

TABLE 17

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 3. CDA SELL INTL MARKTS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 3: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.3	3.1	22.8	73.5	0.3
TABLE 17 IS Q. 31 X Q. 3					
AGE					
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	0.7	4.8	27.2	66.7	0.7
(AVG.= 3.61 SIG.LOWER **)					
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	0.0	4.4	24.8	70.8	0.0
(AVG.= 3.66 SIG.LOWER +)					
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	0.0	2.7	22.3	75.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.72 NO SIG.DIFF)					
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	0.0	0.8	14.7	84.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.84 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	1.0	1.9	25.0	71.2	1.0
(AVG.= 3.68 NO SIG.DIFF)					
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	0.8	2.4	20.3	75.6	0.8
(AVG.= 3.72 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
3	994	15	20.432	0.8440	0.068	**	0.083	0.053C	0.123	0.049	0.000

TABLE 18 IS Q. 32 X Q. 3

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME					
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	0.0	5.4	33.7	59.8	1.1
(AVG.= 3.55 SIG.LOWER ***)					
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	0.5	1.9	29.6	67.6	0.5
(AVG.= 3.65 SIG.LOWER +)					
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	0.5	4.2	19.8	75.0	0.5
(AVG.= 3.70 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	0.0	2.8	19.8	77.4	0.0
(AVG.= 3.75 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	0.0	4.7	16.8	78.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.74 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	0.0	1.3	19.4	79.4	0.0
(AVG.= 3.78 SIG.HIGHR **)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
3	953	15	26.467	0.9666	0.114	***	0.096	0.082C	0.186	0.075	0.000

TABLE 19

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 3. CDA SELL INTL MARKTS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 3: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.3	3.1	22.8	73.5	0.3

TABLE 19 IS Q. 33 X Q. 3

EDUCATION

PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	0.0	4.3	34.4	61.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.57 SIG.LOWER **)					
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	0.6	5.6	26.6	65.5	1.7
(AVG.= 3.60 SIG.LOWER ***)					
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	0.4	1.8	23.5	74.4	0.0
(AVG.= 3.72 NO SIG.DIFF)					
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	0.7	3.5	18.2	77.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.73 NO SIG.DIFF)					
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	0.0	2.3	17.4	80.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.78 SIG.HIGHR **)					
AT SCHOOL < 75>	0.0	2.7	21.3	76.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.73 NO SIG.DIFF)					

IND 33 DEP 3

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
988	15	24.674	0.9455	0.116	***	0.091	0.082C	0.183	0.076	0.000

TABLE 20 IS Q. 34 X Q. 3

SEX

MALE < 499>	0.6	3.2	19.2	76.8	0.2
(AVG.= 3.72 SIG.HIGHR +)					
FEMALE < 501>	0.0	3.0	26.1	70.5	0.4
(AVG.= 3.68 SIG.LOWER +)					

IND 34 DEP 3

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
997	3	9.651	0.9782	-0.044		0.098	-0.057C	-0.142	-0.057	0.000

TABLE 21 IS Q. 35 X Q. 3

LANGUAGE

ENGLISH < 754>	0.4	1.5	15.0	82.8	0.4
(AVG.= 3.81 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
FRENCH < 246>	0.0	3.1	46.3	45.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.37 SIG.LOWER ***)					

IND 35 DEP 3

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
997	3	142.579	1.0000	-0.348	***	0.378	-0.282C	-0.688	-0.379	0.000

TABLE 22

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 3. CDA SELL INTL MARKTS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 3: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.3	3.1	22.8	73.5	0.3
TABLE 22 IS Q. 36 X Q. 3					
SAMPLE STRATA					
B.C. < 113>	0.0	0.9	9.7	89.4	0.0
(AVG.= 3.88 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
ALBERTA < 92>	0.0	4.3	20.7	75.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.71 NO SIG.DIFF)					
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	2.5	0.0	25.0	72.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.67 NO SIG.DIFF)					
MANITOBA < 42>	0.0	0.0	19.0	81.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.81 SIG.HIGHR +)					
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	0.4	1.5	13.1	84.6	0.4
(AVG.= 3.83 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
METRO < 88>	1.1	0.0	10.2	88.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.86 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
QUEBEC < 265>	0.0	7.9	43.0	49.1	0.0
(AVG.= 3.41 SIG.LOWER ***)					
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	0.0	0.0	31.0	65.5	3.4
(AVG.= 3.68 NO SIG.DIFF)					
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	0.0	2.9	20.0	74.3	2.9
(AVG.= 3.74 NO SIG.DIFF)					
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
(AVG.= 4.00 T-TEST IS N/A)					
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	0.0	0.0	20.8	79.2	0.0
(AVG.= 3.79 T-TEST IS N/A)					

IND DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
36 3	997	30	151.348	1.0000	-0.158	***	0.225	-0.144C	-0.323	-0.131	0.000

TABLE 23 IS Q. 37 X Q. 3						
REGION						
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	0.0	0.9	9.7	89.4	0.0	
(AVG.= 3.88 SIG.HIGHR ***)						
PRAIRIES < 174>	0.6	2.3	21.3	75.9	0.0	
(AVG.= 3.72 NO SIG.DIFF)						
ONTARIO < 355>	0.6	1.1	12.4	85.6	0.3	
(AVG.= 3.84 SIG.HIGHR ***)						
QUEBEC < 265>	0.0	7.9	43.0	49.1	0.0	
(AVG.= 3.41 SIG.LOWER ***)						
ATLANTIC < 93>	0.0	1.1	22.6	74.2	2.2	
(AVG.= 3.75 NO SIG.DIFF)						

IND DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
37 3	997	12	136.030	1.0000	-0.189	***	0.213	-0.148C	-0.353	-0.148	0.000

TABLE 24

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 3. CDA SELL INTL MARKTS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 3: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.3	3.1	22.8	73.5	0.3
TABLE 24 IS Q. 38 X Q. 3					
COMMUNITY SIZE					
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	0.3	2.4	21.4	75.9	0.0
(AVG.= 3.73 NO SIG.DIFF)					
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	0.0	3.1	16.9	79.6	0.4
(AVG.= 3.77 SIG.HIGHR **)					
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	0.0	2.0	16.0	81.0	1.0
(AVG.= 3.80 SIG.HIGHR *)					
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	0.6	4.0	30.1	65.0	0.3
(AVG.= 3.60 SIG.LOWER ***)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
3	997	9	23.824	0.9954	-0.102	***	0.089	-0.0928	-0.172	-0.069	0.000

TABLE 25

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 4. CDA DEV OWN SCI/TECH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 4: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.5	1.3	21.6	76.6

TABLE 25 IS Q. 31 X Q. 4

AGE

18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	0.7	2.0	26.5	70.7
(AVG.= 3.67 SIG.LOWER *)				
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	0.7	1.5	26.3	71.5
(AVG.= 3.69 SIG.LOWER **)				
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	0.5	0.5	18.6	80.5
(AVG.= 3.79 SIG.HIGHR +)				
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	0.0	1.6	20.9	77.5
(AVG.= 3.76 NO SIG.DIFF)				
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	1.0	2.9	15.4	80.8
(AVG.= 3.76 NO SIG.DIFF)				
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	0.0	0.0	16.3	83.7
(AVG.= 3.84 SIG.HIGHR **)				

DEP

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
4 997	15	19.547	0.8100	0.098	***	0.081	0.067C	0.169	0.062	0.000

TABLE 26 IS Q. 32 X Q. 4

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	0.0	1.1	19.6	79.3
(AVG.= 3.78 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	0.5	2.3	26.8	70.4
(AVG.= 3.67 SIG.LOWER **)				
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	0.9	0.9	24.5	73.6
(AVG.= 3.71 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	0.6	0.6	16.9	81.9
(AVG.= 3.80 SIG.HIGHR *)				
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	0.9	1.9	25.2	72.0
(AVG.= 3.68 SIG.LOWER +)				
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	0.0	1.3	13.5	85.2
(AVG.= 3.84 SIG.HIGHR ***)				

DEP

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
4 956	15	19.880	0.8234	0.067	**	0.083	0.048C	0.119	0.044	0.000

TABLE 27

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 4. CDA DEV OWN SCI/TECH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 4: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.5	1.3	21.6	76.6
TABLE 27 IS Q. 33 X Q. 4				
EDUCATION				
PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	0.0	2.2	22.6	75.3
(AVG.= 3.73 NO SIG.DIFF)				
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	0.6	2.3	26.6	70.6
(AVG.= 3.67 SIG.LOWER **)				
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	0.7	1.4	22.5	75.4
(AVG.= 3.73 NO SIG.DIFF)				
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	0.7	0.7	17.5	81.1
(AVG.= 3.79 NO SIG.DIFF)				
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 213>	0.5	0.5	18.8	80.3
(AVG.= 3.79 SIG.HIGHR +)				
AT SCHOOL < 75>	0.0	0.0	24.0	76.0
(AVG.= 3.76 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
4	991	15	11.677	0.2967	0.064	**	0.063	0.041C	0.105	0.039	0.000

TABLE 28 IS Q. 34 X Q. 4				
SEX				
MALE < 499>	1.0	1.6	20.0	77.4
(AVG.= 3.74 NO SIG.DIFF)				
FEMALE < 501>	0.0	1.0	23.2	75.8
(AVG.= 3.75 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
4	1000	3	6.921	0.9255	0.011		0.083	-0.011C	-0.030	-0.011	0.000

TABLE 29 IS Q. 35 X Q. 4				
LANGUAGE				
ENGLISH < 754>	0.4	0.8	20.0	78.8
(AVG.= 3.77 SIG.HIGHR ***)				
FRENCH < 246>	0.8	2.8	26.4	69.9
(AVG.= 3.65 SIG.LOWER ***)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
4	1000	3	12.049	0.9928	-0.102	***	0.110	-0.069C	-0.234	-0.093	0.000

TABLE 30

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 4. CDA DEV OWN SCI/TECH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 4: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.5	1.3	21.6	76.6
TABLE 30 IS Q. 36 X Q. 4				
SAMPLE STRATA				
B.C. < 113>	0.0	0.9	23.0	76.1
(AVG.= 3.75 NO SIG.DIFF)				
ALBERTA < 92>	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
(AVG.= 3.75 NO SIG.DIFF)				
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	0.0	2.5	15.0	82.5
(AVG.= 3.80 NO SIG.DIFF)				
MANITOBA < 42>	2.4	4.8	21.4	71.4
(AVG.= 3.62 SIG.LOWER *)				
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	0.7	0.0	14.6	84.6
(AVG.= 3.83 SIG.HIGHR ***)				
METRO < 88>	0.0	1.1	25.0	73.9
(AVG.= 3.73 NO SIG.DIFF)				
QUEBEC < 265>	0.8	2.3	26.4	70.6
(AVG.= 3.67 SIG.LOWER ***)				
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	0.0	6.9	27.6	65.5
(AVG.= 3.59 SIG.LOWER *)				
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	0.0	0.0	22.9	77.1
(AVG.= 3.77 NO SIG.DIFF)				
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
(AVG.= 4.00 T-TEST IS N/A)				
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	0.0	0.0	20.8	79.2
(AVG.= 3.79 T-TEST IS N/A)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
4	1000	30	41.807	0.9257	-0.036	0.118	-0.034C	-0.084	-0.031	0.000

TABLE 31 IS Q. 37 X Q. 4				
REGION				
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	0.0	0.9	23.0	76.1
(AVG.= 3.75 NO SIG.DIFF)				
PRAIRIES < 174>	0.6	1.7	21.8	75.9
(AVG.= 3.73 NO SIG.DIFF)				
ONTARIO < 355>	0.6	0.3	17.2	82.0
(AVG.= 3.81 SIG.HIGHR ***)				
QUEBEC < 265>	0.8	2.3	26.4	70.6
(AVG.= 3.67 SIG.LOWER ***)				
ATLANTIC < 93>	0.0	2.2	22.6	75.3
(AVG.= 3.73 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
4	1000	12	15.892	0.8037	-0.039	0.073	-0.028C	-0.075	-0.028	0.000

TABLE 32

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 4. CDA DEV OWN SCI/TECH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 4: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.5	1.3	21.6	76.6

TABLE 32 IS Q. 38 X Q. 4

COMMUNITY SIZE				
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294> (AVG.= 3.72 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.7	1.0	24.1	74.1
100,000 - 99,999 < 260> (AVG.= 3.78 SIG.HIGHR +)	0.4	0.8	19.2	79.6
10,000 - 99,999 < 100> (AVG.= 3.77 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.0	1.0	21.0	78.0
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346> (AVG.= 3.73 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.5	2.0	21.4	76.0

NO DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
4	1000	9	5.168	0.1806	-0.000	0.042	0.0098	0.018	0.007	0.000

TABLE 33

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 5. CDA KEEP UP WT TECH WARS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 5: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.8	2.8	26.3	70.0	0.1
TABLE 33 IS Q. 31 X Q. 5					
AGE					
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	0.7	3.4	25.2	70.1	0.7
(AVG.= 3.66 NO SIG.DIFF)					
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	1.1	1.5	32.1	65.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.62 SIG.LOWER +)					
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	0.9	3.6	22.7	72.7	0.0
(AVG.= 3.67 NO SIG.DIFF)					
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	0.8	1.6	22.5	75.2	0.0
(AVG.= 3.72 SIG.HIGHR +)					
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	1.0	3.8	26.9	68.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.63 NO SIG.DIFF)					
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	0.0	4.1	24.4	71.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.67 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
5	996	15	12.909	0.3906	0.021		0.066	0.021C	0.044	0.019	0.000

TABLE 34 IS Q. 32 X Q. 5					
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME					
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	1.1	6.5	26.1	66.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.58 SIG.LOWER +)					
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	1.4	3.8	27.7	66.7	0.5
(AVG.= 3.60 SIG.LOWER +)					
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	0.9	3.3	27.8	67.9	0.0
(AVG.= 3.63 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	0.6	0.6	26.6	72.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.71 SIG.HIGHR +)					
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	0.9	2.8	28.0	68.2	0.0
(AVG.= 3.64 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	0.0	0.6	22.6	76.8	0.0
(AVG.= 3.76 SIG.HIGHR **)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
5	955	15	16.955	0.6784	0.093	***	0.077	0.053C	0.109	0.048	0.000

TABLE 35

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 5. CDA KEEP UP WT TECH WARS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 5: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.8	2.8	26.3	70.0	0.1
TABLE 35 IS Q. 33 X Q. 5					
EDUCATION					
PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	0.0	5.4	26.9	67.7	0.0
(AVG.= 3.62 NO SIG.DIFF)					
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	1.1	5.1	29.9	63.8	0.0
(AVG.= 3.56 SIG.LOWER **)					
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	0.7	2.1	28.8	68.4	0.0
(AVG.= 3.65 NO SIG.DIFF)					
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	1.4	0.7	22.4	75.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.72 SIG.HIGHR +)					
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	0.9	2.3	24.8	72.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.68 NO SIG.DIFF)					
AT SCHOOL < 75>	0.0	2.7	20.0	76.0	1.3
(AVG.= 3.74 SIG.HIGHR +)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
S	990	15	16.641	0.6592	0.075	**	0.075	0.055C	0.116	0.051	0.000

TABLE 36 IS Q. 34 X Q. 5

SEX					
MALE < 499>	1.2	1.8	22.4	74.3	0.2
(AVG.= 3.70 SIG.HIGHR **)					
FEMALE < 501>	0.4	3.8	30.1	65.7	0.0
(AVG.= 3.61 SIG.LOWER **)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
S	999	3	13.866	0.9969	-0.080	**	0.118	-0.088C	-0.200	-0.088	0.000

TABLE 37 IS Q. 35 X Q. 5

LANGUAGE					
ENGLISH < 754>	0.8	2.9	23.6	72.5	0.1
(AVG.= 3.68 SIG.HIGHR **)					
FRENCH < 246>	0.8	2.4	34.6	62.2	0.0
(AVG.= 3.58 SIG.LOWER **)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
S	999	3	11.433	0.9904	-0.075	**	0.107	-0.074C	-0.213	-0.099	0.000

TABLE 38

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 5. CDA KEEP UP WT TECH WARS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 5:
1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT
2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
4) VERY IMPORTANT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.8	2.8	26.3	70.0	0.1

TABLE 38 IS Q. 36 X Q. 5

SAMPLE STRATA					
B.C. < 113>	0.0	2.7	22.1	75.2	0.0
(AVG.= 3.73 SIG.HIGHR +)					
ALBERTA < 92>	0.0	2.2	25.0	71.7	1.1
(AVG.= 3.70 NO SIG.DIFF)					
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	0.0	10.0	22.5	67.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.58 NO SIG.DIFF)					
MANITOBA < 42>	2.4	4.8	38.1	54.8	0.0
(AVG.= 3.45 SIG.LOWER **)					
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	1.1	1.9	21.3	75.7	0.0
(AVG.= 3.72 SIG.HIGHR *)					
METRO < 88>	0.0	2.3	21.6	76.1	0.0
(AVG.= 3.74 SIG.HIGHR +)					
QUEBEC < 265>	0.8	2.3	34.3	62.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.59 SIG.LOWER **)					
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	0.0	0.0	24.1	75.9	0.0
(AVG.= 3.76 NO SIG.DIFF)					
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	2.9	5.7	25.7	65.7	0.0
(AVG.= 3.54 NO SIG.DIFF)					
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	20.0	0.0	0.0	80.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.40 T-TEST IS N/A)					
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	0.0	8.3	29.2	62.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.54 T-TEST IS N/A)					

DEP 5	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	999	30	64.112	0.9997	-0.064	**	0.146	-0.044C	-0.091	-0.040	0.000

TABLE 39 IS Q. 37 X Q. 5

REGION					
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	0.0	2.7	22.1	75.2	0.0
(AVG.= 3.73 SIG.HIGHR +)					
PRAIRIES < 174>	0.6	4.6	27.6	66.7	0.6
(AVG.= 3.61 NO SIG.DIFF)					
ONTARIO < 355>	0.6	2.0	21.4	75.8	0.0
(AVG.= 3.72 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
QUEBEC < 265>	0.8	2.3	34.3	62.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.59 SIG.LOWER **)					
ATLANTIC < 93>	2.2	4.3	24.7	68.8	0.0
(AVG.= 3.60 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP 5	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	999	12	22.209	0.9648	-0.056	*	0.086	-0.041C	-0.092	-0.041	0.000

TABLE 40

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 5. CDA KEEP UP WT TECH WARS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 5: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.8	2.3	26.3	70.0	0.1
TABLE 40 IS Q. 38 X Q. 5					
COMMUNITY SIZE					
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	0.3	2.0	24.1	73.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.71 SIG.HIGHR *)					
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	0.8	2.7	20.8	75.4	0.4
(AVG.= 3.71 SIG.HIGHR *)					
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	2.0	3.0	27.0	68.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.61 NO SIG.DIFF)					
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	0.9	3.5	32.1	63.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.58 SIG.LOWER ***)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
5	999	9	15.410	0.9197	-0.099	***	0.072	-0.0888	-0.158	-0.069	0.000

TABLE 41

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 6. SCI/TECH INNOV COME FROM

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 6: 1) SMALL COMPANIES 2) LARGE COMPANIES
3) UNIVERSITIES 4) GOVERNMENT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	21.9	24.4	39.9	13.5	0.3

TABLE 41 IS Q. 31 X Q. 6

AGE

18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	17.7	22.4	42.2	17.7	0.0
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	20.1	27.7	37.2	15.0	0.0
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	24.1	28.2	36.8	10.5	0.5
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	27.1	25.6	34.9	12.4	0.0
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	21.2	17.3	46.2	14.4	1.0
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	22.0	17.1	48.8	11.4	0.8

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
6	994	15	21.350	0.8740	-0.018		0.085	-0.023C	-0.030	-0.022	0.000

TABLE 42 IS Q. 32 X Q. 6

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	16.3	18.5	39.1	26.1	0.0
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	23.5	23.5	37.6	15.0	0.5
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	22.6	22.2	39.6	15.6	0.0
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	19.8	26.0	44.6	9.6	0.0
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	22.4	24.3	39.3	14.0	0.0
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	25.8	30.3	37.4	5.8	0.6

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
6	954	15	29.278	0.9852	-0.105	***	0.101	-0.085C	-0.109	-0.078	0.000

TABLE 43 IS Q. 33 X Q. 6

EDUCATION

PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	25.8	20.4	33.3	18.3	2.2
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	22.0	18.6	36.2	23.2	0.0
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	22.1	24.2	38.2	15.4	0.0
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	23.1	34.3	35.7	7.0	0.0
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	22.5	24.8	45.4	6.9	0.5
AT SCHOOL < 75>	13.3	24.0	53.3	9.3	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
6	988	15	46.569	1.0000	-0.042		0.125	-0.041C	-0.053	-0.038	0.000

TABLE 44 IS Q. 34 X Q. 6

SEX

MALE < 499>	25.3	23.8	40.1	10.6	0.2
FEMALE < 501>	18.6	24.8	39.9	16.4	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
6	997	3	11.304	0.9898	0.093	***	0.106	0.099C	0.138	0.099	0.000

TABLE 45

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 6. SCI/TECH INNOV COME FROM

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 6: 1) SMALL COMPANIES 2) LARGE COMPANIES
3) UNIVERSITIES 4) GOVERNMENT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	21.9	24.4	39.9	13.5	0.3

TABLE 45 IS Q. 35 X Q. 6

LANGUAGE

ENGLISH < 754>	23.7	23.7	41.2	10.9	0.4
FRENCH < 246>	16.3	26.0	36.2	21.5	0.0

IND 35 DEP

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
997	3	21.913	0.9999	0.104	***	0.148	0.0940	0.175	0.127	0.000

TABLE 46 IS Q. 36 X Q. 6

SAMPLE STRATA

B.C. < 113>	23.9	23.0	45.1	8.0	0.0
ALBERTA < 92>	22.8	26.1	39.1	12.0	0.0
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	25.0	10.0	52.5	12.5	0.0
MANITOBA < 42>	23.8	21.4	38.1	11.9	4.8
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	25.1	25.8	37.5	11.6	0.0
METRO < 88>	26.1	22.7	43.2	6.8	1.1
QUEBEC < 265>	17.0	27.5	36.2	19.2	0.0
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	13.8	13.8	55.2	17.2	0.0
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	25.7	11.4	42.9	20.0	0.0
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	0.0
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	12.5	37.5	37.5	12.5	0.0

IND 36 DEP

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
997	30	41.735	0.9246	0.072	**	0.118	0.0670	0.086	0.061	0.000

TABLE 47 IS Q. 37 X Q. 6

REGION

BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	23.9	23.0	45.1	8.0	0.0
PRAIRIES < 174>	23.6	21.3	42.0	12.1	1.1
ONTARIO < 355>	25.4	25.1	38.9	10.4	0.3
QUEBEC < 265>	17.0	27.5	36.2	19.2	0.0
ATLANTIC < 93>	17.2	19.4	45.2	18.3	0.0

IND 37 DEP

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
997	12	25.025	0.9853	0.083	***	0.091	0.0680	0.095	0.068	0.000

TABLE 48 IS Q. 38 X Q. 6

COMMUNITY SIZE

1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	18.4	27.2	41.8	12.2	0.3
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	23.1	23.1	41.9	11.2	0.8
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	23.0	21.0	40.0	16.0	0.0
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	23.7	23.7	37.0	15.6	0.0

IND 38 DEP

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
997	9	8.354	0.5011	-0.008		0.053	-0.0078	-0.009	-0.007	0.000

TABLE 49

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 7. WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 7: 1) UNIVERSITIES 2) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
3) INDUSTRY 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	45.0	26.0	28.9	0.1
TABLE 49 IS Q. 31 X Q. 7				
AGE				
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	49.7	27.2	23.1	0.0
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	40.5	24.3	34.7	0.0
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	44.5	25.5	30.0	0.0
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	49.6	23.3	27.1	0.0
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	45.2	25.0	29.8	0.0
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	45.5	31.7	22.0	0.8

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
7	996	10	11.956	0.7120	-0.024		0.077	-0.018C	-0.023	-0.015	0.000

TABLE 50 IS Q. 32 X Q. 7				
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME				
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	41.3	28.3	30.4	0.0
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	47.4	33.3	19.2	0.0
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	40.1	27.8	32.1	0.0
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	49.7	20.3	29.4	0.6
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	43.9	29.0	27.1	0.0
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	48.4	16.1	35.5	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
7	955	10	26.375	0.9967	0.020		0.118	0.013C	0.017	0.011	0.000

TABLE 51 IS Q. 33 X Q. 7				
EDUCATION				
PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	39.8	39.8	20.4	0.0
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	43.5	30.5	26.0	0.0
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	40.0	28.1	31.6	0.4
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	42.7	22.4	35.0	0.0
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	53.7	17.9	28.4	0.0
AT SCHOOL < 75>	53.3	21.3	25.3	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
7	990	10	28.388	0.9984	-0.038		0.120	-0.039C	-0.050	-0.032	0.000

TABLE 52 IS Q. 34 X Q. 7				
SEX				
MALE < 499>	45.3	21.4	33.3	0.0
FEMALE < 501>	44.9	30.5	24.4	0.2

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
7	999	2	14.862	0.9994	-0.051		0.122	-0.047C	-0.072	-0.047	0.000

TABLE 53

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 7. WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?

ANSWERS TO
Q. 7: 1) UNIVERSITIES 2) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
3) INDUSTRY 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	45.0	26.0	28.9	0.1

TABLE 53 IS Q. 35 X Q. 7

LANGUAGE				
ENGLISH < 754>	47.1	22.5	30.2	0.1
FRENCH < 246>	39.0	36.6	24.4	0.0

DEP 7	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	999	2	18.921	0.9999	0.011		0.138	0.019C	0.039	0.025	0.000

TABLE 54 IS Q. 36 X Q. 7

SAMPLE STRATA				
B.C. < 113>	46.0	17.7	35.4	0.9
ALBERTA < 92>	46.7	18.5	34.8	0.0
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	57.5	25.0	17.5	0.0
MANITOBA < 42>	50.0	19.0	31.0	0.0
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	46.1	23.6	30.3	0.0
METRO < 88>	50.0	18.2	31.8	0.0
QUEBEC < 265>	41.1	34.0	24.9	0.0
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	37.9	44.8	17.2	0.0
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	45.7	22.9	31.4	0.0
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	40.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	29.2	50.0	20.8	0.0

DEP 7	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	999	20	41.346	0.9966	-0.007		0.144	0.004C	0.005	0.003	0.015

TABLE 55 IS Q. 37 X Q. 7

REGION				
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	46.0	17.7	35.4	0.9
PRAIRIES < 174>	50.0	20.1	29.9	0.0
ONTARIO < 355>	47.0	22.3	30.7	0.0
QUEBEC < 265>	41.1	34.0	24.9	0.0
ATLANTIC < 93>	38.7	38.7	22.6	0.0

DEP 7	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	999	8	27.358	0.9994	-0.006		0.117	0.007C	0.009	0.006	0.000

TABLE 56 IS Q. 38 X Q. 7

COMMUNITY SIZE				
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	42.9	24.5	32.3	0.3
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	49.2	21.9	28.8	0.0
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	52.0	24.0	24.0	0.0
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	41.9	30.9	27.2	0.0

DEP 7	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	999	6	10.824	0.9060	-0.017		0.074	-0.013C	-0.019	-0.012	0.000

TABLE 57

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 8. WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 8: 1) UNIVERSITIES 2) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
3) INDUSTRY 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	19.3	18.9	61.5	0.4
TABLE 57 IS Q. 31 X Q. 8				
AGE				
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	25.2	17.0	56.5	1.4
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	15.7	18.2	65.7	0.4
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	14.5	19.1	66.4	0.0
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	17.8	17.8	63.6	0.8
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	21.2	16.3	62.5	0.0
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	28.5	25.2	46.3	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
8	993	10	23.006	0.9893	-0.063	**	0.108	-0.040C	-0.060	-0.033	0.000

TABLE 58 IS Q. 32 X Q. 8				
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME				
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	23.9	23.9	52.2	0.0
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	29.6	24.4	46.0	0.0
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	19.8	22.6	57.5	0.0
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	14.7	19.8	65.5	0.0
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	12.1	17.8	70.1	0.0
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	11.6	6.5	80.6	1.3

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
8	954	10	62.137	1.0000	0.217	***	0.180	0.197C	0.291	0.161	0.000

TABLE 59 IS Q. 33 X Q. 8				
EDUCATION				
PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	24.7	37.6	37.6	0.0
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	24.3	22.0	53.1	0.6
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	22.1	20.4	57.2	0.4
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	14.0	15.4	69.9	0.7
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	11.0	9.2	79.4	0.5
AT SCHOOL < 75>	24.0	17.3	58.7	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
8	987	10	70.596	1.0000	0.173	***	0.189	0.165C	0.249	0.138	0.000

TABLE 60 IS Q. 34 X Q. 8				
SEX				
MALE < 499>	18.2	16.0	65.5	0.2
FEMALE < 501>	20.4	22.0	57.1	0.6

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
8	996	2	8.106	0.9826	-0.066	**	0.090	-0.075C	-0.136	-0.075	0.000

TABLE 61

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 8. WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?

ANSWERS TO
Q. 8: 1) UNIVERSITIES 2) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
3) INDUSTRY 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	19.3	18.9	61.5	0.4

TABLE 61 IS Q. 35 X Q. 8

LANGUAGE

ENGLISH < 754>	17.5	17.0	65.0	0.5
FRENCH < 246>	24.8	25.2	50.0	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
8	996	2	18.456	0.9999	-0.122	***	0.136	-0.113C	-0.258	-0.151	0.000

TABLE 62 IS Q. 36 X Q. 8

SAMPLE STRATA

B.C. < 113>	15.9	15.9	68.1	0.0
ALBERTA < 92>	21.7	16.3	60.9	1.1
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	20.0	10.0	67.5	2.5
MANITOBA < 42>	31.0	7.1	61.9	0.0
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	16.1	17.6	65.5	0.7
METRO < 88>	13.6	12.5	73.9	0.0
QUEBEC < 265>	25.3	24.9	49.8	0.0
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	17.2	31.0	51.7	0.0
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	17.1	14.3	68.6	0.0
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	4.2	41.7	54.2	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
8	996	20	49.410	0.9997	-0.050		0.157	-0.069C	-0.102	-0.056	0.000

TABLE 63 IS Q. 37 X Q. 8

REGION

BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	15.9	15.9	68.1	0.0
PRAIRIES < 174>	23.6	12.6	62.6	1.1
ONTARIO < 355>	15.5	16.3	67.6	0.6
QUEBEC < 265>	25.3	24.9	49.8	0.0
ATLANTIC < 93>	12.9	28.0	59.1	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
8	996	8	35.165	1.0000	-0.064	**	0.133	-0.074C	-0.119	-0.066	0.000

TABLE 64 IS Q. 38 X Q. 8

COMMUNITY SIZE

1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	17.7	18.0	63.9	0.3
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	16.9	15.0	68.1	0.0
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	18.0	19.0	61.0	2.0
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	22.8	22.8	54.0	0.3

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
8	996	6	13.689	0.9667	-0.088	***	0.083	-0.073C	-0.125	-0.068	0.000

TABLE 65

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 9. FED GOVT SHD EMPHASIZE

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 9: 1) FUND RESEARCH 2) APPLIED RESEARCH
3) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	48.8	50.1	1.1
TABLE 65 IS Q. 31 X Q. 9			
AGE			
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	49.0	50.3	0.7
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	51.5	47.4	1.1
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	49.5	49.1	1.4
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	48.8	50.4	0.8
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	51.0	48.1	1.0
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	39.8	58.5	1.6

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
9	986	5	4.824	0.5622	0.045		0.070	0.045C	0.055	0.028	0.031

TABLE 66 IS Q. 32 X Q. 9			
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME			
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	42.4	56.5	1.1
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	44.6	54.5	0.9
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	49.1	50.9	0.0
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	49.7	43.6	1.7
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	51.4	45.8	2.8
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	58.7	40.0	1.3

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
9	945	5	9.887	0.9215	-0.100	***	0.102	-0.112C	-0.136	-0.068	0.078

TABLE 67 IS Q. 33 X Q. 9			
EDUCATION			
PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	39.8	60.2	0.0
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	39.5	59.9	0.6
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	48.4	50.2	1.4
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	52.4	46.2	1.4
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	57.3	40.8	1.8
AT SCHOOL < 75>	52.0	48.0	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
9	980	5	17.941	0.9970	-0.120	***	0.135	-0.140C	-0.174	-0.087	0.099

TABLE 68 IS Q. 34 X Q. 9			
SEX			
MALE < 499>	52.7	46.5	0.8
FEMALE < 501>	44.7	53.9	1.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
9	969	1	5.999	0.0000	0.078	**	0.078	0.078B	0.155	0.078	0.064

TABLE 69

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 9. FED GOVT SHD EMPHASIZE

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 9: 1) FUND RESEARCH 2) APPLIED RESEARCH
3) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	48.8	50.1	1.1

TABLE 69 IS Q. 35 X Q. 9

LANGUAGE			
ENGLISH < 754>	52.7	46.2	1.2
FRENCH < 246>	36.6	62.6	0.8

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
9	989	1	19.787	0.0000	0.141	***	0.141	0.1418	0.323	0.164	0.101

TABLE 70 IS Q. 36 X Q. 9

SAMPLE STRATA			
B.C. < 113>	54.9	43.4	1.8
ALBERTA < 92>	57.6	42.4	0.0
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	45.0	55.0	0.0
MANITOBA < 42>	52.4	45.2	2.4
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	52.1	46.4	1.5
METRO < 88>	53.4	44.3	2.3
QUEBEC < 265>	37.4	61.9	0.8
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	48.3	51.7	0.0
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	51.4	48.6	0.0
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	60.0	40.0	0.0
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	50.0	50.0	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
9	989	10	21.977	0.9848	0.085	***	0.149	0.1130	0.136	0.068	0.113

TABLE 71 IS Q. 37 X Q. 9

REGION			
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	54.9	43.4	1.8
PRAIRIES < 174>	53.4	46.0	0.6
ONTARIO < 355>	52.4	45.9	1.7
QUEBEC < 265>	37.4	61.9	0.8
ATLANTIC < 93>	50.5	49.5	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
9	989	4	19.868	0.9995	0.091	***	0.142	0.1120	0.148	0.075	0.103

TABLE 72 IS Q. 38 X Q. 9

COMMUNITY SIZE			
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	46.3	52.4	1.4
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	52.7	45.8	1.5
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	55.0	45.0	0.0
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	46.0	53.2	0.9

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
9	989	3	4.979	0.8266	0.012		0.071	0.0090	0.012	0.006	0.057

TABLE 73

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 10. WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?

ANSWERS TO
Q. 10: 1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 2) INDUSTRY
3) PROV GOVERNMENT 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	52.9	31.8	14.3	1.0

TABLE 73 IS Q. 31 X Q. 10

AGE

18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	53.7	25.9	19.7	0.7
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	54.0	29.2	16.1	0.7
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	49.5	39.5	8.2	2.7
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	55.0	33.3	11.6	0.0
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	51.9	34.6	12.5	1.0
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	53.7	26.8	19.5	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
10	987	10	20.964	0.9787	-0.005		0.103	-0.005C	-0.007	-0.004	0.000

TABLE 74 IS Q. 32 X Q. 10

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	50.0	22.8	27.2	0.0
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	52.1	28.2	19.7	0.0
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	50.0	31.1	18.4	0.5
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	54.8	33.9	9.0	2.3
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	51.4	41.1	6.5	0.9
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	58.7	34.8	3.9	2.6

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
10	946	10	46.104	1.0000	-0.138	***	0.156	-0.097C	-0.133	-0.079	0.000

TABLE 75 IS Q. 33 X Q. 10

EDUCATION

PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	54.8	20.4	24.7	0.0
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	49.2	30.5	19.2	1.1
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	53.0	35.1	11.2	0.7
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	50.3	36.4	13.3	0.0
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	55.5	32.6	9.2	2.8
AT SCHOOL < 75>	54.7	28.0	17.3	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
10	981	10	23.595	0.9912	-0.061	*	0.110	-0.046C	-0.064	-0.038	0.000

TABLE 76 IS Q. 34 X Q. 10

SEX

MALE < 499>	50.3	37.5	10.8	1.4
FEMALE < 501>	55.3	26.1	18.0	0.6

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
10	990	2	20.106	1.0000	0.017		0.143	-0.006C	-0.010	-0.006	0.00

TABLE 77

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 10. WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 10: 1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 2) INDUSTRY
3) PROV GOVERNMENT 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	52.9	31.8	14.3	1.0

TABLE 77 IS Q. 35 X Q. 10

LANGUAGE				
ENGLISH < 754>	51.5	33.7	13.9	0.9
FRENCH < 246>	56.9	26.0	15.9	1.2

NO DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
10	990	2	4.961	0.9163	-0.022	0.071	-0.029C	-0.067	-0.039	0.000

TABLE 78 IS Q. 36 X Q. 10

SAMPLE STRATA				
B.C. < 113>	55.8	30.1	14.2	0.0
ALBERTA < 92>	51.1	39.1	9.8	0.0
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	62.5	22.5	12.5	2.5
MANITOBA < 42>	47.6	33.3	16.7	2.4
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	51.7	34.8	12.4	1.1
METRO < 88>	39.8	37.5	21.6	1.1
QUEBEC < 265>	57.0	26.8	15.1	1.1
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	51.7	24.1	24.1	0.0
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	57.1	34.3	5.7	2.9
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	20.0	20.0	60.0	0.0
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	54.2	33.3	12.5	0.0

NO DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
10	990	20	30.020	0.9305	0.018	0.123	0.006C	0.009	0.005	0.004

TABLE 79 IS Q. 37 X Q. 10

REGION				
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	55.8	30.1	14.2	0.0
PRAIRIES < 174>	52.9	33.9	12.1	1.1
ONTARIO < 355>	48.7	35.5	14.6	1.1
QUEBEC < 265>	57.0	26.8	15.1	1.1
ATLANTIC < 93>	52.7	30.1	16.1	1.1

NO DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
10	990	8	7.171	0.4817	0.006	0.060	-0.004C	-0.006	-0.004	0.000

TABLE 80 IS Q. 38 X Q. 10

COMMUNITY SIZE				
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	51.7	32.7	15.0	0.7
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	51.9	32.7	13.5	1.9
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	52.0	29.0	18.0	1.0
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	54.6	31.2	13.6	0.6

NO DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
10	990	6	2.004	0.0807	-0.020	0.032	-0.019C	-0.030	-0.018	0.000

TABLE 81

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 11. WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 11: 1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 2) INDUSTRY
3) PROV GOVERNMENT 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	38.9	45.4	15.2	0.4

TABLE 81 IS Q. 31 X Q. 11

AGE

18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	38.1	38.8	22.4	0.7
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	38.3	45.3	16.4	0.0
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	33.2	55.0	11.4	0.5
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	41.1	45.0	12.4	1.6
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	47.1	41.3	11.5	0.0
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	42.3	40.7	17.1	0.0

DEP 11

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
993	10	20.399	0.9743	-0.059	*	0.101	-0.054C	-0.071	-0.044	0.015

TABLE 82 IS Q. 32 X Q. 11

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	42.4	37.0	20.7	0.0
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	48.4	35.2	16.0	0.5
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	37.7	41.0	21.2	0.0
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	40.1	44.6	14.7	0.6
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	32.7	56.1	10.3	0.9
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	26.5	65.6	7.7	0.0

DEP 11

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
953	10	50.673	1.0000	0.034		0.163	0.050C	0.066	0.041	0.064

TABLE 83 IS Q. 33 X Q. 11

EDUCATION

PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	49.5	32.3	18.3	0.0
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	43.5	36.2	19.2	1.1
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	45.3	40.4	14.0	0.4
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	39.9	43.4	16.8	0.0
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	24.8	66.1	8.7	0.5
AT SCHOOL < 75>	30.7	48.0	21.3	0.0

DEP 11

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
987	10	59.104	1.0000	0.083	***	0.173	0.090C	0.120	0.075	0.080

TABLE 84 IS Q. 34 X Q. 11

SEX

MALE < 499>	35.9	53.1	10.6	0.4
FEMALE < 501>	42.1	37.5	20.0	0.4

DEP 11

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
996	2	30.148	1.0000	0.022		0.174	0.004C	0.006	0.004	0.042

TABLE 85

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 11. WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 11: 1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 2) INDUSTRY
3) PROV GOVERNMENT 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	38.9	45.4	15.2	0.4

TABLE 85 IS Q. 35 X Q. 11

LANGUAGE				
ENGLISH < 754>	38.7	46.9	14.2	0.1
FRENCH < 246>	39.8	40.2	18.7	1.2

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
11	996	2	4.366	0.8873	0.019		0.066	0.012C	0.025	0.016	0.000

TABLE 86 IS Q. 36 X Q. 11

SAMPLE STRATA				
B.C. < 113>	36.3	48.7	15.0	0.0
ALBERTA < 92>	44.6	39.1	16.3	0.0
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	47.5	42.5	10.0	0.0
MANITOBA < 42>	45.2	47.6	7.1	0.0
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	39.0	48.3	12.4	0.4
METRO < 88>	29.5	52.3	18.2	0.0
QUEBEC < 265>	40.4	41.5	17.0	1.1
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	37.9	37.9	24.1	0.0
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	20.0	57.1	22.9	0.0
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	40.0	40.0	20.0	0.0
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	54.2	29.2	16.7	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
11	996	20	23.154	0.7187	0.034		0.108	0.036C	0.048	0.029	0.024

TABLE 87 IS Q. 37 X Q. 11

REGION				
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	36.3	48.7	15.0	0.0
PRAIRIES < 174>	45.4	42.0	12.6	0.0
ONTARIO < 355>	36.6	49.3	13.8	0.3
QUEBEC < 265>	40.4	41.5	17.0	1.1
ATLANTIC < 93>	35.5	43.0	21.5	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
11	996	8	10.015	0.7360	0.036		0.071	0.030C	0.043	0.027	0.011

TABLE 88 IS Q. 38 X Q. 11

COMMUNITY SIZE				
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	32.7	51.0	16.0	0.3
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	37.3	47.3	15.0	0.4
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	39.0	46.0	14.0	1.0
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	45.7	38.7	15.3	0.3

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
11	996	6	13.035	0.9575	-0.079	**	0.081	-0.077C	-0.115	-0.071	0.044

TABLE 89

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 12. EMPH SCI/TECH:SEEK CURES

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 12: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) % ====	(2) % ====	(3) % ====	(4) % ====
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	4.7	30.8	64.4	0.1

TABLE 89 IS Q. 31 X Q. 12

AGE				
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	4.1	33.3	62.6	0.0
(AVG.= 2.59 NO SIG.DIFF)				
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	6.2	31.8	62.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.56 SIG.LOWER +)				
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	3.2	30.0	66.8	0.0
(AVG.= 2.64 NO SIG.DIFF)				
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	4.7	31.8	63.6	0.0
(AVG.= 2.59 NO SIG.DIFF)				
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	2.9	31.7	64.4	1.0
(AVG.= 2.62 NO SIG.DIFF)				
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	6.5	25.2	68.3	0.0
(AVG.= 2.62 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
12	996	10	6.647	0.2417	0.028		0.058	0.028C	0.047	0.023	0.000

TABLE 90 IS Q. 32 X Q. 12

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME			
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	3.3	22.8	73.9	0.0
(AVG.= 2.71 SIG.HIGHR *)				
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	3.3	27.7	68.5	0.5
(AVG.= 2.66 SIG.HIGHR *)				
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	4.7	34.9	60.4	0.0
(AVG.= 2.56 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	3.4	33.3	63.3	0.0
(AVG.= 2.60 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	4.7	29.9	65.4	0.0
(AVG.= 2.61 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	9.0	31.6	59.4	0.0
(AVG.= 2.50 SIG.LOWER **)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
12	955	10	15.341	0.8799	-0.085	***	0.090	-0.065C	-0.109	-0.053	0.000

TABLE 91

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 12. EMPH SCI/TECH:SEEK CURES

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 12: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	4.7	30.8	64.4	0.1

TABLE 91 IS Q. 33 X Q. 12

EDUCATION

PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	6.5	21.5	71.0	1.1
(AVG.= 2.65 NO SIG.DIFF)				
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	4.0	33.3	62.7	0.0
(AVG.= 2.59 NO SIG.DIFF)				
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	3.5	31.9	64.6	0.0
(AVG.= 2.61 NO SIG.DIFF)				
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	4.2	31.5	64.3	0.0
(AVG.= 2.60 NO SIG.DIFF)				
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	4.6	32.6	62.8	0.0
(AVG.= 2.58 NO SIG.DIFF)				
AT SCHOOL < 75>	10.7	26.7	62.7	0.0
(AVG.= 2.52 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
12	990	10	11.951	0.7117	-0.038		0.078	-0.026C	-0.045	-0.022	0.000

TABLE 92 IS Q. 34 X Q. 12

SEX

MALE < 499>	7.2	31.1	61.5	0.2
(AVG.= 2.54 SIG.LOWER ***)				
FEMALE < 501>	2.2	30.5	67.3	0.0
(AVG.= 2.65 SIG.HIGHR ***)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
12	999	2	14.699	0.9994	0.092	***	0.121	0.071C	0.146	0.071	0.000

TABLE 93 IS Q. 35 X Q. 12

LANGUAGE

ENGLISH < 754>	5.3	30.8	63.9	0.0
(AVG.= 2.59 NO SIG.DIFF)				
FRENCH < 246>	2.8	30.9	65.9	0.4
(AVG.= 2.63 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
12	999	2	2.497	0.7131	0.035		0.050	0.022C	0.062	0.030	0.000

TABLE 94

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 12. EMPH SCI/TECH:SEEK CURES

ANSWERS TO
Q. 12: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	4.7	30.8	64.4	0.1

TABLE 94 IS Q. 36 X Q. 12

SAMPLE STRATA				
B.C. < 113>	4.4	30.1	65.5	0.0
(AVG.= 2.61 NO SIG.DIFF)				
ALBERTA < 92>	8.7	37.0	54.3	0.0
(AVG.= 2.46 SIG.LOWER **)				
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	5.0	30.0	65.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.60 NO SIG.DIFF)				
MANITOBA < 42>	4.8	26.2	69.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.64 NO SIG.DIFF)				
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	6.4	33.0	60.7	0.0
(AVG.= 2.54 SIG.LOWER *)				
METRO < 88>	3.4	31.8	64.8	0.0
(AVG.= 2.61 NO SIG.DIFF)				
QUEBEC < 265>	3.0	29.1	67.5	0.4
(AVG.= 2.65 SIG.HIGHR +)				
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	6.9	24.1	69.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.62 NO SIG.DIFF)				
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	0.0	28.6	71.4	0.0
(AVG.= 2.71 NO SIG.DIFF)				
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	0.0	20.0	80.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.80 T-TEST IS N/A)				
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.75 T-TEST IS N/A)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
12	999	20	16.563	0.3188	0.075	**	0.091	0.058C	0.097	0.047	0.000

TABLE 95 IS Q. 37 X Q. 12

REGION				
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	4.4	30.1	65.5	0.0
(AVG.= 2.61 NO SIG.DIFF)				
PRAIRIES < 174>	6.9	32.8	60.3	0.0
(AVG.= 2.53 SIG.LOWER +)				
ONTARIO < 355>	5.6	32.7	61.7	0.0
(AVG.= 2.56 SIG.LOWER +)				
QUEBEC < 265>	3.0	29.1	67.5	0.4
(AVG.= 2.65 SIG.HIGHR +)				
ATLANTIC < 93>	2.2	25.8	72.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.70 SIG.HIGHR *)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
12	999	8	9.116	0.6674	0.062	*	0.068	0.051C	0.093	0.045	0.000

TABLE 96

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 12. EMPH SCI/TECH:SEEK CURES

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 12: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	4.7	30.8	64.4	0.1

TABLE 96 IS Q. 33 X Q. 12

COMMUNITY SIZE				
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	3.7	33.0	62.9	0.3
(AVG.= 2.59 NO SIG.DIFF)				
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	4.6	30.8	64.6	0.0
(AVG.= 2.60 NO SIG.DIFF)				
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	5.0	28.0	67.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.62 NO SIG.DIFF)				
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	5.5	29.8	64.7	0.0
(AVG.= 2.59 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
12	999	6	2.104	0.0901	-0.000	0.032	0.007C	0.013	0.006	0.000

TABLE 97

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 13. EMPH SCI/TECH:EFF COMP

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 13: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) % ====	(2) % ====	(3) % ====	(4) % ====
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.2	43.5	47.8	0.4
TABLE 97 IS Q. 31 X Q. 13				
AGE				
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	7.5	46.9	45.6	0.0
(AVG.= 2.38 NO SIG.DIFF)				
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	9.9	47.8	42.3	0.0
(AVG.= 2.32 SIG.LOWER **)				
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	6.8	39.5	53.6	0.0
(AVG.= 2.47 SIG.HIGHR *)				
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	9.3	39.5	50.4	0.8
(AVG.= 2.41 NO SIG.DIFF)				
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	4.8	36.5	55.8	2.9
(AVG.= 2.52 SIG.HIGHR **)				
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	9.8	47.2	43.1	0.0
(AVG.= 2.33 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP 13	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	993	10	13.431	0.7994	0.029		0.082	0.037C	0.054	0.031	0.043

TABLE 98 IS Q. 32 X Q. 13				
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME				
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	9.8	48.9	41.3	0.0
(AVG.= 2.32 SIG.LOWER +)				
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	9.4	44.1	45.5	0.9
(AVG.= 2.36 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	7.5	49.1	42.9	0.5
(AVG.= 2.36 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	9.0	44.1	46.9	0.0
(AVG.= 2.38 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	8.4	30.8	60.7	0.0
(AVG.= 2.52 SIG.HIGHR **)				
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	5.2	40.0	54.8	0.0
(AVG.= 2.50 SIG.HIGHR **)				

DEP 13	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	953	10	16.601	0.9163	0.095	***	0.093	0.084C	0.119	0.068	0.040

TABLE 99

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 13. EMPH SCI/TECH:EFF COMP

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 13: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.2	43.5	47.8	0.4

TABLE 99 IS Q. 33 X Q. 13

EDUCATION

PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	9.7	39.8	49.5	1.1
(AVG.= 2.40 NO SIG.DIFF)				
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	9.0	45.8	43.5	1.7
(AVG.= 2.35 NO SIG.DIFF)				
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	8.1	46.7	45.3	0.0
(AVG.= 2.37 NO SIG.DIFF)				
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	7.0	38.5	54.5	0.0
(AVG.= 2.48 SIG.HIGHR +)				
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	7.3	40.8	51.8	0.0
(AVG.= 2.44 NO SIG.DIFF)				
AT SCHOOL < 75>	9.3	48.0	42.7	0.0
(AVG.= 2.33 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
13	987	10	7.254	0.2987	0.027		0.061	0.027C	0.039	0.022	0.023

TABLE 100 IS Q. 34 X Q. 13

SEX

MALE < 499>	7.4	42.3	49.9	0.4
(AVG.= 2.43 SIG.HIGHR +)				
FEMALE < 501>	9.0	44.7	45.9	0.4
(AVG.= 2.37 SIG.LOWER +)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
13	996	2	1.919	0.6168	-0.044		0.044	-0.045C	-0.079	-0.045	0.000

TABLE 101 IS Q. 35 X Q. 13

LANGUAGE

ENGLISH < 754>	8.6	43.0	48.0	0.4
(AVG.= 2.40 NO SIG.DIFF)				
FRENCH < 246>	6.9	45.1	47.6	0.4
(AVG.= 2.41 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
13	996	2	0.867	0.3517	0.009		0.029	0.004C	0.008	0.005	0.000

TABLE 102

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 13. EMPH SCI/TECH:EFF COMP

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 13: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.2	43.5	47.8	0.4

TABLE 102 IS Q. 36 X Q. 13

SAMPLE STRATA				
B.C. < 113>	8.8	39.8	51.3	0.0
(AVG.= 2.42 NO SIG.DIFF)				
ALBERTA < 92>	16.3	42.4	40.2	1.1
(AVG.= 2.24 SIG.LOWER **)				
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	2.5	47.5	47.5	2.5
(AVG.= 2.46 NO SIG.DIFF)				
MANITOBA < 42>	9.5	47.6	42.9	0.0
(AVG.= 2.33 NO SIG.DIFF)				
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	8.2	44.6	47.2	0.0
(AVG.= 2.39 NO SIG.DIFF)				
METRO < 88>	9.1	39.8	51.1	0.0
(AVG.= 2.42 NO SIG.DIFF)				
QUEBEC < 265>	7.2	44.9	47.5	0.4
(AVG.= 2.41 NO SIG.DIFF)				
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	0.0	44.8	51.7	3.4
(AVG.= 2.54 NO SIG.DIFF)				
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	2.9	40.0	57.1	0.0
(AVG.= 2.54 SIG.HIGHR +)				
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	20.0	40.0	40.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.20 T-TEST IS N/A)				
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	4.2	41.7	54.2	0.0
(AVG.= 2.50 T-TEST IS N/A)				

DEP 13

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
996	20	18.685	0.4577	0.050	0.097	0.038C	0.054	0.031	0.008

TABLE 103 IS Q. 37 X Q. 13

REGION				
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	8.8	39.8	51.3	0.0
(AVG.= 2.42 NO SIG.DIFF)				
PRAIRIES < 174>	11.5	44.3	42.5	1.1
(AVG.= 2.31 SIG.LOWER *)				
ONTARIO < 355>	8.5	43.4	48.2	0.0
(AVG.= 2.40 NO SIG.DIFF)				
QUEBEC < 265>	7.2	44.9	47.5	0.4
(AVG.= 2.41 NO SIG.DIFF)				
ATLANTIC < 93>	3.2	41.9	53.8	1.1
(AVG.= 2.51 SIG.HIGHR *)				

DEP 13

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
996	8	8.163	0.5823	0.044	0.064	0.034C	0.053	0.030	0.008

TABLE 104

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 13. EMPH SCI/TECH:EFF COMP

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 13: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.2	43.5	47.8	0.4

TABLE 104 IS Q. 38 X Q. 13

COMMUNITY SIZE				
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	6.8	43.9	49.0	0.3
(AVG.= 2.42 NO SIG.DIFF)				
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	6.9	39.2	53.5	0.4
(AVG.= 2.47 SIG.HIGHR **)				
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	11.0	42.0	46.0	1.0
(AVG.= 2.35 NO SIG.DIFF)				
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	9.5	46.8	43.4	0.3
(AVG.= 2.34 SIG.LOWER **)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
13	996	6	8.273	0.7812	-0.067	**	0.064	-0.052C	-0.085	-0.049	0.023

TABLE 105

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 14. EMPH SCI/TECH:NAT RESC

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 14: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.1	43.0	48.6	0.2

TABLE 105 IS Q. 31 X Q. 14

AGE

18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	9.5	40.8	49.7	0.0
(AVG.= 2.40 NO SIG.DIFF)				
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	8.4	43.1	48.5	0.0
(AVG.= 2.40 NO SIG.DIFF)				
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	6.4	40.0	53.6	0.0
(AVG.= 2.47 SIG.HIGHR *)				
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	8.5	45.7	45.7	0.0
(AVG.= 2.37 NO SIG.DIFF)				
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	4.8	42.3	51.0	1.9
(AVG.= 2.47 NO SIG.DIFF)				
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	11.4	48.8	39.8	0.0
(AVG.= 2.28 SIG.LOWER **)				

DEP 14

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
995	10	9.508	0.5154	-0.033		0.069	-0.025C	-0.036	-0.020	0.022

TABLE 106 IS Q. 32 X Q. 14

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	13.0	48.9	38.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.25 SIG.LOWER **)				
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	9.9	45.5	43.7	0.9
(AVG.= 2.34 SIG.LOWER +)				
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	7.1	43.9	49.1	0.0
(AVG.= 2.42 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	6.2	40.7	53.1	0.0
(AVG.= 2.47 SIG.HIGHR +)				
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	4.7	39.3	56.1	0.0
(AVG.= 2.51 SIG.HIGHR *)				
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	9.0	41.3	49.7	0.0
(AVG.= 2.41 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP 14

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
954	10	13.257	0.7903	0.082	**	0.083	0.077C	0.110	0.063	0.029

TABLE 107

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 14. EMPH SCI/TECH:NAT RESC

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 14: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.1	43.0	48.6	0.2

TABLE 107 IS Q. 33 X Q. 14
EDUCATION

PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	6.5	53.8	38.7	1.1
(AVG.= 2.33 NO SIG.DIFF)				
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	7.9	45.8	45.8	0.6
(AVG.= 2.38 NO SIG.DIFF)				
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	6.3	42.8	50.9	0.0
(AVG.= 2.45 NO SIG.DIFF)				
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	8.4	36.4	55.2	0.0
(AVG.= 2.47 SIG.HIGHR +)				
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	9.2	44.5	46.3	0.0
(AVG.= 2.37 NO SIG.DIFF)				
AT SCHOOL < 75>	13.3	34.7	52.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.39 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
14	989	10	14.088	0.8310	0.010		0.084	0.020C	0.030	0.017	0.028

TABLE 108 IS Q. 34 X Q. 14
SEX

MALE < 499>	10.4	40.9	48.3	0.4
(AVG.= 2.38 NO SIG.DIFF)				
FEMALE < 501>	5.8	45.3	43.9	0.0
(AVG.= 2.43 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
14	998	2	7.775	0.9795	0.040		0.088	0.028C	0.049	0.028	0.000

TABLE 109 IS Q. 35 X Q. 14
LANGUAGE

ENGLISH < 754>	8.4	42.3	49.2	0.1
(AVG.= 2.41 NO SIG.DIFF)				
FRENCH < 246>	7.3	45.5	46.7	0.4
(AVG.= 2.40 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
14	998	2	0.923	0.3698	-0.009		0.030	-0.012C	-0.028	-0.016	0.000

TABLE 110

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 14. EMPH SCI/TECH:NAT RESC

ANSWERS TO
Q. 14: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.1	43.0	48.6	0.2
TABLE 110 IS Q. 36 X Q. 14				
SAMPLE STRATA				
B.C. < 113>	9.7	44.2	46.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.36 NO SIG.DIFF)				
ALBERTA < 92>	12.0	32.6	55.4	0.0
(AVG.= 2.43 NO SIG.DIFF)				
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	10.0	52.5	37.5	0.0
(AVG.= 2.28 SIG.LOWER +)				
MANITOBA < 42>	4.8	47.6	47.6	0.0
(AVG.= 2.43 NO SIG.DIFF)				
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	7.9	41.6	50.2	0.4
(AVG.= 2.42 NO SIG.DIFF)				
METRO < 88>	9.1	47.7	43.2	0.0
(AVG.= 2.34 NO SIG.DIFF)				
QUEBEC < 265>	7.5	44.2	47.9	0.4
(AVG.= 2.41 NO SIG.DIFF)				
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	3.4	37.9	58.6	0.0
(AVG.= 2.55 NO SIG.DIFF)				
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	5.7	51.4	42.9	0.0
(AVG.= 2.37 NO SIG.DIFF)				
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	20.0	20.0	60.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.40 T-TEST IS N/A)				
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	0.0	41.7	58.3	0.0
(AVG.= 2.58 T-TEST IS N/A)				

DEP 14	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	998	20	16.468	0.3128	0.032	0.091	0.017C	0.024	0.014	0.025

TABLE 111 IS Q. 37 X Q. 14				
REGION				
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	9.7	44.2	46.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.36 NO SIG.DIFF)				
PRAIRIES < 174>	9.8	40.8	49.4	0.0
(AVG.= 2.40 NO SIG.DIFF)				
ONTARIO < 355>	8.2	43.1	48.5	0.3
(AVG.= 2.40 NO SIG.DIFF)				
QUEBEC < 265>	7.5	44.2	47.9	0.4
(AVG.= 2.41 NO SIG.DIFF)				
ATLANTIC < 93>	4.3	43.0	52.7	0.0
(AVG.= 2.48 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP 14	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	998	8	3.563	0.1C53	0.036	0.042	0.024C	0.037	0.021	0.000

TABLE 112

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 14. EMPH SCI/TECH:NAT RESC

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 14: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.1	43.0	48.6	0.2

TABLE 112 IS Q. 38 X Q. 14

COMMUNITY SIZE				
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	6.1	43.5	50.0	0.3
(AVG.= 2.44 NO SIG.DIFF)				
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	7.3	43.1	49.6	0.0
(AVG.= 2.42 NO SIG.DIFF)				
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	10.0	42.0	47.0	1.0
(AVG.= 2.37 NO SIG.DIFF)				
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	9.8	43.1	47.1	0.0
(AVG.= 2.37 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
14	998	6	3.759	0.2908	-0.046	0.043	-0.033C	-0.055	-0.031	0.000

TABLE 113

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 15. EMPH SCI/TECH:INCR EMPL

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 15: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.0	34.6	60.2	0.2

TABLE 113 IS Q. 31 X Q. 15

AGE

18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	4.8	34.7	59.9	0.7
(AVG.= 2.55 NO SIG.DIFF)				
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	5.1	34.3	60.6	0.0
(AVG.= 2.55 NO SIG.DIFF)				
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	5.5	31.8	62.7	0.0
(AVG.= 2.57 NO SIG.DIFF)				
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	3.9	34.1	62.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.58 NO SIG.DIFF)				
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	4.8	35.6	58.7	1.0
(AVG.= 2.54 NO SIG.DIFF)				
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	5.7	39.8	54.5	0.0
(AVG.= 2.49 SIG.LOWER +)				

DEP 15

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
995	10	3.083	0.0206	-0.025	0.039	-0.018C	-0.028	-0.014	0.000

TABLE 114 IS Q. 32 X Q. 15

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	2.2	44.6	53.3	0.0
(AVG.= 2.51 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	4.2	32.9	62.4	0.5
(AVG.= 2.58 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	3.8	35.8	59.9	0.5
(AVG.= 2.56 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	5.1	29.9	65.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.60 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	3.7	36.4	59.8	0.0
(AVG.= 2.56 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	9.7	32.9	57.4	0.0
(AVG.= 2.48 SIG.LOWER *)				

DEP 15

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
954	10	15.657	0.8901	-0.029	0.091	-0.008C	-0.013	-0.006	0.000

TABLE 115

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 15. EMPH SCI/TECH:INCR EMPL

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 15: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.0	34.6	60.2	0.2

TABLE 115 IS Q. 33 X Q. 15

EDUCATION

PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	3.2	35.5	60.2	1.1
(AVG.= 2.58 NO SIG.DIFF)				
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	3.4	36.2	59.9	0.6
(AVG.= 2.57 NO SIG.DIFF)				
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	3.9	31.6	64.6	0.0
(AVG.= 2.61 SIG.HIGHR *)				
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	4.9	33.6	61.5	0.0
(AVG.= 2.57 NO SIG.DIFF)				
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	8.7	35.3	56.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.47 SIG.LOWER **)				
AT SCHOOL < 75>	5.3	40.0	54.7	0.0
(AVG.= 2.49 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
15	989	10	11.765	0.6989	-0.064	**	0.077	-0.045C	-0.072	-0.037	0.000

TABLE 116 IS Q. 34 X Q. 15

SEX

MALE < 499>	6.0	34.3	59.3	0.4
(AVG.= 2.54 NO SIG.DIFF)				
FEMALE < 501>	4.0	34.7	61.3	0.0
(AVG.= 2.57 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
15	998	2	2.211	0.6689	0.032		0.047	0.024C	0.048	0.024	0.000

TABLE 117 IS Q. 35 X Q. 15

LANGUAGE

ENGLISH < 754>	5.3	33.7	60.9	0.1
(AVG.= 2.56 NO SIG.DIFF)				
FRENCH < 246>	4.1	37.0	58.5	0.4
(AVG.= 2.55 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
15	998	2	1.326	0.4848	-0.007		0.036	-0.012C	-0.031	-0.016	0.000

TABLE 118

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 15. EMPH SCI/TECH:INCR EMPL

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 15: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.0	34.6	60.2	0.2

TABLE 118 IS Q. 36 X Q. 15

SAMPLE STRATA				
B.C. < 113>	6.2	29.2	64.6	0.0
(AVG.= 2.58 NO SIG.DIFF)				
ALBERTA < 92>	6.5	34.8	58.7	0.0
(AVG.= 2.52 NO SIG.DIFF)				
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	7.5	37.5	55.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.47 NO SIG.DIFF)				
MANITOBA < 42>	2.4	35.7	61.9	0.0
(AVG.= 2.60 NO SIG.DIFF)				
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	3.7	36.0	59.9	0.4
(AVG.= 2.56 NO SIG.DIFF)				
METRO < 88>	10.2	42.0	47.7	0.0
(AVG.= 2.38 SIG.LOWER ***)				
QUEBEC < 265>	4.9	34.7	60.0	0.4
(AVG.= 2.55 NO SIG.DIFF)				
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	0.0	34.5	65.5	0.0
(AVG.= 2.66 NO SIG.DIFF)				
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	2.9	22.9	74.3	0.0
(AVG.= 2.71 SIG.HIGHR +)				
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.60 T-TEST IS N/A)				
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	0.0	20.8	79.2	0.0
(AVG.= 2.79 T-TEST IS N/A)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
15	998	20	21.629	0.6390	0.036	0.104	0.021C	0.032	0.017	0.000

TABLE 119 IS Q. 37 X Q. 15

REGION				
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	6.2	29.2	64.6	0.0
(AVG.= 2.58 NO SIG.DIFF)				
PRAIRIES < 174>	5.7	35.6	58.6	0.0
(AVG.= 2.53 NO SIG.DIFF)				
ONTARIO < 355>	5.4	37.5	56.9	0.3
(AVG.= 2.52 SIG.LOWER +)				
QUEBEC < 265>	4.9	34.7	60.0	0.4
(AVG.= 2.55 NO SIG.DIFF)				
ATLANTIC < 93>	1.1	26.9	72.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.71 SIG.HIGHR ***)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
15	998	8	10.151	0.7454	0.040	0.071	0.030C	0.051	0.026	0.000

TABLE 120

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 15. EMPH SCI/TECH:INCR EMPL

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 15: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.0	34.6	60.2	0.2
TABLE 120 IS Q. 38 X Q. 15				
COMMUNITY SIZE				
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	6.1	34.7	58.8	0.3
(AVG.= 2.53 NO SIG.DIFF)				
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	2.7	31.5	65.4	0.4
(AVG.= 2.63 SIG.HIGHR **)				
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	5.0	32.0	63.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.58 NO SIG.DIFF)				
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	5.8	37.3	56.9	0.0
(AVG.= 2.51 SIG.LOWER *)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
15	998	6	7.544	0.7265	-0.027	0.061	-0.019C	-0.035	-0.018	0.000

TABLE 121

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 16: 1) SEEK CURES 2) COMPETE ON INT MKTS
3) CREATE TECH FOR RESC 4) INCREASE EMPLOYMENT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	34.2	20.8	13.6	30.3	1.1

TABLE 121 IS Q. 31 X Q. 16

AGE

18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	41.5	15.6	15.6	27.2	0.0
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	32.1	21.2	13.5	32.8	0.4
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	31.8	24.1	13.6	29.1	1.4
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	27.1	26.4	12.4	33.3	0.8
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	35.6	16.3	13.5	31.7	2.9
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	40.7	17.9	13.0	26.0	2.4

NO DEP

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
16 986	15	15.776	0.6029	-0.010		0.073	-0.001C	-0.001	-0.001	0.016

TABLE 122 IS Q. 32 X Q. 16

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	45.7	9.8	13.0	29.3	2.2
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	38.0	16.0	9.9	34.7	1.4
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	31.1	21.2	14.6	32.5	0.5
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	33.9	24.9	10.7	29.4	1.1
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	27.1	26.2	19.6	27.1	0.0
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	27.7	29.7	16.1	25.8	0.6

NO DEP

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
16 947	15	34.576	0.9972	0.013		0.110	0.020C	0.025	0.018	0.010

TABLE 123 IS Q. 33 X Q. 16

EDUCATION

PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	41.9	9.7	14.0	30.1	4.3
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	37.9	15.3	8.5	37.3	1.1
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	34.4	20.0	15.1	30.2	0.4
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	29.4	27.3	9.1	34.3	0.0
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 213>	32.1	28.0	16.1	22.0	1.8
AT SCHOOL < 75>	29.3	18.7	21.3	30.7	0.0

NO DEP

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
16 980	15	39.587	0.9995	-0.005		0.116	0.002C	0.003	0.002	0.012

TABLE 124 IS Q. 34 X Q. 16

SEX

MALE < 499>	28.1	25.9	14.8	29.9	1.4
FEMALE < 501>	40.3	15.8	12.4	30.7	0.8

NO DEP

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
16 989	3	24.376	1.0000	-0.054	*	0.157	-0.071C	-0.097	-0.071	0.014

TABLE 125

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 16: 1) SEEK CURES 2) COMPETE ON INT MKTS
3) CREATE TECH FOR RESC 4) INCREASE EMPLOYMENT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	34.2	20.8	13.6	30.3	1.1

TABLE 125 IS Q. 35 X Q. 16

LANGUAGE					
ENGLISH < 754>	31.8	21.4	13.1	32.5	1.2
FRENCH < 246>	41.5	19.1	15.0	23.6	0.8

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
16	989	3	10.824	0.9873	-0.090	***	0.105	-0.088C	-0.164	-0.119	0.008

TABLE 126 IS Q. 36 X Q. 16

SAMPLE STRATA					
B.C. < 113>	28.3	17.7	15.0	38.9	0.0
ALBERTA < 92>	26.1	20.7	15.2	38.0	0.0
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	37.5	22.5	10.0	30.0	0.0
MANITOBA < 42>	42.9	11.9	7.1	31.0	7.1
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	28.5	26.2	10.9	33.3	1.1
METRO < 88>	35.2	25.0	15.9	20.5	3.4
QUEBEC < 265>	40.8	19.2	15.8	23.4	0.8
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	48.3	20.7	10.3	20.7	0.0
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	37.1	11.4	17.1	34.3	0.0
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	60.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	33.3	4.2	16.7	45.8	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
16	989	30	45.904	0.9683	-0.089	***	0.124	-0.087C	-0.110	-0.080	0.060

TABLE 127 IS Q. 37 X Q. 16

REGION					
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	28.3	17.7	15.0	38.9	0.0
PRAIRIES < 174>	32.8	19.0	12.1	34.5	1.7
ONTARIO < 355>	30.1	25.9	12.1	30.1	1.7
QUEBEC < 265>	40.8	19.2	15.8	23.4	0.8
ATLANTIC < 93>	40.9	12.9	14.0	32.3	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
16	989	12	25.860	0.9888	-0.089	***	0.093	-0.078C	-0.107	-0.078	0.023

TABLE 128 IS Q. 38 X Q. 16

COMMUNITY SIZE					
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	34.7	23.5	17.0	23.1	1.7
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	32.7	23.1	12.3	30.4	1.5
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	32.0	17.0	6.0	44.0	1.0
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	35.5	17.9	13.9	32.4	0.3

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
16	989	9	23.007	0.9938	0.048		0.088	0.038B	0.053	0.038	0.019

TABLE 129

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 17. HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 17: 1) YES 2) NO
3) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.1	84.6	0.3

TABLE 129 IS Q. 31 X Q. 17

AGE

18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	15.0	85.0	0.0
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	14.6	85.0	0.4
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	16.4	83.6	0.0
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	13.2	86.0	0.8
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	11.5	88.5	0.0
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	19.5	79.7	0.8

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
17	994	5	3.643	0.3981	-0.015		0.061	-0.010C	-0.023	-0.006	0.000

TABLE 130 IS Q. 32 X Q. 17

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	12.0	88.0	0.0
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	10.3	89.2	0.5
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	13.7	85.8	0.5
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	15.3	84.7	0.0
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	19.6	80.4	0.0
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	24.5	74.8	0.6

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
17	953	5	16.897	0.9953	-0.125	***	0.133	-0.101C	-0.232	-0.062	0.000

TABLE 131 IS Q. 33 X Q. 17

EDUCATION

PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	11.8	88.2	0.0
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	6.8	93.2	0.0
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	11.6	88.1	0.4
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	13.3	86.7	0.0
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	24.8	74.3	0.9
AT SCHOOL < 75>	26.7	73.3	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
17	988	5	37.764	1.0000	-0.172	***	0.196	-0.140C	-0.335	-0.087	0.000

TABLE 132 IS Q. 34 X Q. 17

SEX

MALE < 499>	19.2	80.4	0.4
FEMALE < 501>	11.2	88.6	0.2

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
17	997	1	12.706	0.0000	0.113	***	0.113	0.113B	0.310	0.081	0.000

TABLE 133

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 17. HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 17: 1) YES 2) NO
3) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.1	84.6	0.3

TABLE 133 IS Q. 35 X Q. 17

LANGUAGE										
ENGLISH < 754>						15.9	83.7	0.4		
FRENCH < 246>						13.0	87.0	0.0		
DEP 17	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	997	1	1.265	0.0000	0.036	0.036	0.036B	0.120	0.030	0.000

TABLE 134 IS Q. 36 X Q. 17

SAMPLE STRATA										
B.C. < 113>						14.2	84.1	1.8		
ALBERTA < 92>						9.8	90.2	0.0		
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>						15.0	85.0	0.0		
MANITOBA < 42>						14.3	85.7	0.0		
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>						19.9	79.8	0.4		
METRO < 88>						19.3	80.7	0.0		
QUEBEC < 265>						13.2	86.8	0.0		
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>						17.2	82.8	0.0		
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>						8.6	91.4	0.0		
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>						0.0	100.0	0.0		
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>						8.3	91.7	0.0		
DEP 17	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	997	10	11.738	0.7005	0.011	0.109	0.015C	0.036	0.009	0.000

TABLE 135 IS Q. 37 X Q. 17

REGION										
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>						14.2	84.1	1.8		
PRAIRIES < 174>						12.1	87.9	0.0		
ONTARIO < 355>						19.7	80.0	0.3		
QUEBEC < 265>						13.2	86.8	0.0		
ATLANTIC < 93>						10.8	89.2	0.0		
DEP 17	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	997	4	9.341	0.9469	0.016	0.097	0.015C	0.040	0.010	0.000

TABLE 136 IS Q. 38 X Q. 17

COMMUNITY SIZE										
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>						18.0	81.3	0.7		
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>						20.4	79.2	0.4		
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>						12.0	88.0	0.0		
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>						9.8	90.2	0.0		
DEP 17	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	997	3	16.043	0.9989	0.111	*** 0.127	0.084C	0.225	0.059	0.000

TABLE 137

31. AGE VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

A.# 1 18 - 24 YEARS

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	1.	4.5 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	2.	9.1 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	3.	13.6 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	5.	22.7 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	2.	9.1 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	1.	4.5 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	3.	13.6 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	1.	4.5 %
12.	FREE TRADE	1.	4.5 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	1.	4.5 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	2.	9.1 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	22.	100.0 %

A.# 2 25 - 34 YEARS

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	2.	5.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	9.	22.5 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	5.	12.5 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	2.	5.0 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	1.	2.5 %
6.	TAX LAWS	1.	2.5 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	6.	15.0 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	1.	2.5 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	3.	7.5 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	1.	2.5 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	2.5 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	2.	5.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	5.	12.5 %

TABLE 137 (CONTINUED)

31. AGE VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 2	25 - 34 YEARS	RESPONSES	PERCENT
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	1.	2.5 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	40.	100.0 %

A.# 3	35 - 44 YEARS	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	1.	2.8 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	8.	22.2 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	4.	11.1 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	4.	11.1 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	2.	5.6 %
6.	TAX LAWS	2.	5.6 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	6.	16.7 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	2.	5.6 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	1.	2.8 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	2.	5.6 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	3.	8.3 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	1.	2.8 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	36.	100.0 %

A.# 4	45 - 54 YEARS	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	2.	11.8 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	5.	29.4 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	2.	11.8 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	2.	11.8 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	1.	5.9 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	1.	5.9 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %

TABLE 137 (CONTINUED)

31. AGE VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 4	45 - 54 YEARS	RESPONSES	PERCENT
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	3.	17.6 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	0.	0.0 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	1.	5.9 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	17.	100.0 %

A.# 5	55 - 64 YEARS	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	1.	8.3 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	3.	25.0 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	0.	0.0 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	2.	16.7 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	2.	16.7 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	2.	16.7 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	1.	8.3 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	1.	8.3 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	12.	100.0 %

A.# 6	65 YEARS OR OLDER	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	5.	20.8 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	1.	4.2 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	5.	20.8 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	2.	8.3 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	1.	4.2 %

TABLE 137 (CONTINUED)

31. AGE VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 6	65 YEARS OR OLDER	RESPONSES	PERCENT
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	4.	16.7 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	2.	8.3 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	2.	8.3 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	2.	8.3 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	24.	100.0 %

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
18	151	80	93.062	0.8493	0.004		0.351	0.0200	0.023	0.021	0.065

TABLE 138

32. ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 1	LESS THAN $10,000	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	2.	18.2 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	0.	0.0 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	1.	9.1 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	1.	9.1 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	1.	9.1 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	2.	18.2 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	1.	9.1 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	1.	9.1 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	2.	18.2 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	11.	100.0 %

A.# 2	$10,000 - $19,999	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	2.	9.1 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	2.	9.1 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	6.	27.3 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	3.	13.6 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	1.	4.5 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	1.	4.5 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	2.	9.1 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	1.	4.5 %
12.	FREE TRADE	1.	4.5 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	1.	4.5 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	1.	4.5 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	1.	4.5 %

TABLE 138 (CONTINUED)

32. ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 2	$10,000 - $19,999	RESPONSES	PERCENT
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	22.	100.0 %

A.# 3	$20,000 - $29,999	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	1.	3.4 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	5.	17.2 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	3.	10.3 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	2.	6.9 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	1.	3.4 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	2.	6.9 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	3.	10.3 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	6.	20.7 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	1.	3.4 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	4.	13.8 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	1.	3.4 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	29.	100.0 %

A.# 4	$30,000 - $39,999	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	1.	3.7 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	7.	25.9 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	7.	25.9 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	5.	18.5 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	1.	3.7 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	2.	7.4 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	1.	3.7 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	1.	3.7 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %

TABLE 138 (CONTINUED)

32. ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 4	$30,000 - $39,999	RESPONSES	PERCENT
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	3.7 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	0.	0.0 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	1.	3.7 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	27.	100.0 %

A.# 5	$40,000 - $49,999	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	1.	4.8 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	3.	14.3 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	4.	19.0 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	1.	4.8 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	1.	4.8 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	4.	19.0 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	2.	9.5 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	1.	4.8 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	1.	4.8 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	4.8 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	2.	9.5 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	21.	100.0 %

A.# 6	$50,000 AND OVER	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	1.	2.6 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	7.	18.4 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	4.	10.5 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	4.	10.5 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	1.	2.6 %
6.	TAX LAWS	2.	5.3 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	8.	21.1 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	2.	5.3 %

TABLE 138 (CONTINUED)

32. ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 6	$50,000 AND OVER	RESPONSES	PERCENT
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	2.6 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	4.	10.5 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	3.	7.9 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	1.	2.6 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	38.	100.0 %

DEP 18

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
148	80	87.023	0.7231	-0.094	0.343	-0.0960	-0.108	-0.098	0.057

TABLE 139

33. EDUCATION VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 1	PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	2.	18.2 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	1.	9.1 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	0.	0.0 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	1.	9.1 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	1.	9.1 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	1.	9.1 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	1.	9.1 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	1.	9.1 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	1.	9.1 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	2.	18.2 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	11.	100.0 %

A.# 2	SOME HIGH SCHOOL	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	3.	25.0 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	4.	33.3 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	2.	16.7 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	2.	16.7 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	8.3 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	0.	0.0 %

TABLE 139 (CONTINUED)

33. EDUCATION VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

A.# 2	SOME HIGH SCHOOL	RESPONSES	PERCENT
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	12.	100.0 %

A.# 3	GRAD HIGH SCHOOL	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	5.	15.2 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	4.	12.1 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	4.	12.1 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	2.	6.1 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	3.	9.1 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	3.	9.1 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	1.	3.0 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	1.	3.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	3.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	2.	6.1 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	6.	18.2 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	1.	3.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	33.	100.0 %

A.# 4	VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	1.	5.3 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	0.	0.0 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	5.	26.3 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	3.	15.8 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	3.	15.8 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	1.	5.3 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	2.	10.5 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %

TABLE 139 (CONTINUED)

33. EDUCATION VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 4	VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP	RESPONSES	PERCENT
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	1.	5.3 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	2.	10.5 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	1.	5.3 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	19.	100.0 %

A.# 5	SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	2.	3.7 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	12.	22.2 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	5.	9.3 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	6.	11.1 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	1.	1.9 %
6.	TAX LAWS	3.	5.6 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	9.	16.7 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	2.	3.7 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	5.	9.3 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	2.	3.7 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	1.9 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	4.	7.4 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	1.	1.9 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	1.	1.9 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	54.	100.0 %

A.# 6	AT SCHOOL	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	1.	5.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	5.	25.0 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	2.	10.0 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	2.	10.0 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	4.	20.0 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %

TABLE 139 (CONTINUED)

33. EDUCATION VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 6	AT SCHOOL	RESPONSES	PERCENT
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	1.	5.0 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	3.	15.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	2.	10.0 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	20.	100.0 %

DEP 18

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
149	80	95.506	0.3862	-0.116		0.358	-0.081C	-0.097	-0.088	0.057

TABLE 140

34. SEX VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

A.# 1 MALE

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	1.	1.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	18.	18.7 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	18.	18.7 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	13.	13.5 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	2.	2.1 %
6.	TAX LAWS	3.	3.1 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	9.	9.4 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	6.	6.2 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	5.	5.2 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	5.	5.2 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	2.	2.1 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	2.	2.1 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	5.	5.2 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	6.	6.2 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	1.	1.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	96.	100.0 %

A.# 2 FEMALE

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	3.	5.4 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	9.	16.1 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	3.	5.4 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	6.	10.7 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	1.	1.8 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	11.	19.6 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	1.	1.8 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	6.	10.7 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	1.	1.8 %
12.	FREE TRADE	2.	3.6 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	2.	3.6 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	1.8 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	1.	1.8 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	7.	12.5 %

TABLE 140 (CONTINUED)

34. SEX VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 2 FEMALE

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	2.	3.6 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	56.	100.0 %

DEP 18

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
152	16	28.693	0.9739	0.135	*	0.434	0.128C	0.151	0.137	0.016

TABLE 141

35. LANGUAGE VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

A.# 1 ENGLISH

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	4.	3.3 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	21.	17.5 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	14.	11.7 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	15.	12.5 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	3.	2.5 %
6.	TAX LAWS	3.	2.5 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	17.	14.2 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	7.	5.8 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	10.	8.3 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	3.	2.5 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	2.	1.7 %
12.	FREE TRADE	2.	1.7 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	2.	1.7 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	2.	1.7 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	4.	3.3 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	8.	6.7 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	3.	2.5 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	120.	100.0 %

A.# 2 FRENCH

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	6.	18.7 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	7.	21.9 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	4.	12.5 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	3.	9.4 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	1.	3.1 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	2.	6.2 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	1.	3.1 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	3.1 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	2.	6.2 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	5.	15.6 %

TABLE 141 (CONTINUED)

35. LANGUAGE VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.#	2	FRENCH	RESPONSES	PERCENT
17.		NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
		NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	32.	100.0 %

DEP
18

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
152	16	14.255	0.4203	0.044	0.306	0.0150	0.025	0.023	0.008

TABLE 142

36. SAMPLE STRATA VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

A.# 1 B.C.

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	3.	18.7 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	2.	12.5 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	2.	12.5 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	2.	12.5 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	1.	6.2 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	3.	18.7 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	3.	18.7 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	16.	100.0 %

A.# 2 ALBERTA

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	2.	22.2 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	4.	44.4 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	0.	0.0 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	1.	11.1 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	1.	11.1 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	1.	11.1 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	0.	0.0 %

TABLE 142 (CONTINUED)

36. SAMPLE STRATA VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

A.# 2 ALBERTA

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	9.	100.0 %

A.# 3 SASKATCHEWAN

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	2.	33.3 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	1.	16.7 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	2.	33.3 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	1.	16.7 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	0.	0.0 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	6.	100.0 %

A.# 4 MANITOBA

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	1.	16.7 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	2.	33.3 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	2.	33.3 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %

TABLE 142 (CONTINUED)

36. SAMPLE STRATA VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 4	MANITOBA	RESPONSES	PERCENT
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	1.	16.7 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	6.	100.0 %

A.# 5	BALANCE ONTARIO	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	2.	3.8 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	9.	17.0 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	6.	11.3 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	3.	5.7 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	3.	5.7 %
6.	TAX LAWS	1.	1.9 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	8.	15.1 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	5.	9.4 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	2.	3.8 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	1.	1.9 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	2.	3.8 %
12.	FREE TRADE	1.	1.9 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	2.	3.8 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	1.9 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	3.	5.7 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	2.	3.8 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	2.	3.8 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	53.	100.0 %

A.# 6	METRO	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	2.	11.8 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	1.	5.9 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	6.	35.3 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	1.	5.9 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	2.	11.8 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	1.	5.9 %

TABLE 142 (CONTINUED)

36. SAMPLE STRATA VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 6	METRO	RESPONSES	PERCENT
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	1.	5.9 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	2.	11.8 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	1.	5.9 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	17.	100.0 %

A.# 7	QUEBEC	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	6.	17.1 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	8.	22.9 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	3.	8.6 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	5.	14.3 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	2.	5.7 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	2.	5.7 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	1.	2.9 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	2.9 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	2.	5.7 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	5.	14.3 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	35.	100.0 %

A.# 8	NEW BRUNSWICK	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	2.	40.0 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	2.	40.0 %

TABLE 142 (CONTINUED)

36. SAMPLE STRATA VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

A.# 8 NEW BRUNSWICK

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	1.	20.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	0.	0.0 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	5.	100.0 %

A.# 9 NOVA SCOTIA

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	0.	0.0 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	1.	33.3 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	0.	0.0 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	1.	33.3 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	1.	33.3 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	0.	0.0 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	3.	100.0 %

TABLE 142 (CONTINUED)

36. SAMPLE STRATA VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

A.# 11 NEWFOUNDLAND

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	1.	50.0 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	0.	0.0 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	50.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	0.	0.0 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	2.	100.0 %

DEP 18

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
152	160	0.000	0.0000	0.059	0.000	0.015C	0.019	0.017	0.089

TABLE 143

37. REGION VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

A.# 1 BRITISH COLUMBIA

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	3.	18.7 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	2.	12.5 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	2.	12.5 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	2.	12.5 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	1.	6.2 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	3.	18.7 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	3.	18.7 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	16.	100.0 %

A.# 2 PRAIRIES

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	5.	23.8 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	4.	19.0 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	3.	14.3 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	1.	4.8 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	3.	14.3 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	3.	14.3 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	1.	4.8 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	1.	4.8 %

TABLE 143 (CONTINUED)

37. REGION VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 2	PRAIRIES	RESPONSES	PERCENT
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	21.	100.0 %

A.# 3	ONTARIO	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	4.	5.7 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	10.	14.3 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	6.	8.6 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	9.	12.9 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	3.	4.3 %
6.	TAX LAWS	2.	2.9 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	10.	14.3 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	6.	8.6 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	2.	2.9 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	2.	2.9 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	2.	2.9 %
12.	FREE TRADE	1.	1.4 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	2.	2.9 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	1.4 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	3.	4.3 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	4.	5.7 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	3.	4.3 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	70.	100.0 %

A.# 4	QUEBEC	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	6.	17.1 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	8.	22.9 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	3.	8.6 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	5.	14.3 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	2.	5.7 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	2.	5.7 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	1.	2.9 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %

TABLE 143 (CONTINUED)

37. REGION VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

A.# 4 QUEBEC

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	2.9 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	2.	5.7 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	5.	14.3 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	35.	100.0 %

A.# 5 ATLANTIC

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	3.	30.0 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	1.	10.0 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	2.	20.0 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	1.	10.0 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	1.	10.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	10.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	1.	10.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	0.	0.0 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	10.	100.0 %

DEP 18

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
152	64	58.264	0.3215	0.038	0.310	0.018C	0.023	0.021	0.016

TABLE 144

38. COMMUNITY SIZE VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

A.# 1 1,000,000 AND OVER

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	2.	3.8 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	11.	20.8 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	5.	9.4 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	8.	15.1 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	1.	1.9 %
6.	TAX LAWS	1.	1.9 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	8.	15.1 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	2.	3.8 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	3.	5.7 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	2.	3.8 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	2.	3.8 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	2.	3.8 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	5.	9.4 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	1.	1.9 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	53.	100.0 %

A.# 2 100,000 - 99,999

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	1.	1.9 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	10.	18.9 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	7.	13.2 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	6.	11.3 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	2.	3.8 %
6.	TAX LAWS	1.	1.9 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	6.	11.3 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	4.	7.5 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	4.	7.5 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	2.	3.8 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	1.	1.9 %
12.	FREE TRADE	1.	1.9 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	2.	3.8 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	1.9 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	2.	3.8 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	3.	5.7 %

TABLE 144 (CONTINUED)

38. COMMUNITY SIZE VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

A.# 2 100,000 - 99,999

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	53.	100.0 %

A.# 3 10,000 - 99,999

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	2.	16.7 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	2.	16.7 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	1.	8.3 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	1.	8.3 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	2.	16.7 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	1.	8.3 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	1.	8.3 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	1.	8.3 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	1.	8.3 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	12.	100.0 %

A.# 4 UNDER 10,000/RURAL

		RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	1.	2.9 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	4.	11.8 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	7.	20.6 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	4.	11.8 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	4.	11.8 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	3.	8.8 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	1.	2.9 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	1.	2.9 %

TABLE 144 (CONTINUED)

38. COMMUNITY SIZE VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 4	UNDER 10,000/RURAL	RESPONSES	PERCENT
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	2.	5.9 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	1.	2.9 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	4.	11.8 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	2.	5.9 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	34.	100.0 %

DEP.	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
18	152	48	30.032	0.0197	0.089	0.257	0.0600	0.072	0.065	0.024

TABLE 145

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI

ANSWERS TO Q. 19:
1) POOR JOB
2) ONLY FAIR JOB
3) GOOD JOB
4) VERY GOOD JOB
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.0	49.2	29.7	3.4	2.6
TABLE 145 IS Q. 31 X Q. 19					
AGE					
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	10.9	48.3	36.7	2.7	1.4
(AVG.= 2.32 SIG.HIGHR *)					
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	9.9	57.7	27.7	1.8	2.9
(AVG.= 2.22 NO SIG.DIFF)					
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	20.5	47.3	26.8	2.3	3.2
(AVG.= 2.11 SIG.LOWER **)					
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	13.2	44.2	33.3	7.0	2.3
(AVG.= 2.35 SIG.HIGHR **)					
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	23.1	44.2	25.0	5.8	1.9
(AVG.= 2.14 NO SIG.DIFF)					
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	17.1	44.7	30.9	4.1	3.3
(AVG.= 2.23 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP 19	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	971	15	36.288	0.9984	-0.024		0.112	-0.028C	-0.041	-0.026	0.000

TABLE 146 IS Q. 32 X Q. 19					
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME					
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	13.0	37.0	41.3	6.5	2.2
(AVG.= 2.42 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	9.9	47.4	34.7	5.2	2.8
(AVG.= 2.36 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	14.2	56.6	25.0	2.4	1.9
(AVG.= 2.16 SIG.LOWER +)					
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	16.4	49.2	28.2	5.1	1.1
(AVG.= 2.22 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	15.0	53.3	29.0	0.9	1.9
(AVG.= 2.16 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	23.2	48.4	22.6	0.6	5.2
(AVG.= 2.01 SIG.LOWER ***)					

DEP 19	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	932	15	39.352	0.9994	-0.158	***	0.119	-0.124C	-0.180	-0.113	0.009

TABLE 147

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 19: 1) POOR JOB 2) ONLY FAIR JOB
3) GOOD JOB 4) VERY GOOD JOB
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.0	49.2	29.7	3.4	2.6

TABLE 147 IS Q. 33 X Q. 19

EDUCATION					
PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93> (AVG.= 2.41 SIG.HIGHR ***)	16.1	35.5	37.6	9.7	1.1
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177> (AVG.= 2.32 SIG.HIGHR *)	9.6	50.8	31.1	4.5	4.0
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 265> (AVG.= 2.19 NO SIG.DIFF)	16.5	47.7	31.6	1.8	2.5
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143> (AVG.= 2.25 NO SIG.DIFF)	7.7	58.0	29.4	1.4	3.5
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218> (AVG.= 2.07 SIG.LOWER ***)	22.0	50.0	21.6	3.7	2.8
AT SCHOOL < 75> (AVG.= 2.20 NO SIG.DIFF)	16.0	50.7	30.7	2.7	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
19	965	15	44.706	0.9999	-0.111	***	0.124	-0.089C	-0.132	-0.083	0.004

TABLE 148 IS Q. 34 X Q. 19

SEX					
MALE < 499> (AVG.= 2.10 SIG.LOWER ***)	19.2	51.9	23.2	2.8	2.8
FEMALE < 501> (AVG.= 2.34 SIG.HIGHR ***)	11.2	46.5	35.9	4.0	2.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
19	974	3	26.781	1.0000	0.159	***	0.166	0.173C	0.273	0.173	0.000

TABLE 149 IS Q. 35 X Q. 19

LANGUAGE					
ENGLISH < 754> (AVG.= 2.12 SIG.LOWER ***)	18.4	51.9	23.9	2.9	2.9
FRENCH < 246> (AVG.= 2.52 SIG.HIGHR ***)	5.3	41.1	47.2	4.9	1.6

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
19	974	3	61.121	1.0000	0.238	***	0.251	0.225C	0.465	0.301	0.031

TABLE 150

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI

ANSWERS TO
Q. 19: 1) POOR JOB 2) ONLY FAIR JOB
3) GOOD JOB 4) VERY GOOD JOB
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.0	49.2	29.7	3.4	2.6

TABLE 150 IS Q. 36 X Q. 19

SAMPLE STRATA					
B.C. < 113>	20.4	56.6	17.7	1.8	3.5
(AVG.= 2.01 SIG.LOWER ***)					
ALBERTA < 92>	12.0	57.6	27.2	1.1	2.2
(AVG.= 2.18 NO SIG.DIFF)					
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	22.5	52.5	20.0	2.5	2.5
(AVG.= 2.03 SIG.LOWER *)					
MANITOBA < 42>	19.0	42.9	26.2	7.1	4.8
(AVG.= 2.22 NO SIG.DIFF)					
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	18.7	50.2	24.7	3.4	3.0
(AVG.= 2.13 SIG.LOWER **)					
METRO < 88>	28.4	48.9	18.2	2.3	2.3
(AVG.= 1.94 SIG.LOWER ***)					
QUEBEC < 265>	6.0	43.4	44.5	4.2	1.9
(AVG.= 2.48 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	6.9	48.3	37.9	3.4	3.4
(AVG.= 2.39 NO SIG.DIFF)					
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	14.3	40.0	40.0	2.9	2.9
(AVG.= 2.32 NO SIG.DIFF)					
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	20.0	60.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
(AVG.= 2.00 T-TEST IS N/A)					
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	8.3	54.2	25.0	12.5	0.0
(AVG.= 2.42 T-TEST IS N/A)					

DEP 19	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	974	30	85.067	1.0000	0.161	***	0.171	0.146C	0.211	0.133	0.006

TABLE 151 IS Q. 37 X Q. 19

REGION					
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	20.4	56.6	17.7	1.8	3.5
(AVG.= 2.01 SIG.LOWER ***)					
PRAIRIES < 174>	16.1	52.9	25.3	2.9	2.9
(AVG.= 2.15 NO SIG.DIFF)					
ONTARIO < 355>	21.1	49.9	23.1	3.1	2.8
(AVG.= 2.08 SIG.LOWER ***)					
QUEBEC < 265>	6.0	43.4	44.5	4.2	1.9
(AVG.= 2.48 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
ATLANTIC < 93>	10.8	47.3	34.4	5.4	2.2
(AVG.= 2.35 SIG.HIGHR *)					

DEP 19	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	974	12	64.468	1.0000	0.182	***	0.149	0.155C	0.246	0.155	0.006

TABLE 152

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 19: 1) POOR JOB 2) ONLY FAIR JOB
3) GOOD JOB 4) VERY GOOD JOB
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.0	49.2	29.7	3.4	2.6
TABLE 152 IS Q. 38 X Q. 19					
COMMUNITY SIZE					
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	18.0	50.3	26.5	3.1	2.0
(AVG.= 2.15 SIG.LOWER *)					
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	16.9	50.4	26.2	3.5	3.1
(AVG.= 2.17 NO SIG.DIFF)					
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	12.0	58.0	24.0	5.0	1.0
(AVG.= 2.22 NO SIG.DIFF)					
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	12.4	44.8	36.4	3.2	3.2
(AVG.= 2.31 SIG.HIGHR ***)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
19	974	9	16.865	0.9491	0.094	***	0.076	0.035	0.127	0.079	0.000

TABLE 153

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 20. GOVT ROLE IN DEV CDN TCH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 20: 1) LESS ACTIVE 2) SME LEVEL ACTVITY
3) MORE ACTIVE 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.4	12.4	81.0	1.1
TABLE 153 IS Q. 31 X Q. 20				
AGE				
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	4.1	12.9	82.3	0.7
(AVG.= 0.79 NO SIG.DIFF)				
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	4.7	10.2	84.7	0.4
(AVG.= 0.80 SIG.HIGHR +)				
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	7.7	10.5	80.5	1.4
(AVG.= 0.74 NO SIG.DIFF)				
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	7.0	14.7	76.0	2.3
(AVG.= 0.71 SIG.LOWER +)				
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	1.9	13.5	82.7	1.9
(AVG.= 0.82 NO SIG.DIFF)				
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	5.7	17.1	76.4	0.8
(AVG.= 0.71 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
20	986	10	11.617	0.6885	-0.037	0.077	-0.031C	-0.082	-0.026	0.000

TABLE 154 IS Q. 32 X Q. 20				
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME				
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	6.5	9.8	83.7	0.0
(AVG.= 0.77 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	5.6	16.0	77.0	1.4
(AVG.= 0.72 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	4.2	10.3	84.0	0.9
(AVG.= 0.80 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	4.5	11.3	84.2	0.0
(AVG.= 0.80 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	5.6	15.9	77.6	0.9
(AVG.= 0.73 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	7.1	11.6	80.6	0.6
(AVG.= 0.74 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
20	949	10	7.182	0.2919	-0.007	0.062	0.000C	0.001	0.000	0.000

TABLE 155

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 20. GOVT ROLE IN DEV CDN TCH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 20: 1) LESS ACTIVE 2) SME LEVEL ACTVITY
3) MORE ACTIVE 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.4	12.4	81.0	1.1

TABLE 155 IS Q. 33 X Q. 20
EDUCATION

PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93> (AVG.= 0.76 NO SIG.DIFF)	3.2	17.2	78.5	1.1
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177> (AVG.= 0.73 NO SIG.DIFF)	5.1	16.4	75.7	2.8
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285> (AVG.= 0.73 NO SIG.DIFF)	6.7	13.0	79.3	1.1
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143> (AVG.= 0.82 NO SIG.DIFF)	4.9	8.4	86.0	0.7
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218> (AVG.= 0.78 NO SIG.DIFF)	5.5	10.6	83.5	0.5
AT SCHOOL < 75> (AVG.= 0.80 NO SIG.DIFF)	5.3	9.3	85.3	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
20	980	10	10.289	0.5845	0.041		0.072	0.040C	0.107	0.033	0.000

TABLE 156 IS Q. 34 X Q. 20
SEX

MALE < 499> (AVG.= 0.74 SIG.LOWER +)	7.0	11.6	80.2	1.2
FEMALE < 501> (AVG.= 0.79 SIG.HIGHR +)	3.8	13.4	81.8	1.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
20	989	2	5.503	0.9362	0.045		0.075	0.020C	0.065	0.020	0.000

TABLE 157 IS Q. 35 X Q. 20
LANGUAGE

ENGLISH < 754> (AVG.= 0.75 SIG.LOWER +)	6.0	12.7	79.8	1.5
FRENCH < 246> (AVG.= 0.81 SIG.HIGHR +)	3.7	11.8	84.6	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
20	989	2	2.415	0.7010	0.048		0.049	0.023C	0.127	0.038	0.000

TABLE 158

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 20. GOVT ROLE IN DEV CDN TCH

ANSWERS TO
Q. 20: 1) LESS ACTIVE 2) SME LEVEL ACTVITY
3) MORE ACTIVE 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.4	12.4	81.0	1.1
TABLE 158 IS Q. 36 X Q. 20				
SAMPLE STRATA				
B.C. < 113>	4.4	7.1	88.5	0.0
(AVG.= 0.84 SIG.HIGHR +)				
ALBERTA < 92>	8.7	26.1	64.1	1.1
(AVG.= 0.56 SIG.LOWER ***)				
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	2.5	20.0	77.5	0.0
(AVG.= 0.75 NO SIG.DIFF)				
MANITOBA < 42>	11.9	7.1	81.0	0.0
(AVG.= 0.69 NO SIG.DIFF)				
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	5.6	11.6	79.8	3.0
(AVG.= 0.76 NO SIG.DIFF)				
METRO < 88>	9.1	10.2	79.5	1.1
(AVG.= 0.71 NO SIG.DIFF)				
QUEBEC < 265>	3.4	11.7	84.9	0.0
(AVG.= 0.82 SIG.HIGHR *)				
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	0.0	17.2	82.8	0.0
(AVG.= 0.83 NO SIG.DIFF)				
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	5.6	11.4	77.1	2.9
(AVG.= 0.71 NO SIG.DIFF)				
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
(AVG.= 1.00 T-TEST IS N/A)				
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	0.0	8.3	91.7	0.0
(AVG.= 0.92 T-TEST IS N/A)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
20	261	20	113.682	1.0000	0.357	***	0.467	0.339C	0.391	0.258	0.310

TABLE 159 IS Q. 37 X Q. 20

REGION				
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	4.4	7.1	88.5	0.0
(AVG.= 0.84 SIG.HIGHR +)				
PRAIRIES < 174>	3.0	20.1	71.3	0.6
(AVG.= 0.64 SIG.LOWER ***)				
ONTARIO < 355>	6.5	11.3	79.7	2.5
(AVG.= 0.75 NO SIG.DIFF)				
QUEBEC < 265>	3.4	11.7	84.9	0.0
(AVG.= 0.82 SIG.HIGHR *)				
ATLANTIC < 93>	3.2	11.8	83.9	1.1
(AVG.= 0.82 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
20	989	8	20.578	0.9916	0.046		0.102	0.034C	0.098	0.030	0.000

TABLE 160

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 20. GOVT ROLE IN DEV CDN TCH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 20: 1) LESS ACTIVE 2) SME LEVEL ACTVITY
3) MORE ACTIVE 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.4	12.4	81.0	1.1
TABLE 160 IS Q. 38 X Q. 20				
COMMUNITY SIZE				
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	4.4	8.8	85.7	1.0
(AVG.= 0.82 SIG.HIGHR **)				
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	6.5	10.4	81.9	1.2
(AVG.= 0.76 NO SIG.DIFF)				
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	3.0	17.0	78.0	2.0
(AVG.= 0.77 NO SIG.DIFF)				
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	6.1	15.9	77.2	0.9
(AVG.= 0.72 SIG.LOWER **)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
20	969	6	12.962	0.9564	-0.074	**	0.081	-0.058C	-0.173	-0.054	0.000

TABLE 161

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 21. AMT $ SCI/TECH PAST YEAR

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 21: 1) DECREASED 2) STAYED THE SAME
3) INCREASED 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	20.8	45.9	27.1	6.2
TABLE 161 IS Q. 31 X Q. 21				
AGE				
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	17.0	46.3	30.6	6.1
(AVG.= 0.14 SIG.HIGHR +)				
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	16.4	48.5	30.7	4.4
(AVG.= 0.15 SIG.HIGHR **)				
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	25.0	45.9	25.0	4.1
(AVG.= 0.00 SIG.LOWER +)				
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	20.2	48.1	22.5	9.3
(AVG.= 0.03 NO SIG.DIFF)				
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	24.0	41.3	24.0	10.6
(AVG.= 0.00 NO SIG.DIFF)				
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	25.2	41.5	26.0	7.3
(AVG.= 0.01 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
21	935	10	11.821	0.7028	-0.077	**	0.080	-0.075C	-0.098	-0.062	0.000

TABLE 162 IS Q. 32 X Q. 21				
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME				
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	23.9	33.7	33.7	8.7
(AVG.= 0.11 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	17.8	46.9	29.1	6.1
(AVG.= 0.12 SIG.HIGHR +)				
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	21.7	45.8	28.3	4.2
(AVG.= 0.07 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	21.5	51.4	24.9	2.3
(AVG.= 0.03 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	21.5	44.9	24.3	9.3
(AVG.= 0.03 NO SIG.DIFF)				
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	24.5	44.5	23.9	7.1
(AVG.=-0.01 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
21	901	10	9.257	0.4921	-0.059	*	0.072	-0.055C	-0.071	-0.045	0.000

TABLE 163

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 21. AMT $ SCI/TECH PAST YEAR

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 21: 1) DECREASED 2) STAYED THE SAME
3) INCREASED 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	20.8	45.9	27.1	6.2
TABLE 163 IS Q. 33 X Q. 21				
EDUCATION				
PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	24.7	40.9	28.0	6.5
(AVG.= 0.03 NO SIG.DIFF)				
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	17.5	44.1	29.9	8.5
(AVG.= 0.14 SIG.HIGHR +)				
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	19.6	47.4	26.3	6.7
(AVG.= 0.07 NO SIG.DIFF)				
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	17.5	53.1	23.1	6.3
(AVG.= 0.06 NO SIG.DIFF)				
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	25.7	42.7	26.6	5.0
(AVG.= 0.01 SIG.LOWER +)				
AT SCHOOL < 75>	20.0	49.3	30.7	0.0
(AVG.= 0.11 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
21	931	10	9.572	0.5212	-0.022		0.072	-0.024C	-0.031	-0.020	0.000

TABLE 164 IS Q. 34 X Q. 21

SEX				
MALE < 499>	23.2	46.3	24.2	6.2
(AVG.= 0.01 SIG.LOWER **)				
FEMALE < 501>	18.2	45.5	30.1	6.2
(AVG.= 0.13 SIG.HIGHR **)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
21	938	2	6.344	0.9581	0.082	**	0.082	0.087C	0.139	0.087	0.000

TABLE 165 IS Q. 35 X Q. 21

LANGUAGE				
ENGLISH < 754>	22.4	44.4	26.8	6.4
(AVG.= 0.05 SIG.LOWER *)				
FRENCH < 246>	15.4	50.4	28.5	5.7
(AVG.= 0.14 SIG.HIGHR *)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
21	938	2	5.951	0.9490	0.055	*	0.080	0.049C	0.106	0.066	0.000

TABLE 166

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 21. AMT $ SCI/TECH PAST YEAR

ANSWERS TO Q. 21: 1) DECREASED 2) STAYED THE SAME 3) INCREASED 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	20.8	45.9	27.1	6.2
TABLE 166 IS Q. 36 X Q. 21				
SAMPLE STRATA				
B.C. < 113>	22.1	51.3	23.0	3.5
(AVG.= 0.01 NO SIG.DIFF)				
ALBERTA < 92>	20.7	54.3	25.0	0.0
(AVG.= 0.04 NO SIG.DIFF)				
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	35.0	30.0	30.0	5.0
(AVG.=-0.05 NO SIG.DIFF)				
MANITOBA < 42>	21.4	40.5	23.8	14.3
(AVG.= 0.03 NO SIG.DIFF)				
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	19.9	40.4	31.5	8.2
(AVG.= 0.13 SIG.HIGHR +)				
METRO < 88>	20.5	45.5	23.9	10.2
(AVG.= 0.04 NO SIG.DIFF)				
QUEBEC < 265>	17.7	49.8	26.0	6.4
(AVG.= 0.09 NO SIG.DIFF)				
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	17.2	55.2	27.6	0.0
(AVG.= 0.10 NO SIG.DIFF)				
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	34.3	37.1	28.6	0.0
(AVG.=-0.06 NO SIG.DIFF)				
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0
(AVG.= 0.50 T-TEST IS N/A)				
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	20.8	45.8	29.2	4.2
(AVG.= 0.09 T-TEST IS N/A)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
21	938	20	20.312	0.5614	0.029	0.104	0.022C	0.028	0.018	0.004

TABLE 167 IS Q. 37 X Q. 21

REGION				
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	22.1	51.3	23.0	3.5
(AVG.= 0.01 NO SIG.DIFF)				
PRAIRIES < 174>	24.1	45.4	25.9	4.6
(AVG.= 0.02 NO SIG.DIFF)				
ONTARIO < 355>	20.0	41.7	29.6	8.7
(AVG.= 0.10 NO SIG.DIFF)				
QUEBEC < 265>	17.7	49.8	26.0	6.4
(AVG.= 0.09 NO SIG.DIFF)				
ATLANTIC < 93>	23.7	45.2	29.0	2.2
(AVG.= 0.05 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
21	938	8	6.980	0.4612	0.031	0.061	0.027C	0.038	0.024	0.000

TABLE 168

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 21. AMT $ SCI/TECH PAST YEAR

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 21: 1) DECREASED 2) STAYED THE SAME
3) INCREASED 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	20.8	45.9	27.1	6.2
TABLE 168 IS Q. 38 X Q. 21				
COMMUNITY SIZE				
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	22.1	42.5	28.9	6.5
(AVG.= 0.07 NO SIG.DIFF)				
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	23.8	45.4	24.2	6.5
(AVG.= 0.00 SIG.LOWER *)				
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	16.0	53.0	25.0	6.0
(AVG.= 0.10 NO SIG.DIFF)				
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	18.5	47.1	28.6	5.8
(AVG.= 0.11 NO SIG.DIFF)				

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
21	938	6	6.940	0.6736	0.032		0.061	0.0240	0.036	0.022	0.000

TABLE 169

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 22. PROM TECH/TAX BREAKS

ANSWERS TO Q. 22:
1) NOT AT ALL
2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT
4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.7	12.8	44.6	36.4	0.4
TABLE 169 IS Q. 31 X Q. 22					
AGE					
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	4.1	12.2	47.6	35.4	0.7
(AVG.= 3.15 NO SIG.DIFF)					
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	5.1	12.8	45.3	36.9	0.0
(AVG.= 3.14 NO SIG.DIFF)					
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	6.4	12.3	46.8	34.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.10 NO SIG.DIFF)					
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	7.0	13.2	42.6	35.7	1.6
(AVG.= 3.09 NO SIG.DIFF)					
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	7.7	18.3	35.6	38.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.05 NO SIG.DIFF)					
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	4.9	9.8	45.5	39.0	0.8
(AVG.= 3.20 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP 22	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	993	15	8.853	0.1149	-0.004		0.055	-0.000C	-0.001	-0.000	0.005

TABLE 170 IS Q. 32 X Q. 22					
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME					
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	2.2	12.0	46.7	39.1	0.0
(AVG.= 3.23 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	4.2	15.0	50.7	29.6	0.5
(AVG.= 3.06 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	6.1	14.2	42.9	36.3	0.5
(AVG.= 3.10 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	7.3	10.2	39.0	43.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.19 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	5.6	10.3	45.8	37.4	0.9
(AVG.= 3.16 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	7.7	12.3	45.2	34.8	0.0
(AVG.= 3.07 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP 22	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	953	15	16.262	0.6351	-0.009		0.075	0.011C	0.015	0.010	0.015

TABLE 171

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 22. PROM TECH/TAX BREAKS

ANSWERS TO
Q. 22: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.7	12.8	44.6	36.4	0.4
TABLE 171 IS Q. 33 X Q. 22					
EDUCATION					
PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	2.2	14.0	48.4	33.3	2.2
(AVG.= 3.15 NO SIG.DIFF)					
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	4.5	13.0	50.8	31.1	0.6
(AVG.= 3.09 NO SIG.DIFF)					
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	5.6	11.2	40.0	43.2	0.0
(AVG.= 3.21 SIG.HIGHR **)					
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	6.3	13.3	49.0	31.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.06 NO SIG.DIFF)					
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	8.3	14.7	39.4	37.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.06 NO SIG.DIFF)					
AT SCHOOL < 75>	5.3	12.0	50.7	32.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.09 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
22	988	15	18.685	0.7717	-0.034		0.079	-0.013C	-0.022	-0.014	0.017

TABLE 172 IS Q. 34 X Q. 22

SEX					
MALE < 499>	7.0	13.8	42.7	35.9	0.6
(AVG.= 3.08 SIG.LOWER +)					
FEMALE < 501>	4.6	11.8	46.7	36.7	0.2
(AVG.= 3.16 SIG.HIGHR +)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
22	996	3	4.303	0.7695	0.046		0.066	0.037C	0.057	0.037	0.000

TABLE 173 IS Q. 35 X Q. 22

LANGUAGE					
ENGLISH < 754>	6.8	10.5	41.5	40.8	0.4
(AVG.= 3.17 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
FRENCH < 246>	2.8	19.9	54.5	22.4	0.4
(AVG.= 2.97 SIG.LOWER ***)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
22	996	3	42.269	1.0000	-0.103	***	0.206	-0.130C	-0.267	-0.176	0.000

TABLE 174

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 22. PROM TECH/TAX BREAKS

ANSWERS TO
Q. 22: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.7	12.8	44.6	36.4	0.4

TABLE 174 IS Q. 36 X Q. 22

SAMPLE STRATA					
B.C. < 113>	4.4	12.4	41.6	41.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.20 NO SIG.DIFF)					
ALBERTA < 92>	4.3	13.0	47.8	34.8	0.0
(AVG.= 3.13 NO SIG.DIFF)					
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	12.5	10.0	40.0	37.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.03 NO SIG.DIFF)					
MANITOBA < 42>	9.5	11.9	35.7	40.5	2.4
(AVG.= 3.10 NO SIG.DIFF)					
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	7.5	11.2	40.1	41.2	0.0
(AVG.= 3.15 NO SIG.DIFF)					
METRO < 88>	10.2	8.0	35.2	44.3	2.3
(AVG.= 3.16 NO SIG.DIFF)					
QUEBEC < 265>	2.6	18.5	53.2	25.3	0.4
(AVG.= 3.02 SIG.LOWER **)					
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	3.4	13.8	41.4	41.4	0.0
(AVG.= 3.21 NO SIG.DIFF)					
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	8.6	0.0	60.0	31.4	0.0
(AVG.= 3.14 NO SIG.DIFF)					
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.20 T-TEST IS N/A)					
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	0.0	8.3	45.8	45.8	0.0
(AVG.= 3.38 T-TEST IS N/A)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
22	996	30	55.375	0.9968	-0.017	0.136	-0.038C	-0.053	-0.035	0.024

TABLE 175 IS Q. 37 X Q. 22

REGION					
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	4.4	12.4	41.6	41.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.20 NO SIG.DIFF)					
PRAIRIES < 174>	7.5	12.1	43.1	36.8	0.6
(AVG.= 3.10 NO SIG.DIFF)					
ONTARIO < 355>	8.2	10.4	38.9	42.0	0.6
(AVG.= 3.15 NO SIG.DIFF)					
QUEBEC < 265>	2.6	18.5	53.2	25.3	0.4
(AVG.= 3.02 SIG.LOWER **)					
ATLANTIC < 93>	4.3	7.5	49.5	38.7	0.0
(AVG.= 3.23 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
22	996	12	40.772	0.9999	-0.024	0.117	-0.040C	-0.062	-0.040	0.020

TABLE 176

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 22. PROM TECH/TAX BREAKS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 22: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.7	12.8	44.6	36.4	0.4
TABLE 176 IS Q. 38 X Q. 22					
COMMUNITY SIZE					
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	6.5	11.9	42.2	38.8	0.7
(AVG.= 3.14 NO SIG.DIFF)					
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	6.5	11.9	41.2	40.4	0.0
(AVG.= 3.15 NO SIG.DIFF)					
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	8.0	11.0	46.0	35.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.03 NO SIG.DIFF)					
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	4.0	14.7	49.1	31.5	0.6
(AVG.= 3.09 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
22	996	9	11.380	0.7494	-0.031	0.062	-0.0423	-0.061	-0.040	0.000

TABLE 177

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 23. PROM TECH/FNDS TO SCHOOL

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 23:
1) NOT AT ALL
2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT
4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.0	4.7	36.1	56.9	0.3
TABLE 177 IS Q. 31 X Q. 23					
AGE					
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	1.4	4.8	33.3	60.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.53 NO SIG.DIFF)					
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	1.1	4.0	35.4	59.1	0.4
(AVG.= 3.53 SIG.HIGHR +)					
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	0.9	6.8	38.6	53.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.45 NO SIG.DIFF)					
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	3.9	3.9	41.9	49.6	0.8
(AVG.= 3.38 SIG.LOWER *)					
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	4.8	4.8	32.7	57.7	0.0
(AVG.= 3.43 NO SIG.DIFF)					
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	2.4	3.3	33.3	60.2	0.8
(AVG.= 3.52 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
23	994	15	17.247	0.6957	-0.033		0.076	-0.023C	-0.040	-0.022	0.000

TABLE 178 IS Q. 32 X Q. 23					
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME					
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	1.1	5.4	32.6	60.9	0.0
(AVG.= 3.53 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	1.9	6.6	39.4	51.6	0.5
(AVG.= 3.42 SIG.LOWER *)					
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	1.9	4.2	35.4	58.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.50 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	1.7	2.3	35.0	61.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.55 SIG.HIGHR +)					
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	3.7	6.5	30.8	58.9	0.0
(AVG.= 3.45 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	1.9	3.9	38.7	55.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.48 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
23	955	15	11.332	0.2712	0.006		0.063	0.012C	0.020	0.011	0.000

TABLE 179

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 23. PROM TECH/FNDS TO SCHOOL

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 23: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.0	4.7	36.1	56.9	0.3

TABLE 179 IS Q. 33 X Q. 23

EDUCATION

PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93> (AVG.= 3.42 NO SIG.DIFF)	1.1	8.6	37.6	52.7	0.0
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177> (AVG.= 3.37 SIG.LOWER **)	3.4	2.8	46.3	46.3	1.1
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285> (AVG.= 3.47 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.8	5.3	33.7	57.9	0.4
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143> (AVG.= 3.54 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.7	4.9	34.3	60.1	0.0
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218> (AVG.= 3.53 NO SIG.DIFF)	1.4	3.7	35.3	59.6	0.0
AT SCHOOL < 75> (AVG.= 3.59 SIG.HIGHR +)	1.3	5.3	26.7	66.7	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
23	988	15	23.161	0.9192	0.038	***	0.088	0.072C	0.123	0.067	0.000

TABLE 180 IS Q. 34 X Q. 23

SEX

MALE < 499> (AVG.= 3.43 SIG.LOWER ***)	2.6	5.8	37.9	53.5	0.2
FEMALE < 501> (AVG.= 3.54 SIG.HIGHR ***)	1.4	3.6	34.3	60.3	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
23	997	3	7.327	0.9378	0.085	***	0.086	0.079C	0.146	0.079	0.000

TABLE 181 IS Q. 35 X Q. 23

LANGUAGE

ENGLISH < 754> (AVG.= 3.54 SIG.HIGHR ***)	1.7	3.8	32.6	61.5	0.3
FRENCH < 246> (AVG.= 3.30 SIG.LOWER ***)	2.8	7.3	46.7	42.7	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
23	997	3	27.777	1.0000	-0.155	***	0.167	-0.145C	-0.338	-0.195	0.023

TABLE 182

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 23. PROM TECH/FNDS TO SCHOOL

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 23:
1) NOT AT ALL
2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT
4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.0	4.7	36.1	56.9	0.3
TABLE 182 IS Q. 36 X Q. 23					
SAMPLE STRATA					
B.C. < 113>	0.9	3.5	31.0	64.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.59 SIG.HIGHR *)					
ALBERTA < 92>	1.1	3.3	39.1	56.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.51 NO SIG.DIFF)					
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	2.5	2.5	35.0	60.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.53 NO SIG.DIFF)					
MANITOBA < 42>	4.8	9.5	35.7	50.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.31 SIG.LOWER *)					
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	1.1	4.1	30.7	63.7	0.4
(AVG.= 3.58 SIG.HIGHR **)					
METRO < 88>	3.4	2.3	31.8	61.4	1.1
(AVG.= 3.53 NO SIG.DIFF)					
QUEBEC < 265>	2.6	6.8	45.3	44.9	0.4
(AVG.= 3.33 SIG.LOWER ***)					
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	3.4	6.9	48.3	41.4	0.0
(AVG.= 3.28 SIG.LOWER *)					
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	2.9	2.9	20.0	74.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.66 SIG.HIGHR +)					
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	0.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.60 T-TEST IS N/A)					
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	0.0	0.0	41.7	58.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.58 T-TEST IS N/A)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
23	997	30	47.202	0.9762	-0.065	**	0.126	-0.065C	-0.109	-0.059	0.007

TABLE 183 IS Q. 37 X Q. 23

REGION					
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	0.9	3.5	31.0	64.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.59 SIG.HIGHR *)					
PRAIRIES < 174>	2.3	4.6	37.4	55.7	0.0
(AVG.= 3.47 NO SIG.DIFF)					
ONTARIO < 355>	1.7	3.7	31.0	63.1	0.6
(AVG.= 3.56 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
QUEBEC < 265>	2.6	6.8	45.3	44.9	0.4
(AVG.= 3.33 SIG.LOWER ***)					
ATLANTIC < 93>	2.2	4.3	33.3	60.2	0.0
(AVG.= 3.52 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
23	997	12	25.513	0.9874	-0.074	**	0.092	-0.063C	-0.116	-0.063	0.002

TABLE 184

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 23. PROM TECH/FNDS TO SCHOOL

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 23: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.0	4.7	36.1	56.9	0.3
TABLE 184 IS Q. 38 X Q. 23					
COMMUNITY SIZE					
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	2.4	4.8	37.1	55.4	0.3
(AVG.= 3.46 NO SIG.DIFF)					
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	1.5	2.7	30.8	65.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.59 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	1.0	7.0	36.0	55.0	1.0
(AVG.= 3.46 NO SIG.DIFF)					
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	2.3	5.5	39.3	52.6	0.3
(AVG.= 3.43 SIG.LOWER *)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
23	997	9	12.364	0.8064	-0.041	0.064	-0.0348	-0.055	-0.030	0.000

TABLE 185

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 24. PROM TECH/SCHOLARSHIPS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 24: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.9	9.3	38.4	48.8	0.5
TABLE 185 IS Q. 31 X Q. 24					
AGE					
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	2.7	8.2	36.7	51.7	0.7
(AVG.= 3.38 NO SIG.DIFF)					
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	2.6	10.9	38.0	48.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.32 NO SIG.DIFF)					
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	2.3	12.7	44.5	40.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.23 SIG.LOWER **)					
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	5.4	10.1	39.5	43.4	1.6
(AVG.= 3.23 SIG.LOWER *)					
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	4.8	6.7	32.7	54.8	1.0
(AVG.= 3.39 NO SIG.DIFF)					
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	0.8	2.4	34.1	61.8	0.8
(AVG.= 3.58 SIG.HIGHR ***)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
24	992	15	30.183	0.9837	0.063	**	0.101	0.036C	0.055	0.033	0.018

TABLE 186 IS Q. 32 X Q. 24					
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME					
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	3.3	3.3	38.0	55.4	0.0
(AVG.= 3.46 SIG.HIGHR +)					
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	2.8	6.1	39.9	50.2	0.9
(AVG.= 3.39 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	1.4	7.5	36.3	54.7	0.0
(AVG.= 3.44 SIG.HIGHR **)					
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	4.0	10.2	37.3	48.0	0.6
(AVG.= 3.30 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	1.9	13.1	39.3	45.8	0.0
(AVG.= 3.29 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	3.9	16.1	39.4	40.0	0.6
(AVG.= 3.16 SIG.LOWER ***)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
24	952	15	25.015	0.9503	-0.116	***	0.094	-0.086C	-0.132	-0.079	0.000

TABLE 187

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 24. PROM TECH/SCHOLARSHIPS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 24: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.9	9.3	38.4	48.8	0.5

TABLE 187 IS Q. 33 X Q. 24

EDUCATION

PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	4.3	3.2	38.7	52.7	1.1
(AVG.= 3.41 NO SIG.DIFF)					
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	1.7	6.2	41.8	49.7	0.6
(AVG.= 3.40 NO SIG.DIFF)					
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	3.2	9.8	36.5	50.2	0.4
(AVG.= 3.34 NO SIG.DIFF)					
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	1.4	13.3	37.8	46.9	0.7
(AVG.= 3.31 NO SIG.DIFF)					
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	2.8	11.9	41.3	43.6	0.5
(AVG.= 3.26 SIG.LOWER +)					
AT SCHOOL < 75>	6.7	8.0	30.7	54.7	0.0
(AVG.= 3.33 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
24	986	15	20.755	0.8552	-0.058	*	0.084	-0.041C	-0.064	-0.039	0.000

TABLE 188 IS Q. 34 X Q. 24

SEX

MALE < 499>	3.0	10.8	33.3	47.3	0.6
(AVG.= 3.31 NO SIG.DIFF)					
FEMALE < 501>	2.8	8.0	38.5	50.3	0.4
(AVG.= 3.37 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
24	995	3	2.646	0.5504	0.041		0.052	0.041C	0.063	0.041	0.000

TABLE 189 IS Q. 35 X Q. 24

LANGUAGE

ENGLISH < 754>	2.7	8.5	37.3	51.1	0.5
(AVG.= 3.37 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
FRENCH < 246>	3.7	12.2	41.9	41.9	0.4
(AVG.= 3.22 SIG.LOWER ***)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
24	995	3	7.588	0.9447	-0.084	***	0.087	-0.078C	-0.171	-0.105	0.000

TABLE 190

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 24. PROM TECH/SCHOLARSHIPS

ANSWERS TO Q. 24:
1) NOT AT ALL
2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT
4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.9	9.3	38.4	48.8	0.5

TABLE 190 IS Q. 36 X Q. 24

SAMPLE STRATA					
B.C. < 113> (AVG.= 3.43 SIG.HIGHR +)	0.9	8.0	38.1	52.2	0.9
ALBERTA < 92> (AVG.= 3.25 NO SIG.DIFF)	3.3	12.0	40.2	43.5	1.1
SASKATCHEWAN < 40> (AVG.= 3.28 NO SIG.DIFF)	5.0	7.5	42.5	45.0	0.0
MANITOBA < 42> (AVG.= 3.26 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.0	9.5	54.8	35.7	0.0
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267> (AVG.= 3.41 SIG.HIGHR *)	1.5	9.0	36.7	52.4	0.4
METRO < 88> (AVG.= 3.34 NO SIG.DIFF)	8.0	4.5	33.0	54.5	0.0
QUEBEC < 265> (AVG.= 3.27 SIG.LOWER *)	3.4	11.7	39.6	44.9	0.4
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29> (AVG.= 3.32 NO SIG.DIFF)	3.4	10.3	34.5	48.3	3.4
NOVA SCOTIA < 35> (AVG.= 3.31 NO SIG.DIFF)	5.7	8.6	34.3	51.4	0.0
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5> (AVG.= 3.80 T-TEST IS N/A)	0.0	0.0	20.0	80.0	0.0
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24> (AVG.= 3.46 T-TEST IS N/A)	0.0	8.3	37.5	54.2	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
24	995	30	30.879	0.5786	-0.013		0.102	-0.0090	-0.013	-0.008	0.016

TABLE 191 IS Q. 37 X Q. 24

REGION					
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113> (AVG.= 3.43 SIG.HIGHR +)	0.9	8.0	38.1	52.2	0.9
PRAIRIES < 174> (AVG.= 3.26 SIG.LOWER +)	2.9	10.3	44.3	42.0	0.6
ONTARIO < 355> (AVG.= 3.39 SIG.HIGHR +)	3.1	7.9	35.8	53.0	0.3
QUEBEC < 265> (AVG.= 3.27 SIG.LOWER *)	3.4	11.7	39.6	44.9	0.4
ATLANTIC < 93> (AVG.= 3.38 NO SIG.DIFF)	3.2	8.6	34.4	52.7	1.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
24	995	12	11.710	0.5307	-0.021		0.063	-0.0090	-0.015	-0.009	0.008

TABLE 192

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 24. PROM TECH/SCHOLARSHIPS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 24:
1) NOT AT ALL
2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT
4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.9	9.3	38.4	48.8	0.5
TABLE 192 IS Q. 33 X Q. 24					
COMMUNITY SIZE					
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	4.1	9.9	36.1	49.7	0.3
(AVG.= 3.32 NO SIG.DIFF)					
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	2.3	10.8	34.6	51.9	0.4
(AVG.= 3.37 NO SIG.DIFF)					
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	2.0	6.0	38.0	53.0	1.0
(AVG.= 3.43 SIG.HIGHR +)					
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	2.6	9.0	43.4	44.5	0.6
(AVG.= 3.31 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP 24	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	995	9	9.842	0.6366	-0.007		0.057	-0.021B	-0.032	-0.019	0.000

TABLE 193

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 25. PROM TECH/FND UNIV/COMP

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 25:
1) NOT AT ALL
2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT
4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.3	6.1	43.1	48.3	0.1

TABLE 193 IS Q. 31 X Q. 25

AGE

18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	1.4	6.8	39.5	52.4	0.0
(AVG.= 3.43 NO SIG.DIFF)					
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	2.2	4.4	46.4	47.1	0.0
(AVG.= 3.38 NO SIG.DIFF)					
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	2.3	7.7	42.7	46.8	0.5
(AVG.= 3.35 NO SIG.DIFF)					
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	3.1	7.0	37.2	52.7	0.0
(AVG.= 3.40 NO SIG.DIFF)					
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	3.8	6.7	45.2	44.2	0.0
(AVG.= 3.30 NO SIG.DIFF)					
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	1.6	4.9	45.5	48.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.40 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
25	996	15	9.185	0.1323	-0.021		0.055	-0.016C	-0.025	-0.015	0.002

TABLE 194 IS Q. 32 X Q. 25

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	2.2	8.7	42.4	46.7	0.0
(AVG.= 3.34 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	3.8	7.5	50.7	38.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.23 SIG.LOWER ***)					
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	1.9	6.6	39.2	51.9	0.5
(AVG.= 3.42 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	0.6	3.4	45.8	50.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.46 SIG.HIGHR +)					
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	1.9	5.6	36.4	56.1	0.0
(AVG.= 3.47 SIG.HIGHR +)					
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	2.6	4.5	40.0	52.9	0.0
(AVG.= 3.43 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
25	955	15	22.143	0.8959	0.091	***	0.088	0.077C	0.123	0.071	0.055

TABLE 195

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 25. PROM TECH/FND UNIV/COMP

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 25: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) % ====	(2) % ====	(3) % ====	(4) % ====	(5) % ====
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.3	6.1	43.1	48.3	0.1
TABLE 195 IS Q. 33 X Q. 25					
EDUCATION					
PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	1.1	8.6	51.6	38.7	0.0
(AVG.= 3.28 SIG.LOWER +)					
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	4.0	6.8	50.3	39.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.24 SIG.LOWER ***)					
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	2.8	5.6	44.2	47.4	0.0
(AVG.= 3.36 NO SIG.DIFF)					
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	1.4	5.6	40.6	51.7	0.7
(AVG.= 3.44 NO SIG.DIFF)					
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	2.3	3.2	38.1	56.4	0.0
(AVG.= 3.49 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
AT SCHOOL < 75>	0.0	12.0	34.7	53.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.41 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
25	990	15	28.950	0.9837	0.107	***	0.099	0.095C	0.154	0.089	0.062

TABLE 196 IS Q. 34 X Q. 25

SEX					
MALE < 499>	3.0	7.2	41.7	47.9	0.2
(AVG.= 3.35 SIG.LOWER +)					
FEMALE < 501>	1.6	5.0	44.7	48.7	0.0
(AVG.= 3.41 SIG.HIGHR +)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
25	999	3	4.749	0.8089	0.041		0.069	0.026C	0.045	0.026	0.000

TABLE 197 IS Q. 35 X Q. 25

LANGUAGE					
ENGLISH < 754>	2.0	5.3	38.9	53.7	0.1
(AVG.= 3.44 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
FRENCH < 246>	3.3	8.5	56.5	31.7	0.0
(AVG.= 3.17 SIG.LOWER ***)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
25	999	3	36.401	1.0000	-0.170	***	0.191	-0.167C	-0.373	-0.225	0.118

TABLE 198

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 25. PROM TECH/FND UNIV/COMP

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 25:
1) NOT AT ALL
2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT
4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.3	6.1	43.1	48.3	0.1
TABLE 198 IS Q. 36 X Q. 25					
SAMPLE STRATA					
B.C. < 113>	0.9	7.1	35.4	56.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.48 SIG.HIGHR +)					
ALBERTA < 92>	2.2	6.5	40.2	51.1	0.0
(AVG.= 3.40 NO SIG.DIFF)					
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	5.0	2.5	37.5	55.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.42 NO SIG.DIFF)					
MANITOBA < 42>	2.4	14.3	38.1	45.2	0.0
(AVG.= 3.26 NO SIG.DIFF)					
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	1.5	3.7	40.4	54.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.48 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
METRO < 88>	4.5	4.5	37.5	52.3	1.1
(AVG.= 3.39 NO SIG.DIFF)					
QUEBEC < 265>	3.0	8.3	53.6	35.1	0.0
(AVG.= 3.21 SIG.LOWER ***)					
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	0.0	3.4	48.3	48.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.45 NO SIG.DIFF)					
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	2.9	5.7	37.1	54.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.43 NO SIG.DIFF)					
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	0.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.60 T-TEST IS N/A)					
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	0.0	0.0	58.3	41.7	0.0
(AVG.= 3.42 T-TEST IS N/A)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
25	999	30	50.407	0.9888	-0.068	**	0.130	-0.076C	-0.120	-0.070	0.103

TABLE 199 IS Q. 37 X Q. 25

REGION					
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	0.9	7.1	35.4	56.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.48 SIG.HIGHR +)					
PRAIRIES < 174>	2.9	7.5	39.1	50.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.37 NO SIG.DIFF)					
ONTARIO < 355>	2.3	3.9	39.7	53.8	0.3
(AVG.= 3.45 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
QUEBEC < 265>	3.0	8.3	53.6	35.1	0.0
(AVG.= 3.21 SIG.LOWER ***)					
ATLANTIC < 93>	1.1	4.3	44.1	50.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.44 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
25	999	12	32.047	0.9986	-0.070	**	0.103	-0.073C	-0.126	-0.073	0.095

TABLE 200

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 25. PROM TECH/FND UNIV/COMP

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 25: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.3	0.1	43.1	48.3	0.1

TABLE 200 IS Q. 38 X Q. 25

COMMUNITY SIZE

1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	3.1	5.8	42.5	48.3	0.3
(AVG.= 3.37 NO SIG.DIFF)					
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	1.9	4.6	38.8	54.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.46 SIG.HIGHR **)					
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	1.0	8.0	39.0	52.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.42 NO SIG.DIFF)					
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	2.3	6.9	48.3	42.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.31 SIG.LOWER **)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
25	999	9	12.090	0.7917	-0.045	0.064	-0.0466	-0.071	-0.041	0.039

TABLE 201

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 26. PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 26:
1) NOT AT ALL
2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT
4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.0	7.5	41.4	48.8	0.2

TABLE 201 IS Q. 31 X Q. 26

AGE

18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	2.7	5.4	42.9	49.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.38 NO SIG.DIFF)					
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	2.6	6.9	40.1	50.4	0.0
(AVG.= 3.38 NO SIG.DIFF)					
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	1.4	8.2	41.8	48.2	0.5
(AVG.= 3.37 NO SIG.DIFF)					
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	3.1	9.3	38.0	48.8	0.8
(AVG.= 3.34 NO SIG.DIFF)					
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	1.0	8.7	39.4	51.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.40 NO SIG.DIFF)					
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 127>	0.8	7.3	47.2	44.7	0.0
(AVG.= 3.36 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
26 995	15	7.574	0.0603	-0.008		0.050	-0.013C	-0.021	-0.012	0.006

TABLE 202 IS Q. 32 X Q. 26

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	2.2	10.9	45.7	41.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.26 SIG.LOWER *)					
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	0.9	8.9	47.9	42.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.31 SIG.LOWER +)					
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	1.9	6.6	41.5	50.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.40 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	1.7	5.1	40.1	53.1	0.0
(AVG.= 3.45 SIG.HIGHR +)					
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	2.8	7.5	31.8	57.0	0.9
(AVG.= 3.44 NO SIG.DIFF)					
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	2.6	6.5	38.1	52.3	0.6
(AVG.= 3.41 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
26 954	15	16.716	0.6639	0.070	**	0.076	0.072C	0.114	0.066	0.033

TABLE 203

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 26. PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 26:
1) NOT AT ALL
2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT
4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.0	7.5	41.4	48.8	0.2

TABLE 203 IS Q. 33 X Q. 26

EDUCATION					
PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	1.1	10.8	51.6	36.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.24 SIG.LOWER *)					
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	2.3	7.3	48.6	41.8	0.0
(AVG.= 3.30 SIG.LOWER +)					
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	2.5	5.3	39.3	53.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.43 SIG.HIGHR +)					
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	0.7	7.7	38.5	53.1	0.0
(AVG.= 3.44 NO SIG.DIFF)					
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	1.4	9.6	35.3	53.2	0.5
(AVG.= 3.41 NO SIG.DIFF)					
AT SCHOOL < 75>	5.3	5.3	45.3	42.7	1.3
(AVG.= 3.27 SIG.LOWER +)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
26	989	15	26.561	0.9675	0.041		0.095	0.0480	0.077	0.045	0.055

TABLE 204 IS Q. 34 X Q. 26

SEX					
MALE < 499>	3.0	6.6	40.5	49.7	0.2
(AVG.= 3.37 NO SIG.DIFF)					
FEMALE < 501>	1.0	8.4	42.3	48.1	0.2
(AVG.= 3.38 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
26	998	3	6.418	0.9070	0.005		0.080	-0.0110	-0.020	-0.011	0.000

TABLE 205 IS Q. 35 X Q. 26

LANGUAGE					
ENGLISH < 754>	1.9	6.6	36.6	54.6	0.3
(AVG.= 3.44 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
FRENCH < 246>	2.4	10.2	56.1	31.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.16 SIG.LOWER ***)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
26	998	3	41.031	1.0000	-0.171	***	0.203	-0.1730	-0.379	-0.233	0.120

TABLE 206

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 26. PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE

ANSWERS TO
Q. 26:
1) NOT AT ALL
2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT
4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.0	7.5	41.4	48.8	0.2

TABLE 206 IS Q. 36 X Q. 26

SAMPLE STRATA

B.C. < 113>	1.8	6.2	28.3	62.8	0.9
(AVG.= 3.54 SIG.HIGHR **)					
ALBERTA < 92>	1.1	9.8	33.7	55.4	0.0
(AVG.= 3.43 NO SIG.DIFF)					
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	2.5	7.5	47.5	42.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.30 NO SIG.DIFF)					
MANITOBA < 42>	4.8	9.5	45.2	40.5	0.0
(AVG.= 3.21 SIG.LOWER +)					
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	0.7	6.0	37.5	55.8	0.0
(AVG.= 3.48 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
METRO < 88>	5.7	3.4	39.8	51.1	0.0
(AVG.= 3.36 NO SIG.DIFF)					
QUEBEC < 265>	2.3	9.8	53.2	34.3	0.4
(AVG.= 3.20 SIG.LOWER ***)					
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	0.0	6.9	48.3	44.8	0.0
(AVG.= 3.38 NO SIG.DIFF)					
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	2.9	2.9	40.0	54.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.46 NO SIG.DIFF)					
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	0.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.00 T-TEST IS N/A)					
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	0.0	8.3	33.3	58.3	0.0
(AVG.= 3.50 T-TEST IS N/A)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
26	998	30	64.402	0.9997	-0.087	***	0.147	-0.093C	-0.145	-0.085	0.108

TABLE 207 IS Q. 37 X Q. 26

REGION

BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	1.8	6.2	28.3	62.8	0.9
(AVG.= 3.54 SIG.HIGHR **)					
PRAIRIES < 174>	2.3	9.2	39.7	48.9	0.0
(AVG.= 3.35 NO SIG.DIFF)					
ONTARIO < 355>	2.0	5.4	38.0	54.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.45 SIG.HIGHR ***)					
QUEBEC < 265>	2.3	9.8	53.2	34.3	0.4
(AVG.= 3.20 SIG.LOWER ***)					
ATLANTIC < 93>	1.1	7.5	39.8	51.6	0.0
(AVG.= 3.42 NO SIG.DIFF)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
26	998	12	38.946	0.9999	-0.087	***	0.114	-0.087C	-0.148	-0.087	0.098

TABLE 208

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 26. PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 26: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.0	7.5	41.4	48.8	0.2
TABLE 208 IS Q. 33 X Q. 26					
COMMUNITY SIZE					
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	3.7	6.8	40.8	48.3	0.3
(AVG.= 3.34 NO SIG.DIFF)					
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	1.9	6.5	36.2	55.4	0.0
(AVG.= 3.45 SIG.HIGHR **)					
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	0.0	11.0	32.0	57.0	0.0
(AVG.= 3.46 NO SIG.DIFF)					
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	1.2	7.8	48.6	42.2	0.3
(AVG.= 3.32 SIG.LOWER *)					

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
26	998	9	24.818	0.9968	-0.021		0.091	-0.0368	-0.055	-0.032	0.043

TABLE 209

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 27. DO MST STIM SCI/TECH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 27:
1) OFFERING TAX BREAKS
2) FUNDS TO SCHOOL
3) FUNDS FOR SCHLRSHIP
4) FUNDING UNIVERSITIES
5) FUND THOSE BEST USE
6) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	13.6	25.2	15.5	17.3	27.8	0.6
TABLE 209 IS Q. 31 X Q. 27						
AGE						
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	7.5	31.3	17.0	17.0	27.2	0.0
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	15.3	23.0	9.5	20.1	31.4	0.7
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	13.2	28.6	14.5	19.1	24.5	0.0
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	15.5	19.4	14.7	15.5	34.1	0.8
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	8.7	28.8	24.0	18.3	18.3	1.9
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	20.3	19.5	22.8	8.9	27.6	0.8

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
27	991	20	48.749	0.9997	-0.047		0.111	-0.034C	-0.042	-0.033	0.036

TABLE 210 IS Q. 32 X Q. 27						
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME						
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	10.9	28.3	21.7	15.2	22.8	1.1
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	10.3	25.8	22.5	15.5	25.4	0.5
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	13.7	26.4	13.2	18.4	27.8	0.5
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	11.3	20.3	17.5	20.3	29.4	1.1
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	15.9	27.1	10.3	15.9	30.8	0.0
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	21.3	23.9	5.8	19.4	29.7	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
27	951	20	38.119	0.9914	0.002		0.100	0.004C	0.005	0.004	0.009

TABLE 211 IS Q. 33 X Q. 27						
EDUCATION						
PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	12.9	23.7	23.7	11.8	28.0	0.0
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	14.1	22.0	20.9	14.1	27.1	1.7
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	13.0	27.4	14.0	17.2	28.1	0.4
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	9.8	22.4	14.7	22.4	30.8	0.0
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	18.8	23.4	10.6	19.3	27.1	0.9
AT SCHOOL < 75>	9.3	36.0	14.7	17.3	22.7	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
27	985	20	30.159	0.9327	-0.011		0.087	-0.009C	-0.011	-0.009	0.014

TABLE 212 IS Q. 34 X Q. 27						
SEX						
MALE < 499>	14.2	23.0	14.2	18.6	29.1	0.8
FEMALE < 501>	13.0	27.3	17.0	15.8	26.5	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
27	994	4	5.083	0.7211	-0.034		0.072	-0.037C	-0.047	-0.037	0.006

TABLE 213

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 27. DO MST STIM SCI/TECH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 27:
1) OFFERING TAX BREAKS
2) FUNDS TO SCHOOL
3) FUNDS FOR SCHLRSHIP
4) FUNDING UNIVERSITIES
5) FUND THOSE BEST USE
6) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	13.6	25.2	15.5	17.3	27.8	0.6

TABLE 213 IS Q. 35 X Q. 27

LANGUAGE						
ENGLISH < 754>	14.3	24.8	12.2	17.0	31.0	0.7
FRENCH < 246>	11.4	26.4	26.0	17.9	17.9	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
27	994	4	35.641	1.0000	-0.064	**	0.189	-0.062C	-0.105	-0.084	0.029

TABLE 214 IS Q. 36 X Q. 27

SAMPLE STRATA						
B.C. < 113>	16.8	17.7	10.6	18.6	36.3	0.0
ALBERTA < 92>	8.7	27.2	14.1	18.5	30.4	1.1
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	12.5	25.0	20.0	20.0	17.5	5.0
MANITOBA < 42>	14.3	31.0	2.4	19.0	33.3	0.0
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	16.1	24.7	13.5	13.1	31.8	0.7
METRO < 88>	18.2	22.7	10.2	22.7	26.1	0.0
QUEBEC < 265>	10.2	27.2	24.9	18.9	18.5	0.4
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	17.2	24.1	20.7	6.9	31.0	0.0
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	11.4	31.4	2.9	17.1	37.1	0.0
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	0.0	40.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	0.0
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	12.5	25.0	8.3	20.8	33.3	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
27	994	40	68.741	0.9969	-0.045		0.131	-0.038C	-0.047	-0.037	0.038

TABLE 215 IS Q. 37 X Q. 27

REGION						
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	16.8	17.7	10.6	18.6	36.3	0.0
PRAIRIES < 174>	10.9	27.6	12.6	19.0	28.2	1.7
ONTARIO < 355>	16.6	24.2	12.7	15.5	30.4	0.6
QUEBEC < 265>	10.2	27.2	24.9	18.9	18.5	0.4
ATLANTIC < 93>	12.9	28.0	11.8	14.0	33.3	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
27	994	16	45.474	0.9999	-0.046		0.107	-0.037B	-0.048	-0.038	0.032

TABLE 216 IS Q. 38 X Q. 27

COMMUNITY SIZE						
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	14.6	23.8	15.3	19.7	25.5	1.0
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	11.9	30.8	14.6	14.6	27.7	0.4
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	16.0	23.0	11.0	18.0	31.0	1.0
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	13.3	22.8	17.9	16.8	28.9	0.3

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
27	994	12	11.569	0.5191	0.025		0.062	0.021C	0.028	0.022	0.011

TABLE 217

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 28. HEARD OF INNOVACTION

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 28: 1) YES 2) NO
3) (NO OPINION)

	(1) % ====	(2) % ====	(3) % ====
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.6	84.3	0.1

TABLE 217 IS Q. 31 X Q. 28

AGE

18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	16.3	83.7	0.0
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	15.0	85.0	0.0
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	14.5	85.0	0.5
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	17.8	82.2	0.0
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	15.4	84.6	0.0
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	16.3	83.7	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
28	996	5	0.831	0.0250	-0.008	0.029	-0.006C	-0.014	-0.004	0.000

TABLE 218 IS Q. 32 X Q. 28

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	16.3	83.7	0.0
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	15.0	85.0	0.0
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	15.6	84.4	0.0
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	11.3	88.7	0.0
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	23.4	75.7	0.9
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	16.1	83.9	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
28	955	5	7.690	0.8258	-0.021	0.090	-0.015C	-0.034	-0.009	0.000

TABLE 219 IS Q. 33 X Q. 28

EDUCATION

PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	17.2	82.8	0.0
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	13.0	86.4	0.6
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	14.7	85.3	0.0
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	18.2	81.8	0.0
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	16.5	83.5	0.0
AT SCHOOL < 75>	14.7	85.3	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
28	990	5	2.115	0.1670	-0.014	0.046	-0.014C	-0.033	-0.009	0.000

TABLE 220 IS Q. 34 X Q. 28

SEX

MALE < 499>	15.6	84.4	0.0
FEMALE < 501>	15.6	84.2	0.2

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
28	999	1	0.000	0.0000	0.000	0.000	0.0008	0.001	0.000	0.000

TABLE 221

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 28. HEARD OF INNOVACTION

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 28: 1) YES 2) NO
3) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.6	84.3	0.1

TABLE 221 IS Q. 35 X Q. 28

LANGUAGE			
ENGLISH < 754>	16.0	83.8	0.1
FRENCH < 246>	14.2	85.8	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
28	999	1	0.477	0.0000	0.022	0.022	0.0228	0.072	0.018	0.000

TABLE 222 IS Q. 36 X Q. 28

SAMPLE STRATA			
B.C. < 113>	21.2	78.8	0.0
ALBERTA < 92>	14.1	85.9	0.0
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	17.5	80.0	2.5
MANITOBA < 42> .	21.4	78.6	0.0
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	9.0	91.0	0.0
METRO < 88>	17.0	83.0	0.0
QUEBEC < 265>	16.6	83.4	0.0
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	17.2	82.8	0.0
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	22.9	77.1	0.0
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	0.0	100.0	0.0
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	29.2	70.8	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
28	999	10	19.056	0.9604	-0.009	0.138	-0.013C	-0.030	-0.008	0.000

TABLE 223 IS Q. 37 X Q. 28

REGION			
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	21.2	78.8	0.0
PRAIRIES < 174>	16.7	82.8	0.6
ONTARIO < 355>	11.0	89.0	0.0
QUEBEC < 265>	16.6	83.4	0.0
ATLANTIC < 93>	21.5	78.5	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
28	999	4	11.304	0.9766	0.003	0.106	-0.003C	-0.007	-0.002	0.000

TABLE 224 IS Q. 38 X Q. 28

COMMUNITY SIZE			
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	18.4	81.6	0.0
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	12.3	87.7	0.0
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	12.0	87.0	1.0
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	16.8	83.2	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
28	999	3	5.112	0.8362	0.008	0.072	0.010C	0.027	0.007	0.000

TABLE 225

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 29. RSN CDA INV IN SPACE

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 29:

1) NATIONAL PRESTIGE
2) KEEP UP TECHNOLOG
3) MAINTAIN GOOD RELTNS
4) PROV IND/ECO BEN
5) FUND L T RESEARCH
6) BE PART SPACE EXPL
7) PROVIDE COMM SERVICE
8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	6.8	48.0	18.7	37.2	36.1	14.4	33.8	2.0
TABLE AGE 225 IS Q. 31 X Q. 29								
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	8.8	44.9	16.3	33.3	40.1	23.1	29.9	1.4
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	4.4	44.2	17.9	39.1	41.2	14.2	36.5	0.7
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	4.5	54.5	15.5	38.6	37.7	12.7	30.0	2.7
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	10.1	49.6	17.1	42.6	33.3	10.1	31.8	2.3
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	10.6	48.1	25.0	34.6	22.1	17.3	38.5	1.9
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	7.3	47.2	25.2	31.7	31.7	9.8	37.4	4.1

DEP 29 N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA
WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION

TABLE ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME 226 IS Q. 32 X Q. 29								
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	5.4	47.8	21.7	33.7	35.9	15.2	31.5	3.3
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	10.3	47.9	24.4	30.0	36.2	16.9	28.6	2.3
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	6.1	44.8	21.7	35.4	32.5	14.6	39.6	2.4
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	5.6	52.0	18.1	38.4	36.7	11.9	32.8	1.7
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	6.5	47.7	15.9	43.0	36.4	15.9	30.8	1.9
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	5.2	48.4	7.7	47.1	42.6	12.3	35.5	0.0

DEP 29 N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA
WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION

TABLE EDUCATION 227 IS Q. 33 X Q. 29								
PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL< 93>	12.9	48.4	24.7	30.1	32.3	20.4	26.9	1.1
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	9.0	50.8	28.8	35.6	24.3	11.9	32.2	3.4
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	6.3	51.6	20.7	33.0	35.8	15.1	35.8	0.7
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	4.2	44.1	18.9	41.3	39.9	13.3	36.4	0.7
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY< 218>	5.5	44.5	8.7	42.2	45.9	9.2	34.4	4.1
AT SCHOOL < 75>	5.3	45.3	10.7	40.0	34.7	25.3	34.7	1.3

DEP 29 N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA
WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION

TABLE SEX 228 IS Q. 34 X Q. 29								
MALE < 499>	8.4	48.1	18.0	40.5	34.9	13.6	31.3	2.0
FEMALE < 501>	5.4	47.7	19.4	33.9	37.1	15.6	36.3	2.0

DEP 29 N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA
WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION

TABLE 229

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 29. RSN CDA INV IN SPACE

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 29:

1) NATIONAL PRESTIGE
2) KEEP UP TECHNOLOG
3) MAINTAIN GOOD RELTNS
4) PROV IND/ECO BEN
5) FUND L T RESEARCH
6) BE PART SPACE EXPL
7) PROVIDE COMM SERVICE
8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	6.8	48.0	18.7	37.2	36.1	14.4	33.8	2.0
TABLE 229 IS Q. 35 X Q. 29								
LANGUAGE								
ENGLISH < 754>	6.5	45.6	17.1	38.1	34.9	16.4	35.7	2.4
FRENCH < 246>	8.1	54.9	23.6	34.6	39.4	8.9	28.0	0.8
DEP N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA								
29 WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION								
TABLE 230 IS Q. 36 X Q. 29								
SAMPLE STRATA								
B.C. < 113>	3.5	46.9	8.8	42.5	43.4	20.4	33.6	0.0
ALBERTA < 92>	3.3	50.0	19.6	46.7	33.7	12.0	28.3	3.3
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	5.0	40.0	27.5	30.0	42.5	17.5	30.0	2.5
MANITOBA < 42>	7.1	47.6	19.0	35.7	31.0	9.5	45.2	2.4
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	7.9	50.9	18.4	35.2	34.5	14.6	35.2	1.1
METRO < 88>	9.1	36.4	17.0	43.2	25.0	22.7	30.7	6.8
QUEBEC < 265>	8.3	54.3	23.4	34.0	37.0	10.9	29.1	1.1
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	3.4	34.5	17.2	41.4	41.4	17.2	44.8	0.0
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	8.6	37.1	11.4	25.7	40.0	8.6	51.4	8.6
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND< 5>	40.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	0.0
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	0.0	33.3	16.7	37.5	45.8	16.7	50.0	0.0
DEP N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA								
29 WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION								
TABLE 231 IS Q. 37 X Q. 29								
REGION								
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	3.5	46.9	8.8	42.5	43.4	20.4	33.6	0.0
PRAIRIES < 174>	4.6	47.1	21.3	40.2	35.1	12.6	32.8	2.9
ONTARIO < 355>	8.2	47.3	18.0	37.2	32.1	16.6	34.1	2.5
QUEBEC < 265>	8.3	54.3	23.4	34.0	37.0	10.9	29.1	1.1
ATLANTIC < 93>	6.5	34.4	15.1	34.4	40.9	14.0	48.4	3.2
DEP N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA								
29 WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION								
TABLE 232 IS Q. 38 X Q. 29								
COMMUNITY SIZE								
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	7.8	50.7	13.9	37.4	33.0	16.0	32.0	3.7
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	6.5	45.8	16.9	38.8	38.1	16.5	33.1	1.9
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	7.0	42.0	27.0	30.0	36.0	14.0	39.0	2.0
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	6.4	48.8	21.7	37.9	37.0	12.1	34.4	0.6
DEP N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA								
29 WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION								

TABLE 233

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 30. PRI SPACE PROG VS OTHER

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 30: 1) MORE IMPORTANT 2) AS IMPORTANT
3) LESS IMPORTANT

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	17.8	48.4	33.8

TABLE 233 IS Q. 31 X Q. 30

AGE			
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	20.4	46.9	32.7
(AVG.=-0.12 NO SIG.DIFF)			
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	16.4	52.6	31.0
(AVG.=-0.15 NO SIG.DIFF)			
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	15.9	53.6	30.5
(AVG.=-0.15 NO SIG.DIFF)			
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	16.3	46.5	37.2
(AVG.=-0.21 NO SIG.DIFF)			
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	15.4	43.3	41.3
(AVG.=-0.26 SIG.LOWER +)			
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	24.4	38.2	37.4
(AVG.=-0.13 NO SIG.DIFF)			

DEP 30	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	997	10	14.476	0.8476	0.028	0.035	0.0320	0.043	0.027	0.000

TABLE 234 IS Q. 32 X Q. 30

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME			
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	21.7	40.2	38.0
(AVG.=-0.16 NO SIG.DIFF)			
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	18.8	48.8	32.4
(AVG.=-0.14 NO SIG.DIFF)			
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	18.4	48.6	33.0
(AVG.=-0.15 NO SIG.DIFF)			
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	16.4	50.3	33.3
(AVG.=-0.17 NO SIG.DIFF)			
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	15.9	47.7	36.4
(AVG.=-0.21 NO SIG.DIFF)			
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	14.8	52.3	32.9
(AVG.=-0.18 NO SIG.DIFF)			

DEP 30	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	956	10	4.945	0.1052	0.023	0.051	0.0180	0.024	0.015	0.000

TABLE 235

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 30. PRI SPACE PROG VS OTHER

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 30: 1) MORE IMPORTANT 2) AS IMPORTANT
3) LESS IMPORTANT

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	17.8	48.4	33.8

TABLE 235 IS Q. 33 X Q. 30

EDUCATION

PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 93>	28.0	31.2	40.9
(AVG.=-0.13 NO SIG.DIFF)			
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	17.5	52.0	30.5
(AVG.=-0.13 NO SIG.DIFF)			
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	16.1	51.6	32.3
(AVG.=-0.16 NO SIG.DIFF)			
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	14.0	47.6	38.5
(AVG.=-0.24 SIG.LOWER +)			
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 218>	16.5	48.6	34.9
(AVG.=-0.18 NO SIG.DIFF)			
AT SCHOOL < 75>	21.3	49.3	29.3
(AVG.=-0.08 NO SIG.DIFF)			

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
30	991	10	18.126	0.9471	0.014		0.096	0.013C	0.018	0.011	0.018

TABLE 236 IS Q. 34 X Q. 30

SEX

MALE < 499>	21.8	47.5	30.7
(AVG.=-0.09 SIG.HIGHR ***)			
FEMALE < 501>	13.6	49.1	37.3
(AVG.=-0.24 SIG.LOWER ***)			

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
30	1000	2	13.061	0.9985	0.107	***	0.114	0.109C	0.176	0.109	0.000

TABLE 237 IS Q. 35 X Q. 30

LANGUAGE

ENGLISH < 754>	18.6	46.3	35.1
(AVG.=-0.17 NO SIG.DIFF)			
FRENCH < 246>	15.0	54.5	30.5
(AVG.=-0.15 NO SIG.DIFF)			

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
30	1000	2	5.060	0.9203	-0.007		0.071	-0.011C	-0.025	-0.015	0.000

TABLE 238

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 30. PRI SPACE PROG VS OTHER

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 30: 1) MORE IMPORTANT 2) AS IMPORTANT
3) LESS IMPORTANT

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	17.8	48.4	33.8
TABLE 238 IS Q. 36 X Q. 30			
SAMPLE STRATA			
B.C. < 113>	18.6	46.0	35.4
(AVG.=-0.17 NO SIG.DIFF)			
ALBERTA < 92>	13.0	54.3	32.6
(AVG.=-0.20 NO SIG.DIFF)			
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	12.5	55.0	32.5
(AVG.=-0.20 NO SIG.DIFF)			
MANITOBA < 42>	14.3	38.1	47.6
(AVG.=-0.33 SIG.LOWER +)			
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	21.0	47.6	31.5
(AVG.=-0.10 SIG.HIGHR +)			
METRO < 88>	18.2	42.0	39.8
(AVG.=-0.22 NO SIG.DIFF)			
QUEBEC < 265>	14.7	53.6	31.7
(AVG.=-0.17 NO SIG.DIFF)			
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	20.7	37.9	41.4
(AVG.=-0.21 NO SIG.DIFF)			
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	28.6	37.1	34.3
(AVG.=-0.06 NO SIG.DIFF)			
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND < 5>	20.0	20.0	60.0
(AVG.=-0.40 T-TEST IS N/A)			
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	20.8	50.0	29.2
(AVG.=-0.08 T-TEST IS N/A)			

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
30	1000	20	20.260	0.5582	-0.018	0.101	-0.012C	-0.015	-0.009	0.014

TABLE 239 IS Q. 37 X Q. 30			
REGION			
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	18.6	46.0	35.4
(AVG.=-0.17 NO SIG.DIFF)			
PRAIRIES < 174>	13.2	50.6	36.2
(AVG.=-0.23 SIG.LOWER +)			
ONTARIO < 355>	20.3	46.2	33.5
(AVG.=-0.13 NO SIG.DIFF)			
QUEBEC < 265>	14.7	53.6	31.7
(AVG.=-0.17 NO SIG.DIFF)			
ATLANTIC < 93>	23.7	39.8	36.6
(AVG.=-0.13 NO SIG.DIFF)			

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
30	1000	8	11.049	0.8011	-0.022	0.074	-0.019C	-0.028	-0.017	0.000

TABLE 240

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 30. PRI SPACE PROG VS OTHER

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 30: 1) MORE IMPORTANT 2) AS IMPORTANT
3) LESS IMPORTANT

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	17.8	48.4	33.8
TABLE 240 IS Q. 38 X Q. 30			
COMMUNITY SIZE			
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	17.0	48.6	34.4
(AVG.=-0.17 NO SIG.DIFF)			
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	21.9	49.6	28.5
(AVG.=-0.07 SIG.HIGHR ***)			
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	19.0	39.0	42.0
(AVG.=-0.23 NO SIG.DIFF)			
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	14.7	49.7	35.5
(AVG.=-0.21 SIG.LOWER +)			

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
30	1000	6	11.024	0.9124	0.040	0.074	0.029C	0.044	0.027	0.006

TABLE 241

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 39. Q1:M1 ADVISE RE CAREER

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 39:
1) COM PROGRAMMING
2) LAW
3) ENGINEERING
4) TEACHING
5) BUSINESS
6) BIOLOGY
7) MEDICINE
8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	34.8	10.4	12.3	6.6	10.8	3.2	20.5	1.3
TABLE 241 IS Q. 31 X Q. 39								
AGE								
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	26.5	10.9	17.0	8.2	15.0	4.1	18.4	0.0
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	40.1	9.9	9.1	7.7	10.6	2.2	20.1	0.4
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	33.6	11.8	11.4	6.4	12.3	3.6	19.1	1.8
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	38.0	11.6	9.3	6.2	10.9	2.3	20.2	1.6
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	33.7	5.8	15.4	4.8	9.6	2.9	26.9	1.0
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	32.5	11.4	16.3	4.9	4.9	4.9	21.1	4.1

DEP 39	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	984	30	31.523	0.6100	0.005		0.080	-0.002C	-0.002	-0.002	0.000

TABLE 242 IS Q. 32 X Q. 39									
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME									
LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	31.5	6.5	9.8	10.9	8.7	7.6	23.9	1.1	
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	38.5	8.0	11.7	6.6	9.4	3.8	19.7	2.3	
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	38.7	12.7	12.7	7.5	6.6	2.4	18.4	0.9	
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	34.5	9.0	9.6	6.8	14.1	1.7	24.3	0.0	
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	29.9	16.8	16.8	0.9	13.1	5.6	15.0	1.9	
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	30.3	11.0	14.8	6.5	14.2	1.3	21.3	0.6	

DEP 39	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	945	30	47.169	0.9760	0.005		0.100	0.013C	0.017	0.013	0.000

TABLE 243 IS Q. 33 X Q. 39									
EDUCATION									
PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL< 93>	37.6	4.3	15.1	6.5	8.6	8.6	16.1	3.2	
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	39.5	10.2	10.2	6.8	7.3	2.8	22.0	1.1	
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	38.2	11.9	12.6	6.3	10.5	0.7	18.2	1.4	
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	34.3	10.5	11.2	6.3	11.2	3.5	21.7	1.4	
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY< 218>	28.9	9.2	13.8	6.9	14.2	4.1	22.5	0.5	
AT SCHOOL < 75>	26.7	16.0	12.0	9.3	12.0	2.7	20.0	1.3	

DEP 39	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	978	30	37.606	0.8399	0.062	*	0.088	0.056C	0.074	0.058	0.000

TABLE 244 IS Q. 34 X Q. 39									
SEX									
MALE < 492>	31.9	11.2	16.2	5.0	10.2	3.8	20.4	1.2	
FEMALE < 501>	37.5	9.6	8.4	8.4	11.6	2.6	20.6	1.4	

DEP 39	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	987	6	21.297	0.9984	-0.014		0.147	-0.029C	-0.037	-0.029	0.000

TABLE 245

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 39. Q1:M1 ADVISE RE CAREER

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 39:

1) COM PROGRAMMING
2) LAW
3) ENGINEERING
4) TEACHING
5) BUSINESS
6) BIOLOGY
7) MEDICINE
8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	34.8	10.4	12.3	6.6	10.8	3.2	20.5	1.3
TABLE 245 IS Q. 35 X Q. 39								
LANGUAGE								
ENGLISH < 754>	36.6	11.1	11.5	6.9	10.2	2.1	19.8	1.7
FRENCH < 246>	28.9	8.1	14.6	6.1	13.0	6.5	22.8	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
39	987	6	19.492	0.9966	0.089	***	0.141	0.086C	0.144	0.115	0.000

TABLE 246 IS Q. 36 X Q. 39								
SAMPLE STRATA								
B.C. < 113>	43.4	8.8	10.6	3.5	11.5	2.7	18.6	0.9
ALBERTA < 92>	40.2	16.3	10.9	4.3	8.7	2.2	17.4	0.0
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	37.5	10.0	12.5	12.5	7.5	0.0	15.0	5.0
MANITOBA < 42>	42.9	4.8	11.9	2.4	11.9	2.4	19.0	4.8
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	37.1	9.7	11.6	9.0	10.9	2.2	18.0	1.5
METRO < 88>	30.7	12.5	10.2	6.8	12.5	0.0	23.9	3.4
QUEBEC < 265>	28.7	10.2	14.3	6.0	12.8	5.7	21.9	0.4
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	24.1	3.4	10.3	6.9	10.3	10.3	34.5	0.0
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	31.4	17.1	14.3	8.6	0.0	5.7	22.9	0.0
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND< 5>	20.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	29.2	4.2	16.7	8.3	8.3	0.0	33.3	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
39	987	60	60.028	0.5253	0.108	***	0.101	0.090C	0.119	0.094	0.006

TABLE 247 IS Q. 37 X Q. 39								
REGION								
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	43.4	8.8	10.6	3.5	11.5	2.7	18.6	0.9
PRAIRIES < 174>	40.2	12.1	11.5	5.7	9.2	1.7	17.2	2.3
ONTARIO < 355>	35.5	10.4	11.3	8.5	11.3	1.7	19.4	2.0
QUEBEC < 265>	28.7	10.2	14.3	6.0	12.8	5.7	21.9	0.4
ATLANTIC < 93>	28.0	9.7	14.0	7.5	6.5	5.4	29.0	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
39	987	24	32.384	0.8823	0.108	***	0.091	0.092C	0.125	0.098	0.002

TABLE 248 IS Q. 38 X Q. 39								
COMMUNITY SIZE								
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	35.4	10.9	11.6	5.8	12.2	1.4	20.7	2.0
100,000 - 99,999 < 260>	32.7	9.2	14.6	6.2	10.4	3.1	22.7	1.2
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	43.0	5.0	11.0	7.0	4.0	6.0	23.0	1.0
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	33.2	12.4	11.6	7.8	12.1	4.0	17.9	0.9

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
39	987	18	23.546	0.8295	-0.006		0.089	-0.001C	-0.001	-0.001	0.000

TABLE 249

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 40. Q1:M2 ADVISE RE CAREER

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 40:

1) COM PROGRAMMING
2) LAW
3) ENGINEERING
4) TEACHING
5) BUSINESS
6) BIOLOGY
7) MEDICINE
8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	20.7	17.4	14.8	9.7	11.3	4.8	21.4	0.0

TABLE 249 IS Q. 31 X Q. 40

AGE

18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	20.4	24.5	10.9	10.2	10.9	5.4	17.7	0.0
25 - 34 YEARS < 272>	21.7	17.3	17.3	8.1	12.9	2.6	20.2	0.0
35 - 44 YEARS < 216>	19.0	17.1	13.9	10.2	11.6	5.1	23.1	0.0
45 - 54 YEARS < 127>	19.7	11.8	15.0	10.2	11.0	7.9	24.4	0.0
55 - 64 YEARS < 103>	24.3	16.5	10.7	9.7	9.7	5.8	23.3	0.0
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 117>	19.7	16.2	18.8	11.1	9.4	4.3	20.5	0.0

DEP 40	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	982	30	23.422	0.2025	0.034		0.069	0.031C	0.039	0.032	0.019

TABLE 250 IS Q. 32 X Q. 40

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

LESS THAN $10,000 < 91>	19.8	20.9	12.1	11.0	5.5	7.7	23.1	0.0
$10,000 - $19,999 < 207>	21.7	17.4	12.6	12.6	11.6	5.3	18.8	0.0
$20,000 - $29,999 < 210>	22.4	17.1	14.3	12.4	9.5	3.3	21.0	0.0
$30,000 - $39,999 < 176>	23.9	18.7	17.6	6.8	10.8	5.7	16.5	0.0
$40,000 - $49,999 < 105>	10.5	20.0	19.0	4.8	11.4	1.9	32.4	0.0
$50,000 AND OVER < 154>	20.1	13.0	13.6	8.4	16.9	5.2	22.7	0.0

DEP 40	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	943	30	42.231	0.9316	0.049		0.095	0.035C	0.043	0.036	0.030

TABLE 251 IS Q. 33 X Q. 40

EDUCATION

PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL < 90>	23.3	15.6	12.2	14.4	3.3	5.6	25.6	0.0
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 174>	17.2	22.4	14.4	10.9	12.1	4.6	18.4	0.0
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 281>	21.7	17.8	15.3	8.2	11.0	4.6	21.4	0.0
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 141>	21.3	17.0	19.1	8.5	7.1	3.5	23.4	0.0
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY < 216>	20.8	13.0	14.4	8.3	15.7	5.6	22.2	0.0
AT SCHOOL < 74>	20.3	17.6	10.8	10.8	14.9	5.4	20.3	0.0

DEP 40	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	976	30	28.261	0.4434	0.027		0.076	0.020C	0.024	0.020	0.010

TABLE 252 IS Q. 34 X Q. 40

SEX

MALE < 491>	20.6	16.9	19.3	7.9	11.2	4.5	19.6	0.0
FEMALE < 494>	20.6	18.0	10.1	11.3	11.3	5.1	23.5	0.0

DEP 40	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	985	6	19.300	0.9963	0.045		0.140	0.043C	0.051	0.043	0.006

TABLE 253

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 40. Q1:M2 ADVISE RE CAREER

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 40:

1) COM PROGRAMMING
2) LAW
3) ENGINEERING
4) TEACHING
5) BUSINESS
6) BIOLOGY
7) MEDICINE
8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	20.7	17.4	14.8	9.7	11.3	4.8	21.4	0.0

TABLE 253 IS Q. 35 X Q. 40

LANGUAGE

ENGLISH < 740>	19.7	18.9	14.2	10.1	12.0	3.8	21.2	0.0
FRENCH < 245>	23.3	13.1	16.3	8.2	9.0	7.8	22.4	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
40	985	6	13.777	0.9678	0.015		0.118	0.008C	0.013	0.011	0.003

TABLE 254 IS Q. 36 X Q. 40

SAMPLE STRATA

B.C. < 111>	19.8	17.1	16.2	12.6	13.5	2.7	18.0	0.0
ALBERTA < 92>	9.8	20.7	17.4	9.8	14.1	5.4	22.8	0.0
SASKATCHEWAN < 38>	18.4	31.6	13.2	10.5	7.9	0.0	18.4	0.0
MANITOBA < 40>	20.0	15.0	17.5	12.5	5.0	7.5	22.5	0.0
BALANCE ONTARIO < 263>	20.2	16.7	14.4	11.4	12.9	3.4	20.9	0.0
METRO < 85>	22.4	21.2	8.2	4.7	14.1	3.5	25.9	0.0
QUEBEC < 263>	24.3	13.3	16.7	6.8	8.4	7.2	23.2	0.0
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	31.0	13.8	10.3	17.2	17.2	3.4	6.9	0.0
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	17.1	20.0	11.4	11.4	5.7	8.6	25.7	0.0
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND< 5>	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	0.0
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	20.8	29.2	12.5	8.3	8.3	0.0	20.8	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
40	985	60	60.669	0.5484	-0.010		0.101	-0.015C	-0.019	-0.016	0.025

TABLE 255 IS Q. 37 X Q. 40

REGION

BRITISH COLUMBIA < 111>	19.8	17.1	16.2	12.6	13.5	2.7	18.0	0.0
PRAIRIES < 170>	14.1	21.8	16.5	10.6	10.6	4.7	21.8	0.0
ONTARIO < 348>	20.7	17.8	12.9	9.8	13.2	3.4	22.1	0.0
QUEBEC < 263>	24.3	13.3	16.7	6.8	8.4	7.2	23.2	0.0
ATLANTIC < 93>	22.6	20.4	10.8	11.8	10.8	5.4	18.3	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
40	985	24	28.015	0.7406	-0.007		0.084	-0.015C	-0.018	-0.015	0.012

TABLE 256 IS Q. 38 X Q. 40

COMMUNITY SIZE

1,000,000 AND OVER < 287>	21.3	17.1	16.4	5.6	12.5	3.8	23.3	0.0
100,000 - 99,999 < 257>	20.6	19.5	12.8	14.0	12.5	5.8	14.8	0.0
10,000 - 99,999 < 98>	13.3	9.2	19.4	13.3	12.2	4.1	28.6	0.0
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 343>	22.2	18.7	13.4	8.7	9.0	5.0	23.0	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
40	985	18	34.461	0.9890	0.010		0.108	0.004C	0.005	0.004	0.019

TABLE 257

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 41. Q29:M1 RSN CDA INV SPACE

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 41:

1) NATIONAL PRESTIGE
2) KEEP UP TECHNOLOG
3) MAINTAIN GOOD RELTNS
4) PROV IND/ECO BEN
5) FUND L T RESEARCH
6) BE PART SPACE EXPL
7) PROVIDE COMM SERVICE
8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	3.0	30.4	7.2	17.9	16.5	6.6	16.3	2.0
TABLE 257 IS Q. 31 X Q. 41								
AGE								
18 - 24 YEARS < 147>	3.4	27.9	6.1	17.0	19.7	13.6	10.9	1.4
25 - 34 YEARS < 274>	1.8	28.8	8.4	18.2	20.1	5.1	16.8	0.7
35 - 44 YEARS < 220>	1.4	34.1	7.3	20.0	19.5	4.5	10.5	2.7
45 - 54 YEARS < 129>	2.3	33.3	3.1	20.9	11.6	7.0	19.4	2.3
55 - 64 YEARS < 104>	7.7	29.8	9.6	14.4	8.7	6.7	21.2	1.9
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 123>	4.9	27.6	8.1	13.8	11.4	4.9	25.2	4.1

DEP 41	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	977	30	63.920	0.9997	0.005		0.114	-0.012C	-0.016	-0.012	0.000

TABLE 258 IS Q. 32 X Q. 41

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

LESS THAN $10,000 < 92>	4.3	27.2	9.8	14.1	16.3	6.5	18.5	3.3
$10,000 - $19,999 < 213>	5.2	27.7	9.4	15.0	17.4	8.0	15.0	2.3
$20,000 - $29,999 < 212>	2.4	32.1	6.6	16.0	13.2	7.5	19.8	2.4
$30,000 - $39,999 < 177>	1.7	33.9	8.5	16.4	16.4	5.1	16.4	1.7
$40,000 - $49,999 < 107>	1.9	30.8	5.6	23.4	15.9	7.5	13.1	1.9
$50,000 AND OVER < 155>	1.9	29.7	2.6	27.7	21.9	3.9	12.3	0.0

DEP 41	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	938	30	39.656	0.8883	-0.013		0.092	-0.007C	-0.009	-0.007	0.000

TABLE 259 IS Q. 33 X Q. 41

EDUCATION

PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL< 93>	5.4	30.1	14.0	14.0	10.8	5.4	19.4	1.1
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 177>	5.1	35.6	11.9	11.9	11.3	5.1	15.8	3.4
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 285>	2.8	30.9	8.4	18.2	13.7	8.1	17.2	0.7
VOC/TECH/COLL/CEGEP < 143>	1.4	33.6	4.9	16.1	21.0	4.9	17.5	0.7
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY< 218>	1.8	27.5	2.8	22.5	23.4	4.6	13.3	4.1
AT SCHOOL < 75>	1.3	20.0	2.7	22.7	18.7	14.7	18.7	1.3

DEP 41	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	971	30	69.419	0.9999	0.093	***	0.120	0.076C	0.098	0.079	0.003

TABLE 260 IS Q. 34 X Q. 41

SEX

MALE < 499>	4.2	30.5	7.2	18.2	16.4	5.8	15.6	2.0
FEMALE < 501>	1.8	30.1	7.4	17.6	16.6	7.6	17.0	2.0

DEP 41	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	980	6	6.379	0.6179	0.042		0.021	0.043C	0.060	0.048	0.000

TABLE 261

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 41. Q29:M1 RSN CDA INV SPACE

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 41:

1) NATIONAL PRESTIGE
2) KEEP UP TECHNOLOG
3) MAINTAIN GOOD RELTNS
4) PROV IND/ECO BEN
5) FUND L T RESEARCH
6) BE PART SPACE EXPL
7) PROVIDE COMM SERVICE
8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	3.0	30.4	7.2	17.9	16.5	6.6	16.3	2.0
TABLE 261 IS Q. 35 X Q. 41								
LANGUAGE								
ENGLISH < 754>	2.8	28.9	6.6	19.6	15.4	7.7	16.6	2.4
FRENCH < 246>	3.7	34.6	9.3	12.6	19.9	3.7	15.4	0.8

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
41	980	6	16.196	0.9873	-0.055	*	0.129	-0.052C	-0.087	-0.069	0.000

TABLE 262 IS Q. 36 X Q. 41								
SAMPLE STRATA								
B.C. < 113>	1.8	28.3	6.2	14.2	20.4	8.8	20.4	0.0
ALBERTA < 92>	1.1	30.4	6.5	26.1	12.0	7.6	13.0	3.3
SASKATCHEWAN < 40>	5.0	25.0	10.0	15.0	15.0	7.5	20.0	2.5
MANITOBA < 42>	2.4	16.7	11.9	16.7	14.3	2.4	33.3	2.4
BALANCE ONTARIO < 267>	3.7	36.0	6.0	18.4	15.7	4.9	14.2	1.1
METRO < 88>	2.3	20.5	2.3	28.4	12.5	18.2	9.1	6.8
QUEBEC < 265>	3.4	34.7	9.8	13.2	18.5	4.2	15.1	1.1
NEW BRUNSWICK < 29>	3.4	10.3	13.8	24.1	10.3	10.3	27.6	0.0
NOVA SCOTIA < 35>	5.7	31.4	2.9	14.3	20.0	0.0	17.1	8.6
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND< 5>	0.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
NEWFOUNDLAND < 24>	0.0	20.8	8.3	12.5	25.0	8.3	25.0	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
41	980	60	98.893	0.9988	-0.021		0.130	-0.018C	-0.023	-0.019	0.031

TABLE 263 IS Q. 37 X Q. 41								
REGION								
BRITISH COLUMBIA < 113>	1.8	28.3	6.2	14.2	20.4	8.8	20.4	0.0
PRAIRIES < 174>	2.3	25.9	8.6	21.3	13.2	6.3	19.5	2.9
ONTARIO < 355>	3.4	32.1	5.1	20.8	14.9	8.2	13.0	2.5
QUEBEC < 265>	3.4	34.7	9.8	13.2	18.5	4.2	15.1	1.1
ATLANTIC < 93>	3.2	21.5	7.5	18.3	18.3	6.5	21.5	3.2

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
41	980	24	33.579	0.9076	-0.039		0.093	-0.031C	-0.041	-0.033	0.000

TABLE 264 IS Q. 38 X Q. 41								
COMMUNITY SIZE								
1,000,000 AND OVER < 294>	1.7	31.6	4.4	19.0	17.3	8.5	13.6	3.7
100,000 - 999,999 < 260>	3.8	27.7	6.5	19.6	16.5	6.9	16.9	1.9
10,000 - 99,999 < 100>	3.0	30.0	9.0	19.0	14.0	7.0	16.0	2.0
UNDER 10,000/RURAL < 346>	3.5	31.2	9.8	15.3	16.5	4.9	18.2	0.6

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
41	980	18	17.995	0.5440	-0.014		0.078	-0.011C	-0.015	-0.012	0.000

TABLE 265

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 42. Q29:M2 RSN CDA INV SPACE

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 42:
1) NATIONAL PRESTIGE
2) KEEP UP TECHNOLOG
3) MAINTAIN GOOD RELTNS
4) PROV IND/ECO BEN
5) FUND L T RESEARCH
6) BE PART SPACE EXPL
7) PROVIDE COMM SERVICE
8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	4.0	18.2	11.8	19.9	20.1	8.0	18.0	0.0
TABLE 265 IS Q. 31 X Q. 42								
AGE								
18 - 24 YEARS < 144>	5.6	17.4	10.4	16.7	20.8	9.7	19.4	0.0
25 - 34 YEARS < 269>	2.6	15.6	9.7	21.2	21.6	9.3	20.1	0.0
35 - 44 YEARS < 212>	3.3	21.2	8.5	19.3	18.9	8.5	20.3	0.0
45 - 54 YEARS < 125>	8.0	16.8	14.4	22.4	22.4	3.2	12.8	0.0
55 - 64 YEARS < 102>	2.9	18.6	15.7	20.6	13.7	10.8	17.6	0.0
65 YEARS OR OLDER < 117>	3.4	20.5	17.9	18.8	21.4	5.1	12.8	0.0

DEP 42	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	969	30	35.858	0.7872	-0.084	***	0.086	-0.066C	-0.081	-0.068	0.016

TABLE 266 IS Q. 32 X Q. 42

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME								
LESS THAN $10,000 < 88>	2.3	21.6	12.5	20.5	20.5	9.1	13.6	0.0
$10,000 - $19,999 < 206>	5.3	20.9	15.5	15.5	19.4	9.2	14.1	0.0
$20,000 - $29,999 < 206>	3.9	13.1	15.5	19.9	19.9	7.3	20.4	0.0
$30,000 - $39,999 < 172>	4.1	18.6	9.9	22.7	20.9	7.0	16.9	0.0
$40,000 - $49,999 < 105>	4.8	17.1	10.5	20.0	21.0	8.6	18.1	0.0
$50,000 AND OVER < 153>	3.3	19.0	5.2	19.6	20.9	8.5	23.5	0.0

DEP 42	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	930	30	27.195	0.3870	0.071	**	0.076	0.055C	0.068	0.056	0.016

TABLE 267 IS Q. 33 X Q. 42

EDUCATION								
PUBLIC/ELEMEN SCHOOL< 91>	8.8	18.7	11.0	16.5	22.0	15.4	7.7	0.0
SOME HIGH SCHOOL < 170>	4.1	15.9	17.6	24.7	13.5	7.1	17.1	0.0
GRAD HIGH SCHOOL < 282>	3.5	20.9	12.4	14.9	22.3	7.1	18.8	0.0
VOC/TECH/CCLL/CEGEP < 141>	2.8	10.6	14.2	25.5	19.1	8.5	19.1	0.0
SOME/GRAD UNIVERSITY< 206>	3.9	18.0	6.3	20.9	23.8	4.9	22.3	0.0
AT SCHOOL < 73>	4.1	26.0	8.2	17.8	16.4	11.0	16.4	0.0

DEP 42	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	963	30	59.057	0.9988	0.056	*	0.111	0.045C	0.056	0.047	0.046

TABLE 268 IS Q. 34 X Q. 42

SEX								
MALE < 484>	4.5	18.2	11.2	22.9	19.0	8.1	16.1	0.0
FEMALE < 486>	3.7	18.0	12.3	16.8	21.1	8.2	19.9	0.0

DEP 42	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	972	6	7.753	0.7432	0.043		0.089	0.049C	0.059	0.049	0.024

TABLE 269

1. DEMO BLOCK VS. 42. Q29:M2 RSN CDA INV SPACE

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 42:
1) NATIONAL PRESTIGE
2) KEEP UP TECHNOLOG
3) MAINTAIN GOOD RELTNS
4) PROV IND/ECO BEN
5) FUND L T RESEARCH
6) BE PART SPACE EXPL
7) PROVIDE COMM SERVICE
8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	4.0	18.2	11.8	19.9	20.1	8.0	18.0	0.0

TABLE 269 IS Q. 35 X Q. 42

LANGUAGE								
ENGLISH <730>	4.0	17.3	10.8	19.0	20.1	9.0	19.7	0.0
FRENCH <242>	4.5	20.7	14.5	22.3	19.8	5.4	12.8	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
42	972	6	12.188	0.9421	-0.097	***	0.112	-0.096C	-0.154	-0.129	0.008

TABLE 270 IS Q. 36 X Q. 42

SAMPLE STRATA								
B.C. <112>	1.8	18.7	2.7	28.6	23.2	11.6	13.4	0.0
ALBERTA <89>	2.2	20.2	13.5	21.3	22.5	4.5	15.7	0.0
SASKATCHEWAN <38>	0.0	15.8	18.4	15.8	28.9	10.5	10.5	0.0
MANITOBA <41>	4.9	31.7	7.3	19.5	17.1	7.3	12.2	0.0
BALANCE ONTARIO <262>	4.6	15.3	12.6	17.2	19.1	9.9	21.4	0.0
METRO <80>	7.5	17.5	16.3	16.3	13.8	5.0	23.8	0.0
QUEBEC <260>	5.0	20.0	13.8	21.2	18.8	6.9	14.2	0.0
NEW BRUNSWICK <29>	0.0	24.1	3.4	17.2	31.0	6.9	17.2	0.0
NOVA SCOTIA <32>	3.1	6.2	9.4	12.5	21.9	9.4	37.5	0.0
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND<5>	40.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0
NEWFOUNDLAND <24>	0.0	12.5	8.3	25.0	20.8	8.3	25.0	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
42	972	60	90.115	0.9928	0.014		0.124	0.002C	0.002	0.002	0.051

TABLE 271 IS Q. 37 X Q. 42

REGION								
BRITISH COLUMBIA <112>	1.8	18.7	2.7	28.6	23.2	11.6	13.4	0.0
PRAIRIES <168>	2.4	22.0	13.1	19.6	22.6	6.5	13.7	0.0
ONTARIO <342>	5.3	15.8	13.5	17.0	17.8	8.8	21.9	0.0
QUEBEC <260>	5.0	20.0	13.8	21.2	18.8	6.9	14.2	0.0
ATLANTIC <90>	3.3	13.3	7.8	16.7	23.3	7.8	27.8	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
42	972	24	44.372	0.9931	0.015		0.107	0.007C	0.009	0.008	0.039

TABLE 272 IS Q. 38 X Q. 42

COMMUNITY SIZE								
1,000,000 AND OVER <279>	3.8	20.1	10.0	19.4	16.5	7.9	19.4	0.0
100,000 - 999,999 <254>	2.8	16.5	10.6	19.7	22.0	9.8	16.5	0.0
10,000 - 99,999 <97>	4.1	12.4	18.6	11.3	22.7	7.2	23.7	0.0
UNDER 10,000/RURAL <342>	2.9	17.8	12.0	22.3	20.8	7.3	16.4	0.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
42	972	18	26.394	0.9089	0.017		0.095	0.015C	0.018	0.015	0.023

TABLE 273

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 1. ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 1:

1) COM PROGRAMMING
2) LAW
3) ENGINEERING
4) TEACHING
5) BUSINESS
6) BIOLOGY
7) MEDICINE
8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
SEEK CURES < 342>	56.7	28.1	21.6	15.8	19.9	10.2	45.0	1.2
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	55.8	26.0	31.2	14.4	22.1	6.7	41.8	1.0
CREATE TECH FOR RESC< 136>	47.1	26.5	31.6	13.2	30.1	9.6	40.4	0.7
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	56.4	29.7	27.7	18.5	21.1	5.3	38.3	1.3
(NO OPINION) < 11>	45.5	0.0	18.2	36.4	9.1	9.1	45.5	18.2
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	55.0	27.6	26.8	16.2	22.0	7.9	41.7	1.3

DEP 1 N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA
1 WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N	(6) N	(7) N	(8) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	194.	96.	74.	54.	68.	35.	154.	4.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	116.	54.	65.	30.	46.	14.	87.	2.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC< 136>	64.	36.	43.	18.	41.	13.	55.	1.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	171.	90.	84.	56.	64.	16.	116.	4.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	5.	0.	2.	4.	1.	1.	5.	2.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	550.	276.	268.	162.	220.	79.	417.	13.

TABLE 274

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 1. ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE

ANSWERS TO
Q. 1:
1) COM PROGRAMMING
2) LAW
3) ENGINEERING
4) TEACHING
5) BUSINESS
6) BIOLOGY
7) MEDICINE
8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
POOR JOB < 152>	55.3	28.9	25.7	17.1	15.1	11.8	42.1	2.0
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	55.7	28.0	26.8	14.0	25.6	5.9	42.3	0.6
GOOD JOB < 296>	54.4	27.0	28.4	20.6	19.3	9.8	39.2	0.7
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	50.0	23.5	26.5	5.9	32.4	8.8	52.9	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26>	53.8	23.1	15.4	15.4	11.5	0.0	42.3	19.2
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	55.0	27.6	26.3	16.2	22.0	7.9	41.7	1.3

DEP
1 N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA
WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N	(6) N	(7) N	(8) N
POOR JOB < 152>	84.	44.	39.	26.	23.	18.	64.	3.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	274.	138.	132.	69.	126.	29.	209.	3.
GOOD JOB < 296>	161.	80.	84.	61.	57.	29.	116.	2.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	17.	8.	9.	2.	11.	3.	18.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	14.	6.	4.	4.	3.	0.	11.	5.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	550.	276.	268.	162.	220.	79.	417.	13.

TABLE 275

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 1. ADVISE RE CAREER CHOICE

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 1:
1) COM PROGRAMMING
2) LAW
3) ENGINEERING
4) TEACHING
5) BUSINESS
6) BIOLOGY
7) MEDICINE
8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	55.6	26.5	28.7	17.4	18.8	10.4	41.3	0.7
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	58.1	26.4	26.0	14.9	23.3	5.4	42.2	1.7
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	49.8	31.5	24.1	15.8	26.6	6.6	42.7	1.2
(NO OPINION) < 10>	60.0	20.0	30.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	55.0	27.6	26.8	16.2	22.0	7.9	41.7	1.3

DEP
1 N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA
WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N	(6) N	(7) N	(8) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 455>	252.	120.	130.	79.	85.	47.	187.	3.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	172.	78.	77.	44.	69.	16.	125.	5.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	120.	76.	58.	38.	64.	16.	103.	3.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	6.	2.	3.	1.	2.	0.	2.	2.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	550.	276.	268.	162.	220.	79.	417.	13.

TABLE 276

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 2: 1) RESOURCE SECTOR 2) MANUF SECTOR
3) SERVICE SECTOR 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
SEEK CURES < 342>	46.5	31.9	20.5	1.2
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	38.9	26.9	33.7	0.5
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	52.9	22.1	24.3	0.7
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	44.6	33.0	21.8	0.7
(NO OPINION) < 11>	54.5	9.1	18.2	18.2
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	45.3	29.6	24.1	1.0

DEP 2	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	981	6	18.962	0.9958	-0.003	0.098	0.0040	0.006	0.004	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	159.	109.	70.	4.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	81.	56.	70.	1.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	72.	30.	33.	1.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	135.	100.	66.	2.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	6.	1.	2.	2.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	453.	296.	241.	10.

TABLE 277

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 2: 1) RESOURCE SECTOR 2) MANUF SECTOR
3) SERVICE SECTOR 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
POOR JOB < 152>	39.5	32.2	25.7	2.6
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	42.7	32.3	24.4	0.6
GOOD JOB < 296>	51.4	24.0	24.3	0.3
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	50.0	26.5	23.5	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26>	53.8	30.8	7.7	7.7
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	45.3	29.6	24.1	1.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
2	966	6	9.338	0.8446	-0.056	*	0.070	-0.054C	-0.090	-0.058	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
POOR JOB < 152>	60.	49.	39.	4.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	210.	159.	120.	3.
GOOD JOB < 296>	152.	71.	72.	1.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	17.	9.	8.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	14.	8.	2.	2.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	453.	296.	241.	10.

TABLE 278

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 3. CDA SELL INTL MARKTS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 3: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
SEEK CURES < 342> (AVG.= 3.66 SIG.LOWER *)	0.3	2.6	27.5	69.0	0.6
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208> (AVG.= 3.80 SIG.HIGHR ***)	0.5	1.4	15.4	82.7	0.0
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136> (AVG.= 3.71 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.0	5.9	16.9	77.2	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303> (AVG.= 3.68 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.0	3.6	24.4	71.6	0.3
(NO OPINION) < 11> (AVG.= 3.36 T-TEST IS N/A)	9.1	0.0	36.4	54.5	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.3	3.1	22.7	73.6	0.3

DEP

3 N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
986	9	21.998	0.9911	0.003	0.086	0.0168	0.030	0.012	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	1.	9.	94.	236.	2.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	1.	3.	32.	172.	0.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	0.	8.	23.	105.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	0.	11.	74.	217.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	1.	0.	4.	6.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	3.	31.	227.	736.	3.

TABLE 279

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 3. CDA SELL INTL MARKTS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 3: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
POOR JOB < 152> (AVG.= 3.74 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.7	3.3	17.1	78.9	0.0
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492> (AVG.= 3.72 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.2	3.5	20.1	76.0	0.2
GOOD JOB < 296> (AVG.= 3.64 SIG.LOWER **)	0.3	2.7	29.4	66.9	0.7
VERY GOOD JOB < 34> (AVG.= 3.65 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.0	2.9	29.4	67.6	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26> (AVG.= 3.81 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.0	0.0	19.2	80.8	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.3	3.1	22.7	73.6	0.3

DEP
3

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
971	9	14.203	0.8847	-0.071	**	0.070	-0.0878	-0.171	-0.070	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
POOR JOB < 152>	1.	5.	26.	120.	0.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	1.	17.	99.	374.	1.
GOOD JOB < 296>	1.	8.	87.	198.	2.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	0.	1.	10.	23.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	0.	0.	5.	21.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	3.	31.	227.	736.	3.

TABLE 280

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 3. CDA SELL INTL MARKTS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 3: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 3.68 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.2	3.3	24.7	71.5	0.2
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 3.74 SIG.HIGHR +)	0.0	2.4	21.3	76.0	0.3
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 3.70 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.4	3.7	20.7	74.7	0.4
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 3.50 T-TEST IS N/A)	10.0	0.0	20.0	70.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.3	3.1	22.7	73.6	0.3

DEP

3	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	987	6	4.049	0.3300	0.026	0.045	0.026C	0.068	0.027	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	1.	15.	112.	324.	1.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	0.	7.	63.	225.	1.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	1.	9.	50.	180.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	1.	0.	2.	7.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	3.	31.	227.	736.	3.

TABLE 281

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 4. CDA DEV OWN SCI/TECH

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 4: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT 3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
SEEK CURES < 342> (AVG.= 3.75 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.6	0.9	21.9	76.6
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 203> (AVG.= 3.77 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.0	2.4	18.3	79.3
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136> (AVG.= 3.79 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.0	0.7	19.9	79.4
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303> (AVG.= 3.70 SIG.LOWER *)	1.0	1.3	24.8	72.9
(NO OPINION) < 11> (AVG.= 3.91 T-TEST IS N/A)	0.0	0.0	9.1	90.9
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.5	1.3	21.6	76.6

DEP

4 N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
989	9	9.429	0.6013	-0.037	0.056	-0.0298	-0.057	-0.021	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	2.	3.	75.	262.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	0.	5.	38.	165.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	0.	1.	27.	108.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	3.	4.	75.	221.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	0.	0.	1.	10.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.	13.	216.	766.

TABLE 282

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 4. CDA DEV OWN SCI/TECH

ANSWERS TO
Q. 4: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
POOR JOB < 152> (AVG.= 3.83 SIG.HIGHR **)	0.7	0.7	13.8	84.9
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492> (AVG.= 3.73 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.4	1.2	23.4	75.0
GOOD JOB < 296> (AVG.= 3.71 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.3	1.4	25.0	73.3
VERY GOOD JOB < 34> (AVG.= 3.74 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.9	2.9	11.8	82.4
(NO OPINION) < 26> (AVG.= 3.85 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.0	3.8	7.7	88.5
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.5	1.3	21.6	76.6

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
4	974	9	15.472	0.9212	-0.061	*	0.073	-0.0588	-0.122	-0.045	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
POOR JOB < 152>	1.	1.	21.	129.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	2.	6.	115.	369.
GOOD JOB < 296>	1.	4.	74.	217.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	1.	1.	4.	28.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	0.	1.	2.	23.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.	13.	216.	766.

TABLE 283

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 4. CDA DEV OWN SCI/TECH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 4: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 3.75 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.2	1.3	21.9	76.6
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 3.74 NO SIG.DIFF)	1.0	1.0	20.6	77.4
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 3.72 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.4	1.7	23.2	74.7
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 4.00 T-TEST IS N/A)	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.5	1.3	21.6	76.6

DEP

4 N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
990	6	3.254	0.2237	-0.020	0.041	-0.010C	-0.028	-0.010	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	1.	6.	99.	347.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	3.	3.	61.	229.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	1.	4.	56.	180.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	0.	0.	0.	10.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.	13.	216.	766.

TABLE 234

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 5. CDA KEEP UP WT TECH WARS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 5: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
SEEK CURES < 342> (AVG.= 3.60 SIG.LOWER **)	0.9	3.5	30.7	64.9	0.0
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208> (AVG.= 3.74 SIG.HIGHR **)	0.0	1.4	23.1	75.5	0.0
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136> (AVG.= 3.68 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.7	2.2	25.7	71.3	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303> (AVG.= 3.66 NO SIG.DIFF)	1.3	3.0	24.1	71.3	0.3
(NO OPINION) < 11> (AVG.= 3.64 T-TEST IS N/A)	0.0	9.1	18.2	72.7	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.8	2.8	26.3	70.0	0.1

DEP 5	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	988	9	11.073	0.7293	0.035	0.061	0.0488	0.086	0.038	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	3.	12.	105.	222.	0.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	0.	3.	43.	157.	0.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	1.	3.	35.	97.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	4.	9.	73.	216.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	0.	1.	2.	8.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.	28.	263.	700.	1.

TABLE 285

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 5. CDA KEEP UP WT TECH WARS

ANSWERS TO Q. 5:
1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
POOR JOB < 152> (AVG.= 3.74 SIG.HIGHR **)	2.0	2.0	15.8	80.3	0.0
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492> (AVG.= 3.66 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.4	2.8	27.2	69.3	0.2
GOOD JOB < 296> (AVG.= 3.62 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.7	3.4	29.1	66.9	0.0
VERY GOOD JOB < 34> (AVG.= 3.65 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.9	0.0	26.5	70.6	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26> (AVG.= 3.54 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.0	3.8	38.5	57.7	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.8	2.8	26.3	70.0	0.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
5	973	9	17.262	0.9552	-0.060	*	0.077	-0.0708	-0.134	-0.058	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
POOR JOB < 152>	3.	3.	24.	122.	0.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	2.	14.	134.	341.	1.
GOOD JOB < 296>	2.	10.	86.	198.	0.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	1.	0.	9.	24.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	0.	1.	10.	15.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.	28.	263.	700.	1.

TABLE 286

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 5. CDA KEEP UP WT TECH WARS

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 5: 1) NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 2) NOT TOO IMPORTANT
3) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 4) VERY IMPORTANT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 3.66 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.7	3.1	26.0	70.2	0.0
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 3.66 NO SIG.DIFF)	1.0	2.7	25.7	70.6	0.0
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 3.65 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.8	2.5	27.4	68.9	0.4
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 3.70 T-TEST IS N/A)	0.0	0.0	30.0	70.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	0.8	2.8	26.3	70.0	0.1

DEP S	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	989	6	0.721	0.0060	-0.005	0.019	-0.004C	-0.010	-0.004	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	3.	14.	118.	318.	0.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	3.	8.	76.	209.	0.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	2.	6.	66.	166.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	0.	0.	3.	7.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.	28.	263.	700.	1.

TABLE 287

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 6. SCI/TECH INNOV COME FROM

ANSWERS TO Q. 6:
1) SMALL COMPANIES
2) LARGE COMPANIES
3) UNIVERSITIES
4) GOVERNMENT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
SEEK CURES <342>	18.7	19.9	47.4	14.0	0.0
COMPETE ON INT MKTS <208>	25.0	26.4	38.5	9.6	0.5
CREATE TECH FOR RESC <136>	23.5	31.6	30.1	14.7	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT <303>	22.8	24.8	37.0	15.2	0.3
(NO OPINION) < 11>	18.2	18.2	45.5	9.1	9.1
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	21.9	24.3	40.0	13.5	0.3

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
6	987	9	20.823	0.9865	-0.046	0.084	-0.0478	-0.065	-0.047	0.003

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
SEEK CURES <342>	64.	68.	162.	48.	0.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS <208>	52.	55.	80.	20.	1.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC <136>	32.	43.	41.	20.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT <303>	69.	75.	112.	46.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	2.	2.	5.	1.	1.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	219.	243.	400.	135.	3.

TABLE 288

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 6. SCI/TECH INNOV COME FROM

ANSWERS TO
Q. 6: 1) SMALL COMPANIES 2) LARGE COMPANIES
3) UNIVERSITIES 4) GOVERNMENT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
POOR JOB < 152>	22.4	23.0	46.7	7.9	0.0
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	25.4	24.8	38.2	11.4	0.2
GOOD JOB < 296>	16.9	24.0	39.9	18.9	0.3
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	20.6	26.5	29.4	23.5	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26>	11.5	23.1	50.0	11.5	3.8
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	21.9	24.3	40.0	13.5	0.3

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
6	972	9	23.455	0.9947	0.088	***	0.090	0.0792	0.118	0.085	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
POOR JOB < 152>	34.	35.	71.	12.	0.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	125.	122.	188.	56.	1.
GOOD JOB < 296>	50.	71.	118.	56.	1.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	7.	9.	10.	8.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	3.	6.	13.	3.	1.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	219.	243.	400.	135.	3.

TABLE 289

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 6. SCI/TECH INNOV COME FROM

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 6: 1) SMALL COMPANIES 2) LARGE COMPANIES
3) UNIVERSITIES 4) GOVERNMENT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	18.3	24.9	41.7	15.0	0.0
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	25.3	21.3	41.2	11.8	0.3
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	25.3	27.4	34.9	12.4	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 10>	0.0	10.0	50.0	20.0	20.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	21.9	24.3	40.0	13.5	0.3

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
6	989	6	11.182	0.9171	-0.082	***	0.075	-0.073C	-0.106	-0.076	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	83.	113.	189.	68.	0.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	75.	63.	122.	35.	1.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	61.	66.	94.	30.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	0.	1.	5.	2.	2.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	219.	243.	400.	135.	3.

TABLE 290

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 7. WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?

ANSWERS TO Q. 7: 1) UNIVERSITIES 2) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 3) INDUSTRY 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
SEEK CURES < 342>	49.7	27.2	23.1	0.0
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	41.8	21.6	36.5	0.0
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	41.9	29.4	28.7	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	44.2	26.4	29.0	0.3
(NO OPINION) < 11>	27.3	18.2	54.5	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	45.1	26.0	28.8	0.1

DEP 7	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	988	6	13.001	0.9570	0.046	0.081	0.046C	0.065	0.042	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	170.	93.	79.	0.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	87.	45.	76.	0.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	57.	40.	39.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	134.	80.	88.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	3.	2.	6.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	451.	260.	288.	1.

TABLE 291

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 7. WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?

ANSWERS TO Q. 7: 1) UNIVERSITIES 2) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 3) INDUSTRY 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
POOR JOB < 152>	52.6	21.1	26.3	0.0
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	45.1	25.2	29.7	0.0
GOOD JOB < 296>	42.2	29.1	28.7	0.0
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	38.2	35.3	26.5	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26>	42.3	23.1	30.8	3.8
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	45.1	26.0	28.8	0.1

DEP

7	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	974	6	7.052	0.6840	0.044	0.060	0.040C	0.066	0.043	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
POOR JOB < 152>	80.	32.	40.	0.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	222.	124.	146.	0.
GOOD JOB < 296>	125.	86.	85.	0.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	13.	12.	9.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	11.	6.	8.	1.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	451.	260.	288.	1.

TABLE 292

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 7. WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?

ANSWERS TO
Q. 7: 1) UNIVERSITIES 2) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
3) INDUSTRY 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	45.7	30.2	23.8	0.2
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	44.6	23.6	31.8	0.0
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	44.8	20.3	34.9	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 10>	40.0	40.0	20.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	45.1	26.0	28.8	0.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
7	989	4	14.637	0.9945	0.060	*	0.086	0.0498	0.075	0.049	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	207.	137.	108.	1.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	132.	70.	94.	0.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	108.	49.	34.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	4.	4.	2.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	451.	260.	288.	1.

TABLE 293

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 8. WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?

ANSWERS TO Q. 8: 1) UNIVERSITIES 2) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 3) INDUSTRY 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
SEEK CURES < 342>	23.7	18.4	57.6	0.3
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	14.4	16.3	69.2	0.0
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	18.4	16.2	64.0	1.5
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	17.8	23.1	58.7	0.3
(NO OPINION) < 11>	27.3	9.1	63.6	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	19.3	19.0	61.3	0.4

DEP 8

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
985	6	13.792	0.9680	0.027	0.084	0.0200	0.034	0.019	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	81.	63.	197.	1.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	30.	34.	144.	0.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	25.	22.	87.	2.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	54.	70.	178.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	3.	1.	7.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	193.	190.	613.	4.

TABLE 294

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 8. WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?

ANSWERS TO Q. 8: 1) UNIVERSITIES 2) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 3) INDUSTRY 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
POOR JOB < 152>	19.7	11.2	68.4	0.7
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	17.9	20.5	61.4	0.2
GOOD JOB < 296>	20.3	21.6	57.8	0.3
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	23.5	14.7	61.8	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26>	26.9	11.5	57.7	3.8
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	19.3	19.0	61.3	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
8	971	6	9.648	0.8597	-0.047	0.070	-0.044C	-0.087	-0.047	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
POOR JOB < 152>	30.	17.	104.	1.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	88.	101.	302.	1.
GOOD JOB < 296>	60.	64.	171.	1.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	8.	5.	21.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	7.	3.	15.	1.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	193.	190.	613.	4.

TABLE 295

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 8. WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?

ANSWERS TO Q. 8: 1) UNIVERSITIES 2) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 3) INDUSTRY 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	21.6	22.5	55.4	0.4
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	19.9	16.9	62.5	0.7
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	14.1	14.5	71.4	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 10>	20.0	30.0	50.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	19.3	19.0	61.3	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
8	986	4	17.486	0.9984	0.116	***	0.094	0.111E	0.189	0.102	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	98.	102.	251.	2.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	59.	50.	185.	2.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	34.	35.	172.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	2.	3.	5.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	193.	190.	613.	4.

TABLE 298

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 9. FED GOVT SHD EMPHASIZE

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 9: 1) FUND RESEARCH 2) APPLIED RESEARCH
3) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
SEEK CURES < 342>	45.6	55.8	0.6
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	51.4	46.6	1.9
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	57.4	41.2	1.5
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	48.8	50.2	1.0
(NO OPINION) < 11>	45.5	54.5	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	48.7	50.2	1.1

DEP 9	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	978	3	9.145	0.9726	-0.051	0.097	-0.0600	-0.082	-0.041	0.066

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	149.	191.	2.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	107.	97.	4.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	78.	56.	2.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	148.	152.	3.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	5.	6.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	487.	502.	11.

TABLE 297

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 9. FED GOVT SHD EMPHASIZE

ANSWERS TO
Q. 9: 1) FUND RESEARCH 2) APPLIED RESEARCH
3) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
POOR JOB < 152>	50.0	46.1	3.9
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	51.8	47.8	0.4
GOOD JOB < 296>	44.9	54.7	0.3
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	44.1	55.9	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26>	30.8	61.5	7.7
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	48.7	50.2	1.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
9	965	3	4.334	0.7724	0.058	*	0.067	0.064C	0.102	0.051	0.054

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N
POOR JOB < 152>	76.	70.	6.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	255.	235.	2.
GOOD JOB < 296>	133.	162.	1.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	15.	19.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	8.	16.	2.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	487.	502.	11.

TABLE 298

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 9. FED GOVT SHD EMPHASIZE

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 9: 1) FUND RESEARCH 2) APPLIED RESEARCH
3) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	48.8	50.1	1.1
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	44.3	54.4	1.4
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	55.2	44.4	0.4
(NO OPINION) < 10>	20.0	70.0	10.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	48.7	50.2	1.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
9	930	2	5.878	0.9471	-0.038	0.077	-0.034C	-0.052	-0.026	0.054

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	221.	227.	5.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	131.	161.	4.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	133.	107.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	2.	7.	1.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	487.	502.	11.

TABLE 299

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 10. WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?

ANSWERS TO Q. 10: 1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 2) INDUSTRY 3) PROV GOVERNMENT 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
SEEK CURES < 342>	55.3	30.1	13.5	1.2
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	55.3	32.7	10.6	1.4
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	53.7	30.9	15.4	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	48.5	34.0	16.5	1.0
(NO OPINION) < 11>	36.4	18.2	45.5	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	52.8	31.8	14.4	1.0

DEP 10

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
979	6	5.882	0.5635	0.061	*	0.055	0.051C	0.079	0.047	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	189.	103.	46.	4.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	115.	68.	22.	3.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	73.	42.	21.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	147.	103.	50.	3.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	4.	2.	5.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	528.	318.	144.	10.

TABLE 300

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 10. WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?

ANSWERS TO
Q. 10: 1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 2) INDUSTRY
3) PROV GOVERNMENT 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
POOR JOB < 152>	52.6	38.2	8.6	0.7
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	52.8	31.7	14.6	0.8
GOOD JOB < 296>	53.7	29.7	15.5	1.0
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	44.1	29.4	26.5	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26>	53.8	23.1	15.4	7.7
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	52.8	31.8	14.4	1.0

DEP 10

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
966	6	10.197	0.8834	0.045	0.073	0.0220	0.039	0.023	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
POOR JOB < 152>	80.	58.	13.	1.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	260.	156.	72.	4.
GOOD JOB < 296>	159.	88.	46.	3.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	15.	10.	9.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	14.	6.	4.	2.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	528.	318.	144.	10.

TABLE 301

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 10. WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 10: 1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 2) INDUSTRY
3) PROV GOVERNMENT 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	53.9	30.5	14.8	0.9
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	52.0	32.1	15.2	0.7
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	52.3	34.4	11.6	1.7
(NO OPINION) < 10>	40.0	20.0	40.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	52.8	31.8	14.4	1.0

DEP
10

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
980	4	2.373	0.3324	-0.007	0.035	0.0013	0.002	0.001	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	244.	138.	67.	4.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	154.	95.	45.	2.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	126.	83.	28.	4.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	4.	2.	4.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	528.	316.	144.	10.

TABLE 302

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 11. WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?

ANSWERS TO
Q. 11: 1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 2) INDUSTRY
3) PROV GOVERNMENT 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
SEEK CURES < 342>	39.2	42.7	17.5	0.6
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	38.5	51.4	10.1	0.0
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	39.0	42.6	18.4	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	38.9	45.9	14.5	0.7
(NO OPINION) < 11>	45.5	27.3	27.3	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	39.0	45.3	15.3	0.4

DEP 11

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
985	6	8.258	0.7802	-0.008	0.065	-0.007C	-0.011	-0.007	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	134.	146.	60.	2.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	80.	107.	21.	0.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	53.	58.	25.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	118.	139.	44.	2.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	5.	3.	3.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	390.	453.	153.	4.

TABLE 303

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 11. WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?

ANSWERS TO Q. 11:
1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
2) INDUSTRY
3) PROV GOVERNMENT
4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
POOR JOB < 152>	33.6	54.6	11.8	0.0
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	38.8	45.1	16.1	0.0
GOOD JOB < 296>	42.9	41.2	15.2	0.7
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	32.4	44.1	23.5	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26>	38.5	42.3	11.5	7.7
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	39.0	45.3	15.3	0.4

DEP 11

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
972	6	9.543	0.8547	-0.011	0.070	-0.0210	-0.036	-0.022	0.009

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
POOR JOB < 152>	51.	83.	18.	0.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	191.	222.	79.	0.
GOOD JOB < 296>	127.	122.	45.	2.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	11.	15.	8.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	10.	11.	3.	2.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	390.	453.	153.	4.

TABLE 304

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 11. WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 11: 1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 2) INDUSTRY
3) PROV GOVERNMENT 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	39.7	42.6	17.2	0.4
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	39.2	46.3	14.5	0.0
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	38.2	49.0	12.0	0.8
(NO OPINION) < 10>	20.0	50.0	30.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	39.0	45.3	15.3	0.4

DEP 11

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
986	4	4.503	0.6579	-0.022		0.048	-0.0138	-0.021	-0.013	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	180.	193.	78.	2.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	116.	137.	43.	0.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	92.	118.	29.	2.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	2.	5.	3.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	390.	453.	153.	4.

TABLE 305

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 12. EMPH SCI/TECH:SEEK CURES

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 12: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
SEEK CURES < 342> (AVG.= 2.77 SIG.HIGHR ***)	1.5	20.2	78.4	0.0
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208> (AVG.= 2.53 SIG.LOWER *)	5.8	35.1	59.1	0.0
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136> (AVG.= 2.49 SIG.LOWER **)	4.4	41.9	53.7	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303> (AVG.= 2.50 SIG.LOWER ***)	7.6	34.7	57.8	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 11> (AVG.= 2.40 T-TEST IS N/A)	9.1	36.4	45.5	9.1
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	4.7	30.8	64.4	0.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
12	989	6	50.113	1.0000	-0.186	***	0.159	-0.153C	-0.282	-0.141	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	5.	69.	268.	0.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	12.	73.	123.	0.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	6.	57.	73.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	23.	105.	175.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	1.	4.	5.	1.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	47.	308.	644.	1.

TABLE 306

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 12. EMPH SCI/TECH:SEEK CURES

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 12: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
POOR JOB <152> (AVG.= 2.62 NO SIG.DIFF)	5.9	26.3	67.1	0.7
ONLY FAIR JOB <492> (AVG.= 2.58 NO SIG.DIFF)	4.9	31.9	63.2	0.0
GOOD JOB <296> (AVG.= 2.60 NO SIG.DIFF)	3.4	32.8	63.9	0.0
VERY GOOD JOB < 34> (AVG.= 2.68 NO SIG.DIFF)	5.9	20.6	73.5	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26> (AVG.= 2.58 NO SIG.DIFF)	7.7	26.9	65.4	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	4.7	30.8	64.4	0.1

DEP 12

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
973	6	5.169	0.4777	0.011	0.052	0.001C	0.003	0.002	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
POOR JOB <152>	9.	40.	102.	1.
ONLY FAIR JOB <492>	24.	157.	311.	0.
GOOD JOB <296>	10.	97.	189.	0.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	2.	7.	25.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	2.	7.	17.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	47.	303.	644.	1.

TABLE 307

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 12. EMPH SCI/TECH:SEEK CURES

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 12: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 2.60 NO SIG.DIFF)	4.2	31.6	64.2	0.0
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 2.60 NO SIG.DIFF)	5.7	28.0	65.9	0.3
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 2.58 NO SIG.DIFF)	4.1	33.6	62.2	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 2.70 T-TEST IS N/A)	10.0	10.0	80.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	4.7	30.8	64.4	0.1

DEP 12

N	D.F.	CHISQRD	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
989	4	2.781	0.4048	-0.012	0.037	-0.0108	-0.017	-0.008	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	19.	143.	291.	0.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	17.	83.	195.	1.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	10.	81.	150.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	1.	1.	8.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	47.	308.	644.	1.

TABLE 308

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 13. EMPH SCI/TECH:EFF COMP

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 13: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
SEEK CURES < 342> (AVG.= 2.30 SIG.LOWER ***)	9.9	50.0	39.8	0.3
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208> (AVG.= 2.62 SIG.HIGHR ***)	3.8	30.3	65.9	0.0
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136> (AVG.= 2.40 NO SIG.DIFF)	3.8	42.6	48.5	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303> (AVG.= 2.37 NO SIG.DIFF)	8.9	45.2	45.2	0.7
(NO OPINION) < 11> (AVG.= 2.20 T-TEST IS N/A)	9.1	54.5	27.3	9.1
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.2	43.5	47.9	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
13	986	6	37.276	1.0000	0.017	0.137	0.0290	0.046	0.026	0.069

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	34.	171.	136.	1.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	8.	63.	137.	0.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	12.	58.	66.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	27.	137.	137.	2.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	1.	6.	3.	1.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	82.	435.	479.	4.

TABLE 309

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 13. EMPH SCI/TECH:EFF COMP

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 13: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
POOR JOB <152> (AVG.= 2.42 NO SIG.DIFF)	8.6	40.1	50.0	1.3
ONLY FAIR JOB <492> (AVG.= 2.38 NO SIG.DIFF)	8.9	44.3	46.5	0.2
GOOD JOB <296> (AVG.= 2.42 NO SIG.DIFF)	7.1	43.6	49.0	0.3
VERY GOOD JOB < 34> (AVG.= 2.50 NO SIG.DIFF)	8.8	32.4	58.8	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26> (AVG.= 2.31 NO SIG.DIFF)	3.8	61.5	34.6	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.2	43.5	47.9	0.4

DEP 13

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
970	6	3.383	0.2406	0.021	0.042	0.015C	0.028	0.016	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
POOR JOB <152>	13.	61.	76.	2.
ONLY FAIR JOB <492>	44.	218.	229.	1.
GOOD JOB <296>	21.	129.	145.	1.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	3.	11.	20.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	1.	16.	9.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	82.	435.	479.	4.

TABLE 310

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 13. EMPH SCI/TECH:EFF COMP

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 13: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 2.40 NO SIG.DIFF)	7.7	44.6	47.2	0.4
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 2.40 NO SIG.DIFF)	8.1	43.2	48.0	0.7
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 2.40 NO SIG.DIFF)	9.1	41.9	49.0	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 2.40 T-TEST IS N/A)	10.0	40.0	50.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.2	43.5	47.9	0.4

DEP 13

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
986	4	0.740	0.0536	0.001	0.019	0.0058	0.009	0.005	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	35.	202.	214.	2.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	24.	128.	142.	2.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	22.	101.	118.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	1.	4.	5.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	82.	435.	479.	4.

TABLE 311

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 14. EMPH SCI/TECH:NAT RESC

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 14: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
SEEK CURES <342> (AVG.= 2.33 SIG.LOWER ***)	9.9	46.8	43.0	0.3
COMPETE ON INT MKTS <208> (AVG.= 2.38 NO SIG.DIFF)	9.1	44.2	46.6	0.0
CREATE TECH FOR RESC <136> (AVG.= 2.65 SIG.HIGHR ***)	2.2	30.9	66.9	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT <303> (AVG.= 2.41 NO SIG.DIFF)	7.6	43.6	48.8	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 11> (AVG.= 2.10 T-TEST IS N/A)	18.2	45.5	27.3	9.1
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.1	43.1	48.6	0.2

DEP 14

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
988	6	25.288	0.9997	0.078	**	0.113	0.066C	0.106	0.060	0.026

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
SEEK CURES <342>	34.	160.	147.	1.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS <208>	19.	92.	97.	0.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC <136>	3.	42.	91.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT <303>	23.	132.	148.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	2.	5.	3.	1.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	81.	431.	486.	2.

TABLE 312

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 14. EMPH SCI/TECH:NAT RESC

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 14: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
POOR JOB < 152> (AVG.= 2.38 NO SIG.DIFF)	9.2	42.8	47.4	0.7
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492> (AVG.= 2.37 SIG.LOWER *)	9.6	44.1	46.1	0.2
GOOD JOB < 296> (AVG.= 2.46 SIG.HIGHR +)	5.1	44.3	50.7	0.0
VERY GOOD JOB < 34> (AVG.= 2.47 NO SIG.DIFF)	11.8	29.4	58.8	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26> (AVG.= 2.62 SIG.HIGHR *)	3.8	30.8	65.4	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.1	43.1	48.6	0.2

DEP 14

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
972	6	8.611	0.8033	0.052	0.067	0.0410	0.077	0.044	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
POOR JOB < 152>	14.	65.	72.	1.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	47.	217.	227.	1.
GOOD JOB < 296>	15.	131.	150.	0.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	4.	10.	20.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	1.	8.	17.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	81.	431.	486.	2.

TABLE 313

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 14. EMPH SCI/TECH:NAT RESC

ANSWERS TO
Q. 14: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 2.45 SIG.HIGH *)	7.1	41.1	51.7	0.2
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 2.38 NO SIG.DIFF)	9.8	42.6	47.3	0.3
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 2.37 NO SIG.DIFF)	7.9	47.7	44.4	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 2.40 T-TEST IS N/A)	10.0	40.0	50.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.1	43.1	48.6	0.2

DEP 14

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
988	4	5.164	0.7291	-0.056	*	0.051	-0.0558	-0.091	-0.052	0.016

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	32.	186.	234.	1.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	29.	126.	140.	1.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	19.	115.	107.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	1.	4.	5.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	81.	431.	486.	2.

TABLE 314

16. MST IMP RSN 5 TO SCI/TCH VS. 15. EMPH SCI/TECH:INCR EMPL

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 15: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
SEEK CURES <342> (AVG.= 2.52 NO SIG.DIFF)	5.0	37.7	57.0	0.3
COMPETE ON INT MKTS <203> (AVG.= 2.51 NO SIG.DIFF)	5.3	38.0	56.7	0.0
CREATE TECH FOR RESC <136> (AVG.= 2.46 SIG.LOWER *)	8.8	36.0	55.1	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT <303> (AVG.= 2.66 SIG.HIGHR ***)	3.0	27.7	69.3	0.0
(NO OPINION) <11> (AVG.= 2.40 T-TEST IS N/A)	9.1	36.4	45.5	9.1
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.0	34.5	60.3	0.2

DEP 15

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
988	6	13.142	0.9941	0.089	***	0.096	0.0750	0.134	0.069	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
SEEK CURES <342>	17.	129.	195.	1.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS <203>	11.	79.	118.	0.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC <136>	12.	49.	75.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT <303>	9.	84.	210.	0.
(NO OPINION) <11>	1.	4.	5.	1.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	50.	345.	603.	2.

TABLE 315

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 15. EMPH SCI/TECH:INCR EMPL

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 15: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
POOR JOB <152> (AVG.= 2.58 NO SIG.DIFF)	6.6	28.9	63.8	0.7
ONLY FAIR JOB <492> (AVG.= 2.54 NO SIG.DIFF)	5.3	35.6	59.1	0.0
GOOD JOB <296> (AVG.= 2.57 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.4	37.8	59.5	0.3
VERY GOOD JOB < 34> (AVG.= 2.65 NO SIG.DIFF)	11.8	11.8	76.5	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26> (AVG.= 2.38 SIG.LOWER +)	11.5	38.5	50.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.0	34.5	60.3	0.2

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
15	972	6	17.781	0.9932	0.018	0.096	0.007C	0.014	0.007	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
POOR JOB <152>	10.	44.	97.	1.
ONLY FAIR JOB <492>	26.	175.	291.	0.
GOOD JOB <296>	7.	112.	176.	1.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	4.	4.	26.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	3.	10.	13.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	50.	345.	603.	2.

TABLE 316

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 15. EMPH SCI/TECH:INCR EMPL

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 15: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 2.53 SIG.LOWER +)	4.6	38.2	57.2	0.0
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 2.62 SIG.HIGHR **)	4.1	29.7	65.5	0.7
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 2.53 NO SIG.DIFF)	6.6	33.6	59.8	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 2.50 T-TEST IS N/A)	10.0	30.0	60.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.0	34.5	60.3	0.2

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
15	988	4	7.844	0.9025	0.016	0.063	0.0309	0.052	0.027	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	21.	173.	259.	0.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	12.	88.	194.	2.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	16.	81.	144.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	1.	3.	6.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	50.	345.	603.	2.

TABLE 317

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH

ANSWERS TO Q. 16:
1) SEEK CURES
2) COMPETE ON INT MKTS
3) CREATE TECH FOR RESC
4) INCREASE EMPLOYMENT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
POOR JOB < 152>	31.6	23.0	13.2	30.3	2.0
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	31.5	22.4	12.8	32.9	0.4
GOOD JOB < 296>	38.9	18.2	16.2	25.7	1.0
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	38.2	14.7	14.7	29.4	2.9
(NO OPINION) < 26>	42.3	15.4	0.0	34.6	7.7
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	34.2	20.8	13.6	30.3	1.1

DEP 16

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
965	9	10.668	0.7009	-0.046	0.061	-0.0478	-0.070	-0.051	0.011

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
POOR JOB < 152>	48.	35.	20.	46.	3.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	155.	110.	63.	162.	2.
GOOD JOB < 296>	115.	54.	48.	76.	3.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	13.	5.	5.	10.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	11.	4.	0.	9.	2.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	342.	208.	136.	303.	11.

TABLE 318

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 16:
1) SEEK CURES
2) COMPETE ON INT MKTS
3) CREATE TECH FOR RESC
4) INCREASE EMPLOYMENT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	35.1	17.9	15.9	29.8	1.3
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	36.8	18.9	10.1	33.8	0.3
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	29.0	29.0	13.7	27.4	0.8
(NO OPINION) < 10>	40.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	20.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	34.2	20.8	13.6	30.3	1.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
16	981	6	18.962	0.9958	-0.003	0.098	0.004C	0.006	0.004	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	159.	81.	72.	135.	6.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	109.	56.	30.	100.	1.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	70.	70.	33.	66.	2.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	4.	1.	1.	2.	2.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	342.	208.	136.	303.	11.

TABLE 319

16. MST IMP RSN 3 TO SCI/TCH VS. 17. HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 17: 1) YES 2) NO
3) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
SEEK CURES < 342>	12.0	87.7	0.3
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 206>	21.2	78.8	0.0
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	16.2	83.8	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	14.2	85.1	0.7
(NO OPINION) < 11>	18.2	81.8	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.2	84.5	0.3

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
17	986	3	8.679	0.9661	-0.015	0.094	-0.017C	-0.046	-0.012	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	41.	300.	1.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 206>	44.	164.	0.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	22.	114.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	43.	259.	2.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	2.	9.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	152.	845.	3.

TABLE 320

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 17. HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 17: 1) YES 2) NO
3) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
POOR JOB < 152>	19.1	80.3	0.7
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	16.9	82.7	0.4
GOOD JOB < 296>	11.8	88.2	0.0
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	14.7	85.3	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26>	0.0	100.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.2	84.5	0.3

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
17	971	3	5.366	0.8531	0.066	**	0.074	0.0540	0.163	0.043	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N
POOR JOB < 152>	29.	122.	1.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	83.	407.	2.
GOOD JOB < 296>	35.	261.	0.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	5.	29.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	0.	26.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	152.	845.	3.

TABLE 321

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 17. HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 17: 1) YES 2) NO
3) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	16.1	83.4	0.4
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	14.9	84.8	0.3
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	14.5	85.5	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 10>	0.0	100.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.2	84.5	0.3

DEP 17

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
987	2	0.410	0.1352	0.020	0.020	0.016C	0.047	0.012	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	73.	378.	2.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	44.	251.	1.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	35.	206.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	0.	10.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	152.	845.	3.

TABLE 322

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

A.# 1	SEEK CURES	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	2.	4.9 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	6.	14.6 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	5.	12.2 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	6.	14.6 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	1.	2.4 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	4.	9.8 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	3.	7.3 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	6.	14.6 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	1.	2.4 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	2.	4.9 %
12.	FREE TRADE	1.	2.4 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	1.	2.4 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	3.	7.3 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	41.	100.0 %

A.# 2	COMPETE ON INT MKTS	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	1.	2.3 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	10.	22.7 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	7.	15.9 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	5.	11.4 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	3.	6.8 %
6.	TAX LAWS	1.	2.3 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	8.	18.2 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	2.	4.5 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	1.	2.3 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	2.3 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	4.	9.1 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	0.	0.0 %

TABLE 322 (CONTINUED)

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

A.# 2	COMPETE ON INT MKTS	RESPONSES	PERCENT
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	1.	2.3 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	44.	100.0 %

A.# 3	CREATE TECH FOR RESC	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	5.	22.7 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	5.	22.7 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	4.	18.2 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	1.	4.5 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	2.	9.1 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	1.	4.5 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	1.	4.5 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	3.	13.6 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	22.	100.0 %

A.# 4	INCREASE EMPLOYMENT	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	1.	2.3 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	6.	14.0 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	4.	9.3 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	4.	9.3 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	8.	18.6 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	1.	2.3 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	5.	11.6 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	1.	2.3 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	1.	2.3 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %

TABLE 322 (CONTINUED)

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

A.# 4	INCREASE EMPLOYMENT	RESPONSES	PERCENT
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	1.	2.3 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	2.	4.7 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	1.	2.3 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	7.	16.3 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	1.	2.3 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	43.	100.0 %

A.# 5	(NO OPINION)	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	0.	0.0 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	0.	0.0 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	1.	50.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	0.	0.0 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	1.	50.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	2.	100.0 %

DEP 18	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
	150	48	59.049	0.8682	0.147	*	0.362	0.086C	0.098	0.088	0.016

TABLE 323

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 1	POOR JOB	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	1.	3.4 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	3.	10.3 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	2.	6.9 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	4.	13.8 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	1.	3.4 %
6.	TAX LAWS	1.	3.4 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	4.	13.8 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	6.	20.7 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	1.	3.4 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	1.	3.4 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	1.	3.4 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	2.	6.9 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	1.	3.4 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	1.	3.4 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	29.	100.0 %

A.# 2	ONLY FAIR JOB	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	3.	3.6 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	17.	20.5 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	12.	14.5 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	13.	15.7 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	2.	2.4 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	9.	10.8 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	1.	1.2 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	9.	10.8 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	2.	2.4 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	1.	1.2 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	2.	2.4 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	1.2 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	3.	3.6 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	6.	7.2 %

TABLE 323 (CONTINUED)

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 2	ONLY FAIR JOB	RESPONSES	PERCENT
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	2.	2.4 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	83.	100.0 %

A.# 3	GOOD JOB	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	6.	17.1 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	6.	17.1 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	2.	5.7 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	2.	5.7 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	6.	17.1 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	1.	2.9 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	1.	2.9 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	1.	2.9 %
12.	FREE TRADE	1.	2.9 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	2.	5.7 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	6.	17.1 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	1.	2.9 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	35.	100.0 %

A.# 4	VERY GOOD JOB	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	1.	20.0 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	1.	20.0 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	0.	0.0 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	0.	0.0 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	1.	20.0 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	1.	20.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	1.	20.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %

TABLE 323 (CONTINUED)

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.#	4	VERY GOOD JOB	RESPONSES	PERCENT
13.		AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.		EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.		SCI/TECH - GENERAL	0.	0.0 %
16.		OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	0.	0.0 %
17.		NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
		NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	5.	100.0 %

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
18	152	48	65.623	0.9538	0.050	0.379	0.014C	0.019	0.018	0.024

TABLE 324

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 1	RESOURCE SECTOR	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	3.	4.1 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	10.	13.7 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	10.	13.7 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	10.	13.7 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	1.	1.4 %
6.	TAX LAWS	1.	1.4 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	8.	11.0 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	4.	5.5 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	4.	5.5 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	3.	4.1 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	2.	2.7 %
12.	FREE TRADE	1.	1.4 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	1.	1.4 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	2.	2.7 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	2.	2.7 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	9.	12.3 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	2.	2.7 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	73.	100.0 %

A.# 2	MANUF SECTOR	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	0.	0.0 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	9.	20.5 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	8.	18.2 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	4.	9.1 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	2.	4.5 %
6.	TAX LAWS	1.	2.3 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	6.	13.6 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	1.	2.3 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	5.	11.4 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	2.	4.5 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	1.	2.3 %
12.	FREE TRADE	0.	0.0 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	1.	2.3 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	0.	0.0 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	2.	4.5 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	2.	4.5 %

TABLE 324 (CONTINUED)

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 18. WHAT SEEN/HEARD/READ

****

A.# 2	MANUF SECTOR	RESPONSES	PERCENT
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	0.	0.0 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	44.	100.0 %

A.# 3	SERVICE SECTOR	RESPONSES	PERCENT
1.	AIDS RESEARCH	1.	2.9 %
2.	NAT RESC DEVL/CONSV	8.	22.9 %
3.	SPACE RESEARCH	3.	8.6 %
4.	LASER/PLANE/COM DEV	5.	14.3 %
5.	UNIVERSITY FUNDING	0.	0.0 %
6.	TAX LAWS	1.	2.9 %
7.	FUNDING - GENERAL	6.	17.1 %
8.	CUTBACKS - GENERAL	2.	5.7 %
9.	MEDICAL RESEARCH	2.	5.7 %
10.	CONDUCTIVITY/RESERCH	0.	0.0 %
11.	ENVIRONMENT/POLLUTN	0.	0.0 %
12.	FREE TRADE	1.	2.9 %
13.	AUTO INDUSTRY	0.	0.0 %
14.	EMPLYMNT/BRAIN DRAIN	1.	2.9 %
15.	SCI/TECH - GENERAL	2.	5.7 %
16.	OTHER RSRCH/PROD DEV	2.	5.7 %
17.	NOTHNG IN PARTICULAR	1.	2.9 %
	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	35.	100.0 %

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
18	152	32	20.340	0.0549	-0.078	0.259	-0.076C	-0.090	-0.081	0.000

TABLE 325

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 19: 1) POOR JOB 2) ONLY FAIR JOB
3) GOOD JOB 4) VERY GOOD JOB
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
SEEK CURES < 342> (AVG.= 2.28 SIG.HIGHR *)	14.0	45.3	33.6	3.8	3.2
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208> (AVG.= 2.14 SIG.LOWER +)	16.8	52.9	26.0	2.4	1.9
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136> (AVG.= 2.28 NO SIG.DIFF)	14.7	46.3	35.3	3.7	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303> (AVG.= 2.17 SIG.LOWER +)	15.2	53.5	25.1	3.3	3.0
(NO OPINION) < 11> (AVG.= 2.22 T-TEST IS N/A)	27.3	18.2	27.3	9.1	18.2
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.2	49.2	29.6	3.4	2.6

DEP 19

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
965	9	10.668	0.7009	-0.046	0.061	-0.0478	-0.070	-0.044	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	48.	155.	115.	13.	11.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	35.	110.	54.	5.	4.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	20.	63.	48.	5.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	46.	162.	76.	10.	9.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	3.	2.	3.	1.	2.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	152.	492.	296.	34.	26.

TABLE 326

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 19:
1) POOR JOB
2) ONLY FAIR JOB
3) GOOD JOB
4) VERY GOOD JOB
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 2.29 SIG.HIGHR ***)	13.2	46.4	33.6	3.8	3.1
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 2.14 SIG.LOWER **)	16.6	53.7	24.0	3.0	2.7
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 2.21 NO SIG.DIFF)	16.2	49.8	29.9	3.3	0.8
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 1.83 T-TEST IS N/A)	40.0	30.0	10.0	0.0	20.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.2	49.2	29.6	3.4	2.6

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
19	966	6	9.338	0.8446	-0.056	*	0.070	-0.0540	-0.090	-0.056	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	60.	210.	152.	17.	14.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	49.	159.	71.	9.	8.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	39.	120.	72.	8.	2.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	4.	3.	1.	0.	2.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	152.	492.	296.	34.	26.

TABLE 327

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 20. GOVT ROLE IN DEV CDN TCH

ANSWERS TO
Q. 20: 1) LESS ACTIVE 2) SME LEVEL ACTVITY
3) MORE ACTIVE 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
SEEK CURES < 342> (AVG.= 0.81 SIG.HIGHR **)	3.8	10.5	83.6	2.0
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208> (AVG.= 0.73 NO SIG.DIFF)	7.2	12.5	79.8	0.5
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136> (AVG.= 0.76 NO SIG.DIFF)	6.6	11.0	82.4	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303> (AVG.= 0.74 NO SIG.DIFF)	5.3	15.2	78.5	1.0
(NO OPINION) < 11> (AVG.= 0.64 T-TEST IS N/A)	9.1	18.2	72.7	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.4	12.5	81.0	1.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
20	978	6	6.377	0.6676	-0.051	0.059	-0.038C	-0.112	-0.035	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	13.	36.	236.	7.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	15.	26.	166.	1.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	9.	15.	112.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	16.	46.	238.	3.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	1.	2.	8.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	54.	125.	810.	11.

TABLE 328

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 20. GOVT ROLE IN DEV CDN TCH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 20: 1) LESS ACTIVE 2) SME LEVEL ACTVITY
3) MORE ACTIVE 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
POOR JOB < 152> (AVG.= 0.83 SIG.HIGHR +)	6.6	3.9	88.2	1.3
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492> (AVG.= 0.79 SIG.HIGHR *)	5.9	8.7	85.2	0.2
GOOD JOB < 296> (AVG.= 0.70 SIG.LOWER **)	3.7	22.0	73.6	0.7
VERY GOOD JOB < 34> (AVG.= 0.56 SIG.LOWER **)	8.8	26.5	64.7	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26> (AVG.= 0.80 T-TEST IS N/A)	3.8	7.7	65.4	23.1
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.4	12.5	81.0	1.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
20	969	6	48.515	1.0000	-0.106	***	0.158	-0.093C	-0.306	-0.099	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
POOR JOB < 152>	10.	6.	134.	2.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	29.	43.	419.	1.
GOOD JOB < 296>	11.	65.	218.	2.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	3.	9.	22.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	1.	2.	17.	6.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	54.	125.	810.	11.

TABLE 329

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 20. GOVT ROLE IN DEV CDN TCH

ANSWERS TO
Q. 20: 1) LESS ACTIVE 2) SME LEVEL ACTVITY
3) MORE ACTIVE 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 0.75 NO SIG.DIFF)	6.0	12.6	80.4	1.1
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 0.79 NO SIG.DIFF)	5.1	10.8	33.1	1.0
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 0.75 NO SIG.DIFF)	5.0	14.5	80.1	0.4
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 0.87 T-TEST IS N/A)	0.0	10.0	70.0	20.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.4	12.5	81.0	1.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
20	981	4	2.055	0.2744	0.007	0.032	0.0038	0.006	0.002	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	27.	57.	364.	5.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	15.	32.	246.	3.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	12.	35.	193.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	0.	1.	7.	2.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	54.	125.	810.	11.

TABLE 330

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 21. AMT $ SCI/TECH PAST YEAR

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 21: 1) DECREASED 2) STAYED THE SAME 3) INCREASED 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
SEEK CURES < 342> (AVG.= 0.12 SIG.HIGHR +)	16.7	47.1	27.8	8.5
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208> (AVG.=-0.03 SIG.LOWER **)	26.0	46.2	23.6	4.3
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136> (AVG.= 0.08 NO SIG.DIFF)	24.3	40.4	31.6	3.7
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303> (AVG.= 0.08 NO SIG.DIFF)	19.8	47.9	27.4	5.0
(NO OPINION) < 11> (AVG.=-0.14 T-TEST IS N/A)	27.3	18.2	18.2	36.4
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	20.7	45.9	27.2	6.2

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
21	931	6	9.227	0.8388	-0.012	0.070	-0.015C	-0.022	-0.014	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	57.	161.	95.	29.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	54.	96.	49.	9.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	33.	55.	43.	5.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	60.	145.	83.	15.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	3.	2.	2.	4.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	207.	459.	272.	62.

TABLE 331

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 21. AMT $ SCI/TECH PAST YEAR

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 21: 1) DECREASED 2) STAYED THE SAME
3) INCREASED 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
POOR JOB < 152> (AVG.=-0.16 SIG.LOWER ***)	35.5	36.8	20.4	7.2
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492> (AVG.= 0.06 NO SIG.DIFF)	20.5	49.6	26.2	3.7
GOOD JOB < 296> (AVG.= 0.17 SIG.HIGHR ***)	15.2	47.3	31.1	6.4
VERY GOOD JOB < 34> (AVG.= 0.33 SIG.HIGHR **)	14.7	35.3	47.1	2.9
(NO OPINION) < 26> (AVG.= 0.15 T-TEST IS N/A)	7.7	26.9	15.4	50.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	20.7	45.9	27.2	6.2

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
21	925	6	35.056	1.0000	0.161	***	0.138	0.132C	0.222	0.141	0.00?

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
POOR JOB < 152>	54.	56.	31.	11.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	101.	244.	129.	18.
GOOD JOB < 296>	45.	140.	92.	19.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	5.	12.	16.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	2.	7.	4.	13.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	207.	459.	272.	62.

TABLE 332

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 21. AMT $ SCI/TECH PAST YEAR

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 21: 1) DECREASED 2) STAYED THE SAME 3) INCREASED 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 0.06 NO SIG.DIFF)	20.8	44.8	28.7	5.7
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 0.10 NO SIG.DIFF)	17.9	47.3	27.4	7.4
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 0.00 SIG.LOWER *)	24.5	46.9	24.5	4.1
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 0.17 T-TEST IS N/A)	10.0	30.0	20.0	40.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	20.7	45.9	27.2	6.2

DEP 21

N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
932	4	3.903	0.5808	-0.042	0.046	-0.0338	-0.055	-0.035	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	94.	203.	130.	26.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	53.	140.	81.	22.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	59.	113.	59.	10.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	1.	3.	2.	4.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	207.	459.	272.	62.

TABLE 333

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 22. PROM TECH/TAX BREAKS

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 22:
1) NOT AT ALL
2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT
4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
SEEK CURES < 342> (AVG.= 3.11 NO SIG.DIFF)	5.3	12.9	46.8	34.5	0.6
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208> (AVG.= 3.08 NO SIG.DIFF)	8.2	13.5	40.4	38.0	0.0
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136> (AVG.= 3.11 NO SIG.DIFF)	6.6	14.0	41.2	38.2	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303> (AVG.= 3.16 NO SIG.DIFF)	4.3	11.9	47.2	36.3	0.3
(NO OPINION) < 11> (AVG.= 3.10 T-TEST IS N/A)	9.1	9.1	36.4	36.4	9.1
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.8	12.8	44.7	36.3	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
22	986	9	6.555	0.3167	0.024	0.047	0.0188	0.026	0.017	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	18.	44.	160.	118.	2.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	17.	28.	84.	79.	0.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	9.	19.	56.	52.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	13.	36.	143.	110.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	1.	1.	4.	4.	1.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	58.	128.	447.	363.	4.

TABLE 334

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 22. PROM TECH/TAX BREAKS

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 22: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH 3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY 5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
POOR JOB < 152> (AVG.= 2.98 SIG.LOWER **)	13.2	14.5	32.9	38.8	0.7
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492> (AVG.= 3.14 NO SIG.DIFF)	4.9	13.0	45.3	36.6	0.2
GOOD JOB < 296> (AVG.= 3.14 NO SIG.DIFF)	4.1	12.5	49.0	34.1	0.3
VERY GOOD JOB < 34> (AVG.= 3.32 SIG.HIGHR +)	5.9	2.9	44.1	47.1	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26> (AVG.= 3.12 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.0	15.4	53.8	26.9	3.8
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.8	12.8	44.7	36.3	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
22	971	9	26.753	0.9985	0.065	**	0.096	0.0308	0.047	0.030	0.019

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
POOR JOB < 152>	20.	22.	50.	59.	1.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	24.	64.	223.	180.	1.
GOOD JOB < 296>	12.	37.	145.	101.	1.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	2.	1.	15.	16.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	0.	4.	14.	7.	1.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	58.	128.	447.	363.	4.

TABLE 335

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 22. PROM TECH/TAX BREAKS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 22: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 3.12 NO SIG.DIFF)	4.4	14.1	45.7	35.1	0.7
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 3.14 NO SIG.DIFF)	6.8	10.8	44.6	37.8	0.0
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 3.10 NO SIG.DIFF)	6.6	13.3	43.2	36.5	0.4
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 3.00 T-TEST IS N/A)	20.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.8	12.8	44.7	36.3	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
22	936	6	4.428	0.3310	-0.008	0.047	0.004C	0.006	0.004	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	20.	64.	207.	159.	3.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	20.	32.	132.	112.	0.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	16.	32.	104.	88.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	2.	0.	4.	4.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	58.	128.	447.	363.	4.

TABLE 336

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 23. PROM TECH/FNDS TO SCHOOL

ANSWERS TO Q. 23: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH 3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY 5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
SEEK CURES < 342> (AVG.= 3.51 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.9	3.2	39.5	55.8	0.6
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208> (AVG.= 3.51 NO SIG.DIFF)	1.9	4.3	34.6	59.1	0.0
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136> (AVG.= 3.43 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.9	7.4	33.8	55.9	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303> (AVG.= 3.43 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.3	5.3	34.0	58.1	0.3
(NO OPINION) < 11> (AVG.= 2.82 T-TEST IS N/A)	18.2	9.1	45.5	27.3	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.0	4.7	36.1	56.9	0.3

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
23	986	9	9.074	0.5695	-0.025	0.055	-0.0018	-0.002	-0.001	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	3.	11.	135.	191.	2.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	4.	9.	72.	123.	0.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	4.	10.	46.	76.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	7.	16.	103.	176.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	2.	1.	5.	3.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	20.	47.	361.	569.	3.

TABLE 337

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 23. PROM TECH/FNDS TO SCHOOL

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 23:
1) NOT AT ALL
2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT
4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
POOR JOB < 152> (AVG.= 3.57 SIG.HIGHR +)	3.3	3.9	25.7	67.1	0.0
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492> (AVG.= 3.50 NO SIG.DIFF)	1.0	5.9	35.4	57.3	0.4
GOOD JOB < 296> (AVG.= 3.44 SIG.LOWER +)	2.7	3.7	40.5	52.7	0.3
VERY GOOD JOB < 34> (AVG.= 3.29 SIG.LOWER *)	5.9	2.9	47.1	44.1	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26> (AVG.= 3.54 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.0	0.0	46.2	53.8	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.0	4.7	36.1	56.9	0.3

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRL	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
23	971	9	21.248	0.9834	-0.078	**	0.035	-0.0338	-0.141	-0.077	0.002

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
POOR JOB < 152>	5.	6.	39.	102.	0.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	5.	29.	174.	282.	2.
GOOD JOB < 296>	8.	11.	120.	156.	1.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	2.	1.	16.	15.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	0.	0.	12.	14.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	20.	47.	361.	569.	3.

TABLE 338

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 23. PROM TECH/FNDS TO SCHOOL

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 23:
1) NOT AT ALL
2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT
4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 3.48 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.2	5.1	35.3	57.0	0.4
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 3.50 NO SIG.DIFF)	1.4	5.1	35.5	57.8	0.3
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 3.48 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.1	3.7	38.6	55.6	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 3.40 T-TEST IS N/A)	10.0	0.0	30.0	60.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.0	4.7	36.1	56.9	0.3

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
23	987	6	2.038	0.0839	0.003	0.032	-0.0030	-0.005	-0.003	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	10.	23.	160.	258.	2.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	4.	15.	105.	171.	1.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	5.	9.	93.	134.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	1.	0.	3.	6.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	20.	47.	361.	569.	3.

TABLE 339

16. MST IMP RSN 3 TO SCI/TCH VS. 24. PROM TECH/SCHOLARSHIPS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 24: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
SEEK CURES < 342> (AVG.= 3.37 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.3	7.9	39.2	49.7	0.9
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208> (AVG.= 3.24 SIG.LOWER **)	3.4	11.5	43.3	41.8	0.0
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136> (AVG.= 3.36 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.9	14.0	27.2	55.9	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303> (AVG.= 3.37 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.6	7.9	38.6	50.2	0.7
(NO OPINION) < 11> (AVG.= 2.91 T-TEST IS N/A)	18.2	0.0	54.5	27.3	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.9	9.4	38.4	48.8	0.5

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQR	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
24	984	9	15.360	0.9185	0.010	0.072	0.0088	0.013	0.008	0.006

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	8.	27.	134.	170.	3.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	7.	24.	90.	87.	0.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	4.	19.	37.	76.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	8.	24.	117.	152.	2.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	2.	0.	6.	3.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	29.	94.	384.	488.	5.

TABLE 340

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 24. PROM TECH/SCHOLARSHIPS

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 24:
1) NOT AT ALL
2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT
4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
POOR JOB < 152> (AVG.= 3.42 SIG.HIGHR +)	5.3	6.6	28.9	58.6	0.7
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492> (AVG.= 3.33 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.0	10.4	39.8	47.2	0.6
GOOD JOB < 296> (AVG.= 3.32 NO SIG.DIFF)	3.0	10.1	38.9	47.6	0.3
VERY GOOD JOB < 34> (AVG.= 3.29 NO SIG.DIFF)	5.9	2.9	47.1	44.1	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26> (AVG.= 3.35 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.0	7.7	50.0	42.3	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.9	9.4	38.4	48.8	0.5

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
24	969	9	16.488	0.9426	-0.039	0.075	-0.0459	-0.074	-0.044	0.002

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
POOR JOB < 152>	8.	10.	44.	89.	1.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	10.	51.	196.	232.	3.
GOOD JOB < 296>	9.	30.	115.	141.	1.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	2.	1.	16.	15.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	0.	2.	13.	11.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	29.	94.	384.	488.	5.

TABLE 341

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 24. PROM TECH/SCHOLARSHIPS

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 24: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 3.35 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.9	8.8	37.7	49.7	0.9
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 3.36 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.4	9.5	38.2	49.7	0.3
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 3.29 NO SIG.DIFF)	3.3	10.4	40.2	46.1	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 3.20 T-TEST IS N/A)	10.0	10.0	30.0	50.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.9	9.4	38.4	48.8	0.5

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
24	985	6	1.569	0.0452	-0.030	0.028	-0.025C	-0.044	-0.026	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	13.	40.	171.	225.	4.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	7.	28.	113.	147.	1.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	8.	25.	97.	111.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	1.	1.	3.	5.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	29.	94.	384.	488.	5.

TABLE 342

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 25. PROM TECH/FND UNIV/COMP

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 25:
1) NOT AT ALL
2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT
4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
SEEK CURES < 342> (AVG.= 3.41 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.6	6.1	38.6	52.6	0.0
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208> (AVG.= 3.41 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.5	6.2	45.2	47.6	0.5
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136> (AVG.= 3.46 SIG.HIGHR +)	1.5	4.4	40.4	53.7	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303> (AVG.= 3.31 SIG.LOWER **)	3.0	6.3	47.9	42.9	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 11> (AVG.= 2.55 T-TEST IS N/A)	18.2	18.2	54.5	9.1	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.3	6.1	43.2	48.3	0.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
25	988	9	12.548	0.8158	-0.054	*	0.065	-0.056B	-0.087	-0.050	0.030

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	9.	21.	132.	180.	0.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	1.	13.	94.	99.	1.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	2.	6.	55.	73.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	9.	19.	145.	130.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	2.	2.	6.	1.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	23.	61.	432.	483.	1.

TABLE 343

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 25. PROM TECH/FND UNIV/COMP

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 25:
1) NOT AT ALL
2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT
4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
POOR JOB < 152> (AVG.= 3.38 NO SIG.DIFF)	4.6	4.6	38.8	52.0	0.0
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492> (AVG.= 3.42 SIG.HIGHR *)	1.6	6.5	40.4	51.2	0.2
GOOD JOB < 296> (AVG.= 3.32 SIG.LOWER +)	2.7	5.1	49.3	42.9	0.0
VERY GOOD JOB < 34> (AVG.= 3.26 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.0	17.6	38.2	44.1	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26> (AVG.= 3.35 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.0	3.8	57.7	38.5	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.3	6.1	43.2	48.3	0.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
25	973	9	21.323	0.9887	-0.047	0.085	-0.0603	-0.099	-0.058	0.038

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
POOR JOB < 152>	7.	7.	59.	79.	0.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	8.	32.	199.	252.	1.
GOOD JOB < 296>	8.	15.	146.	127.	0.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	0.	6.	13.	15.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	0.	1.	15.	10.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	23.	61.	432.	483.	1.

TABLE 344

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 25. PROM TECH/FND UNIV/COMP

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 25: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 3.32 SIG.LOWER **)	2.4	7.3	45.9	44.4	0.0
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 3.45 SIG.HIGHR **)	2.0	4.4	40.5	53.0	0.0
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 3.39 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.1	6.2	41.9	49.4	0.4
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 3.40 T-TEST IS N/A)	10.0	0.0	30.0	60.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.3	6.1	43.2	48.3	0.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
25	989	6	6.816	0.6618	0.050	0.059	0.0490	0.088	0.051	0.014

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	11.	33.	208.	201.	0.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	6.	13.	120.	157.	0.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	5.	15.	101.	119.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	1.	0.	3.	6.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	23.	61.	432.	483.	1.

TABLE 345

16. MST IMP RSN S TO SCI/TCH VS. 26. PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE

ANSWERS TO
Q. 26: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
SEEK CURES <342> (AVG.= 3.34 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.6	7.6	42.4	47.1	0.3
COMPETE ON INT MKTS <203> (AVG.= 3.40 NO SIG.DIFF)	1.4	7.7	40.4	50.5	0.0
CREATE TECH FOR RESC <136> (AVG.= 3.40 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.7	8.1	41.9	49.3	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT <303> (AVG.= 3.40 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.0	6.9	39.6	51.2	0.3
(NO OPINION) < 11> (AVG.= 2.82 T-TEST IS N/A)	9.1	9.1	72.7	9.1	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.0	7.5	41.4	48.9	0.2

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
26	987	9	3.319	0.0497	0.033	0.033	0.0308	0.046	0.027	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
SEEK CURES <342>	9.	26.	145.	161.	1.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS <203>	3.	16.	34.	105.	0.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC <136>	1.	11.	57.	67.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT <303>	6.	21.	120.	155.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	1.	1.	8.	1.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	20.	75.	414.	489.	2.

TABLE 346

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 26. PROM TECH/MAKE BEST USE

ANSWERS TO
Q. 26: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
POOR JOB < 152> (AVG.= 3.34 NO SIG.DIFF)	3.9	8.6	36.2	50.7	0.7
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492> (AVG.= 3.41 SIG.HIGHP *)	1.8	5.9	41.3	50.8	0.2
GOOD JOB < 296> (AVG.= 3.33 NO SIG.DIFF)	1.7	9.5	42.9	45.9	0.0
VERY GOOD JOB < 34> (AVG.= 3.24 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.0	8.8	58.8	32.4	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26> (AVG.= 3.50 NO SIG.DIFF)	0.0	7.7	34.6	57.7	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.0	7.5	41.4	48.9	0.2

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
26	972	9	13.709	0.8669	-0.033	0.069	-0.0478	-0.078	-0.046	0.018

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
POOR JOB < 152>	6.	13.	55.	77.	1.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	9.	29.	203.	250.	1.
GOOD JOB < 296>	5.	28.	127.	136.	0.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	0.	3.	20.	11.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	0.	2.	9.	15.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	20.	75.	414.	489.	2.

TABLE 347

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 26. PROM T:CH/MAKE BEST USE

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 26: 1) NOT AT ALL 2) NOT TOO MUCH
3) SOMEWHAT 4) GREATLY
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 3.32 SIG.LOWER **)	1.8	9.9	43.0	45.3	0.0
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 3.44 SIG.HIGHR *)	1.4	4.4	43.2	50.7	0.3
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 3.42 NO SIG.DIFF)	2.5	7.1	36.5	53.5	0.4
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 3.10 T-TEST IS N/A)	20.0	0.0	30.0	50.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	2.0	7.5	41.4	48.9	0.2

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
26	988	6	12.730	0.9525	0.065	**	0.080	0.064C	0.114	0.066	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	8.	45.	195.	205.	0.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	4.	13.	128.	150.	1.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	6.	17.	88.	129.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	2.	0.	3.	5.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	20.	75.	414.	489.	2.

TABLE 348

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 27. DO MST STIM SCI/TECH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 27:
1) OFFERING TAX BREAKS
2) FUNDS TO SCHOOL
3) FUNDS FOR SCHLRSHIP
4) FUNDING UNIVERSITIES
5) FUND THOSE BEST USE
6) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %
SEEK CURES < 342>	14.6	24.6	15.5	17.5	27.2	0.6
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	16.5	32.2	13.0	18.3	20.2	0.0
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	11.0	24.3	14.7	16.2	33.1	0.7
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	11.6	21.5	18.5	16.5	31.0	1.0
(NO OPINION) < 11>	18.2	27.3	0.0	18.2	36.4	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	13.6	25.2	15.6	17.2	27.8	0.6

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
27	983	12	18.600	0.9014	0.064	**	0.079	0.0490	0.064	0.051	0.035

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N	(6) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	50.	84.	53.	60.	93.	2.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	34.	67.	27.	38.	42.	0.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	15.	33.	20.	22.	45.	1.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	35.	65.	56.	50.	94.	3.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	2.	4.	0.	2.	4.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	136.	252.	156.	172.	278.	6.

TABLE 349

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 27. DO MST STIM SCI/TECH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 27:
1) OFFERING TAX BREAKS
2) FUNDS TO SCHOOL
3) FUNDS FOR SCHLRSHIP
4) FUNDING UNIVERSITIES
5) FUND THOSE BEST USE
6) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %
POOR JOB < 152>	9.9	32.9	13.2	11.8	30.3	2.0
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	14.2	23.4	15.4	19.5	27.0	0.4
GOOD JOB < 296>	14.2	25.0	18.2	15.5	26.7	0.3
VERY GOOD JOB < 54>	17.6	17.6	14.7	20.6	29.4	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26>	11.5	26.9	3.8	19.2	38.5	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	13.6	25.2	15.6	17.2	27.8	0.6

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
27	968	12	14.438	0.7264	-0.008	0.071	-0.0090	-0.013	-0.010	0.006

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N	(6) N
POOR JOB < 152>	15.	50.	20.	18.	46.	3.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	70.	115.	76.	96.	133.	2.
GOOD JOB < 296>	42.	74.	54.	46.	79.	1.
VERY GOOD JOB < 54>	6.	6.	5.	7.	10.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	3.	7.	1.	5.	10.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	136.	252.	156.	172.	278.	6.

TABLE 350

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 27. DO MST STIM SCI/TECH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 27:
1) OFFERING TAX BREAKS
2) FUNDS TO SCHOOL
3) FUNDS FOR SCHLRSHIP
4) FUNDING UNIVERSITIES
5) FUND THOSE BEST USE
6) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	11.3	26.7	17.4	16.6	27.8	0.2
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	13.9	25.0	16.2	18.6	25.7	0.7
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	17.4	22.4	11.6	17.4	29.9	1.2
(NO OPINION) < 10>	20.0	30.0	10.0	0.0	40.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	13.6	25.2	15.6	17.2	27.8	0.6

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
27	984	8	10.393	0.7615	-0.010	0.073	-0.011C	-0.015	-0.012	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N	(6) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	51.	121.	79.	75.	126.	1.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	41.	74.	48.	55.	76.	2.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	42.	54.	28.	42.	72.	3.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	2.	3.	1.	0.	4.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	136.	252.	156.	172.	273.	6.

TABLE 351

16. MST IMP RSN S TO SCI/TCH VS. 28. HEARD OF INNOVACTION

ANSWERS TO Q. 28: 1) YES 2) NO 3) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
SEEK CURES < 342>	17.0	83.0	0.0
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	12.0	88.0	0.0
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	19.9	80.1	0.0
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	14.9	84.8	0.3
(NO OPINION) < 11>	9.1	90.9	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.6	84.3	0.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
28	988	3	4.459	0.7841	0.008	0.067	0.0090	0.025	0.007	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	58.	284.	0.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	25.	183.	0.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	27.	109.	0.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	45.	257.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	1.	10.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	156.	843.	1.

TABLE 352

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 28. HEARD OF INNOVACTION

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 28: 1) YES 2) NO
3) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
POOR JOB < 152>	14.5	85.5	0.0
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	15.4	84.3	0.2
GOOD JOB < 296>	14.9	85.1	0.0
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	23.5	76.5	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26>	23.1	76.9	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.6	84.3	0.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
28	973	3	1.890	0.4045	-0.020	0.044	-0.011C	-0.035	-0.009	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N
POOR JOB < 152>	22.	130.	0.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	76.	415.	1.
GOOD JOB < 296>	44.	252.	0.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	8.	26.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	6.	20.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	156.	843.	1.

TABLE 353

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 28. HEARD OF INNOVACTION

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 28: 1) YES 2) NO
3) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	15.0	84.8	0.2
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	16.9	83.1	0.0
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	15.4	84.6	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 10>	10.0	90.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.6	84.3	0.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
28	989	2	0.487	0.2160	-0.007	0.022	-0.0070	-0.021	-0.005	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	68.	384.	1.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	50.	246.	0.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	37.	204.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	1.	9.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	156.	343.	1.

TABLE 354

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 29. RSN CDA INV IN SPACE

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 29:

1) NATIONAL PRESTIGE
2) KEEP UP TECHNOLOG
3) MAINTAIN GOOD RELTNS
4) PROV IND/ECO BEN
5) FUND L T RESEARCH
6) BE PART SPACE EXPL
7) PROVIDE COMM SERVICE
8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
SEEK CURES < 342>	7.9	43.9	20.8	34.8	36.5	16.7	31.3	3.2
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	7.2	51.0	12.5	44.7	36.5	15.9	28.4	1.4
CREATE TECH FOR RESC< 136>	7.4	50.7	15.4	35.3	38.2	14.0	37.5	0.7
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	5.6	48.5	22.1	36.3	35.0	11.2	38.9	1.0
(NO OPINION) < 11>	0.0	63.6	18.2	18.2	9.1	27.3	27.3	18.2
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	6.9	47.9	18.7	37.2	36.0	14.6	33.8	2.0

DEP N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA

29 WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N	(6) N	(7) N	(8) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	27.	150.	71.	119.	125.	57.	107.	11.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	15.	106.	26.	93.	76.	33.	59.	3.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC< 136>	10.	69.	21.	48.	52.	19.	51.	1.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	17.	147.	67.	110.	106.	34.	118.	3.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	0.	7.	2.	2.	1.	3.	3.	2.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	69.	479.	187.	372.	360.	146.	338.	20.

TABLE 355

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 29. RSN CDA INV IN SPACE

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 29:

1) NATIONAL PRESTIGE
2) KEEP UP TECHNOLOG
3) MAINTAIN GOOD RELTNS
4) PROV IND/ECO BEN
5) FUND L T RESEARCH
6) BE PART SPACE EXPL
7) PROVIDE COMM SERVICE
8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
POOR JOB < 152>	7.2	53.9	17.1	37.5	34.2	13.8	30.3	2.6
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	6.5	47.8	19.1	33.9	35.8	16.5	36.6	1.4
GOOD JOB < 296>	7.1	44.9	18.6	40.2	38.5	13.9	30.7	2.7
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	14.7	55.9	29.4	35.3	32.4	5.9	23.5	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 26>	0.0	38.5	7.7	65.4	26.9	3.8	50.0	3.8
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	6.9	47.9	18.7	37.2	36.0	14.6	33.8	2.0

DEP N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA
29 WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION
NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N	(6) N	(7) N	(8) N
POOR JOB < 152>	11.	82.	26.	57.	52.	21.	46.	4.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	32.	235.	94.	167.	176.	81.	180.	7.
GOOD JOB < 296>	21.	133.	55.	119.	114.	41.	91.	8.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	5.	19.	10.	12.	11.	2.	8.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	0.	10.	2.	17.	7.	1.	13.	1.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	69.	479.	187.	372.	360.	146.	338.	20.

TABLE 356

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 29. RSN CDA INV IN SPACE

****

ANSWERS TO Q. 29:
1) NATIONAL PRESTIGE
2) KEEP UP TECHNOLOG
3) MAINTAIN GOOD RELTNS
4) PROV IND/ECO BEN
5) FUND L T RESEARCH
6) BE PART SPACE EXPL
7) PROVIDE COMM SERVICE
8) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %	(6) %	(7) %	(8) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	7.1	45.0	23.2	34.4	35.1	14.6	34.7	2.4
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	8.4	51.7	16.2	37.8	35.5	13.9	33.4	1.4
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	5.0	47.7	13.3	41.9	39.4	15.4	32.0	2.1
(NO OPINION) < 10>	0.0	70.0	20.0	30.0	10.0	20.0	50.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	6.9	47.9	16.7	37.2	36.0	14.6	33.8	2.0

DEP N D.F. CHISQRE SIGNIF PEARSR SGN CRMRV TAU GAMMA SOMERD LAMBDA
29 WAS NOT CALCULATED --- MULTI-MENTION

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N	(6) N	(7) N	(8) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	32.	204.	105.	156.	159.	66.	157.	11.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	25.	153.	48.	112.	105.	41.	99.	4.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	12.	115.	32.	101.	95.	37.	77.	5.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	0.	7.	2.	3.	1.	2.	5.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	69.	479.	187.	372.	360.	146.	338.	20.

TABLE 357

16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH VS. 30. PRI SPACE PROG VS OTHER

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 30: 1) MORE IMPORTANT 2) AS IMPORTANT
3) LESS IMPORTANT

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
SEEK CURES < 342> (AVG.=-0.26 SIG.LOWER ***)	13.5	46.8	39.8
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208> (AVG.=-0.10 SIG.HIGHR +)	21.6	47.1	31.2
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136> (AVG.=-0.06 SIG.HIGHR *)	20.6	52.9	26.5
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303> (AVG.=-0.15 NO SIG.DIFF)	17.5	49.3	32.7
(NO OPINION) < 11> (AVG.= 0.09 T-TEST IS N/A)	45.5	18.2	36.4
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	17.7	43.3	34.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
30	989	6	13.193	0.9599	-0.066	**	0.082	-0.0620	-0.093	-0.058	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N
SEEK CURES < 342>	46.	160.	136.
COMPETE ON INT MKTS < 208>	45.	98.	65.
CREATE TECH FOR RESC < 136>	29.	72.	36.
INCREASE EMPLOYMENT < 303>	53.	151.	99.
(NO OPINION) < 11>	5.	2.	4.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	177.	483.	340.

TABLE 358

19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI VS. 30. PRI SPACE PROG VS OTHER

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 30: 1) MORE IMPORTANT 2) AS IMPORTANT
3) LESS IMPORTANT

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
POOR JOB < 152> (AVG.=-0.13 NO SIG.DIFF)	23.0	40.8	36.2
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492> (AVG.=-0.19 NO SIG.DIFF)	16.7	48.0	35.4
GOOD JOB < 296> (AVG.=-0.11 SIG.HIGHR +)	18.6	52.0	29.4
VERY GOOD JOB < 34> (AVG.=-0.29 NO SIG.DIFF)	8.8	52.9	38.2
(NO OPINION) < 26> (AVG.=-0.35 SIG.LOWER +)	7.7	50.0	42.3
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	17.7	48.3	34.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
30	974	6	9.573	0.8564	-0.003	0.070	-0.014C	-0.023	-0.015	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N
POOR JOB < 152>	35.	62.	55.
ONLY FAIR JOB < 492>	82.	236.	174.
GOOD JOB < 296>	55.	154.	87.
VERY GOOD JOB < 34>	3.	18.	13.
(NO OPINION) < 26>	2.	13.	11.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	177.	483.	340.

TABLE 359

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 30. PRI SPACE PROG VS OTHER

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 30: 1) MORE IMPORTANT 2) AS IMPORTANT
3) LESS IMPORTANT

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.=-0.17 NO SIG.DIFF)	18.8	45.7	35.5
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.=-0.20 NO SIG.DIFF)	15.9	48.6	35.5
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.=-0.13 NO SIG.DIFF)	17.0	53.1	29.9
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 0.20 T-TEST IS N/A)	40.0	40.0	20.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	17.7	48.3	34.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
30	990	4	4.385	0.6435	-0.017	0.047	-0.0170	-0.027	-0.017	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	85.	207.	161.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	47.	144.	105.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	41.	128.	72.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	4.	4.	2.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	177.	483.	340.

TABLE 360

5. SCI/TECH INNOV COME FROM VS. 10. WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 10: 1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 2) INDUSTRY
3) PROV GOVERNMENT 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
SMALL COMPANIES <219>	46.6	39.7	12.8	0.9
LARGE COMPANIES <243>	46.1	39.1	13.6	1.2
UNIVERSITIES <400>	59.0	27.0	13.0	1.0
GOVERNMENT <135>	56.3	20.7	22.2	0.7
(NO OPINION) < 3>	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	52.8	31.8	14.4	1.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
10	987	6	30.131	1.0000	-0.041	0.124	-0.058C	-0.091	-0.054	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
SMALL COMPANIES <219>	102.	87.	28.	2.
LARGE COMPANIES <243>	112.	95.	33.	3.
UNIVERSITIES <400>	236.	108.	52.	4.
GOVERNMENT <135>	76.	28.	30.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 3>	2.	0.	1.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	528.	318.	144.	10.

TABLE 361

7. WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH? VS. 10. WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ?

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 10: 1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 2) INDUSTRY
3) PROV GOVERNMENT 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
UNIVERSITIES <451>	54.5	30.2	14.4	0.9
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT <260>	63.8	18.1	17.3	0.8
INDUSTRY <288>	39.9	46.9	11.8	1.4
(NO OPINION) < 1>	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	52.8	31.8	14.4	1.0

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
10	969	4	54.572	1.0000	0.061	*	0.166	0.0658	0.104	0.062	0.043

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
UNIVERSITIES <451>	246.	136.	65.	4.
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT <260>	166.	47.	45.	2.
INDUSTRY <288>	115.	135.	34.	4.
(NO OPINION) < 1>	1.	0.	0.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	528.	318.	144.	10.

TABLE 362

8. WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH? VS. 10. WHO FUND LT RESEARCH?

ANSWERS TO Q. 10: 1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 2) INDUSTRY 3) PROV GOVERNMENT 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
UNIVERSITIES <193>	50.3	27.5	21.8	0.5
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT <190>	60.5	18.4	21.1	0.0
INDUSTRY <613>	50.9	37.5	10.1	1.5
(NO OPINION) < 4>	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	52.8	31.8	14.4	1.0

IND	DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
8	10	986	4	41.511	1.0000	-0.063	**	0.145	-0.0278	-0.047	-0.028	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
UNIVERSITIES <193>	97.	53.	42.	1.
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT <190>	115.	35.	40.	0.
INDUSTRY <613>	312.	230.	62.	9.
(NO OPINION) < 4>	4.	0.	0.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	528.	318.	144.	10.

TABLE 363

6. SCI/TECH INNOV COME FROM VS. 11. WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 11: 1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 2) INDUSTRY
3) PROV GOVERNMENT 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
SMALL COMPANIES < 219>	33.8	51.1	15.1	0.0
LARGE COMPANIES < 243>	37.9	50.6	10.7	0.8
UNIVERSITIES < 400>	39.5	43.0	17.0	0.5
GOVERNMENT < 135>	48.1	33.3	18.5	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 3>	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	39.0	45.3	15.3	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
11	993	6	17.441	0.9922	-0.032	0.094	-0.036C	-0.054	-0.034	0.037

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
SMALL COMPANIES < 219>	74.	112.	33.	0.
LARGE COMPANIES < 243>	92.	123.	26.	2.
UNIVERSITIES < 400>	158.	172.	68.	2.
GOVERNMENT < 135>	65.	45.	25.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 3>	1.	1.	1.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	390.	453.	153.	4.

TABLE 364

7. WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH? VS. 11. WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 11: 1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 2) INDUSTRY
3) PROV GOVERNMENT 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
UNIVERSITIES < 451>	37.9	45.0	16.9	0.2
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT < 260>	52.3	30.0	16.9	0.8
INDUSTRY < 288>	28.8	59.4	11.5	0.3
(NO OPINION) < 1>	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	39.0	45.3	15.3	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
11	995	4	49.653	1.0000	0.011	0.158	0.0138	0.020	0.013	0.107

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
UNIVERSITIES < 451>	171.	203.	76.	1.
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT < 260>	136.	78.	44.	2.
INDUSTRY < 288>	83.	171.	33.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 1>	0.	1.	0.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	390.	453.	153.	4.

TABLE 365

8. WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH? VS. 11. WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH?

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 11: 1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 2) INDUSTRY
3) PROV GOVERNMENT 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
UNIVERSITIES < 193>	47.2	32.1	19.7	1.0
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT < 190>	53.7	25.3	21.1	0.0
INDUSTRY < 613>	31.8	56.0	12.1	0.2
(NO OPINION) < 4>	50.0	0.0	25.0	25.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	39.0	45.3	15.3	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
11	993	4	72.065	1.0000	0.058	*	0.190	0.0838	0.136	0.088	0.154

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
UNIVERSITIES < 193>	91.	62.	38.	2.
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT < 190>	102.	43.	40.	0.
INDUSTRY < 613>	195.	343.	74.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 4>	2.	0.	1.	1.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	390.	453.	153.	4.

TABLE 366

10. WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ? VS. 6. SCI/TECH INNOV COME FROM

ANSWERS TO
Q. 6: 1) SMALL COMPANIES 2) LARGE COMPANIES
3) UNIVERSITIES 4) GOVERNMENT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT < 528>	19.3	21.2	44.7	14.4	0.4
INDUSTRY < 318>	27.4	29.9	34.0	8.8	0.0
PROV GOVERNMENT < 144>	19.4	22.9	36.1	20.8	0.7
(NO OPINION) < 10>	20.0	30.0	40.0	10.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	21.9	24.3	40.0	13.5	0.3

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
6	987	6	30.131	1.0000	-0.041		0.124	-0.0580	-0.091	-0.065	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT < 528>	102.	112.	236.	76.	2.
INDUSTRY < 318>	87.	95.	108.	28.	0.
PROV GOVERNMENT < 144>	28.	33.	52.	30.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	2.	3.	4.	1.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	219.	243.	400.	135.	3.

TABLE 367

11. WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH? VS. 6. SCI/TECH INNOV COME FROM

ANSWERS TO
Q. 6: 1) SMALL COMPANIES 2) LARGE COMPANIES
3) UNIVERSITIES 4) GOVERNMENT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT < 390>	19.0	23.6	40.5	16.7	0.3
INDUSTRY < 453>	24.7	27.2	38.0	9.9	0.2
PROV GOVERNMENT < 153>	21.6	17.0	44.4	16.3	0.7
(NO OPINION) < 4>	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	21.9	24.3	40.0	13.5	0.3

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
6	993	6	17.441	0.9922	-0.032	0.094	-0.036C	-0.054	-0.039	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT < 390>	74.	92.	158.	65.	1.
INDUSTRY < 453>	112.	123.	172.	45.	1.
PROV GOVERNMENT < 153>	33.	26.	68.	25.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 4>	0.	2.	2.	0.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	219.	243.	400.	135.	3.

TABLE 368

10. WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ? VS. 7. WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?

ANSWERS TO
Q. 7: 1) UNIVERSITIES 2) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
3) INDUSTRY 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT < 528>	46.6	31.4	21.8	0.2
INDUSTRY < 318>	42.8	14.8	42.5	0.0
PROV GOVERNMENT < 144>	45.1	31.2	23.6	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 10>	40.0	20.0	40.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	45.1	26.0	28.8	0.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
7	989	4	54.572	1.0000	0.061	*	0.166	0.0658	0.104	0.068	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT < 528>	246.	166.	115.	1.
INDUSTRY < 318>	136.	47.	135.	0.
PROV GOVERNMENT < 144>	65.	45.	34.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	4.	2.	4.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	451.	260.	288.	1.

TABLE 369

11. WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH? VS. 7. WHO DO FUND LT RESEARCH?

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 7: 1) UNIVERSITIES 2) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
3) INDUSTRY 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT < 390>	43.8	34.9	21.3	0.0
INDUSTRY < 453>	44.8	17.2	37.7	0.2
PROV GOVERNMENT < 153>	49.7	28.8	21.6	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 4>	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	45.1	26.0	28.8	0.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
7	995	4	49.653	1.0000	0.011	0.158	0.0138	0.020	0.013	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT < 390>	171.	136.	83.	0.
INDUSTRY < 453>	203.	78.	171.	1.
PROV GOVERNMENT < 153>	76.	44.	33.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 4>	1.	2.	1.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	451.	260.	288.	1.

TABLE 370

10. WHO FUND LT RESEARCH ? VS. 8. WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?

ANSWERS TO
Q. 8: 1) UNIVERSITIES 2) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
3) INDUSTRY 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT < 528>	18.4	21.8	59.1	0.8
INDUSTRY < 318>	16.7	11.0	72.3	0.0
PROV GOVERNMENT < 144>	29.2	27.8	43.1	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 10>	10.0	0.0	90.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	19.3	19.0	61.3	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
8	986	4	41.511	1.0000	-0.063	**	0.145	-0.0278	-0.047	-0.026	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT < 528>	97.	115.	312.	4.
INDUSTRY < 318>	53.	35.	230.	0.
PROV GOVERNMENT < 144>	42.	40.	62.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	1.	0.	9.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	193.	190.	613.	4.

TABLE 371

11. WHO FUND APLIED RESERCH? VS. 8. WHO DO APPLIED RESEARCH?

ANSWERS TO
Q. 8: 1) UNIVERSITIES 2) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
3) INDUSTRY 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT < 390>	23.3	26.2	50.0	0.5
INDUSTRY < 453>	13.7	10.6	75.7	0.0
PROV GOVERNMENT < 153>	24.8	26.1	48.4	0.7
(NO OPINION) < 4>	50.0	0.0	25.0	25.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	19.3	19.0	61.3	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
8	993	4	72.065	1.0000	0.058	*	0.190	0.0638	0.136	0.078	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT < 390>	91.	102.	195.	2.
INDUSTRY < 453>	62.	48.	343.	0.
PROV GOVERNMENT < 153>	38.	40.	74.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 4>	2.	0.	1.	1.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	193.	190.	613.	4.

TABLE 372

17. HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH VS. 19. RATE FED GOVT SUPP SCI

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 19: 1) POOR JOB 2) ONLY FAIR JOB
3) GOOD JOB 4) VERY GOOD JOB
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
YES <152> (AVG.= 2.11 SIG.LOWER **)	19.1	54.6	23.0	3.3	0.0
NO <845> (AVG.= 2.24 SIG.HIGHR **)	14.4	48.2	30.9	3.4	3.1
(NO OPINION) < 3> (AVG.= 1.67 T-TEST IS N/A)	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.2	49.2	29.6	3.4	2.6

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
19	971	3	5.366	0.8531	0.066	**	0.074	0.054C	0.163	0.102	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
YES <152>	29.	83.	35.	5.	0.
NO <845>	122.	407.	261.	29.	26.
(NO OPINION) < 3>	1.	2.	0.	0.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	152.	492.	296.	34.	26.

TABLE 373

17. HRD FED GOV INV/SCI/TECH VS. 28. HEARD OF INNOVACTION

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 28: 1) YES 2) NO
3) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %
YES < 152>	19.7	80.3	0.0
NO < 845>	14.9	85.0	0.1
(NO OPINION) < 3>	0.0	100.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	15.6	84.3	0.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
28	996	1	2.254	0.0000	0.048	0.048	0.0403	0.167	0.043	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N
YES < 152>	30.	122.	0.
NO < 845>	126.	718.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 3>	0.	3.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	156.	843.	1.

TABLE 374

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 12. EMPH SCI/TECH:SEEK CURES

ANSWERS TO
Q. 12: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 2.60 NO SIG.DIFF)	4.2	31.6	64.2	0.0
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 2.60 NO SIG.DIFF)	5.7	28.0	65.9	0.3
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 2.58 NO SIG.DIFF)	4.1	33.6	62.2	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 2.70 T-TEST IS N/A)	10.0	10.0	80.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	4.7	30.8	64.4	0.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQR	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
12	989	4	2.781	0.4048	-0.012	0.037	-0.0108	-0.017	-0.008	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	19.	143.	291.	0.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	17.	83.	195.	1.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	10.	81.	150.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	1.	1.	8.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	47.	308.	644.	1.

TABLE 375

3. CDA SELL INTL MARKTS Vs. 12. EMPH SCI/TECH:SEEK CURES

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 12: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT < 3> (AVG.= 2.00 T-TEST IS N/A)	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0
NOT TOO IMPORTANT < 31> (AVG.= 2.35 SIG.LOWER **)	9.7	45.2	45.2	0.0
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT < 227> (AVG.= 2.60 NO SIG.DIFF)	4.8	30.0	64.8	0.4
VERY IMPORTANT < 736> (AVG.= 2.61 NO SIG.DIFF)	4.3	30.3	65.4	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 3> (AVG.= 2.33 T-TEST IS N/A)	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	4.7	30.8	64.4	0.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
12	996	6	11.569	0.9277	0.064	**	0.076	0.025C	0.083	0.041	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT < 3>	1.	1.	1.	0.
NOT TOO IMPORTANT < 31>	3.	14.	14.	0.
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT < 227>	11.	68.	147.	1.
VERY IMPORTANT < 736>	32.	223.	481.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 3>	0.	2.	1.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	47.	308.	644.	1.

TABLE 376

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 13. EMPH SCI/TECH:EFF COMP

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 13: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 2.40 NO SIG.DIFF)	7.7	44.6	47.2	0.4
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 2.40 NO SIG.DIFF)	8.1	43.2	48.0	0.7
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 2.40 NO SIG.DIFF)	9.1	41.9	49.0	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 2.40 T-TEST IS N/A)	10.0	40.0	50.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.2	43.5	47.9	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
13	986	4	0.740	0.0536	0.001	0.019	0.0056	0.009	0.005	0.000

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	35.	202.	214.	2.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	24.	123.	142.	2.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	22.	101.	118.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	1.	4.	5.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	82.	435.	479.	4.

TABLE 377

3. CDA SELL INTL MARKTS VS. 13. EMPH SCI/TECH:EFF COMP

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 13: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT < 3> (AVG.= 2.00 T-TEST IS N/A)	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0
NOT TOO IMPORTANT < 31> (AVG.= 2.00 SIG.LOWER ***)	25.8	48.4	25.8	0.0
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT < 227> (AVG.= 2.29 SIG.LOWER ***)	8.8	52.9	37.9	0.4
VERY IMPORTANT < 736> (AVG.= 2.45 SIG.HIGHR ***)	6.9	40.6	52.2	0.3
(NO OPINION) < 3> (AVG.= 1.00 T-TEST IS N/A)	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.2	43.5	47.9	0.4

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
13	994	6	32.849	1.0000	0.157	***	0.129	0.1020	0.286	0.169	0.080

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT < 3>	1.	1.	1.	0.
NOT TOO IMPORTANT < 31>	8.	15.	8.	0.
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT < 227>	20.	120.	86.	1.
VERY IMPORTANT < 736>	51.	299.	384.	2.
(NO OPINION) < 3>	2.	0.	0.	1.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	82.	435.	479.	4.

TABLE 378

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 14. EMPH SCI/TECH:NAT RESC

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 14: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 2.45 SIG.HIGHR *)	7.1	41.1	51.7	0.2
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 2.38 NO SIG.DIFF)	9.8	42.6	47.3	0.3
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 2.37 NO SIG.DIFF)	7.9	47.7	44.4	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 2.40 T-TEST IS N/A)	10.0	40.0	50.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.1	43.1	48.6	0.2

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
14	988	4	5.164	0.7291	-0.056	*	0.051	-0.055B	-0.091	-0.052	0.016

NO SIGNIFICANT ROW-COLUMN INTERACTION SHOWN.

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	32.	186.	234.	1.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	29.	126.	140.	1.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	19.	115.	107.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	1.	4.	5.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	81.	431.	486.	2.

TABLE 379

3. CDA SELL INTL MARKTS VS. 14. EMPH SCI/TECH:NAT RESC

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 14: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT < 3> (AVG.= 2.00 T-TEST IS N/A)	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0
NOT TOO IMPORTANT < 31> (AVG.= 2.13 SIG.LOWER **)	22.6	41.9	35.5	0.0
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT < 227> (AVG.= 2.35 SIG.LOWER +)	7.9	48.9	42.7	0.4
VERY IMPORTANT < 736> (AVG.= 2.44 SIG.HIGHR ***)	7.3	41.4	51.1	0.1
(NO OPINION) < 3> (AVG.= 2.00 T-TEST IS N/A)	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	8.1	43.1	48.6	0.2

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
14	995	6	17.096	0.9911	0.100	***	0.093	0.061C	0.174	0.101	0.031

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT < 3>	1.	1.	1.	0.
NOT TOO IMPORTANT < 31>	7.	13.	11.	0.
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT < 227>	18.	111.	97.	1.
VERY IMPORTANT < 736>	54.	305.	376.	1.
(NO OPINION) < 3>	1.	1.	1.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	81.	431.	486.	2.

TABLE 380

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 15. EMPH SCI/TECH:INCR EMPL

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 15: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453> (AVG.= 2.53 SIG.LOWER +)	4.6	38.2	57.2	0.0
MANUF SECTOR < 296> (AVG.= 2.62 SIG.HIGHR **)	4.1	29.7	65.5	0.7
SERVICE SECTOR < 241> (AVG.= 2.53 NO SIG.DIFF)	6.6	33.6	59.8	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 10> (AVG.= 2.50 T-TEST IS N/A)	10.0	30.0	60.0	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.0	34.5	60.3	0.2

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
15	988	4	7.844	0.9025	0.016	0.063	0.0308	0.052	0.027	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	21.	173.	259.	0.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	12.	88.	194.	2.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	16.	81.	144.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	1.	3.	6.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	50.	345.	603.	2.

TABLE 381

3. CDA SELL INTL MARKTS VS. 15. EMPH SCI/TECH:INCR EMPL

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 15: 1) POOR/FAIR REASON 2) GOOD REASON
3) VERY GOOD REASON 4) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT < 3> (AVG.= 2.33 T-TEST IS N/A)	33.3	0.0	66.7	0.0
NOT TOO IMPORTANT < 31> (AVG.= 2.35 SIG.LOWER *)	9.7	45.2	45.2	0.0
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT < 227> (AVG.= 2.52 NO SIG.DIFF)	4.0	40.1	55.5	0.4
VERY IMPORTANT < 736> (AVG.= 2.57 SIG.HIGHR *)	5.0	32.5	62.5	0.0
(NO OPINION) < 3> (AVG.= 2.50 T-TEST IS N/A)	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	5.0	34.5	60.3	0.2

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRL	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN	CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
15	996	6	14.274	0.9733	0.072	**	0.085	0.0460	0.145	0.076	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT < 3>	1.	0.	2.	0.
NOT TOO IMPORTANT < 31>	3.	14.	14.	0.
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT < 227>	9.	91.	126.	1.
VERY IMPORTANT < 736>	37.	239.	460.	0.
(NO OPINION) < 3>	0.	1.	1.	1.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	50.	345.	603.	2.

TABLE 382

2. GREATST CONTR ECO PROSP VS. 16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 16:
1) SEEK CURES
2) COMPETE ON INT MKTS
3) CREATE TECH FOR RESC
4) INCREASE EMPLOYMENT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	35.1	17.9	15.9	29.8	1.3
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	36.8	18.9	10.1	33.8	0.3
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	29.0	29.0	13.7	27.4	0.8
(NO OPINION) < 10>	40.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	20.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	34.2	20.8	13.6	30.3	1.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
16	981	6	18.962	0.9959	-0.003	0.098	0.0040	0.006	0.004	0.000

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
RESOURCE SECTOR < 453>	159.	81.	72.	135.	6.
MANUF SECTOR < 296>	109.	56.	30.	100.	1.
SERVICE SECTOR < 241>	70.	70.	33.	66.	2.
(NO OPINION) < 10>	4.	1.	1.	2.	2.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	342.	208.	136.	303.	11.

TABLE 367

3. CDA SELL INTL MARKTS VS. 16. MST IMP RSN $ TO SCI/TCH

****

ANSWERS TO
Q. 16: 1) SEEK CURES 2) COMPETE ON INT MKTS
3) CREATE TECH FOR RESC 4) INCREASE EMPLOYMENT
5) (NO OPINION)

	(1) %	(2) %	(3) %	(4) %	(5) %
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT < 3>	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3
NOT TOO IMPORTANT < 31>	29.0	9.7	25.8	35.5	0.0
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT < 227>	41.4	14.1	10.1	32.6	1.8
VERY IMPORTANT < 736>	32.1	23.4	14.3	29.5	0.8
(NO OPINION) < 3>	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	34.2	20.8	13.6	30.3	1.1

DEP	N	D.F.	CHISQRE	SIGNIF	PEARSR	SGN CRMRV	TAU	GAMMA	SOMERD	LAMBDA
16	986	9	21.998	0.9911	0.003	0.086	0.0168	0.030	0.022	0.003

ACTUAL N'S

	(1) N	(2) N	(3) N	(4) N	(5) N
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT < 3>	1.	1.	0.	0.	1.
NOT TOO IMPORTANT < 31>	9.	3.	8.	11.	0.
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT < 227>	94.	32.	23.	74.	4.
VERY IMPORTANT < 736>	236.	172.	105.	217.	6.
(NO OPINION) < 3>	2.	0.	0.	1.	0.
<AGGREGATE RESULTS>	342.	208.	136.	303.	11.