Catalogue No. 94-03

# RESULTS OF THE INCOME PERMISSION QUESTION 

 FROM THE AUGUST 1993 TESTJanuary 1994

Tom Greenberg, Labour and Household Surveys Analysis Division

The SLID Research Paper Series is intended to document detailed studies and important decisions for the Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics. These research papers are available in English and French. To obtain a summary description of available documents or to obtain a copy of any, please contact Philip Giles, Manager, SLID Research Paper Series, by mail at 11-D8 Jean Talon Building, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, CANADA K1A 0T6, by INTERNET (GILES @STATCAN.CA), by telephone (613) 951-2891, or by fax (613) 951-3253.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes the results of the "permission question" added as a supplement to the Labour Force Survey in August 1993. The respondents were asked if they would agree to allow Statistics Canada access to their Revenue Canada income tax records instead of completing an income survey questionnaire.

The results show that 55 to $60 \%$ of respondents would be willing to allow access to their tax files. This permission rate varied little by geographic area or by demographic group. The differences between those who had been included in the sample of the Survey of Consumer Finance and those who had not, were not large.

It is not possible to determine how strong the negative or positive responses are in this survey. It is conceivable that given the same choice but being asked to sign a document confirming their permission to access their tax files, the response would change dramatically. A test of this possibility should be considered.

With the permission rates as shown, it is not advisable to go to a completely linked methodology for collecting data, as this would lead to a sharp drop in response. The response rate to the Survey of Consumer Finance is $80 \%$ using the current interview procedure.

However, there could be benefits if a mixture of interviewing and linkage were used. A high proportion (about $40 \%$ ) of non-respondents to the Survey of Consumer Finance said they would give permission to access their income tax record. This result suggests there could be an increase in the effective response rate if non-respondents were asked the permission question. Therefore, an analysis of combining interviewing and linkage procedures is recommended.

This report is also published under the same title, as number 01-1994 of the Staff Report series, Labour and Household Surveys Analysis Division.
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

In order to reduce respondent burden and improve data quality, Statistics Canada is considering the feasibility of obtaining income information using a linkage of Revenue Canada tax records with records of respondents to the Labour Force Survey (LFS).

As part of this investigation, a "permission question" was asked during the August 1993 LFS using rotation groups 3 and 4. Group 3 was included in the Survey of Consumer Finance (SCF), which asks income questions. Group 4, the control group, was not.

This "permission question" was asked to determine if respondents would be willing to allow Statistics Canada to access their Revenue Canada income tax records instead of completing an income questionnaire.

This report analyzes the responses to the question for each rotation group to detect any differences between groups. It also examines the responses between those who answered the LFS questions themselves (non-proxy) and those who did not (proxy). ${ }^{1}$ There is concern that these two groups may have different attitudes toward giving permission.

## 2. DESIGN FEATURES

### 2.1 The question

The question and preamble were as follows:

We would like your opinion about a new way of getting some of the information that Statistics Canada collects. We are looking for ways to reduce cost, as well as your time and effort.

Statistics Canada now gets income information by asking up to 25 questions on wages, pensions and other kinds of income. The income tax return has much of the same information.

If you were in a Statistics Canada income survey, would you give us permission to get your information directly from Revenue Canada?

RESPONSE CODES: YES $=7 \quad$ NO $=8 \quad$ NON-RESPONSE $=9$

### 2.2 Field procedures

The question was asked during the August Labour Force Survey in rotation groups 3 and 4. Group 3 was included in the April SCF, which asks income questions as a supplement to the LFS. Group 4, the control group, was not included.

The question was asked of the last LFS respondent in the household and one other randomly selected respondent 15 years and over in the household. ${ }^{2}$ If the
respondent refused or was not available to answer the question, his/her answer was considered a non-response (i.e. no "proxy" response was allowed to this question).

## 3. DATA PROCESSING

There were three valid responses to the income question: 7 (yes), 8 (no) and 9 (non-response).

When the data were captured they were subject to quality checks. If a number other than 7,8 or 9 was recorded, there was a warning. The operator could override the warning if the data were recorded as shown on the questionnaire.

Also, if the questions immediately preceding or following this question were coded a 7,8 or 9 (invalid for those questions) there was a warning which, once again, could be over-ridden. (This edit existed because of the design of the questionnaire.)

A similar edit was available if the rotation group was other than rotation 3 or 4 .

## 4. DATA QUALITY

There were very few invalid responses or unexpected situations.

There were 140 records from rotations other than 3 and 4 that responded to the income question. These records were not included in the analysis. Fifteen records from rotations 3 or 4 which had responses of 0,1 or 2 to the income question were also rejected.

There were 115 records in rotation groups 3 and 4 with 7,8 or 9 in the question preceding or following the permission question. These were not used in the data analysis.

Since these records accounted for less than one per cent of the records analyzed, no further examination of their distribution was considered necessary.

## 5. ANALYTIC LIMITATIONS

It was not possible to distinguish between the LFS proxy and non-proxy respondents in all cases. Question 90 on the LFS questionnaire was the line number of the respondent for the LFS questions. When this response was equal to the page/line number of the permission question respondent, that respondent was considered a non-proxy respondent.

For the elderly ( 70 years and over), question 90 is blank. Interviewers do not ask the LFS questions of the elderly beyond their first month in the survey because most seniors are retired and their LFS status seldom changes. In these cases determining from the August file whether the response was proxy or non-proxy was not possible (unless it was a one person household).

It was also not possible to determine who answered the SCF questionnaire in the household. There could be cases where "income respondents" did not respond on their own behalf. ${ }^{3}$

There was no way to distinguish between types of non-response. Although nonproxy LFS respondents who were non-response obviously refused to answer the permission question, proxy respondents to the LFS could either be refusals or noncontacts. This makes it difficult to evaluate these responses in terms of nonproxy/proxy responses.

## 6. RESULTS

### 6.1 Overall observations ${ }^{4}$

There were a total of 29,582 individual records in rotations 3 and 4 with valid responses to the income question. Of these 14,469 , or $49 \%$ responded yes, 10,082 or $34 \%$ responded no and 5,031 or $17 \%$ were non-response. Excluding the non-response, the response rate was $59 \%$ yes and $41 \%$ no.

There were minor differences between rotation 3 records (SCF respondents) and rotation 4 when all records are considered. The results were $50 \%$ vs $48 \%$ for the yes group, $16 \%$ vs $18 \%$ for the non-response group while the no's remained at $34 \%$ for both rotations. Excluding non-response, the differences between the rotations were less than one per cent, with $59 \%$ yes and $41 \%$ no.

There was a much higher non-response rate in the proxy group (27\%) than in the non-proxy group ( $9 \%$ ). The difference may be caused by non-contact but this possibility cannot be verified. The rest of this study will exclude the nonresponses. ${ }^{5}$ However, tables including the non-responses can be found in Appendix 1.

The positive response (yes) of the non-proxy group was slightly higher (60\%) than that of the proxy group (57\%). The residual group (those who could not be identified as proxy or non-proxy) had a positive response of $56 \%$. The residual group will not be mentioned further except as part of the total and in Appendix 1.


### 6.2 Geographic differences

Provincially, positive response varied from $56 \%$ in Quebec and Prince Edward Island to $66 \%$ in Newfoundland. In some provinces the differences between rotations was evident, but not particularly important. For example, in Newfoundland $70 \%$ of rotation 3 said yes compared to $61 \%$ in rotation 4 . Also in Newfoundland, $68 \%$ of the non-proxy respondents in rotation said yes compared with $73 \%$ of the proxy respondents.

Other provinces and rotations stayed between $55 \%$ and $65 \%$ with some exceptions. However, there was still no extensive agreement to data access in any one province or group.

Within regional offices, the differences were similar to the provincial variations.

| TABLE 2: RESPONDENTS TO INCOME QUESTION BY PROVINCE (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  | ROTATION 4 |  | TOTAL |  |
| PROVINCE | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES | NO |
| NEWFOUNDLAND | 70.3 | 29.7 | 61.4 | 38.6 | 65.8 | 34.2 |
| PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND | 55.9 | 44.1 | 56.5 | 43.5 | 56.2 | 43.8 |
| NOVA SCOTIA | 61.8 | 38.2 | 66.0 | 34.0 | 63.9 | 36.1 |
| NEW BRUNSWICK | 57.1 | 42.9 | 59.7 | 40.3 | 58.3 | 41.7 |
| QUEBEC | 56.0 | 44.0 | 55.8 | 44.2 | 55.9 | 44.1 |
| ONTARIO | 60.1 | 39.9 | 57.6 | 42.4 | 58.9 | 41.1 |
| MANITOBA | 59.6 | 40.4 | 60.5 | 39.5 | 60.1 | 39.9 |
| SASKATCHEWAN | 60.2 | 39.8 | 55.4 | 44.6 | 57.8 | 42.2 |
| ALBERTA | 61.2 | 38.8 | 60.6 | 39.4 | 60.9 | 39.1 |
| BRITISH COLUMBIA | 56.9 | 43.1 | 58.0 | 42.0 | 57.4 | 42.6 |
| TOTAL | 59.4 | 40.6 | 58.5 | 41.5 | 58.9 | 41.1 |

Overall, very little difference surfaced between rural and urban records ( $58 \%$ vs $59 \%$ with yes). ${ }^{7}$ When considering proxy/non-proxy responses, the differences were within $3 \%$ in most cases. The only exception was in rural proxy response, where $60 \%$ said yes in rotation 3 compared to $54 \%$ in rotation 4 .

### 6.3 Demographic differences

Younger respondents were more likely than older members to allow use their tax file. However, with $68 \%$ positive response for the under 25 group, the results are still not impressive. Non-proxy respondents in this age group were more likely to say yes than proxy respondents ( $70 \%$ vs $65 \%$ ).

| TABLE 3: RESPONSES TO INCOME QUESTION BY AGE OF RESPONDENT (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  | ROTATION 4 |  | TOTAL |  |
| AGE GROUP | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES | NO |
| <25 | 67.9 | 32.1 | 67.6 | 32.4 | 67.7 | 32.3 |
| 25-34 | 61.7 | 38.3 | 63.2 | 36.8 | 62.5 | 37.5 |
| 35-44 | 57.7 | 42.3 | 57.3 | 42.7 | 57.5 | 42.5 |
| 45-54 | 56.3 | 43.7 | 53.7 | 46.3 | 55.0 | 45.0 |
| 55-59 | 56.1 | 43.9 | 52.8 | 47.2 | 54.5 | 45.5 |
| 60-64 | 56.5 | 43.5 | 53.4 | 46.6 | 54.9 | 45.1 |
| 65-69 | 56.2 | 43.8 | 53.5 | 46.5 | 54.9 | 45.1 |
| $70+$ | 59.2 | 40.8 | 57.6 | 42.4 | 58.4 | 41.6 |
| TOTAL | 59.4 | 40.6 | 58.5 | 41.5 | 58.9 | 41.1 |

In general, males were slightly less likely than females to say yes $58 \%$ vs $60 \%$ respectively. This held true for most groups.

Married respondents were less likely than other respondents to agree (e.g. $58 \%$ vs $63 \%$ for single respondents). This relationship held for both rotations and proxy / non-proxy groups. Widowed and separated or divorced respondents were similar to the single group.

Fifty-eight per cent of heads of households and spouses said yes to the income question. There was little difference between them in the sub-groups studied. Sons and daughters in the household had higher agreement rates, at $65 \%$.

Respondents in two-person households were somewhat less likely to say yes, with only $56 \%$ of these households saying yes compared with $60 \%$ or more in the other household sizes. Sub-groups showed some higher variation, but the results were well within the ranges seen above.

Similarly, when considering the respondent's education level, the rates are within the same order of magnitude.

### 6.4 SCF rotation group

Higher-income respondents were somewhat less likely to agree to have their tax files accessed. While $62 \%$ of all records ${ }^{7}$ said yes, only $57 \%$ of those with incomes of $\$ 60,000$ or more agreed. Of these high-income respondents, $59 \%$ of non-proxy respondents said yes compared to $54 \%$ of proxy respondents.

There were large differences when considering response to the SCF. Of the almost 2,200 who had income imputed for the SCF in April, only 43\% said yes to the income question in August compared with $62 \%$ who supplied income data. Fortyfive per cent of non-proxy respondents with imputed income said yes compared with $40 \%$ of the proxy respondents.

| TABLE 4: |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| RESPONSES TO INCOME QUESTION BY SCF RESPONSE (\%) |  |  |
|  | YES | NO |
| NO INCOME | 59.4 | 40.6 |
| INCOME SUPPLIED | 62.2 | 37.8 |
| INCOME IMPUTED | 42.9 | 57.1 |
| TOTAL | 59.2 | 40.8 |

## 7. CONCLUSION

Only 55 to $60 \%$ of the individuals who responded to the question would agree to allow the use of Revenue Canada tax files in place of interviews for collecting income and tax data.

Although there was more support among non-proxy respondents than proxy respondents, the differences were minor. Similarly, there were only small
variations between those respondents who were included in the SCF sample, and those who were not included.

If the permission rate is accepted as shown, there would be a sharp drop in response to any survey that uses a linkage collection method exclusively. Since the SCF response rate is $80 \%$, approximately $90 \%$ of respondents would have to agree to the use of the tax file to make this method viable, because not all records will be successfully matched. ${ }^{8}$

It is not known how strong the negatives are: perhaps an experienced interviewer could convert some of these negatives if given the chance. It is also conceivable that faced with more than a hypothetical question, the respondent would react differently. A test of this possibility should be considered.

One interesting result of this analysis is that a high percentage (about 40\%) of nonrespondents to the SCF would agree to allow access to their tax records. If the survey used a combination of interviewing and linkage procedures, this method could increase the response rate of the SCF. ${ }^{9}$ An analysis of the implications of using a combined survey is recommended.

## NOTES

1 These proxy respondents were only considered proxy for the LFS. Proxy responses to the "permission question" were not accepted. If an interviewer could not make contact, the respondent's answer was coded as non-response.

2 For an explanation of the methodology for choosing the second respondent, see the Interviewers Guide in Appendix 2.

3 For example, a mother answered for a child who had not filled out his/her own questionnaire.

4 The data examined were not weighted. Overall, we are interested in the sample, not the population. In any case, it is unlikely

## NOTES

5 The distribution of the non-responses is assumed to be the same as that of the responses.

6 SRU - NSRU were used as proxies for urban - rural.

7 These are the records from rotation 3 that were included in both the SCF in April and the test in August. Approximately 10 \% of the records did not match.

8 A study of 1984 data showed that we could expect to link $90 \%$ of the LFS records with the Revenue Canada tax file. See Horst Alter, Linked records as a foundation for analysis, Staff Report. Statistics Canada, Labour and Household Surveys Analysis Division, July 1988.

9 One problem with this method is the late availability of the RCT tax file. Where SCF is usually ready to publish in December, the preliminary tax file is not available until mid-October. This discrepancy could lead to a delay in the release of the SCF data.

## APPENDIX 1

Analytic Tables

| TABLE 1A: ALL RESPONDENTS TO INCOME QUESTION BY PROVINCE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| PROVINCE | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| NEWFOUNDLAND | 422 | 178 | 123 | 723 | 385 | 242 | 140 | 767 |
| PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND | 203 | 160 | 48 | 411 | 183 | 141 | 65 | 389 |
| NOVA SCOTIA | 535 | 331 | 183 | 1049 | 591 | 305 | 207 | 1103 |
| NEW BRUNSWICK | 453 | 341 | 187 | 981 | 459 | 310 | 192 | 961 |
| QUEBEC | 1372 | 1080 | 426 | 2878 | 1362 | 1077 | 422 | 2861 |
| ONTARIO | 1915 | 1271 | 613 | 3799 | 1812 | 1333 | 710 | 3855 |
| MANITOBA | 492 | 333 | 223 | 1048 | 487 | 318 | 220 | 1025 |
| SASKATCHEWAN | 560 | 370 | 186 | 1116 | 528 | 425 | 206 | 1159 |
| ALBERTA | 706 | 447 | 195 | 1348 | 708 | 460 | 233 | 1401 |
| BRITISH COLUMBIA | 641 | 485 | 215 | 1341 | 655 | 475 | 237 | 1367 |
| TOTAL | 7299 | 4996 | 2399 | 14694 | 7170 | 5086 | 2632 | 14888 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| PROVINCE | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| NEWFOUNDLAND | 58.4 | 24.6 | 17.0 |  | 50.2 | 31.6 | 18.3 |  |
| PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND | 49.4 | 38.9 | 11.7 |  | 47.0 | 36.2 | 16.7 |  |
| NOVA SCOTIA | 51.0 | 31.6 | 17.4 |  | 53.6 | 27.7 | 18.8 |  |
| NEW BRUNSWICK | 46.2 | 34.8 | 19.1 |  | 47.8 | 32.3 | 20.0 |  |
| QUEBEC | 47.7 | 37.5 | 14.8 |  | 47.6 | 37.6 | 14.8 |  |
| ONTARIO | 50.4 | 33.5 | 16.1 |  | 47.0 | 34.6 | 18.4 |  |
| MANITOBA | 46.9 | 31.8 | 21.3 |  | 47.5 | 31.0 | 21.5 |  |
| SASKATCHEWAN | 50.2 | 33.2 | 16.7 |  | 45.6 | 36.7 | 17.8 |  |
| ALBERTA | 52.4 | 33.2 | 14.5 |  | 50.5 | 32.8 | 16.6 |  |
| BRITISH COLUMBIA | 47.8 | 36.2 | 16.0 |  | 47.9 | 34.7 | 17.3 |  |
| TOTAL | 49.7 | 34.0 | 16.3 |  | 48.2 | 34.2 | 17.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  | TOTAL (\%) |  |
| PROVINCE | YES | NO |  | YES | NO |  | YES | NO |
| NEWFOUNDLAND | 70.3 | 29.7 |  | 61.4 | 38.6 |  | 65.8 | 34.2 |
| PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND | 55.9 | 44.1 |  | 56.5 | 43.5 |  | 56.2 | 43.8 |
| NOVA SCOTIA | 61.8 | 38.2 |  | 66.0 | 34.0 |  | 63.9 | 36.1 |
| NEW BRUNSWICK | 57.1 | 42.9 |  | 59.7 | 40.3 |  | 58.3 | 41.7 |
| QUEBEC | 56.0 | 44.0 |  | 55.8 | 44.2 |  | 55.9 | 44.1 |
| ONTARIO | 60.1 | 39.9 |  | 57.6 | 42.4 |  | 58.9 | 41.1 |
| MANITOBA | 59.6 | 40.4 |  | 60.5 | 39.5 |  | 60.1 | 39.9 |
| SASKATCHEWAN | 60.2 | 39.8 |  | 55.4 | 44.6 |  | 57.8 | 42.2 |
| ALBERTA | 61.2 | 38.8 |  | 60.6 | 39.4 |  | 60.9 | 39.1 |
| BRITISH COLUMBIA | 56.9 | 43.1 |  | 58.0 | 42.0 |  | 57.4 | 42.6 |
| TOTAL | 59.4 | 40.6 |  | 58.5 | 41.5 |  | 58.9 | 41.1 |


| TABLE 1B: NON-PROXY RESPONDENTS BY PROVINCE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| PROVINCE | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| NEWFOUNDLAND | 241 | 116 | 24 | 381 | 227 | 144 | 34 | 405 |
| PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND | 127 | 94 | 19 | 240 | 108 | 79 | 22 | 209 |
| NOVA SCOTIA | 329 | 208 | 42 | 579 | 366 | 177 | 52 | 595 |
| NEW BRUNSWICK | 280 | 195 | 39 | 514 | 284 | 172 | 54 | 510 |
| QUEBEC | 858 | 652 | 107 | 1617 | 849 | 645 | 141 | 1635 |
| ONTARIO | 1179 | 748 | 186 | 2113 | 1135 | 753 | 235 | 2123 |
| MANITOBA | 308 | 201 | 68 | 577 | 287 | 189 | 73 | 549 |
| SASKATCHEWAN | 350 | 219 | 64 | 633 | 353 | 260 | 52 | 665 |
| ALBERTA | 468 | 246 | 41 | 755 | 431 | 281 | 70 | 782 |
| BRITISH COLUMBIA | 403 | 275 | 68 | 746 | 428 | 275 | 65 | 768 |
| TOTAL | 4543 | 2954 | 658 | 8155 | 4468 | 2975 | 798 | 8241 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| PROVINCE | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| NEWFOUNDLAND | 63.3 | 30.4 | 6.3 |  | 56.0 | 35.6 | 8.4 |  |
| PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND | 52.9 | 39.2 | 7.9 |  | 51.7 | 37.8 | 10.5 |  |
| NOVA SCOTIA | 56.8 | 35.9 | 7.3 |  | 61.5 | 29.7 | 8.7 |  |
| NEW BRUNSWICK | 54.5 | 37.9 | 7.6 |  | 55.7 | 33.7 | 10.6 |  |
| QUEBEC | 53.1 | 40.3 | 6.6 |  | 51.9 | 39.4 | 8.6 |  |
| ONTARIO | 55.8 | 35.4 | 8.8 |  | 53.5 | 35.5 | 11.1 |  |
| MANITOBA | 53.4 | 34.8 | 11.8 |  | 52.3 | 34.4 | 13.3 |  |
| SASKATCHEWAN | 55.3 | 34.6 | 10.1 |  | 53.1 | 39.1 | 7.8 |  |
| ALBERTA | 62.0 | 32.6 | 5.4 |  | 55.1 | 35.9 | 9.0 |  |
| BRITISH COLUMBIA | 54.0 | 36.9 | 9.1 |  | 55.7 | 35.8 | 8.5 |  |
| TOTAL | 55.7 | 36.2 | 8.1 |  | 54.2 | 36.1 | 9.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| PROVINCE | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| NEWFOUNDLAND | 67.5 |  | 32.5 |  | 61.2 |  | 38.8 |  |
| PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND | 57.5 |  | 42.5 |  | 57.8 |  | 42.2 |  |
| NOVA SCOTIA | 61.3 |  | 38.7 |  | 67.4 |  | 32.6 |  |
| NEW BRUNSWICK | 58.9 |  | 41.1 |  | 62.3 |  | 37.7 |  |
| QUEBEC | 56.8 |  | 43.2 |  | 56.8 |  | 43.2 |  |
| ONTARIO | 61.2 |  | 38.8 |  | 60.1 |  | 39.9 |  |
| MANITOBA | 60.5 |  | 39.5 |  | 60.3 |  | 39.7 |  |
| SASKATCHEWAN | 61.5 |  | 38.5 |  | 57.6 |  | 42.4 |  |
| ALBERTA | 65.5 |  | 34.5 |  | 60.5 |  | 39.5 |  |
| BRITISH COLUMBIA | 59.4 |  | 40.6 |  | 60.9 |  | 39.1 |  |
| TOTAL | 60.6 |  | 39.4 |  | 60.0 |  | 40.0 |  |


|  | TABLE 1C: PROXY RESPONDENTS BY PROVINCE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| PROVINCE | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| NEWFOUNDLAND | 145 | 53 | 88 | 286 | 139 | 85 | 94 | 318 |
| PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND | 70 | 53 | 25 | 148 | 66 | 55 | 38 | 159 |
| NOVA SCOTIA | 156 | 103 | 111 | 370 | 167 | 99 | 134 | 400 |
| NEW BRUNSWICK | 134 | 117 | 119 | 370 | 150 | 110 | 119 | 379 |
| QUEBEC | 449 | 367 | 272 | 1088 | 448 | 389 | 244 | 1081 |
| ONTARIO | 642 | 439 | 354 | 1435 | 575 | 483 | 418 | 1476 |
| MANITOBA | 131 | 107 | 128 | 366 | 150 | 95 | 112 | 357 |
| SASKATCHEWAN | 162 | 112 | 95 | 369 | 136 | 121 | 116 | 373 |
| ALBERTA | 200 | 160 | 126 | 486 | 241 | 153 | 134 | 528 |
| BRITISH COLUMBIA | 185 | 165 | 125 | 475 | 180 | 161 | 143 | 484 |
| TOTAL | 2274 | 1676 | 1443 | 5393 | 2252 | 1751 | 1552 | 5555 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| PROVINCE | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| NEWFOUNDLAND | 50.7 | 18.5 | 30.8 |  | 43.7 | 26.7 | 29.6 |  |
| PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND | 47.3 | 35.8 | 16.9 |  | 41.5 | 34.6 | 23.9 |  |
| NOVA SCOTIA | 42.2 | 27.8 | 30.0 |  | 41.8 | 24.8 | 33.5 |  |
| NEW BRUNSWICK | 36.2 | 31.6 | 32.2 |  | 39.6 | 29.0 | 31.4 |  |
| QUEBEC | 41.3 | 33.7 | 25.0 |  | 41.4 | 36.0 | 22.6 |  |
| ONTARIO | 44.7 | 30.6 | 24.7 |  | 39.0 | 32.7 | 28.3 |  |
| MANITOBA | 35.8 | 29.2 | 35.0 |  | 42.0 | 26.6 | 31.4 |  |
| SASKATCHEWAN | 43.9 | 30.4 | 25.7 |  | 36.5 | 32.4 | 31.1 |  |
| ALBERTA | 41.2 | 32.9 | 25.9 |  | 45.6 | 29.0 | 25.4 |  |
| BRITISH COLUMBIA | 38.9 | 34.7 | 26.3 |  | 37.2 | 33.3 | 29.5 |  |
| TOTAL | 42.2 | 31.1 | 26.8 |  | 40.5 | 31.5 | 27.9 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| PROVINCE | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| NEWFOUNDLAND | 73.2 |  | 26.8 |  | 62.1 |  | 37.9 |  |
| PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND | 56.9 |  | 43.1 |  | 54.5 |  | 45.5 |  |
| NOVA SCOTIA | 60.2 |  | 39.8 |  | 62.8 |  | 37.2 |  |
| NEW BRUNSWICK | 53.4 |  | 46.6 |  | 57.7 |  | 42.3 |  |
| QUEBEC | 55.0 |  | 45.0 |  | 53.5 |  | 46.5 |  |
| ONTARIO | 59.4 |  | 40.6 |  | 54.3 |  | 45.7 |  |
| MANITOBA | 55.0 |  | 45.0 |  | 61.2 |  | 38.8 |  |
| SASKATCHEWAN | 59.1 |  | 40.9 |  | 52.9 |  | 47.1 |  |
| ALBERTA | 55.6 |  | 44.4 |  | 61.2 |  | 38.8 |  |
| BRITISH COLUMBIA | 52.9 |  | 47.1 |  | 52.8 |  | 47.2 |  |
| TOTAL | 57.6 |  | 42.4 |  | 56.3 |  | 43.7 |  |


| TABLE 2A: ALL RESPONDENTS TO INCOME QUESTION BY REGIONAL OFFICE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL OFFICE | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| ST. JOHN'S | 422 | 178 | 123 | 723 | 385 | 242 | 140 | 767 |
| HALIFAX | 1191 | 832 | 418 | 2441 | 1233 | 756 | 464 | 2453 |
| MONTREAL | 1372 | 1080 | 426 | 2878 | 1362 | 1077 | 422 | 2861 |
| STURGEON FALLS | 695 | 523 | 188 | 1406 | 674 | 523 | 260 | 1457 |
| TORONTO | 1220 | 748 | 425 | 2393 | 1138 | 810 | 450 | 2398 |
| WINNIPEG | 819 | 600 | 358 | 1777 | 822 | 604 | 366 | 1792 |
| EDMONTON | 939 | 550 | 246 | 1735 | 901 | 599 | 293 | 1793 |
| VANCOUVER | 641 | 485 | 215 | 1341 | 655 | 475 | 237 | 1367 |
| TOTAL | 7299 | 4996 | 2399 | 14694 | 7170 | 5086 | 2632 | 14888 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL OFFICE | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| ST. JOHN'S | 58.4 | 24.6 | 17.0 |  | 50.2 | 31.6 | 18.3 |  |
| HALIFAX | 48.8 | 34.1 | 17.1 |  | 50.3 | 30.8 | 18.9 |  |
| MONTREAL | 47.7 | 37.5 | 14.8 |  | 47.6 | 37.6 | 14.8 |  |
| STURGEON FALLS | 49.4 | 37.2 | 13.4 |  | 46.3 | 35.9 | 17.8 |  |
| TORONTO | 51.0 | 31.3 | 17.8 |  | 47.5 | 33.8 | 18.8 |  |
| WINNIPEG | 46.1 | 33.8 | 20.1 |  | 45.9 | 33.7 | 20.4 |  |
| EDMONTON | 54.1 | 31.7 | 14.2 |  | 50.3 | 33.4 | 16.3 |  |
| VANCOUVER | 47.8 | 36.2 | 16.0 |  | 47.9 | 34.7 | 17.3 |  |
| TOTAL | 49.7 | 34.0 | 16.3 |  | 48.2 | 34.2 | 17.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  | TOTAL (\%) |  |
| REGIONAL OFFICE | YES | NO |  | YES | NO |  | YES | NO |
| ST. JOHN'S | 70.3 | 29.7 |  | 61.4 | 38.6 |  | 65.8 | 34.2 |
| HALIFAX | 58.9 | 41.1 |  | 62.0 | 38.0 |  | 60.4 | 39.6 |
| MONTREAL | 56.0 | 44.0 |  | 55.8 | 44.2 |  | 55.9 | 44.1 |
| STURGEON FALLS | 57.1 | 42.9 |  | 56.3 | 43.7 |  | 56.7 | 43.3 |
| TORONTO | 62.0 | 38.0 |  | 58.4 | 41.6 |  | 60.2 | 39.8 |
| WINNIPEG | 57.7 | 42.3 |  | 57.6 | 42.4 |  | 57.7 | 42.3 |
| EDMONTON | 63.1 | 36.9 |  | 60.1 | 39.9 |  | 61.6 | 38.4 |
| VANCOUVER | 56.9 | 43.1 |  | 58.0 | 42.0 |  | 57.4 | 42.6 |
| TOTAL | 59.4 | 40.6 |  | 58.5 | 41.5 |  | 58.9 | 41.1 |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

| TABLE 2B: NON-PROXY RESPONDENTS BY REGIONAL OFFICE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL OFFICE | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| ST. JOHN'S | 241 | 116 | 24 | 381 | 227 | 144 | 34 | 405 |
| HALIFAX | 736 | 497 | 100 | 1333 | 758 | 428 | 128 | 1314 |
| MONTREAL | 858 | 652 | 107 | 1617 | 849 | 645 | 141 | 1635 |
| STURGEON FALLS | 435 | 319 | 50 | 804 | 429 | 314 | 84 | 827 |
| TORONTO | 744 | 429 | 136 | 1309 | 706 | 439 | 151 | 1296 |
| WINNIPEG | 516 | 363 | 120 | 999 | 511 | 367 | 110 | 988 |
| EDMONTON | 610 | 303 | 53 | 966 | 560 | 363 | 85 | 1008 |
| VANCOUVER | 403 | 275 | 68 | 746 | 428 | 275 | 65 | 768 |
| TOTAL | 4543 | 2954 | 658 | 8155 | 4468 | 2975 | 798 | 8241 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL OFFICE | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| ST. JOHN'S | 63.3 | 30.4 | 6.3 |  | 56.0 | 35.6 | 8.4 |  |
| HALIFAX | 55.2 | 37.3 | 7.5 |  | 57.7 | 32.6 | 9.7 |  |
| MONTREAL | 53.1 | 40.3 | 6.6 |  | 51.9 | 39.4 | 8.6 |  |
| STURGEON FALLS | 54.1 | 39.7 | 6.2 |  | 51.9 | 38.0 | 10.2 |  |
| TORONTO | 56.8 | 32.8 | 10.4 |  | 54.5 | 33.9 | 11.7 |  |
| WINNIPEG | 51.7 | 36.3 | 12.0 |  | 51.7 | 37.1 | 11.1 |  |
| EDMONTON | 63.1 | 31.4 | 5.5 |  | 55.6 | 36.0 | 8.4 |  |
| VANCOUVER | 54.0 | 36.9 | 9.1 |  | 55.7 | 35.8 | 8.5 |  |
| TOTAL | 55.7 | 36.2 | 8.1 |  | 54.2 | 36.1 | 9.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL OFFICE | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| ST. JOHN'S | 67.5 |  | 32.5 |  | 61.2 |  | 38.8 |  |
| HALIFAX | 59.7 |  | 40.3 |  | 63.9 |  | 36.1 |  |
| MONTREAL | 56.8 |  | 43.2 |  | 56.8 |  | 43.2 |  |
| STURGEON FALLS | 57.7 |  | 42.3 |  | 57.7 |  | 42.3 |  |
| TORONTO | 63.4 |  | 36.6 |  | 61.7 |  | 38.3 |  |
| WINNIPEG | 58.7 |  | 41.3 |  | 58.2 |  | 41.8 |  |
| EDMONTON | 66.8 |  | 33.2 |  | 60.7 |  | 39.3 |  |
| VANCOUVER | 59.4 |  | 40.6 |  | 60.9 |  | 39.1 |  |
| TOTAL | 60.6 |  | 39.4 |  | 60.0 |  | 40.0 |  |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS
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|  | TABLE 2C: PROXY RESPONDENTS BY REGIONAL OFFICE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL OFFICE | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| ST. JOHN'S | 145 | 53 | 88 | 286 | 139 | 85 | 94 | 318 |
| HALIFAX | 360 | 273 | 255 | 888 | 383 | 264 | 291 | 938 |
| MONTREAL | 449 | 367 | 272 | 1088 | 448 | 389 | 244 | 1081 |
| STURGEON FALLS | 219 | 168 | 105 | 492 | 206 | 179 | 151 | 536 |
| TORONTO | 423 | 271 | 249 | 943 | 369 | 304 | 267 | 940 |
| WINNIPEG | 218 | 183 | 189 | 590 | 234 | 173 | 197 | 604 |
| EDMONTON | 275 | 196 | 160 | 631 | 293 | 196 | 165 | 654 |
| VANCOUVER | 185 | 165 | 125 | 475 | 180 | 161 | 143 | 484 |
| TOTAL | 2274 | 1676 | 1443 | 5393 | 2252 | 1751 | 1552 | 5555 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL OFFICE | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| ST. JOHN'S | 50.7 | 18.5 | 30.8 |  | 43.7 | 26.7 | 29.6 |  |
| HALIFAX | 40.5 | 30.7 | 28.7 |  | 40.8 | 28.1 | 31.0 |  |
| MONTREAL | 41.3 | 33.7 | 25.0 |  | 41.4 | 36.0 | 22.6 |  |
| STURGEON FALLS | 44.5 | 34.1 | 21.3 |  | 38.4 | 33.4 | 28.2 |  |
| TORONTO | 44.9 | 28.7 | 26.4 |  | 39.3 | 32.3 | 28.4 |  |
| WINNIPEG | 36.9 | 31.0 | 32.0 |  | 38.7 | 28.6 | 32.6 |  |
| EDMONTON | 43.6 | 31.1 | 25.4 |  | 44.8 | 30.0 | 25.2 |  |
| VANCOUVER | 38.9 | 34.7 | 26.3 |  | 37.2 | 33.3 | 29.5 |  |
| TOTAL | 42.2 | 31.1 | 26.8 |  | 40.5 | 31.5 | 27.9 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL OFFICE | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| ST. JOHN'S | 73.2 |  | 26.8 |  | 62.1 |  | 37.9 |  |
| HALIFAX | 56.9 |  | 43.1 |  | 59.2 |  | 40.8 |  |
| MONTREAL | 55.0 |  | 45.0 |  | 53.5 |  | 46.5 |  |
| STURGEON FALLS | 56.6 |  | 43.4 |  | 53.5 |  | 46.5 |  |
| TORONTO | 61.0 |  | 39.0 |  | 54.8 |  | 45.2 |  |
| WINNIPEG | 54.4 |  | 45.6 |  | 57.5 |  | 42.5 |  |
| EDMONTON | 58.4 |  | 41.6 |  | 59.9 |  | 40.1 |  |
| VANCOUVER | 52.9 |  | 47.1 |  | 52.8 |  | 47.2 |  |
| TOTAL | 57.6 |  | 42.4 |  | 56.3 |  | 43.7 |  |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS


| TABLE 3B: NON-PROXY RESPONDENTS BY SRU/NSRU * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| NSRU | 265 | 178 | 47 | 490 | 301 | 200 | 47 | 548 |
| SRU | 4278 | 2776 | 611 | 7665 | 4167 | 2775 | 751 | 7693 |
| TOTAL | 4543 | 2954 | 658 | 8155 | 4468 | 2975 | 798 | 8241 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| NSRU | 54.1 | 36.3 | 9.6 |  | 54.9 | 36.5 | 8.6 |  |
| SRU | 55.8 | 36.2 | 8.0 |  | 54.2 | 36.1 | 9.8 |  |
| TOTAL | 55.7 | 36.2 | 8.1 |  | 54.2 | 36.1 | 9.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
|  | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| NSRU | 59.8 |  | 40.2 |  | 60.1 |  | 39.9 |  |
| SRU | 60.6 |  | 39.4 |  | 60.0 |  | 40.0 |  |
| TOTAL | 60.6 |  | 39.4 |  | 60.0 |  | 40.0 |  |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

## - 21 -

| TABLE 3C: PROXY RESPONDENTS BY SRU/NSRU * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| NSRU | 145 | 97 | 94 | 336 | 138 | 119 | 84 | 341 |
| SRU | 2129 | 1579 | 1349 | 5057 | 2114 | 1632 | 1468 | 5214 |
| TOTAL | 2274 | 1676 | 1443 | 5393 | 2252 | 1751 | 1552 | 5555 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| NSRU | 43.2 | 28.9 | 28.0 |  | 40.5 | 34.9 | 24.6 |  |
| SRU | 42.1 | 31.2 | 26.7 |  | 40.5 | 31.3 | 28.2 |  |
| TOTAL | 42.2 | 31.1 | 26.8 |  | 40.5 | 31.5 | 27.9 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
|  | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| NSRU | 59.9 |  | 40.1 |  | 53.7 |  | 46.3 |  |
| SRU | 57.4 |  | 42.6 |  | 56.4 |  | 43.6 |  |
| TOTAL | 57.6 |  | 42.4 |  | 56.3 |  | 43.7 |  |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

|  | ALL RESPONDENTS TO INCOME QUESTION BY AGE OF RESPONDENT * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| AGE GROUP | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| <25 | 888 | 420 | 402 | 1710 | 880 | 422 | 467 | 1769 |
| 25-34 | 1680 | 1042 | 413 | 3135 | 1796 | 1044 | 493 | 3333 |
| 35-44 | 1621 | 1187 | 452 | 3260 | 1569 | 1168 | 445 | 3182 |
| 45-54 | 1071 | 830 | 327 | 2228 | 1028 | 888 | 352 | 2268 |
| 55-59 | 427 | 334 | 130 | 891 | 394 | 352 | 162 | 908 |
| 60-64 | 423 | 326 | 149 | 898 | 421 | 368 | 157 | 946 |
| 65-69 | 404 | 315 | 137 | 856 | 365 | 317 | 170 | 852 |
| $70+$ | 785 | 542 | 389 | 1716 | 717 | 527 | 386 | 1630 |
| TOTAL | 7299 | 4996 | 2399 | 14694 | 7170 | 5086 | 2632 | 14888 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| AGE GROUP | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| <25 | 51.9 | 24.6 | 23.5 |  | 49.7 | 23.9 | 26.4 |  |
| 25-34 | 53.6 | 33.2 | 13.2 |  | 53.9 | 31.3 | 14.8 |  |
| 35-44 | 49.7 | 36.4 | 13.9 |  | 49.3 | 36.7 | 14.0 |  |
| 45-54 | 48.1 | 37.3 | 14.7 |  | 45.3 | 39.2 | 15.5 |  |
| 55-59 | 47.9 | 37.5 | 14.6 |  | 43.4 | 38.8 | 17.8 |  |
| 60-64 | 47.1 | 36.3 | 16.6 |  | 44.5 | 38.9 | 16.6 |  |
| 65-69 | 47.2 | 36.8 | 16.0 |  | 42.8 | 37.2 | 20.0 |  |
| $70+$ | 45.7 | 31.6 | 22.7 |  | 44.0 | 32.3 | 23.7 |  |
| TOTAL | 49.7 | 34.0 | 16.3 |  | 48.2 | 34.2 | 17.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  | TOTAL (\%) |  |
| AGE GROUP | YES | NO |  | YES | NO |  | YES | NO |
| <25 | 67.9 | 32.1 |  | 67.6 | 32.4 |  | 67.7 | 32.3 |
| 25-34 | 61.7 | 38.3 |  | 63.2 | 36.8 |  | 62.5 | 37.5 |
| 35-44 | 57.7 | 42.3 |  | 57.3 | 42.7 |  | 57.5 | 42.5 |
| 45-54 | 56.3 | 43.7 |  | 53.7 | 46.3 |  | 55.0 | 45.0 |
| 55-59 | 56.1 | 43.9 |  | 52.8 | 47.2 |  | 54.5 | 45.5 |
| 60-64 | 56.5 | 43.5 |  | 53.4 | 46.6 |  | 54.9 | 45.1 |
| 65-69 | 56.2 | 43.8 |  | 53.5 | 46.5 |  | 54.9 | 45.1 |
| $70+$ | 59.2 | 40.8 |  | 57.6 | 42.4 |  | 58.4 | 41.6 |
| TOTAL | 59.4 | 40.6 |  | 58.5 | 41.5 |  | 58.9 | 41.1 |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

|  | BLE 4B: NON-PROXY RESPONDENTS BY AGE OF RESPONDENT * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| AGE GROUP | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| <25 | 449 | 189 | 58 | 696 | 451 | 186 | 86 | 723 |
| 25-34 | 1126 | 646 | 96 | 1868 | 1181 | 655 | 132 | 1968 |
| 35-44 | 1094 | 750 | 133 | 1977 | 1045 | 729 | 132 | 1906 |
| 45-54 | 709 | 554 | 77 | 1340 | 701 | 564 | 117 | 1382 |
| 55-59 | 275 | 219 | 41 | 535 | 265 | 227 | 52 | 544 |
| 60-64 | 292 | 216 | 53 | 561 | 294 | 221 | 59 | 574 |
| 65-69 | 285 | 200 | 69 | 554 | 240 | 216 | 85 | 541 |
| $70+$ | 313 | 180 | 131 | 624 | 291 | 177 | 135 | 603 |
| TOTAL | 4543 | 2954 | 658 | 8155 | 4468 | 2975 | 798 | 8241 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| AGE GROUP | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| <25 | 64.5 | 27.2 | 8.3 |  | 62.4 | 25.7 | 11.9 |  |
| 25-34 | 60.3 | 34.6 | 5.1 |  | 60.0 | 33.3 | 6.7 |  |
| 35-44 | 55.3 | 37.9 | 6.7 |  | 54.8 | 38.2 | 6.9 |  |
| 45-54 | 52.9 | 41.3 | 5.7 |  | 50.7 | 40.8 | 8.5 |  |
| 55-59 | 51.4 | 40.9 | 7.7 |  | 48.7 | 41.7 | 9.6 |  |
| 60-64 | 52.0 | 38.5 | 9.4 |  | 51.2 | 38.5 | 10.3 |  |
| 65-69 | 51.4 | 36.1 | 12.5 |  | 44.4 | 39.9 | 15.7 |  |
| $70+$ | 50.2 | 28.8 | 21.0 |  | 48.3 | 29.4 | 22.4 |  |
| TOTAL | 55.7 | 36.2 | 8.1 |  | 54.2 | 36.1 | 9.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| AGE GROUP | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| <25 | 70.4 |  | 29.6 |  | 70.8 |  | 29.2 |  |
| 25-34 | 63.5 |  | 36.5 |  | 64.3 |  | 35.7 |  |
| 35-44 | 59.3 |  | 40.7 |  | 58.9 |  | 41.1 |  |
| 45-54 | 56.1 |  | 43.9 |  | 55.4 |  | 44.6 |  |
| 55-59 | 55.7 |  | 44.3 |  | 53.9 |  | 46.1 |  |
| 60-64 | 57.5 |  | 42.5 |  | 57.1 |  | 42.9 |  |
| 65-69 | 58.8 |  | 41.2 |  | 52.6 |  | 47.4 |  |
| $70+$ | 63.5 |  | 36.5 |  | 62.2 |  | 37.8 |  |
| TOTAL | 60.6 |  | 39.4 |  | 60.0 |  | 40.0 |  |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

|  | ABLE | PROXY RESPONDENTS BY AGE OF RESPONDENT * |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| AGE GROUP | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| <25 | 435 | 230 | 335 | 1000 | 429 | 235 | 379 | 1043 |
| 25-34 | 549 | 392 | 304 | 1245 | 597 | 385 | 348 | 1330 |
| 35-44 | 523 | 435 | 312 | 1270 | 516 | 436 | 303 | 1255 |
| 45-54 | 362 | 275 | 241 | 878 | 326 | 321 | 230 | 877 |
| 55-59 | 152 | 115 | 86 | 353 | 129 | 125 | 109 | 363 |
| 60-64 | 130 | 110 | 96 | 336 | 127 | 147 | 98 | 372 |
| 65-69 | 119 | 115 | 66 | 300 | 125 | 101 | 83 | 309 |
| $70+$ | 4 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| TOTAL | 2274 | 1676 | 1443 | 5393 | 2252 | 1751 | 1552 | 5555 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| AGE GROUP | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| <25 | 43.5 | 23.0 | 33.5 |  | 41.1 | 22.5 | 36.3 |  |
| 25-34 | 44.1 | 31.5 | 24.4 |  | 44.9 | 28.9 | 26.2 |  |
| 35-44 | 41.2 | 34.3 | 24.6 |  | 41.1 | 34.7 | 24.1 |  |
| 45-54 | 41.2 | 31.3 | 27.4 |  | 37.2 | 36.6 | 26.2 |  |
| 55-59 | 43.1 | 32.6 | 24.4 |  | 35.5 | 34.4 | 30.0 |  |
| 60-64 | 38.7 | 32.7 | 28.6 |  | 34.1 | 39.5 | 26.3 |  |
| 65-69 | 39.7 | 38.3 | 22.0 |  | 40.5 | 32.7 | 26.9 |  |
| $70+$ | 36.4 | 36.4 | 27.3 |  | 50.0 | 16.7 | 33.3 |  |
| TOTAL | 42.2 | 31.1 | 26.8 |  | 40.5 | 31.5 | 27.9 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| AGE GROUP | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| <25 | 65.4 |  | 34.6 |  | 64.6 |  | 35.4 |  |
| 25-34 | 58.3 |  | 41.7 |  | 60.8 |  | 39.2 |  |
| 35-44 | 54.6 |  | 45.4 |  | 54.2 |  | 45.8 |  |
| 45-54 | 56.8 |  | 43.2 |  | 50.4 |  | 49.6 |  |
| 55-59 | 56.9 |  | 43.1 |  | 50.8 |  | 49.2 |  |
| 60-64 | 54.2 |  | 45.8 |  | 46.4 |  | 53.6 |  |
| 65-69 | 50.9 |  | 49.1 |  | 55.3 |  | 44.7 |  |
| $70+$ | 50.0 |  | 50.0 |  | 75.0 |  | 25.0 |  |
| TOTAL | 57.6 |  | 42.4 |  | 56.3 |  | 43.7 |  |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

| TABLE 5A: ALL RESPONDENTS TO INCOME QUESTION BY SEX * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| MALE | 3129 | 2297 | 1346 | 6772 | 3177 | 2346 | 1433 | 6956 |
| FEMALE | 4170 | 2699 | 1053 | 7922 | 3993 | 2740 | 1199 | 7932 |
| TOTAL | 7299 | 4996 | 2399 | 14694 | 7170 | 5086 | 2632 | 14888 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| MALE | 46.2 | 33.9 | 19.9 |  | 45.7 | 33.7 | 20.6 |  |
| FEMALE | 52.6 | 34.1 | 13.3 |  | 50.3 | 34.5 | 15.1 |  |
| TOTAL | 49.7 | 34.0 | 16.3 |  | 48.2 | 34.2 | 17.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  | TOTAL (\%) |  |
|  | YES | NO |  | YES | NO |  | YES | NO |
| MALE | 57.7 | 42.3 |  | 57.5 | 42.5 |  | 57.6 | 42.4 |
| FEMALE | 60.7 | 39.3 |  | 59.3 | 40.7 |  | 60.0 | 40.0 |
| TOTAL | 59.4 | 40.6 |  | 58.5 | 41.5 |  | 58.9 | 41.1 |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

| TABLE 5B: NON-PROXY RESPONDENTS BY SEX * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| MALE | 1445 | 981 | 215 | 2641 | 1520 | 1005 | 292 | 2817 |
| FEMALE | 3098 | 1973 | 443 | 5514 | 2948 | 1970 | 506 | 5424 |
| TOTAL | 4543 | 2954 | 658 | 8155 | 4468 | 2975 | 798 | 8241 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| MALE | 54.7 | 37.1 | 8.1 |  | 54.0 | 35.7 | 10.4 |  |
| FEMALE | 56.2 | 35.8 | 8.0 |  | 54.4 | 36.3 | 9.3 |  |
| TOTAL | 55.7 | 36.2 | 8.1 |  | 54.2 | 36.1 | 9.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
|  | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| MALE | 59.6 |  | 40.4 |  | 60.2 |  | 39.8 |  |
| FEMALE | 61.1 |  | 38.9 |  | 59.9 |  | 40.1 |  |
| TOTAL | 60.6 |  | 39.4 |  | 60.0 |  | 40.0 |  |


| TABLE 5C: PROXY RESPONDENTS BY SEX * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| MALE | 1418 | 1116 | 977 | 3511 | 1404 | 1142 | 992 | 3538 |
| FEMALE | 856 | 560 | 466 | 1882 | 848 | 609 | 560 | 2017 |
| TOTAL | 2274 | 1676 | 1443 | 5393 | 2252 | 1751 | 1552 | 5555 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| MALE | 40.4 | 31.8 | 27.8 |  | 39.7 | 32.3 | 28.0 |  |
| FEMALE | 45.5 | 29.8 | 24.8 |  | 42.0 | 30.2 | 27.8 |  |
| TOTAL | 42.2 | 31.1 | 26.8 |  | 40.5 | 31.5 | 27.9 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
|  | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| MALE | 56.0 |  | 44.0 |  | 55.1 |  | 44.9 |  |
| FEMALE | 60.5 |  | 39.5 |  | 58.2 |  | 41.8 |  |
| TOTAL | 57.6 |  | 42.4 |  | 56.3 |  | 43.7 |  |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

| TABLE 6A: ALL RESPONDENTS TO INCOME QUESTION BY MARITAL STATUS * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| MARRIED | 4942 | 3569 | 1549 | 10060 | 4915 | 3681 | 1648 | 10244 |
| SINGLE | 1358 | 807 | 562 | 2727 | 1335 | 788 | 656 | 2779 |
| WIDOWED | 475 | 300 | 174 | 949 | 426 | 292 | 204 | 922 |
| SEPARATED OR DIVORCED | 524 | 320 | 114 | 958 | 494 | 325 | 124 | 943 |
| TOTAL | 7299 | 4996 | 2399 | 14694 | 7170 | 5086 | 2632 | 14888 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| MARRIED | 49.1 | 35.5 | 15.4 |  | 48.0 | 35.9 | 16.1 |  |
| SINGLE | 49.8 | 29.6 | 20.6 |  | 48.0 | 28.4 | 23.6 |  |
| WIDOWED | 50.1 | 31.6 | 18.3 |  | 46.2 | 31.7 | 22.1 |  |
| SEPARATED OR DIVORCED | 54.7 | 33.4 | 11.9 |  | 52.4 | 34.5 | 13.1 |  |
| TOTAL | 49.7 | 34.0 | 16.3 |  | 48.2 | 34.2 | 17.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  | TOTAL (\%) |  |
|  | YES | NO |  | YES | NO |  | YES | NO |
| MARRIED | 58.1 | 41.9 |  | 57.2 | 42.8 |  | 57.6 | 42.4 |
| SINGLE | 62.7 | 37.3 |  | 62.9 | 37.1 |  | 62.8 | 37.2 |
| WIDOWED | 61.3 | 38.7 |  | 59.3 | 40.7 |  | 60.3 | 39.7 |
| SEPARATED OR DIVORCED | 62.1 | 37.9 |  | 60.3 | 39.7 |  | 61.2 | 38.8 |
| TOTAL | 59.4 | 40.6 |  | 58.5 | 41.5 |  | 58.9 | 41.1 |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

| TABLE 6B: NON-PROXY RESPONDENTS BY MARITAL STATUS * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| MARRIED | 2783 | 1887 | 362 | 5032 | 2764 | 1937 | 425 | 5126 |
| SINGLE | 853 | 523 | 106 | 1482 | 870 | 483 | 166 | 1519 |
| WIDOWED | 426 | 261 | 125 | 812 | 374 | 257 | 137 | 768 |
| SEPARATED OR DIVORCED | 481 | 283 | 65 | 829 | 460 | 298 | 70 | 828 |
| TOTAL | 4543 | 2954 | 658 | 8155 | 4468 | 2975 | 798 | 8241 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| MARRIED | 55.3 | 37.5 | 7.2 |  | 53.9 | 37.8 | 8.3 |  |
| SINGLE | 57.6 | 35.3 | 7.2 |  | 57.3 | 31.8 | 10.9 |  |
| WIDOWED | 52.5 | 32.1 | 15.4 |  | 48.7 | 33.5 | 17.8 |  |
| SEPARATED OR DIVORCED | 58.0 | 34.1 | 7.8 |  | 55.6 | 36.0 | 8.5 |  |
| TOTAL | 55.7 | 36.2 | 8.1 |  | 54.2 | 36.1 | 9.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
|  | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| MARRIED | 59.6 |  | 40.4 |  | 58.8 |  | 41.2 |  |
| SINGLE | 62.0 |  | 38.0 |  | 64.3 |  | 35.7 |  |
| WIDOWED | 62.0 |  | 38.0 |  | 59.3 |  | 40.7 |  |
| SEPARATED OR DIVORCED | 63.0 |  | 37.0 |  | 60.7 |  | 39.3 |  |
| TOTAL | 60.6 |  | 39.4 |  | 60.0 |  | 40.0 |  |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

| TABLE 6C: PROXY RESPONDENTS BY MARITAL STATUS * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| MARRIED | 1747 | 1364 | 955 | 4066 | 1751 | 1427 | 1011 | 4189 |
| SINGLE | 482 | 270 | 433 | 1185 | 452 | 292 | 466 | 1210 |
| WIDOWED | 10 | 9 | 11 | 30 | 18 | 8 | 22 | 48 |
| SEPARATED OR DIVORCED | 35 | 33 | 44 | 112 | 31 | 24 | 53 | 108 |
| TOTAL | 2274 | 1676 | 1443 | 5393 | 2252 | 1751 | 1552 | 5555 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| MARRIED | 43.0 | 33.5 | 23.5 |  | 41.8 | 34.1 | 24.1 |  |
| SINGLE | 40.7 | 22.8 | 36.5 |  | 37.4 | 24.1 | 38.5 |  |
| WIDOWED | 33.3 | 30.0 | 36.7 |  | 37.5 | 16.7 | 45.8 |  |
| SEPARATED OR DIVORCED | 31.3 | 29.5 | 39.3 |  | 28.7 | 22.2 | 49.1 |  |
| TOTAL | 42.2 | 31.1 | 26.8 |  | 40.5 | 31.5 | 27.9 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
|  | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| MARRIED | 56.2 |  | 43.8 |  | 55.1 |  | 44.9 |  |
| SINGLE | 64.1 |  | 35.9 |  | 60.8 |  | 39.2 |  |
| WIDOWED | 52.6 |  | 47.4 |  | 69.2 |  | 30.8 |  |
| SEPARATED OR DIVORCED | 51.5 |  | 48.5 |  | 56.4 |  | 43.6 |  |
| TOTAL | 57.6 |  | 42.4 |  | 56.3 |  | 43.7 |  |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

$$
\text { - } 30 \text { - }
$$

| TABLE 7A: ALL RESPONDENTS TO INCOME QUESTION BY RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| HEAD | 3935 | 2769 | 1302 | 8006 | 3911 | 2808 | 1397 | 8116 |
| SPOUSE | 2655 | 1848 | 666 | 5169 | 2589 | 1883 | 748 | 5220 |
| SON OR DAUGHTER | 632 | 317 | 381 | 1330 | 594 | 338 | 401 | 1333 |
| OTHER | 77 | 62 | 50 | 189 | 76 | 57 | 86 | 219 |
| TOTAL | 7299 | 4996 | 2399 | 14694 | 7170 | 5086 | 2632 | 14888 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| HEAD | 49.2 | 34.6 | 16.3 |  | 48.2 | 34.6 | 17.2 |  |
| SPOUSE | 51.4 | 35.8 | 12.9 |  | 49.6 | 36.1 | 14.3 |  |
| SON OR DAUGHTER | 47.5 | 23.8 | 28.6 |  | 44.6 | 25.4 | 30.1 |  |
| OTHER | 40.7 | 32.8 | 26.5 |  | 34.7 | 26.0 | 39.3 |  |
| TOTAL | 49.7 | 34.0 | 16.3 |  | 48.2 | 34.2 | 17.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  | TOTAL (\%) |  |
| RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD | YES | NO |  | YES | NO |  | YES | NO |
| HEAD | 58.7 | 41.3 |  | 58.2 | 41.8 |  | 58.5 | 41.5 |
| SPOUSE | 59.0 | 41.0 |  | 57.9 | 42.1 |  | 58.4 | 41.6 |
| SON OR DAUGHTER | 66.6 | 33.4 |  | 63.7 | 36.3 |  | 65.2 | 34.8 |
| OTHER | 55.4 | 44.6 |  | 57.1 | 42.9 |  | 56.3 | 43.8 |
| TOTAL | 59.4 | 40.6 |  | 58.5 | 41.5 |  | 58.9 | 41.1 |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

| TABLE 7B: NON-PROXY RESPONDENTS BY RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| HEAD | 2491 | 1603 | 388 | 4482 | 2460 | 1645 | 478 | 4583 |
| SPOUSE | 1802 | 1228 | 232 | 3262 | 1750 | 1211 | 259 | 3220 |
| SON OR DAUGHTER | 223 | 102 | 36 | 361 | 231 | 99 | 51 | 381 |
| OTHER | 27 | 21 | 2 | 50 | 27 | 20 | 10 | 57 |
| TOTAL | 4543 | 2954 | 658 | 8155 | 4468 | 2975 | 798 | 8241 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| HEAD | 55.6 | 35.8 | 8.7 |  | 53.7 | 35.9 | 10.4 |  |
| SPOUSE | 55.2 | 37.6 | 7.1 |  | 54.3 | 37.6 | 8.0 |  |
| SON OR DAUGHTER | 61.8 | 28.3 | 10.0 |  | 60.6 | 26.0 | 13.4 |  |
| OTHER | 54.0 | 42.0 | 4.0 |  | 47.4 | 35.1 | 17.5 |  |
| TOTAL | 55.7 | 36.2 | 8.1 |  | 54.2 | 36.1 | 9.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| HEAD | 60.8 |  | 39.2 |  | 59.9 |  | 40.1 |  |
| SPOUSE | 59.5 |  | 40.5 |  | 59.1 |  | 40.9 |  |
| SON OR DAUGHTER | 68.6 |  | 31.4 |  | 70.0 |  | 30.0 |  |
| OTHER | 56.3 |  | 43.8 |  | 57.4 |  | 42.6 |  |
| TOTAL | 60.6 |  | 39.4 |  | 60.0 |  | 40.0 |  |

[^0]| TABLE 7C: PROXY RESPONDENTS BY RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| HEAD | 1159 | 950 | 745 | 2854 | 1180 | 946 | 758 | 2884 |
| SPOUSE | 681 | 487 | 334 | 1502 | 675 | 542 | 402 | 1619 |
| SON OR DAUGHTER | 406 | 213 | 339 | 958 | 362 | 238 | 346 | 946 |
| OTHER | 28 | 26 | 25 | 79 | 35 | 25 | 46 | 106 |
| TOTAL | 2274 | 1676 | 1443 | 5393 | 2252 | 1751 | 1552 | 5555 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| HEAD | 40.6 | 33.3 | 26.1 |  | 40.9 | 32.8 | 26.3 |  |
| SPOUSE | 45.3 | 32.4 | 22.2 |  | 41.7 | 33.5 | 24.8 |  |
| SON OR DAUGHTER | 42.4 | 22.2 | 35.4 |  | 38.3 | 25.2 | 36.6 |  |
| OTHER | 35.4 | 32.9 | 31.6 |  | 33.0 | 23.6 | 43.4 |  |
| TOTAL | 42.2 | 31.1 | 26.8 |  | 40.5 | 31.5 | 27.9 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| HEAD | 55.0 |  | 45.0 |  | 55.5 |  | 44.5 |  |
| SPOUSE | 58.3 |  | 41.7 |  | 55.5 |  | 44.5 |  |
| SON OR DAUGHTER | 65.6 |  | 34.4 |  | 60.3 |  | 39.7 |  |
| OTHER | 51.9 |  | 48.1 |  | 58.3 |  | 41.7 |  |
| TOTAL | 57.6 |  | 42.4 |  | 56.3 |  | 43.7 |  |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

| TABLE 8A: ALL RESPONDENTS TO INCOME QUESTION BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| HOUSEHOLD SIZE | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| 1 | 1049 | 661 | 258 | 1968 | 993 | 634 | 302 | 1929 |
| 2 | 2509 | 1879 | 890 | 5278 | 2443 | 2020 | 1012 | 5475 |
| 3 | 1373 | 921 | 495 | 2789 | 1371 | 931 | 511 | 2813 |
| 4 | 1494 | 993 | 445 | 2932 | 1475 | 975 | 481 | 2931 |
| 5 OR MORE | 874 | 542 | 311 | 1727 | 888 | 526 | 326 | 1740 |
| TOTAL | 7299 | 4996 | 2399 | 14694 | 7170 | 5086 | 2632 | 14888 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| HOUSEHOLD SIZE | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| 1 | 53.3 | 33.6 | 13.1 |  | 51.5 | 32.9 | 15.7 |  |
| 2 | 47.5 | 35.6 | 16.9 |  | 44.6 | 36.9 | 18.5 |  |
| 3 | 49.2 | 33.0 | 17.7 |  | 48.7 | 33.1 | 18.2 |  |
| 4 | 51.0 | 33.9 | 15.2 |  | 50.3 | 33.3 | 16.4 |  |
| 5 OR MORE | 50.6 | 31.4 | 18.0 |  | 51.0 | 30.2 | 18.7 |  |
| TOTAL | 49.7 | 34.0 | 16.3 |  | 48.2 | 34.2 | 17.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  | TOTAL (\%) |  |
| HOUSEHOLD SIZE | YES | NO |  | YES | NO |  | YES | NO |
| 1 | 61.3 | 38.7 |  | 61.0 | 39.0 |  | 61.2 | 38.8 |
| 2 | 57.2 | 42.8 |  | 54.7 | 45.3 |  | 55.9 | 44.1 |
| 3 | 59.9 | 40.1 |  | 59.6 | 40.4 |  | 59.7 | 40.3 |
| 4 | 60.1 | 39.9 |  | 60.2 | 39.8 |  | 60.1 | 39.9 |
| 5 OR MORE | 61.7 | 38.3 |  | 62.8 | 37.2 |  | 62.3 | 37.7 |
| TOTAL | 59.4 | 40.6 |  | 58.5 | 41.5 |  | 58.9 | 41.1 |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

| TABLE 8B: NON-PROXY RESPONDENTS BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| HOUSEHOLD SIZE | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| 1 | 1049 | 660 | 231 | 1940 | 990 | 634 | 275 | 1899 |
| 2 | 1292 | 915 | 183 | 2390 | 1282 | 1009 | 243 | 2534 |
| 3 | 813 | 523 | 98 | 1434 | 839 | 520 | 114 | 1473 |
| 4 | 883 | 547 | 90 | 1520 | 857 | 521 | 100 | 1478 |
| 5 OR MORE | 506 | 309 | 56 | 871 | 500 | 291 | 66 | 857 |
| TOTAL | 4543 | 2954 | 658 | 8155 | 4468 | 2975 | 798 | 8241 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| HOUSEHOLD SIZE | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| 1 | 54.1 | 34.0 | 11.9 |  | 52.1 | 33.4 | 14.5 |  |
| 2 | 54.1 | 38.3 | 7.7 |  | 50.6 | 39.8 | 9.6 |  |
| 3 | 56.7 | 36.5 | 6.8 |  | 57.0 | 35.3 | 7.7 |  |
| 4 | 58.1 | 36.0 | 5.9 |  | 58.0 | 35.3 | 6.8 |  |
| 5 OR MORE | 58.1 | 35.5 | 6.4 |  | 58.3 | 34.0 | 7.7 |  |
| TOTAL | 55.7 | 36.2 | 8.1 |  | 54.2 | 36.1 | 9.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| HOUSEHOLD SIZE | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| 1 | 61.4 |  | 38.6 |  | 61.0 |  | 39.0 |  |
| 2 | 58.5 |  | 41.5 |  | 56.0 |  | 44.0 |  |
| 3 | 60.9 |  | 39.1 |  | 61.7 |  | 38.3 |  |
| 4 | 61.7 |  | 38.3 |  | 62.2 |  | 37.8 |  |
| 5 OR MORE | 62.1 |  | 37.9 |  | 63.2 |  | 36.8 |  |
| TOTAL | 60.6 |  | 39.4 |  | 60.0 |  | 40.0 |  |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

| TABLE 8C: PROXY RESPONDENTS BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| HOUSEHOLD SIZE | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 28 | 3 | 0 | 27 | 30 |
| 2 | 806 | 640 | 472 | 1918 | 781 | 689 | 547 | 2017 |
| 3 | 517 | 374 | 367 | 1258 | 493 | 388 | 370 | 1251 |
| 4 | 598 | 439 | 339 | 1376 | 599 | 441 | 364 | 1404 |
| 5 OR MORE | 353 | 222 | 238 | 813 | 376 | 233 | 244 | 853 |
| TOTAL | 2274 | 1676 | 1443 | 5393 | 2252 | 1751 | 1552 | 5555 |
|  |  | ROTA | 3 (\%) |  |  | ROTA | 4 (\%) |  |
| HOUSEHOLD SIZE | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| 1 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 96.4 |  | 10.0 | 0.0 | 90.0 |  |
| 2 | 42.0 | 33.4 | 24.6 |  | 38.7 | 34.2 | 27.1 |  |
| 3 | 41.1 | 29.7 | 29.2 |  | 39.4 | 31.0 | 29.6 |  |
| 4 | 43.5 | 31.9 | 24.6 |  | 42.7 | 31.4 | 25.9 |  |
| 5 OR MORE | 43.4 | 27.3 | 29.3 |  | 44.1 | 27.3 | 28.6 |  |
| TOTAL | 42.2 | 31.1 | 26.8 |  | 40.5 | 31.5 | 27.9 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| HOUSEHOLD SIZE | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| 1 | 0.0 |  | 100.0 |  | 100.0 |  | 0.0 |  |
| 2 | 55.7 |  | 44.3 |  | 53.1 |  | 46.9 |  |
| 3 | 58.0 |  | 42.0 |  | 56.0 |  | 44.0 |  |
| 4 | 57.7 |  | 42.3 |  | 57.6 |  | 42.4 |  |
| 5 OR MORE | 61.4 |  | 38.6 |  | 61.7 |  | 38.3 |  |
| TOTAL | 57.6 |  | 42.4 |  | 56.3 |  | 43.7 |  |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

$$
\text { - } 36 \text { - }
$$

|  | E 9A: ALL RESPONDENTS TO INCOME QUESTION BY EDUCATION * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| EDUCATION | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| 0-8 YEARS | 1084 | 683 | 536 | 2303 | 1016 | 676 | 588 | 2280 |
| SOME SECONDARY | 1618 | 1043 | 618 | 3279 | 1578 | 1068 | 627 | 3273 |
| HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED | 1505 | 1074 | 411 | 2990 | 1473 | 1113 | 489 | 3075 |
| SOME POST-SECONDARY | 571 | 380 | 173 | 1124 | 535 | 361 | 200 | 1096 |
| PS CERTIFICATE OR DIPLOMA | 1762 | 1319 | 477 | 3558 | 1798 | 1337 | 510 | 3645 |
| UNIVERSITY DEGREE | 759 | 497 | 184 | 1440 | 770 | 531 | 218 | 1519 |
| TOTAL | 7299 | 4996 | 2399 | 14694 | 7170 | 5086 | 2632 | 14888 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| EDUCATION | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| 0-8 YEARS | 47.1 | 29.7 | 23.3 |  | 44.6 | 29.6 | 25.8 |  |
| SOME SECONDARY | 49.3 | 31.8 | 18.8 |  | 48.2 | 32.6 | 19.2 |  |
| HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED | 50.3 | 35.9 | 13.7 |  | 47.9 | 36.2 | 15.9 |  |
| SOME POST-SECONDARY | 50.8 | 33.8 | 15.4 |  | 48.8 | 32.9 | 18.2 |  |
| PS CERTIFICATE OR DIPLOMA | 49.5 | 37.1 | 13.4 |  | 49.3 | 36.7 | 14.0 |  |
| UNIVERSITY DEGREE | 52.7 | 34.5 | 12.8 |  | 50.7 | 35.0 | 14.4 |  |
| TOTAL | 49.7 | 34.0 | 16.3 |  | 48.2 | 34.2 | 17.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  | TOTAL (\%) |  |
| EDUCATION | YES | NO |  | YES | NO |  | YES | NO |
| 0-8 YEARS | 61.3 | 38.7 |  | 60.0 | 40.0 |  | 60.7 | 39.3 |
| SOME SECONDARY | 60.8 | 39.2 |  | 59.6 | 40.4 |  | 60.2 | 39.8 |
| HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED | 58.4 | 41.6 |  | 57.0 | 43.0 |  | 57.7 | 42.3 |
| SOME POST-SECONDARY | 60.0 | 40.0 |  | 59.7 | 40.3 |  | 59.9 | 40.1 |
| PS CERTIFICATE OR DIPLOMA | 57.2 | 42.8 |  | 57.4 | 42.6 |  | 57.3 | 42.7 |
| UNIVERSITY DEGREE | 60.4 | 39.6 |  | 59.2 | 40.8 |  | 59.8 | 40.2 |
| TOTAL | 59.4 | 40.6 |  | 58.5 | 41.5 |  | 58.9 | 41.1 |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

## - 37 -

| TABLE 9B: NON-PROXY RESPONDENTS BY EDUCATION* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| EDUCATION | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| 0-8 YEARS | 586 | 363 | 160 | 1109 | 588 | 342 | 211 | 1141 |
| SOME SECONDARY | 956 | 583 | 183 | 1722 | 938 | 603 | 178 | 1719 |
| HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED | 954 | 653 | 108 | 1715 | 935 | 666 | 141 | 1742 |
| SOME POST-SECONDARY | 390 | 221 | 43 | 654 | 348 | 216 | 55 | 619 |
| PS CERTIFICATE OR DIPLOMA | 1167 | 817 | 125 | 2109 | 1166 | 823 | 145 | 2134 |
| UNIVERSITY DEGREE | 490 | 317 | 39 | 846 | 493 | 325 | 68 | 886 |
| TOTAL | 4543 | 2954 | 658 | 8155 | 4468 | 2975 | 798 | 8241 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| EDUCATION | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| 0-8 YEARS | 52.8 | 32.7 | 14.4 |  | 51.5 | 30.0 | 18.5 |  |
| SOME SECONDARY | 55.5 | 33.9 | 10.6 |  | 54.6 | 35.1 | 10.4 |  |
| HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED | 55.6 | 38.1 | 6.3 |  | 53.7 | 38.2 | 8.1 |  |
| SOME POST-SECONDARY | 59.6 | 33.8 | 6.6 |  | 56.2 | 34.9 | 8.9 |  |
| PS CERTIFICATE OR DIPLOMA | 55.3 | 38.7 | 5.9 |  | 54.6 | 38.6 | 6.8 |  |
| UNIVERSITY DEGREE | 57.9 | 37.5 | 4.6 |  | 55.6 | 36.7 | 7.7 |  |
| TOTAL | 55.7 | 36.2 | 8.1 |  | 54.2 | 36.1 | 9.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| EDUCATION | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| 0-8 YEARS | 61.7 |  | 38.3 |  | 63.2 |  | 36.8 |  |
| SOME SECONDARY | 62.1 |  | 37.9 |  | 60.9 |  | 39.1 |  |
| HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED | 59.4 |  | 40.6 |  | 58.4 |  | 41.6 |  |
| SOME POST-SECONDARY | 63.8 |  | 36.2 |  | 61.7 |  | 38.3 |  |
| PS CERTIFICATE OR DIPLOMA | 58.8 |  | 41.2 |  | 58.6 |  | 41.4 |  |
| UNIVERSITY DEGREE | 60.7 |  | 39.3 |  | 60.3 |  | 39.7 |  |
| TOTAL | 60.6 |  | 39.4 |  | 60.0 |  | 40.0 |  |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

|  | TABLE 9C: PROXY RESPONDENTS BY EDUCATION * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROTATION 3 |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 |  |  |  |
| EDUCATION | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| 0-8 YEARS | 293 | 188 | 221 | 702 | 253 | 202 | 241 | 696 |
| SOME SECONDARY | 547 | 364 | 387 | 1298 | 537 | 383 | 401 | 1321 |
| HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED | 484 | 386 | 269 | 1139 | 482 | 396 | 312 | 1190 |
| SOME POST-SECONDARY | 164 | 141 | 118 | 423 | 174 | 131 | 131 | 436 |
| PS CERTIFICATE OR DIPLOMA | 536 | 434 | 312 | 1282 | 560 | 454 | 328 | 1342 |
| UNIVERSITY DEGREE | 250 | 163 | 136 | 549 | 246 | 185 | 139 | 570 |
| TOTAL | 2274 | 1676 | 1443 | 5393 | 2252 | 1751 | 1552 | 5555 |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| EDUCATION | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  | YES | NO | NON-RESP |  |
| 0-8 YEARS | 41.7 | 26.8 | 31.5 |  | 36.4 | 29.0 | 34.6 |  |
| SOME SECONDARY | 42.1 | 28.0 | 29.8 |  | 40.7 | 29.0 | 30.4 |  |
| HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED | 42.5 | 33.9 | 23.6 |  | 40.5 | 33.3 | 26.2 |  |
| SOME POST-SECONDARY | 38.8 | 33.3 | 27.9 |  | 39.9 | 30.0 | 30.0 |  |
| PS CERTIFICATE OR DIPLOMA | 41.8 | 33.9 | 24.3 |  | 41.7 | 33.8 | 24.4 |  |
| UNIVERSITY DEGREE | 45.5 | 29.7 | 24.8 |  | 43.2 | 32.5 | 24.4 |  |
| TOTAL | 42.2 | 31.1 | 26.8 |  | 40.5 | 31.5 | 27.9 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROTATION 3 (\%) |  |  |  | ROTATION 4 (\%) |  |  |  |
| EDUCATION | YES |  | NO |  | YES |  | NO |  |
| 0-8 YEARS | 60.9 |  | 39.1 |  | 55.6 |  | 44.4 |  |
| SOME SECONDARY | 60.0 |  | 40.0 |  | 58.4 |  | 41.6 |  |
| HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED | 55.6 |  | 44.4 |  | 54.9 |  | 45.1 |  |
| SOME POST-SECONDARY | 53.8 |  | 46.2 |  | 57.0 |  | 43.0 |  |
| PS CERTIFICATE OR DIPLOMA | 55.3 |  | 44.7 |  | 55.2 |  | 44.8 |  |
| UNIVERSITY DEGREE | 60.5 |  | 39.5 |  | 57.1 |  | 42.9 |  |
| TOTAL | 57.6 |  | 42.4 |  | 56.3 |  | 43.7 |  |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

| TABLE 10A: MATCHING SCF RESPONDENTS BY INCOME GROUP * |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL RESPONDENTS |  |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| NO INCOME | 485 | 331 | 201 | 1017 |
| < 20,000 | 2928 | 1592 | 850 | 5370 |
| \$20,000-\$39,999 | 1618 | 1100 | 388 | 3106 |
| \$40,000-\$59,999 | 688 | 453 | 143 | 1284 |
| \$60,000 + | 216 | 165 | 65 | 446 |
| TOTAL | 5935 | 3641 | 1647 | 11223 |
|  | YES (\%) | NO (\%) | NON-RESP |  |
| NO INCOME | 47.7 | 32.5 | 19.8 |  |
| < 20,000 | 54.5 | 29.6 | 15.8 |  |
| \$20,000-\$39,999 | 52.1 | 35.4 | 12.5 |  |
| \$40,000-\$59,999 | 53.6 | 35.3 | 11.1 |  |
| \$60,000 + | 48.4 | 37.0 | 14.6 |  |
| TOTAL | 52.9 | 32.4 | 14.7 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |
|  | YES (\%) |  | NO (\%) |  |
| NO INCOME | 59.4 |  | 40.6 |  |
| < \$20,000 | 64.8 |  | 35.2 |  |
| \$20,000-\$39,999 | 59.5 |  | 40.5 |  |
| \$40,000-\$59,999 | 60.3 |  | 39.7 |  |
| \$60,000 + | 56.7 |  | 43.3 |  |
| TOTAL | 62.0 |  | 38.0 |  |

[^1]$$
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| TABLE 10B: MATCHING SCF RESPONDENTS BY INCOME GROUP * |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NON-PROXY RESPONDENTS |  |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| NO INCOME | 323 | 234 | 63 | 620 |
| < $\$ 20,000$ | 1874 | 993 | 269 | 3136 |
| \$20,000 - \$39,999 | 989 | 621 | 86 | 1696 |
| \$40,000-\$59,999 | 379 | 235 | 24 | 638 |
| \$60,000 + | 113 | 77 | 9 | 199 |
| TOTAL | 3678 | 2160 | 451 | 6289 |
|  | YES (\%) | NO (\%) | NON-RESP (\%) |  |
| NO INCOME | 52.1 | 37.7 | 10.2 |  |
| < \$20,000 | 59.8 | 31.7 | 8.6 |  |
| \$20,000-\$39,999 | 58.3 | 36.6 | 5.1 |  |
| \$40,000-\$59,999 | 59.4 | 36.8 | 3.8 |  |
| \$60,000 + | 56.8 | 38.7 | 4.5 |  |
| TOTAL | 58.5 | 34.3 | 7.2 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |
|  | YES (\%) |  | NO (\%) |  |
| NO INCOME | 58.0 |  | 42.0 |  |
| < \$20,000 | 65.4 |  | 34.6 |  |
| \$20,000-\$39,999 | 61.4 |  | 38.6 |  |
| \$40,000-\$59,999 | 61.7 |  | 38.3 |  |
| \$60,000 + | 59.5 |  | 40.5 |  |
| TOTAL | 63.0 |  | 37.0 |  |

[^2]| TABLE 10C: MATCHING SCF RESPONDENTS BY INCOME GROUP* |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PROXY-RESPONDENTS |  |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| NO INCOME | 162 | 97 | 136 | 395 |
| < \$20,000 | 743 | 427 | 426 | 1596 |
| \$20,000 - \$39,999 | 568 | 424 | 275 | 1267 |
| \$40,000 - \$59,999 | 296 | 199 | 108 | 603 |
| \$60,000 + | 98 | 84 | 54 | 236 |
| TOTAL | 1867 | 1231 | 999 | 4097 |
|  | YES (\%) | NO (\%) | NON-RESP (\%) |  |
| NO INCOME | 41.0 | 24.6 | 34.4 |  |
| < \$20,000 | 46.6 | 26.8 | 26.7 |  |
| \$20,000 - \$39,999 | 44.8 | 33.5 | 21.7 |  |
| \$40,000-\$59,999 | 49.1 | 33.0 | 17.9 |  |
| \$60,000 + | 41.5 | 35.6 | 22.9 |  |
| TOTAL | 45.6 | 30.0 | 24.4 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |
|  | YES (\%) |  | NO (\%) |  |
| NO INCOME | 62.5 |  | 37.5 |  |
| < \$20,000 | 63.5 |  | 36.5 |  |
| \$20,000 - \$39,999 | 57.3 |  | 42.7 |  |
| \$40,000-\$59,999 | 59.8 |  | 40.2 |  |
| \$60,000 + | 53.8 |  | 46.2 |  |
| TOTAL | 60.3 |  | 39.7 |  |

[^3]| TABLE 11A: RESPONDENTS TO INCOME QUESTIONNAIRE WITH INCOME |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| BY INCOME RESPONSE GROUP * |  |  |  |  |  |  |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

| TABLE 11B: RESPONDENTS TO INCOME QUESTIONNAIRE WITH INCOME BY INCOME RESPONSE GROUP * |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NON-PROXY RESPONDENTS |  |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NON-RESP | TOTAL |
| NO INCOME | 323 | 234 | 63 | 620 |
| INCOME SUPPLIED | 3355 | 1926 | 388 | 5669 |
| INCOME IMPUTED | 414 | 516 | 132 | 1062 |
| TOTAL | 4092 | 2676 | 583 | 7351 |
|  | YES (\%) | NO (\%) | NON-RESP (\%) |  |
| NO INCOME | 52.1 | 37.7 | 10.2 |  |
| INCOME SUPPLIED | 59.2 | 34.0 | 6.8 |  |
| INCOME IMPUTED | 39.0 | 48.6 | 12.4 |  |
| TOTAL | 55.7 | 36.4 | 7.9 |  |
| PROPORTION EXCLUDING NON-RESPONSE |  |  |  |  |
|  | YES (\%) |  | NO (\%) |  |
| NO INCOME | 58.0 |  | 42.0 |  |
| INCOME SUPPLIED | 63.5 |  | 36.5 |  |
| INCOME IMPUTED | 44.5 |  | 55.5 |  |
| TOTAL | 60.5 |  | 39.5 |  |

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

| TABLE 11C: RESPONDENTS TO INCOME QUESTIONNAIRE WITH INCOME |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| BY INCOME RESPONSE GROUP * |

* UNWEIGHTED COUNTS
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## 1. OVERVIEW

$<$ The Household Surveys Division of Statistics Canada is considering the idea of collecting income information using tax records instead of asking respondents about their income. This method should help reduce respondent burden and improve data quality.
< To do this, we would ask the respondent's permission to access their Revenue Canada income tax file. The results of this test will tell us how many people would give their permission.
$<$ The question will be asked during the August LFS in rotation groups 3 and 4. Group 3 did the Survey of Consumer Finances, which asks income questions. Group 4, the control group, did not. The reason for selecting these two groups is to find the degree of willingness for an alternate collection method between a group that went through the lengthy process of answering sensitive income questions and a group that did not.
< The non-proxy question applies to the Labour Force Survey respondent and one other randomly selected respondent 15 years of age or over. This includes members of the Armed Forces and persons over 69 years of age.
$<$ The question must be asked after all the Forms 05 have been completed for the household.

## 2. SUPPLIES

You will need the following supplies for this test:
$\AA$ this Interviewer's Guide;
$\AA$ the Forms 03 for rotation groups 3 and 4; and
$\AA$ the Question Card/Respondent Selection Table.

## 3. THE INCOME QUESTION

< The Income Question is printed on the Question Card and must be asked exactly as worded. If you use an alternative wording, the respondent's answer may be biased and the results of the survey would not be accurate.

We would like your opinion about a new way of getting some of the information that Statistics Canada collects. We are looking for ways to reduce cost, as well as your time and effort.

Statistics Canada now gets income information by asking up to 25 questions on wages, pensions and other kinds of income. The income tax return has much of the same information.

If you were in a Statistics Canada income survey, would you give us permission to get your information directly from Revenue Canada?
$<$ The respondent is expected to answer "Yes" or "No".
< If the respondent says that the question does not apply because he or she does not file an income tax return, ask the respondent to answer the question hypothetically. You would ask, for example:

6 "If you did file an income tax return, would you give us permission to get your information directly from Revenue Canada?"

## 4. COMMON QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

< Some respondents may ask questions in order to formulate an opinion. These are common questions and answers that may be asked.

## "Will I have to participate in an income survey?"'

Õ Not at this time. But, like everyone else living in Canada, there is a possibility that you could be selected in the future.

## "How would you go about getting my income tax records?"'

Õ Your name, address and date of birth would be used to locate your your income tax information. This would be kept strictly confidential just like the data we collect in all surveys.

## 'I live in Quebec. Does that mean you would be getting my income information from the Quebec income tax people as well?'"

Õ No. Initially we would look at whether this approach is possible using only Revenue Canada information.

## 'I don't want to answer your question!"

Õ Your answer would help us determine if another method can be used to collect income information. This method would reduce the amount of time, money and effort it would take to collect sensitive income information, while at the same time provide good quality information for statistical purposes.
"The media recently reported that Statistics Canada already has Revenue Canada tax information. If this is true, why do you need my permission?''

Õ It is true that Statistics Canada has access to Revenue Canada tax information but currently we do not link it with survey data to produce statistics for the public. In the future, we want to change our methods to reduce cost, time and effort. Today, we are only interested in your opinion. Would you allow Statistics Canada to link your tax information to your survey data?

## 5. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Ask the LFS respondent the Income Question after you have completed the Forms 05 for the household. For the purpose of the Income Question, the LFS respondent is the last person who provided the Form 05 information.
2. If applicable, ask one other household respondent the Income Question:

Õ If there is only one other person aged 15 or over:
6 Ask to speak to this person.
Õ If there are two or more other persons aged 15 or over:
6 Use the Respondent Selection Table to randomly select the second respondent. This person is called the "selected person".
$<$ You must ask the selected person the question. Proxy responses are not permitted.
$<$ You are allowed one call-back to reach the selected person.
< If you cannot call back on the same day (or prior to shipping the LFS forms to the Regional Office), enter the non-response code. The LFS survey deadlines have priority.
3. Enter the appropriate response code in Column 50-C of the Form 03, on the same line as the person's Page/Line number. The "Yes" and "No" response codes are pre-printed in the header for Column 50. Due to limited space, the non-response code is not pre-printed.
< Enter a YES response as: Code 7 in column 50-C.
$<$ Enter a NO response as: Code 8 in column 50-C.
< Enter a DON'T KNOW response as: Code 9 in column 50-C.
< For a NON-RESPONSE, enter: Code 9 in column 50-C.

## INCOME QUESTION: Supplement to the August LFS

## 5. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS . . .

$<$ Non-response is an acceptable status if:
6 the selected person cannot be reached with one call-back,
6 either the LFS respondent or the selected person refuses to answer the question,
6 you cannot conduct a non-proxy interview with the selected person.

Note that a non-response is preferable to a proxy response.
< In households comprised of one or two household members 15 years of age or over (approximately $80 \%$ of all households), the procedures for asking the Income Question will be straightforward.
< In households containing three or more persons aged 15 years or over (approximately $20 \%$ of all households), you must randomly select the second respondent by using the Respondent Selection Table provided. Refer to the following section for the respondent selection procedures.
4. In unusual situations, enter notes in Item 48 of the Form 03. Do not retain the notes.
5. Return the Question Card/Respondent Selection Table to the Regional Office with your last shipment of LFS documents.

## 6. RESPONDENT SELECTION PROCEDURES

## For households with more than two members 15+

## Step 1:

6 Determine the total number of household members 15 years of age or over by referring to Items 33 and 40 of the Form 03.

6 Enter a sequential number for each person 15+ (from top to bottom) in the left-hand margin. This makes it easier to administer the respondent selection procedures.

6 Note that this step can be taken before Survey Week. However, should there be a change in household composition, be sure to update the sequence numbers if the change involved a person 15 years of age or over.

## Step 2:

6 Refer to the first row of the Respondent Selection Table "If number of persons 15+ in the household is ... " and select the column that corresponds to the total number of eligible persons counted in Step 1.

## Step 3:

6 Go down this column to the first available number in the "Select respondent number 9" section. The random number in this box represents the sequence number of the selected person.

## Step 4:

6 Verify that the sequence number for the selected person is not the sequence number of the LFS respondent (i.e., the respondent who has already answered the Income Question).
$<$ If the sequence number is not that of the LFS respondent, draw a line through the random number and ask to speak to the person. This random number is now marked used.
< If the sequence number is that of the LFS respondent, draw a line through the number and pick the next sequence number below it. This random number is now marked used.

## Step 5:

6 Continue Steps 1 to 4 for the next household with more than two household members aged 15 years or over.

## EXAMPLE OF A COMPLETED INTERVIEW

## Follow the example by referring to the completed F03 and the Respondent Selection Table on the next pages.

< According to the Form 03, Household Record Docket, five people live in this household. Janet McTierney was the LFS respondent.
< In Column 50, Janet's line number "2" was circled, indicating she was a respondent for the Income Question.
< Janet was asked the income question. The response code was entered in column 50-C. (In this example the response was Code 7, Yes.)
$<$ Janet was informed that there would be a pause while the second respondent was being selected.

At Step 1: $\quad$ There was a total of three persons aged 15 or over.
6 Andrew McTierney (age 24), sequence number = 1
6 Janet McTierney (age 23), sequence number $=2$
6 Margaret Moorehead (age 19), sequence number $=3$
(The Interviewer did this step prior to the interview.)

At Step 2: The first column of the Respondent Selection Table entitled, "Three 3" corresponded to the number of persons $15+$ in the household.

At Step 3: The second respondent was selected.
$<$ The first random number was " 2 ". This random number was crossed off.


RESPONDENT SELECTION TABLE
For the Income Question
August 1993 LFS

TABLEDE SÉLECTIONDES RÉPONDANTS
Pour la question sur le revenu EPA d'août 1993

| If the number of persons 15+ in the household is ... | Three <br> Trois <br> 3 | Four Quatre 4 | Five <br> Cinq <br> 5 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Six } \\ \text { Six } \\ \mathbf{6} \end{gathered}$ | Seven Sept 7 | Eight or more Huit ou plus 8+ | Si le nombre de membres de 15 ans ou plus du ménage est ... |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Select sequence number 9 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4 | Choisissez le numéro de séquence 9 |
|  | 3 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 5 |  |
|  | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 6 |  |
|  | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 7 |  |
|  | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 |  |
|  | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 2 |  |
|  | 3 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 3 |  |
|  | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 4 |  |
|  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 |  |
|  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 6 |  |
|  | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 7 |  |
|  | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 8 |  |
|  | 3 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 1 |  |
|  | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 |  |

Table Heading: "If the number of persons 15+ in the household is ... "'
<corresponds to the total number of persons aged 15 years or over, including members of the Armed Forces and persons over 69 years of age.

Table Heading: "Select sequence number 9"
<Moving down the columns, these 15 rows of random numbers represent the sequence number of the selected person, as recorded on the Form 03.
<If the sequence number is that of the LFS respondent, pick the next sequence number in the table.

If all random numbers in the column have been used, begin again at the top of the same column. Cross off each "used" random number in a different way to mark the last number selected in this second pass through the column.

Rubrique de la table: *Si le nombre de membres de 15 ans ou plus du ménage est ... +
< Correspond au nombre total de personnes de 15 ans ou plus, y compris les membres des forces armées et les personnes de plus de soixante-neuf ans.

Rubrique de la table: *Choisissez le numéro de séquence 9+ $<$ Du haut vers le bas, ces quinze rangées de numéros aléatoires représentent le numéro de séquence de la personne sélectionnée, tel qu'indiqué sur la formule 03.
$<$ Si le numéro est celui du répondant de l'EPA, choisissez le suivant.

Si vous avez utilisé tous les numéros aléatoires de la colonne, revenez au haut de la colonne et biffez d'une façon différente chaque numéro *utilisé $\boldsymbol{\leftarrow}$ afin d'indiquer le dernier choisi au deuxième tour.

## INCOME QUESTION: Supplement to the August LFS

## Example of a Completed Interview . . .

At Step 4: The Interviewer verified the eligibility of the selected person.
$<\quad$ The " 2 " was the sequence number for Janet McTierney. As she was the LFS respondent and has already answered the Income Question, another respondent had to be selected.
$<$ On the Respondent Selection Table, again from the column entitled "Three 3", the next random number was a " 3 ". This random number was crossed off.
< The "3" was the sequence number for Margaret Moorehead.
$<$ In Column 50 of Form 03, Margaret's line number (5) was circled, to indicate that she was a respondent for the Income Question.
$<$ The Interviewer asked to speak to Margaret. Janet informed the Interviewer that Margaret was not at home. The Interviewer arranged to call-back.
$<$ The Interviewer contacted Margaret later that day and asked her the Income Question. Margaret's response was coded in column 50-C. (In this example, the response was Code 8, No.)

## INCOME QUESTION: Supplement to the August LFS

## OTHER EXAMPLES

A. In the McTierney household, Janet refused to answer the question, complaining of response burden. Margaret Moorehead was not at home at the time of the call-back.

Result: 2 Non-responses
Action: Code 9 was entered in Column 50-C for each of these persons.


## B. A husband and wife with two young children.

Action: Each spouse would be asked the income question.
The Respondent Selection Table would not be used.
C. A single parent with three children under the age of $\mathbf{1 5}$.

Action: Only one respondent would be asked the income question. The Respondent Selection Table would not be used.

## INCOME QUESTION FOR THE AUGUST 1993 LFS

We would like your opinion about a new way of getting some of the information that Statistics Canada collects. We are looking for ways to reduce cost, as well as your time and effort.

Statistics Canada now gets income information by asking up to 25 questions on wages, pensions and other kinds of income. The income tax return has much of the same information.

If you were in a Statistics Canada income survey, would you give us permission to get your information directly from Revenue Canada?

RESPONSE CODES: $\quad$ YES = 7 NO = 8 NON-RESPONSE $=9$

## QUESTION SUR LE REVENU : SUPPLÉMENT DE L'EPA D'AOÛT 1993

Nous voulons votre opinion concernant une nouvelle façon d'obtenir de l'information que Statistique Canada recueille présentement au moyen d'enquêtes. Nous cherchons une façon de réduire les coûts ainsi que le temps et l'effort que vous devez mettre pour répondre à nos enquêtes.

Statistique Canada obtient actuellement les données sur le revenu en posant jusqu'à 25 questions sur les salaires, les pensions et d'autres genres de revenu. La plupart des données figurent dans la déclaration d'impôt sur le revenu.

Si vous deviez participer à une enquête de Statistique Canada sur le revenu, accepteriez-vous qu'on obtienne vos données directement de Revenu Canada?

CODES DE RÉPONSE: OUI = 7 NON $=8$ NON-RÉPONSE $=9$

RESPONDENT SELECTION TABLE
For the Income Question
August 1993 LFS

TABLE DE SÉLECTION DES RÉPONDANTS
Pour la question sur le revenu
EPA d'août 1993

| If the number of persons 15+ in the household is ... | Three Trois 3 | Four Quatre 4 | Five <br> Cinq 5 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Six } \\ \text { Six } \\ \mathbf{6} \end{gathered}$ | Seven Sept 7 | Eight or more Huit ou plus 8+ | Si le nombre de membres de 15 ans ou plus du ménage est ... |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Select sequence number 9 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4 | Choisissez le numéro de séquence 9 |
|  | 3 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 5 |  |
|  | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 6 |  |
|  | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 7 |  |
|  | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 |  |
|  | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 2 |  |
|  | 3 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 3 |  |
|  | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 4 |  |
|  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 |  |
|  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 6 |  |
|  | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 7 |  |
|  | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 8 |  |
|  | 3 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 1 |  |
|  | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 |  |

Table Heading: "If the number of persons 15+ in the household is ... "'
<corresponds to the total number of persons aged 15 years or over, including members of the Armed Forces and persons over 69 years of age.

Table Heading: "Select sequence number 9"'
<Moving down the columns, these 15 rows of random numbers represent the sequence number of the selected person, as recorded on the Form 03.
<If the sequence number is that of the LFS respondent, pick the next sequence number in the table.

If all random numbers in the column have been used, begin again at the top of the same column. Cross off each 'used" random number in a different way to mark the last number selected in this second pass through the column.

Rubrique de la table: *Si le nombre de membres de 15 ans ou plus du ménage est ... +
< Correspond au nombre total de personnes de 15 ans ou plus, y compris les membres des forces armées et les personnes de plus de soixante-neuf ans.

Rubrique de la table: *Choisissez le numéro de séquence 9+ $<$ Du haut vers le bas, ces quinze rangées de numéros aléatoires représentent le numéro de séquence de la personne sélectionnée, tel qu'indiqué sur la formule 03.
$<$ Si le numéro est celui du répondant de l'EPA, choisissez le suivant.

Si vous avez utilisé tous les numéros aléatoires de la colonne, revenez au haut de la colonne et biffez d'une façon différente chaque numéro *utilisé $\ddagger$ afin d'indiquer le dernier choisi au deuxième tour.


[^0]:    UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

[^1]:    * UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

[^2]:    * UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

[^3]:    * UNWEIGHTED COUNTS

