Canada

Angus Reid Institute

Disability in Canada, 2016 [General Population Sample]

Study Documentation

May 1, 2019

Metadata Production

Metadata Producer(s)	Data Services , Queen's University Library
Production Date	May 15, 2017
Identification	ari-disability-E-2016-genpopsample

Table of Contents

Disability in Canada, 2016 [General Population Sample]

Overview

Type	Angus Reid Institute
Identification	ari-disability-E-2016-genpopsample

Abstract
Conducted in partnership with the Rick Hansen Foundation (http://www.rickhansen.com/), this survey examines awareness, perceptions, and attitudes regarding disability and accessibility in Canada.
Angus Reid Institute (http://angusreid.org/) is a national, not-for-profit, non-partisan public opinion research organization.

Unit of Analysis	Individual

Scope & Coverage

Keywords	Accessibility, Barriers, Blind, Disability, Discrimination, Hearing, Mobility, Physical disability, Visual impairment
Time Period(s)	2016
Countries	Canada

Universe
Individuals 18 years and older who are members of the Angus Reid Forum panel.

Producers & Sponsors

Primary Investigator(s)	Angus Reid Institute
Other Producer(s)	Angus Reid Institute
Other Acknowledgment(s)	

Sampling

Sampling Procedure
1330 Canadians adults were randomly selected from Angus Reid Forum panel members. This total was then augmented with an additional 206 Canadians who are Angus Reid Forum members and self-identify as having a physical disability or mobility challenge. This yielded a total of 493 respondents with physical disabilities or mobility challenges.
For comparison purposes only, a probability sample of 1,330 would carry a margin of error of +/- 2.7 percentage points, and a probability sample of 493 would carry a margin of +/- 4.4 percentage points, 19 times out of 20. Discrepancies in or between totals are due to rounding.

Data Collection

Data Collection Dates	start 2016-10-31 end 2016-11-07

Data Collection Notes
Angus Reid Institute conducts its online research through the Angus Reid Forum.

Accessibility	
Access Authority	Data Services (Queen's University Library) , http://library.queensu.ca/search/data-statistics , academic.services@queensu.ca
Contact(s)	Data Services (Queen's University Library) , http://library.queensu.ca/search/data-statistics , academic.services@queensu.ca
Distributor(s)	Data Services
Depositor(s)	

Citation Requirements

The publishing of analysis and results from research using this data is permitted in research communications such as scholarly papers, journals and the like. The author(s) of these communications are required to cite the author as the source of the data and to indicate that the results or views expressed are those of the author/authorized user.

Rights & Disclaimer	
Disclaimer	
The original collector of the data bears no responsibility for use of this collection or for interpretation or inference upon such use.	
Copyright	Angus Reid Institute

Files Description

Dataset contains 1 file(s)

AccessibilityDisability2016-GenPopSample-Public	
# Cases	1330
# Variable(s)	120

Variables Group(s)

Dataset contains 11 group(s)

Group Demographic

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	arf_Gender	ARF - Gender	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
2	arf_Age_Rollup_f	ARF - Age (7 groups)	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
3	ARF_Education_I	ARF - Education [derived variable]	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
4	arf_HH_Income	ARF - HH Income	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
5	arf_HHKids	ARF - Household Kids	discrete	numeric-1.0	1319	11	-
6	arf_Working_Stat	ARF - Working Status	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
7	arf_Home_Lang	ARF - Home language	discrete	numeric-1.0	1318	12	-
8	arf_HH_SIZE_DV	ARF - Household size [derived variable]	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
9	arf_Home_Owner	ARF - Home Ownership	discrete	numeric-1.0	1312	18	-
10	arf_Marital_Status	ARF - Marital Status [derived variable]	discrete	numeric-1.0	1285	45	-
11	Age	ARF - Age (3 groups)	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
12	Age_fine	ARF - Age (6 groups)	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
13	age_gender	ARF - AGE/Gender	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
14	edu	ARF - Education	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
15	income	ARF - Income	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-

Group Geographic

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	arf_Region_Rollu	ARF - Region Rollup	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
2	arf_Urban_Rural	ARF - Urban/Rural	discrete	character-1	1330	0	-
3	arf_First_DV	ARF - First letter of FSA [derived variable]	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	-
4	region	ARF - Region (Manitoba/ Saskatchewan grouped; Atlantic provinces grouped)	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
5	region7	ARF - Region (Atlantic provinces grouped)	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-

Group Race

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	arf_Race_British	ARF - British Isles (e.g., English, Irish, Scottish)	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
2	arf_Race_French	ARF - French	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
3	arf_Race_OtherEu	ARF - Other European (e.g., German, Russian, Italian, Norwegian)	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
4	arf_Race_Aborigi	ARF - Aboriginal (e.g., Inuit, Metis, North American Indian)	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
5	arf_Race_OtherN.	ARF - Other North American (e.g., Canadian, American, Newfoundlander, Quebecois)	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
6	arf_Race_Asian	ARF - South Asian (e.g., East Indian, Pakistani, Goan, Sri Lankan)	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
7	arf_Race_Chinese	ARF - Chinese	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
8	arf_Race_Othersp	ARF - Race - Other (includes Caribbean, Latin, Central, South America, African, Arab/West Asian, Other East and Southeast Asian, Oceania)	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-
9	arf_Mosaic_identi	ARF - Mosaic Identity - Born in Canada	discrete	numeric-1.0	581	749	-
10	Race	ARF - Race	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	-

Group Survey Quesitons

Subgroup(s)	Built Environment , Personal experiences , Perceptions of accessibility , Socio-demographic and other information , Overall barriers , Attitudes

Group Weight

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	wtsex	ARF - Weight - Sex	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	-
2	Wtage	ARF - Weight - Age	continuous	numeric-2.0	1330	0	-
3	Wtedu	ARF - Weight - Education	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	-
4	wgt	ARF - Weight	continuous	numeric-17.15	1330	0	-

Group Built Environment

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	Q1_0	New Building: Energy efficient	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Suppose a new public building (such as a library, school, community centre, etc.) were being built in your community. How important would it be to you, personally, that this new building be… Energy efficient
2	Q1_1	New Building: Made of environmentally sustainable materials	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Suppose a new public building (such as a library, school, community centre, etc.) were being built in your community. How important would it be to you, personally, that this new building be… Made of environmentally sustainable materials
3	Q1_2	New Building: Accessible to people with physical disabilities	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Suppose a new public building (such as a library, school, community centre, etc.) were being built in your community. How important would it be to you, personally, that this new building

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							be… \ Accessible to people with physical disabilities
4	Q1_3	New Building: Affordable to the taxpayer	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Suppose a new public building (such as a library, school, community centre, etc.) were being built in your community. How important would it be to you, personally, that this new building be… \ Affordable to the taxpayer
5	Q1_4	New Building: Family-friendly	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Suppose a new public building (such as a library, school, community centre, etc.) were being built in your community. How important would it be to you, personally, that this new building be… \ Family-friendly (i.e. change-tables in washrooms, parking for people with children, etc.)
6	Q1_5	New Building: Trans-inclusive	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Suppose a new public building (such as a library, school, community centre, etc.) were being built in your community. How important would it be to you, personally, that this new building be… \ Trans-inclusive (i.e. gender-neutral washrooms)
7	Q1_6	New Building: Architecturally interesting and attractive	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Suppose a new public building (such as a library, school, community centre, etc.) were being built in your community. How important would it be to you, personally, that this new building be… \ Architecturally interesting and attractive
8	Q2_0	New building - most important: Energy efficient	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	And, which two from this list do you consider most important for new public buildings?\ Energy efficient
9	Q2_1	New building - most important: Made of environmentally sustainable materials	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	And, which two from this list do you consider most important for new public buildings?\ Made of environmentally sustainable materials
10	Q2_2	New building - most important: Accessible to people with physical disabilities	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	And, which two from this list do you consider most important for new public buildings?\ Accessible to people with physical disabilities
11	Q2_3	New building - most important: Affordable to the taxpayer	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	And, which two from this list do you consider most important for new public buildings?\ Affordable to the taxpayer
12	Q2_4	New building - most important: Family-friendly	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	And, which two from this list do you consider most important for new public buildings?\ Family-friendly (i.e. change-tables in washrooms, parking for people with children, etc.)
13	Q2_5	New building - most important: Trans-inclusive	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	And, which two from this list do you consider most important for new public buildings?\ Trans-inclusive (i.e. gender-neutral washrooms)
14	Q2_6	New building - most important: Architecturally interesting and attractive	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	And, which two from this list do you consider most important for new public buildings?\ Architecturally interesting and attractive

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
15	Q3	Familiar with LEED	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	How familiar would you say you are with the LEED program? Would you say you:
16	Q4	View on LEED program	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q4 question details

Group Personal experiences

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	Q5	Have physical disability	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Do you have what you consider to be a "physical disability"? Let's include here any significant mobility problems, whether experienced from birth or related to aging or injury, hearing or visual impairment, or anything else like this.
2	Q6	Family or friend has physical disability	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	And, do any of your family or close friends have a physical disability?
3	Q7	Impact of physical disability	discrete	numeric-1.0	292	1038	Thinking about your own physical challenges or disability, what kind of an impact would you say this has on your own life and day-to-day activities? Would you say it has:
4	Q8_0	Challenge: Difficulty walking	discrete	numeric-1.0	292	1038	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Difficulty walking
5	Q8_1	Challenge: Require a walker/ cane/scooter	discrete	numeric-1.0	292	1038	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Require a walker/cane/scooter
6	Q8_2	Challenge: Require a wheelchair	discrete	numeric-1.0	292	1038	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Require a wheelchair
7	Q8_3	Challenge: Difficulty hearing /hard of hearing	discrete	numeric-1.0	292	1038	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Difficulty hearing/hard of hearing
8	Q8_4	Challenge: Deaf	discrete	numeric-1.0	292	1038	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Deaf
9	Q8_5	Challenge: Visually impaired	discrete	numeric-1.0	292	1038	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Visually impaired
10	Q8_6	Challenge: Blind	discrete	numeric-1.0	292	1038	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Blind
11	Q8_7	Challenge: Arthritis	discrete	numeric-1.0	292	1038	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Arthritis
12	Q8_8	Challenge: Chronic pain or illness	discrete	numeric-1.0	292	1038	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Chronic pain or illness
13	Q8_9	Challenge: Other	discrete	numeric-1.0	292	1038	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Other (please specify)
14	Q8_10	Challenge: Other [text] [Full text available in Codebook]	discrete	character-255	46	-	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Other (please specify) [text]

Group Perceptions of accessibility

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	Q10_0	Accessibility - current situation: Attend special events	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	Q10_0 question details
2	Q10_1	Accessibility - current situation: Getting into public buildings	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	Q10_1 question details
3	Q10_2	Accessibility - current situation: Getting into private businesses	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	Q10_2 question details
4	Q10_3	Accessibility - current situation: Using public washroom facilities	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	Q10_3 question details
5	Q10_4	Accessibility - current situation: Getting to and from different places in town	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	Q10_4 question details
6	Q10_5	Accessibility - current situation: Opportunities for sport/recreation	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	Q10_5 question details
7	Q10_6	Accessibility - current situation: Access to schools and other education facilities	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	Q10_6 question details

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
8	Q10_7	Accessibility - current situation: Your own community's overall accessibility	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	Q10_7 question details
9	Q11_0	Accessibility - should be: Being able to attend special events	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	Q11_0 question details
10	Q11_1	Accessibility - should be: Getting into public buildings such as hospitals and libraries	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	Q11_1 question details
11	Q11_2	Accessibility - should be: Getting into restaurants, shops and other private businesses	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	Q11_2 question details
12	Q11_3	Accessibility - should be: Using public washroom facilities	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	Q11_3 question details
13	Q11_4	Accessibility - should be: Getting to and from different places in town	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	Q11_4 question details
14	Q11_5	Accessibility - should be: Opportunities for sport/ recreation	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	Q11_5 question details
15	Q11_6	Accessibility - should be: Access to schools and other education facilities	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	Q11_6 question details
16	Q11_7	Accessibility - should be: Your own community's overall accessibility	discrete	numeric-2.0	1330	0	Q11_7 question details
17	Q12_0	Reason for gap: Too expensive	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q12_0 question details
18	Q12_1	Reason for gap: Older buildings/hard to renovate	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q12_1 question details
19	Q12_2	Reason for gap: Not enough demand/need for accessibility	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q12_2 question details
20	Q12_3	Reason for gap: Not a priority in Canada	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q12_3 question details
21	Q12_4	Reason for gap: Governments don't enforce	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q12_4 question details
22	Q12_5	Reason for gap: Builders don't make it a priority	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q12_5 question details
23	Q12_6	Reason for gap: Accessibility not fully understood	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q12_6 question details
24	Q12_7	Reason for gap: Other (Please specify)	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q12_7 question details
25	Q12_8	Reason for gap: Q12_8_other [Full text available in Codebook]	discrete	character-255	21	-	Q12_8 question details
26	Q13	Level of accessibility that should exist	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Thinking of public spaces in general in Canada today - such as these ones we've been considering, what is your overall view about the level of accessibility that should exist for people with physical disabilities? Would you say the goal should be:

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
27	Q14	Places difficult for person with disability	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	In the last six months, have you noticed any places in your local community that you thought would be particularly difficult for a person with a mobility challenge or other physical disability to navigate?

Group Socio-demographic and other information

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	Q24	Made decision about who to hire	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Have you ever been responsible - either alone or as part of a group - for making a decision about who to hire for a job?

Group Overall barriers

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	Q9_0	Improvement to barriers: Accessibility of public places	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q9_0 question details
2	Q9_1	Improvement to barriers: Equal access to health care	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q9_1 question details
3	Q9_2	Improvement to barriers: Educational opportunities	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Below is a list of different barriers that people with physical disabilities might face. In your opinion, to what extent is there room for improvement regarding each of the following different possible barriers facing people with physical disabilities in Canada today? Educational opportunities
4	Q9_3	Improvement to barriers: Employment opportunities	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Below is a list of different barriers that people with physical disabilities might face. In your opinion, to what extent is there room for improvement regarding each of the following different possible barriers facing people with physical disabilities in Canada today? Employment opportunities
5	Q9_4	Improvement to barriers: Housing	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Below is a list of different barriers that people with physical disabilities might face. In your opinion, to what extent is there room for improvement regarding each of the following different possible barriers facing people with physical disabilities in Canada today? Housing
6	Q9_5	Improvement to barriers: Transportation	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Below is a list of different barriers that people with physical disabilities might face. In your opinion, to what extent is there room for improvement regarding each of the following different possible barriers facing people with physical disabilities in Canada today? Transportation
7	Q9_6	Improvement to barriers: Discrimination	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q9_6 question details
8	Q9_7	Improvement to barriers: Lack of understanding of the needs	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q9_7 question details

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
9	Q9_8	Improvement to barriers: Lack of understanding/belief in potential	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q9_8 question details

Group Attitudes

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	Q15_0	Issues - agree/disagree: Accessibility is a basic human right, not a privilege	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately. Accessibility for people with physical disabilities is a basic human right, not a privilege
2	Q15_1	Issues - agree/disagree: Making places accessible and barrier-free is a nice idea, but not worth the cost	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q15_1 question details
3	Q15_2	Issues - agree/disagree: Canada should be a world leader in ensuring universal access to public places	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately. Canada should be a world leader in ensuring universal access to public places
4	Q15_3	Issues - agree/disagree: Should be a high priority to ensure everyone can fully participate	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q15_3 question details
5	Q15_4	Issues - agree/disagree: Understandable employers feel it is risky to hire people with physical disabilities	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately. It's understandable that employers feel it is risky to hire people with physical disabilities
6	Q15_5	Issues - agree/disagree: Waste not to recognize and promote the potential of people with physical disabilities	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately. It's a waste not to recognize and promote the potential of people with physical disabilities
7	Q15_6	Issues - agree/disagree: Never notice disabled people using the disabled washroom or ramps etc	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately. I never notice any disabled people actually using the disabled washroom or ramps, etc.
8	Q15_7	Issues - agree/disagree: There is a lot of prejudice towards people with physical disabilities	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately.

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							\<br /\> There is a lot of prejudice towards people with physical disabilities
9	Q15_8	Issues - agree/disagree: Don't think about it	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately. \<br /\> I rarely think about people with physical disabilities in my day-to-day life
10	Q15_9	Issues - agree/disagree: Feel well informed	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately. \<br /\> I feel well-informed about the challenges people with physical disabilities face
11	Q16_0	Risky to hire: Expensive to make workplace accessible	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q16_0 question details
12	Q16_1	Risky to hire: Many employers have no experience working with them	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q16_1 question details
13	Q16_2	Risky to hire: Employee may take more sick days	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q16_2 question details
14	Q16_3	Risky to hire: Employee may not fit in	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q16_3 question details
15	Q16_4	Risky to hire: Some tasks may be too difficult	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q16_4 question details
16	Q16_5	Risky to hire: Employee may work slower	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q16_5 question details
17	Q16_6	Risky to hire: Other (Please specify)	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Q16_6 question details
18	Q16_7	Risky to hire: Other [text] [Full text available in Codebook]	discrete	character-142	36	-	Q16_7 question details
19	Q17	Deal more with business that hires people with physical disability	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	0	Some companies make it a priority to recruit and hire people with physical disabilities. Suppose you knew of such a business near you. Would this have any impact on your dealings with that business?

Variables Description

Dataset contains 120 variable(s)

File : AccessibilityDisability2016-GenPopSample-Public

arf_Gender: ARF - Gender

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Male	696	649.8	48.9%
2	Female	634	680.2	51.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_Age_Rollup_fine: ARF - Age (7 groups)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-7] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Under 18	0	0.0	
2	18 to 24	135	157.3	11.8%
3	25 to 34	258	227.8	17.1%
4	35 to 44	159	219.3	16.5%
5	45 to 54	296	244.7	18.4%
6	55 to 64	220	220.2	16.6%
7	65+	262	260.8	19.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

ARF_Education_Level_DV: ARF - Education [derived variable]

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-8] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Elementary/grade school/some high school	92	87.8	6.6%
2	High school graduate	445	471.9	35.5%
3	Some college / technical school	126	130.1	9.8%
4	Completed college / technical school	274	290.6	21.8%
5	Some university	85	79.9	6.0%
6	University undergraduate degree	183	165.9	12.5%
7	Some post-graduate school	34	27.8	2.1%
8	Post-graduate degree	91	76.0	5.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_HH_Income: ARF - HH Income

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-8] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Less than $25,000	145	149.6	11.2%
2	$25,000 to less than $35,000	124	117.9	8.9%
3	$35,000 to less than $50,000	198	200.9	15.1%
4	$50,000 to less than $75,000	234	238.1	17.9%
5	$75,000 to less than $100,000	158	150.8	11.3%
6	$100,000 to less than $125,000	108	107.4	8.1%
7	$125,000 or more	138	131.5	9.9%

File : AccessibilityDisability2016-GenPopSample-Public

arf_HH_Income: ARF - HH Income

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
8	Don't know/prefer not to say	225	233.8		17.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_Race_British: ARF - British Isles (e.g., English, Irish, Scottish)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	820	825.7		62.1%
1	Selected	510	504.3		37.9%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_Race_French: ARF - French

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	1128	1128.9		84.9%
1	Selected	202	201.1	15.1%	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_Race_OtherEur: ARF - Other European (e.g., German, Russian, Italian, Norwegian)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	983	984.2		74.0%
1	Selected	347	345.8	26.0%	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_Race_Aboriginal: ARF - Aboriginal (e.g., Inuit, Metis, North American Indian)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	1264	1261.9		94.9%
1	Selected	66	68.1	5.1%	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_Race_OtherNA: ARF - Other North American (e.g., Canadian, American, Newfoundlander, Quebecois)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	699	689.4		51.8%
1	Selected	631	640.6		48.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_Race_Asian: ARF - South Asian (e.g., East Indian, Pakistani, Goan, Sri Lankan)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]

File : AccessibilityDisability2016-GenPopSample-Public

arf_Race_Asian: ARF - South Asian (e.g., East Indian, Pakistani, Goan, Sri Lankan)

Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	**Label**	**Cases**	**Weighted**	**Percentage (Weighted)**
0	Not Selected	1303	1303.2	98.0%
1	Selected	27	26.8	2.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_Race_Chinese: ARF - Chinese

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	**Label**	**Cases**	**Weighted**	**Percentage (Weighted)**
0	Not Selected	1297	1293.9	97.3%
1	Selected	33	36.1	2.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_Race_Otherspecify_DV: ARF - Race - Other (includes Caribbean, Latin, Central, South America, African, Arab/West Asian, Other East and Southeast Asian, Oceania)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	**Label**	**Cases**	**Weighted**	**Percentage (Weighted)**
0	Not Selected	1201	1202.4	90.4%
1	Selected	129	127.6	9.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_Region_Rollup: ARF - Region Rollup

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-8] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	**Label**	**Cases**	**Weighted**	**Percentage (Weighted)**
1	BC	162	172.9	13.0%
2	Alberta	107	143.1	10.8%
3	SK	83	41.5	3.1%
4	MB	85	47.1	3.5%
5	ON	463	497.9	37.4%
6	QC	321	327.0	24.6%
7	Atlantic	109	100.5	7.6%
8	Territories	0	0.0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_HHKids: ARF - Household Kids

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1319 / 1320.452] [Invalid=11 / 9.548]

Value	**Label**	**Cases**	**Weighted**	**Percentage (Weighted)**
1	Yes	334	348.1	26.4%
2	No	985	972.4	73.6%
Sysmiss		11	9.5	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : AccessibilityDisability2016-GenPopSample-Public

arf_Working_Status: ARF - Working Status

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-8] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Employed / self-employed full-time (30 or more hours per wee	574	552.8	41.6%
2	Employed / self-employed part-time (fewer than 30 hours per	140	150.6	11.3%
3	Full-time student	93	102.8	7.7%
4	Homemaker	59	62.7	4.7%
5	Retired	323	322.8	24.3%
6	Currently looking for work	53	54.3	4.1%
7	Not working for medical reasons	71	68.9	5.2%
8	Other	17	15.0	1.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_Home_Lang: ARF - Home language

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1318 / 1316.157] [Invalid=12 / 13.843]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	English	1006	998.9	75.9%
2	French	271	273.7	20.8%
3	Other	41	43.6	3.3%
Sysmiss		12	13.8	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_HH_SIZE_DV: ARF - Household size [derived variable]

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1 person in household	272	265.7	20.0%
2	2 people in household	582	563.3	42.4%
3	3 people in household	205	208.7	15.7%
4	4 people in household	173	185.4	13.9%
5	5 or more people in household	98	106.9	8.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_Home_Ownership: ARF - Home Ownership

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1312 / 1310.517] [Invalid=18 / 19.483]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Own	862	848.3	64.7%
2	Rent	385	392.9	30.0%
3	Other	65	69.4	5.3%
Sysmiss		18	19.5	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : AccessibilityDisability2016-GenPopSample-Public

arf_Urban_Rural: ARF - Urban/Rural

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Urban	1095	1100.1	82.7%
2	Rural	235	229.9	17.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_First_DV: ARF - First letter of FSA [derived variable]

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-15] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	A, B, C, E - Atlantic Provinces	109	100.5	7.6%
2	G - Eastern Quebec	101	107.6	8.1%
3	H - Metropolitan Montréal	90	88.4	6.6%
4	J - Western Quebec	130	131.0	9.8%
5	K - Eastern Ontario	90	92.3	6.9%
6	L - Central Ontario	160	175.7	13.2%
7	M - Metropolitan Toronto	93	101.6	7.6%
8	N - Southwestern Ontario	87	93.6	7.0%
9	P - Northern Ontario	33	34.8	2.6%
10	R - Manitoba	85	47.1	3.5%
11	S - Saskatchewan	83	41.5	3.1%
12	T - Alberta	107	143.1	10.8%
13	V - British Columbia	162	172.9	13.0%
14	X - Northwest Territories and Nunavut	0	0.0	
15	Y - Yukon	0	0.0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_Marital_Status_DV: ARF - Marital Status [derived variable]

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1285 / 1286.827] [Invalid=45 / 43.173]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Single, never married	387	398.6	31.0%
2	Common law/Civil partnership	170	168.1	13.1%
3	Married	487	478.7	37.2%
4	Separated	116	117.1	9.1%
5	Divorced	76	77.1	6.0%
6	Widowed	49	47.3	3.7%
Sysmiss		45	43.2	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

arf_Mosaic_identity_Born_in_CA: ARF - Mosaic Identity - Born in Canada

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=581 / 577.032] [Invalid=749 / 752.968]

File : AccessibilityDisability2016-GenPopSample-Public

arf_Mosaic_identity_Born_in_CA: ARF - Mosaic Identity - Born in Canada

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	Yes	511	509.1		88.2%
2	No	70	67.9	11.8%	
Sysmiss		749	753.0		

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q1_0: New Building: Energy efficient

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	Let's begin with a few questions about architecture and design.
Literal question	Suppose a new public building (such as a library, school, community centre, etc.) were being built in your community. How important would it be to you, personally, that this new building be… Energy efficient

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	Not important at all	22	22.1	1.7%	
2	Not that important	73	79.9	6.0%	
3	Moderately important	451	465.0	35.0%	
4	Very important	784	762.9		57.4%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q1_1: New Building: Made of environmentally sustainable materials

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	Let's begin with a few questions about architecture and design.
Literal question	Suppose a new public building (such as a library, school, community centre, etc.) were being built in your community. How important would it be to you, personally, that this new building be… Made of environmentally sustainable materials

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	Not important at all	41	37.7	2.8%	
2	Not that important	194	187.0	14.1%	
3	Moderately important	613	619.5		46.6%
4	Very important	482	485.8	36.5%	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q1_2: New Building: Accessible to people with physical disabilities

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	Let's begin with a few questions about architecture and design.
Literal question	Suppose a new public building (such as a library, school, community centre, etc.) were being built in your community. How important would it be to you, personally, that this new building be… Accessible to people with physical disabilities

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	Not important at all	17	17.9	1.3%	
2	Not that important	52	48.6	3.7%	
3	Moderately important	359	364.0	27.4%	
4	Very important	902	899.5		67.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : AccessibilityDisability2016-GenPopSample-Public

Q1_3: New Building: Affordable to the taxpayer

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	Let's begin with a few questions about architecture and design.
Literal question	Suppose a new public building (such as a library, school, community centre, etc.) were being built in your community. How important would it be to you, personally, that this new building be… Affordable to the taxpayer

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Not important at all	12	13.2	1.0%
2	Not that important	57	54.1	4.1%
3	Moderately important	355	357.9	26.9%
4	Very important	906	904.9	68.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q1_4: New Building: Family-friendly

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	Let's begin with a few questions about architecture and design.
Literal question	Suppose a new public building (such as a library, school, community centre, etc.) were being built in your community. How important would it be to you, personally, that this new building be… Family-friendly (i.e. change-tables in washrooms, parking for people with children, etc.)

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Not important at all	59	59.7	4.5%
2	Not that important	146	137.7	10.4%
3	Moderately important	561	562.0	42.3%
4	Very important	564	570.6	42.9%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q1_5: New Building: Trans-inclusive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	Let's begin with a few questions about architecture and design.
Literal question	Suppose a new public building (such as a library, school, community centre, etc.) were being built in your community. How important would it be to you, personally, that this new building be… Trans-inclusive (i.e. gender-neutral washrooms)

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Not important at all	349	337.7	25.4%
2	Not that important	323	324.9	24.4%
3	Moderately important	392	402.6	30.3%
4	Very important	266	264.8	19.9%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q1_6: New Building: Architecturally interesting and attractive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	Let's begin with a few questions about architecture and design.
Literal question	Suppose a new public building (such as a library, school, community centre, etc.) were being built in your community. How important would it be to you, personally, that this new building be… Architecturally interesting and attractive

File : AccessibilityDisability2016-GenPopSample-Public

Q1_6: New Building: Architecturally interesting and attractive

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Not important at all	58	56.7	4.3%
2	Not that important	268	266.7	20.1%
3	Moderately important	673	681.1	51.2%
4	Very important	331	325.6	24.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q2_0: New building - most important: Energy efficient

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	Let's begin with a few questions about architecture and design.
Literal question	And, which two from this list do you consider most important for new public buildings? Energy efficient

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	Not Selected	795	807.3	60.7%
1	Selected	535	522.7	39.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q2_1: New building - most important: Made of environmentally sustainable materials

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	Let's begin with a few questions about architecture and design.
Literal question	And, which two from this list do you consider most important for new public buildings? Made of environmentally sustainable materials

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	Not Selected	1126	1124.6	84.6%
1	Selected	204	205.4	15.4%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q2_2: New building - most important: Accessible to people with physical disabilities

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	Let's begin with a few questions about architecture and design.
Literal question	And, which two from this list do you consider most important for new public buildings? Accessible to people with physical disabilities

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	Not Selected	735	724.2	54.5%
1	Selected	595	605.8	45.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q2_3: New building - most important: Affordable to the taxpayer

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	Let's begin with a few questions about architecture and design.
Literal question	And, which two from this list do you consider most important for new public buildings? Affordable to the taxpayer

File : AccessibilityDisability2016-GenPopSample-Public

Q2_3: New building - most important: Affordable to the taxpayer

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	515	521.7		39.2%
1	Selected	815	808.3		60.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q2_4: New building - most important: Family-friendly

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	Let's begin with a few questions about architecture and design.
Literal question	And, which two from this list do you consider most important for new public buildings? Family-friendly (i.e. change-tables in washrooms, parking for people with children, etc.)

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	1079	1067.2		80.2%
1	Selected	251	262.8		19.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q2_5: New building - most important: Trans-inclusive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	Let's begin with a few questions about architecture and design.
Literal question	And, which two from this list do you consider most important for new public buildings? Trans-inclusive (i.e. gender-neutral washrooms)

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	1260	1259.0		94.7%
1	Selected	70	71.0	5.3%	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q2_6: New building - most important: Architecturally interesting and attractive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	Let's begin with a few questions about architecture and design.
Literal question	And, which two from this list do you consider most important for new public buildings? Architecturally interesting and attractive

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	1140	1146.1		86.2%
1	Selected	190	183.9	13.8%	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q3: Familiar with LEED

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	Let's begin with a few questions about architecture and design. LEED is short for "Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design". It is a series of standards and practices for maximizing the energy-efficiency and environmental sustainability of buildings. Buildings that meet these high standards are awarded varying levels of "LEED Certification" (gold/silver/etc.). LEED is not a government program. Buildings that participate in it do so voluntarily. The program is designed to be an incentive for building owners to increase their use of "green" building practices.

File : AccessibilityDisability2016-GenPopSample-Public

Q3: Familiar with LEED

Literal question	How familiar would you say you are with the LEED program? Would you say you:

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Are quite familiar with LEED	67	66.9	5.0%
2	Know a little bit about it	265	252.3	19.0%
3	Have only heard the name	197	201.6	15.2%
4	Have never heard of it until now	801	809.2	60.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q4: View on LEED program

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	Let's begin with a few questions about architecture and design. LEED is short for "Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design". It is a series of standards and practices for maximizing the energy-efficiency and environmental sustainability of buildings. Buildings that meet these high standards are awarded varying levels of "LEED Certification" (gold/silver/etc.). LEED is not a government program. Buildings that participate in it do so voluntarily. The program is designed to be an incentive for building owners to increase their use of "green" building practices.
Literal question	One idea that has been suggested is to have a program similar to LEED that would rate buildings on their accessibility for people with physical disabilities. Those buildings would be awarded varying levels of certification (gold/silver/etc.) for meeting or exceeding accessibility standards. Such a program would exist in addition to current building codes related to accessibility. Participation would be voluntary. The program would be designed as an incentive for building owners to increase the accessibility of their spaces. What are your views on such a program? Would you say a "LEED for accessibility" would be:

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Definitely worthwhile	516	522.1	39.3%
2	Probably worthwhile	621	628.0	47.2%
3	Probably not worthwhile	151	139.0	10.4%
4	Definitely not worthwhile	42	41.0	3.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q5: Have physical disability

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Do you have what you consider to be a "physical disability"? Let's include here any significant mobility problems, whether experienced from birth or related to aging or injury, hearing or visual impairment, or anything else like this.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Yes, I have a physical disability	117	116.7	8.8%
2	No, I do not have a physical disability	1038	1037.8	78.0%
3	I have mobility or other physical, vision or hearing challen	175	175.5	13.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q6: Family or friend has physical disability

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	And, do any of your family or close friends have a physical disability?

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Yes, a physical disability	288	284.7	21.4%

File : AccessibilityDisability2016-GenPopSample-Public

Q6: Family or friend has physical disability

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
2	No, do not	841	840.9		63.2%
3	Mobility/physical challenges, but don't consider it a disabi	201	204.4		15.4%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q7: Impact of physical disability

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=292 / 292.179] [Invalid=1038 / 1037.821]
Universe	If 'Yes' to disability or challenge at Q5
Literal question	Thinking about your own physical challenges or disability, what kind of an impact would you say this has on your own life and day-to-day activities? Would you say it has:

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	Minimal impact - I do basically everything I want to without	86	90.3		30.9%
2	Moderate impact - I live comfortably, but some activities ar	153	146.5		50.1%
3	Major impact - many day-to-day activities are a challenge fo	53	55.4		19.0%
Sysmiss		1038	1037.8		

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q8_0: Challenge: Difficulty walking

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=292 / 292.179] [Invalid=1038 / 1037.821]
Universe	If 'Yes' at Q5
Literal question	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Difficulty walking

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	157	156.0		53.4%
1	Selected	135	136.1		46.6%
Sysmiss		1038	1037.8		

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q8_1: Challenge: Require a walker/cane/scooter

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=292 / 292.179] [Invalid=1038 / 1037.821]
Universe	If 'Yes' at Q5
Literal question	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Require a walker/cane/scooter

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	245	244.9		83.8%
1	Selected	47	47.3		16.2%
Sysmiss		1038	1037.8		

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : AccessibilityDisability2016-GenPopSample-Public

Q8_2: Challenge: Require a wheelchair

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=292 / 292.179] [Invalid=1038 / 1037.821]
Universe	If 'Yes' at Q5
Literal question	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Require a wheelchair

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	283	282.9		96.8%
1	Selected	9	9.3	3.2%	
Sysmiss		1038	1037.8		

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q8_3: Challenge: Difficulty hearing /hard of hearing

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=292 / 292.179] [Invalid=1038 / 1037.821]
Universe	If 'Yes' at Q5
Literal question	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Difficulty hearing/hard of hearing

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	219	224.9		77.0%
1	Selected	73	67.2	23.0%	
Sysmiss		1038	1037.8		

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q8_4: Challenge: Deaf

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=292 / 292.179] [Invalid=1038 / 1037.821]
Universe	If 'Yes' at Q5
Literal question	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Deaf

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	290	290.5		99.4%
1	Selected	2	1.6	0.6%	
Sysmiss		1038	1037.8		

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q8_5: Challenge: Visually impaired

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=292 / 292.179] [Invalid=1038 / 1037.821]
Universe	If 'Yes' at Q5
Literal question	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Visually impaired

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	255	254.9		87.2%
1	Selected	37	37.3	12.8%	
Sysmiss		1038	1037.8		

File : AccessibilityDisability2016-GenPopSample-Public

Q8_5: Challenge: Visually impaired

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q8_6: Challenge: Blind

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=292 / 292.179] [Invalid=1038 / 1037.821]
Universe	If 'Yes' at Q5
Literal question	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Blind

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	292	292.2		100.0%
1	Selected	0	0.0		
Sysmiss		1038	1037.8		

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q8_7: Challenge: Arthritis

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=292 / 292.179] [Invalid=1038 / 1037.821]
Universe	If 'Yes' at Q5
Literal question	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Arthritis

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	175	179.5		61.4%
1	Selected	117	112.7	38.6%	
Sysmiss		1038	1037.8		

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q8_8: Challenge: Chronic pain or illness

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=292 / 292.179] [Invalid=1038 / 1037.821]
Universe	If 'Yes' at Q5
Literal question	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Chronic pain or illness

| Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	176	175.2		60.0%
1	Selected	116	117.0	40.0%	
Sysmiss		1038	1037.8		

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q8_9: Challenge: Other

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=292 / 292.179] [Invalid=1038 / 1037.821]
Universe	If 'Yes' at Q5
Literal question	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Other (please specify)

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	Not Selected	246	247.5	84.7%
1	Selected	46	44.6	15.3%
Sysmiss		1038	1037.8	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q8_10: Challenge: Other [text] [Full text available in Codebook]

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=46 / 44.647]
Universe	If 'Yes' at Q5
Literal question	What kind of mobility or other physical, vision, or hearing challenge(s) do you have? (Please try to choose the option(s) that are closest to the type of challenge(s) you have, even if not an exact fit.) Other (please specify) [text]

| Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
ADHD		1	0.7	1.6%
Amputation de la main droite		1	0.9	2.0%
Arterial sclerosis, MVA injuries to back and neck		1	0.9	2.0%
Arthritis		1	1.1	2.4%
Copd		1	1.0	2.4%
Fibromyalgia, fatigue,		1	1.5	3.4%
Heart Condition		1	0.2	0.6%
I fell at work and injured both my right shoulder and knee. Although WCB would be happy to tell you that I'm some Looney Toon that has lost my marbles, I don't have full range of motion omy shoulder, and experience excruciating pain when doing some tasks.		1	1.0	2.3%
I need glasses		1	1.1	2.4%
Je suis tétraplégique		1	0.9	1.9%
Joint problems		1	1.5	3.3%
Les épaules cou		1	1.2	2.6%

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
# Q8_10: Challenge: Other [text] [Full text available in Codebook]				
Major heart problems		1	0.9	2.1%
Minimal hearing loss and stamina (can work outside for only 6 hours a day.		1	0.7	1.7%
My left wrist gets sore sometimes, I fall on my left arm after tripping on a snow bank early this year.		1	0.9	2.0%
Osteoporosis		1	0.9	2.1%
Paralysie cérébrale		1	1.0	2.3%
Post-Polio Syndrome		1	1.6	3.5%
Problem with building over heated		1	0.9	2.0%
Psoriatic Arthritis		1	1.0	2.2%
Scoliosis, nerve pain		1	1.1	2.4%
Stuutering		1	1.2	2.7%
Type 1 diabetic		1	1.3	2.9%
Vertigo		1	1.5	3.4%
asthma		1	0.7	1.5%
breathing		1	0.9	2.1%
c.i.d.p neuropathy		1	0.8	1.9%
chirurgie épaule.		1	1.0	2.3%
copd		2	2.2	4.9%
depression, anxiety		1	1.4	3.1%
fibromyalgie		1	0.8	1.9%
have a problem going up and down alot of stairs		1	1.1	2.4%
have had recent hip surgery and require a walker for a few months. it is temporary.		1	0.6	1.3%
heart		2	1.8	4.1%
missing limbs		1	1.0	2.3%
no voice		1	1.3	2.8%
parkinsons/ tremors		1	0.7	1.6%
pelvic pouch		1	1.5	3.3%

Q8_10: Challenge: Other [text] [Full text available in Codebook]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
physicaly		1	0.9	2.0%
respiratory		1	0.4	0.8%
rt arm paralysis		1	0.5	1.1%
sore back		1	0.9	2.0%
stroke		1	0.4	0.9%
weak wrists & trembling hands		1	0.8	1.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q9_0: Improvement to barriers: Accessibility of public places

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	We want to get people's views on the different barriers that might face people with physical disabilities. Now, when we refer to "people with physical disabilities" let's consider this broadly, and as including, for example, someone who is blind, hearing impaired, or who uses a wheelchair or has a significant mobility issue, and any other types of physical disability. By "barriers", we're referring broadly to anything that might be in the way or prevent someone's full participation in life.
Literal question	Below is a list of different barriers that people with physical disabilities might face. In your opinion, to what extent is there room for improvement regarding each of the following different possible barriers facing people with physical disabilities in Canada today? Accessibility of public places

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Very little room for improvement	55	54.7	4.1%
2	A bit of room	140	135.3	10.2%
3	Some room	441	445.3	33.5%
4	A lot of room	426	423.3	31.8%
5	Huge room for improvement	268	271.3	20.4%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q9_1: Improvement to barriers: Equal access to health care

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	We want to get people's views on the different barriers that might face people with physical disabilities. Now, when we refer to "people with physical disabilities" let's consider this broadly, and as including, for example, someone who is blind, hearing impaired, or who uses a wheelchair or has a significant mobility issue, and any other types of physical disability. By "barriers", we're referring broadly to anything that might be in the way or prevent someone's full participation in life.
Literal question	Below is a list of different barriers that people with physical disabilities might face. In your opinion, to what extent is there room for improvement regarding each of the following different possible barriers facing people with physical disabilities in Canada today? Equal access to health care

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Very little room for improvement	164	162.2	12.2%
2	A bit of room	201	194.2	14.6%
3	Some room	447	454.0	34.1%
4	A lot of room	317	306.0	23.0%
5	Huge room for improvement	201	213.6	16.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q9_2: Improvement to barriers: Educational opportunities

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	We want to get people's views on the different barriers that might face people with physical disabilities. Now, when we refer to "people with physical disabilities" let's consider this broadly, and as including, for example, someone who is blind,

Q9_2: Improvement to barriers: Educational opportunities

	hearing impaired, or who uses a wheelchair or has a significant mobility issue, and any other types of physical disability. By "barriers", we're referring broadly to anything that might be in the way or prevent someone's full participation in life.			
Literal question	Below is a list of different barriers that people with physical disabilities might face. In your opinion, to what extent is there room for improvement regarding each of the following different possible barriers facing people with physical disabilities in Canada today? Educational opportunities			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Very little room for improvement	97	98.1	7.4%
2	A bit of room	180	176.2	13.3%
3	Some room	465	457.5	34.4%
4	A lot of room	384	382.5	28.8%
5	Huge room for improvement	204	215.6	16.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q9_3: Improvement to barriers: Employment opportunities

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	We want to get people's views on the different barriers that might face people with physical disabilities. Now, when we refer to "people with physical disabilities" let's consider this broadly, and as including, for example, someone who is blind, hearing impaired, or who uses a wheelchair or has a significant mobility issue, and any other types of physical disability. By "barriers", we're referring broadly to anything that might be in the way or prevent someone's full participation in life.
Literal question	Below is a list of different barriers that people with physical disabilities might face. In your opinion, to what extent is there room for improvement regarding each of the following different possible barriers facing people with physical disabilities in Canada today? Employment opportunities

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Very little room for improvement	50	49.9	3.7%
2	A bit of room	117	116.9	8.8%
3	Some room	396	388.5	29.2%
4	A lot of room	468	469.2	35.3%
5	Huge room for improvement	299	305.5	23.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q9_4: Improvement to barriers: Housing

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	We want to get people's views on the different barriers that might face people with physical disabilities. Now, when we refer to "people with physical disabilities" let's consider this broadly, and as including, for example, someone who is blind, hearing impaired, or who uses a wheelchair or has a significant mobility issue, and any other types of physical disability. By "barriers", we're referring broadly to anything that might be in the way or prevent someone's full participation in life.
Literal question	Below is a list of different barriers that people with physical disabilities might face. In your opinion, to what extent is there room for improvement regarding each of the following different possible barriers facing people with physical disabilities in Canada today? Housing

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Very little room for improvement	53	51.5	3.9%
2	A bit of room	122	113.8	8.6%
3	Some room	416	408.5	30.7%
4	A lot of room	461	471.3	35.4%
5	Huge room for improvement	278	284.9	21.4%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q9_5: Improvement to barriers: Transportation

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]

Q9_5: Improvement to barriers: Transportation

Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	We want to get people's views on the different barriers that might face people with physical disabilities. Now, when we refer to "people with physical disabilities" let's consider this broadly, and as including, for example, someone who is blind, hearing impaired, or who uses a wheelchair or has a significant mobility issue, and any other types of physical disability. By "barriers", we're referring broadly to anything that might be in the way or prevent someone's full participation in life.
Literal question	Below is a list of different barriers that people with physical disabilities might face. In your opinion, to what extent is there room for improvement regarding each of the following different possible barriers facing people with physical disabilities in Canada today? Transportation

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Very little room for improvement	56	56.4	4.2%
2	A bit of room	122	119.0	8.9%
3	Some room	414	414.3	31.1%
4	A lot of room	453	446.4	33.6%
5	Huge room for improvement	285	294.0	22.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q9_6: Improvement to barriers: Discrimination

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	We want to get people's views on the different barriers that might face people with physical disabilities. Now, when we refer to "people with physical disabilities" let's consider this broadly, and as including, for example, someone who is blind, hearing impaired, or who uses a wheelchair or has a significant mobility issue, and any other types of physical disability. By "barriers", we're referring broadly to anything that might be in the way or prevent someone's full participation in life.
Literal question	Below is a list of different barriers that people with physical disabilities might face. In your opinion, to what extent is there room for improvement regarding each of the following different possible barriers facing people with physical disabilities in Canada today? Discrimination towards people with disabilities

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Very little room for improvement	68	67.6	5.1%
2	A bit of room	132	130.0	9.8%
3	Some room	394	390.2	29.3%
4	A lot of room	427	429.3	32.3%
5	Huge room for improvement	309	312.9	23.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q9_7: Improvement to barriers: Lack of understanding of the needs

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	We want to get people's views on the different barriers that might face people with physical disabilities. Now, when we refer to "people with physical disabilities" let's consider this broadly, and as including, for example, someone who is blind, hearing impaired, or who uses a wheelchair or has a significant mobility issue, and any other types of physical disability. By "barriers", we're referring broadly to anything that might be in the way or prevent someone's full participation in life.
Literal question	Below is a list of different barriers that people with physical disabilities might face. In your opinion, to what extent is there room for improvement regarding each of the following different possible barriers facing people with physical disabilities in Canada today? Lack of understanding of the needs of people with disabilities

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Very little room for improvement	41	37.2	2.8%
2	A bit of room	123	119.2	9.0%
3	Some room	363	370.2	27.8%
4	A lot of room	460	454.4	34.2%
5	Huge room for improvement	343	348.9	26.2%

Q9_7: Improvement to barriers: Lack of understanding of the needs

Q9_8: Improvement to barriers: Lack of understanding/belief in potential

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	We want to get people's views on the different barriers that might face people with physical disabilities. Now, when we refer to "people with physical disabilities" let's consider this broadly, and as including, for example, someone who is blind, hearing impaired, or who uses a wheelchair or has a significant mobility issue, and any other types of physical disability. By "barriers", we're referring broadly to anything that might be in the way or prevent someone's full participation in life.
Literal question	Below is a list of different barriers that people with physical disabilities might face. In your opinion, to what extent is there room for improvement regarding each of the following different possible barriers facing people with physical disabilities in Canada today? Lack of understanding/belief in the potential of people with disabilities

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Very little room for improvement	47	45.5	3.4%
2	A bit of room	120	121.5	9.1%
3	Some room	349	340.0	25.6%
4	A lot of room	476	477.5	35.9%
5	Huge room for improvement	338	345.6	26.0%

Q10_0: Accessibility - current situation: Attend special events

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Thinking about your own community where you live, for each of the following different situations, please indicate how accessible you think that situation currently is for people with physical disabilities in your community. Let's use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "Not at all accessible" and 10 means "Completely accessible to everyone regardless of physical disability". Of course, you can choose any number in between that best expresses your view. Being able to attend special events

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1 Not at all accessible	10	11.2	0.8%
2	2	27	28.4	2.1%
3	3	54	55.4	4.2%
4	4	85	88.6	6.7%
5	5	212	210.9	15.9%
6	6	241	234.1	17.6%
7	7	271	276.0	20.8%
8	8	221	219.8	16.5%
9	9	115	111.7	8.4%
10	10 Completely accessible to everyone	94	93.9	7.1%

Q10_1: Accessibility - current situation: Getting into public buildings

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Thinking about your own community where you live, for each of the following different situations, please indicate how accessible you think that situation currently is for people with physical disabilities in your community. Let's use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "Not at all accessible" and 10 means "Completely accessible to everyone regardless of physical disability". Of course, you can choose any number in between that best expresses your view. Getting into public buildings such as hospitals and libraries

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1 Not at all accessible	5	5.0	0.4%

Q10_1: Accessibility - current situation: Getting into public buildings

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	2	12	10.7	0.8%
3	3	23	23.1	1.7%
4	4	30	28.8	2.2%
5	5	125	128.4	9.7%
6	6	132	131.2	9.9%
7	7	237	235.1	17.7%
8	8	267	268.6	20.2%
9	9	234	236.1	17.7%
10	10 Completely accessible to everyone	265	263.1	19.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q10_2: Accessibility - current situation: Getting into private businesses

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Thinking about your own community where you live, for each of the following different situations, please indicate how accessible you think that situation currently is for people with physical disabilities in your community. Let's use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "Not at all accessible" and 10 means "Completely accessible to everyone regardless of physical disability". Of course, you can choose any number in between that best expresses your view. Getting into resturants, shops and other private businesses

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1 Not at all accessible	14	13.1	1.0%
2	2	47	44.8	3.4%
3	3	81	83.2	6.3%
4	4	116	116.9	8.8%
5	5	235	246.2	18.5%
6	6	220	215.4	16.2%
7	7	275	269.2	20.2%
8	8	188	182.3	13.7%
9	9	88	92.0	6.9%
10	10 Completely accessible to everyone	66	66.9	5.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q10_3: Accessibility - current situation: Using public washroom facilities

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Thinking about your own community where you live, for each of the following different situations, please indicate how accessible you think that situation currently is for people with physical disabilities in your community. Let's use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "Not at all accessible" and 10 means "Completely accessible to everyone regardless of physical disability". Of course, you can choose any number in between that best expresses your view. Using public wahroom facilities

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1 Not at all accessible	15	15.1	1.1%
2	2	34	34.5	2.6%
3	3	51	50.5	3.8%
4	4	73	69.9	5.3%
5	5	191	192.3	14.5%
6	6	201	193.6	14.6%
7	7	256	262.9	19.8%

Q10_3: Accessibility - current situation: Using public washroom facilities

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
8	8	250	249.6	18.8%
9	9	135	140.0	10.5%
10	10 Completely accessible to everyone	124	121.7	9.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q10_4: Accessibility - current situation: Getting to and from different places in town

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Thinking about your own community where you live, for each of the following different situations, please indicate how accessible you think that situation currently is for people with physical disabilities in your community. Let's use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "Not at all accessible" and 10 means "Completely accessible to everyone regardless of physical disability". Of course, you can choose any number in between that best expresses your view. Getting to and from differnet places in town

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1 Not at all accessible	17	18.2	1.4%
2	2	51	50.8	3.8%
3	3	77	74.9	5.6%
4	4	109	111.1	8.4%
5	5	238	237.8	17.9%
6	6	209	207.8	15.6%
7	7	247	245.3	18.4%
8	8	185	182.8	13.7%
9	9	106	110.5	8.3%
10	10 Completely accessible to everyone	91	90.7	6.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q10_5: Accessibility - current situation: Opportunities for sport/recreation

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Thinking about your own community where you live, for each of the following different situations, please indicate how accessible you think that situation currently is for people with physical disabilities in your community. Let's use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "Not at all accessible" and 10 means "Completely accessible to everyone regardless of physical disability". Of course, you can choose any number in between that best expresses your view. Opportunities for sport/ recreation

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1 Not at all accessible	34	32.5	2.4%
2	2	51	53.8	4.0%
3	3	94	96.3	7.2%
4	4	143	142.3	10.7%
5	5	291	291.5	21.9%
6	6	233	224.4	16.9%
7	7	190	192.4	14.5%
8	8	147	147.1	11.1%
9	9	82	84.5	6.4%
10	10 Completely accessible to everyone	65	65.2	4.9%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q10_6: Accessibility - current situation: Access to schools and other education facilities

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-10] [Missing=*]

Q10_6: Accessibility - current situation: Access to schools and other education facilities

Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Thinking about your own community where you live, for each of the following different situations, please indicate how accessible you think that situation currently is for people with physical disabilities in your community. Let's use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "Not at all accessible" and 10 means "Completely accessible to everyone regardless of physical disability". Of course, you can choose any number in between that best expresses your view. Access to schools and other education facilities

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1 Not at all accessible	5	5.1	0.4%
2	2	15	13.7	1.0%
3	3	30	33.9	2.5%
4	4	44	42.1	3.2%
5	5	169	175.0	13.2%
6	6	171	164.9	12.4%
7	7	259	260.0	19.5%
8	8	269	269.2	20.2%
9	9	182	182.5	13.7%
10	10 Completely accessible to everyone	186	183.7	13.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q10_7: Accessibility - current situation: Your own community's overall accessibility

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Thinking about your own community where you live, for each of the following different situations, please indicate how accessible you think that situation currently is for people with physical disabilities in your community. Let's use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "Not at all accessible" and 10 means "Completely accessible to everyone regardless of physical disability". Of course, you can choose any number in between that best expresses your view. Your community's overall accessibility
Interviewer's instructions	Always place last in series

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1 Not at all accessible	13	13.2	1.0%
2	2	18	19.5	1.5%
3	3	43	42.2	3.2%
4	4	55	53.4	4.0%
5	5	221	218.6	16.4%
6	6	238	231.1	17.4%
7	7	285	296.5	22.3%
8	8	229	226.7	17.0%
9	9	150	155.2	11.7%
10	10 Completely accessible to everyone	78	73.6	5.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q11_0: Accessibility - should be: Being able to attend special events

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	And, how accessible do you think each of these same situations should be for people with physical disabilities? Let's use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "not at all accessible" and 10 means "completely accessible to everyone regardless of physical disability". Of course, you can choose any number in between that best expresses your view. Being about to attend special events

Q11_0: Accessibility - should be: Being able to attend special events

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1 Not at all accessible	5	3.7	0.3%
2	2	3	2.7	0.2%
3	3	11	10.9	0.8%
4	4	17	16.5	1.2%
5	5	77	74.6	5.6%
6	6	63	60.5	4.5%
7	7	103	106.7	8.0%
8	8	180	176.9	13.3%
9	9	174	171.9	12.9%
10	10 Completely accessible to everyone	697	705.6	53.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q11_1: Accessibility - should be: Getting into public buildings such as hospitals and libraries

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	And, how accessible do you think each of these same situations should be for people with physical disabilities? Let's use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "not at all accessible" and 10 means "completely accessible to everyone regardless of physical disability". Of course, you can choose any number in between that best expresses your view. Getting into public buildings such as hospitals and libraries

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1 Not at all accessible	1	0.7	0.0%
2	2	2	1.8	0.1%
3	3	5	3.8	0.3%
4	4	3	2.9	0.2%
5	5	60	60.5	4.5%
6	6	43	42.9	3.2%
7	7	57	57.0	4.3%
8	8	107	105.2	7.9%
9	9	143	141.1	10.6%
10	10 Completely accessible to everyone	909	914.2	68.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q11_2: Accessibility - should be: Getting into restaurants, shops and other private businesses

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	And, how accessible do you think each of these same situations should be for people with physical disabilities? Let's use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "not at all accessible" and 10 means "completely accessible to everyone regardless of physical disability". Of course, you can choose any number in between that best expresses your view. Getting into restuarants, shops and other private businesses

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1 Not at all accessible	5	3.5	0.3%
2	2	5	4.9	0.4%
3	3	11	9.7	0.7%
4	4	25	25.3	1.9%
5	5	77	77.4	5.8%
6	6	60	59.9	4.5%
7	7	94	86.9	6.5%

Q11_2: Accessibility - should be: Getting into restaurants, shops and other private businesses

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
8	8	183	180.3	13.6%
9	9	191	190.1	14.3%
10	10 Completely accessible to everyone	679	692.1	52.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q11_3: Accessibility - should be: Using public washroom facilities

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	And, how accessible do you think each of these same situations should be for people with physical disabilities? Let's use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "not at all accessible" and 10 means "completely accessible to everyone regardless of physical disability". Of course, you can choose any number in between that best expresses your view. Using public washroom facilties

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1 Not at all accessible	3	1.9	0.1%
2	2	3	2.8	0.2%
3	3	5	4.3	0.3%
4	4	11	11.6	0.9%
5	5	62	63.3	4.8%
6	6	55	53.2	4.0%
7	7	63	62.9	4.7%
8	8	106	105.9	8.0%
9	9	156	155.8	11.7%
10	10 Completely accessible to everyone	866	868.3	65.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q11_4: Accessibility - should be: Getting to and from different places in town

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	And, how accessible do you think each of these same situations should be for people with physical disabilities? Let's use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "not at all accessible" and 10 means "completely accessible to everyone regardless of physical disability". Of course, you can choose any number in between that best expresses your view. Getting to and from different places in town

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1 Not at all accessible	3	2.1	0.2%
2	2	7	5.9	0.4%
3	3	9	8.3	0.6%
4	4	21	22.3	1.7%
5	5	74	69.6	5.2%
6	6	54	53.9	4.1%
7	7	98	96.9	7.3%
8	8	165	162.0	12.2%
9	9	188	185.9	14.0%
10	10 Completely accessible to everyone	711	723.1	54.4%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q11_5: Accessibility - should be: Opportunities for sport/recreation

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Q11_5: Accessibility - should be: Opportunities for sport/recreation

Literal question	And, how accessible do you think each of these same situations should be for people with physical disabilities? Let's use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "not at all accessible" and 10 means "completely accessible to everyone regardless of physical disability". Of course, you can choose any number in between that best expresses your view. Opportunities for sport/recreation

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	1 Not at all accessible	6	4.4	0.3%	
2	2	9	9.8	0.7%	
3	3	13	11.5	0.9%	
4	4	25	23.2	1.7%	
5	5	89	92.4	6.9%	
6	6	81	76.1	5.7%	
7	7	119	114.4	8.6%	
8	8	187	187.0	14.1%	
9	9	179	181.0	13.6%	
10	10 Completely accessible to everyone	622	630.1	47.4%	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q11_6: Accessibility - should be: Access to schools and other education facilities

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	And, how accessible do you think each of these same situations should be for people with physical disabilities? Let's use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "not at all accessible" and 10 means "completely accessible to everyone regardless of physical disability". Of course, you can choose any number in between that best expresses your view. Access to schools and other education facilities

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	1 Not at all accessible	3	2.6	0.2%	
2	2	3	2.7	0.2%	
3	3	5	3.7	0.3%	
4	4	15	16.5	1.2%	
5	5	62	61.9	4.7%	
6	6	49	47.4	3.6%	
7	7	74	73.3	5.5%	
8	8	112	108.6	8.2%	
9	9	160	157.8	11.9%	
10	10 Completely accessible to everyone	847	855.6	64.3%	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q11_7: Accessibility - should be: Your own community's overall accessibility

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	And, how accessible do you think each of these same situations should be for people with physical disabilities? Let's use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means "not at all accessible" and 10 means "completely accessible to everyone regardless of physical disability". Of course, you can choose any number in between that best expresses your view. Your own community's overall accessibility
Interviewer's instructions	Always place last in series

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	1 Not at all accessible	2	1.4	0.1%	
2	2	4	4.1	0.3%	
3	3	10	9.5	0.7%	

Q11_7: Accessibility - should be: Your own community's overall accessibility

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
4	4	13	12.1	0.9%
5	5	79	80.5	6.1%
6	6	50	48.6	3.7%
7	7	92	91.3	6.9%
8	8	188	180.8	13.6%
9	9	221	219.8	16.5%
10	10 Completely accessible to everyone	671	682.0	51.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q12_0: Reason for gap: Too expensive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Past research has shown a significant gap between how accessible Canadians think their communities should be and how accessible they think their communities actually are. What do you think are the main reasons for this gap? Please choose up to two from the list that follows, or write in your own. Too expensive

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	Not Selected	861	867.2	65.2%
1	Selected	469	462.8	34.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q12_1: Reason for gap: Older buildings/hard to renovate

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Past research has shown a significant gap between how accessible Canadians think their communities should be and how accessible they think their communities actually are. What do you think are the main reasons for this gap? Please choose up to two from the list that follows, or write in your own. Older buildings/hard to renovate

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	Not Selected	717	722.1	54.3%
1	Selected	613	607.9	45.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q12_2: Reason for gap: Not enough demand/need for accessibility

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Past research has shown a significant gap between how accessible Canadians think their communities should be and how accessible they think their communities actually are. What do you think are the main reasons for this gap? Please choose up to two from the list that follows, or write in your own. Not enough demand/need for accessibility

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	Not Selected	1156	1154.1	86.8%
1	Selected	174	175.9	13.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q12_3: Reason for gap: Not a priority in Canada

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Past research has shown a significant gap between how accessible Canadians think their communities should be and how accessible they think their communities actually are. What do you think are the main reasons for this gap? Please choose up to two from the list that follows, or write in your own. Not a priority in Canada

Q12_3: Reason for gap: Not a priority in Canada

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	1233	1234.7		92.8%
1	Selected	97	95.3	7.2%	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q12_4: Reason for gap: Governments don't enforce

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Past research has shown a significant gap between how accessible Canadians think their communities should be and how accessible they think their communities actually are. What do you think are the main reasons for this gap? Please choose up to two from the list that follows, or write in your own. Governments don't enforce

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	1063	1059.8		79.7%
1	Selected	267	270.2	20.3%	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q12_5: Reason for gap: Builders don't make it a priority

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Past research has shown a significant gap between how accessible Canadians think their communities should be and how accessible they think their communities actually are. What do you think are the main reasons for this gap? Please choose up to two from the list that follows, or write in your own. Builders don't make it a priority

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	1057	1056.1		79.4%
1	Selected	273	273.9	20.6%	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q12_6: Reason for gap: Accessibility not fully understood

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Past research has shown a significant gap between how accessible Canadians think their communities should be and how accessible they think their communities actually are. What do you think are the main reasons for this gap? Please choose up to two from the list that follows, or write in your own. Accessibility not fully understood

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	893	886.1		66.6%
1	Selected	437	443.9	33.4%	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q12_7: Reason for gap: Other (Please specify)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Past research has shown a significant gap between how accessible Canadians think their communities should be and how accessible they think their communities actually are. What do you think are the main reasons for this gap? Please choose up to two from the list that follows, or write in your own. Other (please specify)

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	1309	1307.4		98.3%
1	Selected	21	22.6	1.7%	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q12_8: Reason for gap: Q12_8_other [Full text available in Codebook]

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=21 / 22.603]
Literal question	Past research has shown a significant gap between how accessible Canadians think their communities should be and how accessible they think their communities actually are. What do you think are the main reasons for this gap? Please choose up to two from the list that follows, or write in your own. Other (please specify) [text]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
Climate and landscape		1	0.7	3.3%
Disabilities are still seen as not in the general public's interest.		1	0.6	2.6%
I believe things are far more accessible than the average Canadian knows about		1	0.7	3.2%
I live in cottage country where there are allot of older people and older people don't like change !!		1	1.4	6.3%
If absolutely everything were made / redone to be 100% accessible, quirky little architectural oddities would constantly be destroyed, and you also wouldn't be able to cram as many people / abodes into the city without blocking out the sun with giant buil		1	1.0	4.4%
Il est normal qu'il y ait des difficultés		1	0.7	3.3%
Lots of special interest groups overplay their hand; demand special privileges over and above what would suffice to make them 'equal' to the rest of us		1	0.7	3.0%
My elderly mother lives in a condo for seniors. Most of the doors		1	0.3	1.3%

Q12_8: Reason for gap: Q12_8_other [Full text available in Codebook]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
do NOT have the open door button, and the doors are extremely heavy. because the building is so partitioned, she cannot go from one side of the building to the other because of those heavy				
Takes time and momey to make everything accessible		1	1.0	4.6%
Unknown and unsure of the solutions		1	0.9	4.0%
[City] would appear to be years behind in terms of access to public spaces for the disabled. I hope that this is NOT a provincial trend and simply a (disgraceful) municipal oversight.		1	0.7	3.3%
ca briserait l'architecture de certain batiments		1	1.0	4.3%
don't know		1	1.4	6.4%
fucking greed		1	2.4	10.6%
lack of understanding		1	1.2	5.4%
les gens ne veuillent pas payer pour ce genre de chose		1	1.6	7.0%
not a high a priority as perhaps other life cycle improvements to a building or business		1	0.9	3.8%
not enough education on it		1	1.4	6.1%
not sure		1	1.1	4.9%
stigma, disparagement, wish to hide, afraid of		1	1.1	4.8%
things have change alot		1	1.7	7.7%

Q12_8: Reason for gap: Q12_8_other [Full text available in Codebook]

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q13: Level of accessibility that should exist

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Thinking of public spaces in general in Canada today - such as these ones we've been considering, what is your overall view about the level of accessibility that should exist for people with physical disabilities? Would you say the goal should be:

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	Universal accessibility for everyone whenever this is possib	761	766.6		57.6%
2	Access should be a priority, but with cost feasibility in mi	462	455.6		34.3%
3	Consider access issues, but not a priority	71	71.0		5.3%
4	Do what is easily possible, and that's all that should be ex	36	36.8		2.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q14: Places difficult for person with disability

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	In the last six months, have you noticed any places in your local community that you thought would be particularly difficult for a person with a mobility challenge or other physical disability to navigate?

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	No, haven't noticed any	686	688.8		51.8%
2	Yes, one place	153	151.5		11.4%
3	Yes, a few places	380	372.8		28.0%
4	Yes, I notice them all the time	111	116.9		8.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q15_0: Issues - agree/disagree: Accessibility is a basic human right, not a privilege

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately. Accessibility for people with physical disabilities is a basic human right, not a privilege

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	Strongly Disagree	29	30.0		2.3%
2	Disagree	85	72.4		5.4%
3	Agree	540	538.3		40.5%
4	Strongly Agree	676	689.2		51.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q15_1: Issues - agree/disagree: Making places accessible and barrier-free is a nice idea, but not worth the cost

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately. Making places accessible and barrier-free for people with physical disabilities is a nice idea, but not worth the cost

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	Strongly Disagree	402	414.2		31.1%

Q15_1: Issues - agree/disagree: Making places accessible and barrier-free is a nice idea, but not worth the cost

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
2	Disagree	654	648.1		48.7%
3	Agree	207	204.0		15.3%
4	Strongly Agree	67	63.7		4.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q15_2: Issues - agree/disagree: Canada should be a world leader in ensuring universal access to public places

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately. Canada should be a world leader in ensuring universal access to public places

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	Strongly Disagree	36	33.7	2.5%	
2	Disagree	127	119.6		9.0%
3	Agree	668	674.4		50.7%
4	Strongly Agree	499	502.4		37.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q15_3: Issues - agree/disagree: Should be a high priority to ensure everyone can fully participate

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately. As a society, it should be a high priority to do whatever we can to ensure everyone can fully participate, regardless of whether or not they have a physical disability

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	Strongly Disagree	21	20.3	1.5%	
2	Disagree	95	89.2		6.7%
3	Agree	639	633.9		47.7%
4	Strongly Agree	575	586.6		44.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q15_4: Issues - agree/disagree: Understandable employers feel it is risky to hire people with physical disabilities

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately. It's understandable that employers feel it is risky to hire people with physical disabilities

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	Strongly Disagree	194	190.1		14.3%
2	Disagree	477	472.1		35.5%
3	Agree	564	572.9		43.1%
4	Strongly Agree	95	94.8		7.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q15_5: Issues - agree/disagree: Waste not to recognize and promote the potential of people with physical disabilities

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Q15_5: Issues - agree/disagree: Waste not to recognize and promote the potential of people with physical disabilities

Literal question	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately. It's a waste not to recognize and promote the potential of people with physical disabilities

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Strongly Disagree	60	60.7	4.6%
2	Disagree	100	101.5	7.6%
3	Agree	732	721.3	54.2%
4	Strongly Agree	438	446.4	33.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q15_6: Issues - agree/disagree: Never notice disabled people using the disabled washroom or ramps etc

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately. I never notice any disabled people actually using the disabled washroom or ramps, etc.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Strongly Disagree	266	276.5	20.8%
2	Disagree	624	611.4	46.0%
3	Agree	360	358.2	26.9%
4	Strongly Agree	80	83.8	6.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q15_7: Issues - agree/disagree: There is a lot of prejudice towards people with physical disabilities

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately. There is a lot of prejudice towards people with physical disabilities

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Strongly Disagree	41	43.7	3.3%
2	Disagree	331	319.4	24.0%
3	Agree	713	717.1	53.9%
4	Strongly Agree	245	249.8	18.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q15_8: Issues - agree/disagree: Don't think about it

| Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately. I rarely think about people with physical disabilities in my day-to-day life

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Strongly Disagree	195	196.3	14.8%
2	Disagree	464	463.0	34.8%
3	Agree	561	558.0	42.0%
4	Strongly Agree	110	112.7	8.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q15_9: Issues - agree/disagree: Feel well informed

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Here are some statements people might make about the issues we've been talking about in this survey. For each one, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, strongly or moderately. I feel well-informed about the challenges people with physical disabilities face

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Strongly Disagree	59	65.2	4.9%
2	Disagree	474	467.9	35.2%
3	Agree	650	656.3	49.3%
4	Strongly Agree	147	140.6	10.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q16_0: Risky to hire: Expensive to make workplace accessible

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Regardless of whether you agree or disagree with the statement, "It's understandable that employers feel it is risky to hire people with physical disabilities," many people do feel this way. Please review the list below and select up to two main reasons you think some employers might feel it could be risky to hire people with physical disabilities. Expensive to make workplace accessible

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	Not Selected	763	767.6	57.7%
1	Selected	567	562.4	42.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q16_1: Risky to hire: Many employers have no experience working with them

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Regardless of whether you agree or disagree with the statement, "It's understandable that employers feel it is risky to hire people with physical disabilities," many people do feel this way. Please review the list below and select up to two main reasons you think some employers might feel it could be risky to hire people with physical disabilities. Many employers have no experience working with them

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	Not Selected	728	732.4	55.1%
1	Selected	602	597.6	44.9%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q16_2: Risky to hire: Employee may take more sick days

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Regardless of whether you agree or disagree with the statement, "It's understandable that employers feel it is risky to hire people with physical disabilities," many people do feel this way. Please review the list below and select up to two main reasons you think some employers might feel it could be risky to hire people with physical disabilities. Employee may take more sick days

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	1068	1072.0		80.6%
1	Selected	262	258.0		19.4%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q16_3: Risky to hire: Employee may not fit in

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Regardless of whether you agree or disagree with the statement, "It's understandable that employers feel it is risky to hire people with physical disabilities," many people do feel this way. Please review the list below and select up to two main reasons you think some employers might feel it could be risky to hire people with physical disabilities. Employee may not fit in

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	1205	1205.5		90.6%
1	Selected	125	124.5	9.4%	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q16_4: Risky to hire: Some tasks may be too difficult

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Regardless of whether you agree or disagree with the statement, "It's understandable that employers feel it is risky to hire people with physical disabilities," many people do feel this way. Please review the list below and select up to two main reasons you think some employers might feel it could be risky to hire people with physical disabilities. Some tasks may be too difficult

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	766	761.0		57.2%
1	Selected	564	569.0		42.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q16_5: Risky to hire: Employee may work slower

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Regardless of whether you agree or disagree with the statement, "It's understandable that employers feel it is risky to hire people with physical disabilities," many people do feel this way. Please review the list below and select up to two main reasons you think some employers might feel it could be risky to hire people with physical disabilities. Employee may work slower

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	1003	992.9		74.7%
1	Selected	327	337.1	25.3%	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q16_6: Risky to hire: Other (Please specify)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Q16_6: Risky to hire: Other (Please specify)

Literal question	Regardless of whether you agree or disagree with the statement, "It's understandable that employers feel it is risky to hire people with physical disabilities," many people do feel this way. Please review the list below and select up to two main reasons you think some employers might feel it could be risky to hire people with physical disabilities. Other (please specify)

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	Not Selected	1294	1297.0		97.5%
1	Selected	36	33.0	2.5%	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q16_7: Risky to hire: Other [text] [Full text available in Codebook]

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=36 / 33.042]
Literal question	Regardless of whether you agree or disagree with the statement, "It's understandable that employers feel it is risky to hire people with physical disabilities," many people do feel this way. Please review the list below and select up to two main reasons you think some employers might feel it could be risky to hire people with physical disabilities. Other (please specify) [text]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
ACCIDENTS		1	0.7	2.2%	
As in a previous question, it seems some folks with disabilities can be demanding beyond reason		1	0.7	2.0%	
Can't meet physical demands of the position.		1	1.8	5.5%	
Dangereux		1	0.7	2.1%	
Employee may be ridiculed by rude customers		1	1.1	3.2%	
Employer thinks they can't provide as good service as everyone else		1	1.5	4.6%	
Fear of being accused of discrimination if the employee doesn't work out.		1	1.4	4.3%	
I still feel that there are a number of people who feign disability (or over-exagerate their disability) to get special consideration		1	0.2	0.7%	
Ignorance		1	0.3	0.9%	
Injury		1	0.9	2.7%	
It is difficult to fire the person if		1	1.0	3.0%	

# Q16_7: Risky to hire: Other [text] [Full text available in Codebook]				
Value	**Label**	**Cases**	**Weighted**	**Percentage (Weighted)**
they are bad at their job without it looking like discrimination				
It requires more work to accommodate them. It is easier on hire someone without a disability, rather than rework job description and job tasks		1	0.5	1.5%
May not be able to do all tasks required		1	0.9	2.7%
Placing handicap people in areas of rapid escape scenarios		1	1.2	3.6%
Possible liability		1	0.9	2.7%
Profit only attitude		1	0.3	1.0%
Some tasks they are not able to do		1	1.5	4.6%
Stigma		1	1.4	4.1%
The wide range of accommodation to consider		1	0.9	2.7%
Work site may not be accessible at all		1	1.1	3.3%
benifit costs		1	0.8	2.6%
current employees may not be receptive		1	1.0	3.1%
customer reaction		1	0.4	1.3%
depending on job and the degree or type of disability they may be at higher risk of injury		1	0.5	1.4%
disability may interfere with the type of work and expectations of the job		1	0.7	2.2%
discrimination		1	1.0	3.0%
employee may be more likely to be short-term		1	0.6	1.8%
fucking stupid		1	2.4	7.2%

Q16_7: Risky to hire: Other [text] [Full text available in Codebook]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
healtha and safety		1	1.1	3.4%
insurance liability		1	0.9	2.7%
no openness to their capabilities		1	0.8	2.6%
not universally employable		1	0.6	1.8%
other workers may feel discomforted		1	0.7	2.2%
pas toujours adpate		1	0.8	2.4%
risk of furthe injury at work		1	0.9	2.7%
risque de blessure tout dépend du milieu de travail		1	0.7	2.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q17: Deal more with business that hires people with physical disability

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Some companies make it a priority to recruit and hire people with physical disabilities. Suppose you knew of such a business near you. Would this have any impact on your dealings with that business?

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	No, not something I would think about	340	335.4	25.2%
2	Would make me feel better about them, but would not change m	559	563.1	42.3%
3	Yes, I would try to give them more of my business	431	431.6	32.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Q24: Made decision about who to hire

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Have you ever been responsible - either alone or as part of a group - for making a decision about who to hire for a job?

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Yes, currently responsible for hiring decisions	77	70.2	5.3%
2	Yes, have made hiring decisions in the past	445	432.6	32.5%
3	No, have never been involved in a hiring decision	808	827.2	62.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Race: ARF - Race

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Caucasian	1132	1127.8	84.8%
2	Asian	78	81.4	6.1%

Race: ARF - Race

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
3	Other Visible Minority	120	120.8	9.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Age: ARF - Age (3 groups)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	18-34	393	385.1	29.0%
2	35-54	455	464.0	34.9%
3	55+	482	480.9	36.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Age_fine: ARF - Age (6 groups)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	18-24	135	157.3	11.8%
2	25-34	258	227.8	17.1%
3	35-44	159	219.3	16.5%
4	45-54	296	244.7	18.4%
5	55-64	220	220.2	16.6%
6	65+	262	260.8	19.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

age_gender: ARF - AGE/Gender

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	Male 18-34	194	177.8	13.4%
2	Male 35-54	260	246.2	18.5%
3	Male 55+	242	225.8	17.0%
4	Female 18-34	199	207.3	15.6%
5	Female 35-54	195	217.8	16.4%
6	Female 55+	240	255.2	19.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

edu: ARF - Education

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	HS or less	537	559.7	42.1%
2	College/ Tech school	400	420.7	31.6%
3	Univ+	393	349.6	26.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

income: ARF - Income

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]

income: ARF - Income

Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]			

Value	**Label**	**Cases**	**Weighted**	**Percentage (Weighted)**
1	<$50K	467	468.4	35.2%
2	$50-99K	392	388.9	29.2%
3	$100K+	246	238.9	18.0%
4	DK/REF	225	233.8	17.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

region: ARF - Region (Manitoba/Saskatchewan grouped; Atlantic provinces grouped)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]			

Value	**Label**	**Cases**	**Weighted**	**Percentage (Weighted)**
1	BC	162	172.9	13.0%
2	AB	107	143.1	10.8%
3	MB/SK	168	88.6	6.7%
4	ON	463	497.9	37.4%
5	QC	321	327.0	24.6%
6	ATL	109	100.5	7.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

region7: ARF - Region (Atlantic provinces grouped)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-7] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 / 1330] [Invalid=0 / 0]			

Value	**Label**	**Cases**	**Weighted**	**Percentage (Weighted)**
1	BC	162	172.9	13.0%
2	AB	107	143.1	10.8%
3	SK	83	41.5	3.1%
4	MB	85	47.1	3.5%
5	ON	463	497.9	37.4%
6	QC	321	327.0	24.6%
7	ATL	109	100.5	7.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

wtsex: ARF - Weight - Sex

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-14] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		

Value	**Label**	**Cases**	**Percentage**
1		58	4.4%
2		165	12.4%
3		255	19.2%
4		41	3.1%
5		45	3.4%
6		57	4.3%
7		75	5.6%
8		51	3.8%
9		156	11.7%
10		208	15.6%

wtsex: ARF - Weight - Sex

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
11		44	3.3%
12		38	2.9%
13		50	3.8%
14		87	6.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

Wtage: ARF - Weight - Age

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-42] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=18.82 /-] [StdDev=11.056 /-]

Wtedu: ARF - Weight - Education

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-21] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1		48	3.6%
2		114	8.6%
3		191	14.4%
4		38	2.9%
5		37	2.8%
6		39	2.9%
7		70	5.3%
8		37	2.8%
9		116	8.7%
10		117	8.8%
11		18	1.4%
12		25	1.9%
13		35	2.6%
14		52	3.9%
15		24	1.8%
16		91	6.8%
17		155	11.7%
18		29	2.2%
19		21	1.6%
20		33	2.5%
21		40	3.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

wgt: ARF - Weight

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0.204065873676229-2.84321688122726] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=1 /-] [StdDev=0.37 /-]