



2021 Chronic Disease Prevention Survey Data Release

The aim of the Chronic Disease Prevention (CDP) surveys has been to understand the knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs of policy influencers and the general public on policy topics relevant to the prevention of cancer and other chronic diseases. Understanding policy influencers' and the general public's perceptions of cancer and chronic diseases, and their level of support for policies to address prevention, can help support evidence-based decision-making. The 2021 survey data was collected between March and May 2021, from two populations: policy influencers and members of the general public from across Alberta and Manitoba.

In this data summary we provide an overview of the results from both the policy influencer and general public surveys on items related to: cancer and chronic disease etiology; mental health policy; substance use policy; alcohol control policy; tobacco-control policy; healthy eating policy; physical activity policy; and government activities in Alberta and Manitoba in 2021.

Overall, the target population for the policy influencer survey was provincial officials, municipal authorities, school board members, workplace managers, and media reporters and editors. The target population for the public survey was community-dwelling adults (aged 18 years or older) who could be contacted by mobile telephone at the time of the survey and with access to the internet. The general public sample were given a subsample of questions, while the policy influencer sample received the complete survey. For this reason, some results reported here are only available for the policy influencer sample.

The total number of policy influencer respondents in the CDP census sample was 253 (180 in Alberta, 73 in Manitoba), from a total of 2122 invitations to participate (1295 to Alberta, 827 to Manitoba). This makes the overall policy influencer response rate 12.6%, from 14.7% and 9.4% in Alberta and Manitoba respectively. Data from the general public were collected from participants in Edmonton (n = 520), Calgary (n = 533), Winnipeg (n = 1021), other settlements in Alberta (n = 525), and other settlements in Manitoba (n = 527). The general public response rate in Alberta was 36.0% and 31.8% in Manitoba, with an overall response rate of 33.8%. Targets for stratified sampling were achieved. For the purposes of the data presented here, residents of the Calgary, Edmonton, and Winnipeg CMAs are classified as 'urban', while other settlements are classified as 'rural'. An approximately equal number of men and women were surveyed in the general public survey, with about 1% of these respondents identifying outside of the binary gender categories.

The demographic background of both policy influencer and general public survey participants is provided in Table 1. The Chronic Disease Prevention Survey results (for policy influencers and for the general public) are provided in Table 2 through Table 15^{1} .

Survey Participant Descriptors

The following table provides background information for all respondents to the 2021 Chronic Disease Prevention Survey stratified by sample-type and province (**Table 1**) 1 .

¹ Columns in all tables may not exactly total 100% due to rounding.





Table 1: Demographics of **all 2021 CDP survey respondents** stratified by sample-type and province

	Alberta General Public	Alberta Policy Influencers	Manitoba General Public	Manitoba Police Influencers
	n = 1703	n = 221	n = 1648	n = 94
Demographic Variable	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Gender ¹				
Male	46.9% (732)	62.2% (112)	47% (722)	52.1% (37)
Female	51.7% (807)	37.8% (68)	52.3% (803)	47.9% (34)
Gender Diverse	1.2% (18)	0% (0)	0.7% (10)	0% (0)
Other	0.2% (3)	0% (0)	0.1% (1)	0% (0)
Age ² (mean (SD))	30.28 (15.53)	40.76 (11.15)	32.33 (16.84)	43.14 (10.13)
Health Self-Report ³				
Excellent	11.1% (174)	5% (9)	8.6% (132)	6.8% (5)
Very Good	33.8% (532)	33.1% (60)	30.7% (472)	43.8% (32)
Good	36.5% (575)	45.3% (82)	39.5% (608)	39.7% (29)
Fair	14.6% (230)	14.9% (27)	15.9% (245)	9.6% (7)
Poor	4% (63)	1.7% (3)	5.3% (81)	0% (0)
Mental Health Self-Report ⁴				
Excellent	14.9% (235)	8.8% (16)	12.8% (197)	23.3% (17)
Very Good	32.4% (510)	36.5% (66)	34.2% (525)	34.2% (25)
Good	33% (519)	43.1% (78)	32.9% (505)	35.6% (26)
Fair	14.7% (231)	10.5% (19)	16% (246)	6.8% (5)
Poor	5.1% (80)	1.1% (2)	4% (61)	0% (0)
Education ⁵				
High School Incomplete	1.7% (27)	1.1% (2)	2.5% (39)	1.4% (1)
High School Complete	10.1% (159)	8% (14)	10.1% (155)	8.2% (6)
University Undergraduate Certificate,				
Diploma, or Degree	24% (377)	25.6% (45)	21.2% (325)	19.2% (14)
University Professional or Graduate				
Complete	21.9% (344)	31.8% (56)	28.4% (436)	52.1% (38)
College/Technical/University				
Incomplete	18.3% (288)	13.6% (24)	17.6% (270)	12.3% (9)
College or Technical School Complete	18% (283)	17% (30)	17.3% (265)	5.5% (4)
Trade School Complete	6% (95)	2.8% (5)	3% (46)	1.4% (1)
Household Income ⁶				
Under \$20,000	3.6% (49)	0% (0)	3.4% (46)	0% (0)
\$20,000 to just under \$40,000	8% (110)	1.3% (2)	11.7% (157)	1.7% (1)
\$40,000 to just under \$70,000	18.7% (256)	8.8% (14)	22% (297)	13.3% (8)
\$70,000 to just under \$100,000	20.3% (278)	16.4% (26)	22.2% (299)	16.7% (10)
\$100,000 to just under \$100,000 \$100,000 to just under \$125,000	16.3% (223)	16.4% (26)	16% (216)	20% (12)
\$125,000 or more	33.2% (455)	57.2% (91)	24.6% (332)	48.3% (29)
Visible Minority ⁷	13.1% (191)	5.1% (9)	10.3% (152)	7.2% (9)
Indigenous ⁸	4.9% (75)	1.1% (2)	6.9% (105)	9.7% (7)
Born Outside Canada ⁹	14.3% (224)	5.6% (10)	12.6% (194)	0% (0)





	Alberta General Public	Alberta Policy Influencers	Manitoba General Public	Manitoba Policy Influencers
	n = 1703	n = 221	n = 1648	n = 94
Demographic Variable	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Political alignment ¹⁰				
Extreme Left	2.8% (41)	1.8% (3)	3.7% (53)	0% (0)
2	2.5% (36)	0.6% (1)	3.9% (56)	1.6% (1)
3	11.1% (162)	6.7% (11)	13.9% (198)	10.9% (7)
4	13.1% (190)	9.1% (15)	17.2% (245)	10.9% (7)
5	17.9% (261)	20.1% (33)	17.3% (246)	26.6% (17)
6	18.1% (264)	28.7% (47)	15% (214)	20.3% (13)
7	14.4% (210)	17.7% (29)	11.2% (159)	15.6% (10)
8	10.5% (153)	9.8% (16)	8.9% (127)	6.2% (4)
9	4.7% (68)	3% (5)	4.2% (60)	1.6% (1)
10	2% (29)	0.6% (1)	2.1% (30)	3.1% (2)
Extreme Right	2.8% (41)	1.8% (3)	2.6% (37)	3.1% (2)
iving with Chronic Disease ¹¹	53.5% (816)	57.7% (101)	57.3% (854)	56.9% (41)
Employment Status ¹²				
Self-Employed	13.4% (209)		10.2% (157)	
Employed Full Time (>30hrs/Week)	47.2% (734)		46.3% (711)	
Employed Part Time (<30hrs/Week)	7.6% (118)		7% (107)	
Unemployed	4% (62)	N/A	3.1% (48)	N/A
Student	4% (62)	·	4.2% (64)	·
Homemaker	4.1% (64)		2.3% (36)	
Retired	17.6% (274) 2%		23.8% (365)	
Other	(31)		3.1% (47)	
Organization Type ¹³	` ,		, ,	
Media		18.6% (41)		10.6% (10)
Municipal authorities		51.6% (114)		48.9% (46)
Provincial Government	N/A	4.5% (10)	N/A	6.4% (6)
School or School Board		12.7% (28)		12.8% (12)
Private Workplace		12.7% (28)		21.3% (20)
Nature of Position ¹⁴		,		,
Elected		37.1% (63)		31.0% (22)
Appointed		7.6% (13)	N. / -	2.8% (2)
Hired	N/A	47.6% (81)	N/A	62.0% (44)
Volunteer		0.0% (0)		1.4% (1)
Other		7.6% (13)		2.8% (2)

¹ missingness: AB GP: n= (8.4%), AB PI: n= (18.6%), MB GP: n= (6.8%), MB PI: n= (24.5%)

² missingness: AB GP: n= (0.0%), AB PI: n= (3.6%), MB GP: n= (0.0%), MB PI: n= (4.2%)

³ missingness: AB GP: n= (7.6%), AB PI: n= (18.1%), MB GP: n= (6.7%), MB PI: n= (22.3%)

⁴ missingness: AB GP: n= (7.5%), AB PI: n= (18.1%), MB GP: n= (6.9%), MB PI: n= (22.3%)

⁵ missingness: AB GP: n= (7.6%), AB PI: n= (20.4%), MB GP: n= (6.8%), MB PI: n= (22.3%)

⁶ missingness: AB GP: n= (19.5%), AB PI: n= (28.1%), MB GP: n= (18.3%), MB PI: n= (36.2%)

⁷ missingness: AB GP: n= (12.8%), AB PI: n= (20.8%), MB GP: n= (10.9%), MB PI: n= (26.6%)

^{*} missingness: AB GP: n= (12.8%), AB PI: n= (20.8%), MB GP: n= (10.9%), MB PI: n= (20.8%)

* missingness: AB GP: n= (9.3%), AB PI: n= (19.5%), MB GP: n= (8.1%), MB PI: n= (23.4%)

⁹ missingness: AB GP: n= (7.8%), AB PI: n= (19.5%), MB GP: n= (6.6%), MB PI: n= (22.3%)

¹⁰ missingness: AB GP: n= (14.5%), AB PI: n= (25.8%), MB GP: n= (13.5%), MB PI: n= (31.9%)

¹¹ missingness: AB GP: n= (10.5%), AB PI: n= (20.8%), MB GP: n= (9.5%), MB PI: n= (23.4%)

¹² missingness: AB GP: n= (8.7%), MB GP: n= (6.9%)

¹³ missingness: AB PI: n= 0 (0.0%), MB PI: n=0 (0.0%)

¹⁴ missingness: AB PI: n= (23.1%), MB PI: n= (24.5%)





Data Summary: Cancer and Chronic Disease Etiology Policy Influencers and the General Public: Perceived Behavioural and Environmental Links to Cancer and Chronic Disease

Table 2 reports valid percentages of respondents for each sample who responded "Definitely Linked" or "Might be Linked" when asked whether they believe the listed exposures are linked to cancer or other chronic diseases.

Table 2: Valid percentages of **all respondents**, stratified by province and sample type, who indicated they believe the listed exposures are linked to cancer or other chronic diseases

	Ove	erall	All	Alberta		Manitoba	
Exposure in Question	General Public	Policy Influencer	General Public	Policy Influencer	General Public	Policy Influencer	
Participating in regular exercise	73.6%	80.4%	72.5%	80.3%	74.7%	80.6%	
Eating a healthy balanced diet	74.5%	83.4%	74.6%	83.7%	74.5%	82.8%	
Eating sufficient servings of fruits and vegetables	71.6%	82.4%	71.6%	83.3%	71.6%	80.4%	
Smoking cigarettes	99.0%	99.0%	98.7%	99.1%	99.3%	98.9%	
Vaping (i.e., e-cigarettes, aerosols, e-liquids)	96.6%	98.7%	96.2%	98.6%	97.0%	98.9%	
Using other tobacco products (e.g., chewing tobacco, cigars)	98.6%	99.0%	98.5%	99.1%	98.8%	98.9%	
Exposure to tobacco smoke	97.3%	98.1%	97.3%	98.2%	97.2%	97.9%	
Smoking marijuana	75.5%	88.2%	75.1%	88.7%	76.0%	86.9%	
Drinking excessive alcohol	92.5%	94.5%	92.6%	94.9%	92.5%	93.4%	
Using cannabis products (e.g., oils, edibles)	61.1%	73.8%	61.2%	73.6%	60.9%	74.4%	
Illegal substance use	90.6%	94.8%	90.0%	93.9%	91.3%	96.6%	
Social determinants of health	76.4%	86.2%	74.1%	87.3%	78.8%	83.7%	





Policy Influencers and the General Public: Beliefs about Cancer and Healthy Public Policy

Table 3 reports valid percentages of respondents for each sample who responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" when provided with various statements about cancer and healthy public policy.

Table 3: Valid percentages of **all respondents**, stratified by province and sample type, who indicated they agree with the listed statements about cancer and healthy public policy.

	Ove	erall	Alk	perta	Manitoba	
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Statement in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Most cancers are preventable	45.6%	51.3%	46.8%	50.3%	44.4%	53.4%
Cancer is just bad luck it is not preventable	18.8%	11.8%	19.2%	11.3%	18.4%	12.9%
Cancer treatment is more important than prevention	35.4%	38.8%	35.9%	41.0%	34.8%	33.7%
Most cancers are caused by genetics	53.3%	49.4%	53.4%	46.6%	53.2%	55.8%
There is insufficient evidence social policy can reduce cancer risk	N/A	44.6%	N/A	44.5%	N/A	44.7%
There is insufficient evidence economic policy can reduce cancer risk	N/A	49.4%	N/A	50.3%	N/A	47.2%
Health Care system should be more focused on prevention	N/A	92.1%	N/A	94.6%	N/A	86.0%





Policy Influencers and the General Public: Beliefs about Chronic Disease Etiology and Responsibility

Table 4 reports valid percentages of respondents for each sample who responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" when provided with various statements about causes and responsible parties for in chronic disease etiologies (i.e., cause is an individual's own fault, cause is circumstances beyond an individual's control, responsibility is an individual's to address, responsibility is society's to address).

Table 4: Valid percentages of **all respondents**, stratified by province and sample type, who agreed with the given statements around responsibilities for chronic disease etiologies

	Ove	erall	All	perta	Mani	toba
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Statement in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Healthy eating problem "Cause OWN FAULT"	N/A	41.0%	N/A	38.9%	N/A	46.4%
Healthy eating problem "Cause CIRCUMSTANCES BEYOND CONTROL"	N/A	43.8%	N/A	46.7%	N/A	36.4%
Healthy eating problem "Responsibility to address OWN"	N/A	73.0%	N/A	71.6%	N/A	76.5%
Healthy eating problem "Responsibility to address SOCIETAL"	N/A	38.1%	N/A	34.9%	N/A	46.4%
PA problem "Cause OWN FAULT"	N/A	61.3%	N/A	60.5%	N/A	63.2%
PA problem "Cause CIRCUMSTANCES BEYOND CONTROL"	N/A	40.8%	N/A	39.5%	N/A	43.9%
PA problem "Responsibility to address OWN"	N/A	84.3%	N/A	84.3%	N/A	84.3%
PA problem "Responsibility to address SOCIETAL"	N/A	35.5%	N/A	32.9%	N/A	42.0%
Alcohol problem "Cause OWN FAULT"	61.5%	49.2%	62.2%	48.8%	60.7%	50.0%





	Ove	erall	All	perta	Mani	toba
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Statement in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Alcohol problem						
"Cause	39.8%	43.9%	38.4%	46.2%	41.3%	38.2%
CIRCUMSTANCES	22.275	10.075	33.1,5	10.270	12.075	00.275
BEYOND CONTROL"						
Alcohol problem	2= 40/	-2 -2/	05 5 0/		0= 00/	22.22/
"Responsibility to	85.4%	78.5%	85.5%	76.7%	85.3%	82.9%
address OWN"						
Alcohol problem	F2 00/	40.40/	40.40/	40.00/	F.C. 70/	F2 00/
"Responsibility to address SOCIETAL"	53.0%	49.4%	49.4%	48.0%	56.7%	52.9%
Tobacco problem "Cause OWN FAULT"	80.9%	74.0%	81.5%	75.1%	80.2%	71.0%
Tobacco problem						
"Cause						
CIRCUMSTANCES	25.6%	30.1%	24.9%	29.2%	26.4%	32.4%
BEYOND CONTROL"						
Tobacco problem						
"Responsibility to	91.8%	85.5%	92.0%	84.8%	91.6%	87.3%
address OWN"	91.0%	03.370	32.070	04.070	31.070	07.570
Tobacco problem						
"Responsibility to	38.6%	38.6% 36.7%	36.7%	33.7%	40.4%	44.3%
address SOCIETAL"	20.075					
Obesity problem						
"Cause OWN FAULT"	44.9%	46.2%	45.8%	46.4%	44.0%	45.6%
Obesity problem						
"Cause						
CIRCUMSTANCES	41.1%	61.7%	39.6%	61.9%	42.6%	61.2%
BEYOND CONTROL"						
Obesity problem						
"Responsibility to	76.2%	82.7%	75.6%	81.5%	76.7%	85.7%
address OWN"						
Obesity problem						
"Responsibility to	33.0%	47.3%	32.0%	45.6%	34.1%	51.4%
address SOCIETAL"						
Mental health problem	7 40/	10.20/	0.007	14.60/	6.00/	7.00/
"Cause OWN FAULT"	7.4%	10.2%	8.0%	11.6%	6.8%	7.0%
Mental health problem						
"Cause						
CIRCUMSTANCES	73.1%	80.8%	71.7%	82.5%	74.5%	76.5%
BEYOND CONTROL"						





	Overall		Alk	perta	Manitoba	
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Statement in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Mental health problem "Responsibility to address OWN"	58.7%	61.7%	58.4%	59.5%	59.0%	67.1%
Mental health problem "Responsibility to address SOCIETAL"	69.1%	82.5%	66.3%	84.6%	72.1%	77.5%
Substance use problem "Cause OWN FAULT"	58.0%	62.7%	57.6%	64.5%	58.4%	58.2%
Substance use problem "Cause CIRCUMSTANCES BEYOND CONTROL"	41.2%	48.1%	39.3%	49.7%	43.1%	43.9%
Substance use problem "Responsibility to address OWN"	79.0%	85.4%	78.7%	85.2%	79.4%	85.9%
Substance use problem "Responsibility to address SOCIETAL"	58.2%	58.9%	55.8%	57.7%	60.6%	62.0%





Data Summary: Mental Health Policy Policy Influencers and the General Public: Support for Evidence-Based Mental Health Policy

The following table reports valid percentages for the sample of **policy influencers and the general public**, stratified by province, who responded "Strongly Support" or "Somewhat Support" when asked **to indicate their support for policy approaches related to mental health (Table 5)**.

Table 5: Valid percentages of **all respondents**, stratified by province and sample type, who supported given mental health policies

	Ove	erall	Alk	perta	Mani	toba
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Policy in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Mandate curricula/ training related to mental health promotion, anti-stigma awareness, and suicide prevention among healthcare professionals	94.6%	97.8%	93.7%	98.9%	95.4%	95.1%
Implement a school- based prevention programming that incorporates curricula on suicide and related issues (e.g., anxiety- prevention, resiliency- building, socio- emotional health) and expand workshops and peer support programs in schools	92.7%	95.8%	91.5%	97.3%	93.9%	92.3%
Subsidize recovery and support programs in shelters to aid in breaking the cycle of family violence	N/A	97.8%	N/A	97.9%	N/A	97.6%





	Overall		All	Alberta		Manitoba	
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy	
Policy in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	
Provide maternal mental health resources in all healthcare settings (i.e., trained staff, information for referrals)	N/A	98.1%	N/A	97.8%	N/A	98.8%	
Provide programs for parents to develop parenting skills and early intervention programs for parents of preschool-aged children	93.0%	97.4%	92.8%	98.4%	93.2%	95.1%	
Publicly fund the development and implementation of virtual, technology-based applications to help people access tools, information, and services to address and mental health issues	N/A	94.2%	N/A	94.5%	N/A	93.7%	
Build or facilitate partnerships across organizations to develop community-service based hubs, which provide a single point of access for multiple social services at one location for families or at-risk population groups (e.g., LGBTQ2+, newcomers, people with disabilities, veterans)	N/A	94.6%	N/A	94.6%	N/A	94.8%	





	Ove	erall	All	perta	Mani	toba
5 H	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Policy in Question Legally protect student groups that support the safety and inclusion of marginalized students, including Gay/Straight Alliances as a means of reducing stigma and discrimination in the LGBTQ2+ population	Public N/A	Influencer 85.2%	Public N/A	Influencer 84.2%	Public N/A	Influencer 87.7%
Develop and implement inclusive, culturally competent program delivery and training (e.g., by engaging Black, Indigenous, and other people of colour in the development and implementation) for individuals working in suicide prevention, frontline workers, volunteers, and health care practitioners	N/A	91.5%	N/A	91.2%	N/A	92.3%
Provide information to new immigrants and refugees upon arrival about common mental health problems that may occur with adjustment to Canada and available resources	89.2%	91.7%	86.5%	91.5%	92.0%	92.1%
Fund housing services and income supports for individuals with mental health issues	90.1%	91.4%	88.3%	91.1%	91.9%	92.2%





	Ove	erall	All	perta	Manitoba	
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Policy in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Promote help-seeking						
behaviours in men,						
seniors and other at-						
risk groups through						
phone help-lines,	N/A	98.9%	N/A	98.9%	N/A	98.7%
reduced individual						
cost, incentives, and						
reducing barriers to						
care						
Fund media campaigns						
and targeted						
education and						
programming that						
emphasize the	N/A	95.5%	N/A	95.7%	N/A	95.0%
importance of						
psychological health						
and safety in the						
workplace						
Develop public						
awareness campaigns	N/A	98.9%	N/A	98.4%	N/A	100.0%
against physical and	IN/A	38.376	IN/A	30.470	IN/A	100.076
sexual assault						
Support First Nations,						
Métis, and Inuit	84.8%	89.5%	84.3%	88.1%	85.2%	92.4%
control of mental	04.070	89.576	64.576	00.170	85.276	92.470
health services						
Adapt best practices in						
suicide prevention						
used in training						
healthcare providers in	N/A	94.3%	N/A	93.5%	N/A	96.2%
collaboration with First						
Nations, Métis, and						
Inuit representatives						
Publicly fund programs						
to train health	N/A	97.3%	N/A	97.2%	NI/A	07 50/
practitioners to deliver	IN/A	37.3%	IN/A	37.270	N/A	97.5%
trauma-informed care						





Data Summary: Substance Use Policy Policy Influencers and the General Public: Support for Evidence-Based Substance Use Policy

The following table reports valid percentages for the sample of **policy influencers and the general public**, stratified by province, who responded "Strongly Support" or "Somewhat Support" when asked **to indicate their support for policy approaches related to substance use (Table 6)**.

Table 6: Valid percentages of **all respondents**, stratified by province and sample type, who supported given substance use policies

	0	erall	A IL	erta	Manitoba	
		1	General	1		
Deliania Onestian	General	Policy		Policy	General Public	Policy
Policy in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Develop medical school						
curricula, medical						
association guidelines, and						
professional development programs to train health	N/A	88.4%	N/A	88.6%	N/A	87.7%
care practitioners about	IN/A	88.4%	IN/A	88.0%	IN/A	87.7%
their responsibility to						
counteract stigma towards						
people who use drugs						
Dedicate more funding for						
substance use education						
and prevention programs						
and updated curricula in	N/A	93.6%	N/A	94.2%	N/A	92.1%
elementary and high						
schools						
Develop programs for						
teachers to connect						
students who violate						
school substance use	N/A	94.4%	N/A	95.3%	N/A	92.2%
policies with prevention						
and treatment services						
Develop screening tools						
and interventions to						
identify and assist						
students at risk of	N/A	94.7%	N/A	96.2%	N/A	91.1%
developing substance use	••, •	3 / 5	.,,,	30.270	,	32.273
disorders or experiencing						
substance-related harm						





	Ov	erall	Alk	erta	Manitoba	
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Policy in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Develop public information campaigns on evidence-based treatment options for people living with substance use disorders	N/A	95.4%	N/A	96.2%	N/A	93.4%
Implement specialized inpatient and outpatient addiction medicine care in hospital facilities	87.8%	89.1%	84.6%	89.1%	91.1%	89.2%
Facilitate access to substance use services for children and adults involved with the criminal justice system	N/A	86.4%	N/A	86.0%	N/A	87.3%
Implement harm reduction interventions like sterile syringe distribution and supervised consumption services in correctional facilities	N/A	68.1%	N/A	64.4%	N/A	77.5%
Create publicly-funded permanent supportive housing units for those living with severe substance use disorders	72.0%	77.5%	66.9%	76.1%	77.2%	80.8%
Create more social supports (e.g., child care) for women that are accessing substance use services	N/A	89.8%	N/A	89.6%	N/A	90.3%
Expand the scope of practice for pharmacists to take on a larger role in providing medications for treating opioid addiction for patients	N/A	87.9%	N/A	86.4%	N/A	91.4%





	Ov	erall	All	perta	Manitoba	
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Policy in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Increase access to injectable medications for treating opioid addiction (e.g., hydromorphone) for people with severe opioid use disorders	76.2%	78.1%	71.7%	78.1%	80.8%	77.9%
Support qualified physicians to prescribe limited quantities of prescription opioids as a harm reduction measure for people dependent on street-sourced illegal fentanyl or other opioids	N/A	80.0%	N/A	77.8%	N/A	85.1%
Prohibit exclusionary zoning policies that prevent sterile needle exchange programs, substance use treatment programs, or supervised injection facilities within municipalities	62.3%	58.7%	57.2%	56.1%	67.6%	64.8%
Promote the practice of Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment in primary care settings (i.e., early intervention protocol to assess severity of substance use and appropriate level of treatment)	93.7%	96.1%	92.2%	97.3%	95.4%	93.2%
Improve access to medications for treating opioid addiction in provincial correctional facilities	N/A	84.9%	N/A	83.1%	N/A	89.3%
Allocate more public funding for pharmacotherapies to treat people with substance use disorders	77.2%	81.2%	71.8%	79.4%	82.9%	85.7%





	Overall		Alk	erta	Manitoba	
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Policy in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Increase access to harm reduction services (e.g., sterile syringe distribution, supervised consumption services, peer outreach) for people who are not ready or able to access treatment	N/A	72.9%	N/A	69.9%	N/A	80.6%
Improve integration of medications for treating opioid addiction and other pharmacotherapies for substance use disorders within primary care	N/A	91.7%	N/A	92.2%	N/A	90.4%
Create funding for First Nations, Métis, Inuit, and urban Aboriginal communities to ensure culturally appropriate and community-driven programming and resources	N/A	82.0%	N/A	81.3%	N/A	83.8%
Publicly fund residential addiction treatment programs to eliminate cost barriers to attendance	83.2%	87.8%	78.9%	89.2%	87.5%	84.2%
Publicly fund the development and implementation of virtual, technology-based applications to help people access tools, information, and services to address substance use disorders	N/A	92.5%	N/A	92.3%	N/A	93.0%





Data Summary: Alcohol Control Policy Policy Influencers and the General Public: Support for Evidence-Based Alcohol Control Policy

The following table reports valid percentages for the sample of **policy influencers and the general public**, stratified by province, who responded "Strongly Support" or "Somewhat Support" when asked **to indicate their support for policy approaches related to alcohol control (Table 7)**.

Table 7: Valid percentages of **all respondents**, stratified by province and sample type, who supported given alcohol control policies

	Ove	erall	Alb	erta	Man	itoba
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Policy in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Align restrictions for alcohol advertising on media outlets accessible to minors with strong regulations for tobacco and cannabis	85.2%	86.9%	82.5%	85.7%	87.9%	89.6%
Restrict alcohol marketing targeting youth (product packaging, contests, parties, sport endorsements)	N/A	83.7%	NA	80.5%	N/A	91.1%
Regulate alcohol more like tobacco and cannabis, with much tighter restrictions on marketing	68.8%	66.0%	67.6%	65.9%	70.1%	66.2%
Governments should apply any new alcohol revenue directly to disease prevention and wellness programs	85.3%	82.0%	84.4%	82.1%	86.2%	81.8%
Mandatory front of package health warning labels on alcoholic beverages	66.1%	68.6%	65.5%	66.8%	66.8%	72.7%
Label alcoholic beverages to display quantity relative to standard number of drinks	N/A	80.7%	N/A	79.7%	N/A	83.3%
Increase enforcement against alcohol sales to minors	86.9%	93.5%	85.8%	92.4%	88.1%	96.2%





		erall		erta		itoba
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Policy in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Public monopoly system for the sale of alcohol (e.g., all stores are operated by the government)	N/A	34.1%	N/A	25.6%	N/A	54.8%
Zoning to limit the number of alcohol retail outlets per square kilometer	N/A	52.6%	N/A	52.0%	N/A	54.4%
Require minimum retail prices per standard unit drink	N/A	47.5%	N/A	45.2%	N/A	52.9%
Tax alcoholic beverages based on ethyl alcohol content	51.1%	56.6%	51.0%	57.8%	51.3%	54.1%
Increase access to inpatient and speciality addiction treatment for individuals suffering from alcohol use disorder	N/A	95.3%	N/A	94.5%	N/A	97.4%
Increase access to alcohol screening and brief interventions in primary care and emergency room settings	N/A	93.4%	N/A	92.4%	N/A	95.9%
Increase the legal drinking age from 18 or 19 to 21 years of age	N/A	46.0%	N/A	46.0%	N/A	45.9%
Provide culturally safe counselling services as one option to support people to recover from alcohol use disorder	N/A	96.2%	N/A	96.7%	N/A	94.9%
Publicly fund the development and implementation of virtual, technology-based applications to help people access tools, information, and services to address alcohol use disorder	N/A	88.2%	N/A	89.2%	N/A	85.7%





Data Summary: Tobacco Control Policy Policy Influencers and the General Public: Support for Evidence-Based Healthy Tobacco Control Policy

The following table reports valid percentages for the sample of **policy influencers and the general public**, stratified by province, who responded "Strongly Support" or "Somewhat Support" when asked **to indicate their support for policy approaches related to tobacco control (Table 8)**.

Table 8: Valid percentages of **all respondents**, stratified by province and sample type, who supported given tobacco control policies

	Ove	erall	All	perta	Manitoba	
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Policy in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Fully enforce current tobacco and vaping reduction legislation (e.g., by hiring more inspectors)	N/A	85.9%	N/A	86.3%	N/A	85.0%
Governments should apply any new tobacco tax revenue directly to disease prevention and wellness programs	N/A	93.7%	N/A	93.6%	N/A	94.0%
Effective evidence- based stop smoking treatment and counselling services should be fully funded by the (public) health care system	N/A	77.1%	N/A	76.4%	N/A	78.6%
Ban smoking and vaping in all public outdoor spaces where children are permitted (e.g., children's playgrounds, parks, sports fields, public events, and beaches)	81.9%	90.3%	78.9%	90.7%	85.0%	89.4%
Ban the use of water pipes (hookahs) in all public places where tobacco use is banned	80.9%	91.9%	78.5%	90.9%	83.4%	94.0%





	Overall		All	perta	Manitoba	
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Policy in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Strengthen retailer regulations to prevent illegal tobacco and vaping device sales to minors (e.g., mandatory ID check for anyone under 25, staff training, no employees under age 18)	90.8%	92.6%	90.1%	93.2%	91.6%	91.4%
Prohibit the sale of vaping products in pharmacies until they are officially approved as medical devices for smoking cessation	N/A	90.3%	N/A	90.8%	N/A	89.3%
Increase tobacco taxes by at least \$1 per pack of 20 cigarettes to help reduce youth smoking	72.2%	78.0%	69.8%	77.0%	74.6%	80.2%
Governments should require tobacco companies to pay for the cost of tobacco reduction efforts	84.9%	88.5%	82.3%	87.3%	87.6%	91.4%





Data Summary: Healthy Eating Policy Policy Influencers and the General Public: Support for Evidence-Based Healthy Eating Policy

The following table reports valid percentages for the sample of **policy influencers and the general public**, stratified by province, who responded "Strongly Support" or "Somewhat Support" when asked **to indicate their support for policy approaches related to healthy eating (Table 9)**.

Table 9: Valid percentages of **all respondents**, stratified by province and sample type, who supported given healthy eating policies

	Ove	erall	All	perta	Manitoba	
Policy in Question	General Public	Policy Influencer	General Public	Policy Influencer	General Public	Policy Influencer
Fund government media campaigns that encourage healthy food and beverage choices	N/A	85.4%	N/A	83.4%	N/A	90.1%
Mandate priority space for healthy foods and beverages in all public buildings	N/A	73.3%	N/A	71.7%	N/A	77.3%
Mandate priority space for healthy foods and beverages in all public recreation facilities	82.1%	76.1%	79.4%	76.0%	84.9%	76.5%
Mandate government- led front of package nutrition labelling on all processed foods and beverages	N/A	83.0%	N/A	79.9%	N/A	90.0%
Mandate government- led logos or symbols in grocery stores to help identify healthy foods and beverages	N/A	80.4%	N/A	79.5%	N/A	82.7%
Remove sales taxes on pre-cut vegetables and fruits in grocery stores	N/A	92.6%	N/A	91.5%	N/A	95.1%
Regulate portion sizes in food outlets	N/A	43.2%	N/A	39.6%	N/A	51.9%





	Ove	erall	All	berta	Manitoba	
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Policy in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Eliminate all forms of subsidies that make unhealthy food cheaper than healthy food	N/A	88.1%	N/A	88.0%	N/A	88.3%
Tax sugary drinks and energy drinks on top of sales taxes	58.2%	66.4%	55.5%	65.2%	61.0%	69.1%
Subsidize the purchase of healthy foods and beverages	N/A	68.9%	N/A	65.8%	N/A	76.2%
Ensure sufficient social assistance food allowances for recipients to purchase a nutritious food basket	N/A	87.8%	N/A	86.9%	N/A	89.9%
Enact zoning to increase the number of small grocery stores that people can walk to in every neighbourhood	N/A	71.0%	N/A	72.1%	N/A	68.5%
Enact zoning that limits the number of fast food restaurants per square kilometre	49.3%	34.1%	48.0%	33.5%	50.6%	35.6%
Restrict or ban new fast food restaurant drive-through facilities	30.1%	18.7%	28.5%	18.6%	31.8%	19.0%
Ban sugary drinks in schools and childcare settings	N/A	75.1%	N/A	73.5%	N/A	78.6%
Restrict unhealthy foods in schools and childcare settings	N/A	77.4%	N/A	74.6%	N/A	84.0%
Mandate policies for healthy foods and beverages at schools and childcare settings	89.4%	87.3%	88.2%	85.0%	90.7%	92.7%





	0	erall	A.II	perta	Manitoba	
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Policy in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Provide free fruit and	1 dbiic	mindericei	Tublic	iiiidelieei	1 dbiic	minacricer
vegetable subscription						
programs for schools	N/A	85.1%	N/A	83.2%	N/A	89.6%
and childcare settings						
Create incentives to						
foster local food and						
beverage producers to						
.	N/A	89.6%	N/A	86.7%	N/A	96.3%
provide healthy foods to schools and						
childcare settings						
Monitor and evaluate						
food and beverage	N/A	87.6%	N/A	87.6%	N/A	87.7%
initiatives in school	·					
and childcare settings						
Restrict sugary drink		54 F0/	21/2	40.40/		50.00/
sales in all public	N/A	51.5%	N/A	48.4%	N/A	59.0%
buildings						
Ensure breastfeeding						
is permitted and						
adequate facilities	93.8%	95.4%	93.0%	95.1%	94.6%	96.2%
exist in all public						
buildings						
Restrict unhealthy						
foods sales in all	54.8%	53.0%	51.6%	50.8%	58.2%	58.2%
recreation facilities						
Mandate priority						
space in grocery stores						
for healthy foods and						
beverages (e.g., Fruit	N/A	68.8%	N/A	67.8%	N/A	71.2%
stand instead of candy						
"powerwalls" in						
checkout aisles)						
Prohibit advertising						
and promotion of	76.7%	75.6%	73.8%	72.3%	79.6%	83.3%
unhealthy foods and	70.770	75.070	73.070	72.570	75.070	03.570
beverages to children						
Mandate nutrition						
information on all	N/A	76.4%	N/A	76.3%	N/A	76.5%
restaurant menus						
Permit zoning to						
restrict the supply of	N/A	48.3%	N/A	47.0%	N/A	51.3%
junk food near schools						





	Overall		Alk	perta	Manitoba	
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Policy in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Adopt and implement an evidence-based food and beverage rating system for meals and snacks consumed by children	N/A	90.9%	N/A	91.0%	N/A	90.9%
Provide comprehensive nutrition education in schools and childcare settings	N/A	98.2%	N/A	98.4%	N/A	97.6%





Data Summary: Physical Activity Policy Policy Influencers and the General Public: Support for Evidence-Based Physical Activity Policy

The following table reports valid percentages for the sample of **policy influencers and the general public**, stratified by province, who responded "Strongly Support" or "Somewhat Support" when asked **to indicate their support for policy approaches related to physical activity (Table 10)**.

Table 10: Valid percentages of **all respondents**, stratified by province and sample type, who supported given physical activity policies

	Ove	erall	Alb	erta	Man	itoba
Policy in Question	General Public	Policy Influencer	General Public	Policy Influencer	General Public	Policy Influencer
Subsidize programs for those who cannot afford to participate in organized sport, physical activity, and recreation	N/A	91.9%	N/A	92.6%	N/A	90.1%
Provide incentives for workplaces to implement physical activity policies for workers and provide access to physical activity opportunities and facilities	N/A	86.6%	N/A	85.5%	N/A	89.0%
Provide incentives for workplaces to reduce extended sitting time among their employees (e.g., standing desks and walking meetings)	89.2%	84.2%	87.8%	82.3%	90.6%	88.8%
Provide resources to reduce sedentary behaviours on school grounds for all children, including those living with disabilities (e.g., classroom and recess movement activities, physically active learning, outdoor classrooms, etc.)	96.8%	96.3%	96.8%	97.4%	96.8%	94.0%





	Overall		Alberta		Manitoba		
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy	
Policy in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	
Mandate physical activity requirements of 180 minutes per day in all childcare settings, including 60 minutes of energetic play for all children, including those living with disabilities	86.9%	83.7%	86.0%	83.0%	87.9%	85.3%	
Provide more high-quality resources to support the implementation of physical education school curriculum for all children, including those living with disabilities	N/A	98.2%	N/A	98.4%	N/A	97.6%	
Building and maintenance of accessible active transportation infrastructure in communities to support walking, bicycling, and public transit year-round	90.6%	92.2%	87.9%	89.8%	93.3%	97.6%	
Restrict vehicular traffic in high-use pedestrian areas during peak hours to support active transportation (e.g., walking, cycling) or public transportation	N/A	73.6%	N/A	69.2%	N/A	83.5%	
Promote safe active transportation to school through walk or cycle-to-school programs and crossing patrols	95.6%	96.3%	95.1%	96.8%	96.2%	95.1%	
Invest in public transit improvements including frequency, routes, and scheduling to encourage multi-modal active transportation	86.1%	83.7%	82.6%	79.3%	89.5%	93.5%	





	Overall		Alberta		Manitoba	
	General	Policy	General	Policy	General	Policy
Policy in Question	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer	Public	Influencer
Improve opportunities for physical activity through neighbourhood revitalization programs	N/A	97.4%	N/A	97.3%	N/A	97.5%
Amend provincial legislation to ensure municipalities are empowered to establish minimum standards for health promoting environments that developers need to address	N/A	81.7%	N/A	81.8%	N/A	81.3%
Enhance the quantity, quality, and accessibility of green spaces in all neighbourhoods	96.7%	98.5%	96.1%	98.4%	97.2%	98.8%
Modify bylaws to allow the safe use of sporting equipment (hockey and soccer nets) in neighbourhood streets	N/A	81.7%	N/A	82.0%	N/A	81.0%
Mandate the consideration of active transit infrastructure when updating current features (e.g., adding bike lanes when roads are improved)	N/A	78.6%	N/A	73.4%	N/A	90.2%
Mandating improvements to quality of outdoor play spaces in childcare settings	N/A	88.9%	N/A	86.9%	N/A	93.7%
The provincial government should engage stakeholders to develop, adopt, and implement a provincial active transportation strategy	N/A	88.5%	N/A	86.7%	N/A	92.5%





Data Summary: Government Activities

Policy Influencers: Attitudes on the Legitimate Scope of Government Activities

The following table reports valid percentages for the sample of **policy influencers**, stratified by province, who responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" when asked to indicate their level of agreement with statements regarding government activities (Table 11).

Table 11: Valid percentages of **policy influencers**, stratified by province, who agree with the given statements on government activities

Statement in Question	Overall	Alberta	Manitoba
The government should lower taxes	46.8%	48.7%	42.2%
The government has taken over too many things that should be handled by individuals, families, and private businesses	48.8%	50.6%	44.3%
The government should be actively involved in solving problems that develop between groups, businesses, and individuals	51.3%	52.8%	47.7%
The government should reduce its assistance to the poor	11.9%	13.4%	8.5%
The government should not formally intervene to prevent chronic diseases because it interferes with an individual's decision on how to behave	22.3%	23.1%	20.3%





Policy Influencers: Attitudes on Current Policies

The following table reports valid percentages for the sample of **policy influencers**, stratified by province, who responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" when asked to indicate their level of agreement with statements regarding current government policies (Table 12).

Table 12: Valid percentages of **policy influencers**, stratified by province, who agree with the given statements on current policies

Statement in Question	Overall	Alberta	Manitoba
Policies on mental health in my province make the healthy choice the easy choice	52.7%	55.3%	47.1%
Policies on substance use in my province make the healthy choice the easy choice	45.9%	51.6%	32.3%
Policies on alcohol in my province make the healthy choice the easy choice	53.4%	51.6%	57.8%
Policies on tobacco in my province make the healthy choice the easy choice	65.5%	63.0%	71.2%
Policies on nutrition in my province make the healthy choice the easy choice	47.3%	49.1%	43.1%
Policies on physical activity in my province make the healthy choice the easy choice	53.9%	57.9%	43.8%





Policy Influencers: Stakeholder Meetings

The following tables report valid percentages for the sample of **policy influencers** who responded "Yes" when asked **to indicate whether they had had contact with external stakeholders on healthy public policy issues,** stratified by province (Table 13); and what the content focus of this contact was overall (Table 14) and stratified by province (Table 15).

Table 13: Valid percentages of **policy influencers**, stratified by province, who had contact with external stakeholders on given healthy public policy issues

Organization in Question	Overall	Alberta	Manitoba
Stakeholders outside organization for mental health	61.9%	67.8%	48.0%
Stakeholders outside organization for substance use	37.7%	42.5%	25.7%
Stakeholders outside organization for alcohol	32.6%	34.2%	28.4%
Stakeholders outside organization for tobacco	31.3%	36.7%	19.0%
Stakeholders outside organization for nutrition	31.5%	33.9%	25.7%
Stakeholders outside organization for physical activity	50.4%	53.8%	42.1%





Table 14: Valid percentages of the content of stakeholder contact with various external stakeholders according to the overall **policy influencer** sample

Focus of Contact with Stakeholders	Mainly Health Promotion	Mainly Commercial	Equally on Both	Other
Mental Health	70.9%	2.6%	16.6%	9.9%
Substance Use	70.8%	1.0%	20.8%	7.3%
Alcohol	48.2%	13.3%	27.7%	10.8%
Tobacco	80.0%	3.8%	12.5%	3.8%
Nutrition	59.5%	10.1%	26.6%	3.8%
Physical Activity	50.0%	7.8%	31.2%	10.9%





Table 15: Valid percentages of the content of stakeholder contact with various external stakeholders according to the **policy influencer** sample, by province

		Alberta			Manitoba			
Focus of Contact with Stakeholders	Mainly Health Promotion	Mainly Commercial	Equally on Both	Other	Mainly Health Promotion	Mainly Commercial	Equally on Both	Other
Mental Health	73.1%	2.5%	16.0%	8.4%	62.5%	3.1%	18.8%	15.6%
Substance Use	72.7%	1.3%	16.9%	9.1%	63.2%	0.0%	36.8%	0.0%
Alcohol	49.2%	12.7%	27.0%	11.1%	45.0%	15.0%	30.0%	10.0%
Tobacco	78.5%	4.6%	13.8%	3.1%	86.7%	0.0%	6.7%	6.7%
Nutrition	60.7%	6.6%	31.1%	1.6%	55.6%	22.2%	11.1%	11.1%
Physical Activity	48.5%	8.2%	33.0%	10.3%	54.8%	6.5%	25.8%	12.9%





Addendum: Key Considerations for Data Use

- Provision of the data in no way implies transfer of ownership by the University of Alberta.
- The APCCP must be **named** and given credit for conducting the research in all dissemination of the data herein.
- The APCCP Research Committee member(s)/investigator(s) who led the research must be named on all
 internal and external releases of data and be provided with the opportunity to ensure that any technical
 aspects and/or interpretation of data are technically correct. Please contact the PLACE Research Lab for
 details.
- Data released to APCCP stakeholders are immediately free to share them *internally* within their organizations.
- Data released to external partners, stakeholders, or the media are subject to additional conditions (see below).

External Data Releases (i.e., Media Releases)

The APCCP Research Committee member(s)/investigator(s) via the PLACE Research Lab:

- Must be notified in writing (<u>minimum</u> of 48 hours notice), in advance of any planned media releases involving data reported here. Should the APCCP *Research Committee* fail to respond within a timely manner or decline to participate, data requesters can proceed with a public release of the data *unless otherwise notified*.
- Will ensure that the interpretation of data is consistent with other APCCP messaging.
- May elect to participate directly through a joint media release with the stakeholder.
- May request the temporary or permanent delay of the release in order to fulfill their research obligations.





Acknowledgements

Funding for the 2009 Chronic Disease Prevention Survey provided through the Alberta Policy Coalition for Cancer Prevention, an initiative funded by Alberta Health Services – Alberta Cancer Prevention Legacy Fund. Funding for the 2014 & 2016 Chronic Disease Prevention Survey was provided by the POWER UP! project (2013-2016). POWER UP! stands for Policy Opportunity Windows – Engaging Research Uptake in Practice. POWER UP! was a team of researchers, practitioners, and policy makers who came together to gather and share evidence on chronic disease prevention with Canadians – all in one place. Funding for POWER UP! was provided by the federal government through the Canadian Partnership Against Cancer's Coalitions Linking Action & Science for Prevention (CLASP) program. Funding for the 2017-2021 Chronic Disease Prevention Survey provided by Alberta Innovates under the Collaborative Research and Innovation Opportunities funding portfolio Cancer Prevention Research Opportunity, as part of the Impact of Benchmarking Food Environments on Policies and Actions to Promote Healthy Eating for Reducing Cancer Risk project. Funding for the 2019 and 2021 Chronic Disease Prevention Survey provided by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research as part of the Health, Prevention, and Policy Environments (HAPPEN): Investigating Policy-Maker and Public Knowledge, Attitudes, and Beliefs about the Effectiveness of Healthy Public Policies project.

Suggested Citation

Policy Location and Access in Community Environments (PLACE) Research Lab (2021). 2021 Chronic Disease Prevention Survey Data Release: Complete Summary from Policy Influencers and the General Public in Alberta and Manitoba. School of Public Health, University of Alberta. 2021.

CONTACT US:

Dr. Candace Nykiforuk, Lead Investigator
PLACE Research Lab
placeresearchlab@ualberta.ca | www.placeresearchlab.com
Alberta Policy Coalition for Chronic Disease Prevention
info@abpolicycoalitionforprevention.ca | www.abpolicycoalitionforprevention.ca