|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Canadian General Social Survey on Giving, Volunteering, and Participating, 2018 (cycle 33)** |
| Sample type | Stratified Sampling (stratified design employing probability sampling) |
| Sample size | A field sample of approximatively 50,000 units was used. Among them, about 40,000 invitation letters to the electronic questionnaire were sent to selected households across Canada. A completion of 24,000 questionnaires was expected. |
| Target population | all persons 15 years of age and older in Canada, excluding:  1. Residents of the Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut;  2. Full-time residents of institutions. |
| Sampling frame | This survey uses a frame that combines landline and cellular telephone numbers from the Census and various administrative sources with Statistics Canada's dwelling frame. |
| Survey mode(s) | self completed electronic questionnaire or CATI (computer assisted telephone interviewing) |
| Timeline | Reference period: Past 12 months preceding interview date  Collection period: Every 5 years, from September to December |
| Response rate | 41.9% |
| Weights | WGHT\_PER: This is the basic weighting factor for analysis at the person level. In addition to the estimation weights, bootstrap weights have been created for the purpose of design-based variance estimation. |
| Data processing | Survey data was processed using SSPE that ensured high quality results through automated and manual checks at different stages. Errors were identified and corrected such as verifying family relationships, age consistency and correct question flow, using the CATI system and head office reviews. |
| Cleaning, imputation, etc. | Imputation was carried out in nine steps. When donor imputation could not be used, mean imputation among a pool of donors was used. Personal income data were obtained from the 2017 T1FF for 81.9% of respondents. Missing information for other respondents was imputed. |
| Sources of error | Common errors include sampling and non-sampling error.  coverage error and non-response bias  processing errors |
| Limitations, known biases | Households without telephones, as well as households with telephone services not covered by the current frame  Some non-response occurred at the household level, and some at the individual level. Survey estimates will be adjusted (i.e. weighted) to account for non-response cases.  Households without telephones were therefore excluded from the survey population. Survey estimates were adjusted (weighted) to represent all persons in the target population, including those not covered by the survey frame. |
| Citation | General Social Survey - Giving, Volunteering and Participating (GSS GVP), Statistics Canada |
| Links to any documentation or additional sources used | https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&Id=796234 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Canadian Election Study Online Survey, 2019** |
| Sample type | Stratified sampling (stratified by region and balanced on gender and age within each region and balanced on gender and age within each region). It was composed of a two-wave panel  with a modified rolling-cross section during the campaign period and a post-election recontact wave. |
| Sample size | Campaign Period survey : 37,822 members of the Canadian general population  Post Election survey : 10,340 respondents from the campaign period survey was re-contacted |
| Target population | Respondents aged 18 or over, Canadian citizens or PR holders |
| Sampling frame | 1. cps19\_weight\_general\_all - all campaign period respondents  2. cps19\_weight\_general\_restricted - only high-quality campaign period respondents  (see Data Quality section below)  3. pes19\_weight\_general\_all - all post-election survey respondents  4. pes19\_weight\_general\_restricted - only high-quality post-election survey respondents |
| Survey mode(s) | Qualtrics online platform |
| Timeline | Campaign Period Survey occurred from September 13th to October 21st 1, 2019.  Post-Election Survey occurred from October 24th to  November 11th, 2019 |
| Response rate | Pre-election survey : 45.48% clean complete  Post election survey : 61.62% clean complete |
| Weights | Weights have been created for the dataset using an iterative "raking'' process, as provided by  the ipfraking command in STATA15. Marginal values were successively weighted according to  province, as well as gender, age group, and education level. All population data were taken  from the 2016 Canadian census. A maximum of 200 iterations were completed. The dataset  includes the weights produced as 4 variables, depending on which portion of the sample is  being used:    1. cps19\_weight\_general\_all - all campaign period respondents  2. cps19\_weight\_general\_restricted - only high-quality campaign period respondents  (see Data Quality section below)  3. pes19\_weight\_general\_all - all post-election survey respondents  4. pes19\_weight\_general\_restricted - only high-quality post-election survey respondents  Note that respondents from the territories do not have weights, as they were not included in the  sampling frame, because data collection in the territories is too sparse to be representative. |
| Data processing | During the data cleaning process, respondents were categorized based on their most important reason for removal, removed duplicates. |
| Cleaning, imputation, etc. | Removal criteria and identify duplicates |
| Sources of error |  |
| Limitations, known biases | Incomplete responses, duplicate responses of previous respondents, speeders, those who  “straight-lined” grid questions (“straightliners”), and respondents whose postal code didn’t match  their province have all been removed from the data file, and are excluded from numbers  reported in this codebook. Inattentive respondents who took more than 60 minutes to complete the survey. |
| Citation | Stephenson, Laura B., Allison Harell, Daniel Rubenson  and Peter John Loewen. The 2019 Canadian Election Study – Online Survey. [dataset] |
| Links to any documentation or additional sources used | http://www.ces-eec.ca/2019-canadian-election-study/ |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Trophic niche flexibility in Glossophaga soricina: how nectar seeker sneaks an insect snack** |
| Sample type | The study involved field samples (faecal samples) and behavioral experiments with a captive colony of bats to assess dietary habits and echolocation behaviors |
| Sample size | 38 faecal samples |
| Target population | Glossophaga soricine bats |
| Sampling frame | All Glossophaga soricine, in  the Area de Conservacion de Guanacaste, Costa Rica during the study period. |
| Survey mode(s) | ﬁeld surveys, captive behavioural experiments,  acoustic analyses and genetic methods to assess niche ﬂexi-  bility in G. soricina and describe the behavioural and acous-  tic mechanisms of insect capture and the species of insects  targeted. |
| Timeline | Caught Glossophaga soricina during a 7-week period from late May to early July 2009. No other information was found in this document. |
| Response rate | unknown |
| Weights | unknown |
| Data processing | DNA extraction, dietary analysis, |
| Cleaning, imputation, etc. | unknown |
| Sources of error | Only half of the insects were identiﬁed to species level,  as the reference data base for the area is comprised.  molecular techniques used for diet analysis are not well-suited for estimating the proportions of different prey items, as they detect presence but not abundance. |
| Limitations, known biases | The study faced limitations in accurately estimating insect consumption by G. soricina. Not all bats produced faecal pellets during captivity, potentially underestimating insectivory. Additionally, the absence of insect fragments in pellets was not definitive proof of nectarivory, as some bats might not have produced pellets within the study timeframe. |
| Citation | Functional Ecology 2014, 28, 632–641 doi: 10.1111/1365-2435.12192 |
| Links to any documentation or additional sources used | https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/1365-2435.12192 |