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## 1. Executive Summary

Leger is pleased to present The Privy Council Office of Canada, as well as the Government of Canada, with this technical report describing the methodology used for the longitudinal study on public perceptions, knowledge and behaviours during the COVID-19 pandemic.

This report was prepared by Leger who was contracted by The Privy Council Office (contract number 35035-200624/001/CY awarded October $8^{\text {th }}, 2020$ ). Phase 2 of this project covers waves 9 to 16 . Details for the eight previous waves were published under the title: Implementation of the World Health Organization's Behavioural Insights Covid19 Survey Tool in the Canadian Context: Rapid and Cost-Effective Monitoring of Public Perceptions, Knowledge and Behaviours.

### 1.1 Background and Objectives

In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Privy Council Office (PCO), the secretariat responsible for providing nonpartisan advice to the Prime Minister and coordinating the work of federal government departments and agencies, needed ongoing access to quantitative data describing the evolution of Canadians' perceptions, attitudes, knowledge, and behaviours in this uncertain context. The Behavioural Insight Tool (BI), developed by the World Health Organization (WHO), was used as the data collection tool for this study. At each survey wave, the collection tool was adjusted to reflect the evolution of the pandemic and the primary data needs of PCO.

The main objectives of this study were to provide PCO and other government departments (e.g., Health Canada \& Public Health Agency of Canada) with research-based information on Canadians' perceptions, knowledge and behaviours relating to COVID-19. This includes:

- trust in health authorities, recommendations, and information;
- risk perceptions;
- acceptance of recommended behaviours;
- knowledge;
- barriers/drivers to recommended behaviours;
- misperceptions;
- and stigma.

The results of this public opinion study has been and will be put to various uses by PCO and other federal departments and agencies:

- Track Canadians' evolving perceptions, knowledge and behaviours relating to COVID19 , to better understand how public awareness campaigns and broader government
response efforts have been affecting the population more holistically and to inform whole-of-government decision-making moving forward;
- Compare data trends cross-nationally (i.e., with other allied countries that adopt the WHO BI protocol) in a standardized manner, facilitating a better understanding how the Canadian populace fares relative to other nations on an ongoing basis in their perceptions, attitudes, and knowledge; and
- Enable the Government of Canada to further develop and refine COVID-19 response efforts to meet the specific needs of Canadians. This study was seen as an element of broader public engagement efforts in response to COVID-19 that intend to proactively and iteratively educate and encourage Canadians to play their part in sustained response efforts.


### 1.2 Notes on The Interpretation of The Findings

Since a sample drawn from an Internet panel is not probabilistic in nature, the margin of error cannot be calculated for this survey. Respondents for this survey were selected from among those who have volunteered to participate/registered to participate in online surveys. The results of such surveys cannot be described as statistically projectable to the target population. The data have been weighted to reflect the demographic composition of the target population. Because the sample is based on those who initially self-selected for participation, no estimates of sampling error can be calculated.

### 1.3 Declaration of Political Neutrality and Contact Information

I hereby certify, as chief agent of Leger, that the deliverables are in full compliance with the neutrality requirements of the Policy on Communications and Federal Identity and the Directive on the Management of Communications-Appendix C (Appendix C: Mandatory Procedures for Public Opinion Research).

Specifically, the deliverables do not include information on electoral voting intentions, political party preferences, party positions, or the assessment of the performance of a political party or its leaders.

Signed by:


## Christian Bourque

Executive Vice President and Associate
Leger
507 Place d'Armes, Suite 700
Montréal, Quebec
H2Y 2W8
cbourque@leger360.com

### 1.4 Methodology

This study was conducted through a web-based survey of the Canadian population aged 18 and over who can speak English or French. The respondents were randomly selected through the Leo panel, our panel of Canadian Internet users comprising nearly half a million Internet users.

A total of sixteen waves of surveys were completed in two phases for this research project, with this report focusing on the second phase, covering waves nine to sixteen. A sample of approximately 2,000 respondents was collected each wave. Since this was a longitudinal study, the objective was to re-invite the 2,000 respondents from wave one in subsequent survey waves. Our goal was to maximize the number of respondents who respond to the maximum number of survey waves. Respondents who cease to participate in subsequent waves were replaced following the gender, age and regional quotas that were implemented in the project.

All respondents were contacted via email by Leger. All invitations were bilingual to ensure that no respondent gets a unilingual invitation in the wrong official language. Each respondent was provided with an invitation that includes preapproved information from PCO regarding the nature of the research (i.e. Government of Canada) including the required information for consent and the rights and obligations of respondents.

Fieldwork for this project took place from November 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}, 2020$ to November 22, 2021. Details of waves nine to sixteen are provided in the following sections.

### 1.5 Quotas

A series of quotas were implemented for this project. Quotas were cross-referenced by gender and age groups and were also imposed on the region of residence of respondents. The first quota is $50 \%$ men and $50 \%$ women for the gender sample. These gender quotas were also respected within the following age groups: 18-34, 35-54 and 55 and over. Those gender and age quotas had to be respected at the regional level. The Canadian regions were split as follows:

- Atlantic Canada (Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick);
- Quebec;
- Ontario;
- Manitoba/Saskatchewan/Nunavut;
- Alberta/Northwest Territories;
- British Columbia/Yukon.

The following table details the expected distribution of the sample across the provinces and territories for each wave.

The sample distribution was planned as follows:

| Provinces and Territories | NL | NS | PE | NB | QC | ON | MB | SK | AB | BC | NU | NT | YT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# of Respondents | 40 | 80 | 22 | 60 | 400 | 620 | 126 | 106 | 260 | 280 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

As there were no respondents from Nunavut, the two planned respondents were replaced by respondents from Manitoba and Saskatchewan. As for any general population sample derived from a national survey, the final results were weighted by region, age groups, gender, education and the presence of children in the household to make the final samples representative of the actual population of Canada. Details on the weighting factors are presented in a subsequent section of this report.

## 2. Details for Each Wave

### 2.1 Pretest

To validate the programming of the questionnaire, a pretest was conducted before each wave of the project. The following table shows the details of those pretests. A validation of frequencies and databases was done after each pretest to ensure that the programming was accurate and functional.

Table 1. Pretest details for waves 9 through 16

## Wave 9

Date of the pretest
November 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}, 2020$


### 2.2 Data collection

Data collection for this project began in November 2020 and was carried out over several waves until November 2021. Each wave lasted between seven and eight days in field. A minimum target of 2,000 respondents for each wave was established. Following the first wave, Léger conducted recontacts to maximize the number of respondents who participated in previous waves and replaced respondents who ceased to participate in subsequent waves following the gender, age and regional quotas. The first days of data collection were aimed at recontacting previous respondents, while the last days of data collection were aimed at replacing the non-returning respondents, due to attrition. The following table details the collection dates and the number of respondents and recontacts for each wave.
It should be noted that wave 15 has fewer than 2,000 respondents. This wave had to be ended before the scheduled end of the field because a federal election was called. The fieldwork had to be completed prematurely since no public opinion research may be conducted during an election campaign.

Table 2. Data collection details for waves 9 through 16

| Wave 9 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Start of data collection | November 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}, 2020$ |
| End of data collection | November 8 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2020$ |
| Invitations sent | 5,359 |
| Recontact | 4,487 |
| New respondents | 872 |
| Number of completed interviews | 2,055 |
| Recontact | 2,044 |
| New respondents | 11 |
| Survey Length (Average) | 24 minutes |
| Survey Length (Median) | 21 minutes |
| Wave 10 |  |
| Start of data collection | December $16^{\text {th }}$, 2020 |
| End of data collection | December 22 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$,2020 |




| Invitations sent | 14,384 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Recontact | 2,090 |
| New respondents | 666 |
| Number of completed <br> interviews | 2,033 |
| Recontact | 1,765 |
| New respondents | 268 |
| Survey Length (Average) | 25 minutes |
| Survey Length (Median) | 22 minutes |

### 2.3. Participation rate

Below is the calculation of the participation rate to the web survey for wave nine to sixteen. The participation rate is calculated using the following formula: Participation rate / response rate $=\mathrm{R} \div(\mathrm{U}+\mathrm{IS}+\mathrm{R})$. The table below provides details of the calculation. For wave nine to sixteen, the participation rate ranges between $15 \%$ and $41 \%$.

Table 3. Participation rate for wave 9

| Base Sample | $\mathbf{5 , 3 5 9}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Invalid cases | 0 |
| Invitations mistakenly sent to people who did <br> not qualify for the study | 0 |
| Incomplete or missing email addresses | 0 |
| Unresolved (U) | $\mathbf{2 , 8 1 6}$ |
| Email invitations bounce back | 0 |
| Email invitations unanswered | 2,816 |
| EFFECTIVE SAMPLE* | 2,191 |
| In-scope non-responding units (IS) | 116 |
| Non-response from eligible respondents | 0 |
| Respondent refusals | 0 |
| Language problem | 0 |
| Selected respondent not available (illness; <br> leave of absence; vacation; other) | 0 |
| Early break-offs | 116 |
| Responding units (R) | 2,075 |
| Completed surveys disqualified -quota filled | 0 |


| Completed surveys disqualified for other <br> reasons | 20 |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 , 0 5 5}$ |
| Participation rate | $\mathbf{4 1 \%}$ |

Table 4. Participation rate for wave 10

| Base Sample | $\mathbf{1 3 , 2 1 8}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Invalid cases | 0 |  |  |  |
| Invitations mistakenly sent to people who did <br> not qualify for the study | 0 |  |  |  |
| Incomplete or missing email addresses | 0 |  |  |  |
| Unresolved (U) | $\mathbf{1 0 , 4 8 6}$ |  |  |  |
| Email invitations bounce back | 0 |  |  |  |
| Email invitations unanswered | 10,486 |  |  |  |
| EFFECTIVE SAMPLE* | 2,391 |  |  |  |
| In-scope non-responding units (IS) | $\mathbf{2 4 2}$ |  |  |  |
| Non-response from eligible respondents | 0 |  |  |  |
| Respondent refusals | 0 |  |  |  |
| Language problem | 0 |  |  |  |
| Selected respondent not available (illness; <br> leave of absence; vacation; other) | $\mathbf{0}$ |  |  |  |
| Early break-offs | $\mathbf{2 4 2}$ |  |  |  |
| Responding units (R) | $\mathbf{2 , 1 4 9}$ |  |  |  |
| Completed surveys disqualified - quota filled | 0 |  |  |  |
| Completed surveys disqualified for other <br> reasons | $\mathbf{2 4}$ |  |  |  |
| COMPLETED INTERVIEWs | $\mathbf{2 , 1 2 5}$ |  |  |  |
| Participation rate |  |  |  |  |

Table 5. Participation rate for wave 11

| Base Sample | $\mathbf{6 , 1 9 5}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Invalid cases | 0 |
| Invitations mistakenly sent to people who did <br> not qualify for the study | 0 |
| Incomplete or missing email addresses | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Unresolved (U) | $\mathbf{3 , 3 8 0}$ |


| Email invitations bounce back |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Email invitations unanswered | 0 |  |  |  |
| EFFECTIVE SAMPLE* | 3,380 |  |  |  |
| In-scope non-responding units (IS) | 2,139 |  |  |  |
| Non-response from eligible respondents | 80 |  |  |  |
| Respondent refusals | 0 |  |  |  |
| Language problem | 0 |  |  |  |
| Selected respondent not available (illness; <br> leave of absence; vacation; other) | 0 |  |  |  |
| Early break-offs | 0 |  |  |  |
| Responding units (R) | $\mathbf{8 0}$ |  |  |  |
| Completed surveys disqualified - quota filled | $\mathbf{2 , 0 5 9}$ |  |  |  |
| Completed surveys disqualified for other <br> reasons | 0 |  |  |  |
| COMPLETED INTERVIEWS | 22 |  |  |  |
| Participation rate |  |  |  | $\mathbf{2 , 0 3 7}$ |

Table 6. Participation rate for wave 12

| Base Sample | $\mathbf{1 0 , 0 0 7}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Invalid cases | 0 |
| Invitations mistakenly sent to people who did <br> not qualify for the study | 0 |
| Incomplete or missing email addresses | 0 |
| Unresolved (U) | $\mathbf{7 , 6 6 7}$ |
| Email invitations bounce back | 0 |
| Email invitations unanswered | 7,667 |
| EFFECTIVE SAMPLE* | 2,157 |
| In-scope non-responding units (IS) | 64 |
| Non-response from eligible respondents | 0 |
| Respondent refusals | 0 |
| Language problem | 0 |
| Selected respondent not available (illness; <br> leave of absence; vacation; other) | 0 |
| Early break-offs | 64 |
| Responding units (R) | 2,093 |
| Completed surveys disqualified - quota filled | 0 |


| Completed surveys disqualified for other <br> reasons | 23 |
| :--- | :---: |
| COMPLETED INTERVIEWS | $\mathbf{2 , 0 7 0}$ |
| Participation rate | $\mathbf{2 1 \%}$ |

Table 7. Participation rate for wave 13

| Base Sample | $\mathbf{9 , 1 5 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Invalid cases | 0 |
| Invitations mistakenly sent to people who did <br> not qualify for the study | 0 |
| Incomplete or missing email addresses | 0 |
| Unresolved (U) | $\mathbf{6 , 5 2 4}$ |
| Email invitations bounce back | 0 |
| Email invitations unanswered | 6,524 |
| EFFECTIVE SAMPLE* | $\mathbf{2 , 1 8 8}$ |
| In-scope non-responding units (IS) | 87 |
| Non-response from eligible respondents | 0 |
| Respondent refusals | 0 |
| Language problem | 0 |
| Selected respondent not available (illness; <br> leave of absence; vacation; other) | 0 |
| Early break-offs | $\mathbf{8 7}$ |
| Responding units (R) | $\mathbf{2 , 1 0 1}$ |
| Completed surveys disqualified - quota filled | 0 |
| Completed surveys disqualified for other <br> reasons | $\mathbf{1 8}$ |
| COMPLETED INTERVIEWs | $\mathbf{2 , 0 8 3}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{2 4 \%}$ |

Table 8. Participation rate for wave 14

| Base Sample | $\mathbf{1 0 , 7 3 9}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Invalid cases | 0 |
| Invitations mistakenly sent to people who did <br> not qualify for the study | 0 |
| Incomplete or missing email addresses | 0 |
| Unresolved (U) | $\mathbf{8 , 1 9 2}$ |
| Email invitations bounce back | 0 |


| Email invitations unanswered | 8,192 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2,123 |  |  |
| In-scope non-responding units (IS) | 65 |  |  |
| Non-response from eligible respondents | 0 |  |  |
| Respondent refusals | 0 |  |  |
| Language problem | 0 |  |  |
| Selected respondent not available (illness; <br> leave of absence; vacation; other) | 0 |  |  |
| Early break-offs | 65 |  |  |
| Responding units (R) | $\mathbf{2 , 0 5 8}$ |  |  |
| Completed surveys disqualified - quota filled | 0 |  |  |
| Completed surveys disqualified for other <br> reasons | $\mathbf{3 3}$ |  |  |
| COMPLETED INTERVIEWS | $\mathbf{2 , 0 2 5}$ |  |  |
| Participation rate |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ |

Table 9. Participation rate for wave 15

| Base Sample | $\mathbf{5 , 6 2 8}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Invalid cases | 0 |
| Invitations mistakenly sent to people who did <br> not qualify for the study | 0 |
| Incomplete or missing email addresses | 0 |
| Unresolved (U) | $\mathbf{3 , 2 3 9}$ |
| Email invitations bounce back | 0 |
| Email invitations unanswered | 3,239 |
| EFFECTIVE SAMPLE* | 2,128 |
| In-scope non-responding units (IS) | 222 |
| Non-response from eligible respondents | 0 |
| Respondent refusals | 0 |
| Language problem | 0 |
| Selected respondent not available (illness; <br> leave of absence; vacation; other) | 0 |
| Early break-offs | 222 |
| Responding units (R) | 1,906 |
| Completed surveys disqualified - quota filled | 0 |


| Completed surveys disqualified for other <br> reasons | 33 |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 , 8 7 3}$ |
| Participation rate | $\mathbf{3 5 \%}$ |

Table 10. Participation rate for wave 16

| Base Sample | $\mathbf{1 4 , 3 8 4}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Invalid cases | 0 |  |  |  |
| Invitations mistakenly sent to people who did <br> not qualify for the study | 0 |  |  |  |
| Incomplete or missing email addresses | 0 |  |  |  |
| Unresolved (U) | $\mathbf{1 1 , 6 2 8}$ |  |  |  |
| Email invitations bounce back | 0 |  |  |  |
| Email invitations unanswered | 11,628 |  |  |  |
| EFFECTIVE SAMPLE* | 2,193 |  |  |  |
| In-scope non-responding units (IS) | 114 |  |  |  |
| Non-response from eligible respondents | 0 |  |  |  |
| Respondent refusals | 0 |  |  |  |
| Language problem | 0 |  |  |  |
| Selected respondent not available (illness; <br> leave of absence; vacation; other) | 0 |  |  |  |
| Early break-offs | $\mathbf{1 1 4}$ |  |  |  |
| Responding units (R) | 2,079 |  |  |  |
| Completed surveys disqualified - quota filled | 0 |  |  |  |
| Completed surveys disqualified for other <br> reasons | 46 |  |  |  |
| COMPLETED INTERVIEWS | $\mathbf{2 , 0 3 3}$ |  |  |  |
| Participation rate |  |  |  | $\mathbf{1 5 \%}$ |

