

**Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES)  
Module 3: Sample Design and Data Collection Report**

Country: Brazil  
Date of Election: first round: 2010, October, 3rd  
Second round, 2010, October, 31<sup>st</sup>  
Type of election: presidential; governors and state and federal legislative  
Prepared by: Rachel Meneguello  
Date of Preparation: October, 15, 2011

**NOTES TO COLLABORATORS:**

- Where brackets [ ] appear, answer by placing an “X” within the appropriate bracket or brackets.
- If more space is needed to answer any question, please lengthen the document as necessary.

**Collaborator(s):**

Collaborators are the contact persons for election studies that appear in the CSES dataset - they are not necessarily the parties who collected the data. These collaborators and their contact information will be listed on the CSES website.

Name: Rachel Meneguello Title: Dr Organization: University of Campinas(UNICAMP)- Dept.of Political Science and Center for Studies on Public Opinion(Cesop)  Address: Cidade Universitaria Zeferino Vaz, Caixa Postal 6110, Campinas, Sao Paulo, 13081-970, Brasil  Telephone: 55-19-3531-7093 Fax: 55-19-3289-4309 E-Mail: racael@unicamp.br Website: www.cesop.unicamp.br	Name: Marta Maia Title: Dr (Technical Manager) Organization: Vox Populi  Address: Rua Ouro Preto, nº1.295 Bairro: Santo Agostinho Belo Horizonte – MG – Brasil CEP: 30.170-041  Telephone: (55 31) 3014.5000 Fax: (55 31) 3014.5008  E-Mail: Website: www.voxpopuli.com.br
---	--

**Data Collection Organization:**

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

Organization: Vox Opinião Pesquisa e Projetos Ltda.  
Address: Rua Ouro Preto, nº 1.295 – Bairro: Santo Agostinho – CEP: 30.170-041 – Belo Horizonte – MG – Brasil.

Telephone: (55 31) 3014.5000  
Fax: (55 31) 3014.5008

Website: [www.voxpopuli.com.br](http://www.voxpopuli.com.br)

**Funding Organization(s):**

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

Organization: CNPq \_ Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico and Universidade de Campinas UNICAMP / Centro de Estudos de Opinião Pública CESOP  
Address: Cidade Universitaria Zeferino Vaz, Caixa Postal 6110, Campinas, Sao Paulo, 13081-970, Brasil

Telephone: 55-19-3521-7093  
Fax: 19-3289-4309  
E-Mail: [cesop@unicamp.br](mailto:cesop@unicamp.br)  
Website: [www.cesop.unicamp.br](http://www.cesop.unicamp.br)

Organization: Vox Opinião Pesquisa e Projetos Ltda.  
Address: Rua Ouro Preto, nº 1.295 – Bairro: Santo Agostinho – CEP: 30.170-041 – Belo Horizonte – MG – Brasil.

Telephone: (55 31) 3014.5000  
Fax: (55 31) 3014.5008

Website: [www.voxpopuli.com.br](http://www.voxpopuli.com.br)

**Archiving Organization**

If appropriate, please indicate the primary location where the full, original election study dataset (not just the CSES portion) will be archived:

Organization: University of Campinas(UNICAMP) \_ Center for Studies on Public Opinion (CESOP)

Address: Cidade Universitaria Zeferino Vaz, Caixa Postal 6110, Campinas, Sao Paulo, 13081-970, Brasil

Telephone: 55-19-3531-7093

Fax:55-19-3289-4309

e-mail: [bdcesop@unicamp.br](mailto:bdcesop@unicamp.br)

[www.cesop.unicamp.br](http://www.cesop.unicamp.br)

**Please indicate the date when the study is expected to be available at this archive: November 30, 2011.**

### **Study Design**

1. Timing of the study that the CSES Module was included in:

**Post-Election Study**

2a. Date Post-Election Interviewing Began:

**November 04, 2010**

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended:

**November 20, 2010**

3. Mode of (post-election) interview:

**In person, face-to-face**

4a. Was the survey part of a panel study?

**No**

### **Translation**

Please provide copies of questionnaires in all languages used as part of the election study deposit. For questionnaires in a language other than English, please also provide a version of each translated back into English. Note: Questions are based on those developed for the ISSP.

5. Was the questionnaire translated?

**Yes.**

6. Please list all languages used for the fielded module:

**Portuguese Language**

7a. If the questionnaire was translated, was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?

Yes

7b. If the questionnaire was translated, was the questionnaire pre-tested?

**The questionnaire was translated by CESOP's team; it was pre-tested.**

7c. If the questionnaire was translated, were there any questions which caused problems when translating?

**No**

**Note: there are 27 different versions of the questionnaire filled with different names of local politicians (governors, senators) for each state of federation.**

## **Sample Design and Sampling Procedures**

### **Eligibility Requirements**

**Age: minimum: 16; maximum: -**  
**Citizenship: Brazilian**  
**Other requirements: no**

### **Sample Frame**

10a. Were any regions of the country excluded from the sample frame?  
**No**

10b. Were institutionalized persons excluded from the sample?  
 Yes

People inhabiting in Institutions such as: prisons, churches, schools, had been excluded from the sample for not representing the population of that place.

10c. Were personnel excluded from the sample?  
 No

### **Sample Selection Procedures**

11. Please describe, in your own words, how the sample for the study was selected. If the survey is part of a panel study, please also describe the original sample, from the beginning of the study.

**See answer 13a**

12a. What were the primary sampling units?

***In the first stage, 149 primary sampling units (PSU), or municipios, were selected probability proportional to size (PPS). Each PSU consists of a single municipio as defined by IBGE. For the 2009 Projeção da População, IBGE divided Brazil into 5 census region with 27 states and 5566 municipios.***

12c. Were the primary sampling units randomly selected?  
 Yes

13. Were there further stages of selection?  
 Yes

13a. If there were further stages of selection, what were the sampling units at each of the additional stages?

**The study employs a three stage stratified probability sample of Brazilian adults. In the first stage, 149 primary sampling units (PSU), or municipios, were selected probability proportional to size (PPS). In the second stage, 500 secondary units (census tracts) were selected PPS within each of the PSUs. In the third stage, the households were selected within census tracts with one adult respondent being selected by quota by situação (urbana/rural) age, sex, education level, working/not working population, according to 2008 PNAD (IBGE). The interviewer has specific procedures to complete the quotas: in sum, the interviewer enumerates the blocs within census tracts, walks the blocs oriented by hour direction, and at each three households he runs the interview. Inside the household the quotas are applied to choose the respondent. These procedures allow checking the interviews and limit the interviewer to run the interviews within the selected census tract.**

14b. Could more than one respondent be interviewed from a single household?

No

Did the sample design include stratification?

Definition: Stratification involves the division of the population of interest according to certain characteristics (for instance: geographic, political, or demographic). Random selection then occurs within each of the groups that result.

Yes

**The stratification involves administrative division. Brazil is divided in 5 administrative regions. The population distribution is the following, according to 2009 Population Estimation**

**North: 8,0%**

**Northeast: 28,0%**

**Southeast: 42,3%**

**South: 14,5%**

**Center-west: 7,2%**

19. Under what circumstances was a household designated non-sample? Please check all that apply:

Non-residential sample point

All members of household are ineligible

Housing unit is vacant

*When a household was selected, but didn't have criteria to be part of the sample, this house was substituted for the following domicile listed by the researcher.*

**Incentives**

24a. Prior to the study, was a letter sent to the respondent?

No

24b. Prior to the study, was a payment sent to the respondent?

No

24c. Prior to the study, was a token gift sent to the respondent?

No

24d. Did respondent receive an additional payment after their participation? (Do not include any payment made prior to the study.)

No

24e. Were any other incentives used?

No

### Interviewers

25. Please describe the interviewers (e.g., age, level of education, years of experience):

**The majority of interviewers had experience of field work;**

**Interviewers' age between 18 to 50;**

**Level of education: it was necessary minimum high school.**

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training:

***In the training given to the field interviewers such had been considered all the procedures of the field work as: procedures to be followed, material to be used, the use of quota procedures, the selection of the interviewed one in each domicile, entering in the domiciles, as to carry through of the interview, reading of all the questionnaire and explanation of codes and procedures asks for question.***

### Contacts

What was the average number of contact attempts made per household, for the entire sample?

***The average number was 5 contacts per household for each interview done.***

During the field period, how many contacts were made with the household before declaring it a **non-sample?**

**01 contact**

During the field period, how many contacts were made with the household before declaring it a **non-interview?**

**01 contact**

During the field period, what were the maximum number of days over which a household was contacted?

**2 days**

During the field period, did interviewers vary the time of day at which they re-contacted the household?

**yes**

### **Refusal Conversion**

Were efforts made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed?

**No**

Were respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed sent a letter persuading them to take part?

**No**

Was payment offered to respondents who were reluctant to take part?

**No**

Were respondents who were reluctant to take part turned over to a more experienced interviewer?

**No**

Were any other methods used to persuade respondents reluctant to be interviewed to take part?

**No**

### **Interview/Survey Verification**

Definition: Interview/survey verification is the process of verifying that an interview was conducted and that the survey was administered to the correct respondent, for quality control purposes.

30. Was interview/survey verification used?

**Yes**

If yes, please describe the method(s) used: **Telephone ckecking**

If yes, please indicate the percent of completed surveys that were verified: 30 %



## Response Rate

32. Please provide the following statistics for the survey that the CSES Module appeared in.

Note: If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please report the statistics for the first wave of the study, even if the CSES Module did not appear in that wave.)

A. Total number of households in sample:	2000
B. Number of valid households:	2000
C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households:	8.045
D. Number of households of unknown validity:	3.342
E. Number of completed interviews:	2000
F. Number of partial interviews:	0
G. Number of refusals and break-offs:	2983
H. Number non-contact (never contacted):	3.342
I. Other non-response:	

**Post-Survey Adjustment Weights**

37. Are weights necessary to make the sample representative of the population being studied?

No

38. Are weights included in the data file?

Yes

39. If weights are included in the data file, please describe in detail how the weights were constructed:

*Weight used was for population projection.*

40a. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to compensate for disproportionate probability of selection?

No

40b. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to match known demographic characteristics of the population?

No

40c. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to correct for non-response?

No

40d. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to correct to the official election results?

No

41. Comparison of Completed Interviews to Population (please provide as percentages of the total):

Characteristic	Population Estimates	Completed Interviews	
		Distribution	
<u>Age</u>			
16-17	0,1%	0,1%	
18-24	17,0%	16,9%	
25-34	24,5%	24,5%	
35-44	19,9%	19,8%	
45-59	22,5%	22,6%	
60 or more	16,1%	16,3%	
<u>Education</u>			
ATÉ 4 SÉRIE	34,1%	33,3%	
DE 5ª A 8ª SÉRIE	23,9%	23,9%	
MÉDIO	29,7%	31,1%	
SUPERIOR	12,4%	11,7%	
<u>Education *</u>			
Primary Completed	57,9%	57,2%	
Secondary Completed	29,7%	31,1%	
University Degree	12,4%	11,7%	
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	48,4%	48,3%	
Female	51,7%	51,7%	

\*these age groups are provided to compare to BES2006

The demographic data come from PNAD- 2008. The PNAD is a national research for sample in households carried through IBGE annually (IBGE is the government institute that makes the census in Brazil).