

**Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES)
Module 4: Design Report (Sample Design and Data Collection Report)**

September 10, 2012

Country: Argentina
Date of Election: October 25, 2015

Prepared by: Noam Lupu, Virginia Oliveros, Luis Schiumerini
Date of Preparation: December 2016

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: Noam Lupu Title: Associate Professor of Political Science Organization: Vanderbilt University Address: Commons Center, PMB 0505 230 Appleton Place Nashville, TN 37212 USA Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: noam.lupu@vanderbilt.edu Website: www.noamlupu.com	Name: Virginia Oliveros Title: Assistant Professor of Political Science Organization: Tulane University Address: Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: volivero@tulane.edu Website: https://virginiaoliveros.com/
Name: Luis Schiumerini Title: Postdoctoral Prize Research Fellow Organization: University of Oxford Address: Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: luis.schiumerini@nuffield.ox.ac.uk	Name: Title: Organization: Address: Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: Website:

<p>Website: https://sites.google.com/site/leschiumerini/</p>	
---	--

Data Collection Organization:

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

Organization: MBC Mori Address: Av. Coronel Diaz, 2777, 12A Buenos Aires Argentina Telephone: +54 (11) 4829 8800 Fax: E-Mail: info@mbc-mori.com.ar Website:
--

Funding Organization(s):

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

Organization: Address: Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: Website:
Organization: Address: Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: Website:
Organization: Address: Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: Website:

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: Address: Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: Website: www.noamlupu.com

Please indicate the date when the study is expected to be available at this archive:

Study Design

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

- Post-Election Study
- Pre-Election/Post-Election Panel Study
- Between Rounds

2a. Date Post-Election Interviewing Began:

November 21, 2015

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended:

December 30, 2015

3. Mode of interviewing for the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared:

(If multiple modes were used, please mark all that apply.)

- In person, face-to-face
- Telephone
- Mail or self-completion supplement
- Internet

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

- Yes
- No

4b. If the survey was part of a panel study, please describe the design of the panel study, including the date at which interviewing for each prior wave began and ended:

The first wave was conducted between June 24, 2015 and August 7, 2015. The second wave of the survey reinterviewed as many original respondents as possible plus a refresh sample of 626 respondents.

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, translated by member(s) of research team
- Yes, by translation bureau
- Yes, by specially trained translator(s)
- No, not translated

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

Spanish

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

- Yes, by group discussion
- Yes, an expert checked it
- Yes, by back translation
- Other; please specify: _____
- No
- Not applicable

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

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

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

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

7d. If the questionnaire was translated, please provide a list of all questions which caused problems when translating. For each question listed, describe what problems were encountered and how they were solved:

Sample Design and Sampling Procedures

8. Please describe the population that your sample is meant to be representative of:

Argentine citizens over 18 years of age

Eligibility Requirements

9a. Must a person be a certain age to be interviewed?

Yes

No

If yes, what ages could be interviewed?

18 or over

9b. Must a person be a citizen to be interviewed?

Yes

No

9c. Must a person be registered to vote to be interviewed?

Yes

No

9d. Please list any other interviewing requirements or filters used:

Sample Frame

10a. Were any regions of the country excluded from the sample frame?

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? _____ %

If yes, please explain:

10b. Were institutionalized persons excluded from the sample?

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? _____ %

If yes, please explain:

10c. Were military personnel excluded from the sample?

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? _____ %

If yes, please explain:

10d. If interviews were conducted by telephone, what is the estimated percentage of households without a phone? _____ %

Please explain:

10e. If interviews were conducted by telephone, were unlisted telephone numbers included in the population sampled?

Yes

No

If no, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? _____ %

10f. Were other persons excluded from the sample frame?

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? _____ %

If yes, please explain:

10g. Please estimate the total percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame: _____ 0 %

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.

Table 1 summarizes the details of the multistage sample design (the stratification rationale and procedure are explained below).

Table 1. *APES multistage sampling*

Stage	Sampling unit	Number of units	Cases within unit			Selection procedure
			Mean	Min	Max	
1	Cities/towns	18	63.83	27	349	Stratified sampling within strata of 2011 vote
2	Census fractions					PPS sampling
3	Census radiuses					PPS sampling
4	Blocks/PSU	160	7.18	4	9	Simple random sampling
5	Households	1,149	1	1	1	Systematic random sampling
6	Individuals	1,149	1	1	1	Gender and age quotas

Note: PPS stands for “Probability Proportional to Size”

Stages 2 through 6 were conducted according to standard household sampling procedures, using different types of probabilistic selection procedures when the population is composed of geographic areas or households, and turning to a quota (non-probability) procedure at the last stage, where the population is individuals. The high cost of probability sampling at this stage made it advisable to turn to standard quota procedures, which are easier to implement, less expensive, and less disruptive of the relationship between the interviewers and the members of the selected households. A combination of gender and age-range quotas were used at the PSU level, so that interviewers in a given block had to look for specific types of interviewers in order to complete the assigned gender and age profiles.

The selection of cities in stage 1 followed a different strategy. Cost consideration required us to select only 18 localities at this stage, a relatively small sample. As randomness requires large numbers to produce representative samples, the selection of cities was done with alternative methods. We first divided the country’s 23 provinces (plus the federal district of Buenos Aires) into four electoral strata. That is, instead of stratifying the sample by the usual criteria in public opinion surveys (e.g., region or city size), we stratified according to our main variable of interest, electoral behavior. This was especially appropriate in a context in which politics and elections have become denationalized and regional.

The APES team constructed four strata based on the 2011 presidential electoral results, using as the stratifying variable the percentage of the valid votes obtained by the incumbent Cristina Fernández de Kirchner. Provinces were classified into four strata and cities/towns selected within each stratum. Table 2 presents the details.

Table 2. *APES stratification by prior vote*

CFK 2011								
vote	Substratum	Weight	Province	City/town	Effective N			
<45%	Federal Capital	10.27	Capital Federal	Capital Federal	117			
	Córdoba San Luis Santa Fe	16.15	Córdoba	Córdoba Capital	50			
			Córdoba	Alta Gracia	46			
			Santa Fe	Rosario	46			
			Santa Fe	Santa Fe	39			
45–63%	Greater Buenos Aires	29.98	Buenos Aires	Greater Buenos Aires	349			
	Buenos Aires (int) Chubut Entre Ríos La Pampa La Rioja Mendoza Neuquén	23.97	Mendoza	Gran Mendoza	48			
			Buenos Aires	Mar del Plata	46			
			Entre Ríos	Paraná	38			
			La Rioja	La Rioja	49			
			Neuquén	Neuquén	46			
			Buenos Aires	Ayacucho	47			
			63–72%	Catamarca Corrientes Chaco Jujuy Misiones Río Negro Salta San Juan Tucumán Tierra del Fuego	16.89	Tucumán	Gran Tucumán	47
Chaco	Resistencia	39						
Corrientes	Corrientes	29						
Jujuy	S. S. de Jujuy	48						
Río Negro	Cipolletti	27						
>72%	Formosa Santa Cruz Santiago del Estero	2.75				Santiago del Estero	Termas de Río Hondo	38
		100.00			1,149			

The selection of cities within each stratum was based on a combination of purposeful and random sampling. All the cities larger than 10,000 inhabitants in each electoral stratum were listed. From this sampling frame the APES team randomly selected cities, but ensuring diversity in terms of size (such that the sample includes the range of cities from the metropolis of Buenos Aires, to large cities such as Córdoba or Mendoza, to medium-sized cities such as Corrientes and La Rioja, to small cities such as Cipolletti and Ayacucho) and in terms of the province in which they are located (giving more weight to larger provinces such that some are represented by two cities (e.g., Buenos Aires, Córdoba) and some by zero cities (e.g., Catamarca, Tierra del Fuego). Finally, cost considerations meant avoiding remote cities (e.g., in Southern Patagonia).

The metropolitan area of the city of Buenos Aires (where 32% of Argentines live), was given special treatment. Since it stretches over two different subnational districts (the federal capital and the province of Buenos Aires), it was divided into the City of Buenos Aires (or federal district) and Greater Buenos Aires. These two areas were defined as substrata within their strata

and included in the sample with a number of cases proportional to their weight in the population (that is, in the universe of Argentines living in cities of 10,000 inhabitants or larger). This means that about 40% of the country's adult population is fully represented by the inclusion in the sample of the City of Buenos Aires and Greater Buenos Aires, while the remaining 60% is represented by the other 16 cities.

12a. What were the primary sampling units?

Blocks

12b. How were the primary sampling units selected?

Randomly from within census radiuses (see Table 1 above)

12c. Were the primary sampling units randomly selected?

Yes

No

Please explain how the units were randomly selected. If the units were not randomly selected, please provide a justification for why the units were not randomly selected.

13. Were there further stages of selection?

Yes

No

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

See above

13b. If there were further stages of selection, how were the sampling units selected at each of the additional stages?

See above.

13c. If there were further stages of selection, were units at each of these stages randomly selected?

Yes

No

Please explain how the units were randomly selected. If the units were not randomly selected, please provide a justification for why the units were not randomly selected.

14a. How were individual respondents identified and selected in the final stage?

Random sampling within quotas

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

Yes

No

If yes, please explain:

15. Did the sample design include clustering at any stage?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

16. 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

No

If yes, please describe (please include the list of characteristics used for stratification):

Prior vote

17. Was quota sampling used at any stage of selection?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

Age and gender quotas

18. Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of the selection process or during fieldwork?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

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

No answer at housing unit after _____ callbacks

Other (Please explain):

20. Were non-sample replacement methods used?

Yes

No

Please describe:

21a. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a random digit dial (RDD) sample?

- Yes
- No

21b. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a listed sample?

- Yes
- No

21c. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a dual frame sample?

- Yes
- No

If yes, what % list frame _____ and what % RDD _____

22. For surveys conducted by mail, was the sample a listed sample?

- Yes
- No

Please describe:

23. For surveys conducted on the Internet, did any respondents self-select into the survey?

- Yes
- No

Please explain:

Incentives

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

Yes

No

(If yes, please provide a copy of the letter.)

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

Yes

No

If yes, please describe (including amount of payment):

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

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

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

Yes

No

If yes, please describe (including amount of payment):

24e. Were any other incentives used?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

Interviewers

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

Typically college educated, 30s-40s, with 10+ years of experience

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training:

Extensive two-day training including role-playing and field tests

Contacts

27a. What was the average number of contact attempts made per household, for the entire sample?

This information was not recorded

27b. For households where contact was made, what was the average number of contact attempts prior to first contact?

This information was not recorded

27c. During the field period, how many contacts were made with the household before declaring it a **non-sample**?

This information was not recorded

28d. During the field period, how many contacts were made with the household before declaring it a **non-interview**?

Three

28e. During the field period, what were the maximum number of days over which a household was contacted?

This information was not recorded

28f. During the field period, did interviewers vary the time of day at which they re-contacted the household?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

Refusal Conversion

29a. Were efforts made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed?

Yes

No

Please describe:

29b. Were respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed sent a letter persuading them to take part?

Yes

No

(If yes, please provide a copy of the letter or letters.)

If yes, please describe:

29c. Was payment offered to respondents who were reluctant to take part?

Yes

No

If yes, how much?

29d. Were respondents who were reluctant to take part turned over to a more experienced interviewer?

Yes

No

29e. What was the maximum number of re-contacts used to persuade respondents to be interviewed?

None

29f. Were any other methods used to persuade respondents reluctant to be interviewed to take part?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

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

No

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

Phone verification

If yes, please indicate the percent of completed surveys that were verified: ___30___ %

Response Rate

Note: If multiple modes of interviewing were used for the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared, please repeat the following questions as appropriate for each of the modes used.

31. What was the response rate of the survey that the CSES Module appeared in? Please show your calculations. (If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please report the response rate of the first wave of the study, even if the CSES Module did not appear in that wave.)

35.2% (1,149 / 3,261)

32. Please provide the following statistics for the survey that the CSES Module appeared in. (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:	4,588
B. Number of valid households:	3,261
C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households:	1,327
D. Number of households of unknown validity:	0
E. Number of completed interviews:	1,149
F. Number of partial interviews:	15
G. Number of refusals and break-offs:	1,816
H. Number non-contact (never contacted):	281
I. Other non-response:	0

The sum of B+C+D should equal the value of A. If not, please describe why:

If statistic D (number of households of unknown validity) has a value greater than zero (0), please estimate the proportion of households of unknown validity that are valid:

The sum of E+F+G+H+I should equal the value of B. If not, please describe why:

If statistic I has a value greater than zero (0), please describe what cases fall into this category:

33. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, how many waves were conducted prior to the wave that included the CSES Module?

One

34. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, what was the total panel attrition between the first wave of the study and the wave that included the CSES Module? Please show your calculations.

68% (780 out of 1,149 original respondents)

35. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please provide the number of completed interviews for the wave that included the CSES Module:

1,406

36. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please provide the following statistics for panel attrition by age and education. In each cell, indicate the percent of all completed interviews in each category for the indicated wave.

Age	First wave of study	Wave that included CSES
18-25	20.28%	20.06%
26-40	30.72%	30.30%
41-64	36.38%	37.27%
65 and over	12.62%	12.38%

Education	First wave of study	Wave that included CSES
None	0.09%	0.21%
Incomplete primary	7.85%	7.43%
Primary completed	24.17%	24.29%
Incomplete secondary	19.11%	20.79%
Secondary completed	25.31%	25.36%
Post-Secondary Trade/Vocational	11.25%	11.29%
University incomplete	7.85%	6.57%
University degree	4.36%	4.07%

Post-Survey Adjustment Weights

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

Yes

No

If yes, please explain:

Weights adjust the sample to the target population on the basis of the joint distribution of age, gender, and education.

38. Are weights included in the data file?

Yes

No

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

Raking was used to build post-stratification weights that match the joint distribution of the overall two-wave sample to that of the Argentine population in terms of age, gender, and level of education proportions. Age was recoded as 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-69, 70+. Education was recoded as primary or less, complete secondary, and complete tertiary/college. (See "edu2"). The resulting variable "weight" is the ratio between the percentage of each demographic combination in the population and the percentage of each demographic combination in the sample. As noted in question 37, the weights were built to match the distribution of the overall sample rather than the post-election wave included in CSES.

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

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

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

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

Weights adjust the sample to the target population on the basis of the joint distribution of age, gender, and education.

- 40c. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to correct for non-response?
 Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:

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

Characteristic	Population Estimates	Completed Interviews	
		Unweighted Distribution	Weighted Distribution
<u>Age</u>			
18-25	20%	20%	18%
26-40	32%	30%	35%
41-64	34%	37%	35%
65 and over	14%	12%	11%
<u>Education</u>			
None	0.1%	0.21%	0.2%
Incomplete Primary	13%	7%	5%
Primary Completed	26%	24%	18%
Incomplete Secondary	20%	21%	15%
Secondary Completed	20%	31%	30%
Post-Secondary Trade/ Vocational	6%	6%	15%
University Incomplete	8%	7%	6%
University Degree	7%	3%	9%
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	49%	45%	47%
Female	51%	55%	53%

42. Please indicate the source of the population estimates in the prior question. English language sources are especially helpful. Include website links or contact information if applicable.

2010 Argentine census:

<http://200.51.91.245/argbin/RpWebEngine.exe/PortalAction?BASE=CPV2010B>