

**Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES)
Module 5: Design Report (Sample Design and Data Collection Report)**

August 16, 2018

Country: México
Date of Election: July 1st, 2018

Prepared by: Ulises Beltrán and Rodrigo Castro
Date of Preparation: August 10th, 2018

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: Ulises Beltrán Title: Affiliate Professor Organization: Political Studies Division, CIDE Address: Carr. México-Toluca 3655, Santa Fe, Altavista, Álvaro Obregón, 01210 Ciudad de México, CDMX Telephone: +52.55 5727 9800 Fax: E-Mail: ulises.beltran@gmail.edu Website:	Name: Rodrigo Castro Cornejo Title: Professor Organization: Political Studies Division, CIDE Address: Carr. México-Toluca 3655, Santa Fe, Altavista, Álvaro Obregón, 01210 Ciudad de México, CDMX Telephone: +52.55 5727 9800 Fax: E-Mail: rodrigo.castro@cide.edu Website:
--	--

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

Data Collection Organization:

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

Organization: Ipsos, México Address: Av. Paseo de las Palmas 500, Lomas - Virreyes, Lomas de Chapultepec I Secc, Miguel Hidalgo, 11000 Ciudad de México, CDMX Telephone: 55 2122 5860 Fax: E-Mail: Jesica.Madrid@ipsos.com Website: ipsos.com/es-mx

Funding Organization(s):

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

Instituto Nacional Electoral, IFE Address: Viaducto Tlalpan 100 Arenal Tepepan, Tlalpan México, D.F. 14610 Telephone: +01800-433-2000 Fax: E-Mail: Website: www.ife.org.mx

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: BIIACS, CIDE Address: Carretera México-Toluca 3655 Col. Lomas de Santa Fe, Delegación Álvaro Obregón, México, D.F. 01210 Telephone: 52 (55)5081-4005 extensions: 2477 and 2417 Fax: 52 5727-9800 ext. 2475 : E-Mail: biiacs@cide.edu Website: http://www.biiacs.cide.edu/

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 (with interviewing starting within 6 months after the election)
 - Post-Election Study (with interviewing starting more than 6 months after the election)
 - Pre-Election/Post-Election Panel Study
 - Between Rounds

2a. Date Post-Election Interviewing Began: July 7th, 2018

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended: July 15th, 2018

3a. 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 - using a questionnaire on paper
- In person, face-to-face - using an electronic/computerized questionnaire
- Telephone
- Mail or self-completion supplement
- Internet

3b. Was there a mode change *within* interviews (e.g., selected self-completion elements within the questionnaire)?

- No
- Yes; please provide details:

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 CSES interview was included in a four-round pre- and post-election panel survey. Respondents were interviewed twice prior to the general election held on July 1, 2018, and twice after the election. The CSES sample comprises the third wave of interviews (N = 1,239). Interviewing for the third wave featuring CSES took place from July 12 to 18, 2018. For the first wave, respondents were sampled in a stratified multistage random cluster sample (see Question 11 for further details). Only respondents that were successfully interviewed in waves 1 and 2 were eligible for the CSES interview in wave 3 (47.7% of respondents interviewed in the first pre-election wave also completed wave 3).

4c. If the survey was entirely or partly conducted via the Internet, please indicate whether it was based on an access panel (i.e. respondents were selected from a group of pre-screened panelists):

- Yes
- No

4d. If the survey was based on an Internet access panel, please describe the access panel (company, population [does it include persons without initial access to the Internet and how are they interviewed], method of recruiting members, total size of access panel, method of selecting survey respondents from the panel):

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:

National population, 18 years and older.

Eligibility Requirements

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

Yes

No

If yes, what ages could be interviewed?

18 years and older

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? ___0.06%

If yes, please explain: Convicted felons and mentally ill individuals cannot vote.

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. If interviews were conducted via the Internet, what is the estimated percentage of households without access to the Internet? _____ %

10g. If interviews were conducted via the Internet, were provisions taken to include members of the population without access to the Internet? And if so, which?

Yes

No

If "Yes", please explain:

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

10h. 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:

10i. Please estimate the total percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame: 0.06%

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 and/or based on an Internet access panel, please also describe the original sample, from the beginning of the study.

The sample is selected by a multistage procedure. The universe was divided in three regions: states with a PAN Governor, states with a PRI governor and states with a PRD governor. An independent sample was drawn within each region. In each region precincts were ordered by the vote for PRI in the last election, and divided into four groups of the same number of precincts. Within each group, precincts are clustered by county. So you have groups with similar vote for PRI and the same county. The first selection stage is done with this list, clustering precincts within each group with probability proportional to size (PPS), being turnout the size of the cluster. In the second stage precincts are selected with PPS. Fieldwork teams receive the sample of precincts. In the field, the third stage are blocks randomly selected in the precinct area. In each block, houses are selected following systematic methods of random start. Respondent was randomly selected. To do this were enlisted all citizen over 18 years by their birthday in each housing and was chosen the person with the birthday closest date.

12a. What were the primary sampling units?

The primary sampling units were clusters of electoral precincts. The clusters were defined as groups of all the precincts with similar electoral results and belonging to the same county (municipality)

12b. How were the primary sampling units selected?

PPS

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.

All units have a known PPS to be 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?

Fieldwork teams receive the sample of precincts. In the field, blocks are randomly selected in the precinct area by a systematic procedure. In each block, houses are selected following systematic

methods of random start. Respondent was randomly selected. To do this were enlisted all citizen over 18 years by their birthday in each housing and was chosen the person with the birthday closest date.

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

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?

Interviewer lists all persons living in the household over 18 years with their birthday's date, and then asks for the person with the closest birthday's date. If not at home, ask for next.

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:

The primary sampling units were electoral precincts clusters. The clusters were defined as groups of all of the precincts with similar electoral results and belonging to the same county (municipality). See sample design.

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, and in the case of multi-stage selection processes the stage[s] at which stratification occurred):

Stratification in three groups: states governed by PAN, states governed by PRI and states

governed by PRD.

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:

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 ___3___ callbacks
 Other (Please explain):

20. Were non-sample replacement methods used?

- Yes
 No

Please describe:

Please describe: If the selected person is not found at the time of the visit, a second visit was made to contact her. In case of not finding her, then the household is replaced by a systematic method: three households to the left.

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 respondents self-select into the survey, at any stage?

- 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 respondents 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):

Respondents received an incentive of 150 MXN (approximately 7 USD) if they participated in the second and third waves of the panel survey. Incentives were paid after each wave (wave 2 and 3). All respondents received the same incentives, even the reluctant respondents.

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):

135 interviewers 25-45 years old, with post-secondary, technical or university and at least 3-5 years of experience

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training. If possible please differentiate between general interviewer training and study-specific components:

Interviewers are full time interviewers working for the professional firm hired for the fieldwork, Ipsos, a well known and experienced company.

26a. Please provide a description of the content, structure and time used for general training of interviewers:

Interviewers are trained in a four to five hours session with the main responsible of the questionnaire design based on a previously prepared manual with all questions and codes. Each question is discussed and some interviews are simulated. Several persuasion approaches are proposed based on a detailed description of the study and its importance.

Contacts

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

Two

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

Two

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

Two

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

Two

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

Two

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?

One

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:

The electronic devices register the GPS coordinates and are verified on line against the sample, and all interviews are recorded for post verification.

If yes, please indicate the percent of completed surveys that were verified: 35 %

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.)

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.)

Response Rate for Wave 1 (First-round pre-election interview):

A. Total number of households in sample:	<u>3,500</u>
B. Number of valid households:	<u>3,500</u>
C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households:	<u>0</u>
D. Number of households of unknown validity:	<u>0</u>
E. Number of completed interviews:	<u>2,600</u>
F. Number of partial interviews:	<u>0</u>
G. Number of refusals and break-offs:	<u>55</u>
H. Number non-contact (never contacted):	<u>710</u>
I. Other non-response:	<u>135</u>

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:

Only minors in the household

The targeted number of participants in the survey was 1,200. In the first wave of the study, 2,600 households were selected to have enough participants in the following waves of the panel. The idea was to drop those households where the person contacted in the first wave could not be interviewed for any reason up to 1,200 participants were interviewed. In the second wave 1,540 persons participated, 1,239 in the third and 1,018 in the fourth wave in January of the following year.

If you estimate considering the 2,600 households contacted in the first wave, the response rate estimated would be of 27.5% but we think that is not the correct estimate since many of the original 2,600 were not even contacted in the second wave. So, we think that the correct participation rate should be estimated based on the 1,540 households contacted in the second wave.

That is a response rate of 80.4%

Response rate=# Answers# /Contacts*100%

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

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.

Completed Interviews in Round 1: N = 2,600

Completed Interviews in Round 2: N = 1,540

Completed Interviews in Round 3 (the one featuring CSES M5): N = 1,239

Completed Interviews in Round 4 (after CSES): N = 1,018

Total panel attrition for wave 3 = $1 - (1,239 / 2,600) = 52.3\%$

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:

The third wave featuring CSES includes 1,239 completed interviews.

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.

Post-Survey Adjustment Weights

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

Yes

No

If yes, please explain:

The main purpose of the weighting is to correct slight deviations from the census age and sex distributions

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:

Description of weights

The weight is the inverse of the probability of selection of the individual. This probability depends directly on the way the electoral sections are selected. In this survey, the sample was selected by forming conglomerates of sections within each stratum. Two sections are selected within each conglomerate.

The probability of selection of individuals is as follows:

$$p(\text{selección}) = \frac{ncong \cdot pob18_conglomerado}{pob18_estrato} * \frac{nsec \cdot pob18_sec}{pob18_conglomerado} * \frac{muestra}{pob18_sec}$$

p(selección): Probability of selection of the individual
pob18_conglomerado: Population 18 or older within de conglomerate
pob18_sec: Population 18 or older in the electoral section.
pob18_estrato: Population 18 or older in the stratum.
ncong: Number of conglomerates to select within the stratum
nsec: Number of sections to select within the conglomerate (two in this case).

$$\pi = \frac{pob18_estrato}{ncong * nsec * muestra}$$

muestra: Number of individuals in each section.

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 match gender and age data based on census data from 2015

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 for 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
Age			
18-25	21.2%	21.2%	22.5%
26-40	33.5%	35.1%	35.5%
41-64	34.7%	34.2%	29.2%
65 and over	10.7%	9.5%	12.7%
Education			
None	6.3%	1.1%	1.5%
Incomplete Primary	9.7%	4.5%	4.6%
Primary Completed	16.6%	9.6%	11.3%
Incomplete Secondary	6.5%	8.6%	13.0%
Secondary Completed	19.4%	27.9%	23.3%
Post-Secondary Trade/ Vocational	22.9%	38.2%	33.5%
University Incomplete	3.7%	2.2%	2.8%
University Degree	14.8%	8.9%	11.4%
Gender			
Male	47.6%	51.0%	47.8%
Female	52.4%	49.0%	52.2%

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.

<http://www.inegi.org.mx>