

Prepared by: *Denise Mercedes Núñez Nascimento Lopes*

Date: *15/02/05*

**COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ELECTORAL SYSTEMS**  
**Module 2: Sample Design and Data Collection Report**  
August 23, 2004

**Country:** *Brazil*

**Date of Election:** *First round: October 6, 2002; and second round: October 27, 2002*

Type of Election (e.g., presidential, parliamentary, legislative): *presidential and legislative*

Organization that conducted the survey field work: *Uff-Universidade Federal Fluminense*

**Investigators Responsible for Data Collection:**

Name: *Alberto Carlos Melo de Almeida*

Name: *Rachel Meneghelo*

Affiliation: *UFF-Universidade Federal Fluminense and FGV-Fundação Getúlio Vargas*

Affiliation: *Unicamp - Cesop*

Address: *Rua Candido Mendes, 1070-40, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil.*

Address: *Cidade Universitária "Zeferino Vaz", Caixa Postal: 6110, Campinas - São Paulo*

Fax: *55 21 2524-7068/8521*

Fax: *55 19 3788-7093 / 3289-4309*

Phone: *55 21 2507-9948*

Phone: *55 19 3788-7093 / 3289-4309*

*55 21 9915-8602*

E-mail: *racael@unicamp.br*

E-mail: *aalmeida@fgv.br*

## **A. Study Design**

### *Post-Election Study*

Date Post-Election Interviewing Began: *October 31, 2002*

Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended: *December 28, 2002*

Mode of (post-election) interview:

- In person, face-to-face*

Language(s) used in questionnaire(s) (Please provide copies of questionnaires in all languages used, as well as a version translated in English, if applicable, as part of the Election Study Deposit): *Portuguese*

## **B. Sample Design and Sampling Procedures**

### 1. Eligibility Requirements

- a) Age: Minimum: *16* Maximum: *-*
- b) Citizenship: *Yes*
- c) Other requirements: *No*

### 2. Sample Frame:

- a) Were any regions of the country excluded from the sample frame?

*Yes*

*To reduce costs of travel, all municipios were excluded with less than 20,000 inhabitants and more than 70 percent of rural households. This comes to a total of 11.4 percent of the municipios and 3 percent of the population excluded from the sample.*

- b) 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.*

- c) Were military personnel excluded from the sample?

*No*

e) Were other persons excluded from the sample frame?

*Yes*

*People with mental deficiency, deaf people and dumbs had been excluded. If a people with these problems were selected in the house, another member of the house was selected.*

f) Estimated total (a + b + c + d + e) percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame:

*It's impossible to calculate the precisely percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame. We don't have estimates for the people with mental deficiency and deaf. We think that this people is about 1% of the population. If so, the percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame are 4%.*

### 3. Sample Selection Procedures:

a) What were the primary sampling units?

*In the first stage, 102 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 1996 Contagem, IBGE divided Brazil into 5 census region with 27 states and 5507 municipios.*

b) Were the primary sampling units randomly selected?

*No*

*27 of these municipios were selected with certainty as self-representing PSUs and 75 as non self-representing PSUs. The self-representing PSUs are state capitals.*

c) Were there further stages of selection?

*Yes*

*The study employs a three stage stratified probability sample of Brazilian adults. In the first stage, 102 primary sampling units (PSU), or municipios, were selected probability proportional to size (PPS). In the second stage, 280 secondary units (census tracts) were selected PPS within each of the PSUs. In the third stage, households were selected PPS within census tracts with one adult respondent being selected at random.*

d) How were individual respondents identified?

*A date of reference for the research was defined: 27 of October. When arriving at the domicile, the researcher listed all members of household. The selection of the interviewed was done from the date of anniversary. The person who had the date of*

*anniversary next the date to reference of the research was the selected to answer the questionnaire.*

e) Under what circumstances was a sample line designated non-sample?

- Non-residential sample point*
- All members of household are ineligible*
- Housing unit is vacant*

f) Were non-sample replacement methods used?

*Yes*

*When a house 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.*

#### 4. Compliance:

Prior to the study:

a) Was a letter sent to respondent?

*No*

b) Was payment sent to respondent?

*No*

c) Was a token gift sent to respondent?

*No*

d) Were any other incentives used?

*No*

#### 5. During the Field Period:

a) How many contacts were made with the household before declaring it **non-sample?**

*We not have a number of contacts specified. If the person was not found during a reasonable time the interview was not done and was considered as not response.*

b) How many contacts were made with the household before declaring it **non-interview?**

*Maximum: 15 contacts.*

c) Maximum number of days over which a household was contacted?

*Maximum: one month.*

d) Did interviewers vary the time of day at which they re-contacted the household?

*Yes*

*The interviewers were training to vary times and days in contacting a house. The interviewers used a paper of control of its visits to the domicile. This paper has been given to the field supervisor who controls the norms and proceeds of fieldwork.*

e) Refusal Conversion:

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

*Yes*

*In the cases the person were reluctant to be interviewed, two types of procedures were taken. First, the interviewer left a letter explaining the research. If the respondent still be reluctant, another more experienced interviewer or the supervisor contact him to explain the importance of the research.*

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

*Yes*

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

*No*

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

*Yes*

v. What was the maximum number of re-contacts used to persuade respondent to be interviewed?

*Tree.*

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

*No*

6. Response Rate:  
(Note: if a panel study, please report response rate of the first wave)

Total number of sample lines issued:	3507
Number of refusals:	250
Number never contacted (no-contact):	0
Other non-response:	743
Number of lines of non-sample:	-
Total number of completed interviews:	2514
Response Rate:	72%

9. Sample Weights

a) Are weights included in the data file?

Yes

Please describe how the weights were constructed:

*The data of the ESEB had been weighed to correct differences between the searched profile and the profile of the population. The used data to compare the demographic data partner of the research had been gotten through PNAD- 2001. The PNAD is a national research for sample in domiciles carried through IBGE annually - institute that makes the census in Brazil. Moreover, the database was weighed to correct a disproportion in the sample of the State of São Paulo. The sample of the state of São Paulo was made of independent form, therefore, the researchers of São Paulo had obtained extra financing to make a bigger sampling, what it allowed a lesser margin of error to analyze the SP data. Thus, the sample of the ESEB in the city of São Paulo is bigger of the one than it would have to be. It was used one weight for correct it in the final data base national.*

b) Are the weights designed to compensate for disproportionate probability of selection at the respondent/household level?

No

c) Are the weights designed to match known demographic characteristics of the population?

Yes

d) Are the data weighted to correct for non-response?

No

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

*The majority of the researchers that had worked in the collection of data are college's student with average of age of 28 years and with experience of work in field research.*

- b) 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: position of a researcher, procedures to be followed, material to be used, as it is the work in a tax sector, as to cover the sector, listing of the domiciles, the election 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.*

#### 11. Comparison of Sample to Population

Characteristic	<u>Population Estimates</u>	<u>Sample Estimates</u>	
		Unweighted	Weighted
<u>Age</u>			
16-24	18,93%	22,87%	18,93%
25-34	21,94%	24,62%	22,08%
35 and over	59,13%	52,51%	58,83%
<u>Education</u>			
Primary Completed	56,26%	62,61%	55,89%
Secondary Completed	30,75%	31,42%	31,03%
University Degree	12,99%	6,76%	12,93%
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	47,11%	44,11%	46,90%
Female	52,89%	55,89%	52,94%

*The used data to compare the demographic data partner of the research had been gotten through PNAD- 2001. The PNAD is a national research for sample in domiciles carried through IBGE annually - institute that makes the census in Brazil.*

*Os dados do ESEB foram ponderados para corrigir diferenças entre o perfil pesquisado e o perfil da população. Os dados utilizados para comparar os dados sócio demográficos da pesquisa foram obtidos através da PNAD- 2001. A PNAD é uma pesquisa nacional por amostra em domicílios realizada anualmente pelo IBGE – instituto que faz os censos no Brasil.*

*Além disso, o banco de dados foi ponderado para corrigir uma desproporcionalidade na amostra do Estado de São Paulo. A amostra do estado de São Paulo foi feita de forma independente, pois, os pesquisadores de São Paulo conseguiram financiamento extra para fazer uma amostragem maior, o que permitiu uma margem de erro menor para analisar os dados de SP.*

*Assim, a amostra do ESEB na cidade de São Paulo é maior do que deveria ser e, assim, foi utilizado um peso para corrigi-la no banco de dados nacional final.*