

## Appendix B

### Argentina Voters' Surveys

This Appendix describes the sampling design and other aspects of the survey methodology for three different surveys we took of Argentine voters in the years 2001, 2003, and 2009.

#### B.1 2001 SURVEY

Our first surveys of Argentine voters took place in December 2001 and January 2002. We used multistage cluster sampling techniques, based on census tracts, to select a probability sample of 1,920 voters, in the provinces of Buenos Aires, Córdoba, and Misiones and including an oversample from the area of Mar del Plata in Buenos Aires province. There were 480 adults selected in each of the four areas, giving an overall margin of error of plus or minus 4.5 percent.

The survey allowed us to explore the strategies of clientelist parties indirectly, by revealing what kinds of voters these parties target and who among the voters are responsive to private rewards. Respondents were asked a variety of questions, for instance, whether they had received any goods from a political party during the election campaign that had taken place two months earlier, what kinds of goods they had received, whether respondents believed that receiving goods had influenced their vote, whether the person had turned to a locally important political actor for help during the past year, and whether, if the head of their household lost his or her job, the family would turn to a party operative for help (Job). See Stokes 2005 for further description of sampling design and survey questions.

#### B.2 2003 SURVEY

We also conducted an original survey in 2003 to explore various topics, including the relationship between income, risk aversion, and vote buying. We

instructed researchers to conduct face-to-face interviews with 500 randomly selected people age 18 and older in each of four Argentine provinces: Buenos Aires, Córdoba, Misiones, and San Luis, for a total of 2,000 interviews. The response rate was 97 percent, although this includes only direct refusals and may not include people whose houses were selected but were not at home. We again used multistage cluster sampling procedures, based on census tracts. The margin of error of the survey was plus or minus 6 percent. The analyses reported in the book mostly pool the surveys into a single dataset, but we check throughout, as reported, for variations in effects across the distinct regional samples. The interviews were conducted in August 2003.

### B.3 2009 SURVEY

The 2009 Argentina survey was conducted in collaboration with Noam Lupu. The survey consisted of face-to-face interviews of 1,199 eligible voters in the Argentine provinces of Córdoba and Santa Fe (600 respondents per province) and was administered from August–October 2009 by the polling firm Consultores en Políticas Públicas.

Within each province, a two-stage clustered probability sample was generated based on the 2001 national census. Sixty *radios censales* (the smallest available geographic unit in the census) were selected as primary sampling units (PSUs), and 10 voters were sampled from each PSU. The PSUs with populations under 1,000 were excluded from the sampling frame. Choosing a random start point, investigators selected households using an interval sampling method (every fourth household) and used the birthday method (most recent birthday) to select adult respondents within each household. In case of refusals or failure to contact the selected adult after two attempts, households were replaced with the adjacent household. To administer the survey experiments described in the text, four different versions of the questionnaire were used in sequential order. The response rate for the survey was 19.3 percent, the cooperation rate was 30.7 percent, the refusal rate was 43.5 percent, and the contact rate was 62.9 percent. The margin of error assuming maximal variance (proportions of .5 on dichotomous questions) was 6.7 percent.