

# AmericasBarometer 2018/19: DominicancRepublic

Technical Informath8n

---

Dominican Republic	2019	1,516	Self-Weighted	April 9 <sup>th</sup> -May 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2019
--------------------	------	-------	---------------	--

## **LAPOP AmericasBarometer 2018/19 Survey Round**

LAPOP is a pioneer in survey research methods. LAPOP's AmericasBarometer is a unique tool for assessing the public's experiences with democratic governance. The AmericasBarometer permits valid comparisons across individuals, regions, countries, and time, via a common core questionnaire and standardized methods.

The 2018/19 AmericasBarometer represents the 8th round of this project. Fieldwork for this

correlation, while taking advantage of economies of fieldwork that simple random selection of interviews within the entire PSU would not make possible.

The remaining pages of this technical note describe the sample design of the 2018/19 AmericasBarometer survey in the Dominican Republic.

## **2018/19 AmericasBarometer: Dominican Republic**

This survey was carried out between April 9<sup>th</sup> and May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2019, as part of LAPOP's 2018/ 19 AmericasBarometer. It is a follow on to LAPOP's AmericasBarometer Dominican Republic surveys of 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014 and 2017

enumeration areas no longer contained households as a result of urban renewal or spreading commerce. Following LAPOP's substitution protocols,<sup>3</sup> the replacement sampling points were located within the same primary sampling unit (PSU) and, in the case of Dominican Republic, in the same census sector.

Santo Domingo Metropolitan Area	552	551
North	528	532
East	192	193
South	240	240
More than 100,000 inhabitants	864	865
Between 25,000 and 100,000 inhabitants	336	337
Less than 25,000	312	314

LAPOP uses “frequency matching,” a technique that permits one to obtain a sample with a distribution of age and gender similar to that of the national census or electoral registration lists. Frequency matching avoids the extremely costly effort involved in making multiple callbacks to each missed unit within each PSU in an effort to obtain a balanced sample. In national, face-to-face interviewing, multiple callbacks are often impractical from a cost standpoint. Our experience reveals that even three callbacks leave the sample with a notable gender imbalance (more women than men, since women are more likely to be at home than men). Rather than having to include post-hoc weights to adjust for this sample error, which can be large, we resolve the problem in the field via using a distribution of interviews among gender and ages that reflects the structure of the population.<sup>4</sup>

A single respondent was selected in each household, following the frequency matching distribution programmed into the sample design, by gender and age as mentioned above. Respondents are limited to household members who reside permanently in that household (thus excluding visiting relatives), who fit the age and residency requirements.

Participation in the AmericasBarometer survey is anonymous and voluntary.<sup>5</sup> Eligible respondents agree to participate in the survey are administered the survey after the questionnaire after giving their consent to interviewers.<sup>6</sup>

## **Weighting of the Dominican Republic datasets**

The dataset contains a variable called "wt" which is the "country weight" variable. Since in the case of

Response Rate 3 (RR3) = \_\_\_\_\_

Where: where C refers to completed interviews, P to partial interviews, R to refusals, N for non-contacts, O for others, UH for unknown if household, UO to unknown others, and e is the eligibility rate calculated using the CASRO method:  $e = \text{Eligible} / (\text{Eligible} + \text{Ineligible})$ .

Country	AB2018/19		
	RR1	RR3	Eligibility
Uruguay	0.11	0.18	0.55
Argentina	0.12	0.15	0.78
El Salvador	0.12	0.13	0.86
Bolivia	0.15	0.2	0.67



# Annex 1: Quality Control Report

## Introduction

Producing high quality survey data is a core mission at the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP). The LAPOP research team implements and constantly updates a set of rigorous fieldwork protocols that both office personnel and fieldwork operators are required to follow closely. These include state-of-the-art sampling techniques; iterative pre-testing; interviewer, supervisor and quality control officer training; and standardized methods of data processing and analysis. They further include a sophisticated monitoring algorithm of data collection in real time. LAPOP's fieldwork monitoring system – FALCON © (Fieldwork Algorithm for LAPOP Control over survey Operations and Norms) – includes, but is not limited to, data fabrication and falsification audits, a geo-fencing system, a reading control check, an interviewer identity monitoring check, and timestamp checks. FALCON works with SurveyToGo (STG) software that is customized for LAPOP fieldwork. FALCON enables quality control teams at LAPOP and in the survey firms to assess the quality of interviews while fieldwork is in progress, and to provide feedback to interviewers throughout fieldwork.

During fieldwork, the system automatically flags interviews in which enumerators appear to be fabricating data. Trained quality control officers meticulously study these flagged interviews to assess the extent to which there is enough evidence of fraud. Auditors then communicate their findings to country coordinators in LAPOP central. After making a decision, LAPOP communicates with the survey company so they can replace the fraudulent interviews and adjust interviewer behavior, or at the extreme, separate faulty interviewers from the project.

The geo-fencing system flags interviews conducted in the wrong location. If a location flag is triggered, then we consult with the firm and use the GPS coordinates to check whether the interview took place at a residence in the assigned location. We regularly check mobile device logs to ensure that interviewers have not altered phone settings to impede, for example, the collection of GPS coordinates, and an automatic feature flags the use of GPS masking apps. We also audit interviewer routes, to assess whether they correctly followed rules for selecting dwellings and individual respondents.

Quality control officers also compare images silently captured via front-facing cameras to interviewer photos to ensure that the enumerators in the field are those trained by LAPOP staff.<sup>9</sup> The background of those images also provides information about the environment in which the

---

<sup>9</sup> All images use a front-facing camera to ensure that respondent anonymity is not compromised (that is, the camera only records images of the interviewers). Study participants are informed prior to consenting to be interviewed that some of their answers are recorded for quality control.



interview takes place, permitting detection of interviews conducted in odd places (e.g., at parks or shops).

Our quality control personnel audit “Key Performance Indicators,” which provide detailed information about fieldwork start and end times each day, the number of interviews carried out in a particular timeframe, and the average duration of interviews, among other metrics. Finally, we listen to audio recordings to ensure that enumerators read items completely and correctly, without interpreting the question, skipping items, or influencing respondents’ answers.

Based on these audits, we assign each interview a quality control score using a “demerit” system. In this system, higher scores indicate more serious errors, and we refuse to accept (that is, we require the cancelation of) low quality interviews. Local firms audit 100% of all interviews according to our protocols. All interviews are also run through LAPOP’s automatic flagging system, and then LAPOP’s team manually audits a subset of the interviews. When low quality interviews are identified by the local firm or LAPOP, the firm is obligated to replace them. Because FALCON works in real time (meaning, while fieldwork is in progress), canceled interviews can be and are replaced by high quality interviews.

In this report, we summarize the results of this quality control process as implemented in the 2019 Dominican Republic AmericasBarometer national survey.

LAPOP worked with the local survey firm CESDEM to collect data from 1,516 voting-age adults in 41 municipalities in Dominican Republic. For more information on the sample design, see the project’s [website](#) [website](#) [website](#) [website](#) /Lang o/F4 10.56 T4e. /F4 10.00912 0 612 792 reW\*nepted Rō atCrAple /Span

12
The enumerator interviews himself/herself <sup>13</sup>
Audio files are attached, but no one is heard speaking - or only the interviewer can be heard <sup>14</sup>
The interviewer sets the device to "Airplane Mode" <sup>15</sup>
The interviewer turns off the device's GPS <sup>16</sup>
The interviewer covers or disables the camera to avoid photo captures <sup>17</sup>
The interviewer interviews another enumerator <sup>18</sup>
The interviewer interviews someone that he/she knows <sup>19</sup>
The photographs do not correspond to those of the interviewer or there are inconsistencies in the photographs <sup>20</sup>
The voice in the audio files does not correspond to the interviewer's voice <sup>21</sup>
The attempts are exhausted <sup>22</sup>
The respondent does not complete the interview and leaves it <sup>23</sup>
The interviewer decides to end the interview for any other reason <sup>24</sup>
The interview is carried out in an incorrect location (a shopping mall, store, park, gas station, school, etc.) <sup>25</sup>
The interview starts and ends in different locations <sup>26</sup>
The net interview duration is less than 25 minutes or more than 2 hours <sup>27</sup>
The interviewer does not read the complete study information sheet <sup>28</sup>
The interviewer reads only parts of the study information sheet <sup>29</sup>
The interviewer changes words from the study information sheet <sup>30</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Each item has a predetermined score that STG automatically computes after the auditing process is completed. Based on our protocols, if an interview reaches a score of 20 or more, the interview is canceled and replaced by the local firm.

<sup>13</sup> This item refers to an interviewer who asks and responds to questions by himself/herself without the present of a valid respondent.

<sup>14</sup> This point refers to interviewers who complete an interview without asking questions.

<sup>15</sup> This point refers to interviewers turning on "airplane mode" on the device deliberately.

<sup>16</sup> This point refers to interviewers turning off the GPS of the device deliberately.

<sup>17</sup> This point refers to interviewers covering the front camera of the device deliberately.

<sup>18</sup> This point refers to interviewers who interview other enumerators.

ê ter

The interviewer changes the expected duration in the information sheet <sup>31</sup>
The interviewer is overly pushy with respect to continuing with the interview, in response to an individual expressing reservations about participating <sup>32</sup>
The interviewer reads 1, 2, or 3 (or more) questions incompletely/incorrectly <sup>33</sup>
The interviewer reads 1, 2, or 3 (or more) too quickly/unintelligibly <sup>34</sup>
The interviewer interprets a question meaning 1, 2, or 3 (or more) times <sup>35</sup>
The interviewer skips 1, 2, or 3 (or more) questions without reading , or the interviewer does not give the interviewee time to respond <sup>36</sup>

## Problems reported during the quality control process

Our efforts to identify the different types of errors that occur during interviews allow insight into the prevalence of serious errors like those consistent with fabrication. We are pleased to report that such errors account for a very small portion of all errors in our interviews. The vast majority of errors, such as misreading questions, are consistent with sloppy or forgetful interviewing, not with data fabrication.<sup>37</sup>

Change of interview duration on the consent information sheet	0.1%
Interpretation of questions	0.1%
Partial reading of the consent information sheet	0.8%
Skips of questions	1.8%
Interviews flagged for questions' time by the automatic quality control system <sup>38</sup>	18.1%
Poor reading of multiple questions <sup>39</sup>	9%

<sup>31</sup> This point refers to interviewers changing the anticipated duration of the interview on the information sheet at the beginning of the interview.

<sup>32</sup> This point refers to interviewers who continue an interview even though the respondent definitively rejected his/her participation on the consent information sheet.

<sup>33</sup> This point refers to interviewers reading incorrectly and incompletely at least one question of the questionnaire.

<sup>34</sup> This point refers to interviewers reading too fast, on at least one question of the questionnaire.

<sup>35</sup> This point refers to interviewers interpreting the meaning of a question asked of respondents.

<sup>36</sup> This point refers to interviewers skipping and not asking at least one question on the questionnaire.

<sup>37</sup> For information about these proc2 0 612 s re0.00000912 0 612 79/F4 9 ee(t )-2(r)6(e)-4(p)-2(r)-6(oc267e)-t79/21-(n)16(o)-5(t)12(

## **Key performance indicators:**

Key performance indicators are STG measures that help us track fieldwork progress and analyze teams' efficiency. Below are results for interview average duration, GPS information, and geofencing data.