Supplementary Appendix for "Making it Personal Clientelism, Favors, and the Personalization of Public Administration in Argentina"

Virginia Oliveros
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
Tulane University
volivero@tulane.edu

May 24, 2015

Survey Methodology

The survey consisted of face-to-face interviews of 1184 low and mid-level local public sector employees in the Argentinean municipalities of Salta (province of Salta), Santa Fe (province of Santa Fe) and Tigre (province of Buenos Aires).[1] My team of research assistants and I interviewed around 400 employees in each municipality. The survey was administered between August 10 and December 30 2010 in Santa Fe, between August 11 and November 26 2010 in Tigre, and from June 6 to August 11 2011 in Salta.[2] It was preceded by a pilot administered in Santa Fe between July 22 and July 29 2010 consisting of 40 cases. Survey interviews lasted an average of 24 minutes.

[1] The survey methodology and the survey instrument were approved under Columbia University IRB protocol IRB-AAAE9968.

[2] The survey in Salta was scheduled to be conducted in November and December 2010 but changes in the electoral calendar generated by the death of the main presidential pre- candidate (Nestor Kirchner) made the authorities in Salta reluctant to allow me to conduct the survey on the scheduled dates. As a result, the survey in Salta was administered after the April 2011 provincial elections (when both the governor and the mayor were reelected), but before the October 2011 national elections.

A random sample taken from the official list of public employees (excluding elected officials and high-level positions) was generated for each municipality.[3] The selected employees were then directly approached to interview at public offices during their working hours. Because the random sample was drawn from an official and complete list of public employees and the survey was administered during office hours at the municipality, the permission and collaboration of the local authorities were crucial. In order to minimize the probability of antagonizing the authorities and maximize the chances of getting their approval for the survey, I took two precautions. First, I designed the survey instrument to be as short as possible to ensure employees would not be kept away from their jobs for an extended period of time. Second, I excluded particularly sensitive questions—especially ones concerning the mayor. Authorities in each municipality read the survey instrument carefully but did not censor any of the proposed questions.

I provided interviewers with lists of the public employees in the random sample and the addresses of their respective places of work. Places of work ranged from offices at the City Hall or at decentralized offices (*delegaciones*) to parks, construction cites, cemeteries, hospitals, health centers, and the street itself. In cases in which the selected employee was absent at the time of the visit, or preferred to answer the survey at a different time, interviewers were instructed to make an appointment to return later. If the selected employee refused to answer the survey, or the interview could not be conducted after the second attempt, the respondent was replaced with the following name on the official list of public employees. I instructed the interviewers to make detailed records of failed interviews. Because there were survey and list

[3] Information on public employment is not publicly available and Argentinean politicians are usually very reluctant to share it, so obtaining these lists was particularly challenging and time consuming. The fact that obtaining this data was a daunting task illustrates the opacity of the Argentine bureaucracy.

experiment questions embedded in the survey instrument with two conditions each (treatment and control), two versions of the questionnaire were used. With the exception of the survey and the list experiment questions, respondents were asked questions from identical questionnaires. Interviewers used the two different questionnaires in sequential order, assigning respondents alternatively to either the treatment or the control group.

Since the survey was conducted face-to-face at public offices, obtaining truthful answers from public employees presented a challenge. While high-ranking public officials usually have their own offices, most public employees in Argentina share their workspaces with others. Public employees may be unwilling to reveal sensitive information in front of others, especially if they think their jobs could be jeopardized by their answers. Following standard IRB procedures, all interviews started with the enumerators explaining the purpose of the survey and the confidentiality of all the data collected. Enumerators were instructed to emphasize the strictly academic purpose of the survey and to ensure that respondents understood that the information would not be shared with the mayor or with any other person. In addition to this standard procedure, I implemented two distinct but complementary strategies to minimize social response bias, whether in the form of inaccurate answers or refusals.

First, I designed a series of survey list experiments with the goal of providing respondents with the anonymity needed to induce them to give accurate information about their political activities. Second, I followed Scacco's (2010) strategy (originally developed to survey rioters in Africa), and split the questionnaire into two parts. The first part (Part A) contained background and general information about the respondent, as well as the less sensitive questions and a series of lists experiments. The second part (Part B) contained the more sensitive questions about voting behavior and political preferences. Each part of the questionnaire was marked with

a different survey identification number that could only be matched with a document not available to the enumerators at any time. Apart from this number, the second part of the questionnaire had no information—such as age, gender, or occupation—that could be used to identify the respondent. Enumerators administered the first part of the questionnaire, while the sensitive part (Part B) was read and filled out by the respondents themselves.[4] In this way, the other employees in the office were able to hear neither the questions nor the answers. This part of the questionnaire was designed to be short and very easy to understand with only closed-ended questions. Finally, the respondents were asked to store the second part of the questionnaire in a sealed cardboard box similar to a ballot box (this practice is familiar to Argentineans as paper ballots and cardboard ballot boxes are still used in Argentinean elections).[5]

I instructed the enumerators to provide a detailed explanation of these procedures before handing Part B of the questionnaire to the respondents and to make sure respondents understood that their responses were confidential. This explanation was crucial in ensuring the resulting success of the technique (see Oliveros 2013).

The interviewers were recruited from Humanities and Social Science departments in Santa Fe, Salta and Buenos Aires and were either advanced undergraduate or recently graduated students. For the purpose of survey verification, basic information about the employees (age, years in the position, and type of contract) was obtained from each of the municipalities and was not distributed to the enumerators. If this information did not match the one reported by the

[4] Literacy rates are very high in Argentina so there was no concern that the respondents would not be able to read and fill Part B of the questionnaires by themselves. According to the Argentina 2010 census, only 1.96% of the total population older than 10 years old is illiterate.

[5] In a few cases, respondents asked enumerators to fill in part B for them. Enumerators were instructed to agree with these requests, and Part B was still stored in the cardboard box when the survey was completed.

interviewer in the survey instrument beyond reasonably expected mistakes, further verification was conducted on the interviews administered by that interviewer. This second round of verification was done in person (by me) with the respondents.[6] The contact rate for the survey was 59 percent, the response rate was 56 percent, the cooperation rate 95 percent, and the refusal rate 3 percent. The margin of error was 2.7 percent.[7]

References

Oliveros, Virginia (2013). *A Working Machine: Patronage Jobs and Political Services in Argentina*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University.

Scacco, Alexandra (2010). *Who Riots? Explaining Individual Participation in Ethnic Violence*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University.

[6] With this methodology, one enumerator was identified who was fabricating the responses. The full set of interviews conducted by her was replaced.

[7] Rates calculated according to the American Association of Public Opinion Research.

Table A1: Socio-demographic and political characteristics of the municipalities

	Salta	Santa Fe	Tigre
Province	Salta (North)	Santa Fe (Center)	Buenos Aires
Mayor	Miguel Angel Isa	Mario Barletta	Sergio Massa
Mayor in power	2003-present	2007-2011	2007-2013
Mayor's party	Peronist	Radical	Peronist
Electoral Competition	Low	High	Middle/Low
Population 2001	472,971	369,589	301,223
Population 2010	536,113	485,345	376,381
% w/college	9%	11%	7%
% w/health insurance	48%	59%	45%
% poverty	21%	14%	20%

Note: Data from the 2001 Census (except for population, 2010 data was not available at the time of the survey). Mayors are the ones in power at the time of the survey.

Table A2: Survey sample representativeness (Salta)

Variable	Employees in the survey		All employees	
	N	%	N	%
Observations	389		4263	
Gender				
Male	228	58.61	2701	63.35
Female	161	41.39	1562	36.65
Start working with current mayor	211*	54.24	1491**	46.75
Older than 40 years old	230	59.13	2121***	70.04
Tenure				
With tenure	242	62.21	2992****	77.11
No tenure	146	37.53	888****	22.89

*1 missing observation
**1074 missing observations
***1235 missing observations
****383 missing observations

Table A3: Survey sample representativeness (Santa Fe)

Variable	Employees included in the survey		All employees	
	N	%	N	%
Observations	395		4528	
Gender				
Male	235	59.49	2917	64.42
Female	160	40.51	1611	35.58
Start working with current mayor	141	35.70	1949**	44.87
Older than 40 years old	270*	67.94	2765***	63.34
Tenure				
With tenure	256	64.81	2484	54.86
No tenure	139	35.19	2044	45.14

* 2 observations missing
** 184 observations missing
*** 163 observations missing

Table A4: Survey sample representativeness (Tigre)

Variable	Employees in the survey		All employees	
	N	%	N	%
Observations	400		2406	
Gender				
Male	193	48.25	1323	54.99
Female	207	51.75	1083	45.01
Start working with current mayor	184*	46.00	1034***	45.37
Older than 40 years old	192**	48.61	1201***	52.70
Tenure				
With tenure	88	22.00	475	19.74
No tenure	312	78.00	1931	80.26

* 2 missing observations
** 5 missing observations
*** 127 missing observations

Table A5: Covariate balance across type of questionnaires, by municipality

	Tigre		Santa Fe		Salta		Whole Sample	
Variable	Type 1	Type 2	Type 1	Type 2	Type 1	Type 2	Type 1	Type 2
Observations	199	201	196	199	196	193	591	593
Female	0.55	0.48	0.41	0.40	0.40	0.42	0.46	0.44
Age	39.33	39.65	44.63	44.80	43.86	43.11	42.61	42.51
Education	6.37	6.11	5.30	5.11	5.56	5.63	5.74	5.62
Salary	3.08	3.14	2.56	2.62	2.59	2.67	2.74	2.81

Note: The balanced distribution of the variables across the two conditions suggests that the groups are fairly equivalent on observable characteristics and that the randomization was successful in all municipalities. None of the differences between control and treatment groups are statistically significant (at the 95 percent level).

Table A6: Making favors. List-experiment estimates conditional on the education and gender of the respondents

Characteristic	No	Yes	Differences in Effects
College Degree	0.44***	0.42***	0.02
	(0.08)	(0.15)	(0.17)
	N=911	N=267	N=1178
Female	0.34***	0.55***	0.20
	(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.14)
	N=655	N=526	N=1181

Note: Average treatment effects calculated as the difference between the treatment and the control groups. Standard errors in parentheses calculated with unequal variance; ***p < 0.01, **p< 0.05, *p < 0.1

Table A7: Helpful responses, across employees' time of hiring

Responses	Hired during previous administrations	Hired during current administration	Total
… not the person in charge	3% (N=15)	3% (N=13)	3% (N=28)
… office she has to go	41% (N=202)	40% (N=157)	40% (N=359)
… office she has to go and give her the name of someone that you know at that office to make sure that the problem gets solved	56% (N=280)	57% (N=225)	57% (N=505)
	497 (100%)	395 (100%)	892 (100%)

Pearson chi2(2) = 0.1114 Pr = 0.946