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Study Description
**ISSP Study Description Form**

*Please use this form for reporting on Module 2006 and later!*

**Study title:** Trabajo en el hogar, vida familiar y laboral.

**Fieldwork dates:**
- Start: 2012-10-06
- End: 2013-07-29

(Please note: different problems –financial and other types- required that the field work be carried out in a time period longer than usual).

**Principal investigators:** Jorge Raúl Jorrat, Instituto Gino Germani, Universidad de Buenos Aires, and CONICET (Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas).

**Sample type:** Stratified three-stage probability sampling. Stages: area units, households, persons. (Random selection at all stages).

**Fieldwork institute:** Instituto Gino Germani (after CEDOP), Universidad de Buenos Aires.

**Fieldwork methods:** Paper and pencil, respondent reading questionnaire. As many did not accept to read from a blank questionnaire offered by the interviewer, the interviewer read the questions (aloud) side by side with the interviewee. Instructions were to put pressure on the interviewees in order that this last alternative be accomplished.

**N. of respondents:** number of respondents in the final ISSP file: 977

**Details about issued sample:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size) *</td>
<td>............ 3732...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interviews (1.0)</td>
<td>............ 977...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Eligible, Non-Interview</td>
<td>2171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Refusal/Break-off (2.10)</td>
<td>............ 1214..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Non-Contact (2.20)</td>
<td>............ 957..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Language Problems (2.33)</td>
<td>............ 0......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: The field work was as follows:*
The interviewer was provided with a Route Sheet with 50 lines, were 20 of them were randomly marked. Around three blocks were part of what we call a Sampling Point. After beginning in a designated corner, they had to start walking. When they arrived at the first marked line, they had to ring in that address. They had to follow until they obtained around 5 interviews, indicating the different results obtained in each case. They were required to go back twice to addresses where nobody answered.

(This is “theory”. To control the described procedures was not easy nor cheap. Supervision for these procedures was carried out within the limits of scarce resources, but the job was done as carefully as possible.)

Under this type of design, it is not possible for us to talk about “starting” addresses (and/or substitution, as it is required below). In theory, we thought we could obtain 1 interview out of 5 attempts. Given financial limitations, we planned a sampling size of 1000 cases. So, around 200 Sampling Points were selected, with the idea of obtaining 5 interviews in 20 randomly chosen addresses within each Sampling Point.

So, what we write below as a "starting total number", it is just the sum of all other results in “Details about issued sample”.

Please follow the standards laid down in AAPOR/WAPOR, Standard Definitions: [http://www.aapor.org/u](http://www.aapor.org/u)
The numbers in the parentheses are those used in Tables 2 and 3 of Standard Definitions.

ii. Miscellaneous Other (2.31, 2.32, 2.35)  ...  ... ...0...

3. Unknown Eligibility, Non-Interview (3.0)  ............  0.....

4. Not Eligible  584
   A. Not a Residence (4.50)  ..........  581..
   B. Vacant Residence (4.60)  ............  3.....
   C. No Eligible Respondent (4.70)  ..........  0..
   D. Other (4.10,4.90)  ............  0..

* When new sample units are added during the field period via a new dwelling units list or other standard updating procedure, these additional issued units are added to the starting number of units to make up the total gross sample size. Also, when substitution is used, the total must include the originally drawn cases plus all substitute cases. See AAPOR/WAPOR Standard Definitions, pp. 9-10 for further clarification.

Note: See comments on “Sample type” section.

Language(s): Spanish

Weight present: Yes.

Weighting procedure: First, we cross-tabbed our sample on the basis of the following variables: a) Sex, b) Population or city size [1) Buenos Aires Metropolitan Area, 2) Large and middle-large cities, 3) Middle, smaller cities and rural places], and c) Educational level [1) up to complete primary, 2) secondary and incomplete tertiary, 3) complete tertiary and undergraduate and graduate university studies].

Second, we carried out the same procedure based on the 2001 Population Census.

Third, we divided the second on the first set of cross-tab values. Hence, we obtained: 2 x 3 x 3 = 18 weighting values. After weighting, the unweighted sample size (977) was maintained.

Known systematic properties of sample: Surveys usually might have differences with official statistics on employment. But, given that under the present national administration our Bureau of the Census (INDEC) was –and is- accused of manipulation of this kind of information, we do not have reliable data to see the employment issue. After some observed biases were corrected by means of weighting, we do not see any important additional remaining bias.

Deviations from ISSP questionnaire: All questions were asked. Few, small differences might be noted: 1) If a person had no religion, attendance of religious services was not asked for him/her. 2) Given that in Argentina voting is mandatory, we did not asked first if they had voted in the last general election, but the question on voting had two items about this: a) could not vote and b) did not want to vote. Also, given that for people 70 years and older voting is not mandatory, we registered these people who did not choose to vote. 3) In Argentina people usually have no clear idea of their “gross” income. So, we asked for their “net” income. It is also customary to talk about “monthly” income.

Publications: None.

Please Note: This version has a slight correction of an erratum found in Section: “Details about issued sample”. In our previous mailing 63 cases were wrongly placed in 4C, when they should have been added to 4A). In the Study Monitoring Form the right version is presented.