

FSD1046 BALTIAN MUUTOS 1993

FSD1046 SOCIAL CHANGE IN BALTIC COUNTRIES 1993

---

Tämä dokumentti on osa yllä mainittua Yhteiskuntatieteelliseen tietoaarkistoon arkistoitua tutkimusaineistoa.

Dokumenttia hyödyntävien tulee viitata siihen asianmukaisesti lähdeviitteellä.

---

This document forms a part of the above mentioned dataset, archived at the Finnish Social Science Data Archive.

If the document is used or referred to in any way, the source must be acknowledged by means of an appropriate bibliographic citation.

---

Detta dokument utgör en del av den ovannämnda datamängden, arkiverad på Finlands samhällsvetenskapliga dataarkiv.

Om dokument är utnyttjat eller refererat till måste källan anges i form av bibliografisk referens.

---

**FSD1046 Baltian muutos 1993**

Tämä asiakirja on osa yllä mainittua tutkimusaineistoa. Sitä hyödyntävien tulee viitata siihen seuraavasti:

Blom, Raimo: Baltian muutos 1993 [Elektroninen aineisto]. Raimo Blom & Latvia Social Research Centre [aineistonkeruu], 1993. Tampere : Yhteiskuntatieteellinen tietoaarkisto [jakaja], 2000.

Lisätietoja: URL: <http://www.fsd.uta.fi/aineistot.html>

**FSD1046E Social Change in Baltic Countries1993**

This document is part of the research material mentioned above. Required citation to the material is:

Blom, Raimo: Social Change in Baltic Countries 1993 [Computer file]. Raimo Blom & Latvia Social Research Centre [data collection], 1993. Tampere : Finnish Social Science Data Archive [distributor], 2000.

More information: URL: <http://www.fsd.uta.fi/english/data.html>

## Appendix

### **SURVEY IN ESTONIA**

The universe consists of persons aged 18 - 65, living in Estonia.

The sample size is 1499.

The stratified random sample was used. The sample is stratified by region. The chosen places in the sample represent economically and socially different areas of Estonia as follows:

#### A. Industrialized part of Estonia

1. Tallinn - the centre of economic and administrative activities
2. Kohtla-Järve and Ida-Viru - area of large-scale industry with population of great Russian majority

#### B. Rural part of Estonia

3. Pärnu - area at middle level of economic and social development in South-Western Estonia
4. Tartu and county of Tartu - remarkable cultural and university centre in Southern Estonia
5. Põlva - rural area in South-Eastern Estonia
6. Counties Lääne and Saare - poor rural area in Western Estonia
7. Viljandi-- wealthy rural area in Middle-Estonia
8. Rapla - typical area of middle level development of Middle-Estonia

The population of these chosen places represent over two thirds (69.2 %) of population of Estonia.

The names of the interviewees were drawn (Estonians and Russians separately) from inhabitant registers of towns and counties chosen in the sample. Nationality, sex and age were used as demographic criteria in sampling.

Tables 1. - 4. describes various distributions of population and sample characteristics.

Table 1. Distribution by sex

	Population (All) Number (1 000)		Sample Number	
		%		%
1. Male	703.6	46.7	651	44.0
2. Female	803.3	53.3	829	56.0
Total	1 506.9	100.0	1 480	100.0

Table 2. Distribution by age

	Population (aged 20 - 64) Number (1 000)		Sample Number	
		%		%
1. 20- 29	209.2	23.5	323	24,4
2. 30- 39	222.5	24.9	325	24.6
3. 40-49	194.1	21.8	315	23.8
4. 50-59	181.0	20.3	266	20.1
5. 60-64	84.0	9.4	94	7.1
Total	890.8	100.0	1 323	100.0

Table 3. Distribution by place of living: Tallinn - other country

	Population (All) Number (1 000)		Sample Number	
		%		%
1. Tallinn	442.7	29.4	454	30.4
2. Other country	1064.2	70.6	1 039	69.6
Total	1 506.9	100.0	1493	100.0

Table 4. Distribution by nationality

	Population (All) Number (1 000)		Sample Number	
		%		%
1. Estonians	962.6	63.9	974	65.2
2. Russians	436.4	29.0	416	27.8
3. Ukrainians	40.5	2.7	34	2.3
4. Other	67.4	4.4	71	4.7
Total	1506.9	100.0	1495	100.0

## Appendix

### SURVEY IN LATVIA

### FIELDWORK REPORT

December 1993

### SAMPLING

The survey had the target population of persons aged 15 and more, living in Latvia. The planned sample size was 1600 persons.

Actual sample size - 1637.

The stratified random sample, based on a combined sampling method was used:

- A. Proportional sampling - in stage of estimating the number of respondents for regions and for different types of populated points (urban / rural area).
- B. Quota sampling in stage of selection of respondents for keeping socio.-demographic proportions.

Calculations of sample characteristics were based on statistical data, valid for the beginning, of 1993 (source - Natural Increase and migration of the population in Latvia, 1992 /statistical bulletin/ Latvia State Statistical Committee, Riga 1993).

The respondents were chosen by a 'route' method (random starting address) according to the quota prescription.

Stratification parameters

a) Geographic grouping:

The country is divided into five regions (areas) -

1. Riga city  
+ four traditional regions
2. Vidzeme (Centre and North)
3. Latgale (East)
4. Zemgale (South)
5. Kurzeme (West)

Riga city, consists of six administrative sub-districts. Regions contain cities and administrative districts. the latest consist of towns and rural communities.

b) Grouping by degree of urbanization:

The sample was stratified by four categories with respect of urbanization (size of populated point) -

1. Riga city (875 000 residents)
2. Cities (towns with 40 000 or more residents)
3. Towns (average small towns, less than 40 000 residents)
4. Rural communities (villages, other small populated points, separately located farms).

c) Grouping by socio-demographic characteristics:

The quoting was based on the following parametres:

1. Gender
2. Age - five groups (15-24, 25-34, 35-49, 50-64, 65+)
3. Nationality-- three groups (Latvians, Russians, representatives of other nationalities)

The survey was carried out in 28 survey area and 69 survey points across the country.

## **FIELDWORK**

The survey was carried out between November 15 and December 12, 1993.

All interviews were made using face-to-face interviewing by 101 Latvia Social Research Centre's part-time interviewers.

Interviews were held at respondent's dwellings, which were chosen by 'route' method according to the randomly chosen starting address provided by supervisor.

Interviewers were provided with the quota sheet, which contained necessary demographic proportions of respondents (by nationality, gender, age) and route instructions for (every fourth dwelling in multistage buildings, odd numbers in districts of individual houses).

After the fieldwork 132 interviews were checked by repeated visiting of the respondents.

Tables 1. - 4. describes various distributions of population and sample characteristics.

Table 1. Distribution by sex

	Population (Aged 18+) Number (1000)	%	Sample Number	%
1. Male	876.8	45.0	708	43.8
2. Female	1 073.2	55.0	909	56.2
Total	1 950.0	100.0	1617	100.0

Table 2. Distribution by age

	Population (Aged 18+) Number (1 000)	%	Sample Number	%
1. 18 -24	249.7	12.8	205	12.6
2. 25 - 34	382.9	19.6	341	21.0
3. 35 -49	504.6	25.9	424	26.1
4. 50- 64	481.6	24.7	414	25.5
5. 65 -	331.2	17.0	241	14.8
Total	1 950.0	100.0	1 625	100.0

Table 3. Distribution by place of living: Riga - other country

	Population (Aged 18+) Number (1 000)	%	Sample Number	%
1. Riga	677.3	34.7	567	34.7
2. Other country	1 272.7	65.3	1 069	65.3
Total	1 950.0	100.0	1 636	100.0

Table 4. Distribution by nationality

	Population (All) Number (1 000)	%	Sample Number	%
1. Latvians	1 391.5	54.2	906	55.6
2. Russians	849.3	33.1	520	31.9
3. Belorussians	150.1	4.1	52	3.2
4. Other	220.0	8.6	151	9.3
Total	2565.9	100.0	1636	100.0

## APPENDIX

### LITHUANIAN SAMPLE '93

Respondents' names surnames, dates of birth genders and places of living (adress) are known from the election list (1992). More detail information such as education, or especially, present occupation is unknown. It is possible to add such information according to the latest list of population census (1989), but it would be out-of-date for a great number of cases: about education - less, about present occupation and work - too often.

The theoretical sample was constructed according to the following statistical data 1) of living, 2) age, 3) gender, 4) nationality, 5) education. Each interviewer received distribution of his respondents by those sample characteristics. First of all they tried to find the concrete person by the known adress. If they had failed to find the concrete person, they had the right to find another respondent with the same characteristics of sample.

1500 respondents were chosen. The theoretical sample was constructed for this number respondents. 1483 interviews were held. So the percent of participation in the survey is 99%. 17 respondents didn't participate in the sample for various reasons:

Reason	N
1. Respondent's refuse	3
2. Interviewer's refuse	2 interviewers=6 respondents.
3. impossibility to find respondent by the variables of the theoretical sample	7
4. Incomplete questionnaire	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17</b>

Interviewers found this questionnaire too difficult, which required a lot of time, Two interviewers didn't finish their work. As the result - 6 respondents were lost.

Some respondents changed their mind during the interview. 3 respondents refused to continue the participation in the interview: they answered only some questions and then interrupted the interview: two of them - women, one, - man, all from the small towns. 1 questionnaire was not completed = spoilage.

The most difficult for the interviewers was to find find of 30-39 years old group in some centers of the districts (small towns) with "other" nationality. Some interviewers had difficulties to find people with the special secondary and primary education. The concept of the primary education has been changing in course. of many years: some people who treated themselves as with primary education - didn't have it in fact.



Some people of Russian nationality in small town again (in Mazeikiai – the center of the oil industry of Lithuania), refused to participate in the survey. As the result 5 Russians according to their other sample characteristics were additionally interviewed in Vilnius

Tables 1-9 describe various distributions of population and sample characteristics.

**TABLE 1. Sample distribution by urban-rural population.**

Estimate at January 1, 1993.

Place of living	Population (thousands)	%	Sample (N)		
			theoretical	in fact	%
Urban	2570.9	68	1020	1014	68
Rural	1180.5	32	480	469	32
TOTAL	3751.4	100	1500	1483	100

**TABLE 2. Sample distribution by sex (average in 1992)**

Sex	Population		Sample		
	Total number	%	theoretical	in fact	%
1. Male	1 771 413	47	690	692	47
2. Female	1 970 258	53	810	791	53
TOTAL	3 741 671	100	1500	1483	100

**TABLE 3. Resident population (urban - rural) by sex.**

Estimate at January 1, 1993.

	Urban		Rural		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
<b>Population</b>	910.287	1.066.312	431.379	491.371	2.899.349
per cent	31	37	15	17	100
<b>Sample:</b>					
theoretical	465	555	225	255	1500
in fact	471	543	221	248	1483
per cent	31	37	15	17	100

**TABLE 4. Sample distribution by age.**

Estimate at January 1, 1993.

Age	Population		Sample		
	Total number	%	theoretical	in fact	%
1.15-19	266.422	9	120	137	9
2.20-29	580.241	20	315	294	20
3.30-39	561.424	19	285	272	19
4.40-49	443.726	15	240	242	16
5.50-59	430.606	16	225	225	15
6.60&>	616.930	21	325	313	21
TOTAL	2.899.349	100	1500	1483	100

TABLE 5. Resident population (urban-rural) by sex and age.  
Estimate at January 1, 1993.

URBAN										
Age	Male					Female				
	Population	%	Sample			Population	%	Sample		
			THO.	INF.	%			THO.	INF.	%
15-19	93.834	10	47	50	10	93.572	9	50	47	9
20-29	211.033	23	107	106	23	208.035	20	111	109	20
30-39	202.646	22	102	99	21	217.961	20	111	106	20
40-49	150.800	17	79	79	17	173.938	16	89	93	17
50-59	126.521	14	65	71	15	153.985	14	77	77	14
60 &>	125.453	14	65	66	14	218.821	21	117	111	20
TOTAL	910.287	100	465	471	100	1.066.312	100	555	543	100

  

RURAL										
Age	Male					Female				
	Population	%	Sample			Population	%	Sample		
			THO.	INF.	%			THO.	INF.	%
15-19	41.120	10	22	22	10	37.896	8	20	19	8
20-29	86.427	20	45	43	20	74.746	15	38	36	15
30-39	75.524	18	40	38	17	65.293	13	33	30	12
40-49	60.034	14	32	35	16	58.954	12	31	34	13
50-59	67.987	16	36	31	14	82.113	17	43	45	18
60 &>	100.287	22	50	52	23	172.369	35	90	84	34
TOTAL	431.379	100	225	221	100	491.371	100	255	248	100

THO.- theoretical

INF.- in fact

TABLE 6. Sample distribution by place of living.  
Estimate at January 1, 1993.

Towns (former Republic subordination) Population in thousands	%	Sample			
		Theoretical		In fact	
		N	%	N	%
Population					
Vilnius (city)	590.1	236	36	251	37
Kaunas	429.0	169	26	173	26
Klaipeda	206.4	81	13	83	12
Siauliai	147.8	61	9	61	9
Panevezys	132.0	54	8	57	8
Alytus	77.6	34	5	36	5
Marijampole	52.1	20	3	21	3
Other	52.8	--	--	--	--
<b>Total</b>	<b>1687.8</b>	<b>675</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>682</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>DISTRICTS:</b>					
Towns	883.1		345		332
Village	1180.5		480		469
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3751.4</b>		<b>1500</b>		<b>1483</b>

TABLE 7. Sample distribution by nationality  
(1989 population census data)

Nationality	Population		Theoretical	Sample	
	Total number	%		In fact	%
1. Lithuanians	2.230.905	80	1200	1187	80
2. Russia	250.977	9	135	150	10
3. Polish	195.204	7	105	97	7
4. Other	111.545	4	60	49	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2.788.631</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1500</b>	<b>1483</b>	<b>100</b>

TABLE 8. Sample distribution by education  
(1989 population census data)

Education	Population		Theoretical	Sample	
	Total number	%		In fact	%
1. High	301.394	11	165	188	12
2. Not completed high	52.697	2	30	37	3
3. Special secondary	554.389	20	300	282	19
4. Secondary	718.364	26	390	374	25
5. Not completed secondary	463.174	17	255	255	17
6. Primary	488.810	17	255	233	16
7. Not completed primary	209.711	7	105	114	8
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2.788.539</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1500</b>	<b>1483</b>	<b>100</b>

**TABLE 9. Pensioners (average 1992)**

	Population	Sample in
Fact*		
>16 years	2 850 800	1483
Pensioners	911 000	-553
% of working age population	32	37

\*32 % of pensioners of working age of population was the reality in Lithuania in 1992. In 1993 the their number only increased, but we'll receive the new data only in the. begining of this summer. Thecategory pensioners includes all kinds of pensions. So our data, and this endependent variable of sampling, shows the

great social problem of Lithuanian society and, we hope, we have a good posibility to deal it.