

TECHNICAL REPORT

Study description:	LATVIA
Fieldwork dates:	October 25 - November 19, 1996
Principal investigators:	Hans-Dieter Klingemann, Social Science Research Center Berlin; Germany; Ilze Koroleva, Foundation for the Advancement of Sociological Studies, Riga, Latvia
Sample type:	Population: Total non-institutionalized population of Latvia (citizens and non-citizens), 18 to 85 years. Five-stage area probability sample: (1) Proportional to population size the country is divided into 64 strata (types of communities). (2) Within each stratum the primary sampling units (communities) are selected at random. (3) Within each primary sampling unit secondary sampling units (the districts of the communities) were divided into subdistricts according to types of houses and the distance to the district centers) are randomly selected. The total number of secondary sampling units was 81. (4) Within each secondary sampling unit houses (third sampling unit) are randomly selected (random route) as starting points for the selection of households (fourth sampling unit). (5) Within each household the respondent is randomly selected using the (next) birthday method (fifth sampling unit).
Fieldwork institute:	Foundation for the Advancement of Sociological Studies, Riga
Fieldwork method:	Interviews were conducted by 56 interviewers which were trained especially for the study. 3 percent of randomly selected respondents were called back by phone to ensure quality of fieldwork.
Sample size:	1,200
Response rate:	$(1200/1853) \times 100 = 64.7$ percent
Languages:	Latvian and Russian

Comparison with National Population Characteristics: Latvia

	Census 1989 %	Sample %	Difference
Gender			
Male	47	44	-3
Female	53	56	+3

Age Groups

18-19	4	6	+2
20-29	23	20	-3
30-39	21	22	+1
40-49	18	19	+1
50-59	17	17	0
60-69	10	11	+1
70+	7	5	-2

Urban/Rural

Urban	71	69	-2
Rural	29	31	+2

Nationality^a

Latvian	51	59	+8
Russian + Other	49	41	-8

^a The ethnic composition of the population of Latvia has changed since 1989, but no other official statistics are available. Ethnic identification of the respondent is not available in the data. The language chosen for the interview is not completely comparable to the language indicated in the census of 1989. Among those who indicated another language than Latvian or Russian in the census some may have chosen Latvian and some Russian as language of interview.