European
University
Institute

# ESTONIA

## 2009 EES Technical Report – EUI-GALLUP

# Table of Contents

# I. Survey details

| | |
|---|---|
| *Fieldwork organization:* | Saar Poll LLC |
| *Fieldwork period:* | 07/06/2009 – 25/06/2009 |
| *Languages (s) of interviewing:* | Estonian and Russian |
| *Mode of interviewing:* | 700 f2f and 300 WebCATI interviews at home of respondent |
| *Number of interviewers:* | 90 (61 f2f and 29 CATI interviewers) |
| *Translation:* | Questionnaire was provided by EUI in the local languages and the fieldwork agency was asked to review and suggest changes if necessary. Changes were then either accepted or rejected by EUI. |

## I.1 Fieldforce

The CATI team of interviewers (29 interviewers and 2 supervisors) was compiled through internal competition between interviewers with most experience (mostly between 1-1.5 years). The following criteria were used when choosing the interviewers: effectiveness, response rates, average interview length.

For F2F interviewing: there were 2 supervisors working on the project from the beginning and 1 supervisor added on the stage of questionnaire checking. On total there were 61 interviewers working in the F2F part and 29 interviewers working in the CATI part.

Most (86%) of interviewers have 2-17 years of experience in research field. All interviewers have participated in special training for this particular survey organized in different location of around Estonia by Saar Poll staff.

## I.2 Briefing of interviewers

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of interviewers received EES specific personal briefing at central training | 83 |
| Length of EES specific personal briefing per interviewer | 120 mins |
| Written EES instructions | yes |
| Training in refusal conversion | yes |

The F2F instructors made further  trainings for the rest F2F interviewers.

## II. Sampling

| | |
|---|---|
| *Universe:* | General population, aged 18 and over. |
| *Coverage:* | National |
| Sample size: | 700 f2f and 300 WebCATI |
| Selection of households: | f2f: Random route, CATI: RDD |
| *Selection of respondents:* | Most recent birthday within the household. |
| *Number of recalls:* | F2f: up to 4 visits. WebCATI: up to 15 attempts |

**Table 1. Regional distribution of the sample for F2F interviews**

**Interviews in strata**

| NUTS3 | | Urbanisation | | | Target | | Sample | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1-capital | 2-other town | 3-rural area | Total | % | Total | % |
| EE001 | Põhja-Eesti | 228 | 11 | 33 | 272 | 38.2 | 270 | 38.2 |
| EE004 | Lääne-Eesti | 0 | 44 | 55 | 99 | 13.9 | 92 | 13 |
| EE006 | Kesk-Eesti | 0 | 33 | 44 | 77 | 10.8 | 75 | 10.6 |
| EE007 | Kirde-Eesti | 0 | 66 | 11 | 77 | 10.8 | 83 | 11.7 |
| EE008 | Lõuna-Eesti | 0 | 110 | 77 | 187 | 26.3 | 187 | 26.5 |
| | Total | 209 | 264 | 220 | 712 | 100 | 707 | 100 |

\* source: EUSTAT, 2007

**Table 2. Regional distribution of the sample for WebCATI interviews**

| NUTS 3 | | Total population | Target | | Sample | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | % | interviews | % | interviews |
| EE001 | Põhja-Eesti | 428542 | 39.4 | 118 | 36.7 | 110 |
| EE004 | Lääne-Eesti | 129605 | 11.9 | 36 | 12.3 | 37 |
| EE006 | Kesk-Eesti | 111599 | 10.3 | 31 | 10.7 | 32 |
| EE007 | Kirde-Eesti | 142245 | 13.1 | 39 | 13.7 | 41 |
| EE008 | Lõuna-Eesti | 276068 | 25.4 | 76 | 26.7 | 80 |
| | Total | 1088059 | 100 | 300 | 100 | 300 |

\* source: EUSTAT, 2007

# III. Fieldwork procedures

## III.1 Final disposition codes

### Table 3a. Fieldwork outcome for webCATI interviews

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Completed interviews | **1.0/1.10** | **300** |
| | | |
| Eligible, non-interview (Category 2) | **2.000** | **692** |
| Refusal and breakoff | **2.100** | **633** |
| Refusal | **2.110** | **633** |
| Household-level refusal | 2.111 | 452 |
| Known-respondent refusal | 2.112 | 181 |
| Break off | 2.120 | 0 |
| Non-contact | **2.200** | **6** |
| Respondent never available | 2.210 | 4 |
| Telephone answering device (confirming HH) | **2.220** | **2** |
| Answering machine household-no message left | 2.221 | 1 |
| Answering machine household-message left | 2.222 | 1 |
| Other, non-refusals | **2.300** | **53** |
| Deceased respondent | 2.310 | 0 |
| Physically or mentally unable/incompetent | 2.320 | 52 |
| Language problem | **2.330** | **1** |
| Household-level language problem | 2.331 | 0 |
| Respondent language problem | 2.332 | 1 |
| No interviewer available for needed language | 2.333 | 0 |
| Miscellaneous | 2.350 | 0 |
| Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3) | **3.000** | **170** |
| Unnown if housing unit | **3.100** | **170** |
| Not attempted or worked | 3.110 | 0 |
| Always busy | 3.120 | 1 |
| No answer | 3.130 | 52 |
| Answering machine-don't know if household | 3.140 | 117 |
| Call blocking | 3.150 | 0 |
| Technical phone problems | 3.160 | 0 |
| Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent | 3.200 | 0 |
| No screener completed | 3.210 | 0 |
| Other | 3.900 | 0 |
| Not eligible (Category 4) | **4.000** | **713** |
| Out of sample - other strata than originally coded | 4.100 | 0 |
| Fax/data line | 4.200 | 19 |
| Non-working/disconnect | **4.300** | **72** |
| Non-working number | 4.310 | 72 |
| Disconnected number | 4.320 | 0 |
| Temporarily out of service | 4.330 | 0 |
| Special technological circumstances | **4.400** | **1** |
| Number changed | 4.410 | 0 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Cell phone | 4.420 | 0 |
| Call forwarding | **4.430** | 1 |
| Residence to residence | 4.431 | 1 |
| Non-residence to residence | 4.432 | 0 |
| Pager | 4.440 | 0 |
| Non-residence | **4.500** | **2** |
| Business, government office, other organizations | 4.510 | 1 |
| Institution | 4.520 | 1 |
| Group quarters | 4.530 | 0 |
| No eligible respondent | 4.700 | 4 |
| Quota filled | 4.800 | 615 |
| Other | 4.900 | 0 |
| Total phone numbers used | | **1875** |

## Table 3b. Fieldwork outcome for f2f interviews

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Completed interviews | 1.0/1.1 | 707 |
| Partial | 1.2 | 0 |
| | | |
| 2. Eligible, Non-Interview | **2.000** | **653** |
| Refusal and break-offs. | **2.100** | **379** |
| Refusals | 2.110 | 379 |
| Household-level refusal | 2.111 | 271 |
| Known respondent refusal | 2.112 | 108 |
| Break-off | 2.120 | 0 |
| Non-contact | **2.200** | **271** |
| Unable to enter building/reach housing unit | 2.230 | 1 |
| No one at residence | 2.240 | 209 |
| Respondent away/unavailable | 2.250 | 61 |
| Other | **2.300** | **3** |
| Dead | 2.310 | 0 |
| Physically or mentally unable/incompetent | 2.320 | 3 |
| Language | **2.330** | **0** |
| Household-level language problem | 2.331 | 0 |
| Respondent language problem | 2.332 | 0 |
| No interviewer available for needed language | 2.333 | 0 |
| Miscellaneous | 2.360 | 0 |
| 3. Unknown eligibility, non-interview | **3.000** | **10** |
| Unknown if housing unit | **3.100** | **0** |
| Not attempted or worked | 3.110 | 0 |
| Unable to reach/unsafe area | 3.170 | 0 |
| Unable to locate address | 3.180 | 0 |
| Housing unit/Unknown if eligible respondent | 3.200 | 10 |
| No screener completed | 3.210 | 0 |
| Other | 3.900 | 0 |
| 4. Not Eligible | **4.000** | **178** |
| Out of sample | 4.100 | 128 |

| | | |
|---|---:|---:|
| Not a housing unit | **4.500** | **3** |
| Business, government office, other organization | 4.510 | 2 |
| Institution | 4.520 | 1 |
| Group quarters | 4.530 | 0 |
| Vacant housing unit | **4.600** | **47** |
| Regular, Vacant residences | 4.610 | 27 |
| Seasonal/Vacation/Temporary residence | 4.620 | 12 |
| Other | 4.630 | 8 |
| No eligible respondent | 4.700 | 0 |
| Quota filled | 4.800 | 0 |

## III.2 Outcome indicators

### Table 4. Outcome rates

| | webCATI | F2F |
|---|---:|---:|
| I=Complete Interviews (1.1) | 300 | 707 |
| P=Partial Interviews (1.2) | 0 | 0 |
| R=Refusal and break off (2.1) | 633 | 379 |
| NC=Non-Contact (2.2) | 6 | 271 |
| O=Other (2.0, 2.3) | 53 | 3 |
| e=estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that are eligible (enter a value in line 62 or accept the value in line 62 as a default) | 0.910 | 0.884 |
| Estimate of e is based on proportion of eligible households among all numbers for which a definitive determination of status was obtained (a very conservative estimate).  This will be used if you do not enter a different estimate in line 62. | 0.910 | 0.850 |
| UH=Unknown household (3.1) | 170 | 0 |
| UO=Unknown other (3.2, 3.9) | 0 | 10 |
| | | |
| Response Rate 1 | | |
| $I/(I+P) + (R+NC+O) + (UH+UO)$ | 0.258 | 0.516 |
| Response Rate 2 | | |
| $(I+P)/(I+P) + (R+NC+O) + (UH+UO)$ | 0.258 | 0.516 |
| Response Rate 3 | | |
| $I/((I+P) + (R+NC+O) + e(UH+UO) )$ | 0.262 | 0.516 |
| Response Rate 4 | | |
| $(I+P)/((I+P) + (R+NC+O) + e(UH+UO) )$ | 0.262 | 0.516 |
| | | |
| Cooperation Rate 1 | | |
| $I/(I+P)+R+O)$ | 0.304 | 0.649 |
| Cooperation Rate 2 | | |
| $(I+P)/((I+P)+R+0))$ | 0.304 | 0.649 |
| Cooperation Rate 3 | | |
| $I/((I+P)+R))$ | 0.322 | 0.651 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Cooperation Rate 4 | | |
| (I+P)/((I+P)+R)) | 0.322 | 0.651 |
| Refusal Rate 1 | | |
| R/((I+P)+(R+NC+O) + UH + UO)) | 0.545 | 0.277 |
| Refusal Rate 2 | | |
| R/((I+P)+(R+NC+O) + e(UH + UO)) | 0.552 | 0.277 |
| Refusal Rate 3 | | |
| R/((I+P)+(R+NC+O)) | 0.638 | 0.279 |
| Contact Rate 1 | | |
| (I+P)+R+O / (I+P)+R+O+NC+ (UH + UO) | 0.849 | 0.795 |
| Contact Rate 2 | | |
| (I+P)+R+O / (I+P)+R+O+NC + e(UH+UO) | 0.860 | 0.796 |
| Contact Rate 3 | | |
| (I+P)+R+O / (I+P)+R+O+NC | 0.994 | 0.801 |

The average interview length was: 26,1 min.


## III.3 The use and estimated effectiveness of the response enhancement techniques

*CATI mode of survey.* During the interviews a number of effectiveness and response enhancement techniques were used to improve interviewee response rates. Most of these techniques focused on the beginning of the call. These techniques were exercised in daily trainings and interviewers with lower response rates received special attention and additional support.

From among the techniques mainly two were used: probing and follow-up, institutional importance. Probing and follow-up focused on finding a suitable time for giving the responses in the cases where the respondent refused the interview. The respondent was suggested several other options (day, time) for call-back making it easier to agree to the interview. The interview was considered as a refusal only in the case where the respondent did not agree to choose any of the given options. In addition, the prominence of the survey and the client was addressed.

The techniques helped to enhance the response rates considerably.

*F2F mode of survey.* In order to increase the response rate we used enhancement techniques according to the Interviewer Manual (parts 3.2 and 3.3). All interviewers were trained how to use these techniques on trainings organized by Saar Poll supervisors all around Estonia.

For instance, we used ways of getting reluctant respondents to participate, especially during introduction situation, by answering arising objections. Also in order to confirm that the interviewer represents the company Saar Poll we insisted on showing the working certificate issued by Saar Poll to each working interviewer and suggested for doubtful respondent to call into Saar Poll company by given phone numbers in order to reassure the questioning situation. On the other hand the introducing informative letter was used in order to give respondents additional information about the purpose and background of the survey.

Interviewers were also trained how to prevent termination of interviewing and how to decrease the number of „Don't know" answers during interview.

Using these techniques allowed us to convert approximately a fifth of initial refusals into full responses.

## III.4 Soft refusal conversion

In case of soft refusal, an experienced interviewer (other than the one who called the respondent previously) specifically trained for this task called up the respondent, politely introduced the survey again and asked for cooperation. If respondent refused this time too, no more contacts were made with him/her. If the person was cooperative, the interviewer conducted the interview. It could happen that the respondent was willing to take part but did not have time to complete the survey at the time of the re-call, in this case interviewer fixed an appointment with him/her.

The results of these attempts are summarised in the table below:

**Table 5. Soft refusal conversion success rate**

|  | all | Turned to hard refusal | | Turned to other status | | Converted into interview | | Success rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | N | % of all | N | % of all | N | % of all | % of all contacted |
| Soft Refusal | 61 | 24 | 39% | 31 | 51% | 6 | 10% | 20% |

## III.5 Quality control of interviewing

|  | *F2F* | *WebCATI* |
|---|---|---|
| *N of interviews back-checked:* | 72 | 30 |
| *Mode of back-checking:* | personal | phone |
| *Eligible person interviewed:* | 100% | 100% |
| *Sat. with interviewers (top2box):* | 97% | 97% |

# IV. Qualitative report of the fieldwork agency

## In their own words:

The CATI fieldwork process was very smooth and there were no considerable problems or obstacles. Interviewing went according to the original plan. The number of completed interviews was monitored during the whole process and necessary changes were made immediately (e.g. adding more/less staff based on results and specifics of different week days).

During the survey all interviewers were monitored daily, additionally the supervisors listened to the interviews of each interviewer. Main mistakes were recorded and followed up on during the daily training. Every day on average 5 interviewers were listened to personally and followed up with personal improvement notes.

On the whole, face-to-face fieldwork too went smoothly. Due to the fact that most of our interviewers that took part in the fieldwork have a high quality, there were no problems during interviewing process. The biggest problem was how to get reluctant or refusing respondent to participate. The response enhancement techniques were used in order to solve this problem.

Economic crisis was an important factor during the period of fieldwork and influenced quite much the process of fieldwork. There were also two events connected with the period of fieldwork. One of them is Midsummer Day that is a great national celebration day. The second event that influenced the fieldwork was the new legislation (on employment conditions, health insurance and some other social benefits), which had to come into force on the 1st of July. There are some permanent differences in attitudes towards survey of Estonian-speakers and Russian-speakers. Some of the comments of interviewers for the fieldwork of this survey:

The fieldwork was the at the time of Midsummer event, when lots of people travel and go for vacation. The public sentiment in this year was very doomed, people had no money to travel or participate in events, so had to stay at home. In this sense it helped the fieldwork. But people were very pessimistic, life in Estonia is very hard now and people do not want to answer political questions. –." (Estonian interviewers)"

„The big problem was non-EU citizens, especially in regions with the bigger proportion of Russian-speaking population. Therefore it is impossible to know whether the people who refused to take part in the survey (under code „32") have EU citizenship or not, as a lot of people refused immediately to answer without opening the door and without any comments.

"The new legislation was a big event for Russian-speaking population. Also because new restrictions were implemented on the goods brought from Russia to Estonia across the border– those restrictions are hard for inhabitants of border towns like Narva with large Russian population that either made money with it or saved their own expenses. Here the Russian-speakers' attitudes had some new characteristics - they used the participation in the survey as a possibility to make their opinion known to the official institutions." (Russian-speaking interviewers)

# V. Weighting

A non-response population weighting was implemented on the EES dataset to correct for sampling disparities. The following variables were used in the raking procedure:

Age

Sex

Region

Education

The table below presents a comparison of the sample (unweighted and weighted) and the universe.

**Table 6. Weighting targets**

| | label | Class size by EUSTATS 2007 ('000) | Proportion in universe | Number of cases in EES | Unweighted proportion in EES | Weighted proportion in EES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Age&Sex** | | | | | | |
| 1 | male, 18-29 | 124372 | 11.477 | 73 | 7.249 | 11.477 |
| 2 | female, 18-29 | 120193 | 11.091 | 77 | 7.646 | 11.091 |
| 3 | male, 30-49 | 179243 | 16.540 | 117 | 11.619 | 16.540 |
| 4 | female, 30-49 | 190852 | 17.611 | 182 | 18.073 | 17.611 |
| 5 | male, 50-64 | 105586 | 9.743 | 94 | 9.335 | 9.743 |
| 6 | female, 50-64 | 134279 | 12.391 | 177 | 17.577 | 12.391 |
| 7 | male 65+ | 75982 | 7.011 | 81 | 8.044 | 7.011 |
| 8 | female 65+ | 153176 | 14.135 | 206 | 20.457 | 14.135 |
| | *total* | *1083683* | *100* | *1007* | *100* | *100* |
| **Education** | | | | | | |
| 1 | Primary education or first stage of basic education - level 1 (ISCED 1997) | 93035 | 9.085 | 18 | 1.787 | 8.982 |
| 2 | Lower secondary or second stage of basic education - level 2 (ISCED 1997) | 201325 | 19.659 | 151 | 14.995 | 19.681 |
| 3 | Upper secondary education - level 3 (ISCED 1997) | 436366 | 42.610 | 467 | 46.375 | 42.658 |
| 4 | Post-secondary non-tertiary education - level 4 (ISCED 1997) | 27337 | 2.669 | 53 | 5.263 | 2.672 |
| 5 | Tertiary education - levels 5-6 (ISCED 1997) | 266019 | 25.976 | 318 | 31.579 | 26.006 |
| | *total* | *1024082* | *100* | *1007* | *100* | *100* |
| **Regions (based on NUTS)** | | | | | | |
| EE001 | Põhja-Eesti | 428542 | 39,386 | 380 | 37,736 | 39,105 |
| EE004 | Lääne-Eesti | 129605 | 11,912 | 129 | 12,810 | 11,838 |
| EE006 | Kesk-Eesti | 111599 | 10,257 | 107 | 10,626 | 10,219 |
| EE007 | Kirde-Eesti | 142245 | 13,073 | 124 | 12,314 | 12,937 |
| EE008 | Lõuna-Eesti | 276068 | 25,373 | 267 | 26,514 | 25,901 |
| | *total* | *1088059* | *100* | *1007* | *100* | *100* |

**Fix phones**

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | fix phone - no | 552678 | 51.000 | 564 | 56.008 | 51.000 |
| I | fix phone - yes | 531005 | 49.000 | 443 | 43.992 | 49.000 |
| | total | 1083683 | 100 | 1007 | 100 | 100 |

* source: EUSTAT,  2007

# VI. Country-specific variables

Q4: Which political party do you think would be best at dealing with [the most important issue]?

> 01 - Eesti Reformierakond
> 02 - Eesti Keskerakond
> 03 - Isamaa ja Res Publica Liit
> 04 - Sotsiaaldemokraatlik Erakond
> 05 - Erakond Eestimaa Rohelised
> 06 - Eestimaa Rahvaliit

Q8: In a typical week, how many days do you watch the following news programmes?

a. Aktuaalne kaamera 21.00 (ETV)
b. Reporter 19.00 (Kanal2)

(Q9: Is there any other channel on which you watch the news more often than these?)
Q10: Which one?

> 01 - NTV
> 02 - PBK (Pervõi Baltiski Kanal)
> 03 - RTR Planeta
> 04 - PRO7
> 05 - YLE1
> 06 - YLE2
> 07 - France 3
> 08 - Mega Channel

Q12: In a typical week, how many days do you read the following newspapers?

a. Postimees
b. Öhtuleht
c. Eesti Ekspress

(Q13: Is there any other newspaper that you read more frequently than these?)
Q14: Which one?

> 01 - Äripäev
> 02 - Eesti Päevaleht
> 03 - Molodezh Estonii
> 04 - Pärnu Postimees
> 05 - Sakala
> 06 - Vesti Dnja

(Q24: A lot of people abstained in the European Parliament elections of June 4/7, while others voted. Did you cast your vote?)

Q25: Which party did you vote for?

 01 - Eesti Reformierakond
 02 - Eesti Keskerakond
 03 - Isamaa ja Res Publica Liit
 04 - Sotsiaaldemokraatlik Erakond
 05 - Erakond Eestimaa Rohelised
 06 - Eestimaa Rahvaliit

Q26: If you had voted in the European Parliament elections, which party would you have voted for?

 01 - Eesti Reformierakond
 02 - Eesti Keskerakond
 03 - Isamaa ja Res Publica Liit
 04 - Sotsiaaldemokraatlik Erakond
 05 - Erakond Eestimaa Rohelised
 06 - Eestimaa Rahvaliit

Q27: Which party did you vote for at the [General Election] of [Year of Last General Election]?

 01 - Eesti Reformierakond
 02 - Eesti Keskerakond
 03 - Isamaa ja Res Publica Liit
 04 - Sotsiaaldemokraatlik Erakond
 05 - Erakond Eestimaa Rohelised
 06 - Eestimaa Rahvaliit

Q28: And if there was a general election tomorrow, which party would you vote for?

 01 - Eesti Reformierakond
 02 - Eesti Keskerakond
 03 - Isamaa ja Res Publica Liit
 04 - Sotsiaaldemokraatlik Erakond
 05 - Erakond Eestimaa Rohelised
 06 - Eestimaa Rahvaliit

Q39: We have a number of parties in (country) each of which would like to get your vote. How probable is it that you will ever vote for the following parties? Please specify your views on a scale where 0 means "not at all probable" and 10 means "very probable".

    a - Eesti Reformierakond
    b - Eesti Keskerakond
    c - Isamaa ja Res Publica Liit
    d - Sotsiaaldemokraatlik Erakond
    e - Erakond Eestimaa Rohelised
    f - Eestimaa Rahvaliit

Q47: And about where would you place the following parties on this scale? Which number from 0 to 10, where 0 means "left" and 10 means "right" best describes (Party X)?

    a - Eesti Reformierakond
    b - Eesti Keskerakond
    c - Isamaa ja Res Publica Liit
    d - Sotsiaaldemokraatlik Erakond
    e - Erakond Eestimaa Rohelised
    f - Eestimaa Rahvaliit

Q81: And about where would you place the following parties on this scale? Which number from 0 to 10, where 0 means "already gone too far" and 10 means "should be pushed further" best describes (party X)?

    a - Eesti Reformierakond
    b - Eesti Keskerakond
    c - Isamaa ja Res Publica Liit
    d - Sotsiaaldemokraatlik Erakond
    e - Erakond Eestimaa Rohelised
    f - Eestimaa Rahvaliit

Q87: Do you consider yourself to be close to any particular party? If so, which party do you feel close to?

    01 - Eesti Reformierakond
    02 - Eesti Keskerakond
    03 - Isamaa ja Res Publica Liit
    04 - Sotsiaaldemokraatlik Erakond
    05 - Erakond Eestimaa Rohelised
    06 - Eestimaa Rahvaliit

(Q89: Do you feel yourself a little closer to one of the political parties than others?)
Q90: Which party is that?

01 - Eesti Reformierakond
02 - Eesti Keskerakond
03 - Isamaa ja Res Publica Liit
04 - Sotsiaaldemokraatlik Erakond
05 - Erakond Eestimaa Rohelised
06 - Eestimaa Rahvaliit

Q101: What is the highest level of education you have completed in your education?

01 - Põhiharidus (põhikooli 1 - 6 klassi)
02 - Põhiharidus (põhikooli 7 - 9 klassi)
03 - Põhiharidus (kutseõpe põhihariduse baasil)
04 - Keskharidus (kutseõpe keskhariduse baasil)
05 - Keskharidus (gümnaasiumi 10-12 klassi)
06 - Keskharidus (kutsekõrghariduslik õpe)
07 - Kõrgharidus (diplomiõppe diplom)
08 - Kõrgharidus (rakenduskõrghariduse diplom)
09 - Kõrgharidus (bakalaureuseõpe ja kraad)
10 - Kõrgharidus (magistriõpe ja kraad)
11 - Kõrgharidus (doktoriõpe ja kraad)

Q113: Just to confirm that I understand your answer correctly, would you say, that your current / last job is [NAME OF THE CODE ASSIGNED]?

01 - Spetsialist (arst, õpetaja, insener, näitleja, raamatupidaja)
02 - Tippjuht (pankur, direktor, kõrge valitsusametnik)
03 - Kontoritöötaja (sekretär, ametnik, avalik teenistuja, arveametnik)
04 - Müügitöötaja (müügijuht, poepidaja, poetöötaja, kindustusagent, ostujuht)
05 - Teenindustöötaja (restoranipidaja, politseinik, ettekandja, juuksur, hooldaja, medõde)
06 - Oskustööline (mehaanik, trükitööline, õmbleja, elektrik)
07 - Tööline (ehitustööline, bussijuht, puusepp, pagar)
08 - Lihttööline (töömees, uksehoidja, lihtne tehasetööline, koristaja)
09 - Talutööline (lihttööline, traktorijuht)
10 - Talupidaja, talu juhataja
11 - Õpin jätkuvalt
12 - Pole kunagi töötanud