

DEMSTAR

Democracy, the State, and Administrative Reforms

State of the State in Latvia

Appendix 4:
Questionnaire Frequencies and Quotes

Ole Nørgaard & Ole Hersted Hansen

with

Ilze Ostrovska
(Research Design and Implementation) &

Luise Pape Møller
(Compilation of Appendices)

Research Report No. 1

May 2000

Appendix 4

Questionnaire frequencies and quotes

Abbreviations used in this appendix:

M Minister
 PM Prime Minister
 SM State Minister

1. Preparation for decision making

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Search Information	36	70.6	70.6	70.6
Government guidelines	5	9.8	9.8	80.4
Other	10	19.6	19.6	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 1 : how do you begin the preparation for decision-making?

Comments

M - Welfare: Other comments: In the first government of Latvia after the reestablishment of independence decisions were made by the ministry, first of all, taking into account the experiences of England / Germany as well as technical advice from the old system.

M - Interior Affairs: The situation in the country was different than today. The minister did not establish policy but actually ran the work of his ministry which is now within the competence of state secretaries.

M -Industry: Additional information must be collected. The marked ones are the cornerstones.

M - Human Rights: The marked opinion includes following guidelines set forth both by government and parliament. But if I was sure of my competence, I made a decision without consulting.

SM - Energy, Ministry of Economics: Search for information is half of the work. Relevant structures are set up and ministers use them to get information.

M - Finance: The situation in the country was different than today. The minister did not establish policy but actually ran the work of his ministry which is now within the competence of state secretaries.

M - Economics: It begins with the problems addressed in the program of the party, then I search for what is said about the problem in the government's action-plan. If there was nothing in the plan, then the ministry worked out the proposals itself, calculating what would be lost and what may be gained.

M - Foreign Affairs: There are many different variants: in general - in spite of who initiated - everything begins with the gathering of information, often on the order of the Cabinet of Ministers in accordance with the needs of the development of democracy. In foreign affairs the decisions made are for the long term.

PM, M - Finance: 1. Pressing problems are the main reason. The current problems, sociopolitical significance and necessity. 2. The necessity to carry out the reforms and the necessary tempo of reforms.

PM, M - Traffic: When I myself had a problem, that had appeared to my mind as burning issue and under the pressure of the society and life itself, the Cabinet and the Parliament got involved.

M - Welfare: There are two different approaches: 1) the idea comes from the ministry itself (1). 2) The idea comes from government or other ministries (2+3).

M - Welfare: Investigation, opinions and discussions.

M - Welfare: The government prepared main the concepts. Decisions were prepared by the ministry, in consultation with other ministries and the Parliament (The respondent was a minister in the first Latvian government).

M - Environment: The main concept is formulated (national environmental politics), then the ministry follows the guidelines of this concept.

M - Finance and EU: It depends on the situation.

SM - investment and credit policies, Ministry of Finance: All possible answers are closely tied together and it depends on who initiates the decision.

PM, M - State Reforms: I study the experiences of the small European states.

PM, M - Economy: Prepared guidelines by my ministry.

2. Trust in officials

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Technical				
Yes	42	82.4	85.7	85.7
No	7	13.7	14.3	100.0
Total	49	96.1	100.0	
Missing	2	3.9		
Total	51	100.0		
Political				
No	33	64.7	66.0	66.0
Yes	17	33.3	34.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 2: in most cases were / are you in your ministry able to trust that your ministerial officials would / will provide reliable information about both technical and political matters?

Comments

M - Agriculture: The officials' preparation in technical and political matters was not bad. It was better than what the new officials are doing now. The legislation was changing.

M - Interior Affairs: They provided information if I did not have it myself. (In those times the Parliament did not consist of fractions - the deputies were independent.)

M - Industry: Officials desired to show a politically competent face, but in fact they were not ready.

M - Welfare: Partly because there were cases when they were not too qualified on particular issues (everyone was teaching and learning by doing).

SM - Welfare: Providing the minister with information on political matters was not desirable.

PM, M - Economy: Technical: mostly yes. Political: competence of the minister.

PM, M - Economy: Political: that is not a competence of ministerial officials.

M - Finance: Government should be once again become a government of professionals, not a political government.

3. Reliable advisors

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Political Advisor				
Not mentioned	31	60.8	60.8	60.8
Mentioned	19	37.3	37.3	98.0
Missing	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	
Political Parties				
Not mentioned	38	74.5	76.0	76.0
Mentioned	12	23.5	24.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		
Academic specialists				
Not mentioned	14	27.5	28.0	28.0
Mentioned	36	70.6	72.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		
NGOs				
Not mentioned	30	58.8	60.0	60.0
Mentioned	20	39.2	40.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		
Others				
Not mentioned	7	13.7	58.3	58.3
Mentioned	5	9	41.7	100.0
Total	12	23.5	100.0	
Missing	39	76.5		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 3: if you can't rely on your ministerial officials, who would you rely on, or have you relied on, to get the information you need?

Comments

M - Finance: Others: foreign experts.

Minister of Economics: Others: experts.

M - Agriculture: There were in fact different advisors on different issues.

M - Social Provision: Others: The Latvian Popular Front, of which I used to be a member / the experience of other countries / representatives from the area of social security.

M - Interior Affairs: It was the only ministry that continuously received operative information - it had its own network of agents in different circles. The received information was collected, analyzed and conclusions were made on this basis.

M - Industry: NGO specialists took part in particular questions that concerned the environment.

M - Human Rights: Others: all of the partners from the coalition.

M - Finance: The International Monetary Fund, The World Bank and the Latvian Bank's specialists on monetary analysis.

SM - Energy, Ministry of Economics: Experts from the fields of energy and infrastructure.

M - Foreign Affairs: Others: People that I trust. Among them could be persons mentioned above, but the criterion is persons I could rely on. It is always good if there are different sources of opinion.

M - Economics: 1) Relied on myself. 2) Asked the advice of economic advisor of the foreign embassies and The World Bank, attended a half year training program in the USA for economic specialists from Eastern Europe.

M - Foreign Affairs: If I need advice on the question specialists are invited.

PM, M - Finance: 1. None of those mentioned. 2. Cooperative ties were used to get the necessary information, no one from the state administration, but those who are independent from the state administration. I think that information gained in the context of the audience was the most reliable.

PM, M - Traffic: I could always rely on the specialists of my ministry and I got the best information from them.

M - Welfare: There were no political parties when the respondent held office (only Latvian Popular Front and Interfront).

M - Environment: Others: Center of Monitoring and Consultation.

PM, M - Economy: Officials - interests of their sector. That is why you need information from other sources.

PM, M - State Reforms: Others: political party.

M - Finance: Other: other administrative institutions.

4. Has the quality of civil servants declined

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	11	21.6	22.4	22,4
Disagree	38	74.5	77.6	100,0
Total	49	96.1	100.0	
Missing	2	3.9		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 4: concerning ministries, would you say that the quality of the civil servants has declined in the time since independence, regarding their ability to give technical and political advise?

Comments

M - Finance: Hard to compare with what it was like before.

M - Social Provision: It is hard to say about the period of the latest years. There is a system of how to increase one's qualifications. Certainly there are important exceptions.

M - Agriculture: If technical matters are in connection with the experience of the national economy the quality has declined. As to political matters the quality has declined.

SM - Energy, Ministry of Economics: Technical advice has improved. It is difficult to say about quality of political advice.

M - Human Rights: The ability has certainly increased.

M - Industry: Civil service is developing. In the beginning there were non-developed issues.

M - Economics: Agrees partially and is able to compare the two "ages": then there were servants with a good sense of responsibility and they were reliable, they were not chosen by accident.

M - Welfare: The quality of the bureaucracy increases all the time (in the process of acquiring experience form other countries). It is necessary to create a new bureaucratic system after 40 years.

PM, M - Economy: Before independence there were qualified and independent civil servants and governmental institutions.

5. If declined, then why

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
First reason				
They are not qualified	6	11.8	37.5	37.5
Second jobs	2	3.9	12.5	50.0
Left for private jobs	6	11.8	37.5	87.5
Other	2	3.9	12.5	100.0
Total	16	31.4	100.0	
Missing	35	68.6		
Total	51	100.0		
Second reason				
They are not qualified	1	2.0	8.3	8.3
Left for private jobs	6	11.8	50.0	58.3
Left for international jobs	2	3.9	16.7	75.0
Lack of motivation	2	3.9	16.7	91.7
Other	1	2.0	8.3	100.0
Total	12	23.5	100.0	
Missing	39	76.5		
Total	51	100.0		
Third reason				
Left for international jobs	5	9.8	83.3	83.3
Lack of motivation	1	2.0	16.7	100.0
Total	6	11.8	100.0	
Missing	45	88.2		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 5: if declined, what are the main reasons?

Comments

SM - Energy, Ministry of Economics: The civil servants have a strong motivation.

M - Agriculture: Other: A question of prestige and salary.

M - Trade: Other: Lack of common working experience.

M - Finance: Officials' educational level is not satisfactory (technical preparation).

6. Working relationship with the significant organizations

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	40	78.4	80.0	80.0
No	10	19.6	20.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 6: in your own ministry, is / was it common practice that ministerial officials have a close working relationship with the significant organizations (business, NGO or state) in the field of the ministry?

Comments

M - Finance: No, and that was the biggest problem.

M - Agriculture: An official has to be a specialist whose experience in the private sector has been great. For an official to make conceptual decisions he has to comprehend how it is going to affect the lowest level.

M - Interior Affairs: There was no organization of that kind. However, there was a close relationship with the mass media.

M - Human Rights: I should say that it was not too close (I would not use the word close). I wished it had been closer with the international organizations. The information from abroad was not processed in due time.

SM - Energy, Ministry of Economics: Only with the minister's permission could ministerial officials do that.

M - Agriculture: A close working relationship was just becoming established.

M - Traffic: In the early 1990s many sectors were state owned.

M - Economics: A few; the civil servants were remote from reality.

SM - Foreign Affairs: With NGOs and with the Latvian Institute.

M - Foreign Affairs: Civil servants encapsulate themselves. Exceptions are rare. One must invent a mechanism of additional demands to do it, otherwise nothing will happen.

M - Foreign Affairs: It depends on the ministry. There is no need to make consultations in foreign affairs, but there are cases when this is realized with for example economic organizations.

PM, M - Finance: It makes public officers' lives more complicated. Public officers' self-defense function works: if there are relations they lead to a greater number of alternatives, which means that the public officer has to defend his project.

SM - Welfare: Because the main responsibility was investment and loans. Any co-operation involved a risk of corruption.

SM - State Income, Ministry of Finance: Both answers are partial because some had a relationship and some had not. There were relationships with pharmaceutical companies.

PM, M - State Reforms: The role of NGOs at that time was just starting to increase.

M - Finance: Ministerial officials have a working relationship with related (branch ministries).

7. Is / was this a common practice in other ministries

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	34	66.7	66.7	66.7
No	6	11.8	11.8	78.4
Don't know	11	21.6	21.6	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 7: is / was this a common practice in other ministries?

Comments

M - Agriculture: In some ministries the practice was better and in others it was worse. A sudden separation took place in the second half of 1993 when government personnel was changed. Inexperienced people took their place in the government and lost contracts already established. Now contacts are being renewed.

M - Human Rights: Everywhere a similar inefficiency was observed. Everybody only seemed to be concerned with his / her own responsibility.

M - Finance: In each ministry is a work group which co-ordinates decision-making to be in accordance with EU demands.

M - Economics: 1. Hard to judge. 2. There is no research about it. 3. Maybe that is how it should be although the ministries are quite different.

M - Economics: The collaboration is not developed.

M - Foreign Affairs: It becomes more active, sometimes it is even institutionalized. Civil servants perceive it as an additional job.

PM, M - Traffic: Better or worse, the practice is common in all ministries.

M - Welfare: In other ministries it was less common practice.

M - Welfare: It was less common practice.

PM, M - Economy: In some cases it was not common practice.

PM, M - State Reforms: That depends on the minister's attitude.

SM - Credit Policies and Investment, Ministry of Finance: It depends on the ministry, in some ministries such things always happen, in other ministries sometimes, but the process is in every ministry.

8. Officials' membership of governing coalition party

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
More than two thirds	15	29.4	30.0	30.0
About half	16	31.4	32.0	62.0
Less than a third	16	31.4	32.0	94.0
No coalitions	3	5.9	6.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 8: in your time as minister how many of your top officials (Deputy Ministers, Assistants, Advisors, Press Secretary, State Minister) were members of a coalition party?

Comments

M - Human Rights: The separation began in the beginning of 1993 when new parties were formed. In the period of 1990-92 the government used to work in conformity. They did not waste their time in political ambitions.

M - Interior Affairs: There were no coalitions. The re-establishment of Latvia's independence had just been proclaimed. So there were no parliamentary secretaries.

M - Industry: But not many (were replaced). In those days there was no governing coalition. Civil service had been inherited.

M - Human Rights: All of the named positions belonged to the governing coalition party.

M - Finance: The state secretary, who aspires to be apolitical, is an exception.

M - Economics: The ministry was not very "politicized".

PM, M - Traffic: There is only one category that have to be political figures, the state secretaries. Lower down they have to be professionals.

Minister of Welfare: There were not different parties in government (only Latvian Popular Front).

PM, M - Economy: As Latvian Way formed civil servant institutions, many were representatives of this political orientation.

9. Replacement of staff

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Most	3	5.9	6.5	6.5
About half	4	7.8	8.7	15.2
Less than half	31	60.8	67.4	82.6
None	2	3.9	4.3	87.0
Don't know	6	11.8	13.0	100.0
Total	46	90.2	100.0	
Missing	5	9.8		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 9: in general how many of the general administrative staff are (were) replaced when a new minister appears / -ed in the ministry from another party?

Comments

M - Agriculture: When I was a minister, political replacements did not take place.

M - Agriculture: Almost none was replaced.

M - Social Provision: When I began my duties the ministry had not been reorganized. A number of representatives from the Soviet regime were working there. About one fourth of them were replaced, including officials of the highest level.

M - Agriculture: The number of employees decreased from 550 to 150 people. It was a good chance to choose specialists who were well experienced. They started with a desire to change the system of management.

M - Interior Affairs: One of my first orders was this: people belonging to the ministry either had to leave it or cease being members of the Communist Party. All who were not loyal to the new Republic of Latvia were replaced.

M - Interior Affairs: This process is not connected with party membership.

M - Foreign Affairs: It isn't connected with party membership.

M - Special Targets for the EC: The ministry was established under my leadership time and we needed a professional one.

M - Interior Affairs: There is no such approach because the staff is measured only by its professional values.

M - Interior Affairs: Almost nobody.

M - Finance and EU: The People's Party is trying to replace almost all staff, the party Fatherland and Freedom do not, or very seldom.

SM - Foreign Affairs: None was replaced in my time. I did not raise such questions and did not ask for any replacements.

M - Foreign Affairs: It is simply a characteristic of the ministries run by Latvian Way.

M - Foreign Affairs: If two ministers are from the same party then there are also changes. Latvian Way was here since 1993, but we have a rotation system and this determines objective replacements.

PM, M - Finance: I replaced them myself. There was no connection with the party. I simply chose persons who were professionals with greater responsibility.

PM, M - Traffic: They are replaced not for political reasons but because of the lack of professionalism. During my time as the minister, out of 16 heads of departments 6 were replaced.

M - Trade: Substitution of government cannot be connected with substitution of clerks.

M - Welfare: Only the non-loyal and non-competent were replaced.

M - Traffic: Nobody was replaced as the ministers were from the same party.

PM, M - Economy: Only some were replaced (but not by political parties). Other ministries had different practice.

PM, M - State Reforms: In my time many positions were just established. If officials were replaced back then, it was only because of the level of professional characteristic.

10. Better when civil servants are members

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	3	5.9	6.0	6.0
Disagree	18	35.3	36.0	42.0
Strongly disagree	21	41.2	42.0	84.0
No significance	8	15.7	16.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 10: do you agree that it is better if civil servants are members of a governing coalition party?

Comments

M - Agriculture: Civil servants should be neutral.

M - Agriculture: Civil servants must be without party affiliation.

M - Agriculture: A civil servant must do his job professionally. Governing parties often try to change the personnel, so that their members obtain the posts.

M - Interior Affairs: During their period of civil service they must be non-party.

M - Industry: A civil servant must fulfil a specifically regimented job. A civil servant is there for the society, not the opposite.

M - Human Rights: The main thing is competence, not political affiliation.

M - Economics: The civil servants should stay out of parties.

SM - Foreign Affairs: Civil servants should be politically neutral.

PM, M - Finance: There is a level of bureaucracy that must not be politicized. It has to end at some level.

M - Welfare: Bureaucracy should be independent from political parties.

M - Traffic: In the ideal case civil servants should not be members of any political party.

11. Advisory functions of officials

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
On technical matters	23	45.1	45.1	45.1
Political strategy	2	3.9	3.9	49.0
Both	26	51.0	51.0	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 11: ministerial advisors should advice, A. on technical matters, B. and political strategy, C. they should advice on both.

Comments

M - Industry: Today it should be so. This is one of the main criteria for quality. But it is hard to tell about the officials of those times.

M - Economics: But the officials should know the main political strategies.

SM - Foreign Affairs: One could ask and expect "C" (advice on both political and technical matters) from the counselors working directly for the minister and quitting the job when the minister leaves office.

M - Welfare: B (technical matters): the respondent agrees that ministerial officials should advise only on sector political strategy (in the field of the ministry).

M - Welfare: Ministerial officials should be competent in political strategy.

PM, M - Finance: Political analyses have to be non-partisan.

PM, M - Economy: B (technical matters): partly (in special cases) for politicians who are not strong in political questions.

PM, M - State Reforms: In 1993 deputies did not understand what political government means.

12. Appointment of officials by ministers

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	3	5.9	6.0	6.0
Agree	20	39.2	40.0	46.0
Disagree	19	37.3	38.0	84.0
Strongly disagree	7	13.7	14.0	98.0
No significance	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 12: in your opinion it is better when ministers themselves can appoint their civil servants?

Comments

SM - Energy, Ministry of Economics: Ministers are changing and constant changes in the civil service would lead to chaos.

M - Agriculture: I agree from the practical point of view, but disagree that appointments are driven by political motivation.

M - Agriculture: The minister himself sets his team to some extent, but this does not mean that wide replacements take place.

M - Agriculture: Ministers must take responsibility. Civil servants form a team but its members are not necessarily from the same party. They should just be good professionals.

M - Industry: A minister who is responsible for developing a policy must have a right to appoint his civil servants. How can he work without the right? Any minister has his own requirements on criteria of quality, manners etc.

M - Economics: The servants should not be "over-protected".

M - Foreign Affairs: At the present stage of development it is better if civil servants become more professional. Therefore it is not advisable to change them. Actually there is nobody to put in their place. There is a deficit of professional civil servants.

PM, M - Finance: It is easier to demand responsibility if they are changed. Totally to change everybody is not necessary, but the majority must be changed.

PM, M - Traffic: The civil service has to develop gradually on the basis of selection. The key to everything is the state secretary.

M - Welfare: Civil servants should honestly do governmental work all by themselves. The bureaucracy of the ministry should not change together with elected officials.

SM - Welfare: Otherwise a lack of civil servants in ministries is inevitable.

13. Information between ministries

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	15	29.4	29.4	29.4
Agree	26	51.0	51.0	80.4
Disagree	8	15.7	15.7	96.1
Strongly Disagree	1	2.0	2.0	98.0
Don't know	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 13: it is said that in a law that civil servants in one ministry should be allowed to give information concerning a matter to other ministries without prior permission, how do you agree to this position?

Comments

SM - Energy, Ministry of Economy: If it is said in the law I have to agree even though I might doubt its effectiveness, since there are conflicts of interest between the various institutions.

M - Agriculture: Information exchange should be limited since there is competition between ministries.

M - Interior Affairs: Of course, if the information does not concern national secrets.

M - Industry: It is the same apparatus of governing the state. How can a civil servant draft a bill that concerns other ministries if he is deprived of the right? Of course, the principle of confidentiality must be observed.

M - Interior Affairs: The law does not say so. It depends on the situation.

M - Welfare: It depends on the kind of information (i.e. when state budget is shared among ministries, then one cannot be very frank with other ministries).

14. Common occurrence

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	8	15.7	17.0	17.0
Yes	39	76.5	83.0	100.0
Total	47	92.2	100.0	
Missing	4	7.8		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 14: if agree, was / is this a common occurrence between yours and other ministries?

Comments

SM - Energy, Ministry of Economics: There was an information exchange but it was limited.

M - Agriculture: By and large no such information was given.

M - Foreign Affairs: Yes but, substantially, not enough. Civil servants are better informed of what is going on in the neighboring ministry than the minister himself.

PM, M - Finance: Yes, on the level of specialists if necessary. There was a partial tendency to keep information to oneself.

PM, M - Traffic: Yes, even on the lowest level – between the civil servants there are discussions and in such discussions decisions are made (for instance, the problem about the transportation of invalids and repressed persons).

SM - Welfare: The ministries are not willing to exchange information between them.

PM, M - State Reforms: The respondent believes that much of this tradition was started in his time.

15. Most influential players

Before independence			
Respondent	First	Second	Third
1	CPSU	KGB	Popular Front of Latvia
2	Popular Front of Latvia	KGB	CPSU
3	CPSU	Government	Courts prosecutor
4			
5	Popular Front of Latvia		
6	Popular Front of Latvia		
7	KGB	CPSU	
8	Communist Party of Latvia	CPSU	Council of Ministry
9	Communist Party of Latvia, CPSU		
10	Anatolijs Gorbunovs	Ivars Kezbers	Janis Peters
11	Political parties	KGB	Executive power field
12	Helsinki 86	Latvian National Independence Movement	Anatolijs Gorbunovs
13	KGB	Central Committee (CPSU)	Small executive committees delegating heads of cities/regions
14	Popular Front of Latvia	Club of Environmental Protection	Ivars Kezbers, Anatolijs Gorbunovs, Janis Peters
15	Secretaries of the CPSU	KGB	
16	Leaders of CPSU	Popular Front of Latvia	
17	Leaders of CPSU	Popular Front of Latvia	Orthodox Communists
18	Ivars Godmanis	Alfreds Rubiks	Dainis Ivans
19	Dkapars	Ivars Godmanis	Sandra Kalniete
20	CPSU		
21	Alfreds Rubiks	Janis Vagris	Anatolijs Gorbunovs
22	KGB	CPSU	
23			
24	Alfreds Rubiks	Anatolijs Gorbunovs	Imant Daudish
25	CPSU	KGB	First secretary of CPSU
26	Janis Peters	Dainis Ivans	Sandra Kalniete Janis Shkapars
27	Popular Front of Latvia	TV-project Labvakar	Anatolijs Gorbunovs
28	Janis Peters	Dainis Ivans	Anatolijs Gorbunovs
29	Communist Party	Anatolijs Gorbunovs	Janis Peters
30	Popular Front	Arvids Pelse	CPSU
31	Popular front	Interfront	Ivars Godmanis
32	Helsinki86	Janis Peters	Lavents Aleksandrs Larents

33	Central Committee of CPSU	Supreme Soviet of Latvia	
34	Popular Front of Latvia	Egils Levits	Ojars Kehris
35	Popular Front of Latvia	Vilnis E. Bresis	Janis Stradins
36	Leadership of CPSU	II Secretary	KGB Intellectuals.
37	Popular Front of Latvia	USSR	Western political support (Thatcher, Reagan, Chatoqua Conference)
38	Ivars Godmanis	Mavriks Vulfsoms	Janis Peters
39	Janis Peters	Dainis Ivans	Alfreds Rubiks
40	Central Committee of CPSU		
41	CPSU and its nomenklatura	Security structures	
42	CPSU	From 1988 Latvian Popular Front	
43	CPSU		
44	CPSU		
45	PSKP	KGB	Nomenclatura
46	PSKP – CPSU		
47	CPSU		
48	Popular Front of Latvia	Interfront	Red Army
49	Popular Front of Latvia	Professionally significant associations	
50	CPSU	State security committee	
51	Popular Front of Latvia	Anatolijs Gorbunovs	Janis Vagris

After independence			
Respondent	First	Second	Third
1	Popular Front of Latvia	Banking sector	Parliament
2	Parliament	Government	Latvian Way
3	Parliament	Government	Mass media
4	Mayor of Ventspils city, Aivars Aivars Lembergs	Mayor of Daugavpils	President of Parex Bank
5	Latvian National Independence Movement	Latvian Way	
6			
7	Armands Grutups	Aivars Lembergs	Valerijs Kargins
8	The Coalition of parties		
9	Valerijs Kargins	Aivars Lembergs	Andris Skele
10	Ivars Godmanis	Andris Skele	Aivars Lembergs
11	Political parties	Private business	Legislature
12	Guntars Krasts	Andris Skele	Chairman of For Fatherland and Freedom

13	Economic factions (oil business)	Banks (Parex Unibank Hanzabank)	People from KGB now in the system of security
14	For Fatherland and Freedom / Latvian National independence Movement	People's party	The Latvian Way
15	Latvian Popular Front	Association of Intellectuals	Political Parties
16	Governing parties	Main sponsors of the parties	
17	Popular Front	Latvian Way	Economic Group of Ventspils
18	Dicle	Anatolijs Gorbunovs	Guntars Krasts
19	Anatolijs Gorbunovs	Janis Dinevies	Strautioo
20	Latvian Way	Aivars Lembergs	Armands Grutups
21	Aivars Lembergs	Ojars Kehris	Uldis Osis
22	Latvian way (Valdis Birkavs)	Andris Skele	Aivars Lembergs
23	Too many rumours to identify true players		
24	Ojars Kehris	Andris Skele	Aivars Lembergs
25	Parliament	Prime Minister	Economic groups
26	Ivars Godmanis	Anatolijs Gorbunovs	Janis Dinevies
27	Latvias Way	Andris Skele and People's Party	The President Vaira Vike Freiberga
28	Janis Peters	Andris Skele	Aivars Lembergs
29	Aivars Lembergs	Andris Skele, Valerijs Kargins	
30	Ojars Kehris	Latvian way	Secret archives
31	Bank of Latvia	Latvian way	Janis Kinna, Ainars Gulbis
32	Andris Skele	Armands Grutups	Ojars Kehris, Aivars Lembergs
33	Latvian Popular Front	Latvian Way	
34	Ivars Godmanis	Club21	
35	Latvian Popular Front	Social Democrats	Vaira Vike Freiberga
36	Leadership of political parties	Mass media	Parliament/ executive power
37	Pantelejev	Latvian Way	Einars Repse
38	Ojars Kehris	Andris Skele	Aivars Lembergs
39	Ivars Godmanis	Andris Skele	Anatolijs Gorbunovs
40	Latvian Way	For Fatherland and Freedom	Aivars Lembergs
41	Different parties (Latvian Way)	People's Party, Fatherland and Freedom and economic interest groups (Ventspils)	
42	Latvian Way	Club21 whose members are Grey Cardinals	
43	Latvian Way	Other parties	Business structures

44	Political parties, in power and in opposition		
45	Heads of coalition parties	Cabinet	Parliament
46	Latvian Popular Front		
47	Latvian Popular Front	Latvian Way	Fatherland and Freedom
48	Latvian Way	Baltijas Banka	Pareks Banka
49	Latvian Popular Front	Professionally significant associations	
50	Latvian Way	Latvian Popular Front	Fatherland and Freedom
51	Ivars Godmanis	Einars Repse	Latvian way

Note: responses to question no. 15: name the three most influential local political players (organizations and / or persons) in Latvia before and after independence in general; (for example: legislature, executive power field, political parties, "Grey Cardinals", private business, etc.).

Comments

M - Finance: V15: Anatojjs Gorbunovs - was the 2nd Secretary of the Communist Party of Latvia, today minister of Transport and Communication. I. Kezbers - was the ideology secretary of the Communist Party of Latvia, he died during a parliamentary visit in Vienna a few years ago (under allegedly suspicious circumstances).

J Peters - was and is a very famous poet, a leader of the revival movement in the eighties, after independence he was ambassador to Russia, today he is in business.

Ivars Godmanis - first prime minister after independence, before the most recent election to the parliament he joined the party Latvijas Cels (LC).

A. Skele and Aivars Lembergs have been introduced.

16. Influential in the field of responsibility

Respondent	First political agent	Second political agent	Third political agent
2	Privatization agency of Latvia	Coalition of political parties	Political parties
3	Privatization agency of Latvia	Latvian energy company	Transit industry
4	PM Valdis Birkavs	M - Economy Ojars Kehris	M - Finance Uldis Osis
5	FM Valdis Birkavs		
6	Ojars Kehris minister of economy	Uldis Osis M - Finance	PM Valdis Birkavs
7	Armands Grutups	Aivars Lembergs	V. Kargins
8	P M	Foreign Minister	
9	Janis Naglis	Ojars Kehris	M.Galis
10	Aivars Lembergs	Andris Skele	Ojars Kehris
11	Western Diplomats	Prime Minister	My deputy
12	Ivars Godmanis	Inara Bite	Andrejs Krastins
13	Valdis Birkavs (PM then)	Egils Levits (M - justice then)	Maris Gailis (M - Reforms then)
14	Ivars Godmanis	Mr. Blumbergs	Anna Seile
15	Ivars Godmanis	Janis Kinna	
16	Saeima (the Parliament)	Council of Ministers	Latvian Popular Front
17	Latvijas Cels	Ministry of Agriculture	
18	Girts Valdis Kristovkis	Chevers Ziedonis	Talavs Jundzis
19	Krastioo	Girts Valdis Kristovkis	Chevers Ziedonis
20	Einars Repse	Andris Skele	Rimsevics
21	Viktors Kalnberzs	Janis Platkajis	Valdis Nagobads
22	Uldis Osis	Ojars Kehris	Vilis Kristopans
23	Prime minister	Minister	Head of party
24	Janis Adamsons	Oskar Grigs	Juris Dobelis
25	Prime Minister		
26	James Baker	Uffe Elleman Jensen	K. F. Gensher
27	Aleksandrs Lavents	Ivars Godmanis	Aivars Lembergs
28	Aivars Lembergs	Andris Skele	Aleksandrs Kargin
29	Aivars Lembergs	Uldis Osis	Janis Nagils
30	Aleksandrs Lavents	Einars Repse	Aija poca
31	IMF	Aleksandrs Lavents	World Bank
32	Andris Skele	Aivars Lembergs	Janis Naglis
33	Aivars Lembergs	Andris Berzins	Atis Zorgevics
34	Valdis Birkavs	Egils Levits	Ojars Kehris
35	Einars Repse	Valentina Jeile	Edvins Kide
36	Anatojis Gorbunovs	Valdis Birkavs	Maris Riekstins
37	Armands Grutups, his laws on land	Einars Repse	Aivars Lembergs
38	Valdis Birkavs	Maris Riekstins	Martins Virsis.

39	Einars Repse	Janis Naglis	Andris Skele
40	Aivars Lembergs	Talis Straume	Uldis Petersons
41	Andris Skele	Aivars Lembergs	Valdis Birkavcs of Latvia's Way; others
42	Representatives of main energy companies in Latvia	Indirectly Russian economic interests	Latvia's Way
43	Latvian Peasants Party	Latvia's Way	Various associations
44	Andris Berzins	Vladimirs Makarovs	Maija Porsneva (Secretary of state)
45	Indulis Emsis (respondent's name)	Heads of coalition parties	NGOs
46	Andris Berzins	Vladimirs Makarovs	Janis Platais
47	Anatojis Gorbunovs	Ludmila Kuprijanova	Andris Berzins (respondent's name)
48	Ivars Godmanis	Cepans	
49			
50	Latvia's Way		
51	Free labor unions	Latvian Popular Front	Janis Jurkans

Note: responses to question no. 16: name the three most influential political actors in the field you are (were) responsible for as minister after independence.

Comments

M - Economics: At different levels there are different people – some people influencing macroeconomics, others businesses. They change dynamically all the time during the process.

17. Core ministry

	Frequency
Mentioned ministry of finance	47
Mentioned ministry of economics	5
Mentioned ministry of foreign affairs	3
Mentioned ministry of interior affairs	2
Mentioned ministry of welfare	1
Mentioned ministry of prosperity	1

Note: responses to question no. 17: which ministry do you consider to be the core ministry in terms of influence on decision-making in other ministries?

18. Influence of other ministries

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Generally acceptable	46	90.2	90.2	90.2
Generally not acceptable	5	9.8	9.8	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 18: if other ministries tried / tries to influence proposals in your own ministry and you would have to lose competence or resources to the benefit of the whole country, would you perceive it?

Comments

SM - Energy, Ministry of Economics: However, no such position is popular anymore since personal / institutional interests play an important role.

PM, M - Traffic: There have been cases. Once when we had to give money to other ministries on the behalf of the ministry of education, the ministry of connections gave the largest sum of money.

19. Third part involvement

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	40	78.4	80.0	80.0
Disagree	9	17.6	18.0	98.0
Don't know	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 19: in your perception when other ministries interfered in your business, could it be that a third part outside the political realm has interfered in the decision-making?

If you agree, give an example of who this third part may be:

Respondent	Example
1	No answer
2	Interest groups
3	Politically interested groups
4	Agriculture, Lattelekom
9	Business structures
10	Ventspils, Parex Bank, Ave Lat
13	International organizations and their heads
15	A representative of private business interests
18	Mafia
19	Business structures
20	Grey Cardinals, potential clients of state orders
21	Viktors Kalnberzs
22	The party
23	Business people
30	Foreign embassies
31	Ministry of Agriculture, farmers
32	Economic Groups
33	Economic Groups
34	Now it happens
35	Economic Groups
37	Agricultural lobbies, producers of alcohol
38	Political parties, interest groups.
39	Local governments
40	NGO or some organization
43	Business structures, political parties
44	Heads of other parties

45	Enterprises. Groups.
46	Trade Unions
47	Medical doctors and insurance companies
48	The Latvian peasantry
50	Financial groupings
51	No answer

Comments

M - Interior Affairs: There was no such cases where other ministries interfered in the area of the ministry for which I was responsible.

M - Finance: 1. Groupment of Ventspils (transit politics - A. Lemgbergs); 2. Groupment of Ave Lat - A. Skele, Parax Bank - V. Kargins.

Prime Minister, Minister of State Reforms: Not in my time (but now it happens).

20. Influence on proposals

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Ministries				
Finance	14	27.5	35.9	35.9
Agriculture	9	17.6	23.1	59.0
Economy	4	7.8	10.3	69.2
Foreign Affairs	1	2.0	2.6	71.8
Welfare	2	3.9	5.1	76.9
Interior	1	2.0	2.6	79.5
Other	8	15.7	20.5	100.0
Total	39	76.5	100.0	
No answer	12	23.5		
Total	51	100.0		
Parties				
Fatherland and Freedom	10	19.6	25.0	25.0
Latvian Way	9	17.6	22.5	47.5
Farmers' Union	4	7.8	10.0	57.5
Popular Front	2	3.9	5.0	62.5
Democratic Party Master	2	3.9	5.0	67.5
LNNK	1	2.0	2.5	70.0
People's Party	1	2.0	2.5	72.5
Equal Rights	1	2.0	2.5	75.0
Social Democrats	1	2.0	2.5	77.5
Interfront	2	3.9	5.0	82.5
Other	7	13.7	17.5	100.0
Total	40	78.4	100.0	
No answer	11	21.6		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 20: in the cases when other ministries or parliamentary fraction of other parties tried to influence proposals in your own ministry, who did that most often?

Comments

M - Industry: Each ministry had its own problems because previous links with the border areas of the former USSR were dissolved. There were few people who had time for "playing around" in other ministries.

M - Agriculture: It is difficult to answer in one way. Influence of various ministries and parties varied regarding different issues.

M - Welfare: The issue was: central government versus self-government influence in health policy.

PM, M - Traffic: They blocked the adoption of the law on the construction of roads.

21. Foreign influence

Respondent	First actor	Second actor	Third actor
1	European transport ministers' conference	ERBD	World Bank
2	EBRD	WB	IMF
3	WB	IMF	EU
4	IMF	WTO	OSCE
5	Russia	USA	EU
6	IMF		
7	Swedish government	City department of Moscow	
8	Chairman of European Commission	PHARE Program officials	Delegations of the EU
9	IMF	EBRD	European Commission
10	IMF	World Bank	EBRD
11	USA	Germany	Sweden
12			
13	Brian Burdekin (from international organization)		
14			
15	EU experts on agriculture and industry	Ministries of Agriculture, Denmark, Finland, The Netherlands, Germany	
16	US Consulate	Employees of various foreign mass media	
17	IMF	World Bank	EU
18	NATO	USA	Sweden
19	NATO	USA	Scandinavian countries
20	World Bank	IMF	
21	WHO	Swedish healthcare companies	World Bank
22	USA	German government	EU
23	IMF	World Bank	EU
24	None		
25	USA	Germany	France
26	USA	Germany	Denmark
27	World Bank	EU organizations (local)	Foreign companies (concerning Latvia's state monopolies).
28			
29	IMF	European Commission	Finland
30	IMF	World Bank	
31	Aleksandrs Lavents	World Bank	IMF
32	World Bank	IMF	EBRD
33	World Bank	EBRD	European Commission

34	PHARE, EU	European Commission	
35	IMF		
36	EU	Washington	Edso – Max van der Stuhl
37	Head of the IMF mission	German government	USA
38	Edso Max van der Stuhl	European Commission	EU member states
39	IMF	World Bank	EU, during screening when programs are compared
40	Estonia	IMF	World Bank
41	EU	WTO	Other Baltic countries
42	World Bank	EBRD	Governments of other countries (Denmark)
43	World Bank	EU	
44	World Bank	Danish government	
45	Swedish government	The Netherlands, in educational field	Finnish government
46	Germany: Rehabilitation Center in Jurmila	International organization located in Switzerland [res. couldn't name it]	
47	World bank	UNDP	JLO
48	IMF		
49	Estonia	Lithuania	IMF, World Bank
50	Embassies		
51	Russian government	German government	Danish government

Note: responses to question no. 21: did foreign actors (governments, international organizations) during your time in government try to influence policy and regulations in your ministry?

Comments

M - Interior Affairs: "To influence" is not the right word. It was a complicated time, and I as a minister had a good collaboration with those mentioned.

M - Industry: In those times there was nobody who could have had influence. The Western countries were just beginning to get introduced with Latvia.

SM - State Income, Ministry of Finance: The first two mentioned were very active. The Swedes tried to make changes in Latvia's health care situation.

22. Effect of foreign influence

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Always positive	5	9.8	11.1	11.1
Most cases positive	38	74.5	84.4	95.6
Seldom positive	2	3.9	4.4	100.0
Total	45	88.2	100.0	
Missing	6	11.8		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 22: in general, in those cases when foreign actors had an influence, would you say that their influence on the decisions to be made had a positive or negative effect on the solutions of local problems?

Comments

M - Finance: Western actors have a positive influence, Russian actors have a negative influence.

M - Finance: Foreigners do not have a clear understanding of the local situation. They used to experiment with us.

M - Economics: Positive concerning small and medium size enterprise sector, but very negative concerning the LATTELECOM case.

M - Social Provision: They often don't get to the bottom of the situation in Latvia. If they were aware of facts beginning from World War II through the time of the awakening and up to the present day, there would be a different attitude in matters like citizenship etc.

M - Agriculture: We managed to explain the factual historical situation and received great support for our agriculture. The attitude has changed over the last years. Probably the viewpoint of the Western countries toward Latvia as a candidate country for the EU has changed. Also the ability of the corresponding officials to maintain the collaboration must be mentioned.

SM - Energy, Ministry of Economics: It is possible to answer positively in all cases. At the beginning foreign influence seemed to be necessary and good, yet this evaluation has changed recently and might be interpreted in a negative light.

M - Agriculture: It is difficult to answer unequivocally: many decisions are difficult to implement and rather painful now, but they might be necessary in the long run.

M - Human Rights: Because people have not understood the situation in Latvia completely, advice was imposed that was not right. The process is going on. Often they follow the democratic experience of their own countries.

M - Interior Affairs: The attitude of the former USSR could be considered negative (Gorbachev). At the same time there was a very good and positive collaboration with the government of Russia (Yeltsin).

M - Finance: International institutions could be more helpful in solving problems with salaries for teachers and money for pensioners. [This comment was specially aimed at Danish researchers to demonstrate that this respondent disagrees with Latvia's participation in the EU.]

SM - Energy, Ministry of Economy: My memories are positive because we were always able to find a common solution. The approach of the international institutions was tolerant.

M - Foreign Affairs: If the influence is too great then the effect can be contrary to what was planned, as in the case of the language law.

M - Foreign Affairs: As concerns influence the mechanism is as follows: Latvia wants to join the EU because of the security guarantees.

PM, M - Finance: It may be unpleasant but this influence has secured the fact that changes of the social, economic, political system cannot be turned back.

PM, M - Traffic: We are in contact with those who want the best for our country, support the way towards a market economy and our desire to increase our living standards.

M - Welfare: Each case should be regarded independently.

M - Environment: When the ministry's management system was in the developmental stage support was very essential.

SM - Investment and Credit Policies, Ministry of Finance: It is hard to say. Sometimes for a short period it has a positive effect but in the longer term it becomes a negative effect and the other way round.

SM - State Income, Ministry of Finance: The World Health Organization helped to change the Latvian Health care organization towards modern principles, providing experience and knowledge.

PM, M - Economy: There were some governments who tried to lobby for their firms in Latvia. Mostly good projects which help to change the existing situation. From that point of view (nowadays) some things were done in a hurry.

23. Pressure from outside actors

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Often	10	19.6	19.6	19.6
Often, but not important	2	3.9	3.9	23.5
Sometimes	22	43.1	43.1	66.7
Rarely	7	13.7	13.7	80.4
Never	10	19.6	19.6	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 23: have you ever felt a pressure from outside actors (non-state organisations, peak level business, etc.) to initiate new legislation?

Comments

M - Agriculture: There was no direct pressure.

M - Welfare: Interfront, Chernobilian Association (victims of Chernobil catastrophe), Association of Blind People.

SM - State Income, Ministry of Finance: There were huge activities against the anti-tobacco law from the House of Prince.

24. Attitude to pressure

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Good				
Always Good	1	2.0	5.6	5.6
Most Cases	11	21.6	61.1	66.7
Rarely	3	5.9	16.7	83.3
Difficult to answer	3	5.9	16.7	100.0
Total	18	35.3	100.0	
Missing	33	64.7		
Total	51	100.0		
Wrong				
Always Wrong	3	5.9	25.0	25.0
Most Cases	4	7.8	33.3	58.3
Rarely	3	5.9	25.0	83.3
Never	1	2.0	8.3	91.7
Difficult to answer	1	2.0	8.3	100.0
Total	12	23.5	100.0	
Missing	39	76.5		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 24: if often, did you feel that this pressure was good or wrong for the country?

Comments

M - Agriculture: It is difficult to answer unequivocally: many decisions are difficult to implement and rather painful now, but they might be necessary in the long run.

M - Welfare: This pressure was good for policy formulation, but because of the lack of finances many suggestions were not materialized.

PM, M - Finance: In order to tell whether it was good or bad at least 5 years are needed.

25. Working relationship with organizations

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes, mostly	12	23.5	24.5	24.5
Yes, but important issues	19	37.3	38.8	63.3
No	17	33.3	34.7	98.0
Dont know	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	49	96.1	100.0	
Missing	2	3.9		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 25: in my time as minister my civil servants had a close working relationship with peak business organizations of the ministry's resort;

Comments

M - Interior Affairs: There was no such organization in this area. There was close collaboration with organizations concerning the protection of rights.

M - Interior Affairs: The questions are not correct, because all depends on the situation. The information must be taken from the different sources.

M - Interior Affairs: It is difficult to answer because the question is not correct. It depends on the kind of outcome you want.

M - Foreign Affairs: There wasn't any lobbying in my ministry at that time.

M - Foreign Affairs: It is always worth listening to all sides, but the decision is still made by myself.

PM, M - Traffic: there were good bilateral ties.

M - Finance: It was a process of formation by peak business organization.

26. Lobbying

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Information				
Negative	10	19.6	24.4	24.4
Positive	31	60.8	75.6	100.0
Total	41	80.4	100.0	
Missing	10	19.6		
Total	51	100.0		
Support				
Negative	23	45.1	53.5	53.5
Positive	20	39.2	46.5	100.0
Total	43	84.3	100.0	
Missing	8	15.7		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 26: considering lobbying, the procedure in which certain outside interests try to make their views influence on the political process, how would you in most cases agree to the following statements?

27. Decisions better when concerned interests are involved

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes, mostly	39	76.5	81.3	81.3
Yes, sometimes	8	15.7	16.7	97.9
No, only rarely	1	2.0	2.1	100.0
Total	48	94.1	100.0	
Missing	3	5.9		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 27: do you believe that decisions get better when the concerned interests are incorporated or heard in the process of formulation?

Comments

M - Social Provision: Everyone must participate who can be influenced / connected with a corresponding issue.

M - Industry: It is a great sin that the parts are often not involved. We would have less trouble and the rating of politicians would go up if a dialogue was maintained. The more sides who participate in discussing a decision, the more democratic and of use for the society it will be. Often the range of problems that will be affected by the document is not investigated. For example rules of trading etc.

M - Human Rights: We miss this thing in Latvia because the concerned interests and competent persons are not incorporated in the formulation of a decision.

SM - Energy, Ministry of Economy: I always listened to various opinions, yet the minister took the decision and it frequently differed from those opinions.

M - Agriculture: It was impossible to incorporate or hear all concerned interests.

M - Agriculture: Involved sides must always be heard , even though it will not influence the decision too much.

M - Interior Affairs: The author of this question is not familiar with our laws. There cannot be other decision-makers than the minister.

M - Agriculture: All interested (concerned) sides must be represented in the work groups that administer the resolution.

M - Finance: The information in the ministries is sufficient, but, for the sake of keeping peace, one can hear out all sides too.

M - Economics: The decision is more impartial after it is taken. Then no one can argue that he / she could not get to express his / her interests.

M - Welfare: It decreases the chances of future conflicts.

M - Foreign Affairs: It depends on the decision. There can be a procedure in the law.

PM, M - Traffic: The interested parts have to have a dialogue with society.

SM - State Income, Ministry of Finance: There are no decisions that are acceptable for all parts. If the decision is of little importance, the parts could be involved.

Decision-making Process

28. Important formal actors

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Minister	32	62.7	62.7	62.7
Prime Minister	13	25.5	25.5	88.2
Ministerial advisers	1	2.0	2.0	90.2
Parliament Chairmen	1	2.0	2.0	92.2
Parliament	1	2.0	2.0	94.1
Top level officials	3	5.9	5.9	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 28: try to rank the most important formal decision-makers affecting decisions in your ministry The Minister; the president; the prime minister; formal ministerial advisers; administrative advisers; chairmen of parliamentary committees; individual members of parliament.

29. Important fora

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Cabinet	35	68.6	68.6	68.6
Committees of cabinet	8	15.7	15.7	84.3
Parliamentary committees	2	3.9	3.9	88.2
Other	6	11.8	11.8	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 29: try to rank the following fora with regard to decision-making with relevance for your ministry; the cabinet; council of ministers; committees of the cabinet; parliamentary committees, courts.

Comments

M - Foreign Affairs: Aim is the most influential element. Everything that does not coincide with the aim is pushed aside. For instance, Lembergs wants me to improve relations with Russia. There are other goals that are of equal importance. The main goal influences the decision.

30. Most important informal fora for decision-making

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Outside the state	26	51.0	61.9	61.9
Inside the state	16	31.4	38.1	100.0
Total	42	82.4	100.0	
Missing	9	17.6		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 30: Name the most important informal fora for decision-making affecting your ministry in general

Comments

M - Social Provision: Nobody could influence or affect anything if he / she did not have a relation with the ministry (only coalition partners).

SM - Privatization, Ministry of Economics: Mass media, individual parliamentarians.

M - Economics: The state secretary of the ministry, advisors of the government.

31. Importance of party

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very important	6	11.8	12.5	12.5
Important	23	45.1	47.9	60.4
Of little importance	13	25.5	27.1	87.5
Of no importance	4	7.8	8.3	95.8
Non-party	2	3.9	4.2	100.0
Total	48	94.1	100.0	
Missing	3	5.9		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 31: in your time as minister, how important were your party (party leaders meetings, party organizations, party donors) for government decision-making?

Comments

M - Foreign Affairs: The parties have programs but these do not influence serious decisions.

32. Rank of importance

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
First rank				
Leaders	10	19.6	35.7	35.7
Party organization	13	25.5	46.4	82.1
Rank & file	1	2.0	3.6	85.7
Donors	4	7.8	14.3	100.0
Total	28	54.9	100.0	
Missing	23	45.1		
Total	51	100.0		
Second rank				
Leaders	10	19.6	45.5	45.5
Party organization	4	7.8	18.2	63.6
Rank & file	5	9.8	22.7	86.4
Donors	3	5.9	13.6	100.0
Total	22	43.1	100.0	
Missing	29	56.9		
Total	51	100.0		
Third rank				
Leaders	4	7.8	20.0	20.0
Party organization	6	11.8	30.0	50.0
Rank & file	7	13.7	35.0	85.0
Donors	3	5.9	15.0	100.0
Total	20	39.2	100.0	
Missing	31	60.8		
Total	51	100.0		
Fourth rank				
Leaders	1	2.0	5.9	5.9
Party organization	1	2.0	5.9	11.8
Rank & file	5	9.8	29.4	41.2
Donors	10	19.6	58.8	100.0
Total	17	33.3	100.0	
Missing	34	66.7		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 32: If very important or important, how would you rank the following in your party for decision-making?

Comments

M - Agriculture: Everything depended on the areas and issues concerned.

M - Welfare: The opinion of the party organization is like an expert opinion (party members and independents) and strategy of the party.

33. Financial structure of party

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Most important				
Membership fees	11	21.6	24.4	24.4
Donations by organization	25	49.0	55.6	80.0
Private donations	6	11.8	13.3	93.3
Other	1	2.0	2.2	95.6
Don't know	2	3.9	4.4	100.0
Total	45	88.2	100.0	
Missing	6	11.8		
Total	51	100.0		
Second most important				
Membership fees	10	19.6	25.6	25.6
Donations by organizations	10	19.6	25.6	51.3
Private donations	19	37.3	48.7	100.0
Total	39	76.5	100.0	
Missing	12	23.5		
Total	51	100.0		
Third most important				
Membership fees	10	19.6	38.5	38.5
Donations by organizations	3	5.9	11.5	50.0
Private donations	12	23.5	46.2	96.2
Other	1	2.0	3.8	100.0
Total	26	51.0	100.0	
Missing	25	49.0		
Total	51	100.0		
Fourth most important				
Private donations	1	2.0	33.3	33.3
Income from business	1	2.0	33.3	66.7
Other	1	2.0	33.3	100.0
Total	3	5.9	100.0	
Missing	48	94.1		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 33: what is the usual financial structure of a party?

Comments

M - Agriculture: The others should not be included (4, 5).

SM - State Income, Ministry of Finance: The most important money comes in but only party heads know from where.

34. Budget financing of party

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	10	19.6	20.0	20.0
Yes	40	78.4	80.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 34: In your opinion, must parties be financed from budget?

Comments

M - Interior Affairs: I think this chain cannot be changed anyway, and everything is all right.

M - Finance: The state is not able to implement this.

M - Economics: If the state can afford this.

M - Welfare: The number of political parties should be decreased.

M - Finance: Economic groups have weak control.

SM - Investment and Credit Policies, Ministry of Finance: But not exactly at this moment and not full financing from the budget.

35. Reasons for troubled decision-making

Respondent	First reason	Second reason	Third reason
1	Bad management in government committees	Bad communication between the Government and the Parliament	Poor management of the decision making process
2	Often decision makers are unprepared	Poor management during decision making process	Lack of objectivity
3	Difficult to find common solution in coalition with five factions, when all have different views on the subject	The management was too subjective	
4	Analyzing the information	Long debates about the necessity of changing the law	Common solution finding
5	Low attendance in the parliamentary committees	Proposals get lost in the cabinet Committees	
6	Adjustment of different views	Long taking evaluations	
7			
8	Had to coordinate with coalition partners who had different favors	It is first imperative to examine similar decisions made in EU and associated countries	Insufficient capacity of the translating center
9	Unsatisfactory information and information insufficiently prepared	Officials not interested in expediting decision making process	The number of formal steps required for reconciliation too high

10	Legislation process in Parliament inconvenient because we don't have a two-party system	Influence of large economic groups	Poorly educated ministers
11	Small and weak country in foreign affairs	Lack of western style education and expertise	
12	Not sufficiently professional level	Proposals must be prepared in time	Influence from interest groups
13	Fear of taking responsibility, taking decisions	Incompetence	Inability to agree. Intentions are selfish
14	Goals of decisions have not been formulated clearly	The essence of a decision has not been discussed among the main juridical persons involved; obstacles of a bureaucratic origin	
15	Objectively - the reason is that the decision is complex / important for the country	Non-objectively - the opinions of the parties do not coincide, both among themselves and with the opinions of lobbies and founders	
16	On the level of legislation our ministry had no problems, but often interests of different groups confront		
17	Insufficient authority of minister	Insufficient competence of civil servants	Discordance between political parties
18	Capacity of legislative and civil service is not sufficient	The connection with other spheres is disturbing	Democracy
19	Technical process of preparing		Effectiveness of parliamentary committees work
20	It is not too long and complicated		
21	Coordination problems	Incompatibility with priorities of government	Incompatibility with priorities of parliament
22	Coordination between authorities	Authorities are unwilling to take responsibility	Salaries of civil servants and officials are too low
23	Unclear conceptions	Unclear political and economic consequences	Weak experts, low professional level
24	Very long way through all institutions	Unwillingness to make decisions, take responsibility	Frequent changes of the Cabinet
25	Things can't be changed, everything OK		
26	Conflicts between the members of different political parties		
27			

27	Too complicated procedures	They do not want to compromise	They do not want to take responsibility (they are scared)
28	Bureaucracy	Lobbying of opposite interests	Disorder in legislation
29	Coordination of different opinions		
30	Too many groups of interests (both political and administrative)		
31	Lack of initiative of administrative staff	Insufficient level of qualification of administrative staff	Insufficient procedures for coordination of different opinion
32	Different level of qualification of officials	Presence of economic and political lobbies	
33	Decision makers haven't the information needed	No strong coordination procedures	
34	Undeveloped procedures	Extremely complicated procedure of decision making	Bad, weak leadership
35	Large amount of rules etc.	Decision making in separate institutions	Influence of lobbies
36	Different personal interests of lobbies and their fight	Complicated decision making procedure	Insufficient level of information in society and negative reaction of the society. Society rejects the decisions and sometimes in a very active way
37	Not competent, not experienced decision makers	Bad informative bases	Corruption
38	Democracy	Bureaucracy	Lack of knowledge
39	Weak bases of the initial information	Lack of prognoses on which to base analyses, sense of insecurity	
40	There are too few statesmen in the state that can think about the state	The legacy of the past, lack of knowledge and education	
41	Involvement of many institutions		
42	Lack of experience on how to transfer from socialism to capitalism		
43	Long harmonization and confirmation procedures		
44	If important decisions must be accepted then process of making decisions is not too long and troublesome.	Decision making process in Latvia is faster compared to the same process in other countries (modern states)	The process in Latvia is even too fast. Therefore policies are being changed so often.

45	Decision making is too hasty, the process of legislation is too short	Public interests are not considered as political groups have the greatest influence on decision making	
46	When someone is interested in deferring decision making (usually economic interests)		
47	Respondent disagrees, believes that decision making process in Latvia is faster than in many other countries.		
48	Multistage system	Clashing of different interests	Different bureaucratic obstacles
49	Accepted procedure of legislation		
50	There is no necessary coordinating procedure.	Priorities are not defined correctly	
51	Poor society awareness	Decision receivers ignorance, lack of experience	Not arranged decision receiver's internal order

Note: responses to question no. 35: often the process of making decisions is often too long and troublesome. In such cases as from your experience could you name the three (or less) most important reasons why this is so?

36. Legislation

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Solve via administrative measures	3	5.9	5.9	5.9
Administrative measures and new legislation	37	72.5	72.5	78.4
Change legislation first	8	15.7	15.7	94.1
Other	3	5.9	5.9	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 36: If legislation has prevented the solution of acute problems, what do you believe has been the general response in ministries?

Comments

M - Foreign Affairs: Yes, but if a decision goes against the interests of the bureaucracy then it demands additional control.

M - Economics: If somebody is interested in solving the problem.

M - Agriculture: Only if it does not contradict the law.

M - Industry: During the time I was a minister there was no legislation as such. It was a personal risk and responsibility to acknowledge a possible condemnation and criticism. Up to today a development of legislation has taken place. So B is the answer (in accordance with parliamentary committees so that the minister would not be the one who has made the decision alone). The party receives a punch if, when a law comes into force, a corresponding change in legislation has not taken place.

M - Welfare: The main thing that prevents the solution of acute problems is the shortage of legislation in certain fields.

M - Welfare: Making changes in legislation according to § 81 of the constitution (that gives legislation power to government while the parliament is on vacation).

Implementation

37. Trust in decisions

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	7	13.7	14.0	14.0
Yes	43	84.3	86.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 37: were you in general able to trust that the decisions of your ministry would be carried through as intended by your staff?

Comments

M - Industry: I could trust them but I was not sure if they were able to carry out the decisions. They might try but there were objective things which, independently of them, hindered coherence in political economical terms.

M - Welfare: My staff only creates the normative bases for the ministry's decisions. Agencies and inspectorates carry out decisions.

M - Welfare: Partly because of insufficient ministerial staff (only 100 were allowed). Part of the staff was hardly to be trusted because of their political orientation (communists).

38. Business undertakers positive

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	3	5.9	6.0	6.0
Agree	27	52.9	54.0	60.0
Disagree	16	31.4	32.0	92.0
Strongly disagree	3	5.9	6.0	98.0
Don't know	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 38: how do you agree to the following proposition: it is positive when private business organizations participate as undertakers in the process of implementation of decisions?

If you strongly agree or disagree, please give examples:

Respondent	Example
1	Car technical service stations
3	Laws for special economic zones, agricultural law, energy law
7	SAPARD agency, Intervence agency, NGO "Virkeni"
12	Ltd. Birojs 2000
15	Management over buildings / rooms of a ministry
16	System of privatization
17	Land surveying
18	In the sphere of supplement (food, clothing), the sphere of printing
19	Construction

21	Law of pharmacy
22	Haven't heard of it
23	CSDD, Utility services, Lursoft company register (database)
24	Making order at the alcohol market, more effective using of the sanatoriums in Jurmala
26	There were not such organizations in our ministry, but good idea
29	Privatization of LATVENERGO, LATTELECOM
31	Nothing special
33	Privatization
37	Service functions: car supply subdivision, supply of the information, legal consultations -all of these functions can be done by private units
38	Laws are not intentionally made to give the possibility to violate them. If someone does it is on his own risk. The question cannot be answered within the given alternatives
42	A need for business organizations participating
43	Organizations with control / monitoring functions, laboratories
45	Environmental projects, Environmental Investment Foundation
46	Social security centers
47	Private institutions providing social services
49	Economical instruments must be chosen so that contractors who would provide economical life (and stimulate it) get through
51	Companies register – Lursoft action of statistics, action of development agency

Comments

M - Industry: It is a hidden extension of civil service.

SM - State Property: The respondent believes that the function of a state must be to rebuild the private structure. The respondent does not have any examples.

SM - Investment and Credit Policies, Ministry of Finance: Agree only if the undertaker is state owned but subject to private law.

39. Escape regulatory measures:

Respondent	Example
5	It is possible although not very often. It should not happen.
10	Latvian Shipping avoided state control, Latvenergo
12	Mantess, Latvias Dzelzceļš (Latvian railway)
13	Center of NGOs
15	Owner of Vernisaza, Lido
16	Taxes, smuggling
17	The insurance of dangerous cargo
18	Oil business, trade
19	Taxes, State cannot guarantee laws
20	Banks, Transit traffic
21	No control with 15% overprice on medicine
22	Business people act autonomously
24	Transit associations, union of self governments
30	Taxes (especially social tax), Traffic rules
31	Taxes, Competitions for public procurements

33	Transit enterprises
35	Shadow economy
36	There are mechanisms that help avoid, for instance, off-shore zones
39	Only during a short period, payment of taxes, Krisbergs trial, shipping company
40	Trade and VAT problems
42	Contradictory legislation, strong non-state actors
43	Various economic interest groups
45	They tend to escape, but they are short in possibilities.
46	They are doing it all the time, but they should not
49	Different associations -federation of peasants etc.- in all branches.
51	World's tax systems use (offshore firms), subordination of clerks

Note: responses to question no. 39: how do you agree to the following proposition: powerful non-state actors (individuals, organizations, business etc.) can escape regulatory measures directed toward their business?

40. Implementation under the old system

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	6	11.8	11.8	11.8
Agree	22	43.1	43.1	54.9
Disagree	14	27.5	27.5	82.4
Strongly disagree	2	3.9	3.9	86.3
Missing	1	2.0	2.0	88.2
Don't know	6	11.8	11.8	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 40: In your opinion, under the communist Soviet system, political decisions were implemented more loyally by the bureaucracy than now?

Comments

M - Social Provision: It must be seen individually. In the times of the former USSR the dictatorial approach dominated and the control system was greater. Now the democratic approach prevails.

SM - Energy, Ministry of Economics: It is difficult to say since the question is what the bureaucracy was more loyal to: state, party, or population.

M - Industry: During Soviet times the bureaucracy was relatively homogenous because the ideology of the state and policy was unified. There was just one party. Bureaucracy was tended in one direction - there was no alternative. They did not look around because there was nowhere to look. If civil servants were independent of parties these days, the answer would be different.

M - Economics: But there was no democracy.

M - Economics: Because there was just one party.

M - Foreign Affairs: There are spheres where there is too little regulation of the state. The inert subjects have to be put in a position where they have to begin to move in order to survive.

M - Welfare: These institutions are hardly to be compared because in totalitarian regimes loyalty is usually achieved by coercion.

PM, M - Economy: In a totalitarian society bureaucrats were not free persons. This kind of loyalty could be higher but could never be characterized as precise and conscious work and attitude.

M - Traffic: Partly agree. Bureaucracy did not have as much power as now.

M - Finance and EU: It is impossible to compare because the communist Soviet system was not democratic.

State - Society Relations

41. State involvement

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Much more involvement	1	2.0	2.0	2.0
Some more involvement	15	29.4	29.4	31.4
Present balance	5	9.8	9.8	41.2
Some more individual	13	25.5	25.5	66.7
Much more individual	17	33.3	33.3	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 41: in general, what is your preferred degree of state involvement in the economy and society?

Comments

SM - Energy, Ministry of Economics: The present balance is satisfactory, it is impossible to go back to socialism. That is to a certain extent supported by social democrats now.

M - Agriculture: The state should create and explain clear rules of the game to everybody.

M - Industry: Of course it varies. State involvement must be more active in creating vocational positions (by taxes and regulation). As to the area of social provision it is abnormal that children do not attend school. The initiative belongs to the state, not individuals. Now the state is ignoring these aspects.

M - Welfare: Social security is already the responsibility of the state.

PM, M - Traffic: We have to interfere a little but correctly. Where we do not interfere we must not interfere at all.

M - Traffic: In a transition period both are needed.

42. Role of the public

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Elect representatives and let them run the country	3	5.9	6.1	6.1
Interest in politics	9	17.6	18.4	24.5
Engage actively	37	72.5	75.5	100.0
Total	49	96.1	100.0	
Missing	2	3.9		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 42: what should be the role of the public generally in politics and government?

Comments

SM - Energy, Ministry of Economy: The question is how to achieve this.

M - Industry: Nihilism and sinking into oneself can be understood but it will not lead to the aim.

PM, M - Traffic: Society must follow and understand the political process, then it can participate in the decision-making.

43. Misuse of status common place

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	8	15.7	15.7	15.7
Agree	29	56.9	56.9	72.5
Disagree	12	23.5	23.5	96.1
Strongly disagree	1	2.0	2.0	98.0
Don't know	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 43: the misuse of status positions in order to serve own or other particular interests is common in Latvian politics?

44. Level of misuse

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Top level				
Not mentioned	29	56.9	59.2	59.2
Mentioned	20	39.2	40.8	100.0
Total	49	96.1	100.0	
Missing	2	3.9		
Total	51	100.0		
State secretaries and deputies				
Not mentioned	32	62.7	65.3	65.3
Mentioned	17	33.3	34.7	100.0
Total	49	96.1	100.0	
Missing	2	3.9		
Total	51	100.0		
Medium level				
Not mentioned	22	43.1	44.9	44.9
Mentioned	27	52.9	55.1	100.0
Total	49	96.1	100.0	
Missing	2	3.9		
Total	51	100.0		
Lower level				
Not mentioned	25	49.0	51.0	51.0
Mentioned	24	47.1	49.0	100.0
Total	49	96.1	100.0	
Missing	2	3.9		
Total	51	100.0		
Parliament				
Not mentioned	33	64.7	67.3	67.3
Mentioned	16	31.4	32.7	100.0
Total	49	96.1	100.0	
Missing	2	3.9		
Total	51	100.0		
Don't know				
Not mentioned	43	84.3	89.6	89.6
Mentioned	5	9.8	10.4	100.0
Total	48	94.1	100.0	
Missing	3	5.9		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 44: at which level of government do you perceive that this phenomenon occurs most often?

Comments

SM – Energy, Ministry of Economy: Medium level civil servants could do it. Top level was too much under the control of society, government as well as these medium level civil servants.

M - Agriculture: Medium level civil servants by and large controlled the process.

M - Economy: The whole system is permeated. The level of corruption cannot be measured easily. It is everywhere.

PM, M - Traffic: Politicians interfere with the work of agencies – Privatization agency.

M - Economics: At all levels.

M - Welfare: In executive institutions whose main functions are controlling and licensing (i.e. police department concerning traffic).

45. Knowledge of activities

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Own ministry				
Not mentioned	41	80.4	82.0	82.0
Mentioned	9	17.6	18.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		
Other ministries				
Not mentioned	36	70.6	72.0	72.0
Mentioned	14	27.5	28.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		
Assume that it is so				
Not mentioned	22	43.1	44.0	44.0
Mentioned	28	54.9	56.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		
No not at all				
Not mentioned	43	84.3	86.0	86.0
Mentioned	7	13.7	14.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 45: did you in your time as minister receive any knowledge about people engaged in such activities on governmental level?

Comments

M - Welfare: This phenomenon occurs at all levels, except for the fact that the higher the post the person occupies, the bigger the rumors that circulate.

M - Foreign Affairs: Lattelekom issue.

SM - Welfare: It is known that some officials will not help or sign some document unless they receive something in return.

46. Bribes

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Often	1	2.0	2.0	2.0
Sometimes	9	17.6	17.6	19.6
A few times	12	23.5	23.5	43.1
Never	28	54.9	54.9	98.0
No answer	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 46: During your time as minister did you experience any attempts to bribe you to favour specific groups or an individual?

Comments

SM - Energy, Ministry of Economics: It was mostly indirect and in the form of some service rather than money.

47. Threats

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Often	3	5.9	6.0	6.0
Sometimes	10	19.6	20.0	26.0
A few times	8	15.7	16.0	42.0
Never	28	54.9	56.0	98.0
No answer	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 47: during your time as minister did you receive any threats from non- state actors (peak level business, interest groups etc.)?

Comments

M - Finance: Concerning the process of privatization,

M - Economics: Issues of privatization.

M - Agriculture: There were no threats to kill. The pressure did not have a negative connotation.

M - Social Provision: Solving issues of a political character.

M - Agriculture: After the so-called barricade times in January 1991. It is because I myself together with my personnel was responsible for the barricades.

M - Interior Affairs: Latvia used to be in the field of vision of the OMON stationed here, and from which I received threats. The Inter Front should also be mentioned.

M - Human Rights: Anonymous letters regarding protection of rights.

M - Interior Affairs: When my activities were confronted with measures initiated by predecessors under the influence of some structures or individuals.

M - Foreign Affairs: It happened one or two times a year. The most explicit cases occurred when the fight against alcohol smuggling began and when heads of criminal organizations were arrested.

M - Welfare: The Ministry of Interior Affairs received threats a few times concerning decisions about the ministry's staff. The Ministry of Welfare never received any.

M - Welfare: Medical Doctors' Association threatened the minister with strike.

SM - Investments and Credit Policies, Ministry of Finance: Political kinds of threats, when the issue of alcohol contraband was on the agenda.

SM - State Income, Ministry of Finance: In the case of reorganization of the Institute of Traumatology (only political threats).

PM, M - Economy: Questions about privatization.

48. Effect of threats

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	12	23.5	33.3	33.3
Yes	17	33.3	47.2	80.6
Dont know	7	13.7	19.4	100.0
Total	36	70.6	100.0	
Missing	15	29.4		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 48: if such pressure was exerted in any of ministries, what is your opinion, did it have effect on the decisions or the implementation?

Comments

M - Foreign Affairs: I assume that it could be so but I do not know whether it influenced decision-making.

M - Economics: I think that the effect was not very strong. It is rather difficult to influence the ministers.

PM, M - Finance: Those who agree to become ministers are not afraid.

SM - Welfare: Only rumors that someone cracked under pressure.

SM - Investment and Credit Policies, Ministry of Finance: In most cases without any effect.

PM, M - Economy: I have no concrete facts, but I cannot exclude the possibility.

PM, M - State Reforms: I have not heard about threats but sometimes decisions are such – you know they support the interests of some groups.

M - Finance: It could have some effect on the process of decision making.

49. Legal requirements of corruption sufficient

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	35	68.6	70.0	70.0
Yes	14	27.5	28.0	98.0
Dont know	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 49: in your opinion, do you believe that the legal requirements for combating corruption and self-promotion are sufficient?

Comments

M - Foreign Affairs: We have not real rule of law in our country. For example in the USA they do.

M - Foreign Affairs: They are elaborated constantly. As concerns corruption nothing is ever sufficient. If the anti-corruption system is isolated from the climate in society nothing can change substantially.

M - Environment: Party dependence on financing from economical groupings.

50. Causes of corruption

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
First rank				
Low salaries	22	43.1	44.9	44.9
Low morale	12	23.5	24.5	69.4
Legacy	3	5.9	6.1	75.5
Mafia	3	5.9	6.1	81.6
Other	9	17.6	18.4	100.0
Total	49	96.1	100.0	
Missing	2	3.9		
Total	51	100.0		
Second rank				
Low salaries	9	17.6	25.0	25.0
Low morale	13	25.5	36.1	61.1
Legacy	9	17.6	25.0	86.1
Mafia	2	3.9	5.6	91.7
Others	3	5.9	8.3	100.0
Total	36	70.6	100.0	
Missing	15	29.4		
Total	51	100.0		
Third rank				
Low salaries	3	5.9	13.6	13.6
Low morale	3	5.9	13.6	27.3
Legacy	9	17.6	40.9	68.2
Mafia	7	13.7	31.8	100.0
Total	22	43.1	100.0	
Missing	29	56.9		
Total	51	100.0		
Fourth rank				
Low salaries	1	2.0	11.1	11.1
Low morale	2	3.9	22.2	33.3
Legacy	1	2.0	11.1	44.4
Mafia	4	7.8	44.4	88.9
Others	1	2.0	11.1	100.0
Total	9	17.6	100.0	
Missing	42	82.4		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 50: in your opinion, what are the main cause(s) for corruption in the state administration?

Comments

M - Industry: I avoid comments on the legacy of the Soviet system. There is no one from that system left anymore. Policemen's salaries are low, so should they stop looking for murderers? There are specific acts of legislation in which the possibility for corruption is included, for example the system of punishment carried out by the Road Police or the system of trading. The normative acts are worked out as tended.

M - Agriculture: This is a legacy of European countries with the same level of corruption.

M - Energy, Ministry of Economics: Others: lack of modern education.

SM - Foreign Affairs: Mafia - diminishing.

M - Foreign Affairs: The readiness of society to solve problems with money. Seventy percent are ready to give money. Solving the problem with cash is faster. It is easier to give five lats to the traffic police than to spend time and additional money to get back your driver's license.

PM, M - Traffic: Other: The possibility given to the civil servants to make decisions concerning the distribution of the resources.

M - Economics: The benefits are bigger than possible moral and legal losses.

M - Economic Reforms: Unreasonable interference into business, ambiguous and contradictory formulation of rules.

M - Welfare: 1. Insufficient implementation of administrative reforms 2. Low salaries 3. Insufficient punishment for corruption.

M - Finance and EU: The society is not ready to fight against corruption (it has to be done by every individual).

PM, M - Economy: Lack of an effective system (weak legislation). The state has not reached a stable level of economic development (many people do not believe in a better situation in the future).

PM, M - State Reforms: There is no clear and visible process of decision making. People in society are too tolerant (of corrupt practices).

Background questions

Ministerial resort

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Finance – Economics	21	41.2	41.2	41.2
Interior – Welfare	22	43.1	43.1	84.3
Foreign Affairs	8	15.7	15.7	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

51. Party-membership of minister

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Latvian Way	17	33.3	33.3	33.3
Democratic Party Master	2	3.9	3.9	37.3
For Fatherland and Freedom	7	13.7	13.7	51.0
Latvian Peasants Party	2	3.9	3.9	54.9
Latvian Popular Front	4	7.8	7.8	62.7
DPS	3	5.9	5.9	68.6
New Party	2	3.9	3.9	72.5
Non-member	9	17.6	17.6	90.2
Latvian Farmers' Association	1	2.0	2.0	92.2
Union of Christian Democrats	1	2.0	2.0	94.1
LSDSP	1	2.0	2.0	96.1
Zemnieku Savieniba	1	2.0	2.0	98.0
Green Party	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 51: which party were/are you member of while being minister?

52. Party-position

Respondent	Party position
1	Member of council, member of faction
2	Member
3	Member of council
4	Member of the faction council
5	Vice chairman of the faction
6	Member of the council
7	Member of board
8	Head of the faction
9	Non-member
10	Chairman of party, member of board
11	Member
12	Member of the formation
13	Member of the formation
14	Non-member
15	First: member of the formation, later: member of the board
16	Non-member
17	Deputy chairman
18	Non-member
19	Chairman of LNNK
20	Board member
21	Non-member
22	No position
23	Board member
24	Chairman
25	Vice-chairman
26	Non-member
27	Member
28	Co-chairman of Council
29	Chairman of LFA, now only member
30	Member
31	Member
32	Board member
33	Board member
34	Board member
35	Non-member
36	Member of the board
37	Member of board
38	Chairman of the party
39	Political secretary
40	Member of board
41	Member of party council
42	Not relevant
43	Member of the party council

44	Member of board
45	Member of board
46	Non-member
47	Member of the party, member of parliamentary fraction
48	Non-member
49	Head of national economy committee
50	Non-member
51	Private

Note: responses to question no. 52: what were/is your position in this party?

53. Age

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Below 40	8	15.7	15.7	15.7
40 – 50	20	39.2	39.2	54.9
Above 50	23	45.1	45.1	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 53: what is your age?

Respondents' sex

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Female	4	7.8	8.0	8.0
Male	46	90.2	92.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Missing	1	2.0		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 53: what is your sex?

54. Marital status of respondent

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Married	47	92.2	92.2	92.2
Divorced	4	7.8	7.8	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 54: what is your marital status?

55. Respondent's ethnic status

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Latvian	50	98.0	98.0	98.0
Other	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 55: what is your ethnic status?

56. Ethnic status of respondents' spouses

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Latvian	43	84.3	89.6	89.6
Russian	3	5.9	6.3	95.8
Estonian	1	2.0	2.1	97.9
Ukraine	1	2.0	2.1	100.0
Total	48	94.1	100.0	
Missing	3	5.9		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 56: if married, what is the ethnic status of your spouse?

57. Country of birth

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Latvia	48	94.1	94.1	94.1
USA	1	2.0	2.0	96.1
Russia	2	3.9	3.9	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 57: in which country were you born?

58. Were you a resident in Latvia under communism

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	3	5.9	5.9	5.9
Yes	48	94.1	94.1	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 58: were you resident in Latvia under the Soviet system?

60. Party membership under communism

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Communist Party	30	58.8	63.8	63.8
Young Communist League	8	15.7	17.0	80.9
Non-member	9	17.6	19.1	100.0
Total	47	92.2	100.0	
Missing	4	7.8		
Total	51	100.0		

Note: responses to question no. 60: if resident in Latvia under the Soviet system: Were you member of a party under the Soviet system?

61. Occupation under the Soviet system

Respondent	Occupation
1	Economy sector, governmental institutions
2	Technical manager in a factory
3	Economy, top manager level
6	Economy sector
7	Head of self government
8	Architect
9	Professor in high-school
10	Researcher, owner of a cooperative
11	Medical Doctor, Professor and Chairman
12	Economist, leader
13	Studied and worked
14	Engineer, general director of a factory, civil servant
15	Head of a production company connected with science
16	Chief of the Criminal Police of the Republic
17	Director of Sovchoz
18	Student, athlete
19	Lawyer
20	Student, scientist
21	Doctor
22	Associate professor
23	Research Associate
24	Police officer
25	Military officer
26	Lecturer of the Latvian State University
27	Studying
28	Studying
29	Deputy director of computing center, chief economist of Agrotim
30	Capital budgeting and accountant
31	Scientific Research
32	Scientist
33	Civil engineer, CP functionary
34	Engineer
35	Finances
36	Lecturer and coach of carate
37	Scientist, lecturer
38	Scientist
39	Scientist
40	Professional sportsman and coach
41	Chairman of a collective farm
42	University teacher
43	Chief engineer of a collective farm
44	Medical Doctor
45	Researcher
46	Doctor, traumatology
47	Education system, committee of work and social questions
48	Administrative work
49	Scientific work
50	Lecturer in high school
51	Functionary of state and party

Note: responses to question no. 61: what was your occupation under the Soviet system?

62. Educational level of respondent

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Higher	50	98.0	98.0	98.0
Secondary, special	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	51	100.0	100.0	

Note: responses to question no. 62: what is your education?

63. Field of education; 64. Supplementary education after independence

Respondent	Field of education	Supplementary education after 1991
1	Chemistry	
2	Energy	Courses
3	Energy	Many courses
4	Biology	Courses
5	Political science	
6	Technical sciences	Courses
7	Agricultural Engineer	Various
8	Architecture, history of art	Internships in the US Congress; Parliament of Great Britain
9	Economics	Several courses
10	Chemistry sciences	Courses
11	Medicine	No courses
12	Architectural engineer	
13	Theology	Courses, Department of Law
14	Electroenergetics	
15	Engineering	Doctoral degree in engineering
16	Law	Law course
17	Agricultural	
18	Engineering, Law	Master, Law
19	Law	Yes
20	Economy	Yes
21	Surgery	Health care management
22	Economics	Service training in Denmark
23	Economics	Week courses, World Bank
24	Philology	
25	Military	Courses in crisis management, defense
26	Philology	No
27	Master of Economics	Master of Economics
28	Technologist, punch pressforms	Norwegian, economics
29	Engineering economist	Business administration
30	Finance and accounting	Many courses
31	Economics	
32	Economics	
33	Construction	Language courses
34	Engineer – Mechanic	Accountancy
35	Finance	
36	History	Legislation, English, computers

37	Economy	Economic Freedom courses
38	Law, Dr. of Law	
39	Physicist	Euro-business seminars
40	Architecture and construction	Courses in the USA, GB, and Germany
41	Agronomist	Various courses
42	Energy sector	Various courses
43	Engineering mechanic	Courses in democracy, economics
44	Medical	Law Faculty
45	Biology, ecology	Courses
46	Medical	
47	History	International labor legislation, macro-economics, insurance, public relation.
48	Commerce Economics	Courses
49	Economics	No
50	Economics	Improving of qualification
51	Woodworking	Management course

Note: responses to questions no 63 smf 64: in which field do you have your education? Have you completed a supplementary education after independence in 1991, e.g. courses or master's degree?

65. Place of education

	Frequency
Latvia	47
Russia	14
Western Europe	4
USA	4
Other	2

Note: responses to question no. 65: where did you receive your education, before and after independence?