



SOCIAL COHESION RADAR REPORT

2023

Authors

Iveta Kažoka, Laima Bērziņa

Table of Contents

Summary	2
Introduction and Methodology	5
IV Conclusions on Social Cohesion in Latvia	7
V Recommendations for Measuring Social Cohesion.....	15
VI Recommendations for Social Cohesion Radar – Cohesive Society Criteria	17
List of Surveys Used in the Report.....	26

Summary

In September and October of 2023, by the request of the Society Integration Foundation, the Centre for Public Policy PROVIDUS conducted the survey “Report on Social Cohesion Radar 2023”. The objective of the report is to summarise and systematise the data of the last three years that are related to social cohesion and to propose the most appropriate methods to be used in the future for determining whether Latvian society is becoming more cohesive. For the purposes of the report, the experience and lessons learned by international organisations and other countries in measuring social cohesion were also examined.

The following parameters of social cohesion were recorded during the study and changes thereof should be measured on a regular basis in the future in order to determine whether the Latvian society is becoming more cohesive.

Parameters relating to identity and a sense of belonging

76 %	Percentage of the Latvian population with a sense of belonging to Latvia
28 % 60 %	Percentage of the Latvian population prepared to defend Latvia with weapons (first value) or in a non-military way (second value) in case of a military attack
68 %	Percentage of the Latvian population feeling accepted in Latvia
36 %	Percentage of the Latvian population feeling resentment towards Latvia
34 %	Percentage of the Latvian population without objections to having neighbours that represent a potentially marginalised minority group
53 %	Percentage of the Latvian population with a sense of unity towards all the Latvian people
79 %	Percentage of the Latvian population considering that the Latvian people have much in common
42 %	Percentage of the Latvian population never using the Latvian language when communicating with others

Parameters relating to social relationships

56 %	Percentage of the Latvian population considering it is important to participate in the elections
42 %	Percentage of the Latvian population considering that their vote matters in Latvia
81 %	Percentage of the Latvian population not engaged additional civic actions in recent years (other than participation in the elections)
35 %	Percentage of the Latvian population with no confidence in any basic institutions of democracy
59 %	Percentage of the Latvian population disappointed in the political situation in Latvia

46 %	Percentage of the Latvian population considering that anyone in Latvia can express their political views freely and without fear
39 %	Percentage of the Latvian population considering that most people can be trusted
75 %	Percentage of the Latvian population having someone to rely on (other people) in case of serious personal problems
27 %	Percentage of the Latvian population not having helped a stranger in the past year
52 %	Percentage of the Latvian population considering that ethnic tension can be observed in Latvia

Parameters relating to economic solidarity

34 %	Percentage of the Latvian population disagreeing with the opinion that being born poor in Latvia and working hard can ensure financial security
42 %	Percentage of the Latvian population considering that in Latvia they have equal opportunities to succeed in life as other people
82 %	Percentage of the Latvian population considering that there is a major income gap among people in Latvia
18 %	Percentage of the Latvian population considering it is acceptable not to report their income with the aim of evading payment of taxes
23 %	Percentage of the Latvian population considering it is acceptable to accept bribes for public services
7 %	Percentage of the Latvian population having experienced corruption in the past 12 months

There are five additional (optional) questions on economic solidarity, measuring the percentage of the Latvian population without access to the Internet, cultural events, quality education or retraining opportunities, and also believing that in Latvia there are no equal opportunities to receive medical services.

When analysing data on social cohesion, several parameters of social cohesion show extensive differences among different social groups in Latvia. Most frequent and most significant differences can be observed between high-income and low-income people and also between those who speak Latvian and those who speak Russian in their families.

The comparison of Latvian citizens and the citizens of other EU Member States reveals the following distinctive parameters:

- 1) Latvia and France have the largest number of citizens who in the past five years have not participated in the elections or have done it only a few times. Moreover, Latvian citizens are ranked among the lowest in the European Union in terms of what importance they attribute to elections (only slightly more than half of citizens consider that their vote in elections is important).
- 2) Latvian citizens are among the most sceptical in the European Union in terms of the role of hard work to succeed in life. Latvia has also the highest percentage of citizens in the European Union considering it is acceptable not to report income with the aim of evading payment of taxes.
- 3) On a positive note, Latvian citizens less often than citizens in any other EU Member State believe that gender is an important aspect to succeed in life.

Additional analysis conducted for the purposes of this report suggests that in terms of attitudes towards a number of socially divisive issues there are no fundamental differences within one generation of Russian-speaking citizens and Russian-speaking non-citizens of Latvia. Nevertheless, the views of young adults from Russian-speaking families (aged under 30) usually is somewhere between the views of Latvian-speaking individuals and Russian-speaking individuals of older generations, sometimes more towards one group or the other.

It is suggested by researchers that these parameters are further measured once every two years with the help of standardised surveys in order to determine progress, stability, or regression in the currently recorded social cohesion parameters. The results of the survey should be published in the form of a special report on social cohesion radar, highlighting also changes in various socio-economic groups for the most crucial issues. Both, the survey and the report, should additionally explore the topicalities of the previous two years in the field of social cohesion.

Introduction and Methodology

The objective of the present report is to summarise and systematise the data of the last three years that are related to social cohesion and to propose the most appropriate methods to be used in the future for determining whether the Latvian society is becoming more cohesive. According to the request of the Society Integration Foundation of Latvia (SIF), the survey was conducted by the Centre for Public Policy PROVIDUS (researchers: Iveta Kažoka and Laima Bērziņa). The survey was conducted in the second half of September and in October of 2023.

For the purposes of preparing the report, the experience and lessons learned by international organisations and other countries in measuring social cohesion were examined. This examination led to the following common understanding of a cohesive society shared by different countries that can also be used in Latvia:

A cohesive society is a society where individuals and communities are bound together by strong social ties and a common identity. A society which contributes to building trust and mutual respect among different members thereof, ensuring equal rights and opportunities to everyone. In a cohesive society, people actively take part in social and political processes, have a deep sense of belonging, and are confident about orientation of the public administration towards the public good.

Having further explored international experience in measuring social cohesion, the authors of this report came across the following characteristics:

- 1) the international experience in measuring social cohesion, in order to be analysed in this report, had to cover a broad range of social cohesion topics and be more than just a narrow aspect of social cohesion (e.g. only civic participation or trust);
- 2) the experience could not be excessively broad and cover too many topics or such topics that are only partly related to social cohesion (e.g. social capital research or human development research);
- 3) the experience could not be theoretical, but had to include either social cohesion measurements in practice or, at least, methodological guidelines on how to conduct such research (e.g. dimensions to be measured or specific questions to be asked);
- 4) these methodological guidelines could envisage both the measurements of social cohesion perception (most often: in the form of sociological surveys) and/or the analysis of social cohesion through objective data. Furthermore, these methodological guidelines could also provide for both regular cohesion assessments (e.g. in the form of indices or regular reports) and a single in-depth study without any intention to repeat the study in the future.

The results of exploring the international experience were further compared with the Social Cohesion Assessment Matrix prepared by the Society Integration Foundation of Latvia (see below). The latter allowed to revise the matrix according to the best international practice in the field of social cohesion, i.e. sub-sections of this report are structured according to the revised matrix.

Table 1. *Social Cohesion Assessment Matrix offered by the Society Integration Foundation.*

Component 'Identity and belonging' parameters	Component 'Social relationships' parameters	Component 'Economic solidarity' parameters
Sense of belonging	Family ties and friends	Social inequality
Official language proficiency	Trust	Economic mobility and equal opportunities of society groups
Discrimination	Public benefit, prosocial behaviour, and solidarity	Altruism and charity
Migration processes	Attitudes towards diversity and accepting differences	Intragroup relationships
Assessment of integrity and corruption within the society	Desire to live	Financial well-being
Social and political practices of the population		

The following principles were taken into account when conducting the research of data concerning each aspect of social cohesion:

- 1) Data had to be collected over the last three years (from autumn of 2020), earlier data could not be used. Only exception: Eurobarometer survey on undeclared work where data were collected in September of 2019.
- 2) Central source for data acquisition: public opinion survey on social cohesion requested by Vidzeme University of Applied Sciences and conducted by the research centre SKDS in May of 2023. The results of this public opinion survey are published for the first time in the present report.
- 3) In addition, other sociological surveys conducted in Latvia during the past three years were also used under the condition that the research team had access to data on correct survey methodology (i.e. how they represent the Latvian society, data on time of conducting the survey, sample respondents, etc.) and precise questions that were asked, possible answers, and also the breakdown of responses from respondents for each possible answer.
- 4) Similar conditions were also applied to international public opinion surveys.

A short period of time was given for the preparation of the report (a little more than a month), therefore, it was not possible to ensure additional summary and analysis of objective (non-survey) data that might concern the subject of social cohesion. This is not a significant drawback because such data are available in a limited amount and characterise social cohesion indirectly (implicitly).

One of the major limitations of the report: comparisons between Latvia and other countries are based on Eurobarometer public opinion surveys (both regular and thematic). Such surveys are conducted in all 27 European Union Member States at once, but only EU citizens are included in the surveys. This means

that a large part of the Latvian society (about 10 %), i.e. people with the status of non-citizens of Latvia, are not included in these surveys. Therefore, this report presents a clear distinction of whether the analysis covers the entire Latvian population (including non-citizens) or only the citizens of Latvia.

The research team, while working on international comparisons, always ensured contextualisation of Latvian parameters by comparing them with the average figures in the EU, Lithuania, and Estonia, and also the highest and lowest figures in the European Union.

We express our sincerest gratitude to the Friedrich Ebert Foundation (Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung e.V. Lettland) for allowing us to use only partially published data to conduct an additional analysis for the purposes of this report. For the purposes of this report, PROVIDUS approached SKDS with a request to conduct an additional analysis to determine differences in the views of Russian-speaking young adults, compared to Russian-speaking Latvian population of other generations, and also whether Russian-speaking Latvian citizens and non-citizens of one generation have significantly different views in certain matters relating to the invasion of Ukraine by Russia and other subjects covered in the survey requested by the Friedrich Ebert Foundation. This additional analysis was of particular importance for the following reasons: 1) to understand whether young adults from Russian-speaking families (aged under 30) belong to a group that should be perceived differently from other Russian-speaking Latvian population; 2) whether Latvian non-citizens are a group that should be dealt with separately in the context of social cohesion or whether they share similar attitudes and behaviour as other Russian-speaking individuals of the same age (reference point 50+ years) (who have obtained Latvian citizenship).

The age groups (aged under 30 and over 50) were structured according to the fact that people under 30 years of age mostly attended school during the 21st century Latvia, while people over 50 years of age mostly attended school during the period of the Soviet Union.

Conclusions on the present social cohesion in Latvia are provided at the end of the report. There are also recommendations for further measurements of social cohesion on a regular basis. Such measurements are only based on questions that have already been included in any of the surveys conducted in the past three years because these questions, although far from perfect (e.g. part of the questions are only related to Latvian citizens, part of the questions would require rephrasing), will allow to instantly measure progress, regression, or stability in the field of social cohesion.

IV Conclusions on Social Cohesion in Latvia

Social and political practices of the population

- There is a high number of citizens in Latvia who in the past years have not participated in the elections or have done it only a few times: 17 %. This is the lowest figure (along with France) in the European Union.
- The higher the level of education and the level of income, the higher the likelihood that a citizen has participated in elections at least once in the last five years.
- Only slightly more than half of Latvian citizens consider that voting in elections is important. This is among the lowest figures in the European Union.

- In comparison with the average figures of European Union Member States, Latvian citizens less frequently consider that they have the capability to influence decision-making on a local, national, or European Union scale.
- In general, Latvian citizens are less active in terms of engaging in civic actions as opposed to European Union citizens on average, but it is not a major difference.
- The higher the level of education and the level of income, the more frequently a person is engaged in civic actions. Furthermore, civic actions strongly correlate with citizenship (citizen or non-citizen) and the language spoken in the family.
- There is no major difference between the Latvian population and its neighbouring countries Lithuania and Estonia, and also the average figures in the European Union in terms of taking interest in public processes or the use of the media.

Trust in authorities

- Compared to the average figures in the European Union and the neighbouring Estonia, Latvian citizens in 2023 had significantly lower trust in the public administration, the police, the justice system, and also medical practitioners. Trust in local governments and the army was comparable (and high), trust in parliament, government, and political parties was comparable (but low).
- There is a clear correlation between a low level of income and distrust in authorities.
- In total, 35 % of the Latvian population said they did not trust any authority in autumn of 2020.
- Latvian population are feeling optimistic about Europe. Only a quarter believe that the future of Latvia would be better outside the European Union.
- Compared to citizens of other EU Member States (average figures), Latvian citizens have greater trust in NATO.
- At the same time, attitudes towards NATO differ widely across different groups of the Latvian society. Russian-speaking population of older generations are deeply sceptical about NATO troops stationed in Latvia.
- The views of Russian-speaking young adults on NATO and NATO troops are more favourable than that of older generations.
- In spring of 2023, the views of Latvian citizens on national events (Is everything going in the right direction? Are you satisfied with the functioning of democracy?) were comparable with average figures in the European Union, even slightly higher.
- Disappointment in the current political situation in Latvia and the feeling of the necessity of change are particularly characteristic to the Russian-speaking and also low-income population.
- Compared to the average figures of the citizens of other EU Member States, Latvian citizens are slightly more likely to trust the work of the media. However, this trust depends on the question and the group to which the respondent belongs.

Trust in other people

- Latvian citizens, like the average citizen of the European Union, are not generally guided by the assumption that other people have the best intentions. Only a quarter of Latvian citizens view their fellow citizens in such good faith.
- By percentage, 39 % of the Latvian population believes that most people can be trusted. The level of trust is associated with the level of education and the level of income: the higher the level of education and the level of income, the more trust they have in other people. Latvian-speaking respondents trust other people slightly more than Russian-speaking respondents, especially non-citizens.

- Latvian population has the highest trust in the family and friends, followed by all other groups in society.

Sense of belonging

- The attachment of Latvian citizens to their native town or village, their country or the European Union is rather high and remains close to the average figures in the European Union.
- In general, Latvian citizens have a sense of belonging to Latvia, they are proud of and feel a close bond with their country, feel accepted and united with all the Latvian people.
- Some figures (especially the feeling of being accepted) are significantly lower among people who speak Russian in their families.
- A slightly lower sense of belonging and rootedness was observed among young adults and also low-income population.
- Most of the Latvian population would not be prepared to defend Latvia with weapons in case of a military attack, but would be prepared to support the armed forces by other, non-military means.

Official language proficiency

- The majority of Latvian people are able to communicate in three languages: in Latvian, Russian, and English.
- In total, 60 % of the Latvian population evaluated their official language proficiency as excellent (5 on a scale of 5). Only 9 % of non-citizens and 14 % of the Latvian population speaking Russian in their families have the same proficiency level of the Latvian language.
- When communicating with others from the Latvian population, 5 % of the Latvian population never use the Latvian language. Mostly these are non-citizens of Latvia Russian-speaking population of older generations.

Migration processes

- On average, it is easier for Latvian citizens to imagine themselves living in another country than for the average EU citizen. The inhabitants of Latvia also more frequently have actual migration experience.
- However, three quarters of Latvian citizens have lived and worked only in Latvia.
- Young adults in Latvia would like to move to another country more often than compared to other groups.
- Russian-speaking population of Latvia, especially non-citizens, have more frequent experience [compared to Latvian-speaking population] in living outside Latvia and returning back to Latvia.
- In comparison with the citizens of other EU Member States, the possibility to travel and work freely in other EU countries is especially important for Latvian citizens.
- Compared to the average figures in the European Union, the Latvian population is more sceptical towards immigration and the contribution of immigrants to Latvian economy.
- At the same time, the ability to move between countries and between European regions seems particularly important to the Latvian population.
- If taking into account the entire Latvian population, quite many people (44 %) believe that life in Latvia could become worse due to immigrants. Negative attitudes are particularly common among people having acquired only basic education, low-income and Russian-speaking individuals, especially non-citizens.

Assessment of adherence to law, integrity, and corruption within the society

- In Latvia, people feel safe at their place of residence and the surroundings thereof. People who speak Russian in their families and low-income people feel slightly less safe.
- Latvia and the European Union share a similar level of social uncertainty caused by encounters with drug users.
- Latvian people believe that children on the Internet rarely come across sexual harassment. Figures in Latvia are the lowest among EU countries. This probably means that adults are simply not aware of such harassment and that it is not talked about much in public.
- The experience of Latvian citizens with corruption is similar to the average in the European Union: the vast majority of citizens have not faced corruption during the past year.
- It is worrying that almost a quarter of Latvian citizens believe that bribes are an acceptable form of communication with the public administration.
- The majority of Latvian citizens (like the majority of EU citizens in other Member States) see corruption as a widespread problem affecting both local and national authorities.

Discrimination and respect for human rights

- Values of Latvian citizens with regard to the principles of human rights (freedoms and non-discrimination) are quite similar to those of the average EU citizen. Namely, the importance of these principles, at least in words, is highly valued.
- The Latvian population either rarely acknowledges or rarely experiences discrimination based on religious grounds, sexual orientation, or gender. Latvian people are relatively more likely to experience discrimination based on political beliefs and ethnic origin (especially Russian-speaking population), and also socio-economic status (especially people having acquired only basic education and people with a low level of income).
- According to observations of the Latvian population, the most common grounds for discrimination in the Latvian society are sexual orientation, ethnic origin, and socio-economic status.
- In spring of 2023, Russian-speaking population in Latvia believed that people without any knowledge or poor knowledge of the Russian language were being discriminated in Latvia. Such opinion was expressed by various Russian-speaking generations, including young adults. Latvian-speaking population disagrees to this.
- There is high discord among different groups of the Latvian society as to whether people can express their views on politics in Latvia without fear. This can be particularly observed between Latvian-speaking and Russian-speaking people and also between high-income and low-income population.

Family ties and friends

- The absolute majority of the Latvian people have a family and friends they can trust and spend time with.
- Non-citizens, low-income people, and older generations feel relatively lonelier.
- Three quarters of the Latvian population have people they can rely on in a difficult situation. People having acquired only basic education, Russian-speaking population of Latvia (especially non-citizens), and low-income people more often do not have anyone to rely on.

Attitudes towards diversity and accepting differences

- Almost every inhabitant of Latvia has friends of various ages.
- Similarly, there are a few people in Latvia who do not have friends of other nationalities.
- There are more Latvian people without friends with different ethnic backgrounds (compared to the Russian-speaking Latvian population without friends with different ethnic backgrounds).
- More than half of the Latvian population, especially the older generations, have no friends or acquaintances with a different sexual orientation.
- People with higher income are more often exposed to the diversity of Latvian society.
- There are very few inhabitants in Latvia (only 8 %) who have a negative opinion about children of different nationalities learning together at school. Such percentage remains unchanged regardless of the language and the status of citizenship.
- There are certain prejudices within the Latvian society against some groups. Most commonly the Latvian population would refuse to live next door to Muslims (especially older generations and low-income earners), the Roma people, sexual minorities (especially older generations and Russian-speaking Latvian population), and also people from the countries of South Asia who in recent years have been studying in Latvia and working in the courier services and information technology sector.
- Only a third of the Latvian population admitted they would have no objections to living next door to members of any of the previously mentioned groups.
- The percentage of the Latvian population who would not want to live next door to members of these groups is almost identical to the percentage of the Latvian population who would not like these people as their co-workers.
- At the same time, the reluctance to start a family is much stronger and more intense, especially with regard to the Roma people, sexual minorities, Muslims, people from the countries of South Asia, and people with mental disabilities.
- The majority of Latvian citizens would have no objections to seeing immigrants among their friends, neighbours, work colleagues, doctors, and even family members. Nevertheless, compared to the citizens of other EU Member States, Latvian citizens are more sceptical about the possibility of an immigrant being their work colleague, doctor, or family member.

Solidarity

- There are not many Latvian people who would say that they did not care at all about the well-being of various social groups in Latvia. Practically the entire Latvian population have at least some sense of solidarity with the elderly, families with children, Latvian people in general, and the people of their neighbourhood. There is a very explicit solidarity with the unemployed. Attitude towards Europeans and immigrants is rather lukewarm.
- Compared to the citizens of other EU Member States (average), Latvian citizens more frequently share the view that the government should support the vulnerable population in the country to ensure a life of dignity for them, i.e. support for solidarity at national level is higher than in Lithuania and Estonia.
- Similarly, there is high support among Latvian citizens for the theoretical right to asylum for people who are persecuted. However, this support decreases when asked specifically whether Latvia should help refugees.

Altruism and charity

- Latvian people quite often help strangers and also donate money and possessions to charity, especially people with high incomes.

- Participation in clean-ups and volunteer work is also quite common. Whereas blood donations are rare.

Desire to live

- Compared to the average European, in spring of 2023, Latvian citizens were optimistic, i.e. only 12 % thought that their lives were heading in the wrong direction.
- Life satisfaction rate in Latvia was also similar to both the EU average and that of neighbouring countries.
- In spring of 2023, 8 % of the Latvian population admitted they were not happy at all. A considerably higher number of unhappy people are among people who have acquired only basic education and low-income earners.
- Overall, 43 % of the Latvian population said that they usually recovered quickly from difficulties. High-income earners and young adults find it particularly easy to recover from difficulties.
- The majority of the Latvian population, especially those with high incomes, were hopeful about the future of Latvia right after the *Saeima* elections in 2022.
- Meanwhile nearly half of the Latvian population felt that the future of Latvia is under threat.
- More than half of the Russian-speaking population and a large percentage of people with low incomes felt resentment towards the country.

Intragroup relationships

- Latvian citizens almost as often (79 %) as citizens of other EU Member States (81 %) say that people living in the country have a lot in common. Lithuania and Estonia have similar figures.
- Unfortunately, the public opinion survey conducted in spring of 2023 shows that the majority of the Latvian society believes that tensions can be observed in Latvia between different ethnic groups. Such opinion is spread rather evenly across all demographic groups.
- Both people who speak Latvian in their families and people who speak Russian in their families mostly believe the attitude of Latvian people towards the Russian-speaking population in Latvia has become worse since the invasion of Ukraine by Russia.
- There are a very few Latvian people who rule out the possibility of a serious ethnic conflict in Latvia.

Economic mobility and equal opportunities of society groups

- Nearly half of Latvian citizens feel that growing up in a wealthy family is important to succeed in life. Such result is also broadly equivalent to the perceptions of the average European and the perceptions of Lithuanian and Estonian people.
- Latvian citizens believe that hard work, a good education, and growing up in a wealthy family are important factors to succeed in life. However, it is interesting that hard work has been mentioned by 59 % of citizens that is one of the lowest figures in the EU, while in Estonia 76 % of citizens believe in the importance of hard work, which is the highest in the EU. The importance of acquiring a good education to succeed in life has been also mentioned less often by Latvian people than in Lithuania and even much less than in Estonia.
- Latvia has the lowest perception in the European Union that gender plays an important role in people's success in life, i.e. only 20 % of the Latvian population, compared to the EU average of 41 %.

- A third of the Latvian population disagree with the statement that being born poor in Latvia and working hard can ensure financial security. People having acquired only basic education, low-income earners, and also Russian-speaking families agree to this statement especially often. However, quite many high-income earners also agree to this statement.
- Slightly less than half (52 %) of Latvian citizens believe they have the same opportunities to succeed in life as other people in Latvia. This is lower than the EU average and the other two Baltic countries.
- Only 20 % of citizens can agree with the statement about whether people in Latvia in general earn what they deserve.
- Almost half of the Latvian population believe that the possibility of getting a well-paid job in Latvia depends on the gender, age, ethnicity, or disability status of a person.
- A quarter of the Latvian population have the opinion that there is a lack of equal opportunities in the field of education in Latvia.
- Access to healthcare at times when such service is necessary is regarded as problematic by the Latvian population. This is a particularly serious matter for low-income people, most of whom say they or their relatives cannot afford to pay for healthcare services.
- Older generations and low-income earners sometimes have problems accessing cultural events.
- Approximately one quarter of people aged between 65 and 75 have no access to the Internet. Meanwhile, if comparing Internet access between Latvian citizens and the citizens of other EU countries, Internet access, as a whole, in Latvia is quite good.

Social inequality

- A total of 86 % of Latvian citizens agree to the statement that nowadays the income gap among people in Latvia is too large. This is a slightly more popular opinion than in general in the EU (81 %).
- If social status in a society is imagined as a staircase with 10 steps, where the highest step is the highest status, then most often people in Latvia see themselves on the fifth step.
- The wealthiest part (quintile) of the Latvian society most often saw their social status on the seventh step.
- People speaking Latvian in their families slightly more often see themselves on higher steps of the social status, whereas Russian-speaking population – on lower steps.
- Compared to other EU Member States, one may notice that Latvian citizens are more likely to classify themselves as representatives of the working class, i.e. one third of Latvian citizens believe so, while the average rate in the European Union is lower (23 %).
- Meanwhile, Latvian citizens are the least likely in the European Union to identify themselves as left-wing political party supporters (only 7 % of citizens, compared to an EU average of 29 % and even 51 % in Sweden).
- Latvia has the highest percentage of citizens in the European Union considering it is acceptable not to report income with the aim of evading payment of taxes.

Financial well-being

- More than half (61 %) of Latvian citizens never or almost never face the difficulty to pay the invoices at the end of the month. This reflects also the situation in the EU and the neighbouring countries.
- In comparison with Lithuanian and Estonian citizens and also the average EU citizen, Latvian citizens were more optimistic in spring of 2023 in terms of their predictions about their work and financial situations. Only 13 % expected worsening of their financial situation in the upcoming year.

- The survey conducted in spring of 2023 also showed that, if assessing the current situation of personal finances, the Latvian society is rather pessimistic: a quarter of the Latvian population are dissatisfied with their financial situation.
- Approximately a quarter of Latvian citizens have a poor understanding of financial matters. This corresponds to the EU average.
- Compared to the average EU citizen, Latvian citizens are much more uncertain about whether they will have enough money to live comfortably in retirement.

Attitudes towards Russia and Ukraine: various generations

- The views of Russian-speaking young adults about the Russian President Vladimir Putin are highly negative and this group of the Latvian population also regards Russia as a threat to peace and security in Europe. In that respect, their opinion is much closer to the average views of the Latvian-speaking population than the views of the Russian-speaking population over the age of 50.
- Very few Latvian people blame Ukraine for the outbreak of the war, while a significant proportion of the older Russian-speaking population in Latvia believe that the USA is responsible for provoking the war in Ukraine. Russia is seen as responsible for the war by around half of Russian-speaking young adults and a quarter of those over the age of 50.
- There are no fundamental differences in attitudes towards these matters between one generation of Russian-speaking Latvian citizens and non-citizens, i.e. their views are quite similar.
- As regards other issues that polarise the Latvian society, the opinion of Russian-speaking young adults is usually in the middle between the opinion of the Latvian-speaking population and that of the older generations of the Russian-speaking population. This applies also to the issue of the demolition of Soviet-era monuments.

V Recommendations for Measuring Social Cohesion

1. Assessments of social cohesion that have been validated in various countries / international organisations usually focus on the following elements of social cohesion: 1) trust in public authorities; 2) civic participation; 3) acceptance of diversity, inclusive nation; 4) broad social ties of the population, pro-social actions, e.g. volunteer work, charity; 5) sense of dignity and worth (satisfaction with life, financial situation, feeling of fair treatment towards an individual); 6) social peace and protection from violence, crime; 7) not too excessive inequality in the country, the economy prioritises the common good; 8) good access to healthcare; 9) solidarity towards those who are less privileged in the given society; 9) a sense of belonging to the respective country; 10) trust in fellow citizens; 12) frequency of contact between different ethnic and religious groups; 13) access to and quality of education.

We suggest that the Social Cohesion Radar of Latvia is based on similar subjects (see below the list of 24 + 5 proposed questions for regular monitoring of social cohesion).

2. The most recent methods used worldwide for assessing social cohesion do not postulate social homogeneity as the goal of cohesion. Instead, it is assumed that a modern society cannot exist without diversity (ethnically, socially, religiously, or politically), i.e. cohesion is manifested in good mutual relationships, the intensity of different contacts, and the ability to work towards the achievement of social welfare goals.
3. The main purpose of radars, indices, and similar measuring tools is to provide useful knowledge to decision-making bodies so that they can use this new knowledge to improve public policies and implementation thereof. Thus, there should be clear understanding of what changes within the society suggest a higher level of cohesion and what changes – a lower level of cohesion.
4. Our suggestion is to make the Social Cohesion Radar of Latvia similar to the social cohesion report of Australia:
 - a. Methodological core – a sociological survey organised once every two years with fixed, unchanged questions to detect positive or negative changes.
 - b. Once every two years the survey results are published in the form of a special publicly accessible report. Changes are monitored both at the level of the society as a whole and with regard to major social groups (e.g. low-income people, Russian-speaking population).
 - c. Over time, the radar can be extended with additional parameters without changing its core.
 - d. The report and the survey should also address additional issues that have been particularly relevant for cohesion during the past two years, e.g. the impact of the pandemic on the general feeling in the society or the impact of the war (as in this report, questions about the attitude of the Russian-speaking Latvian population towards the invasion of Ukraine by Russia are addressed separately).
 - e. When forming the Social Cohesion Radar, it is important to ensure the compliance thereof with two basic principles: 1) relevance to policy makers, i.e. be clear where additional 'interventions' are required to improve social cohesion results; 2) constant methodological basis, i.e. the core of which should remain constant over time, thus allowing to detect progress or regression in the field of social cohesion.

5. Our suggested core method – regular survey. It is preferable to include a more extensive range of respondents in the survey than the minimum required (e.g. around two thousand respondents) in order to ensure a more precise detection of changes not only at the level of the entire society, but also for separate groups. When selecting the questions for the Social Cohesion Radar, we were guided by the following criteria:
 - a) Preferably, the question should have been asked to the Latvian population (or, at least, to Latvian citizens) in a properly organised sociological survey throughout the last three years. This provides a baseline against which to measure progress or regression for the first Social Cohesion Radar report.
 - b) When choosing between several similar survey questions, preference is given to the one that is most likely to address an important aspect of social cohesion and is the least misunderstood.
 - c) Duplication of questions should be avoided as far as possible, but there can be several questions on the same topic if they each measure an aspect of the Latvian society that is important for cohesion.
 - d) If several surveys measured the same (or almost the same) question, the most recent survey was selected.

6. In a special section below, we present 24 + 5 parameters (indicators) to measure social cohesion in Latvia, the corresponding value for each (according to the most recent measurement), and some instructions on how to ask a question repeatedly to ensure proper comparison of the results afterwards.

VI Recommendations for Social Cohesion Radar – Cohesive Society Criteria

	What could suggest a good change in social cohesion?	Dimensions	Formulation of questions and possible answers	Current value, year and source	Comment
1.	Increased number (percentage) of the population with a sense of belonging	Identity and belonging	<p>“Please consider to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement!” Statement: “I feel a sense of belonging to Latvia.” Possible answers: Strongly disagree, mostly disagree, neutral, mostly agree, strongly agree, difficult to say / NA.</p> <p>Afterwards it is necessary to combine the answers “strongly agree” and “mostly agree” (a new category – “agree”). If the number goes up, this is a positive trend.</p>	<p>76 % (2023)</p> <p>Source: Survey of Social Cohesion Index 2023</p>	<p>In future surveys, it is preferable to rephrase the statement as follows: “I feel a sense of belonging to Latvia as a country.” Rephrasing the statement will not allow accurate comparison of the changes with the value of 2023, but will help avoid ambiguity (attachment to a territory, people, or a country).</p>
2.	Increased number (percentage) of the population prepared to defend Latvia with weapons or in a non-military way in case of a military attack	Identity and belonging	<p>In your opinion, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements: strongly agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree or strongly disagree?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In case of a military attack, I am prepared to defend Latvia with weapons. 2. In case of a military attack, I am prepared to defend Latvia in a non-military way (to support the armed forces). 3. In case of a military attack, I am prepared to help only fellow citizen victims. 4. In case of a military attack, I would definitely leave the country. <p>Two values need to be analysed separately: 1. In case of a military attack, I am prepared to defend</p>	<p>28 % In case of a military attack, I am prepared to defend Latvia with weapons.</p> <p>60 % In case of a military attack, I am prepared to defend Latvia in a non-military way (to support the armed forces).</p> <p>(2022)</p>	<p>Please note that there are two important values for this question!</p>

			Latvia with weapons. 2. In case of a military attack, I am prepared to defend Latvia in a non-military way (to support the armed forces). An increase in one or both questions would show a positive trend.	Source: Survey by Centre the for Security and Strategic Research, 2022	
3.	Increased number (percentage) of the population feeling accepted in Latvia	Identity and belonging	“Please consider to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement!” Statement: “I feel accepted in Latvia.” Possible answers: Strongly disagree, mostly disagree, neutral, mostly agree, strongly agree, difficult to say / NA. Afterwards it is necessary to combine the answers “strongly agree” and “mostly agree” (a new category – “agree”). If the number goes up, it is good.	68 % (2023) Source: Survey of Social Cohesion Index 2023	
4.	Decrease in the number (percentage) of the population feeling resentment towards Latvia	Identity and belonging	Question: “In your opinion, to what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement? I feel resentment towards the State of Latvia.” Possible answers: strongly agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, strongly disagree, don’t know / NA Afterwards it is necessary to combine the results for answers “strongly agree” and “mostly agree”. If the number goes up, this is a bad trend.	36 % (2022) Source: Providus Survey 2022	
5.	Increased number (percentage) of the Latvian population without objections to having neighbours that represent a potentially marginalised minority group	Identity and belonging	The list includes various groups of people. Who would you not like as your neighbour? (Multiple answers possible.) 1) People from European countries (e.g. French, Germans); 2) People from the countries of South Asia (e.g. Indians, Pakistanis); 3) Gay, lesbian, and transgender people; 4) Roma people (gypsies); 5) People with physical disabilities; 6) People with mental disabilities; 7) Muslims; 8) Jews; 9) No objections to any of them 10) Difficult to say / NA. Only the answer “No objections to any of them” should be subject to further analysis. Increased number means a positive trend.	34 % (2020) Source: Providus Survey 2020	
6.	Increased number (percentage) of the Latvian population with a sense of unity towards all the Latvian	Identity and belonging	“Please consider to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement!” Statement: “I feel a sense of unity towards all the Latvian people.”	53 % (2023)	

	people		Possible answers: Strongly disagree, mostly disagree, neutral, mostly agree, strongly agree, difficult to say / NA. Afterwards it is necessary to combine the results for answers “strongly agree” and “mostly agree” (a new category – “agree”). Increased number suggests positive changes.	Source: Survey of Social Cohesion Index 2023	
7.	Increased number (percentage) of the population considering that the Latvian people have much in common	Identity and belonging	“In your opinion, do you strongly agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, or strongly disagree with this statement? People in our country have much in common.” Possible answers: strongly agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, strongly disagree, don’t know. Afterwards it is necessary to combine the results for answers “strongly agree” and “mostly agree”. If the number goes up, this is a positive trend.	79 % (Only Latvian citizens surveyed) (2023) Source: Standard Eurobarometer 99 (spring of 2023).	The answers of both, citizens and non-citizens, should be monitored for this question. Therefore, the value of 2023 can be used only partly.
8.	Decrease in the number (percentage) of the Latvian population never using the Latvian language in their interactions with others	Identity and belonging	“I use the Latvian language when communicating with other nationalities in the Latvian population: 1) Never; 2) Rarely; 3) Sometimes; 4) Often; 5) Always; 6) Difficult to say / NA” The answer “Never” should be subject to analysis. If the number goes down, this suggests positive dynamics.	5 % (2023) Source: Survey of Social Cohesion Index 2023	
9.	Increased number (percentage) of the population considering it is important to participate in the elections	Social relationships	“How important or unimportant is it for you to participate in parliamentary elections in Latvia?” Possible answer: “important”. A scale of 10 points should be proposed, where 10 represents “Voting is something you consider particularly important, it is the most important duty of a citizen” and 1 represents “Voting is of no importance to you”. The results of high importance (8, 9, and 10) should be combined, the same as for question QA16b (European Parliament Eurobarometer 2023). Increase shows a positive trend.	56 % (Only Latvian citizens surveyed) (2023) Source: European Parliament Eurobarometer 2023	Only answers of citizens should be monitored for this question.
10.	Increased number (proportion) of the population considering that their vote matters in Latvia	Social relationships	Question: “In your opinion, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: My vote matters in Latvia.” Possible answers: 1)	42 % (Only Latvian citizens surveyed) (2023)	The answers of both, citizens and non-citizens, should be monitored for this question. Therefore, the

			<p>Strongly agree; 2) Mostly agree; 3) Mostly disagree; 4) Strongly disagree; 5) Don't know.</p> <p>Afterwards it is necessary to combine the answers "Strongly agree" and "Mostly agree", the same as in the Standard Eurobarometer 99 (a new category needs to be created – "Agree"). If the number goes up, this shows a positive change.</p>	<p>Source: Standard Eurobarometer 99 (spring of 2023)</p>	<p>value of 2023 can be used only partly.</p>
11.	<p>Decrease in the number (percentage) of the population not engaged additional civic actions in recent years (other than participation in the elections)</p>	<p>Social relationships</p>	<p>Have you done any of the following activities in the last two years (mark as appropriate)? 1. Contacted the members of the parliament I elected in the local government or the <i>Saeima</i>; 2) Participated in a picket or another protest action; 3) Donated my free time or resources to solve a problem of public importance; 4) Participated in a consultation organised by a local or national authority where I expressed my opinion; 5) Signed a petition, public initiative, or open letter; 6) Did none of the above; 7) Don't remember / NA.</p> <p>Answer 6 "Did none of the above" should be analysed to see if there is any improvement (decrease) or deterioration (increase).</p>	<p>81 % (2020)</p> <p>Source: Providus Survey 2020.</p>	
12.	<p>Decrease in the number (percentage) of the in population with no confidence in any basic institutions of democracy</p>	<p>Social relationships</p>	<p>Please have a look at the list of authorities and tell us in what authorities do you have complete or partial trust. 1) The <i>Saeima</i>; 2) The Cabinet; 3) Local governments; 4) Judicial system; 5) Public media; 6) Public organisations; 7) No trust in any of these; 8) Difficult to say / NA.</p> <p>Answer "No trust in any of these" should be subject to further analysis: whether the percentage for this answer increases (bad) or decreases (good).</p>	<p>35 % (2020)</p> <p>Source: Providus Survey 2020.</p>	
13.	<p>Decrease in the number (percentage) of the population disappointed in the political situation in Latvia</p>	<p>Social relationships</p>	<p>In your opinion, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: I am disappointed in the political situation in Latvia. Possible answers: Strongly agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, strongly disagree, difficult to say / NA.</p> <p>Afterwards it is necessary to combine the values of the answers "strongly agree" and "mostly agree"</p>	<p>59 % (2022)</p> <p>Source: Providus Survey 2022</p>	

			(a new category – “agree”). It is necessary to monitor whether the number of those who agree decreases (good) or increases (bad).		
14.	There is more widespread opinion that anyone in Latvia can express their political views freely and without fear	Social relationships	In your opinion, to what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement? Any individual in Latvia can express his or her political views freely and without fear. Possible answers: strongly agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, strongly disagree, difficult to say / NA. Afterwards it is necessary to combine the results for answers “strongly agree” and “mostly agree”. If the number goes up, this is a positive trend.	46 % (2022) Source: Providus Survey 2022	
15.	Increased number (percentage) of the Latvian population considering that most people can be trusted	Social relationships	Question: “Please consider to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement! Most people can be trusted.” Possible answers: strongly agree, mostly agree, neutral, mostly disagree, strongly disagree, difficult to say / NA Afterwards it is necessary to combine the results for answers “strongly agree” and “mostly agree”. If the number goes up, this is a positive trend.	39 % (2023) Source: Survey of Social Cohesion Index 2023	
16.	Increased number (percentage) of the population having someone to rely on (other people) in case of serious personal problems	Social relationships	Question: “Please consider to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement! There are people I can rely on in case of serious personal problems.” Possible answers: strongly agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, strongly disagree, difficult to say / NA. Afterwards it is necessary to combine the results for answers “strongly agree” and “mostly agree”. If the number goes up, this is a positive trend.	75 % (2023) Source: Survey of Social Cohesion Index 2023	
17.	Decrease in the number (percentage) of the Latvian population who in the past year have not helped a stranger who needed help	Social relationships	Question “I have helped a stranger or an unknown person who needed help in the past 12 months”. Possible answers: 1) Never; 2) Rarely; 3) Sometimes; 4) Often; 5) Very often; 6) Difficult to say / NA. Only answer “Never” should be subject to further	27 % (2023) Source: Survey of Social Cohesion Index 2023	

			analysis: good if the number decreases.		
18.	Less widespread opinion within the society that ethnic tension can be observed in Latvia	Social relationships	Question: "Please consider to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement! Ethnic tension can be observed among various ethnic groups in Latvia." Possible answers: strongly agree, mostly agree, neutral, mostly disagree, strongly disagree, difficult to say / NA. Afterwards it is necessary to combine the results for answers "strongly agree" and "mostly agree". If the number goes up, this is a negative trend.	52 % (2023) Source: Survey of Social Cohesion Index 2023	
19.	Decrease in the number (percentage) of the population disagreeing with the opinion that being born poor in Latvia and working hard can ensure financial security	Economic solidarity	Question: "Please consider to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement! A person who has been born poor in Latvia and is working hard can become financial secure." Possible answers: strongly agree, mostly agree, neutral, mostly disagree, strongly disagree, difficult to say / NA. Afterwards it is necessary to combine the results for answers "strongly disagree" and "mostly disagree". If the number goes up, this is a negative trend.	34 % (2023) Source: Survey of Social Cohesion Index 2023	
20.	Increased number (percentage) of the population considering that in Latvia they have equal opportunities to succeed in life as other people	Economic solidarity	"In your opinion, to what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement? Nowadays people in Latvia have equal opportunities to succeed in life." Possible answers: Strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree, don't know. Example: Justice Eurobarometer 2022, question QC1.3. Afterwards it is necessary to combine answers "strongly agree" and "mostly agree". If the number goes up, this is a positive trend.	42 % (Only Latvian citizens surveyed) (2022) Source: Justice Eurobarometer 2022	The answers of both, citizens and non-citizens, should be monitored for this question. Therefore, the value of 2022 can be used only partly.
21.	Decrease in the number (percentage) of the population considering that there is a major income gap among people in Latvia	Economic solidarity	"In your opinion, to what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement? Nowadays the income gap among people in Latvia is too large." Possible answers: Strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree, don't know. Example: Justice Eurobarometer 2022, question QC4.1. Afterwards it is necessary to combine answers "strongly agree" and "mostly agree". If the number goes up, this is a negative	86 % (Only Latvian citizens surveyed) (2022) Source: Justice Eurobarometer 2022	The answers of both, citizens and non-citizens, should be monitored for this question. Therefore, the value of 2022 can be used only partly.

			trend.		
22.	Decrease in the number (percentage) of the population considering it is acceptable not to report their income with the aim of evading payment of taxes	Economic solidarity	<p>In your opinion, to what extent do you consider such behaviour is acceptable or unacceptable? Please use the following scale: “1” represents the opinion that such behaviour is unacceptable and “10” represents the opinion that such behaviour is fully acceptable.</p> <p>A private individual or self-employed person is engaged in tax evasion by not declaring his or her income or part of his or her income. (%)</p> <p>There should be a possibility to refuse to answer spontaneously or to answer “Don’t know”.</p> <p>Afterwards the category “Acceptable” is created (answer values from 7 to 10). If the number of answers under this category increases, this is a negative trend.</p>	<p>18 % (Only Latvian citizens surveyed) (2019)</p> <p>Source: Undeclared Work Eurobarometer 2019</p>	The answers of both, citizens and non-citizens, should be monitored for this question. Therefore, the value of 2019 can be used only partly.
23.	Decrease in the number (percentage) of the population considering it is acceptable to accept bribes for public services	Economic solidarity	<p>Question: “Generally speaking, if you wanted to receive something from the public administration, to what extent do you think it would be acceptable to give money?” Possible answers: 1) Always acceptable; 2) Sometimes acceptable; 3) Never acceptable; 4) Don’t know.</p> <p>Afterwards the following answers are combined: 1) Always acceptable; 2) Sometimes acceptable (a new category – “Acceptable”).</p> <p>If the number increases over time, this is a negative trend.</p> <p>Example: Corruption Eurobarometer 2023, question QA4.1.</p>	<p>23 % (Only Latvian citizens surveyed) (2023)</p> <p>Source: Corruption Eurobarometer 2023</p>	The answers of both, citizens and non-citizens, should be monitored for this question. Therefore, the value of 2023 can be used only partly.
24.	Decrease in the number of cases where the Latvian population personally experience corruption	Economic solidarity	<p>Question: “Have you witnessed or observed a case of corruption in the past 12 months? (Multiple answers possible.)” Possible answers: 1) Yes, I have; 2) Yes, I observed; 3) No; 4) Refuse to answer (spontaneously); 5) Don’t know.</p> <p>A combined answer “Yes” is necessary (how many</p>	<p>7 % (Only Latvian citizens surveyed) (2023)</p> <p>Source: Corruption</p>	The answers of both, citizens and non-citizens, should be monitored for this question. Therefore, the value of 2023 can be used only partly.

			people have selected one or the other). If the number increases, this is a bad trend. Example: Corruption Eurobarometer 2023, question QA12.	Eurobarometer 2023	
(25)	<i>Optional question! Extends question 20!</i> Decrease in the number (percentage) of the population without access to the Internet and technologies in order to use digital services	Economic solidarity	Question: "Please consider to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement! I have access to the Internet and technologies in order to use digital services." Possible answers: strongly agree, mostly agree, neutral, mostly disagree, strongly disagree, difficult to say / NA. Afterwards it is necessary to combine the results for answers "strongly disagree" and "mostly disagree". If the number goes up, this is a negative trend.	11 % (2023) Source: Survey of Social Cohesion Index 2023	
(26)	<i>Optional question! Extends question 20!</i> Decrease in the number (percentage) of the population without access to cultural events and cultural establishments	Economic solidarity	Question: "Please consider to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement! I have access to cultural events and cultural establishments." Possible answers: strongly agree, mostly agree, neutral, mostly disagree, strongly disagree, difficult to say / NA. Afterwards it is necessary to combine the results for answers "strongly disagree" and "mostly disagree". If the number goes up, this is a negative trend.	13 % (2023) Source: Survey of Social Cohesion Index 2023	
(27)	<i>Optional question! Extends question 20!</i> Decrease in the number (percentage) of the population who or whose relatives have no access to quality education	Economic solidarity	Question: "Please consider to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement! "I or my relatives have no access to quality education." Possible answers: strongly agree, mostly agree, neutral, mostly disagree, strongly disagree, difficult to say / NA. Afterwards it is necessary to combine the results for answers "strongly disagree" and "mostly disagree". If the number goes up, this is a negative trend.	19 % (2023) Source: Survey of Social Cohesion Index 2023	
(28)	<i>Optional question! Extends question 20!</i>	Economic solidarity	Question: "Please consider to what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements! I have learning opportunities in order to acquire profession	25 % (2023)	

	Decrease in the number (percentage) of the population considering that they or their relatives have no learning opportunities in order to acquire profession or get retraining, if necessary		or get retraining, if necessary. Possible answers: strongly agree, mostly agree, neutral, mostly disagree, strongly disagree, difficult to say / NA. Afterwards it is necessary to combine the results for answers "strongly disagree" and "mostly disagree". If the number goes up, this is a negative trend.	Source: Survey of Social Cohesion Index 2023	
(29)	<i>Optional question! Extends question 20!</i> Decrease in the number (percentage) of the population believing that in Latvia there are no equal opportunities to receive medical services	Economic solidarity	Question: "Please consider to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement! All members of the society have equal access to medical services, regardless of their gender, age, ethnicity, disability." Possible answers: strongly agree, mostly agree, neutral, mostly disagree, strongly disagree, difficult to say / NA. Afterwards it is necessary to combine the results for answers "strongly disagree" and "mostly disagree". If the number goes up, this is a negative trend.	38 % (2023) Source: Survey of Social Cohesion Index 2023	

List of Surveys Used in the Report

Title used in the present report	Full title (if published) and a link	Who conducted the survey?	Who requested the survey?	When were the data collected?	Sample respondents (number of respondents in Latvia)
Survey of Social Cohesion Index 2023	Not published, conducted specifically for the purposes of designing the Social Cohesion Index (Radar) of SIF	SKDS	Vidzeme University of Applied Sciences	2023 (May)	1010
Child Protection Eurobarometer 2023	Flash Eurobarometer 532 Protection of children against online sexual abuse	Kantar	European Commission	2023 (June, July)	1020
Survey by Centre the for Security and Strategic Research, 2022	Results published in the report Relationship of the Latvian society and the country in the context of Russia–Ukraine war	SKDS	Centre the for Security and Strategic Research	2022 (October)	1000
European Parliament Eurobarometer 2023	EP Spring 2023 Survey: Democracy in action – One year before the European elections . Eurobarometer 99.1	Kantar	European Commission	2023 (March)	1000
FES Survey 2023	Until now, published only partly in the report “ UNDER PRESSURE. An Analysis of the Russian-Speaking Minority in Latvia .” For the purposes of this report, the Friedrich Ebert Foundation allowed to use complete data with the analysis conducted additionally by SKDS.	SKDS	Friedrich Ebert Foundation in the Baltic States	2023 (April)	2021
Financial Literacy Eurobarometer 2023	Flash Eurobarometer 525 Monitoring the level of financial literacy in the EU .	Kantar	European Commission	2023 (March, April)	1018
Integration of Immigrants Barometer 2022	Integration of Immigrants in the European Union . Special Eurobarometer 519.	Kantar	European Commission	2021 (November, December)	1001
Corruption Eurobarometer 2023	Citizens' attitudes towards corruption in the EU in 2023	Kantar	European Commission	2023 (April, May)	1009
Rural Areas Eurobarometer 2021	A long term vision for EU rural areas . Flash Eurobarometer 491	Kantar	European Commission	2021 (April)	1006

Mobility Eurobarometer 2022	Special Eurobarometer 528: Intra-EU labour mobility after the pandemic	Kantar	European Commission	2022 (May, June)	1000
Undeclared Work Eurobarometer 2010	Undeclared Work in the European Union. Special Eurobarometer 498.	Kantar	European Commission	2019 (September)	1006
Impact of Drugs Eurobarometer 2021	Impact of drugs on communities. Flash Eurobarometer 493.	Kantar	European Commission	2021 (June, July)	1002
Providus Survey 2020	Survey of the Latvian population on civic participation and integration	SKDS	Providus	2020 (October, November)	1013
Providus Survey 2022	Until now, published only partly in the form of the report “What was the message of the voters in the 14th Saeima elections and what does it show about the sentiment in the Latvian society?” Also unpublished data were used for this report.	SKDS	Providus	2022 (October)	2005
SPEKTR Survey 2023	Research report: risk tolerance of Latvian residents and their attitude towards current events. Survey of Latvian residents (until now, published only partly)	SKDS	Online medium SPEKTR	2023 (March)	2251
Standard Eurobarometer 97 (summer of 2022)	Standard Eurobarometer 97 – Summer 2022	Kantar	European Commission	2022 (June–July)	1028
Standard Eurobarometer 99 (winter of 2022 and 2023)	Standard Eurobarometer 98 – Winter 2022–2023	Kantar	European Commission	2023 (January)	1039
Standard Eurobarometer 99 (spring of 2023)	Standard Eurobarometer 99 – Spring 2023.	Kantar	European Commission	2023 (May and June)	1025
Justice Eurobarometer 2022	Fairness, inequality, and intergenerational mobility. Special Eurobarometer 529.	Kantar	European Commission	2022 (May, June)	1000
Justice Eurobarometer 2021	Special Eurobarometer 514. Justice, Rights and Values.	Kantar	European Commission	2021 (March and April)	1009
Values Eurobarometer 2020	Values and identities of EU citizens. Special Eurobarometer 508	Kantar	European Commission	2020 (October, November)	1050

