

## Tables

**Table 1 Sample size and response rates in the ministry and agency surveys, 1976, 1986, 1996, 2006 and 2016**

	Ministry		Agency	
	Responses	%	Responses	%
1976	784	72	-	-
1986	1185	72	1072	68
1996	1497	72	1024	64
2006	1874	67	1452	59
2016	2322	60	1963	60
Total	7662		5511	

**Table 2 Number of officials in ministries and agencies over time\***

	1976	1986	1996	2006	2016
Ministries	2812	3491	3945	4350	4752
Agencies	-	-	9182	11040	15359

\*Comparable numbers are missing for agencies in 1976 and 1986 (Christensen et al. 2018: 27).

**Table 3 Civil servants in ministerial departments who report that the following institutions are fairly or very important when important decision are made within own dossier (percent)\***

	1976	1986	1996	2006	2016
Own ministry	93	96	95	95	96
Own subordinated agencies, public enterprises	48	45	50	61	65
Own regional and local agencies	46	48	25	22	24
Other ministries	57	58	62	60	69
Regional and local administration	32	24	20	15	17
The Parliament	67	71	77	71	76
The Government	73	82	83	84	87
Employee organizations	48	20	16	16	12
Interest organizations	16	25	21	20	20
Consultancies/think-thanks	-	-	-	-	7
Private business	12	14	9	9	10
Research and educational institutions	24	28	24	30	32
Mass media	18	22	26	33	22
The European Commission	-	-	17	20	18
The EU Council	-	-	-	-	11
The EU Parliament	-	-	-	-	10
EU agencies	-	-	11	8	7
Other international governmental organizations	14	19	15	17	19

\*The original value scale in the survey: Very important (value 1), fairly important (value 2), both/and (value 3), fairly unimportant (value 4), very unimportant (value 5), don't know/not relevant (value 6).

**Table 4 Civil servants in agencies who report that the following institutions are fairly or very important when important decision are made within own dossier (percent)\***

	1976	1986	1996	2006	2016
Own agency	-	87	75	76	81
Own parent ministry	-	64	69	75	78
Own regional and local agencies	-	41	48	35	43
Other ministries and agencies	-	26	27	27	34
Regional and local administration	-	13	13	15	17
The Parliament	-	53	47	52	51
The Government	-	50	45	54	56
Employee organizations	-	37	17	14	15
Interest organizations	-	22	16	17	16
Private business	-	20	17	15	15
Research and educational institutions	-	25	25	27	25
Mass media	-	19	21	26	17
The European Commission	-	-	12	17	20
The EU Council	-	-	-	-	8
The EU Parliament	-	-	-	-	8
EU agencies	-	-	-	11	13
Other international governmental organizations	-	16	13	14	11

\*The original value scale in the survey: Very important (value 1), fairly important (value 2), both/and (value 3), fairly unimportant (value 4), very unimportant (value 5), don't know/not relevant (value 6).

**Table 5 Civil servants in ministerial departments who report that own unit has succeeded fairly much or very much in influencing the following institutions (percent)\***

	1976	1986	1996	2006	2016
The Government	66	57	61	64	68
The Parliament	65	52	53	55	59
Own ministry	-	71	77	79	81
Other ministries	54	32	44	51	57
Own subordinate agencies	65	57	62	65	65
Regional and local administration	-	22	24	17	16
The European Commission	-	-	11	11	9

\* The original value scale in the survey: Very much (value 1), fairly much (value 2), both/and (value 3), fairly little (value 4), very little (value 5), don't know/not relevant (value 6).

**Table 6 Civil servants in agencies who report that own unit has succeeded fairly much or very much in influencing the following institutions (percent)\***

	1976	1986	1996	2006	2016
The Government	-	34	41	45	40

The Parliament	-	32	37	41	39
Own parent ministry	-	48	60	64	62
Other ministries and agencies	-	17	20	27	24
Own regional and local agencies	-	-	-	44	41
Regional and local administration	-	17	16	25	23
The European Commission	-	-	5	9	7
EU agencies/ EU agency networks	-	-	-	-	8

\* The original value scale in the survey: Very much (value 1), fairly much (value 2), both/and (value 3), fairly little (value 4), very little (value 5), don't know/not relevant (value 6).

**Table 7 Civil servants within ministerial departments characterizing coordination as fairly good or very good within their own policy area along the following dimensions (percent)\***

	2006	2016
--	------	------

Between different government institutions within own policy area	59	64
With government institutions in other policy areas	35	38
With regional and local authorities	16	16
With supranational/international organizations	33	34
With private sector/civil society	24	27

\* The original value scale in the survey: Very good (value 1), fairly good, value 2), both/an (value 3), fairly bad (value 4), very bad (value 5), not relevant (value 6).

**Table 8 Civil servants within agencies characterizing coordination as fairly good or very good within their own policy area along the following dimensions (percent)\***

	2006	2016
Between different government institutions within own policy area	43	44
With government institutions in other policy areas	22	22
With regional and local authorities	18	18
With supranational/international organizations	30	25

\* The original value scale in the survey: Very good (value 1), fairly good, value 2), both/an (value 3), fairly bad (value 4), very bad (value 5), not relevant (value 6).

**Table 9 Civil servants' characterization of mutual trust relationships between ministries and agencies within their own policy area (percent)\***

	2006	2016

Ministry officials: Trust between own ministry and subordinate agencies and institutions	70	69
Agency officials: Trust between own agency and own parent ministry	74	74

\* The original value scale in the survey: very good (value 1), fairly good (value 2), both/and (value 3), fairly bad (value 4), very bad (value 5), don't know (value).

**Table 10 Summary of factors affecting officials' reported influence vis-a-vis own institution (own ministry/own agency) and the Government (standardized beta coefficients; linear regressions on ministry and agency officials; 2016 data)<sup>a, b</sup>**

	Influence on own institution (own ministry/own agency)	Influence on the Government
Vertical inter-organizational specialization (ministry/agency)	-.25**	-.23**
Vertical intra-organizational specialization (rank)	-.09**	-.12**
Organizational affiliation (seniority)	.05*	.04

\*  $p \leq 0.05$  \*\* $p \leq 0.01$

a) Coding of the dependent variable: The original value scale in the survey: Very much (value 1), fairly much (value 2), both/and (value 3), fairly little (value 4), very little (value 5), don't know/not relevant (value 6).

b) Coding of the independent variables: Vertical inter-organizational specialization: ministry (value 1), agency (value 0); Vertical intra-organizational specialization (Director General or higher levels/adviser/Director or equivalent (value 1), Deputy director general (value 2), Assistant director general/adviser (value 3), Principal officer/adviser (value 4), Executive officer, Higher executive officer/adviser (value 5); Organizational affiliation (natural continuous variable).