

WZB

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin
für Sozialforschung



Céline Teney, Oliver Strijbis, Sarah Carol
and Senem Tepe

**Elite survey of the Bridging Project
“The Political Sociology of Cosmopolitanism
and Communitarianism”**

Technical Report

Discussion Paper

SP VI 2018–105

November 2018

WZB Berlin Social Science Center

Research Area

Migration and Diversity

Research Unit

Migration, Integration, Transnationalization

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung gGmbH
Reichpietschufer 50
10785 Berlin
www.wzb.eu

Copyright remains with the authors.

Discussion papers of the WZB serve to disseminate the research results of work in progress prior to publication to encourage the exchange of ideas and academic debate. Inclusion of a paper in the discussion paper series does not constitute publication and should not limit publication in any other venue. The discussion papers published by the WZB represent the views of the respective authors and not of the institute as a whole.

Céline Teney, Oliver Strijbis, Sarah Carol and Senem Tepe
Elite survey of the Bridging Project
“The Political Sociology of Cosmopolitanism and Communitarianism”,
Technical Report
Discussion Paper SP VI 2018–105
WZB Berlin Social Science Center (2018)

Affiliation of the authors

Céline Teney (corresponding author)
Georg-August-Universität Göttingen | E-mail: celine.teney@sowi.uni-goettingen.de

Oliver Strijbis
Universität Zürich (UZH) | E-mail: strijbis@ipz.uzh.ch

Sarah Carol
Universität zu Köln | E-mail: carol@wiso.uni-koeln.de

Senem Tepe | E-mail: tepe.senem@gmail.com

Elite survey of the Bridging project
“The Political Sociology of Cosmopolitanism and Communitarianism”
Technical Report

by Céline Teney, Oliver Strijbis, Sarah Carol, and Senem Tepe *

* For excellent research assistance we would like to thank Joschua Helmer, Wiebke Junk, Bettina Kausch, Daniel Mader, Jagoda Maćkowiak, Tabea Palmtag, Jacek Plewicki, Rebeca Sahagun, Can Saruhan, and Oktay Tuncer. We are particularly grateful to Jonas Kahle for taking care of the data management.

Abstract

This elite survey has been carried out as part of the data collection effort of the WZB bridging project “The Political Sociology of Cosmopolitanism and Communitarianism”. Elites from five countries that were selected to represent five world regions (Germany, Poland, Turkey, Mexico and USA) compose the cross-national samples. Moreover, we included a sample of elites working at the EU and global levels. For each of these seven cases, we sampled positional elites working in the following 12 societal sectors: politics, administration, justice, military and police, labor union, lobbying, finance and economy, research, religious institutions, civil society, culture and media. We applied the same positional approach to identify elites at the national, European and global levels: elites are defined as the persons holding the highest positions in the most influential organizations within societal sectors. The sample design allows thus the comparison of elites at the same level across sectors and elites from the same sector across levels (i.e., national, European and global). The questionnaire focuses on denationalization issues that are most likely to be contested by actors on a cosmopolitan/communitarian ideological dimension: regional integration (border crossing of authority), immigration (border crossing of people), human rights (border crossing of norms), climate change (border crossing of pollutants) and international trade (border crossing of goods). One further objective of this elite survey was to enable elite-mass attitudinal comparison on the five denationalization issues across the five countries. Therefore, we included in the questionnaire items that were administered in cross-national mass surveys. All in all, the sampling and questionnaire designs of this elite survey enable three different types of analysis: (1) national and cross-national comparative analysis of the opinions of elites on the five denationalization issues across sectors of activity; (2) cross-level comparison of the attitudes of elites working at the national, EU and global levels across sectors of activity; and (3) analysis of the elite-mass gap in attitudes toward denationalization issues in the five countries. We used a mixed-mode approach for the data collection and contacted elites by combining personalized emails, personalized letters and telephone reminders. The data collection took place from spring 2014 until spring 2015. In total, 1604 completed questionnaires were collected. This paper discusses the sampling and questionnaire designs, response rates and data cleaning. It also presents the list of variables available from these survey data.

Keywords: Cosmopolitanism, Communitarianism, Elites

Table of contents

1	Introduction	6
2	Sample design: Including national, European and global elites within a single probability sampling framework	8
2.1	Positional elite approach	9
2.1.1	Combining the vertical, horizontal and cross-level delimitations	11
2.1.2	Definition of the sectors across levels and countries	13
2.1.3	The political sector	13
2.1.4	The administrative sector	15
2.1.5	The sector of justice	16
2.1.6	The sector of military and police	17
2.1.7	The labor union sector	19
2.1.8	The sector “Lobbyism”	20
2.1.9	The finance and economy sector	22
2.1.10	The research sector	23
2.1.11	The religious sector	26
2.1.12	The sector of civil society	27
2.1.13	The cultural sector	29
2.1.14	The sector of media	31
2.1.15	Summary	33
3	Questionnaire design	34
4	Questionnaire	35
5	Administration of the survey	50
6	Response rates and socio-demographics	51
6.1	Conceptualization and measurement of response rate	51
6.2	Response rate, bias, and weights	54
6.3	Socio-demographics	58
7	Data processing	61
7.1	Data entry, data cleaning, and recoding	61
7.2	Data collection problems	61
8	List of variables	62
9	Public use conditions	70
10	References	71

1 Introduction

This elite survey has been carried out as part of the data collection effort of the WZB bridging project “The Political Sociology of Cosmopolitanism and Communitarianism”. The purpose of the Bridging Project is to explore the way that globalization and denationalization have worked as a catalyst to socio-political restructuring of traditional cleavage structures at the national, supranational, and global levels as well as to explore how these foundational shifts vary within the nation-state context across multiple countries and for various types of actors including citizens, elites, parties, and the public sphere (De Wilde et al., forthcoming; Strijbis, Helmer, and De Wilde, 2018; Teney, Lacewell, and De Wilde, 2014; Zürn and De Wilde, 2016). The elite survey in particular has been used to analyze variance in preferences on a cosmopolitan vs. communitarian dimension between masses and elites (Strijbis, Teney, and Helbling, forthcoming) as well as within elites (Strijbis, forthcoming).

One of the key contributions of the project is to extend the analysis to cases outside the Western European nation states used by the Kriesi et al. (2012; 2008) project. Also important is the inclusion of two supranational cases: the European and the global levels. The case selection of the project is composed of democratic nation states that are dominant country in each of the following five regions: Western Europe (Germany), Central and Eastern Europe (Poland), Eurasia/Middle East (Turkey), Latin America (Mexico), and North America (USA). Therefore, the elite survey has been carried out in these five countries as well as at the European and global levels.

Moreover, the bridging project focuses on issues that are most likely to be contested by actors on a cosmopolitan/communitarian basis: regional integration (border crossing of authority), immigration (border crossing of people), human rights (border crossing of norms), climate change (border crossing of pollutants) and international trade (border crossing of goods). These issues are the primary focus of the empirical part of the bridging project and therefore of the elite survey questionnaire.

The aim of this survey that has been carried out among elites from 12 sectors of activity is to provide data that enables the analysis of the positions of elites at both the national (i.e., in Germany, Poland, Turkey, Mexico and the U.S.) and supranational (i.e., European and global) levels on the five aforementioned denationalization issues.

The design of the elite survey enables three different types of analysis. First, it enables the analysis of the positions taken by elites on the five denationalization issues and the extent to which these issues polarize elites across countries and sectors of activity. Second, the

questionnaire design of the elite survey allows the comparison of the elite survey data with mass survey data. This questionnaire design enables the assessment of the role of elites in this cosmopolitan-communitarian divide: do elites represent mass opinion in their position on denationalization issues or do we observe a gap between elite opinions and mass beliefs on the five contested issues? It has been indeed argued that cosmopolitanism is a construct of the elite western frequent travelers who benefit the most from the opening of national borders (Calhoun, 2002). The comparison of the data from the elite survey with the data from several existing mass surveys will assess the relevance of this claim for the five countries. Lastly, the data enable the assessment of a potential polarization of the elites along their level of activity: do global and European elites hold more cosmopolitan stances than their counterparts working within the nation state borders? In other words, does social transnationalization exert a polarizing function on denationalization issues among the elites? These three ambitious aims imply four main challenges for the questionnaire and elite sample designs:

- For the comparison of elites across countries, the samples for the five countries need to be similar
- For the comparison of the European and international elites with the respective national elites, the samples at the European and international levels need to correspond as far as possible to the sample for the five countries
- For the comparison of national elite positions with the ones of the general population on the five denationalization issues, the questionnaire has to contain as far as possible items that are identical to the ones of the mass surveys used in the analysis of citizens' attitudes
- For the comparison of the positions of the national elites with the ones of the European and international elites, the questionnaire for the European and international elites needs to be as similar as possible to the questionnaire for the national elites

In the following sections, we will first summarize the sample design of the survey for the seven cases. Next, we will present the questionnaire design. Third, we will describe the administration of the survey. Fourth, the response rates across sectors and cases will be presented.

2 Sample design: Including national, European and global elites within a single probability sampling framework

As a result of denationalization, labor markets and career perspectives are no longer contained within the state borders. Some scholars even claim that globalization is leading to the emergence of a global elite with its own class consciousness (Calhoun, 2002; Robinson & Harris, 2000; Sklair, 2001). Similarly, a European elite class is assumed to be on the rise with the deepening of the European Union integration (Fligstein, 2008). So far, representative studies on the emergence of a global and European elite class have focused on a limited type of elites, such as the European administrative and political elites or global business elites. Empirical evidence of a European and global elite class has thus remained sparse (Hoffmann-Lange, 2012). Further empirical studies that assess the existence of social cohesion and consensual positions among supranational elites are therefore strongly needed to push forward the debate on the emergence of a European and global elite with a supranational outlook.

In our elite survey, we developed a probability sampling methodology that expands previous sample designs of European and global elites to a broad range of sectors of activity. Moreover, our methodology enabled the application of the same probability sampling design at the global, European and national levels. In doing so, we applied the same positional approach to identify elites at the national, European and global levels: elites are defined as the persons holding the highest positions in the most influential organizations within societal sectors. The level attributed to an elite corresponds to the level in which his/her organization is active. We use thus an organizational perspective to distinguish between national, European and global elites. For instance, persons holding leading positions within the United Nations, within the European Parliament and within the national parliament are considered respectively as global, European and national elites for the political sector. In developing these representative samples, we strived to maximize the comparability of the sector-based samples across levels and to avoid overlaps between samples across levels. Our sample design allows both the comparison of elites at the same level across sectors and elites from the same sector across levels.

This section is structured as follows. First, we discuss the positional approach we applied for sampling elites quantitatively. Second, we present the strategy we used to transpose the sampling design at the European and global level. Lastly, we describe for each sector of activity the criteria used to define elites across countries and across levels.

2.1 Positional elite approach

The first challenge of an elite sample deals with the definition of the target population (Ecker, 1998). This definition choice is essential: depending on our understanding of elites, different sample methods can be used. We followed the positional approach that has been applied by nearly all major comprehensive studies of national elites to identify the target population (Hoffmann-Lange, 2007). Accordingly, elites are persons who possess the resources to influence important societal decisions (Hoffmann-Lange, 1992, p. 19). Such power resources are segmented across societal sectors because of the relative independence of functional subsystems (or sectors) in differentiated modern societies (Machatzke, 1997). Moreover, these power resources are institutionally organized in developed democratic industrial societies: they are available to the holders of the highest positions in the most important organizations¹ within societal sectors (Machatzke, 1997). This conceptualization of positional elites does not consider power as an individual attribute. Rather, it implies that these resources are only available to the persons as long as they hold the corresponding positions (Machatzke, 1997). Accordingly, elites are defined as “incumbents of leadership positions in powerful political institutions and private organizations who, by virtue of their control of intra-organizational power resources, are able to influence important (political) decisions” (Hoffmann-Lange, 2008, p. 53). The positional approach is thus based on an institutional definition of elites and of their power resources. This institutional conceptualization of elites provides a straightforward method to draw representative elite samples. Indeed, defining elites by the type of positions they hold enables to draw clear-cut, reliable and replicable criteria for identifying the target population to be sampled².

The positional elite approach implies two decisions for sampling elites at the national level: the horizontal and vertical delimitations (Hoffmann-Lange, 2007). First, positional elite samples need to be delimited vertically: since power is available to the highest positions in the most important organizations of societal sectors, the highest positions of the most important organizations are sampled, while positions lower in the organizations’ hierarchy as well as less

¹ For the sake of coherence, we use the generic term of “organizations” across all sectors, even if the term of “institutions” is more common for some sectors, such as the political sector.

² The positional approach is not the only available methodology to sample elites. For instance, the reputational approach is a two-steps sampling method. First, a sample of experts is asked to name the most influential and powerful persons within their sector of activity. In a second step, the mentioned persons are considered as reputational elites and included in the sample. In contrast to the positional method, this approach is highly time-consuming for a large range of sectors of activity and not replicable. Another approach is to consider major societal decision making and sample the most influential persons directly linked to the process of these decision-making. This decisional approach defines elites only in term of active and direct influence and does not consider indirect or informal influence on the process of decision making. By contrast, the positional approach includes both direct and indirect societal influences (Hoffmann-Lange, 1992).

influential organizations are excluded from the sample. This requires a two-steps procedure: first, one selects the highest organizations for each sector, and then one selects the highest positions within these organizations (Hoffmann-Lange, 1992, pp. 86-90). The selection of the most important organizations within a sector is based on a consistent criterion, such as sale volumes of companies or market share of newspapers (Machatzke, 1997). Once the most influential organizations have been selected, one samples elites by following a top-down strategy: first sampling the highest positions of the highest organizations within a sector, then going down in the positional hierarchical steps until the sample size is sufficient. Second, one needs to delimit the sample horizontally by sampling a range of societal sectors. Which sectors provide resources to the positional elites that allow them to influence important societal decision making? While positional elites in the political sector possess the direct resources to make important societal decisions, positional elites from other sectors of activity, such as economy, civil society or media hold resources to influence indirectly these decision makings (see Machatzke, 1997 for further details). In order to broaden the scope of previous European and global elite surveys, we opted for a broad understanding of influence and took into account societal sectors that provide not only direct, but also indirect influence on important decision-making. We therefore used as a starting point the sector-based sampling design of the Potsdam elite survey (Bürklin & Rebenstorf, 1997) which is the latest comprehensive elite survey with conventional survey research methods carried out in the tradition of the well-established German elite research field (Hoffmann-Lange, 2001). The Potsdam elite survey is composed of leaders working in 12 sectors of activity (i.e., administration, politics, economy and finance, professional associations, religion, media, civil society, research, labor union, justice, culture, military). The Potsdam elite survey constitutes the German elite sample with the broadest range of sectors of activity (see Bunselmeyer, Holland Cunz, & Dribbisch, 2013; Helbling & Teney, 2015; Teney & Helbling 2014, 2016 for a recent replication of the Potsdam elite survey focussing on core elites; see Ecker, 1998 for a comparison of sector-based elite surveys in Germany).

The strategy we adopted for sampling European and global elites is to transpose the sampling frame of the Potsdam elite survey to the European and global levels: we drew a representative sample of leaders working in these 12 sectors of activity (i.e., administration, politics, economy and finance, trade and professional associations, religion, media, civil society, research, labor union, justice, culture, police and military) at the European and global levels that matches the national sector-based sampling design as closely as possible. This sampling strategy enabled us to broaden the scope of previous European and global elite surveys by maximizing the range of sectors of activity. Moreover, we strived to sample national, European and global elites within

each sector based on similar selection criteria. This enables the comparison of positional elites within sectors across the three levels.

2.1.1 Combining the vertical, horizontal and cross-level delimitations

The theoretical idea of transposing the sector-based sampling design of the Potsdam elite survey to the European and global levels is straightforward. However, this cross-level sampling strategy raised various challenges from a practical perspective. Indeed, while defining the vertical and horizontal delimitations for sampling elites at the national level is intuitive, it becomes much less clear-cut once we consider elites at the European and global levels. Furthermore, the inclusion of global, European and national elites within the same sampling frame required us to consider a cross-level delimitation that is as consistent as possible across sectors.

We defined general rules for the vertical (i.e., number of highest organizations and highest positions to be sampled), horizontal (i.e., delimitation between sectors) and cross-level delimitations that can be applied for sampling each sector at each level. The first challenge concerns the cross-level delimitation: the global, European and national levels had to be defined in such a way as to avoid any overlap of sectors across the three levels. Moreover, while the national level has clear-cut boundaries defined by the borders of nation-states, the global and to a lesser extent the European levels have blurred boundaries. For instance, organizations that might be considered as being part of the global level (e.g., Anheuser-Busch InBev) are not necessarily present in every country around the world. Moreover, while some sectors –such as the political or administrative- have clearly defined borders at the European level (the European Union borders), other sectors such as the cultural or religious sectors at the European level go beyond the European Union borders. In order to determine the levels consistently across sectors, we drew general guidelines regarding the levels that apply to each sector. First, we applied an organizational approach to attribute a level to elites: the scope of organizations in which a person hold a leading position defines whether this person is considered as part of the national, European or global elite. Second, at the national level, we sampled the highest organizations with a national scope, leaving aside organizations with a subnational scope, even though such subnational organizations can be influential in federal nation-states. Sampling solely national organizations allows us to clearly define the upper and lower limits of the national level. Third, we expanded the institutional perspective of the positional approach to determine the limits of the European level. Indeed, the European Union is composed of legislative, executive and judiciary institutions that are similar to the ones of a nation state. We can thus consider the

borders of the European Union to determine the European level whenever possible. In other words, we sampled the most influential organizations with a European Union scope. However, this strategy is not applicable for every sector. If the scope of the most influential European organizations within a sector goes beyond the European Union borders, we relaxed our EU borders criterion for the entire sector and sampled the most influential European organizations within the sector, even if they did not meet our EU borders criterion. For the sake of clarity, we will use the term of “European Union” to define organizations that meet the EU borders criterion, while the term of “European” will be applied for European organizations that do not meet this criterion. Lastly, we sampled the most influential organizations with the largest scope at the global level. The scope of the most influential organizations varies across sectors at the global level: while some sectors –such as the administrative or political- have an effective global scope (e.g., UN bodies), the scope of other sectors is less global, because the scope of the most influential organizations of these sectors does not encompass all world countries. Our guidelines for the global level enabled us to strive to sample organizations as global as possible, depending on the characteristics of the sectors.

The second challenge of our sampling frame concerns the horizontal delimitation (i.e., delimitation between sectors). Some sectors have already clear-cut horizontal limits at the European and global levels, such as the political and administration European sectors with the European Parliament and the Commission or with the UN bodies. By contrast, defining other sectors at the European and global levels is less straightforward. Indeed, a European society is still on the making (Favell & Guiraudon, 2011) and several societal sectors are still at early stages of their European development (see for instance Hartmann, 2011 for the European business class; or Koopmans & Statham, 2010 for the European public sphere). Furthermore, while we can already find some evidence of a European society on the rise, the institutionalization of sectors at the global level is even less developed. Hence, the development of these sectors at the European and global levels is an on-going process. Even if challenging, mapping the horizontal borders of these sectors at the European and global levels is nevertheless highly relevant: it can indeed shed light on the existing and missing components for the rise of European and global societies. Moreover, the extent to which elites working at the European and global levels in these sectors perceive themselves as being part of a European or global elite is a question that can only be assessed empirically by the means of survey data. Sampling and surveying less institutionalized sectors at the European and global levels can therefore contribute to the academic debate on the emergence of European and global societies. The specific sampling strategy for every sector across the three levels will be detailed in the next section. Nevertheless, we describe in this section the general guidelines we followed. For the

horizontal delimitation, we strived to maximize the comparability of the sectors across levels. This means that we prioritized the comparability of the sectors across levels even if it implies some deviations from the sampling frame of the Potsdam elite survey. Moreover, we applied an institutional approach for the definition of the sectors across levels whenever it was possible: we favored sampling highly influential institutionalized organizations over highly influential organizations that lack an institutional structure. For instance, for the labor union sectors we sampled European and global labor union federations that have been officially recognized by respectively the European Commission and UN bodies as social partners. By contrast, we left out other supranational labor union federations that lack this institutional recognition.

Lastly, for the vertical delimitation (i.e., number of highest organizations and highest positions to be sampled) we decided against weighting the sample size of sectors. Indeed, weighting the sample size of sectors at the European and global level would have been hazardous given the little knowledge available on specific European and global sectors such as the cultural or religious ones. Rather, we used a similar sample size optimum for each sector ($n=300$). Only when it was not possible to sample 300 top elites for one sector (because of a too restricted number of influential organizations or because the required information was not available), did we reduce the sample size of the specific sector in order to avoid sampling persons holding lower positions than the sampled position of the other sectors. This strategy enabled us to maximize the comparability of positions across sectors.

2.1.2 Definition of the sectors across levels and countries

In this section, we present the criteria we used to delimit the sectors horizontally (i.e., between sectors) and across levels³. Moreover, in the tables summarizing the sample design per sector, we describe briefly the most influential organizations and positions within these organizations across the two supranational levels and the five countries and present the sample size for each case.

2.1.3 The political sector

We delimited the political sector horizontally by sampling positions with a decision-making function in the most important legislative and executive organizations. Positions with a decision-making function constitute a selection criterion that is consistent across levels. By

³ We will not discuss the vertical delimitation in this section, since the vertical delimitation is constant across sectors: we sampled the 300 highest positions among the mentioned most influential organizations within each sector at each level.

contrast, the selection of elected representative positions for the political sample would not have been applicable at the global level. With regard to the cross-level delimitation, the national level is composed of national legislative and executives organizations. The European level is constituted by the legislative and executive EU apparatus with an EU scope. For instance, we excluded the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities because of its non-European scope. Lastly, such a centralized political and administrative regime is missing at the global level. We therefore selected the most influential International Organizations (IO) with the largest scope whose functions partly reflect the functions of centralized political regimes, namely the UN (including bodies and funds), IMF, WTO and the World Bank. We considered these IO as “global state regimes” with a legislative, executive and judiciary apparatus for the entire sample. With regard to the political sector, the global level encompasses legislative and executive branches of the UN, IMF, WTO and the World Bank. For both the European and global levels, we only selected primary positions and excluded positions that are subsidiary to a national position, in order to minimize the overlaps between levels. For instance, we included the president of the European Council but excluded the national heads of state for the European political sector.

Table 1: Political sector: Organizations and positions by case

Case	Organizations	Positions	N
Global	UN, IMF, WTO, World Bank	Highest positions with decision-making function if they are not subsidiary to a national position.	298
European	EU legislature and executive organizations e.g.,: EU Parliament, European Council, Council of the EU, European Commission,	Highest positions with decision-making function if they are not subsidiary to a national position.	295
Germany	Federal government cabinet, Ältestenrat, Office of the President of the Bundestag, main political parties and political foundations	Ministers, members of boards of political parties, members	317
Poland	Sjem, Senat, government and	Deputies, senators, ministers,	298

	main political parties	members of boards of political parties	
Turkey	National Grand Assembly of Turkey	Deputies	540
USA	House of Representatives, Senate, cabinet, political parties, President, Vice President	Congressmen, congresswomen, senators, cabinet officers, President, Vice President, party leaders	302
Mexico	Federal congress	Senators and deputies	214

2.1.4 The administrative sector

The administrative sector is delimited horizontally by sampling organizations that prepare and implement legislations. In contrast to the political elites, administrative elites do not hold decision-making functions. We considered officials without any decision-making function working in government and ministries in the administrative sample. The cross-level delimitation is straightforward: we included national ministries for the national level; the major administrative bodies of the EU with an EU scope for the EU level and the main administrative bodies of the UN, IMF, WTO and World Bank for the global level.

Table 2: Administrative sector: Organizations and positions by case

Case	Organizations	Positions	N
Global	Main administrative bodies of the UN IMF, WTO and World Bank	Highest administrative positions if they are not subsidiary to a national position.	246
European	Major administrative bodies of the EU with a EU scope e.g., Directorates-Generals of the European Commission, European Agencies, European External Action Service, European Economic and Social Committee, Council of the European Union	Highest administrative positions if they are not subsidiary to a national position.	300

Germany	Federal ministries, Bundestag, Office of the Federal President, federal authorities	President, chairperson, operative and board directors	257
Poland	National ministries and central government agencies	Secretaries of the state, general directors and directors of official ministry departments	150
Turkey	National ministries	Highest administrative positions	412
USA	U.S. Departments (except Defense and Homeland Security), other agencies with status of cabinet-rank	Leading positions in the executive departments	300
Mexico	Federal ministries, office of the president	Sub secretaries, general directors and chief of units	130

2.1.5 The sector of justice

The sample for the sector of justice is composed of organizations that interpret and apply the law in the name of the state, the EU or IO. Within these organizations, we sampled judges and prosecutors.

Table 3: Sector of justice: Organizations and positions by case

Case	Organizations	Positions	N
Global	Courts with (quasi) global scope, (quasi) binding decisions and independent judges E.g., International Criminal Court, International Court of Justice, International Court for the Law of the Sea, ILO Tribunal, IMF Administrative Tribunal, World Bank Administrative Tribunal, UN Dispute Tribunal, UN Appeals Tribunal	President, vice president and judges	140
European	Courts with jurisdiction over the EU, i.e. the Court of Justice of the European Union which is divided composed of the Court of	President, vice president and judges	75

	Justice, the General Court and the Civil Service Tribunal.		
European extended	European Court of Human Rights	President, vice president and judges	49
Germany	Main federal courts (Ordinary Jurisdiction, Labor Jurisdiction, Administrative Jurisdiction, Social Jurisdiction, Financial Jurisdiction and Constitutional Court)	Presidents, vice presidents and judges	297
Poland	Main courts with national scope	Presidents, deputy presidents and judges	120
Turkey	Federal courts (constitutional court, supreme court, court of jurisdictional dispute)	Presidents, vice presidents, heads of department	131
USA	Supreme Court, Appellate Courts, U.S. District Courts	Associate justices, chief justices, judges	116
Mexico	Federal courts (supreme court of justice, electoral tribunal, circuit collegiate tribunals)	Presidents and prosecutors	82

With regard to the cross-level delimitation, we selected courts with a national jurisdiction for the national level. At the EU level, we only included courts with a jurisdiction over the EU. We therefore excluded the European Court of Human Rights from the EU sample, since its jurisdiction goes beyond the EU member states. Nevertheless, since the European Court of Human Rights is a very influential judicial institution, we included all judges from the ECHR in an extra sample. At the global level, we selected courts composed of independent judges with a jurisdiction at the global or quasi-global levels that issue (quasi) binding decisions.

2.1.6 The sector of military and police

The horizontal delimitation for the sector of military and police was done by sampling organizations authorized by the state, the EU or the UN to use force.

Table 4: Sector of military and police: Organizations and positions by case

Case	Organizations	Positions	N
Global	none	none	-
European	EU agencies that coordinate the military and police forces, i.e. EUROPOL, FRONTEX, European Defence Agency, Political and Security Committee, European Union Military Committee, Crisis Management and Planning Directorate, European Union Military Staff, Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability	Highest positions	165
Germany	Army, air force, marine, police	Admirals and generals, positions in the police with the highest salary level	171
Poland	Police headquarters, border guard headquarters, armed forces	Directors, deputies, generals, navy admirals	118
Turkey	Army, navy, marines, air force, coast guard, police, gendarmerie	Highest ranking positions	151
USA	Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, coast guard, Police	Highest ranking positions	203
Mexico	Military educational institution	Future generals	43 ¹

Note: ¹Convenience sample

At the national level, we sampled the military and police forces. At the European level, we considered EU agencies that coordinate the military and police forces. Since the member states of the European Union remain the main actors regarding the European foreign and security policy, the European agencies' main task is to coordinate and supervise cooperation in this policy field between the different member states. Nevertheless, these EU coordinating agencies have a significant impact on European military and police policies and measures and therefore possess crucial decision making influences. At the global level, we selected the Peacekeeping Department of the UN

2.1.7 The labor union sector

Following our institutional guideline to define the sectors horizontally at the three levels, we considered organizations representing the interests of workers and employees that are recognized as social partners by the national state, the European Union or by the UN (through either the International Labor Organization or the Economic and Social Council). Thus, at the national level, we selected the largest labor unions in terms of number of members. At the European and global levels, we sampled trade union organizations that can claim a high degree of either European or global representativeness in terms of their capacity to aggregate, articulate and advance employee interests vis-à-vis respectively the EU and the UN (Platzer & Müller, 2011, p. 20). For both the European and global levels, we only selected primary positions and excluded positions at the European or global level that are subsidiary to a national position, in order to minimize the overlaps between levels.

Table 5: Labor union sector: Organizations and positions by case

Case	Organizations	Positions	N
Global	Labor union organizations that are recognized as social partners by the International Labor Organization or the Economic and Social Council, i.e. member organizations of the Council of Global Unions and the World Federation of Trade Unions ²	Highest positions if they are not subsidiary to a national position.	258
European	Labor union organizations that are recognized as social partners by the European Union, i.e. the cross-sectorial European Trade Union Confederation, its affiliated member organizations; the 5 sectorial trade union organizations that are considered as social partners by the European Commission ¹	Highest positions if they are not subsidiary to a national position.	222
Germany	Largest national umbrella organization of trade unions	Members of the federal executive boards	209
Poland	The three centralized labor unions (Solidarnosc, OPZZ, FZZ)	All governing positions	118

Turkey	Three confederations in the private sector (DİSK, TÜRK-İş, HAK-İş) and three confederations in the public sector (KESK, KAMU-Sen, TÜRKİYE KAMU-Sen)	Directive boards, control commissions, boards of discipline	360
USA	Two largest national umbrella organization and their members	President, vice president, deputy	300
Mexico	National labor unions with the largest number of members (National union of teachers, national union for social security workers, national university workers union, confederation of Mexican workers, federation of unions of state workers)	General secretary, heads of committees and sections	62

¹ European Confederation of Independent Trade Unions, European Cockpit Association, European group of the International Federation of Actors, European group of the International Federation of Musicians and International Federation of Professional Footballers' Associations (see European Commission, 2013).

² See United Nations Economic and Social Council (2013)

2.1.8 The sector “Lobbyism”

Similarly to the labor union sector, we followed our institutional guideline to define horizontally the sector of trade and professional associations. Those are non-profit voluntary associations that represent the interests of occupational elites from various professions (Evan, 1974) and of different types of business and industry. For the national level, we included the largest trade and professional associations in terms of number of members. For the European level, we sampled the trade and professional associations with an EU scope that are registered in the European Union Encyclopedia and Directory 2011 (Europa Publications, 2010). At the global level, we selected the trade and professional associations that have a consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council. Here again we only considered non-subsidiary positions at the European and global levels in order to minimize the overlaps between levels.

Table 6: Sector “Lobbyism”: Organizations and positions by case

Case	Organizations	Positions	N
Global	Trade and professional associations with consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council	Highest positions if they are not subsidiary to a national position.	130
European	Trade and professional associations with a EU scope registered in the European Union Encyclopedia and Directory 2011	Highest positions if they are not subsidiary to a national position.	300
Germany	Members of the three largest national umbrella professional associations	Presidents and vice presidents	300
Poland	Main national professional and trade associations	Members of presiding body	87
Turkey	18 professional organizations that are defined as public professional organizations by law	Executive staff, inspection councils, discipline committees and committees of honored members and other relevant councils	357
USA	Main professional organizations	(Vice) Presidents, senior vice presidents, (vice) chairmen, CEOs/CFOs/COOs, (Secretary) treasurers, executive directors, secretaries, co-presidents,	298
Mexico	Professional and trade associations with a nationwide scope and involved in lobbying efforts with federal authorities (e.g., bar of lawyers, national accountant association, national association on lobbying professionals)	Presidents, board members, general directors	93

2.1.9 The finance and economy sector

The cross-level delimitation for the finance and economy sector is not straightforward. Indeed, corporations have their headquarters within a nation state. Therefore, the list of the largest world or European corporations entirely overlaps with the list of the largest national corporations. Moreover, with the exception of few corporations such as Airbus and Eurostar, very few companies have so far their headquarters in several European countries. Therefore, the delimitation of this sector across levels cannot be as clear-cut as for the other sectors. In order to avoid dropping out this sector from our sample, we decided to relax the rule of cross-level consistency in the delimitation of the sector. Indeed, the criterion we used for defining the most influential organizations at the European level differs from the criterion we used for identifying the most influential national and global organizations. For the global level, we used the 2012 list of the world's top 100 non-financial transnational corporations published by the UNCTAD (2013a). The transnationality index used by UNCTAD for its corporates ranking is calculated as the average of the following three ratios: foreign assets to total assets, foreign sales to total sales and foreign employment to total employment. This index measures the intensity of foreign activities in relation to domestic activities (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2007, p. 13). Moreover, we selected the top 50 financial transnational corporations published by the UNCTAD (2013b). This ranking of the largest financial transnational corporations is computed with the geographically spread index. This index is calculated as the square root of the Internationalization Index multiplied by the number of host countries. The Internationalization Index in turn is computed as the number of foreign affiliates divided by the number of all affiliates (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2009, p. 234). The ranking of the top 50 financial and top 100 non-financial transnational corporations published by the UNCTAD lists thus the most globalized (or “transnational”) world corporations and constitutes our finance and economic sample at the global level. At the national level, we selected the largest financial and non-financial corporations that are included in the national stock market indexes, as long as these corporations are not listed in the UNCTAD transnational corporation ranking. The use of the UNCTAD top transnational corporations list and the national stock market indexes for building the finance and economic sectors at the national and global level enabled us to delimit the national and global levels for these sectors in a meaningful way. However, we can't disentangle the European from the global levels by using corporations' transnationalization characteristics: the most Europeanized corporations also belong to the UNCTAD list of the top transnational corporations. Therefore, we decided to include the corporations' departments for EU public affairs that are registered in the European public affairs directory 2010 (Dod's European companion, 2010). Moreover, in

order to avoid any overlap across levels, we sampled the CEO's and Members of the Executive Committee for the national and global levels, and the heads of the departments for EU public affairs for the EU level.

Table 7: Finance and economy sector: Organizations and positions by case

Case	Organizations	Positions	N
Global	top 50 financial and top 100 non-financial transnational corporations published by the UNCTAD	CEO's and Members of the Executive Committee	386
European	Departments for EU public affairs of the corporations that are registered in the European public affairs directory 2010	Heads of the departments for EU public affairs	302
Germany	Companies listed in DAX and MDAX indexes if not sampled at global level	CEO, Members of the Executive Committee	285
Poland	Companies listed in the Polish stock market exchange if not sampled at global level	Members of boards	295
Turkey	Companies listed in the Turkish stock market exchange if not sampled at global level	Chairperson, Board Member, CEO/CFO, CEO Assistant	476
USA	Companies listed in the US stock market exchange if not sampled at global level	First and second highest ranked person within the company (mainly CEOs and CFOs)	300
Mexico	Companies listed in the Mexican stock market exchange if not sampled at global level	CEOs, CFOs, managers	52

2.1.10 The research sector

Similarly to the finance and economy sector, drawing clear-cut boundaries between the three levels for the research sector turned out to be a challenging task. Indeed, the world leading

universities are embedded in nation states. For instance, the use of ranking such as the Shanghai ranking would enable us to determine the most influential research organizations at either the global or the European level. However, this strategy would lead to huge overlaps in the research elite samples across the three levels. Moreover, sampling the highest ranked journals at the national, European and global levels would also have led to such overlaps between sectors. In order to avoid cross-level overlaps, we deviated from the sampling design of the Potsdam elite survey for delimiting horizontally the research sector. Instead of selecting universities and research funding agencies (see Machatzke, 1997 for further details on the research sample of the Potsdam elite survey), we opted for sampling the only existing research organizations with clear-cut national, European and international boundaries: the research associations and the journals they publish. Indeed, national, European and international associations exist for each scientific discipline. A research association is an organization that aims at promoting research and scientific knowledge within its own discipline. Moreover most of these research associations publish their own journals. The presidents of these associations and editors of their journals tend to be established and recognized researchers in their discipline. These positions can thus be considered as prestigious and influential. We therefore sampled national, European and international research associations as well as the journals they publish. In order to avoid any discipline bias in the selection of the scientific subdisciplines, we sampled the research associations and their journals of all subdisciplines funded by the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, 2012). Moreover, we weighted the sample in order to select an equivalent number of associations and journals from humanities, social sciences, life sciences, natural sciences and engineering sciences.

Table 8: Research sector: Organizations and positions by levels

Level	Organizations	Positions	N
Global	International research associations of subdisciplines in humanities, social sciences, life sciences, natural sciences and engineering sciences. The journals published by these research associations	Executive Committee Members of the international research associations, editors of the national scientific journals	300
European	European research associations of subdisciplines in humanities, social sciences, life sciences, natural sciences	Executive Committee Members of the European research associations, editors of the	299

	and engineering sciences. The journals published by these research associations	national scientific journals	
Germany	German research associations of subdisciplines in humanities, social sciences, life sciences, natural sciences and engineering sciences. The journals published by these research associations	Presidents and deputy of association and editors of journals	301
Poland	Polish research associations of subdisciplines in humanities, social sciences, life sciences, natural sciences and engineering sciences. The journals published by these research associations	Presidents of association and editors of journals	85
Turkey	Turkish research associations of subdisciplines in humanities, social sciences, life sciences, natural sciences and engineering sciences. The journals published by these research associations	Editors of the main scientific national magazines/journals that are listed in The Turkish Academic Network and Information Centre (ULAKBIM) of The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK), presidents and vice-presidents of the research or professional associations that publish the magazines	318
USA	US research associations of subdisciplines in humanities, social sciences, life sciences, natural sciences and engineering sciences. The journals published by these research associations	Directors of association and editors of journals	271
Mexico	Scientific journals and research associations that publish the journals	Editors of journals, presidents, vice-president and general	86

listed in the national council of science and technology index, weighted by discipline secretary of associations

2.1.11 The religious sector

At the national level, we sampled the religious denominations with the highest numbers of adherents. For each of these religious denominations, we selected the highest organizations that represent the adherents nationally. However, with the exception of the Catholic Church, most religions are not hierarchically structured beyond the national level. This means that we cannot apply the same sample criterion for the EU and global levels as the ones used at the national level. At the European level, national organizations from the same religious denominations have built European federations.

Table 9: Religious sector: Organizations and positions by case

Case	Organizations	Positions	N
Global	Global organizations of religious denominations with the largest number of adherents around the world e.g., Muslim World League, World Fellowship of Buddhists, Commission of the Churches of International Affairs	Highest positions if they are not subsidiary to a national position.	127
European	EU permanent missions of European religious federations	Highest positions if they are not subsidiary to a national position.	103
Germany	Catholic, Protestant Churches, Jewish and Muslim councils	Leading positions such as cardinals, bishops, presidents of council	140
Poland	Catholic and Christian orthodox churches	Head of Episcopate, bishops	150
Turkey	Ministry of Religious Affairs, Chambers attached to the ministry, Foundation for Religious Affairs in Turkey	Presidents and deputies, Muftis of the Turkish departments	322

USA	Religious bodies as they appear in the Religious Congregations & Membership Study (RCMS), Yearbook of American & Canadian Churches, additional groups from the study's advisory board and other experts in the field of US religious studies	Leading positions such as cardinals, bishops, presidents of council	294
Mexico	Catholic, Presbyterian and Pentecostal churches	Leading positions such as cardinals, bishops	138

Some of these European religious federations are official dialogue partners of the European Commission and therefore have a permanent mission to the EU (European Commission, 2010). However, these religious federations are not restricted to EU member states, but also comprise other European countries outside of the EU (such as Switzerland). While these religious federations are not necessarily limited to EU countries, they have nevertheless a EU scope in representing their followers to the European Commission. For the European level, we sampled the EU permanent missions of these European religious federations if they are present in at least two EU member states.

At the global level, we selected the religious denominations present in at least two countries with the largest number of adherents around the world. We sampled the global organizations of these “world religions” that aim at promoting the religion’s interests in general. These global religious organizations have a consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council (e.g., Muslim World League and World Muslim Congress) (United Nations Economic and Social Council, 2013). For the European and global levels, we only selected non-subsidiary positions to avoid cross-level overlaps.

2.1.12 The sector of civil society

Civil society can be defined as the intermediate realm between the private sphere, the market and the state, where particular and universal non-economic interests organize publically and interact with each other and the other sectors. We delimited the sample horizontally by focusing on "organized" civil society in form of interest groups that are non-state organizations (although potentially obtaining funding from state sources), not-for-profit and not directly business- or industry-related. Since trade unions and professional associations are separate sectors in our

sample, they were excluded from the civil society sample. Regarding the cross-level delimitation, we sampled registered civil society associations with a national scope. For the European level, we followed our institution-oriented guideline and sampled the eight umbrella organizations that consult with the EU, namely those composing the EU Civil Society Contact Group (EU Civil Society Contact Group, 2013). Those umbrella organizations are large rights- and value-based NGO's in the following sectors: culture, environment, education, development, human rights, public health, social and women. In a second step, we included all NGOs with an EU or European Office that are members of these umbrella organizations. Excluding NGOs without an EU or European office enabled us to avoid overlaps between on one hand the national and the European levels and on the other one between the European and global levels. At the European level, the sampled organizations have thus an EU scope but might be also active in European non-EU member countries. Within the sampled NGO's, we selected the staff with the highest non-subsiary positions working in the EU office. At the global level, we selected the civil society organizations that have a consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council (United Nations Economic and Social Council, 2013). Similarly to the European level, we then sampled the staff with the highest non-subsiary positions working in the international offices of these organizations.

Table 10: Sector of civil society: Organizations and positions by case

Case	Organizations	Positions	N
Global	Civil society organizations that have a consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council	Highest positions -if they are not subsidiary to a national position- in the international offices of the selected organizations	255
European	European civil society organizations member of the EU Civil Society Contact Group	Highest positions -if they are not subsidiary to a national position- in EU office of the selected organizations	285
Germany	National registered NGOs in the field of environment and animals, welfare, citizens and individual rights	Presidents and directors	294
Poland	NGOs with largest number of members	Members of head	150

Turkey	Registered NGOs in the field of civil rights, health, poverty, environment, education	Leaders of the executive staff	351
USA	Register by USAID (governmental development agency), which lists private voluntary organizations with headquarters in the US working on several issues including also learning, environment, sports	Highest position in the organization	325
Mexico	NGOs registered in the national directory of social organizations working in the fields of animal protection and environment, health, political action, education, poverty and social development.	Directors and presidents	98

2.1.13 The cultural sector

For the horizontal delimitation, we considered visual arts, film, theatre, literature and music as part of the cultural sector. This restrictive definition of the cultural sector avoids overlaps with other sectors such as the civil society. In order to delimit the cultural sector across levels, we applied an institutionalized approach and selected the most important events and associations/organizations of each cultural field at each level. These events and associations include: a) national, European and international awards, b) national, European and international festivals, c) national, European and international fairs and exhibitions, d) national, European and international associations. For each of these events and associations, we selected the leading organizational and artistic positions (e.g. award winners, jury members, presidents, executive directors).

Table 11: Cultural sector: Organizations and positions by case

Case	Organizations	Positions	N
Global	Main international awards,	Leading organizational and	283

	festivals, fairs, exhibitions and associations in visual arts, film, theatre, literature and music	artistic positions, recipients of awards	
European	Main European awards, festivals, fairs, exhibitions and associations in visual arts, film, theatre, literature and music	Leading organizational and artistic positions, recipients of awards	299
Germany	Main organizations and awards in visual arts, cinema, literature, music, and theatre such as, festivals, publishing houses or German exhibitions.	Recipients of awards, heads and boards of organizations	240
Poland	Main organizations and awards in cinema, literature, music, theatre and graphic arts, such as main state museums, publishing houses, art galleries	Recipients of awards, heads and boards of organizations	131
Turkey	Main organizations and awards in visual arts, cinema, literature, music, and theatre as well as Alevi organizations (since they are considered not as religious but as cultural organization by the state)	Leading organizational and artistic positions, recipients of awards	447
USA	Most important events or organizations in the categories visual arts/general arts, film, literature, music and theatre	Award winners, jury members, presidents, executive directors	321
Mexico	Main organizations in cinema, literature, music, theatre and graphic arts, such as main museums, Mexico City Philharmonic or national actors guild	Highest positions such as directory boards, honorary members,	60

2.1.14 The sector of media

We restricted this sector to news media, in order to avoid any overlaps with the cultural sector. We included print media (newspapers and newsmagazine), broadcast news (radio and television) as well as internet. At the national level, we sampled news media organizations (print, broadcast and internet) with the highest market share. For each news media organization, we selected the chief editor, editor and managing director. Moreover, we included laureates of national journalism awards. This sampling strategy cannot be applied at the European level, since with a few exceptions there are so far no European media (Koopmans & Statham, 2010). We therefore opted for an institutional approach and selected all European journalists with an EU accreditation. We also included the laureates of EU journalism awards. Similarly, we selected journalists with an UN accreditation for the global level. We also included the laureates of international journalism awards.

Table 12: Sector of media: Organizations and positions by case

Case	Organizations	Positions	N
Global	News media with an UN accreditation. International journalism awards	Journalists with UN accreditation. Laureates of international journalism awards.	208
European	News media from a EU country with an EU accreditation. EU journalism awards	Journalists with EU accreditation. Laureates of EU journalism awards.	307
Germany	National print, broadcast and internet news media with highest market share. National journalism awards.	Editors-in-chief, directors, recipients of journalism awards	250
Poland	National newspapers, magazines, radio-stations, TV stations, news websites with national coverage and highest market share; journalism awards	Editors-in-chief, directors, recipients of journalism awards	150
Turkey	National print, broadcast and internet news media with highest market share. National	Editors-in-chief, deputies, directors, recipients of journalism awards	341

	journalism awards.		
USA	Print, broadcast and internet news media with highest market share. National journalism awards.	Editors-in-chief, directors, recipients of journalism awards	201
Mexico	Newspapers, magazines, radio-stations, TV stations, news websites with national coverage and highest market share	Editors-in-chief, directors	68

2.1.15 Summary

After the detailed description of the sampling per country and sector we can provide an overview. This is done in Table 13, which summarizes the sample sizes for each sector across each case.

Table 13: Sample size per sector and case

Sector	DE	PO	TU	MX	US	EU	IN	TOTAL
Administration	257	150	412	130	300	300	246	1795
Church	140	150	322	138	294	103	127	1274
Civil Society	294	150	351	98	325	285	255	1758
Culture	240	131	447	60	321	299	283	1781
Business	285	295	476	52	300	302	386	2096
Justice	297	120	131	82	116	124	140	1010
Labor Unions	209	118	360	62	300	222	258	1529
Media	250	150	341	68	201	307	208	1525
Military	171	118	151	(43) ¹	203	165	0	851
Politics	317	298	540	214	302	295	298	2264
Lobbyism	300	87	357	93	298	300	130	1565
Research	301	85	318	86	271	299	300	1660
Total	3061	1852	4206	1126	3231	3001	2631	19108

Legend: DE=Germany, PO=Poland, TU=Turkey, MX=Mexico, US=United States, EU=Europe, IN=International

Notes: ¹Convenience sample

3 Questionnaire design

One of the purposes of the elite survey is to enable elite-mass attitudinal comparison on the five denationalization issues across the five countries. Therefore, most of the items asked in the elite survey are items that were administered in cross-national mass surveys. Because the only mass survey with a coverage of the five countries (World Value Survey (WVS)) does not contain items for each of the five issue areas, we selected items of additional mass surveys that cover less countries in order to encompass all five denationalization issues in the elite questionnaire. We included questions asked in the Transatlantic Trend Survey (TTS) that contains population data for four countries (Poland, Germany, Turkey and US). Moreover, for the regional integration issue, we split the countries according to the regions they belong to (i.e. Germany, Poland and Turkey VS Mexico and the US) and ask separate questions on regional integration relevant for these two regions. The most fine-grained items on the European integration are to be found in the Eurobarometer survey waves. Moreover, our three selected European countries are part of the Eurobarometer sample. We therefore included items from the Eurobarometer waves for the European integration for the Turkish, German, and Polish samples. We then adapted these questions on the EU to the Mexican and U.S. cases by replacing the EU with NAFTA and Europe with North America.

Moreover, for some questions such as the questions on transnational practices, we could not find any relevant items in existing cross-national mass surveys. Therefore, some of the questions of the elite survey cannot be matched to mass survey data.

With few exceptions, all selected items that are available in mass survey meet two criteria. First, they measure attitudes toward one of the five denationalization issues. Second, they are more or less normally distributed among both the general population of the sampled countries and among the highly educated respondents of the sampled countries. Items with a highly skewed distribution limit to a large extent in-depth statistical analysis. Indeed, if all respondents agree strongly on items (and thus if there is no variation in the answers of the respondents), it is not feasible to investigate determinants that affect attitudes on these non-varying items. We therefore strive to select items that are the most likely to be normally distributed among the elites.

A second purpose of the elite survey is to provide comparable attitudinal data for national, European and global elites. In order to fulfill this purpose, we strived to draw a questionnaire for the European and global samples that is as similar as possible to the questionnaire for the national elites. The questionnaire was translated from English into German, Polish, Spanish and Turkish for respectively the German, Polish, Mexican and Turkish samples by at least two

native speakers who cross-checked their translation. The questionnaire was administrated in English for the European and global cases and in the main national language for Germany, Poland, Mexico, the U.S. and Turkey. In the Codebook we list the baseline questionnaire items with remarks on their variations across the seven cases if applicable. Moreover, we mention the mass survey from which they are derived if applicable.

4 Questionnaire

General remarks:

- *For every question, a “no answer” category was included*
- *Remarks indicate if variables have been recoded or dropped after the data collection*
- *The different answer categories appear as different variables in the dataset (see “List of variables”)*
- *Questions with different options depending on filters appear as different variables and/or recoded single variables in the data set (see “List of variables”)*

Cntry (only for EU and INT): What is your nationality? (If you have more than one nationality, please select the nationality of the country in which you resided the longest)

Remarks:

- *Each of the following questionnaire items referring to a country was adapted to the country selected by the respondents of the European and international samples*
- *The variable has been recoded into “nationality”*

BLOCK 1: Democracy

a01 from World Value Survey 2006 v210-v213

To what extent do you personally feel you are... (to a great extent (1) – not at all (5))

1. A citizen of the town where you live
2. A citizen of the region where you live
3. A [national] citizen
4. A North American citizen (for MX, US + INT elites if they come from a North American country)
5. A Latin American citizen (for MX)
6. A European citizen (for PL, DE, TK, EU + INT elites if they come from a European country)

7. A citizen of the world

a02 from Eurobarometer 71.3 QE1

In your opinion, which of the following are the most important elements that make up a European identity (for DE, TK, PL, EU + INT elites if they come from Europe)/North American identity (for MX, US + INT elites if they come from North America)?

1. Common history
2. Geography
3. Democratic values
4. A high level of social protection
5. Common culture
6. Common religious heritage
7. Entrepreneurship

a03 from World Value Survey 2006 v148-v151

Here is a list of various types of political systems. We would like to know what you think about each as a way of governing this country. For each one, would you say it is a very good (1), fairly good (2), neither/nor (3), fairly bad (4) or very bad (5) way of governing this country?

1. Having a strong leader who does not have to bother with the legislature and elections
2. Having experts, not government, make decisions according to what they think is best for the country
3. Having the army rule
4. Having a democratic political system
5. Having religious leaders rule

a04 from World Value Survey 2006 v131-v147

How much you personally trust each of the following institutions? (completely trust (1) – no trust at all (5))

1. Justice/the legal system
2. Political parties
3. The [national] parliament
4. The European Union (for PL, DE, TK, EU and INT)
5. NAFTA (for MX, US and INT)
6. The United Nations

a05 from European Social Survey round 5, question B27

And on the whole, how satisfied are you with the way democracy works in...(extremely dissatisfied (1) – extremely satisfied (10))

1. [country] ?
2. The European Union? (for PL, DE, TK, EU)
3. The United Nations?

a06 from European Social Survey round 5

How important do you think it is for democracy in general that citizens have the final say on the most important political issues by voting on them directly in referendums?

Not at all important for democracy in general (0) – Extremely important for democracy in general (10)

a07 from World Value Survey 2006 V71

People sometimes talk about what the goals of [country] should be for the next ten years. Some of the goals to which different people give top priority are listed below. From this list would you please rank the most important and second most important goal for you personally?

1. Maintaining order in the nation
2. Giving people more say in important government decisions
3. Fighting rising prices
4. Protecting freedom of speech

a08

If you would like to tell us more about your opinion on the way democracy works [CNTnat] , at the regional level or at the international level, please, use the box below:

BLOCK 2: Human rights, development and humanitarian aid

b01 from Transatlantic Trend Survey 2008 Q25a (question also available for Mexico in *global view*)

Do you think it should or should not be the role of [country] to help establish democracy in other countries?

1. It should be the role of [country]
2. It should not be the role of [country]

b01EU *Extension of original question from Transatlantic Trend Survey 2008 Q25a*

Do you think it should or should not be the role of the European Union to help establish democracy in other countries? (for DE, TK, PL, EU and INT)

1. It should be the role of the European Union
2. It should not be the role of the European Union

b02 *Extension of original question from Transatlantic Trend Survey 2008 Q25a*

Do you think it should or should not be the role of the United Nations to help establish democracy in other countries?

1. It should be the role of the UN
2. It should not be the role of the UN

b03 No mass survey with a comparable item

During the 2000 Millennium Summit of the United Nations, 189 nations made a promise to free people from extreme poverty and multiple deprivations (the so-called Millennium Development Goals).

Some people say that [country] should do as much as it can to accelerate progress toward reaching these goals, even if other countries do less. Others say that [country] should do only as much as other countries. Which view is closer to your own?

1. We should do as much as we can, even if other countries do less
2. We should only do as much as other countries

b04 from World Value Survey 2006 V178

Thinking at your own country's problems, should [country]'s leaders give top priority to help reducing poverty in the world or should they give top priority to solving your own country's problems? 1 "top priority to help reducing poverty in the world" - 10 "top priority to solving my own country's problems."

b05

If you would like to tell us more about your opinion on development and humanitarian aid, please, use the box below

BLOCK 3: Regional and international integration

c01 from World Value Survey v179-v183 + extension to other policies based on Eurobarometer wave 74.2, question QA22-23:

Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations or regional organizations rather than by each national government separately. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the national governments. For each of the following issues, would you please tell us whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the state governments (1), by the national governments (2), jointly within the European Union [for DE, PL, TK, EU + INT elites from EU and EU candidate countries] / NAFTA [for MX, US and INT elite from Canada, Mexico or USA] / Regional organizations [for INT elites from non-EU and non-NAFTA countries] (3), or jointly at the international level within the United Nations (4)?

1. Peacekeeping
2. Protection of the environment
3. Aid to developing countries
4. Refugees
5. Human rights
6. Fighting climate change
7. Fighting crime
8. Taxation
9. Health care
10. Fighting unemployment
11. Immigration
12. Economic growth
13. Reform and supervision of the financial sector

c02 from Survey “Public opinion and foreign policy in US, China, India, Australia and South Korea” 2006 (Q700) and Global View 2010 (Q55)

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: "When dealing with common problems, the U.S. and Mexico should be more willing to make decisions jointly, even if this means that the U.S. will sometimes have to go along with a policy that is not its first choice." (strongly agree (1)- strongly disagree (5)) (for MX and US)

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: “When dealing with common problems, [country] and the other EU countries should be more willing to make decisions jointly, even if this means that [country] will sometimes have to go along with a policy that is not its first choice.” (strongly agree (1)- strongly disagree (5)) (for DE, PL and TK)

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: “When dealing with common problems, [country] and its neighboring countries should be more willing to make decisions jointly, even if this means that [country] will sometimes have to go along with a policy that is not its first choice.” (strongly agree (1)- strongly disagree (5)) (for INT and EU)

c03 from Eurobarometer 72.4

(for DE, PL, EU elites if they are from a EU country, INT elites if they are from a EU country)

Generally speaking, do you think that [country]’ s membership of the European Union is

1. A very good thing
2. A good thing
3. Neither good nor bad
4. A bad thing
5. A very bad thing

(for TK, EU elites if they are from a European non-EU country, INT elites if they are from a European non-EU country)

Generally speaking, do you think that [country]’ s membership of the European Union would be

1. A very good thing
2. A good thing
3. Neither good nor bad
4. A bad thing
5. A very bad thing

(for MX, US + INT elites from Canada, Mexico and US)

Generally speaking, do you think that [country]’ s membership of NAFTA is ...

1. A very good thing
2. A good thing
3. Neither good nor bad
4. A bad thing
5. A very bad thing

c04 from Eurobarometer 72.4

(for DE, PL, EU elites if they are from a EU country, INT elites if they are from a EU country)

Taking everything into account, would you say that [country] has, on balance, benefited or not benefited from being a member of the EU?

1. Strongly benefited
2. Benefited
3. neither nor
4. not benefited
5. not benefited at all

(for TK, EU elites if they are from a European non-EU country, INT elites if they are from a European non-EU country)

Taking everything into account, would you say that [country] would, on balance, benefit or would not benefit from being a member of the EU?

1. Would strongly benefit
2. Would benefit
3. neither nor
4. Would not benefit
5. Would not benefit at all

(for MX, US + INT elites from Canada, Mexico and US)

Taking everything into account, would you say that [country] has, on balance, benefited or not benefited from being a member of NAFTA

1. Strongly benefited
2. benefited
3. neither nor
4. not benefited
5. not benefited at all

c05 from Eurobarometer 72.4

(for DE, TK, PL, EU + INT elites if they are from a European country)

What does the EU mean to you personally? (multiple answers possible)

1. Peace
2. Economic prosperity
3. Democracy
4. Social protection
5. Freedom to travel, study and work anywhere in the EU

6. Cultural diversity
7. Stronger say in the world
8. Euro
9. Unemployment
10. Bureaucracy
11. Waste of money
12. Loss of our cultural identity
13. More crime
14. Not enough control at external borders
15. Other:

Remark: Answer on "Other" recoded into variable c05b

c05

If you would like to tell us more about your opinion on the process of regional and international integration, please, use the box below:

Remark: Recoded into variable c05b

BLOCK 4: Immigration

d01 from World Value Survey 2006 V124

Concerning people from other countries coming to [country] to work, how much do you strongly agree or disagree with the following statements? (1: strongly agree- 5: strongly disagree)

1. The government should let anyone come who wants to?
2. The government should let people come as long as there are jobs available?
3. The government should place strict limits on the number of foreigners who can come here?
4. The government should prohibit people coming here from other countries?

d02 from Transatlantic Trend Survey Immigration 2009 (Q9)

How important are the following in deciding whether or not immigrants should be admitted to [country] (1: very important- 5: not important at all)

1. Knowing the national language

2. Having a family member already in [country]
3. Having a job offer
4. Having a high level of education
5. Coming from a country with a similar religious heritage to [country]´s

d03 from World Value Survey 2006 v217-v220

How important should the following be as requirements for somebody seeking [national] citizenship? (1: very important- 5: not important at all)

1. Having ancestors from [country]
2. Being born on [country]´s soil
3. Adopting the customs of [country]
4. Abiding by [country]´s laws
5. Knowing the national language

d04 from World Value Survey v45

Please indicate your agreement with the following statement: „When jobs are scarce, employers should give priority to [nationals] over immigrants” (1: strongly agree- 5: strongly disagree)

d05

If you would like to add something about your views on immigration to [country], please, use the box below:

BLOCK 5: Globalization and trade

e01 No corresponding mass survey item

Do you think globalization is good, bad, or somewhere in between for the following? (1: very good- 5: very bad)

1. The [national] economy
2. [national] companies
3. Consumers
4. Creating jobs in [country]
5. The environment
6. Job security for [national] workers
7. Your own standard of living
8. The next generation of [nationals]

e02 No corresponding mass survey item

How much do you agree with the following statements? [strongly agree (1)- strongly disagree (5)]

1. Globalization is an opportunity for economic growth
2. Globalization increases social inequalities

e03 No corresponding mass survey item

What do you think foreign trade means to [country]? Do you see foreign trade more as: [strongly agree (1)- strongly disagree (5)]

1. An opportunity for economic growth through increased [national] exports
2. A threat to the economy because of foreign imports

e04a from Transnational Trend Survey 2009 (Q29_6)

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

“In times like these, it is important for [country] to remain open to international trade” (1: strongly agree- 5: strongly disagree)

e04b from Transnational Trend Survey 2009 (Q29_5)

“In times like these, we should buy more [national] goods and not worry about our economic partners” (1: agree strongly - 5: disagree strongly)

e04c from ISSP2003 (data available for PL, DE, US)

“[country] should limit the import of foreign products in order to protect our national economy” (1: strongly agree- 5: strongly disagree)

e05

If you would like to add something on globalization and/or international trade, please, use the box below:

BLOCK 6: Climate change

f01 from Transatlantic Trend Survey 2009 (Q26_1)

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement:

“Climate change is an unstoppable process, we cannot do anything about it” (1: strongly agree – 5: strongly disagree)

f02 from Transatlantic Trend Survey 2009 (Q28) (only asked if f01>2)

Some people say that we should do everything possible to fight climate change, even if it slows economic growth. Others say that we should do everything possible to maximize economic growth, even if it hurts efforts to combat climate change. Which view is closer to your own?

1. We should fight climate change even if it slows economic growth
2. We should maximize economic growth even if it hurts efforts to combat climate change

f03 from Transatlantic Trend Survey 2009 (Q27) (only asked if f01<2)

Some people say that the European countries (for DE, PL, EU) / [country] [for TK, US, MX, INT] should do as much as it can to fight climate change, even if other countries do less. Others say that the European countries (for DE, PL, EU) / [country] [for TK, US, MX, INT] should only do as much as other countries. Which view is closer to your own?

1. We should do as much as we can, even if other countries do less
2. We should only do as much as other countries do

f04

If you would like to add something on climate change and possible responses to climate change, please, use the box below:

BLOCK 7: Personal characteristics

g01

“In political matters people talk of “left” and “right.” On the scale shown below, where 1 indicates furthest left and 10 indicates furthest right, please choose the number which best describes your position.

g02

(for DE, PL, TR. MX. US)

We would like to know what you think about [national] political parties. Could you please rate each of the following parties on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means you strongly dislike that party and 10 means that you strongly like that party. If you haven't heard of a party or you feel you do not know enough about, just answer with "no answer".

- List of National parties

(For EU and INT)

We would like to know what you think about different types of political parties, sometimes referred to as ‘party families’. Could you rate each of the following party families on a scale from 1 to 10 where 1 indicates that you strongly dislike this type of party and 10 indicates that you strongly like this type of party. If you haven’t heard of a party type or you feel you do not know enough about it, just answer with "no answer".

1. The Agrarians
2. The Christian Democrats
3. The Communists
4. The Conservatives
5. The Greens/Ecologists
6. The Liberals
7. The Nationalists/Populists
8. The Social Democrats
9. The Socialists

g03

Which of the following sectors best fits your current position?

1. politics
2. Bureaucracy/Civil Service
3. military/police
4. justice
5. media
6. culture
7. civil society
8. church
9. research
10. economy
11. professional lobbyist
12. labor union
13. other:

Remark: Answer to option “other” recoded into variable g03a

g04

What is the name or title of your current position? (open question)

Remark: Dropped due to potential issues of confidentiality

g05

Are you...

1. Male
2. Female

Remark: Recoded with sampling information for all cases (including non-response) to “gender”

g06

Which has been the highest education degree you received?

1. None
2. Primary education diploma
3. High school diploma
4. Occupationally specific vocational certificate
5. Associate of Arts / Science degree
6. Bachelor’s degree
7. Master’s degree
8. Other post-graduate certificate
9. Doctorate

Remark: Based on country information the years of education was estimated and recoded into a variable “edyrs”

g07

What was your main study field? (only asked if g06>3)

1. Humanities
2. Social sciences
3. Natural sciences
4. Engineering
5. Computer sciences
6. Military sciences
7. Law
8. Economics/business
9. Other applied sciences
10. Other:

Remark: Answer to option “Other” recoded into variable g07a

g08

What is your current place of residence?

Remark: Recoded into a grouped variable "residence"

g09

Do you belong to a religion or religious denomination?

g09a

Which religion do you belong to? (only asked if g09==yes)

1. Christianity: Catholic
2. Christianity: Protestant
3. Christianity: Orthodox
4. Christianity: other
5. Jewish
6. Islam: Sunni
7. Islam: Shi'a
8. Islam: Alevite (only for TK, EU and INT)
9. Islam: other
10. Hindu
11. Buddhist
12. Other

Remark: Answer on "Other" recoded into variable g09aa

g10

Apart from weddings and funerals, about how often do you attend religious services nowadays?

(only asked if g09==yes)

1. More than once a week
2. Once a week
3. Once a month
4. Several times a year
5. Once a year
6. Less than once a year
7. Never, or practically never

g11

What is your year of birth?

Remark: Recoded into variable "age"

g12a

Were you born in [country of nationality]?

Remark: Recoded into variable "age"

g12a

In which country were you born?

g12b

When did you arrive in your current country of residence?

g13

How frequently do you have contact with friends living in a country outside of your current country of residence and of your country of birth? (By contact, we mean any kind of communication like phone, letter, email, social networking, or face to face):

1. At least once a day
2. At least once a week
3. At least once a month
4. Less than once a month

g14

In the context of your job, how frequently, do you have contact with organizations or people in countries other than your current country of residence? (By contact, we mean any kind of communication like phone, letter, email, social networking, or face to face):

1. At least once a day
2. At least once a week
3. At least once a month
4. Less than once a month

g15

Did you complete all or part of your schooling and/or studies in a country other than your current country of residence and/or than your country of birth? (if yes, in which country and for how long approximately)

Remark: Answer on “if yes, in which country and for how long approximately?” recoded into g15a

g16

Besides your schooling and studies, have you ever lived for at least 3 months in a country other than your current country of residence and/or than your country of birth? (yes-no) (if yes, in which countries did you spend the most time?)

Remark: Answer on “if yes, in which countries did you spend the most time?” recoded into g16a

g17

Approximately how much of your life has been spent living in a country that is not your current country of residence or your country of birth?

Remark: Recoded into variable “abroad”

5 Administration of the survey

We used a mixed-mode approach to contact elites for our survey. For the sampled persons whose emails were publicly available, we first contacted them with a personalized email containing a personalized link to the online questionnaire. The online version of the questionnaire has been set up with the free and open software Lime Survey. A pre-test was carried out with half of the Mexican and Polish samples in November 2013. The first wave of the online survey was conducted for all other samples simultaneously in March 2014.

We sent a personalized reminder per email a week after having sent the first email invitation. A few days after the reminder has been sent, we targeted the elites from the sectors showing the lowest response rates and contacted them by phone. We also tried to find alternative email addresses for those elites, whose addresses proved to be invalid. We concluded the email survey with a second reminder. In order to increase the response rate in this second reminder we

attached letters of recommendation from well-known scholars in the respective countries (see appendix).

Additionally to the email survey we conducted a postal survey. We collected postal addresses for targeted elites for which we were not able to find an email address, sectors and countries with many technical errors (e.g. "delivery failed" messages), and non-responding elites from countries and sectors with low response rates. In the invitation letter, we provided the elites with a link to access the online questionnaire, a print version of the questionnaire and a pre-paid envelope. The elites had thus the alternative to answer to the survey either by post or online. These invitation letters we are again accompanied by letters of support from well-known scholars. They were sent in late 2014 and early 2015.

6 Response rates and socio-demographics

6.1 Conceptualization and measurement of response rate

With regard to the conceptualization of our response/no response classification scheme we follow the Standard Definitions of The American Association for Public Opinion Research (2011).

For the responses and non-responses to our online (Internet) survey we created three main categories – returned questionnaires, eligible, no returned questionnaire, and unknown eligibility, no returned questionnaire:

1. Returned questionnaires (response): This category is subdivided into two groups: complete which means that a respondent has answered more than 80% of all applicable questions asked and partially complete which comprises all cases in which more than no and less than 80% of all questions asked were answered. This subgroup also includes break-offs.
2. Eligible, no returned questionnaire (non-response): This category refers to the recipients that were invited to participate in the Internet survey, whom we can assume are (still) eligible for inclusion in the survey and from whom no questionnaire was returned to us. Eligibility here means that only the named person is the appropriate respondent. It comprises the following subgroups:
 - Recipients from whom we received an automatic out of office reply
 - Recipients who logged in to the online survey and “opted out”, i.e. clicked on the button for final exclusion from the survey
 - Explicit refusals for recipients who sent us an e-mail stating that they do not want to participate in the survey

- Recipients whom we invited and for whom we were notified – mostly by another person working at the same institution – that this person has moved
 - Implicit refusals for recipients who logged in to the URL of the online survey with an ID, but did not answer any of the survey questions.
3. Unknown eligibility, no returned questionnaire (non-response): This group includes all cases in which no completed questionnaire was received and it is unknown whether the sampled respondent is (still) eligible for inclusion into the survey. It comprises the following subgroups:
- All cases in which it is unknown whether the e-mail invitation reached or could have reached the sampled respondent. This includes cases in which the invitation was never sent – e.g. because we were lacking an e-mail address for the sampled respondent – and cases in which no information about the outcome of the mailing ever reached us.
 - The second subgroup of this category includes all cases in which the invitation was not delivered, i.e. was returned undelivered. It comprises the cases in which we got automated replies stating that the e-mail address was not valid or non-existent or that the e-mail could not be delivered due to a temporary reason, e.g. when the mailbox of the recipient had exceeded its limit.

After the invitations to our Internet survey and two Email-reminders, we conducted a mail survey. In a first step this comprised all sampled respondents from the sectors politics and economy from all seven levels for whom we had a full postal address and from whom we had not received a reply to our Internet survey or whom we could not invite for the latter because we were lacking their e-mail address. In a second step the same logic was applied and we mailed invitations to sampled respondents from the sectors church, culture, justice, labor unions, media and professional lobbyists from the U.S.A., Turkey and Mexico. In all applicable cases the e-mail non-response codes were overwritten with the mail non-response codes. This applies to recipients of the relevant sectors and cases that were placed in the eligible, no returned questionnaire group after the finalization of the Internet survey and the coding of the non-responses, from whom we received an out of office reply and for whom we had a full postal address and who hence received an invitation to the mail survey. The same is true for everybody that we placed in the unknown eligibility, no returned questionnaire category.

The mail codes to responses and non-responses apply therefore to a) all cases in which a sampled respondent was invited by e-mail first, eventually placed in one of the above mentioned categories (eligible, no returned questionnaire or unknown eligibility, no returned questionnaire) and then invited by mail once more, given that we had obtained a full postal address for the person; and to b) all cases in which the sampled respondent could not be invited by e-mail,

because an e-mail address for that person could not be obtained and was thus solely invited by mail.

Parallel to the logic applied to the coding of responses to the Internet survey, we then coded as follows:

- Returned questionnaire (response): This category is subdivided into two groups: complete which means that a respondent has answered more than 80% of all applicable questions asked and partially complete which comprises all cases in which more than no and less than 80% of all questions asked were answered. This subgroup also includes break-offs.
- Eligible, no returned questionnaire (non-response): All sampled respondents to whom the non-response codes eligible, no returned questionnaire – out of office reply, unknown eligibility, no returned questionnaire (with all its subsets) for the Internet survey applied, who received a mail invitation to the survey; the following subgroups were formed:
 - cases in which the above-mentioned criteria apply and in which the letter/mailling was returned to us – opened or unopened – with a remark by the respective country’s postal service stating that the sampled respondent has moved from or left the institution
 - explicit refusals for recipients to whom the above-mentioned criteria apply and who sent us a letter stating that they do not want to participate in the survey.
- Unknown eligibility, no returned questionnaire (non-response): All sampled respondents to whom the non-response codes eligible, no returned questionnaire – out of office reply, unknown eligibility, no returned questionnaire (with all its subsets) for the Internet survey applied, who received a mail invitation to the survey; the following subgroups were formed:
 - All cases to whom the above-mentioned criteria apply and in which it is unknown whether the mail invitation reached or could have reached the sampled respondent. This includes cases in which the invitation was never sent⁴ – e.g. because we were unable to obtain a full postal address for the sampled respondent – and cases in which no information about the outcome of the mailing ever reached us, i.e. nothing was ever returned to us.
 - All cases to whom the above-mentioned criteria apply and in which the invitation was not delivered, i.e. was returned – opened or unopened -

⁴ Except for the cases in which also the invitation to the Internet survey could not be sent due to a not-obtained e-mail address. These individuals have been excluded from the data set.

undelivered by the respective postal service with a remark stating, without further clarification, that the mailing could not be delivered to the recipient.

6.2 Response rate, bias, and weights

The following three tables describe the response rate. Table 14 describes the absolute number of responses by level and sector. Table 15 describes the relative response rates by level and sector. Table 16 describes types of responses and non-responses by levels.

The low response rates may have caused sample bias. Bias can also have resulted from lack of information on email and postal addresses. However, because there is no information on the demographics of the narrowly defined target group, no post-stratification weights could be developed. Given the narrowly defined target group and the lack of information of the target group on a national level to assess potential selection bias, the data should not be treated as representative. However, the inclusion of the non-respondents with basic information (e.g. sector, level, and gender) in the dataset allows applying techniques to correct for selection bias.

Table 14: Absolute number of responses by level and sector

Sector								TOTA
	DE	PO	TU	MX	US	EU	IN	L
Administration	20	15	9	15	8	28	3	98
Church	15	26	23	4	39	11	16	134
Civil Society	45	38	31	8	16	31	16	185
Culture	31	21	14	3	18	40	17	144
Business	24	11	47	2	2	15	18	119
Justice	38	13	14	5	8	5	7	90
Labor Unions	22	14	44	6	19	25	31	161
Media	14	9	21	2	6	13	11	76
Military	10	11	3	(43) ¹	0	3	0	70
Politics	48	19	26	3	1	19	20	136
Lobbyism	25	12	38	10	20	17	12	134
Research	56	23	47	21	17	45	48	257
Total	348	212	317	122	154	252	199	1604

Legend: DE=Germany, PO=Poland, TU=Turkey, MX=Mexico, US=United States, EU=Europe, IN=International

Notes: ¹Convenience sample

Table 15: Response rate by level and sector in percentage

Sector	DE	PO	TU	MX	US	EU	IN	TOTAL
Administration	7.78	10	2.18	11.54	2.67	9.33	1.22	5.46
Church	10.71	17.33	7.14	2.9	13.27	10.68	12.6	10.52
Civil Society	15.31	25.33	8.83	8.16	4.92	10.88	6.27	10.52
Culture	12.92	16.03	3.13	5	5.61	13.38	6.01	8.09
Business	8.42	3.73	9.87	3.85	0.67	4.97	4.66	5.68
Justice	12.79	10.83	10.69	6.1	6.9	4.03	5	8.91
Labor Unions	10.53	11.86	12.22	9.68	6.33	11.26	12.02	10.53
Media	5.6	6	6.16	2.94	2.99	4.23	5.29	4.98
Military	5.85	9.32	1.99	(100) ¹	0	1.82	-	8.23
Politics	15.14	6.38	4.81	1.4	0.33	6.44	6.71	6.01
Lobbyism	8.33	13.79	10.64	10.75	6.71	5.67	9.23	8.56
Research	18.6	27.06	14.78	24.42	6.27	15.05	16	15.48
Total	11.37	11.45	7.54	10.83	4.77	8.4	7.56	8.39

Legend: DE=Germany, PO=Poland, TU=Turkey, MX=Mexico, US=United States, EU=Europe, IN=International

Notes: ¹Convenience sample

Table 16: Response rate by type and level in percentage

Type	DE	PO	TU	MX	US	EU	IN	TOTAL
complete	9.77	9.61	5.85	9.68	3.99	7.4	6.35	7.07
partially complete	1.6	1.84	1.69	1.15	0.77	1	1.22	1.33
non-response, eligible	5.49	2.48	1.45	1.15	2.29	5.24	2.32	3.04
non-response, unknown eligibility	83.13	86.07	91.01	88.01	92.94	86.36	90.11	88.57
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Legend: DE=Germany, PO=Poland, TU=Turkey, MX=Mexico, US=United States, EU=Europe, IN=International

6.3 Socio-demographics

The following three tables describe the respondents in terms of socio-demographics. Table 17 describes the sample and the respondents in terms of gender. This allows to assess whether the sample is biased in this respect. As the table shows there is no noteworthy gender bias in the data. Additionally, Table 18 describes the respondents in terms of age and Table 19 in terms of education.

Table 17: Distribution of gender in full sample and among respondents

Statistics	DE	PO	TU	MX	US	EU	IN	TOTAL
Sample	78%	73%	85%	79%	75%	69%	72%	76%
Respondents	77%	74%	86%	80%	75%	68%	76%	77%
N sample	3059	1442	4084	1024	3206	2954	2592	18361
N respondents	348	209	317	122	154	252	199	1601

Legend: DE=Germany, PO=Poland, TU=Turkey, MX=Mexico, US=United States, EU=Europe, IN=International

Table 18: Age

Statistics	DE	PO	TU	MX	US	EU	IN	TOTAL
Mean	53.7	51.7	51.8	50.9	57.0	51.8	55.6	53.1
Std. Dev.	9.4	12.5	9.8	10.4	11.1	10.0	10.5	10.5
Min	29	22	26	24	28	23	24	22
Max	80	78	75	80	91	78	80	91
N	284	173	262	109	118	205	165	1316

Legend: DE=Germany, PO=Poland, TU=Turkey, MX=Mexico, US=United States, EU=Europe, IN=International

Table 19: Highest educational degree in percentage

Highest educational degree	DE	PO	TU	MX	US	EU	IN	TOTAL
Elementary education	0.99	0	0.73	0	0	0	0	0.42
High School diploma	1.97	2.15	2.92	1.79	2.31	0.43	1.71	2.48
Occupationally specific vocational certificate	1.97	1.08	1.82	-	2.31	3.9	1.14	1.27
Associate of Arts / Science degree	5.92	2.69	5.47	-	2.31	0.43	0.57	3.05
Bachelor's degree	2.3	5.91	4.38	26.79	16.92	6.49	13.71	8.57
Master's degree	7.24	28.49	37.23	49.11	36.92	41.99	30.29	30.45
Other post-graduate certificate	39.8	27.42	20.44	0.89	7.69	13.85	13.14	20.82
Doctorate	39.8	32.26	27.01	21.43	31.54	32.9	39.43	32.93
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	304	186	274	112	130	231	175	1412

7 Data processing

7.1 Data entry, data cleaning, and recoding

The data processing consisted of several steps. Firstly, data from postal surveys was entered into the online mask. Second, wrong data entries were corrected if possible or recoded to missing if not enough information was available for correction. In the postal survey respondents could overview filters for some items. In cases that respondents answered questions they were not supposed to we deleted their answers. Secondly, system variables were recoded into meaningful categories and new variables were created on its basis (e.g. language variable). Third, additional variables were created for questions with identical questions and non-identical but comparable response categories. Fourth, the variables on the place of residence and time lived abroad were recoded into meaningful categories. In order to avoid problems of anonymity the more detailed original questions to these answers were removed from the dataset. Finally, we generated a standardized variable for levels of education.

7.2 Data collection problems

A number of problems arose during data collection. Some were due to problems of translation while others were result of the reproduction of the online survey in the postal form.

List of errors:

- Question g12 was asked in the European and global postal survey while it was intentionally left out in the European and global online survey.
- The paper questionnaire included a question for international elites with Latin American nationality, which did not exist in the online survey.
- In question g01 of the paper survey in the Mexican sample the value 1 is referred to as "extreme left" instead of "left" and the value 10 for "extreme right" instead of "right"
- A few completed postal surveys could not be used because the respondents ripped the first page with the token off.
- Paper questionnaire includes as response categories for a01_4 both North American and Latin American and European. For all respondents who did not provide information on their nationality, the answers to these response categories need to be ignored. (Some people replied to all three options.)
- a03 for Mexico: It was asked about "dictatorship" instead of "military rule".

8 List of variables

Variable name	Variable label
LEVEL	Sampled country or suprnational level
SECTOR	Sampled sector
completed	Share of the survey questions completed
id	Identification number
language	Language of questionnaire
reminder_f	Frequency of reminders sent
response	Type of (non)response
response_2	Response dummy
wave	Wave
a01_a	A citizen of the town where you live
a01_b	A citizen of the region where you live
a01_c	A [national] citizen
a01_d_all	A [regional] citizen
a01_d_eu	An European citizen
a01_d_la	A Latin American citizen
a01_d_na	A North American citizen
a01_e	A citizen of the world
a02_1_eu	Common history [European identity]
a02_1_la	Common history [Latin American identity]
a02_1_na	Common history [North American identity]
a02_1_re	Common history [regional identity]
a02_2_eu	Geography [European identity]
a02_2_la	Geography [Latin American identity]
a02_2_na	Geography [North American identity]
a02_2_re	Geography [regional identity]
a02_3_eu	Democratic values [European identity]
a02_3_la	Democratic values [Latin American identity]
a02_3_na	Democratic values [North American identity]
a02_3_re	Democratic values [regional identity]
a02_4_eu	A high level of social protection [European identity]
a02_4_la	A high level of social protection [Latin American identity]

a02_4_na	A high level of social protection [North American identity]
a02_4_re	A high level of social protection [regional identity]
a02_5_eu	Common culture [European identity]
a02_5_la	Common culture [Latin American identity]
a02_5_na	Common culture [North American identity]
a02_5_re	Common culture [regional identity]
a02_6_eu	Common religious heritage [European identity]
a02_6_la	Common religious heritage [Latin American identity]
a02_6_na	Common religious heritage [North American identity]
a02_6_re	Common religious heritage [regional identity]
a02_7_eu	Entrepreneurship [European identity]
a02_7_la	Entrepreneurship [Latin American identity]
a02_7_na	Entrepreneurship [North American identity]
a02_7_re	Entrepreneurship [regional identity]
a03_a	Evaluation policial system: Strong leader
a03_b	Evaluation policial system: Experts
a03_c	Evaluation policial system: Army rule
a03_d	Evaluation policial system: Deomcratic system
a03_e	Evaluation policial system: Religious leaders
a04_a	Trust: Justice/the legal system
a04_b	Trust: Political parties
a04_c	Trust: The [national] partliament
a04_d_eu	Trust: The European Union
a04_d_nafta	Trust: NAFTA
a04_e	Trust: The United Nations
a05_a	Satisfaction: [country]
a05_b	Satisfaction: The European Union
a05_c	Satisfaction: The United Nations
a06	Citizens final say in referendum
a07_1	[Rank 1] Most important goal
a07_2	[Rank 2] Most important goal
a07_3	[Rank 3] Most important goal

a07_4	[Rank 4] Most important goal
a08	Opinion on the way democracy works
abroad	Time spent abroad?
age	Age
b01	Role of your country to help establish democracy
b01EU	Role of EU to help establish democracy
b02	Role of United Nations to help establish democracy
b03	Millennium Development Goals: Country should do...
b04	Country's leaders give top priority to help reduce poverty in...
b05	Opinion on development and humanitarian aid
c01_a	Level of decision making: Peacekeeping
c01_b	Level of decision making: Protection of the environment
c01_c	Level of decision making: Aid to developing countries
c01_d	Level of decision making: Refugees
c01_e	Level of decision making: Human rights
c01_f	Level of decision making: Fighting climate change
c01_g	Level of decision making: Fighting crime
c01_h	Level of decision making: Taxation
c01_i	Level of decision making: Health care
c01_j	Level of decision making: Fighting unemployment
c01_k	Level of decision making: Immigration
c01_l	Level of decision making: Economic growth
c01_m	Level of decision making: Reform and supervision of the financial sector
c02	My country and its neighbouring countries should be more willing to make decisions jointly
c03	[Country]'s membership of the EU/NAFTA is/would be...
c04	[Country] has/would, on balance, benefit(ed) or not

	benefit(ed) from being a mem
c05_a	EU meaning: Peace
c05_b	EU meaning: Economic prosperity
c05_c	EU meaning: Democracy
c05_d	EU meaning: Social protection
c05_e	EU meaning: Freedom to travel, study and work anywhere in the EU
c05_f	EU meaning: Cultural diversity
c05_g	EU meaning: Stronger say in the world
c05_h	EU meaning: Euro
c05_i	EU meaning: Unemployment
c05_j	EU meaning: Bureaucracy
c05_k	EU meaning: Waste of money
c05_l	EU meaning: Loss of our cultural identity
c05_m	EU meaning: More crime
c05_n	EU meaning: Not enough control at external borders
c05_o	EU meaning: Other
c05b_new	Which? [c05_o]
c06	Immigration: Opinion on the process of regional and international integration
d01_a	Immigration: The government should let anyone come who wants to
d01_b	Immigration: The government should let people come as long as there are jobs available
d01_c	Immigration: The government should place strict limits on the number of foreigners who can co
d01_d	Immigration: The government should prohibit people coming here from other countries
d02_a	Admission: Knowing the national language
d02_b	Admission: Having family members already in your country
d02_c	Admission: Having a job offer
d02_d	Admission: Having a high level of education
d02_e	Admission: Coming from a country with a Christian

	heritage
d03_a	Citizenship: Having ancestors from your country
d03_b	Citizenship: Being born on the soil of your country
d03_c	Citizenship: Adopting the customs of your country
d03_d	Citizenship: Abiding by the laws of your country
d03_e	Citizenship: Knowing the national language
d04	When jobs are scarce, employers should give priority to nationals over immigrant
d05	Opion on immigration to your country
e01_a	Globalization: [Country's] economy
e01_b	Globalization: [Country's] companies
e01_c	Globalization: Consumers
e01_d	Globalization: Creating jobs in [country]
e01_e	Globalization: The environment
e01_f	Globalization: Job security of [country's] workers
e01_g	Globalization: Your own standard of living
e01_h	Globalization: The next generation of nationals
e02_a	Globalization is an opportunity for economic growth
e02_b	Globalization increases social inequalities
e03_a	Trade: An opportunity for economic growth through increased [country's] exports
e03_b	Trade: A threat to the [country's] economy because of foreign imports
e04_a	Open to international trade
e04_b	Should buy more [country's] goods and not worry about our economic partners
e04_c	Should limit the import of foreign products in order to protect our national economy
e05	Opinion about globalization and/or international trade
edyrs	Years of education
f01	Climate change is an unstoppable process and we

	cannot do anything about it
f02	Climate change vs. economic growth
f03	Fight climate as much as we can vs. as much as other countries
f04	Opinion on climate change and possible responses to it
g01	Left-right self-placement
g02DE_a	Sympathy AFD
g02DE_b	Sympathy B90/Die Grünen
g02DE_c	Sympathy CDU
g02DE_d	Sympathy CSU
g02DE_e	Sympathy Die Linke
g02DE_f	Sympathy Die Piraten
g02DE_g	Sympathy FDP
g02DE_h	Sympathy NPD
g02DE_i	Sympathy SPD
g02INT_EU_a	Sympathy Agrarians
g02INT_EU_b	Sympathy Christian Democrats
g02INT_EU_c	Sympathy Communists
g02INT_EU_d	Sympathy Conservatives
g02INT_EU_e	Sympathy Greens/Ecologists
g02INT_EU_f	Sympathy Liberals
g02INT_EU_g	Sympathy Nationalists/Populists
g02INT_EU_h	Sympathy Social Democrats
g02INT_EU_i	Sympathy Socialists
g02MX_a	Sympathy PANAL (Partido Nueva Alianza)
g02MX_b	Sympathy PAN (Partido Acción Nacional)
g02MX_c	Sympathy PVEM (Partido Verde Ecologista de México)
g02MX_d	Sympathy PRD (Partido de la Revolución Democrática)
g02MX_e	Sympathy PRI (Partido Revolucionario Institucional)
g02MX_f	Sympathy PT (Partido del Trabajo)
g02PL_a	Sympathy Kongres Nowej Prawicy (KNP)

g02PL_b	Sympathy Platforma Obywatelska RP (PO)
g02PL_c	Sympathy Polska Jest Najważniejsza (PJN)
g02PL_d	Sympathy Polska Partia Pracy - Sierpień 80 (PPP)
g02PL_e	Sympathy Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe (PSL)
g02PL_f	Sympathy Prawica RP
g02PL_g	Sympathy Prawo i Sprawiedliwość (PiS)
g02PL_h	Sympathy Ruch Palikota (RP)
g02PL_i	Sympathy Samoobrona
g02PL_j	Sympathy Demokratycznej (SLD)
g02TK_a	Sympathy Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi (AKP)
g02TK_b	Sympathy Büyük Birlik Partisi (BBP)
g02TK_c	Sympathy Barış ve Demokrasi Partisi (BDP)
g02TK_d	Sympathy Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (CHP)
g02TK_e	Sympathy Demokrat Parti (DP)
g02TK_f	Sympathy Demokratik Sol Parti (DSP)
g02TK_g	Sympathy Doğru Yol Partisi (DYP)
g02TK_h	Sympathy Halkların Demokratik Partisi (HDP)
g02TK_j	Sympathy Hak ve Eşitlik Partisi (HEPAR)
g02TK_k	Sympathy İşçi Partisi (İP)
g02TK_l	Sympathy Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi (MHP)
g02TK_m	Sympathy Saadet Partisi (SP)
g02TK_n	Sympathy Türkiye Komünist Partisi (TKP)
g02US_a	Sympathy Democratic Party
g02US_b	Sympathy Republican Party
g03	Which of the following sectors best fits your current position?
g03a	Which? [g03]
g06	Highest educational degree
g07	What was your main field of study?
g07a	Which? [g07]
g09	Do you belong to a religion or religious denomination?
g09a	Which religion do you belong to?
g09aa	Specify other religion [g09a]

g10	Apart from weddings and funerals, about how often do you attend religious services
g12	Were you born in [country of citizenship]?
g12a	In which country were you born?
g12b	When did you arrive in [country of citizenship]
g13	Contact abroad: Friends
g14	Contact abroad: Work
g15	Schooling/studies abroad
g15a	Which countries and for how long, approximately? [g15]
g16	Besides schooling/studies abroad
g16a	In which countries did you spend the most time?
gender	Gender
nationality	Nationality
region	Continental region
religion	Religion
residence	Place of residence

9 Public use conditions

Ownership of the data lies with the WZB Berlin Social Science Center (WZB), department Migration, Integration, Transnationalization.

In the course of 2019 the data will be made available for public use. Users have to agree to the terms of use. These include that they cannot forward the data to anyone. When using the International Elite Survey data for presentations, papers, thesis and publications, this Discussion Paper should always be cited.

10 References

- American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR). (2011). Standard Definitions Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys. Seventh Edition.
- Bunselmeyer, E., Holland Cunz, M., & Dribbisch, K. (2013). *Projektbericht "Entscheidungsträger in Deutschland: Werte und Einstellungen". Discussion Paper P 2013-001*. Berlin Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung.
- Bürklin, W., & Rebenstorf, H. (1997). *Eliten in Deutschland. Rekrutierung und Integration*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Calhoun, C. (2002). The Class Consciousness of Frequent Travelers: Toward a Critique of Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 101(4), 869-897.
- De Wilde, Pieter, Ruud Koopmans, Wolfgang Merkel, Oliver Strijbis, and Michael Zürn. forthcoming. *The Struggle over Borders. Cosmopolitanism and Communitarianism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. (2012). Kennzahlen zu öffentlich finanzierten Forschung in Deutschland Available from http://www.dfg.de/download/pdf/dfg_im_profil/evaluation_statistik/foerderatlas/dfg-foerderatlas_2012.pdf
- Dod's European companion (Ed.). (2010). *The European Union Public Affairs Directory: The Essential Guide to the Public Affairs Community in Brussels*. London: Dod's European companion.
- Ecker, M. (1998). *Die "Deutsch-Polnische Elitestudie". Konstruktion und Repräsentativität der deutschen Stichprobe. Discussion Paper P 98-305*. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung.
- EU Civil Society Contact Group. (2013). Members and Partners. Retrieved 20th of August 2013, from <http://www.act4europe.org/code/en/about.asp?Page=3&menuPage=3>
- Europa Publications. (2010). *The European Union Encyclopedia and Directory 2011*. London: Routledge.
- European Commission. (2010). Dialogue with Religions, Church and Humanisms. List of permanent missions and organizations. Retrieved 20th of August 2013, from http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/policy_advisers/archives/activities/dialogue_religions_humanisms/list_en.htm
- European Commission. (2013). List of European social partners' organisations consulted under Article 154 TFEU. Retrieved 19th August 2013, from <http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=2154&langId=en>
- Evan, W. M. (1974). Multinational Corporations and International Professional Associations. *Human Relations*, 27(6), 587-625.
- Favell, A., & Guiraudon, V. (2011). *Sociology of the European Union*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fligstein, N. (2008). *Euro-Clash. The EU, European Identity, and the Future of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hartmann, M. (2011). Internationalisation et spécificités nationales des élites économiques. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 190, 10-23.
- Helbling, M., & Teney, C. (2015). The cosmopolitan elite in Germany. Transnationalism and postmaterialism. *Global Networks*, 15(4), 446-468.

- Hoffmann-Lange, U. (1992). *Eliten, Macht und Konflikt in der Bundesrepublik*. Opladen: Leske+Budrich.
- Hoffmann-Lange, U. (2001). Elite research in Germany. *International Review of Sociology*, 11(2), 201-216.
- Hoffmann-Lange, U. (2007). Methods of Elite Research. In R. Dalton & H.-D. Klingemann (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political behavior* (pp. 911-927). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hoffmann-Lange, U. (2008). Studying elite vs mass opinion. In W. Donsbach & M. Traugott (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of public opinion research* (pp. 53-63). London.
- Hoffmann-Lange, U. (2012). Vertical and horizontal accountability of global elites: Some theoretical reflections and a preliminary research agenda. *Historical Social Research*, 37(1), 193-208.
- Koopmans, R., & Statham, P. (2010). *The making of a European public sphere. Media discourse and political contention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kriesi, H., Grande, E., Dolezal, M., Helbling, M., Hoeglinger, D., & Hutter, S. (2012). *Political Conflict in Western Europe*. Cambridge ; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Kriesi, H., Grande, E., Lachat, R., Dolezal, M., Bornschie, S., & Frey, T. (2008). *West European politics in the age of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Machatzke, J. (1997). Die Potsdamer Elitestudie. Positionsauswahl und Ausschöpfung. In W. Bürklin & H. Rebenstorf (Eds.), *Eliten in Deutschland* (pp. 35-68). Opladen: Leske+Budrich.
- Platzer, H.-W., & Müller, T. (2011). *Global and European Trade Union Federations: A Handbook and Analysis of Transnational Trade Union Organizations and Policies*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Robinson, W. I., & Harris, J. (2000). Towards a Global Ruling Class? Globalization and the Transnational Capitalist Class. *Science & Society*, 64(1), 11-54.
- Sklair, L. (2001). *The transnational capitalist class*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Strijbis, Oliver, Céline Teney, and Marc Helbling. (forthcoming). Why are elites more cosmopolitan than masses? In: Pieter De Wilde, Ruud Koopmans, Wolfgang Merkel, Oliver Strijbis, and Michael Zürn (Eds.): *The Struggle over Borders. Cosmopolitanism and Communitarianism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Strijbis, Oliver, Joshua Helmer, and Pieter De Wilde. (2018). A Cosmopolitan–Communitarian Cleavage around the World? Evidence from Ideological Polarization and Party-Voter Linkages.” *Acta Politica*, online first.
- Strijbis, Oliver. (forthcoming). Who is the most frequent traveller? The cosmopolitanism of national, European, and global elites. In: De Wilde, Pieter, Ruud Koopmans, Wolfgang Merkel, Oliver Strijbis, and Michael Zürn (Eds.): *The Struggle over Borders. Cosmopolitanism and Communitarianism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Teney, Céline, & Marc Helbling. (2014). How denationalization divides the elite and citizens. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 43(4), 258-271.
- Teney, Céline, & Marc Helbling. (2016). Solidarity between the elites and the masses in Germany. In K. Banting & W. Kymlicka (Eds), *The strains of commitment: The political sources of solidarity in diverse societies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Teney, Céline, Onawa Promise Lacewell, and Pieter De Wilde. (2014). Winners and Losers of Globalization in Europe: Attitudes and Ideologies. *European Political Science Review* 6 (04): 575–595. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755773913000246>.
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2007). *The Universe of the Largest Transnational Corporations*. New York and Geneva: United Nations.
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2009). *World investment report. Transnational corporations, agricultural production and development*. New York and Geneva: United Nations.
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2013a). Annex Table 28 - The world's top 100 non-financial TNCs, ranked by foreign assets, 2012. Retrieved 23.07.2013: <http://unctad.org/en/Pages/DIAE/World%20Investment%20Report/Annex-Tables.aspx>
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2013b). Annex Table 30 - The top 50 financial TNCs, ranked by Geographical Spread Index (GSI), 2012. Retrieved 23.07.2013: <http://unctad.org/en/Pages/DIAE/World%20Investment%20Report/Annex-Tables.aspx>
- United Nations Economic and Social Council. (2013). List of non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council as of 1 September 2012. *E/2011/INF/4* Retrieved 19th of August 2013, from <http://csonet.org/content/documents/E2012INF6.pdf>
- Zürn, Michael, and Pieter De Wilde. 2016. “Debating Globalization: Cosmopolitanism and Communitarianism as Political Ideologies.” *Journal of Political Ideologies* 21 (3): 280–301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2016.1207741>.