Bureaucratic autonomy of international organizations' secretariats (Michael W. Bauer, Jörn Ege) – Supplemental material

Appendix 1. Coding of indicators.

1. <i>Autonomy of will</i>
staff_hqratio: Ratio of staff (to total staff) working at international governmental organization (IGO) headquarters.
staff_homogen: Ratio of ten largest nationalities (in terms of staff) to total organizational personnel.
staff_mobility: Indicator takes into account the organizational rules governing internal mobility: 1: no mobility rules; 0.5: mobility is voluntary, but explicitly encouraged; 0: mobility is mandatory.
staff_permratio: The ratio of staff with open-ended contracts to total number of staff.
sg_internal: Share of Secretary-Generals (SGs) who previously worked as civil servants in the organization under consideration (only the last five SGs are considered).
research: The research capacity of the international bureaucracy is coded as follows: 1: existence of a research body at the <i>department</i> level (directly below the SG); 0.66: existence of two or more research bodies at the <i>division</i> level (two hierarchical levels below the SG); 0.33: existence of one research body at the <i>division</i> level (two hierarchical levels below the SG); 0: no research body at division level or above.
2. <i>Autonomy of action</i>
sg_agenda: The agenda-setting competences of the SG are coded as follows: 1: SG is responsible for preparation of the draft agenda, and items cannot be removed prior to the actual legislative meeting; 0.66: SG is responsible for preparation of the draft agenda, but items can be removed (through objection by a single member state [MS], or by decision of the executive body) prior to the actual meeting; 0.33: the executive body, not the SG, is responsible for preparation of the draft agenda, and items cannot be removed prior to the actual meeting;

0: the executive body, not the SG, is responsible for preparation of the draft agenda, and items can be removed prior to the actual meeting.

sanctioning: Sanctioning powers (see Brown 2010 for a similar measure):

1: autonomous capacity to impose sanctions (sanctions related to the failure to pay mandatory MS contributions are not included).

0.66: power to call for sanctions against non-compliant members;

0.33: denial of membership benefits (e.g., voting rights and IGO services);

0: only naming and shaming by issuing reports or admonitions;

staff_perpolicy: The size of human resources is coded as follows:

1: the organization employs 1,500 staff or more per policy field;

0.66: the organization employs between 1,000 and 1,499 staff per policy field;

0.33: the organization employs between 500 and 999 staff per policy field;

0: the organization employs fewer than 500 staff per policy field.

The number of policy fields is based on Hooghe and Marks 2015; the respective values are listed in Table 3.

income: Independence of financial resources:

1: self-financing;

0.5: mandatory contributions;

0: voluntary contributions.

In case an organization relies on several financial resources, we use the source providing the highest share of the budget. The budget of the OECD, for instance, consists of 70.3% mandatory contributions and 25.6 % voluntary contributions (with the rest coming from other sources). Thus, the organization is coded with 0.5, indicating that the majority of its revenues comes from mandatory contributions.

Appendix 2. Descriptive statistics of variables.

Variable name	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
staff_hqratio	15	.73	.29	.20	1
staff_homogen*	14	.54	.19	.35	1
staff_mobility	15	.72	.34	0	1
staff_permratio*	13	.31	.34	0	.93
sg_internal	15	.31	.33	0	.8
research	15	.55	.39	0	1
sg_agenda	15	.64	.34	0	1
sanctioning	15	.34	.36	0	1
staff_perpolicy	15	.42	.39	0	1
income	15	.6	.34	0	1

Source: Authors' calculations. *Note:* For the variables marked with an asterisk, we estimated the values for staff homogeneity for the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB: 0.68) and permanent contracts for the IDB (0.33) and the World Trade Organization (0.36) by considering the values of IGOs that are similar with regard to membership and staff size. For this procedure, the *impute* command in Stata 12.1 was used.

Appendix 3. Pairwise correlations of variables measuring autonomy of will.

	staff_hqratio	staff_homogen	staff_mobility	staff_permratio	sg_internal	research
staff_hqratio	1.0000					
staff_homogen	0.3479	1.0000				
staff_mobility	0.7090	0.5344	1.0000			
staff_permratio	0.5699	-0.0718	0.1831	1.0000		
sg_internal	-0.2743	-0.1492	-0.0717	-0.1197	1.0000	
research	0.0961	-0.5242	-0.0300	-0.0787	-0.2059	1.0000

Source: Authors' calculations. *Note:* Relevant values in bold. In the case of the four variables measuring administrative cohesion (staff_hqratio, staff_homogen, staff_mobility, staff_permratio), we used Cronbach's alpha instead of pairwise correlations. The substantial value of this measure ($\alpha = 0.71$) with no indication of reversed items suggests sufficient internal consistency.

Appendix 4. Pairwise correlations of variables measuring autonomy of action.

	sg_agenda	sanctioning	staff_perpolicy	income
sg_agenda	1.0000			
sanctioning	0.1607	1.0000		
staff_perpolicy	0.1921	0.2830	1.0000	
income	-0.2925	0.1363	0.1092	1.0000

Source: Authors' calculations. *Note:* Relevant values in bold.

Appendix 5. Pairwise correlations of the four dimensions.

	admincohe_score	admindiff_score	statpower_score	adminres_score
admincohe_score	1.0000			
admindiff_score	-0.2503	1.0000		
statpower_score	-0.1095	0.1055	1.0000	
adminres_score	0.1632	0.2262	0.1632	1.0000

Source: Authors' calculations. *Note:* Relevant values in bold.