**Online appendices:**

**Self-maintenance vs. goal attainment: drivers of mortality anxiety in organized civil society**

**Appendix A:**

**A.1 Supplementary information about case selection**

Table A1 classifies European and Anglo-Saxon democracies stable since WWII along three central macro characteristics – size, societal heterogeneity and multilevel structure – considered important for the formation and structure of membership organizations, their behavior and resource access. It shows that our democracies cover four of the five empirically relevant ‘macro configurations’.[[1]](#footnote-1)

Table A1. Macro characteristics of long-lived democracies and country selection for surveys

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Societal Structure** | **Big State** | **Small State** |
| **Federal** | *Socio-cultural Fractionalization* ***below*** *OECD Mean* | **Germany**  United States  Canada  Australia | Austria |
| *Socio-cultural Fractionalization* ***above*** *OECD Mean* | n/a | **Switzerland**  Belgium |
| **Unitary** | *Socio-cultural Fractionalization* ***below*** *OECD Mean* | **UK**  Italy  France | **Norway**  Finland  Iceland  Denmark  Sweden  New Zealand  Netherlands  Luxembourg  Ireland |
| *Socio-cultural Fractionalization* ***above*** *OECD Mean* | n/a | n/a |

**Note:** Democracies in **bold** selected for surveys. Socio-cultural fractionalization as proxy for societal heterogeneity based on 1985/2000 data by Patsiurko et al. (2012); Federal-unitary distinction based on Biela et al. (2013); distinction big vs. small states based on average population size (1990-2014) UN World Population Prospect 2015.

**A.2 Supplementary information on the representativeness of the surveys**

Regarding the distribution of groups and parties, the percentage of groups in the overall population of organizations is 98.6% and in our dataset it is 97.2%. The percentage of parties in the overall population is 1.3%, in our dataset 2.8%. We have tested if our groups’ survey data has a representative response regarding the representation of policy field in each country sample using the R-indicator (Schouten et al 2009). The respective R-indicators are: 0.94 for UK, 0.87 for Norway, 0.92 for Germany and 0.92 for Switzerland (the closer to 1, the more representative the sample). Regarding our party’ survey data, our data is widely representative concerning the proportion of parliamentary and extra-parliamentary parties and ideological coverage. The proportion of parliamentary parties in our sample is 26% while in the population is 20.7%. Meanwhile, all main party families are covered in all country-samples.

**Appendix B: Summary statistics and correlations table**

In Appendix B, we present detailed information about the dependent and independent variables used in our analysis. Starting with our dependent variable, we include information about the question used in the survey and about its distribution by country (Table B1). Regarding our independent variables, we include information about the questions used in the survey and the basic summary statistics for each one of the variables (Table B2-Table B19). In addition, we include a table of the correlation between our independent variables and a table of their variance inflation factor value to check for multicollinearity, which shows that our analyses do not present any problem of multicollinearity (Table B20 and Table B21).

Table B1. Distribution of proportions of “Mortality Anxiety” by country

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Question: Sometimes, the very existence of an organization is challenged, whether by internal or external forces. Within the next five years, would you estimate that your organization will face a serious challenge to its existence? | | | |
|  | Norway | UK | Germany | Switzerland |
| Very unlikely (%) | 19.82 | 20.83 | 21.33 | 16.51 |
| Unlikely (%) | 29.43 | 29.04 | 21.56 | 25.00 |
| Moderately likely (%) | 31.83 | 27.08 | 28.52 | 27.52 |
| Likely (%) | 14.71 | 13.41 | 19.63 | 20.44 |
| Very likely (%) | 4.20 | 9.64 | 8.96 | 10.53 |
| Observations | 333 | 768 | 1350 | 636 |

Table B2. Distribution of proportions of components of “State Funding”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question: Organizations get financial support from different sources. How relevant was each of the following funding sources for your organization back then? | | | |
|  | Observations | Important (%) | Very important (%) |
| Public funding from national government | 2774 | 7.97 | 18.46 |
| Public funding from the other levels of government (local, regional, EU, international) | 2747 | 7.03 | 9.10 |

Table B3. Distribution of proportions of components of “Private Donations”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question: Organizations get financial support from different sources. How relevant was each of the following funding sources for your organization back then? | | | |
|  | Observations | Important (%) | Very important (%) |
| Donations and gifts not from individuals | 2704 | 5.77 | 5.92 |
| Donations and gifts from individuals | 2861 | 9.65 | 12.79 |

Table B4. Summary statistics of “Organizational Maturity”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question: In what year was your organization founded? | | | |
| Mean | St. Deviation | Range | Observations |
| 52.76 | 41.40 | 0-554 | 3212 |

Table B5. Distribution of proportions of components of “Organizational Stability”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question: It is fairly common for organizations to make changes in order to enhance their survival prospects. Has your organization undertaken any of the following strategies in the past five years? | | | |
|  | Observations | Yes (%) | No (%) |
| We have narrowed or broadened the range of issues upon which we focus | 2986 | 63.93 | 36.07 |
| We have narrowed or broadened the constituency we claim to represent | 2970 | 37.81 | 62.19 |
| We have changed the mission or programme of our organization | 3004 | 22.50 | 77.50 |
| We have changed the services we offer | 3010 | 48.31 | 51.69 |
| We have changed the tactics we use to influence public policy | 2992 | 32.75 | 67.25 |

Table B6. Distribution of proportions of “Member Loyalty”

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question: How large was the membership five years ago compared to today? | | |
| Larger than current size  (%) | Approximately the same size as today (%) | Smaller than current size (%) |
| 23.98 | 39.19 | 36.82 |
| Observations 3248 | | |

Table B7. Distribution of proportions of “Member Involvement”

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question: Organizations vary in the degree to which members (or supporters) are involved in organizational activities (e.g., express opinions, contact organizational leaders, attend organizational functions, etc.). How about your organization’s members (or supporters)? | | | | |
| They are not at all involved (%) | They are slightly involved (%) | They are moderately involved (%) | They are very involved (%) | They are extremely involved (%) |
| 1.60 | 12.40 | 35.59 | 35.44 | 14.97 |
| Observations 3259 | | | | |

Table B8. Distribution of proportions of “Salience Challenge”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question: How important are the following challenges for the maintenance of your organization? | | | |
|  | Observations | Important (%) | Very important (%) |
| Changes in public opinion about the issues important to your organization | 2981 | 26.10 | 18.25 |

Table B9. Distribution of proportions of “Aggregation Challenge”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question: How important are the following challenges for the maintenance of your organization? | | | |
|  | Observations | Important (%) | Very important (%) |
| Individualization/ growing societal diversity | 2939 | 18.07 | 8.03 |

Table B10. Summary statistics of “Policy-oriented Staff”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question: How many of your paid staff (full-time equivalent) have a policy-oriented and/or political function, such as doing research, campaigning, monitoring policy processes, writing positions papers, etc.? | | | |
| Mean | St. Deviation | Range | Observations |
| 3.27 | 30.32 | 0-1000 | 2902 |

Table B11. Summary statistics of “Competition Density”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Mean | St. Deviation | Range | Observations |
| 897.96 | 663.25 | 1-1890 | 3265 |

Table B12. Distribution of proportions of “Resource Competition”

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question: Are there other organizations with broadly similar purposes or goals with whom your organization competes for new members, funds, government contracts or other key resources? | | |
| Observations | Yes (%) | No (%) |
| 3092 | 51.26 | 48.74 |

Table B13. Distribution of proportions of “Specialization”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question: The table below lists a range of activities organizations can engage in to exercise political influence. Please indicate which activities your organization engages in nowadays. | | | | | |
|  | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Very often |
| Contact reporters, write letters to the editor, issue press releases (%) | 14.17 | 19.55 | 32.50 | 23.17 | 10.61 |
| Paid advertisements in media outlets (%) | 63.51 | 21.54 | 10.43 | 3.21 | 1.30 |
| Arrange debates/hold press conferences (%) | 30.78 | 24.46 | 29.02 | 12.35 | 3.39 |
| Encourage members and others to contact decision-makers (%) | 15.98 | 19.89 | 36.17 | 22.68 | 5.27 |
| Participate in public consultations (%) | 15.74 | 16.89 | 33.36 | 24.73 | 9.29 |
| Contact government officials (e.g., ministers, members of parliament, civil servants) (%) | 17.10 | 18.45 | 30.89 | 24.50 | 9.06 |
| Publish analyses and research reports (%) | 29.38 | 23.00 | 27.88 | 14.39 | 5.35 |
| Legal direct action (e.g., authorized strikes) and public demonstrations (%) | 78.58 | 12.33 | 6.38 | 2.14 | 0.57 |
| Civil disobedience and illegal direct action (%) | 96.15 | 2.68 | 0.77 | 0.23 | 0.17 |
| Electoral and/or referenda campaigns (%) | 78.24 | 10.45 | 6.49 | 2.95 | 1.87 |
| Donations to political parties (%) | 96.71 | 1.85 | 0.81 | 0.44 | 0.20 |
| Cooperation with specific interest or advocacy group(s) (%) | 27.65 | 17.98 | 28.71 | 18.25 | 7.41 |
| Cooperation with a political party/parties (%) | 66.22 | 13.79 | 12.38 | 5.27 | 2.34 |

Table B14. Summary statistics of “Administrative Staff”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question: How many of your paid staff (full-time equivalent) have an administrative or internally oriented function such as recruiting, dealing with members, financial and budgetary activities, bureaucratic or managerial tasks? | | | |
| Mean | St. Deviation | Range | Observations |
| 9.90 | 191.92 | 0-10000 | 2900 |

Table B15. Distribution of proportions of “Membership Fees”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question: Organizations get financial support from different sources. How relevant was each of the following funding sources for your organization back then? | | | |
|  | Observations | Important (%) | Very important (%) |
| Membership subscriptions (corporate and/or individual members) | 3095 | 11.73 | 71.21 |

Table B16. Summary statistics of “Membership Size”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question: Considering the predominant type of members in your organization, what is currently the total membership? | | | |
| Mean | St. Deviation | Range | Observations |
| 14266.16 | 182307.1 | 0-6970000 | 3207 |

Table B17. Distribution of proportions of “Composition”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question: Some organizations have a membership that includes other organizations/associations. Some have individual members, or a mix of different types of members. Which statement best describes your organization? | |
|  | (%) |
| Membership is predominantly composed of organizations (e.g. firms, local authorities, etc.) | 23.56 |
| Membership is predominantly composed of individual citizens | 48.62 |
| Membership is predominantly composed of associations with individual members | 8.85 |
| Membership is predominantly composed of a mixture of individuals and organizations/associations | 18.98 |
| Observations | 3256 |

Table B18. Distribution of proportions of “Organizational Type”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question: Which one of the following categories best describes your organization? | |
|  | (%) |
| Political Party | 2.78 |
| Interest/advocacy group | 69.80 |
| Organization focused on service-provision | 27.42 |
| Observations | 3235 |

Table B19. Distribution of proportions of components of “Funding Diversity”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question: Organizations get financial support from different sources. How relevant was each of the following funding sources for your organization back then? | | | |
|  | Observations | Important (%) | Very important (%) |
| Membership subscriptions (corporate and/or individual members) | 3095 | 11.73 | 71.21 |
| Contributions by public office-holders | 2653 | 1.43 | 1.36 |
| Donations and gifts from individuals | 2861 | 9.65 | 12.79 |
| Donations and gifts not from individuals | 2704 | 5.77 | 5.92 |
| Public funding from national government | 2774 | 7.97 | 18.46 |
| Public funding from the other levels of government (local, regional, EU, international) | 2747 | 7.03 | 9.10 |
| Financial transfers from other units of your organization | 2764 | 7.53 | 8.50 |
| Other income generating activities such as services/sales to members, savings/investments etc. | 2878 | 13.72 | 18.21 |

Table B20. Correlations between the independent variables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | State Funding | Private Donations | Organizational Maturity (log) | Organizational Stability | Member Loyalty | Member Involvement | Salience Challenge | Aggregation Challenge | Policy-oriented Staff (log) |
| State Funding | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Private Donations | 0.12 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Organizational Maturity (log) | -0.03 | 0.01 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Organizational Stability | -0.11 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Member Loyalty | -0.01 | -0.06 | -0.19 | -0.10 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Member Involvement | 0.01 | -0.04 | 0.03 | -0.12 | 0.09 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Salience Challenge | 0.10 | 0.08 | -0.02 | -0.20 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 1 |  |  |
| Aggregation Challenge | 0.14 | 0.11 | 0.09 | -0.16 | -0.10 | 0.02 | 0.21 | 1 |  |
| Policy-oriented Staff (log) | 0.12 | -0.01 | 0.10 | -0.24 | 0.07 | 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.09 | 1 |
| Competition Density (log) | -0.15 | -0.21 | 0.11 | -0.02 | -0.04 | 0.10 | -0.05 | -0.05 | 0.01 |
| Resource Competition | 0.13 | 0.06 | 0.01 | -0.18 | -0.03 | -0.02 | 0.18 | 0.15 | 0.12 |
| Specialization | 0.12 | 0.04 | -0.02 | -0.31 | 0.10 | 0.23 | 0.26 | 0.14 | 0.51 |
| Administrative Staff (log) | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.22 | -0.27 | 0.05 | 0.16 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.63 |
| Membership Fees | -0.28 | -0.04 | 0.09 | 0.08 | -0.06 | 0.02 | -0.02 | -0.04 | -0.06 |
| Membership Size (log) | 0.01 | 0.13 | 0.25 | -0.07 | 0.01 | -0.09 | 0.08 | 0.15 | 0.16 |
| Composition | 0.02 | 0.16 | -0.03 | 0.15 | 0.01 | -0.29 | -0.01 | 0.11 | -0.18 |
| Organizational Type | 0.07 | -0.03 | 0.10 | -0.04 | -0.01 | -0.03 | -0.04 | 0.00 | -0.02 |
| Country | -0.02 | 0.04 | 0.12 | -0.12 | -0.02 | 0.19 | -0.03 | 0.15 | 0.00 |

Table B20. Correlations between the independent variables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Competition Density (log) | Resource Competition | Specialization | Administrative Staff (log) | Membership Fees | Membership Size (log) | Composition | Organizational Type | Country |
| Competition Density (log) | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resource Competition | -0.07 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specialization | -0.02 | 0.12 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative Staff (log) | 0.06 | 0.17 | 0.33 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Membership Fees | 0.19 | -0.06 | -0.02 | -0.13 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Membership Size (log) | -0.09 | 0.13 | 0.10 | 0.32 | 0.14 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Composition | -0.14 | 0.07 | -0.15 | -0.14 | -0.03 | 0.33 | 1 |  |  |
| Organizational Type | 0.21 | 0.05 | -0.13 | 0.18 | -0.09 | -0.04 | -0.10 | 1 |  |
| Country | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.04 | -0.01 | -0.10 | 0.01 | 1 |

Table B21. Variance inflation factors (VIF)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | VIF |
| State Funding | 1.16 |
| Private Donations | 1.11 |
| Organizational Maturity (log) | 1.20 |
| Organizational Stability | 1.24 |
| Member Loyalty | 1.09 |
| Member Involvement | 1.20 |
| Salience Challenge | 1.16 |
| Aggregation Challenge | 1.17 |
| Policy-oriented Staff (log) | 2.07 |
| Competition Density (log) | 1.20 |
| Resource Competition | 1.11 |
| Specialization | 1.57 |
| Administrative Staff (log) | 2.16 |
| Membership Fees | 1.21 |
| Membership Size (log) | 1.52 |
| Composition | 1.39 |
| Organizational type | 1.18 |
| Country | 1.11 |

**Appendix C: Robustness checks**

In Appendix C, we show the results of the different robustness checks we performed. First, we have run our main model with multiple imputations following King et al. (2001) via the Amelia package in R (Honaker et al. 2011), increasing the number of observations from 2105 to 3265. This model shows that the main findings obtained with list-wise deletion remain the same (see Table 3 in the article). More importantly, the fact that most of the findings remain in both types of analyses highlights that our missing cases are indeed missing at random.

Second, we have run our model without those values considered as outliers (values higher than three standard deviations from the mean) and the main results remain the same.

Third, we have run the model by each country separately and most of the main results are reproduced in the majority of the countries, substantiating that our main results are not driven by a particular country setting.

Fourth, in order to assess the relevance of different resource dependencies for organizations, we have also run our model controlling for the possible implications of funding diversity. We have included an additive index capturing the relevance of different funding sources for organizations measured on a five-point Likert scale indicating its importance. Each item has been coded as 1 when an income source was rated as “important” or “very important” and has a range from 0 to 8 (see table B19 in Appendix B for information on the survey items used). As table C4 shows, not only this variable is not significant but our results remain the same.

Finally, we have performed a robustness check including a new variable to assess how the relationship between specialization and exposure to resource competition might affect mortality anxiety. Our results do not support such relationship and, importantly, our main findings are not altered by it either.

Table C1. Ordered logistic regression model after multiple imputation for mortality anxiety

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Full model** | |
| *External Resource Dependencies* | Coefficient | Std. errors |
| State Funding | 0.082 | 0.067 |
| Private Donations | 0.149† | 0.080 |
| *Intra-organizational Resilience* | | |
| Organizational Maturity (log) | -0.190\*\*\* | 0.041 |
| Organizational Stability | -0.165\*\*\* | 0.029 |
| Member Loyalty | -0.510\*\*\* | 0.045 |
| Member Involvement | -0.178\*\*\* | 0.038 |
| *External Representation Challenges* | | |
| Salience Challenge | 0.409\*\*\* | 0.074 |
| Aggregation Challenge | 0.428\*\*\* | 0.086 |
| *Intra-organizational Policy/ Political Capacity* | | |
| Policy-oriented Staff (log) | -0.137\* | 0.063 |
| *Control Variables* | | |
| Competition Density (log) | 0.022 | 0.042 |
| Resource Competition | 0.361\*\*\* | 0.071 |
| Specialization | 0.008 | 0.020 |
| Administrative Staff (log) | 0.012 | 0.053 |
| Membership Fees | -0.027 | 0.095 |
| Membership Size (log) | -0.111\*\*\* | 0.020 |
| Composition | 0.045 | 0.081 |
| Interest Group (vs. Party) | -0.136 | 0.277 |
| Service-oriented org. (vs. Party) | -0.263 | 0.279 |
| UK (vs. Norway) | 0.242† | 0.130 |
| Germany (vs. Norway) | 0.265\* | 0.125 |
| Switzerland (vs. Norway) | 0.468\*\*\* | 0.127 |
| Cut 1 | -2.455 | 0.318 |
| Cut 2 | -1.179 | 0.314 |
| Cut 3 | 0.151 | 0.314 |
| Cut 4 | 1.540 | 0.313 |
| N | 3265 | |
| †p<0.1, \*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001  Logistic coefficients reported | | |

Table C2. Ordered logistic regression model for mortality anxiety without outliers

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Full model** | |
| *External Resource Dependencies* | Coefficient | Std. errors |
| State Funding | 0.074 | 0.064 |
| Private Donations | 0.147 | 0.099 |
| *Intra-organizational Resilience* | | |
| Organizational Maturity (log) | -0.250\*\*\* | 0.053 |
| Organizational Stability | -0.179\*\*\* | 0.030 |
| Member Loyalty | -0.529\*\*\* | 0.056 |
| Member Involvement | -0.160\*\*\* | 0.048 |
| *External Representation Challenges* | | |
| Salience Challenge | 0.380\*\*\* | 0.086 |
| Aggregation Challenge | 0.421\*\*\* | 0.097 |
| *Intra-organizational Policy/ Political Capacity* | | |
| Policy-oriented Staff (log) | -0.179\* | 0.075 |
| *Control Variables* | | |
| Competition Density (log) | 0.043 | 0.046 |
| Resource Competition | 0.428\*\*\* | 0.084 |
| Specialization | 0.028 | 0.023 |
| Administrative Staff (log) | -0.024 | 0.065 |
| Membership Fees | -0.119 | 0.116 |
| Membership Size (log) | -0.100\*\*\* | 0.023 |
| Composition | 0.064 | 0.101 |
| Interest Group (vs. Party) | -0.472 | 0.370 |
| Service-oriented org. (vs. Party) | -0.665† | 0.377 |
| UK (vs. Norway) | 0.223 | 0.162 |
| Germany (vs. Norway) | 0.344\* | 0.154 |
| Switzerland (vs. Norway) | 0.524\*\*\* | 0.156 |
| Cut 1 | -2.845 | 0.414 |
| Cut 2 | -1.507 | 0.412 |
| Cut 3 | -0.140 | 0.410 |
| Cut 4 | 1.316 | 0.413 |
| N | 2062 | |
| †p<0.1, \*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001  Logistic coefficients reported | | |

Table C3. Ordered logistic regression model for mortality anxiety by country

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Norway** | | **United Kingdom** | | **Germany** | | **Switzerland** | |
| *External Resource Dependencies* | B | Std. errors | B | Std. errors | B | Std. errors | B | Std. errors |
| State Funding | 0.423\* | 0.197 | 0.081 | 0.164 | -0.026 | 0.090 | 0.092 | 0.144 |
| Private Donations | 0.565 | 0.362 | 0.149 | 0.212 | 0.271† | 0.145 | -0.033 | 0.211 |
| *Intra-organizational Resilience* | | | | | | | | |
| Organizational Maturity (log) | -0.109 | 0.153 | -0.368\*\*\* | 0.113 | -0.249\*\* | 0.080 | -0.107 | 0.108 |
| Organizational Stability | 0.044 | 0.100 | -0.218\*\*\* | 0.064 | -0.129\*\* | 0.046 | -0.289\*\*\* | 0.063 |
| Member Loyalty | -0.604\*\*\* | 0.174 | -0.629\*\*\* | 0.107 | -0.395\*\*\* | 0.089 | -0.564\*\*\* | 0.124 |
| Member Involvement | -0.183 | 0.144 | -0.042 | 0.091 | -0.194\*\* | 0.075 | -0.234\* | 0.109 |
| *External Representation Challenges* | | | | | | | | |
| Salience Challenge | 0.757\* | 0.299 | 0.463\*\* | 0.180 | 0.304\* | 0.126 | 0.257 | 0.187 |
| Aggregation Challenge | 0.822\* | 0.370 | 0.687\*\*\* | 0.230 | 0.308\* | 0.135 | 0.420\* | 0.206 |
| *Intra-organizational Policy/ Political Capacity* | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy-oriented Staff (log) | -0.588\* | 0.262 | -0.382\* | 0.181 | -0.051 | 0.093 | -0.294† | 0.165 |
| *Control Variables* | | | | | | | | |
| Competition Density (log) | 0.261 | 0.168 | -0.068 | 0.100 | 0.115 | 0.072 | -0.020 | 0.085 |
| Resource Competition | 1.100\*\*\* | 0.292 | 0.351\* | 0.172 | 0.422\*\*\* | 0.126 | 0.274 | 0.184 |
| Specialization | -0.033 | 0.078 | 0.020 | 0.054 | 0.044 | 0.034 | 0.031 | 0.048 |
| Administrative Staff (log) | 0.273 | 0.244 | 0.088 | 0.145 | -0.122 | 0.084 | 0.051 | 0.128 |
| Membership Fees | -0.640\* | 0.302 | 0.268 | 0.267 | -0.167 | 0.177 | 0.045 | 0.264 |
| Membership Size (log) | -0.177† | 0.092 | -0.147\* | 0.061 | -0.106\*\*\* | 0.031 | -0.059 | 0.048 |
| Composition | -0.327 | 0.373 | -0.019 | 0.231 | -0.026 | 0.144\* | 0.417\* | 0.211 |
| Interest Group (vs. Party) | -1.515 | 1.043 | 0.579 | 0.803 | -0.954 | 0.923 | -0.628 | 0.617 |
| Service-oriented org. (vs. Party) | -2.188\* | 1.062 | 0.174 | 0.818 | -0.850 | 0.929 | -0.833 | 0.640 |
| Cut 1 | -3.674 | 1.180 | -2.997 | 0.776 | -3.341 | 0.967 | -3.024 | 0.809 |
| Cut 2 | -1.917 | 1.168 | -1.390 | 0.770 | -2.232 | 0.965 | -1.568 | 0.799 |
| Cut 3 | -0.171 | 1.157 | -0.051 | 0.767 | -0.926 | 0.961 | -0.131 | 0.798 |
| Cut 4 | 1.702 | 1.182 | 1.222 | 0.772 | 0.602 | 0.962 | 1.257 | 0.805 |
| N | 218 | | 517 | | 931 | | 439 | |
| †p<0.1, \*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001  Logistic coefficients reported | | | | | | | | |

Table C4. Ordered logistic regression model for mortality anxiety with “Funding Diversity”

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Full model** | |
| *External Resource Dependencies* | Coefficient | Std. errors |
| State Funding | -0.010 | 0.098 |
| Private Donations | 0.107 | 0.139 |
| *Intra-organizational Resilience* | | |
| Organizational Maturity (log) | -0.232\*\*\* | 0.051 |
| Organizational Stability | -0.173\*\*\* | 0.030 |
| Member Loyalty | -0.505\*\*\* | 0.056 |
| Member Involvement | -0.155\*\*\* | 0.048 |
| *External Representation Challenges* | | |
| Salience Challenge | 0.370\*\*\* | 0.086 |
| Aggregation Challenge | 0.433\*\*\* | 0.098 |
| *Intra-organizational Policy/ Political Capacity* | | |
| Policy-oriented Staff (log) | -0.173\* | 0.072 |
| *Control Variables* | | |
| Competition Density (log) | 0.055 | 0.046 |
| Resource Competition | 0.437\*\*\* | 0.084 |
| Specialization | 0.023 | 0.023 |
| Administrative Staff (log) | -0.022 | 0.063 |
| Membership Fees | -0.153 | 0.134 |
| Membership Size (log) | -0.114\*\*\* | 0.023 |
| Composition | 0.085 | 0.099 |
| Interest Group (vs. Party) | -0.553 | 0.379 |
| Service-oriented org. (vs. Party) | -0.764\* | 0.386 |
| UK (vs. Norway) | 0.174 | 0.162 |
| Germany (vs. Norway) | 0.305\* | 0.154 |
| Switzerland (vs. Norway) | 0.516\*\*\* | 0.156 |
| Funding diversity | 0.049 | 0.064 |
| Cut 1 | -2.869 | 0.423 |
| Cut 2 | -1.512 | 0.421 |
| Cut 3 | -0.152 | 0.419 |
| Cut 4 | 1.279 | 0.422 |
| N | 2054 | |
| †p<0.1, \*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001  Logistic coefficients reported | | |

Table C5. Ordered logistic regression model for mortality anxiety with “No Resource Competition and Specialization”

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Full model** | |
| *External Resource Dependencies* | Coefficient | Std. errors |
| State Funding | 0.065 | 0.063 |
| Private Funding | 0.156 | 0.097 |
| *Intra-organizational Resilience* | | |
| Organizational Maturity (log) | -0.231\*\*\* | 0.051 |
| Organizational Stability | -0.173\*\*\* | 0.030 |
| Member Loyalty | -0.513\*\*\* | 0.055 |
| Member Involvement | -0.157\*\*\* | 0.047 |
| *External Representation Challenges* | | |
| Salience Challenge | 0.358\*\*\* | 0.084 |
| Aggregation Challenge | 0.427\*\*\* | 0.096 |
| *Intra-organizational Policy/ Political Capacity* | | |
| Policy-oriented Staff (log) | -0.172\* | 0.070 |
| *Control Variables* | | |
| Competition Density (log) | 0.042 | 0.045 |
| Resource Competition | 0.425\*\*\* | 0.088 |
| Specialization | 0.026 | 0.023 |
| Administrative Staff (log) | -0.026 | 0.060 |
| Membership Fees | -0.098 | 0.114 |
| Membership Size (log) | -0.111\*\*\* | 0.022 |
| Composition | 0.077 | 0.098 |
| Interest Group (vs. Party) | -0.473 | 0.368 |
| Service-oriented org. (vs. Party) | -0.662 | 0.375 |
| UK (vs. Norway) | 0.211 | 0.160 |
| Germany (vs. Norway) | 0.328\* | 0.153 |
| Switzerland (vs. Norway) | 0.532\*\*\* | 0.155 |
| No Resource Competition and Specialization | -0.051 | 0.146 |
| Cut 1 | -2.837 | 0.413 |
| Cut 2 | -1.500 | 0.411 |
| Cut 3 | -0.144 | 0.409 |
| Cut 4 | 1.296 | 0.412 |
| N | 2105 | |
| †p<0.1, \*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001  Logistic coefficients reported | | |
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1. The only category that is not covered is the one of small, federal states that are societally homogenous which is – unlike all the other empirically relevant categories - only represented by one case, namely Austria. Austria is considered by the literature as only ‘quasi-federal’ given its very weak regional governments (Erk 2004: 2). Thus, while Norway is constitutionally unitary, it has directly elected regional governments with limited competences as Austria has. While ideally we could have included this country as well, leaving it out is unlikely to significantly lower the representativeness of our findings. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)