3 Method

3.1. Methodologies in empirical social research: A comparison for selecting the appropriate method to study multinational teams

The analysis of relevant factors for the performance of multinational teams in the European Commission and the European Parliament was the setting for this study. The research method used (qualitative or quantitative) should help to reach the proposed research aim (Lamnek, 2000: 26).

Quantitative research methodology has a long tradition and is widely spread in empirical social research. In recent years these approaches have reached their limits and consequently an increase of the impact of qualitative research methods can be recognized (Bewley, 2002; Hermanowicz, 2002; Kölbl, 2001: 1). In research practice these methodological approaches are predominantly separately used. In the literature particular characteristics can be found which differentiate qualitative and quantitative methods (e.g. Bortz & Döring, 2002; Brüsemeister, 2000; Flick et al., 2000; Lamnek, 2000). Sample size is one of these characteristics: In general, quantitative research is characterized by large sample size whereas in qualitative research sample size is limited to a smaller number (Brüsemeister, 2000: 21). In quantitative research existing theoretical propositions are tested with precise hypotheses (Bucher, 1994: 23). Quantitative techniques focus on measuring things that can be counted “using predetermined categories that can be treated as interval or ordinal data and subjected to statistical analysis” (Patton, 1997: 273).

Qualitative research, however, concentrates on the detection of theoretical propositions on the basis of the empirical data (Kölbl, 2001: 2). The intention of empirical-qualitative exploratory studies is to generate new hypotheses and theories (Bewley, 2002). The particular presentation and use of qualitative data help to identify causal relationship and phenomena in a specific field which has not been studied in detail until now (Bortz & Döring, 2002: 386). Qualitative research aims to explain social reality by describing the complexity of the social setting under study from the people’s experiences (Flick et al., 2000: 14) and “the meanings they place on the events, processes and structures of their normal social setting” (Skinner et al., 2000: 165). In contrast to quantitative research the subjective elements of the interviewed individual are the main research focus in qualitative research (Mruck & Mey, 2000: 3). The main difference between these two methodological approaches can be explained with the terms “discovery” and “testing”. Whereas a discovery can already be made with the help of one interview, the testing in the quantitative research needs significantly measurable quantities in order to verify or disprove the underlying hypotheses (Brüsemeister, 2000: 22).

In order to define the appropriate type of research study for the above-described research aspects an analysis of the differences and similarities in both – quantitative and qualitative – approaches was conducted.
• Qualitative research gathers and analyzes „pure” qualitative data (with the exception of socio-demographic data).
• It is assumed that there are two different methodological approaches in quantitative research:
  • Collection and analysis of “real” quantitative data, i.e. the analysis of measured statistical values/data (e.g. economic statistics).
  • Collection and analysis of “quasi-quantitative” data: The term “quasi-quantitative” was introduced as in the framework of a questionnaire a “qualitative” interpretation by the interviewed person is needed, which will be converted in a quasi-quantitative interpretation along a Likert-Scale. The data won’t be measured, but the interviewed persons are asked to identify a (subjective) value for a particular question. This value is given by the developer of the questionnaire and is consequently biased by his/her subjective estimations or by his/her subjective interests. As an example a question concerning self-description can be given: “How do you describe yourself?” The values for the self-description of the interviewed person are predetermined by the developer of the questionnaire. They are a list of pre-defined values, which are mostly based on the subjective value-estimation (“Which values are important for me as the developer of the questionnaire?”) of the developer of the questionnaire. In a next step these data are analyzed in the same manner as “measured” quantitative data, i.e. using statistical analysis tools.

The ignorance of the differences between quantitative and quasi-quantitative data and the possible bias inherent in the particular measurement can lead to a loss of information which might be of relevance for the particular research question. Table 6 compares quasi-quantitative data with qualitative data and shows their impact on data collection and analysis. It is refrained from considering quantitative data in the overview as they are not particularly important in the field of multinational team research. According to these findings, a clear separation between quasi-quantitative and qualitative research cannot easily be made. It becomes obvious that in order to find the “right” data collection method for the particular research question one has to be aware of the differences between the three possible interview methods: standardized interview, semi-standardized interview, and non-standardized (open) interview. Other qualitative methods like observation are excluded from the analysis.

The impact on and the gathering of social situations in the interview depend on whether the interview concept is open i.e. less structured or if a structured questionnaire is used. The degree of structure is defined by the aim of research: The less structured the interview is the more qualitative-oriented it is. In contrast, the higher the degree of structure of the interview is, the more it allows for the collection of quantitative aspects (Atteslander, 2000: 156).
Table 6: Social data and its impact on data collection and data analysis in the quasi-quantitative and the qualitative research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quasi-quantitative Research</th>
<th>Qualitative Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Apparently measured quantita-tive data</td>
<td>Observed qualitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Openly asked for qualitative data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structured asked for quantitative/qualitative data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Standardized Interview</td>
<td>Non-standardized (open) interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-standardized interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Interpretation</td>
<td>Quasi-Quantitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The author

The *standardized interview* is characterized by a structured order of questions and the wording of questions is binding on the interviewer. The questions have to be defined precisely and have to be quickly answerable by the person interviewed. It is recommended to use this form of interview if there exists already knowledge about a clearly defined research topic like in the end phase of a study. A special form of the standardized interview is that including open questions. An open question is characterized by non-fixed response categories. Therefore, the person interviewed is able to define his/her answer on his/her own. The interviewer has to minute the statements of the interviewee in detail. In the course of the data analysis these statements are connected to determined categories (Atteslander, 2000: 158).

In the *semi-standardized interview* the interviewer uses a so-called interviewer-guide. This guide is based on an in-depth analysis of the research issue. Thus, the interview is concentrated on a certain issue and the interviewed person is encouraged to have one’s say preferably free, i.e. the interviewer should use a non-directive interview form. This kind of interview should also be used when there exists already knowledge about the issue under research (Mayring, 2002: 67; Bortz & Döring, 2002: 315-317).

In contrast to the (semi)-standardized interview, the *non-standardized interview* is characterized by providing only a thematically framework for the interview. The interview form is open, i.e. the interviewer has to stimulate a conversation. This kind of interview is most notably used in explorative studies to get a first impression of information and opinions about a certain topic and about com-
plex patterns of behaviours and motives. Selected types of non-standardized inter-
views are the problem-centred and the narrative interview as well as group discus-
sions. In the narrative interview the interviewed person is encouraged to openly
tell about his/her experiences (Mayring, 1999: 55). This enables the collection of
subjective meanings of the interviewee. Consequently, new and pervasive cogni-
tions about the research topic can be gathered, which might be limited in the
framework of a systematic standardized questioning (based on predefined as-
sumptions).

Based on this analysis, qualitative social research was identified as the appro-
priate method in this study. Therefore, the following method-decision tree is de-
veloped (Figure 5).

**FIGURE 5: METHOD-DECISION TREE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision 1</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Research setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What type of research question?</td>
<td>- Explorative study: qualitative research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision 2</td>
<td>What kind of data?</td>
<td>- Openly asked for data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision 3</td>
<td>What kind of questions?</td>
<td>- Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision 4</td>
<td>What kind of data collection method?</td>
<td>- Non-standardized interview: narrative interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision 5</td>
<td>What kind of data analysis method?</td>
<td>- Qualitative data analysis: qualitative content analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The author

According to this decision tree, narrative interviews and in consequence qualita-
tive content analysis will be used to gather and analyse the data.

### 3.2. Techniques used to develop hypotheses

The techniques used to develop hypotheses are based on the narrative interview
and on the qualitative content analysis according to Mayring (2003).

**3.2.1. Narrative Interview**

The technique of narrative interviews allows to collect information/data
without restricting data collection by presuppositions (prejudices, previous
restrictive assumptions). It is a hermeneutic method to be applied whenever we have inadequately detailed information insufficient for theory building or when there are doubts about the assumptions made in already existing theories (Bewley, 2002). With narrative interviews we collect short stories about situations experienced in multinational teamwork. Short stories about real incidents permit us (the experts) to analyze the reported events and to convert collected experience of managers into knowledge. Otherwise we would collect only information about the reflections, prejudices and stereotypes of the interviewed persons (Fink, 2002).

Procedure
Mostly in convenience samples interview partners are identified with the help of a range of informed people like accessible managers, trade representatives, but also by directly approaching top and middle managers of international firms. To be a worthwhile interview partner the interviewee must a) have experienced something, b) still remember the incident, c) find it to be a worthwhile story, and d) be willing to tell the interviewer (Fink, 2002).

The interviewed person is willing to tell little stories, if she/he finds the interviewer likeable or if she/he can help the interviewer to solve a difficult task. Interviewed persons mostly find interviewers who belong to their own culture more likeable and trustworthy. Interviewed persons do not want to look bad or lose their face during the interview (Bewley, 2002). Van de Vijver & Tanzer (1997: 268) raise the issue: "Construct bias can occur if there is only partial overlap in the definitions of the construct across cultures." If interviews are led by interviewers who are not from the same culture as the interviewed person, there is a higher risk that interviewer and interviewed person consider different factors as important, because of different cultural standards. They both would attribute different meanings and interpretations to the events/behaviour described by the interviewed person. When Alexander Thomas tried to undertake narrative interviews in China with Chinese managers he encountered numerous problems due to the differences between direct and indirect communication styles and between fact and harmony orientation (Thomas, 1996). These forms of construct bias mostly can be avoided when interviewers and interviewed persons belong to the same culture.

The interviewer bias is quite often linked with interviews in foreign languages and can have a strong impact on trust building, the current flow of the interview and on the content of the interview (e.g. number of critical incidents told, stereotypes, generalisations). Age, gender, personality, appearance, and expectations of interviewers and interviewed persons can easily lead to unnoticed problems during the interview. Not only the interviewer himself/herself, his/her behaviour and his/her relationship with the interviewee, but also the context of the interview could influence research results. Some people become embarrassed when openly asked about critical incidents, e.g. when male interviewers interview females, or females interview males, when interviews do not take place in a purely bilateral
setting, but a secretary or the wife/husband of the interviewed manager is listening, etc.

To deal with interviewer bias and construct bias it is strongly recommended that interviews are undertaken by members from the same culture as the interviewed persons. We recently tested this effect. An Austrian student who interviewed American managers could not collect critical incidents. He was only told generalizations and various repetitions of auto- and hetero-stereotypes (Fink et al., 2004a: 12).

Originally Alexander Thomas followed the recommendations by Witzel (1982) and Lamnek (1995) to confront the interview partners only at the beginning of the interview with the aim of the interviews (Thomas, 1993, 1996). After jointly discussing our experiences we decided to modify the original approach (Fink et al., 2004a: 12). Since interviewees should tell short stories about incidents they need time to mobilize their memory (Hermanowicz, 2002). Therefore, information about the research topic should be given in advance. When establishing the first contact we inform the persons to be interviewed that we want to collect short stories about encounters/situations experienced within the multinational team (Fink et al., 2004a: 12). During the interview, after an opening remark the interviewed persons are asked to tell significant or remarkable task-related critical incidents. We again explain what critical incidents are. After the interviewed person has told a little story, he/she is asked in a first feedback-loop: "How do you explain that?", next: "How did you cope with that problem?", and finally: “What was your reaction? Did you adjust your behaviour later on?” (Fink & Meierewert, 2001). These questions are posed in order to collect information about value perceptions, stereotypes and learning behaviour of the interviewed person (Latein, 1996: 13; Ward et al., 2001). The collected information about the personal assessment of critical incidents, of stereotypes, value judgments, and coping strategies should help at this and later stages to deal with possible bias in data collection and interpretation of the data.

After each interview the interviewer has to reflect on her/his experience: What went well, what went wrong, and how to improve the interview technique? The interviewers are also asked to participate in interview trainings and group discussions at regular intervals.

**3.2.2. Transcription and Content Analysis**

To move towards identifying relevant categories determining multinational team work it is necessary to undertake a qualitative content analysis of the interviews (Mayring, 2000a, b). All narrative interviews must be taped. A transcript of all narrative interviews has to be produced. The results of the transcription of the interviews are so-called “primary documents” which have to be analyzed and coded. Kuckartz (1999: 25) defines the coding of the data as the selection of relevant text passages and the assignment of significant codes. The interpretative ap-
A computer assisted qualitative data analysis software package. This software package aids users in handling non-numerical and unstructured qualitative data. However, it does not substitute the "human interpretation-work" (Kuckartz, 1999: 75).

Procedure

The transcripts are analyzed with structured qualitative content analysis developed by Mayring (1999, 2000a, 2000b) to identify social reality by deducing from characteristics of a transcript (an existing text) to characteristics of a non coded context (Merten, 1983: 16). Content analysis according to Mayring is based on 3 steps: summarizing, explication, structuring (Lamnek, 1995: 208). By selection, bundling, omission, integration and generalization the text will be reduced to the important content (summarizing). Additional material (e.g. relevant literature) is used to get an understanding for those parts of the text which are not easily interpreted because of the chosen wording, terminology or incomplete formulation of sentences (explication). In a last step it has to be defined what characteristics a piece of text or a phrase has to meet in order to be of use for a specific category. Categories are characteristics of the text which were developed by the researcher during reading and rereading the interview protocols and the transcripts (structuring) (Lamnek, 1995: 208). The development of categories is at the centre of qualitative content analysis as huge data material can be reduced to the most relevant contents (Mayring, 2000b: 74). Besides explication, analysis and interpretation of text passages, the qualitative content analysis aims at identifying similar parts of analysis in diverse text passages. There are two different ways of developing a manageable amount of categories: inductive category development and deductive category application. With inductive category development it is "of central interest to develop the aspects of interpretation, the categories, as near as possible to the material and to formulate them in terms of the material. ... Deductive category application works with prior formulated, theoretically derived aspects of analysis, bringing them in connection with the text" (Mayring, 2000a: 3-4). In research practice a mix of those two approaches seems to be appropriate as also qualitative researchers have mostly vaguely defined hypothesis about the research topic and knowledge of research findings in the particular literature. Therefore, it was decided to use an approach somewhere between the inductive and deductive approaches (Figure 6).

According to this scheme, thematic main categories (derived from research aspects and theoretical background) are created which are described by subcategories. If a text passage is assigned to a category, it has to be tested – in comparative analysis loops - if the next text passage can also be assigned to this category or if a new category has to be developed. If a code-word is represented by a text passage in particular, then this text passage is used as a “significant code” for the ongoing analysis.
FIGURE 6: RESEARCH APPROACH SOMEWHERE BETWEEN THE INDUCTIVE AND DEDUCTIVE APPROACHES

Research question

Determination category definition (criterion for selection) and levels of abstraction for inductive categories AND Theory based definition of the aspects of analysis

Step by step formulation of categories out of the material, regarding category definition and level of abstraction: main categories, sub categories Subsumption of old categories or formulating new categories Collecting categories in a coding agenda

Revision of categories after 10-50% of the material

Final working through the texts

Interpretation of results (quantitative steps of analysis, e.g. frequencies)

Formative check of reliability

Summative check of reliability

Source: amended from Mayring (2000a: Paragraph 11, 14); Mayring (2003: 75)

Together with the identified relevant codes those variables of each interview that may have had an impact on the interview like context, age, gender, experience of the interviewed person, etc. should be coded (Kuckartz, 1999: 157).

Remarks which were made at earlier stages of the interview have to be compared with remarks reported at later stages of the interview (Boeije, 2002). After checking individual interviews for consistency, the researcher starts with the interpretation of results to finally achieve a summary presentation of typical cases ordered by categories (Lamnek, 1995: 208). Further comparative steps are recommended. 1) Pair-wise comparisons: compare the first interview with the second; the second with the third interview etc. 2) Compare short series of interviews: Do the results of the first 6 interviews differ from the results of the second 6 interviews, etc.? Why do these results differ? What conclusion can be drawn from the sub series in comparison with the whole interview series?
A summary analysis of the first 4-6 interviews was found to be helpful to improve interview techniques. After that interviews usually become more effective. One may consider the first few interviews as biased by the interviewer. Usually after 12 interviews an experienced interviewer will have a record that covers all important types of incidents. However, only after 25 interviews one will be able to identify the most important types of incidents. It is helpful to establish a rank order by how many respondents mentioned a similar type of incident (Fink, 2002). The result of the content analysis is grouped by different preliminary categories that should be sufficiently homogenous and distinct from other categories.

The main problem at this stage of the analysis is the so-called cultural interpretation bias. The culture, experiences, prejudices and stereotypes of the analyzing researcher can have an impact on content analysis.

3.3. How to assess reliability and validity

Quantitative research is characterized by providing accepted criteria defining whether or not a particular measurement may be regarded as objective, reliable, and valid (Mruck & Mey, 2000: Paragraph 29). In contrast, qualitative research has to define its own quality factors as those of quantitative research are not implicitly target-oriented for measurement in the qualitative field of social research (Mayring, 1996: 115):

Usually qualitative researchers regard the research evaluation criterion “objectivity” as inadequate. In qualitative research subjectivity should not be eliminated as an interference variable, but has to be used for communicative and understanding processes (Mruck & Mey, 2000: Paragraph 30). Bernart & Krapp (1998: 33) underline that the aim of the narrative interview is not the identification of the objectively detectable truth but the explication and reconstruction of the subjective perception of the interviewed person.

Demands towards reliability, i.e. the accuracy and precision in the process of measurement (Mayring, 1999: 116), are also rejected by few researchers (Mruck & Mey, 2000: Paragraph 31). In contrast to quantitative methods a re-test of qualitative findings is difficult, as social reality is not constant but ever evolving. Mayring (1993: 107) states that “people (also test persons) are continually developing and situational conditions are changing, parallel to social change”. Especially in the case of narrative interviews the interviewed person might reconsider and adjust her behaviour in a particular situation. Consequently, they might tell other stories when they are re-questioned about their experiences.

As in quantitative research, the validity of a measurement is the most important quality factor in qualitative research (Bortz & Döring, 2002: 327). Mayring (2002: 144-148) identified 6 general quality factors in qualitative research:
• **Documentation of the method**: making the pre-assumptions, the decision for a particular qualitative analysis tool and the collection and analysis of data as comprehensible and transparent as possible.

• **Argumentative coverage of the interpretation**: the interpretation has to be coherent – if there are argumentative breaks they have to be explained.

• **Observation of method rules**: it is important to be aware of every single analysis step in the analysis model (see figure) in order to gain highly qualitative "qualitative data".

• **Closeness to the subject**: as qualitative research focuses on the analysis of concrete social problems the researcher has to be close to the everyday life of the participant persons to collect the data.

• **Triangulation**: triangulation is concerned with diverse solution strategies for a given problem. However, the aim is not to achieve exactly the same results with the diverse method approaches but to compare the diverse perspectives and to make a kind of SWOT analysis of the diverse approaches.

• **Communicative validity**: in order to ensure the validity of interpretations and generalizations the consent development and intersubjective agreements are very important (Mruck & Mey, 2000: Paragraph 32). The so-called "communicative validity, i.e. the discussion and interpretation of the results with/by the research participants) is one possibility to ensure validity in the qualitative research process. This validation tool is already used during the narrative interview where the participants are asked how they explain a particular situation (feedback loops within the interview). Their responses are included as a part of the analysis process (Mruck & Mey, 2000: Paragraph: 32).

With the exception of triangulation the present study considers the quality factors mentioned by Mayring (2002) and consequently ensures validity of the measurement tool.

3.4. Sample

3.4.1. Sample in the European Commission

In February 2004, 25 narrative interviews with Austrian employees in the European Commission were conducted in Brussels. Appendix A describes the European Commission’s aim and tasks. In table 7 sex, age, number of years in the European Commission, foreign languages, educational background and position of each interview partner are presented. If there is an “X” the interviewed person was not willing to reveal this sensible information in order to guarantee anonymity.

To allow to identify the corresponding demographic questionnaire and interview pairs and yet to ensure anonymity, interviews were tagged with pseudo ran-
random numbers generated using the rand function of PERL, version 5.6.1 using a time dependent random seed.

Table 8 presents the number of interviews in various directorates-general. In the European Commission there are four separate grades: A-, B-, C- and D-grades. The so called A-officials are employees with a university degree. The A-grade is the policy-making and policy management grade. It is divided into eight points. The responsibilities in each point are as follows: A1 – director general or equivalent; A2 – deputy director general, director or principal adviser; A3-head of unit; A4-A5 –principal administrator, or in some cases head of unit; A6-A8 – assistant administrator (Nugent, 2001: 169).

The interviews were undertaken with Austrians in A-positions as multinational team work especially takes place at this level. The outcomes of this study cannot claim to yield an overall model of multinational team performance. However, data provided by the interview partners were comprehensive and tight enough to end interviewing after 25 interviews. Additionally, it has to be underlined that in January 2004, 178 Austrian permanent employees were in A-level positions (see Bulletin Statistique: Le Personnel de la Commission, January 2004: 20). Consequently, 14 % of the population could be interviewed.

**Table 7: Demographic and statistical information of the interview partners in the European Commission**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years in the EC</th>
<th>Foreign Languages</th>
<th>Educational Background (Master/Doctorate)</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EK_461</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>French, English</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EK_543</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Head of department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EK_191</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>English, French</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Head of department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EK_751</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>English, French</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Head of department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EK_43</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>English, French, Italian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EK_156</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>English, French</td>
<td>Degree in Law</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EK_586</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>English, French</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EK_312</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>English, French, Spanish</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EK_579</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>English, French, Spanish</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EK_910</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>English, French, Russian, Dutch, Italian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EK_716</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>English, French</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EK_489</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>English, French, Dutch, Italian</td>
<td>Degree in Law</td>
<td>Hauptverwaltungsrat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be continued
Table 8: Overview of interviews in diverse directorates-general

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate – General</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
<th>Directorate – General</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELARG (Enlargement)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TAXUD (Tax and Customs Union)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRI (Agriculture)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>BUDG (Budget)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV (Environment)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RTD (Research)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC (Education and Culture)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RELEX (External Relations)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFSO (Information Society)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Counsellor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTR (Enterprise)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Member of Cabinet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKT (Internal Market)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ADMIN (Personnel and administration)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREN (Transport and Energy)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4.2. Sample in the European Parliament

In February 2004, 15 interviews (including interviews with 8 members and 7 employees of the European Parliament) with Austrians working at the European Parliament were conducted (Table 9). Appendix B describes the European Parliament’s aim and tasks. In February 2004, (when the interviews were conducted) 21 Austrians were European parliamentarians. Consequently, 38% of the population of Austrian members of the European Parliament could be interviewed, supplemented by 7 interviews with Austrians working for the members of the European Parliament.

In order to guarantee anonymity the political party of the interviewed persons is not listed.
Table 9: Demographic and statistical information of the interview partners in the European Parliament

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years in the EP</th>
<th>Foreign Languages</th>
<th>Educational Background</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EP_819</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>French, English</td>
<td>University Degree</td>
<td>MEP (Member of European Parliament)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP_122</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>English, French, Italian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP_817</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Doctoral Degree in Philosophy</td>
<td>MEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP_708</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>English, French, Spanish</td>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>MEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP_404</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Vocational School</td>
<td>MEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP_188</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>University Degree</td>
<td>MEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP_416</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>English, French</td>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP_745</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>English, French</td>
<td>Degree in Law</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP_129</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>English, French</td>
<td>Doctoral Degree in Law</td>
<td>MEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP_430</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>University Degree</td>
<td>MEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP_384</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>English, Spanish, French</td>
<td>College of Higher Education</td>
<td>Political Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP_847</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>English, French</td>
<td>University Degree</td>
<td>MEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP_287</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>English, French</td>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP_967</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>English, French</td>
<td>Degree in Law</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>