

The Development of the International Organization (IO) and Organizational Sociology Theories and Perspectives.

Part 2- Definitions and Types of IO

Medani P. Bhandari ¹,

¹ Akamai University, Hilo, Hawaii, USA

Abstract— This paper provides a pedagogical overview of how international organizations were formed, for what purposes and how their structure has been changed. The distinction between formal organizational studies and studies of international organizations is minimal, because both help to widen the idea of creating an original position for better combinations of favorable circumstances or situations in human affairs. The chapter will explain, the origin of the term international organization (OR); historical roots of or studies; and define or; analyze the types of ORs in the contemporary world; reveals the relationship between the international relation (IR) and regime theories application in the OR's studies; and the impact of the globalization. The chapter also unveils the relationships between organizational sociology and OR and finally it gives a general outline on the application institution theory in the study of OR following a brief summary. Organizations have the ability of inspiring and bringing people in concert to achieve combined goals. They are accountable for determining the intelligence needed to meet their goals. This chapter provides a glimmer of international organizations theory, origin, historical account, definitions and utilization of contemporary academic world intertwined with the international relations, regime and globalization as well as the organizational sociological theories and perspectives can be utilized to study of international organizations. This chapter will help to understand the historical account of international organization, pedagogical development and contemporary theories and practices of international organizations and organizational sociology.

Index Terms— international organizations, international relation, organizational sociology, organizations theory, globalization, regime theory.

I. DEFINITION OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Traditionally study of International organizations was a field

of political science which examined international organizations along with International Relations. Political perspectives assume that states have military and economic power, but other institutions or individuals do not (Barkin 2006). International relations theory sees world politics as struggle for power among sovereign states. According to (Barkin 2006, p. 3) IOs can be seen as the agents of forces for globalization because roles of international organizations change due to technological changes and lead to more interdependency among states. IOs can be seen as regime as well as institution creator. In this context international organizations are understood to be intergovernmental organizations, or those organizations created by agreement among the states. The international organizations established by a political group or non-affiliated individuals and groups are part of the international political system, but they are not considered as IOs in traditional political science literature (Barkin 2006). However, the trend and field of IOs has been becoming broader since the First World War. As Kratochwil (2006) states, International Organizations can be conceived of as the investigation of the various organizational forms that populate the international arena. This leads to the conclusion that the study of IOs does not just cover the IOs but includes all forms of organizations which have international influences or relationships. On the basis of Kratochwil's notion, the study of international organizations covers NGOs, nation-states, international regimes, security alliances, multinational corporations, economic classes, and democratic forms of governance, nationalisms, ethnicities, and cultures (Kratochwil, 1994). In this context international organizations cannot be the sole concern of political science but become matters for multidisciplinary investigation.



Theoretically, organizational research broadly examines (1) producing units and what factors determine organizational effectiveness or productivity and (2) sets of individuals whose well-being is affected by the terms of organizational membership and whose motivation to continue that membership depends on their assessment of its comparative contribution to their well-being (Kahn 1990, p. 3). This notion can be applied to investigating the role of international organizations because they follow more complex formalities than domestic formal organizations. The roles of organizations depend upon the motives behind why, how, and for what purpose organizations were formed.

To understand the international organizations, it is essential to investigate what criteria make an organization international. The Year Book of International Organizations (1976/1977), published by the Union of International Associations (UIA), broadly states eight major criteria: (1) the aims must be genuinely international with the intention to cover at least three states. (2) Membership must be individual or involve collective participation, with full voting rights, from at least three states and must be open to any individual or entity appropriately qualified in the organization's area of operations. Voting must be arranged so that no one national group can control the organization. (3) The constitution must provide for a formal structure giving members the rights to periodically elect governing bodies and officers. Provision should be made for continuity of operation with a permanent headquarters. (4) Officers should not all be the same nationality for more than a given period. (5) There should be a substantial contribution to the budget from at least three states and there should be no attempt to make profits for distribution to members. (6) Those with an organic relationship with other organizations must show they can exist independently and elect their own officials. (7) Evidence of current activities must be available. And (8) there are some negative criteria: size, politics, ideology, fields of activity, geographical location of headquarters, and nomenclature are irrelevant in deciding whether a set-up is an "international organization" or not (Archer 1992, pp. 33-34). UIA provides a clear picture of how organizations should be categorized and evaluated.

Several authors have tried to define international organizations along the same lines as these suggested by the Union of International Associations (UIA 1976/1977) (Archer 1983, 1992, 2001); however, they depend on disciplinary orientations (political science, law, sociology, business, administration, religion, etc.). An example from a legal perspective is as follows: "Any contemporary international organization (intergovernmental) is created by states by means of a concluding and international treaty for the purpose. A constituent instrument of an international organization provides for certain rights and capabilities of the organization and possesses a certain degree of international legal personality" (Osaka 1972, pp. 24-30, as cited by Archer 1992, p. 35). Another definition from a socialist perspective is "in its most general form...a stable, clearly structured instrument of

international co-operation, freely established by its members for the joint solution of common problems and the pooling of efforts within the limits laid down by its statute....[Such organizations] have rule of at least three member countries. These may be governments, official organizations or nongovernmental organizations. International organizations have agreed aims, organs with appropriate terms of reference and also specific institutional features such as statutes, rule of procedure, membership etc. The aims and activity of an international organization must be in keeping with universally accepted principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and must not have a commercial character or purpose of profit making (Morozove 1977, p. 30, cited by Archer 1992, p. 35). Authors like Reuter (1958), see an IO as permanently expressing a juristic will distinct from that of its individual members, and Pentland (1976) sees it as a legal body of bureaucratic structure. Archer (1992) actually provides a comparative list of definitions and confirms that there is no homogeneity in the definitions.

These definitions give a kind of fuzzy picture of "what international organizations" are. Generally, the UIA (1976/1977) outline is widely accepted. Authors like Pierre Gerbet (1977), Plano and Riggs (1967), Wallage and Singer (1970), Virraly (1977) have also tried to capture the notion of IOs basic nature. Among them Gerbet's definition is most convincing. He states "The idea of an international organization is the outcome of an attempt to bring order into international relations by establishing lasting bonds across frontiers between governments or social groups wishing to defend their common interests within the context of permanent bodies, distinct from national institutions, having their own individual characteristics, capable of expressing their own will and whose role it is to perform certain functions of international importance" (Gerbet 1977, p. 7, cited in Archer 1992, p. 36). On the basis of these common criteria, Archer states that an "IO is a formal, continuous structure established by agreement between members (governmental and/or nongovernmental) from two or more sovereign states with the aim of pursuing the common interest of membership" (Archer 1992, p. 37). It is a common concept that international organizations should have international memberships, aim to serve common interests, and have a certain structure of operation.

In the contemporary world, the impact of international organizations can be found in every sphere of the political, social, economic, and environmental arenas. The political function of IOs is to provide the means of cooperation among states in areas in which cooperation provides advantages for all or a large number of nations. Their social function is to try to reduce social inequality. Their economic function can be to reduce inequality on a global scale, and their environmental function can be to make collaborative efforts to overcome global environment problems (Young 1999; Bennett 1982; Ness and Bechin 1988; Archer 1992). As Selznick (1957) notes, international organizations represent a form of institution that refers to a formal system of rules and objectives and are a

rationalized administrative instrument. Likewise, Duverger (1972) states that a formal technical and material organization includes a constitution, local chapters, physical equipment, mechanics, emblems, letterhead stationery, a staff, an administrative hierarchy, and so forth (Archer 1992, p. 2). As noted above, international organizations form to attain certain goals and have specified rules and regulations at both local and global levels. They hold the authority (granted by the respected governments) to spread their products and services beyond any one country's borders and therefore assist globalization. International organizations are also defined as a process; international organizations are representative aspects of the phase of that process which has been reached at given time (Claude 1964, p. 4, as cited by Archer 1992, p. 2). These accounts show the relationships between globalization and the spread of international organizations in various categories.

II. TYPES OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

International organizations can be grouped according to their objectives and their functions. There are three major categories of organizations: inter-governmental organizations (IGOs), international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), and multinational enterprises or multinational corporations (MNCs). Inter-governmental organizations are based on a formal instrument of agreement between the governments of nation states, including three or more nation states as parties to the agreement; and possessing a permanent secretariat performing ongoing tasks. INGOs are defined and classified as in the ECOSOC definition of INGOs; they should be international NGOs in terms of aims, members, structure, officers, finance, autonomy, and activities, all of them taking place in three or more countries. To be considered multinational enterprises, organizations should have the products and services in more than three countries. In this paper my focus will be on INGOs, those established to attain certain goals, and their relationship with certain organizational theories, according to niche and demands. These INGOs are considered as non-state actors and have significant influence role on socio-economic and human services delivery (education, health, human rights, and women's rights), economic development (agriculture, microcredit, and infrastructures), environment conservation and on world politics. There are many varieties of INGOs, and they have a long history of their products and services delivery. For example, the International Red Cross Society is the one of the oldest INGOs and was established in February 1863 in Geneva, Switzerland, with the purpose of treating war victims and delivering health services. Fauna & Flora International was established in 1903 as the world's first international conservation organization with the purpose of conserving flora and fauna; it was instrumental in establishing much of today's global and local conservation infrastructure, including organizations such as the World Wide Fund for Nature, IUCN, The World Conservation Union, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna &

Flora, and conservation instruments such as the Red List of endangered species.

There are thousands of international organizations working in various sectors. Each of them has varieties of identical role and contributions for conservation of nature, social development, human rights, economic development, governance, health, infrastructure development, crisis management etc. In other words, the contemporary world in which there are no international organizations creating rules, monitoring behavior or promoting cooperation (Barkin 2006). These organizations are also key actors for socio-political and economic transformation. It is important to explore the contribution of international organizations to understand how international social orders are created, connected, maintained, and changed through complex formal organizations (Avant 2004) in the contemporary world.

III. INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

Contemporary scholars in the social sciences are fascinated by international organizations. Traditionally, many social scientists, particularly from political science, have long been engaged in analyzing international organizations, primarily in terms of power and security. However, there was a gradual shift of their focus in the first decades of the nineteenth century. In the contemporary arena, political scientists look farther afield as they study international affairs, political economy, policy studies and analysis, comparative politics, international relations, and international organizations. In studying international organizations, they focus largely on the problem of cooperation in world politics. Political scientists examine international organizations by asking fundamental political questions, including those about the nature of political authority and political rights, the relationship between power and values, variation in the role and quality of government, the origins of political institutions, and the dynamics of international politics. There is a distinction between political scientists' and sociologists' approach to the study of international organizations. Sociologists examine the social actors' activities in the society and social problems. The purpose of social science is to find better options for a better society. Paul Taylor notes: "In the 20th century conventional social science developed as a trilogy of disciplines -economics, sociology, and political sciences --which purport, between them, to cover all social behavior" (Taylor 2000, p. 1106). There is a common notion of economic, political, and sociological theory that began with the same goal and purpose to benefit society. Robert Cox notes that "Social and political theory is history-bounded at its origin, since it is always traceable to an historically-conditioned awareness of certain problems and issues, a problematic, while at the same time it attempts to transcend the particularity of its historical origins in order to place them within the framework of some general propositions or laws" (Cox 1981, p. 128).

The study of international organizations in the contemporary world is a common agenda. However, as noted earlier, the formation of international organizations was basically for political purposes, which is why political science has included the study of international organizations from the very beginning of its disciplinary development. Political scientists began to examine international organizations prior to the rise of the League of Nations. They also evaluate international organizations as means of global interaction. Archer (1992) illustrates Keohane and Nye's (1971, xii) proposition of global interaction as occurring through (1) communication--the movement of information, including the transmission of belief; (2) transportation--the movement of physical objects, including war material and personal property as well as merchandise; (3) finance--the movement of money and instruments of credits; and (4) travel--the movement of persons (Archer 1992, p. 29). This notion of interaction resulted in the growth of international organizations. In other words, a favorable political environment is one of the causes of the exponential growth of international governmental, nongovernmental, and multinational corporations. The examples can be drawn from formal Soviet Union or other communists' regimes on one hand and proliferation of international organizations in the democratic republics of the developing world such as India, Bangladesh, Nepal, etc. on the other. However, for decades in sociology, researchers have largely failed to fully apply a sociological imagination to the study of international organizations. As the world becomes more interconnected and these types of social structures become more important, the need for critical analyses becomes more urgent (Brechin 1997). Ness and Brechin (1988) made an early attempt to bridge the gap between the study of international organizations and the sociology of organization. In terms of bridging the gap they first argue that international organizations are different according to their roles and functions. They reject the functionalist notion and argue that contingency theory is more suitable to understand international organizations which are essentially alike. Following the Galbraith (1973) principles of contingency theory (- there is no one best way to organize and any way to organizing is not equally effective, page 2), they state that 'contingency theory argues that there is no one best way to organizing anything; the best structure and process is contingent upon such things as the environment and technology' (Ness and Bechin 1988, p. 249). Theoretically the contingency approach allows us to examine external and internal constraints in organization. Ness and Brechin attempt to focus on how technological enhancement can make a difference in global organizational settings. They state "technology links the organization with its environment, creating a conduit through which influence, power, and materials pass. Relationships also exist between technology and another organization element-structure. Technology is one which can contribute to the international organizations (Ness and Brechin 1988, pp. 256-257). It is not necessary that organizational environment always remains placid; it can be turbulent and complex. However, contingency theory allows us

to examine international and external environments to fit with complex situations. I see a clear link between technology organization and international organization as proposed by Ness and Brechin. Because of the technological development contemporary world became more interconnected and the role of international organizations is becoming increasingly significant and, importantly for international policy-making, the process accelerates with the globalization of world politics.

International organizations, even the well-known and influential ones involved in economic development, have rarely been studied from a sociological perspective (Brechin 1989, 1997; Le Prestre 1985; Ness and Brechin 1988). Political scientists, particularly neorealists, have historically seen international organizations as relatively insignificant players in international politics and affairs, at best as little more than the simple extensions of powerful states (Brechin 1997). More recently Finnemore (1996, 2004) and several other authors representing political science, international relations, public administration, and law, have argued that international organizations are actually provocative institutions of power, especially in the developing world (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998; Barnett and Finnemore 1999). Barnett and Finnemore utilize sociological theory in explaining how social norms and values impact international organizations in terms of international relations. They argue that international relations (IR) scholars have not given systematic consideration to how IOs actually behave. Finnemore (1994) has applied the sociological perspective to study the extending role of UNESCO; however, her leaning is more towards political theory rather than sociological theory.

This important new realization in the literature, however, does not fully utilize sociological insights to examine complex formal organizations. Sociology views complex organizations with greater nuance. With legitimate authority, resources, and goals, complex organizations attempt to promote their professionalized missions and themselves while negotiating various institutional and technical environmental demands. The outcomes of these negotiations likely allow for greater or lesser organizational autonomy depending on actual conditions and politics from local to international levels. Sociology also views how technology and resource makes the differences in organizational functions (Pfeffer and Salancik 1978). Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) argue that none of the organizations can be totally self-sufficient and so they have to obtain resources from their environment. Obtaining resources depends on power, which originates in social and economic exchanges, under uncertain conditions, when organizations seek to acquire vital resources but avoid dependence on organizations that supply those resources. This power dynamism equally applies in the case of international organizations when particular states hegemonize the authority to another state. In this context as Barnett and Finnemore (1999 : 699) note 'the rational-legal authority that IOs embody gives them power independent of states that created them and channels that power in particular directions. From a review of the political science literature

related to international organizations, it is clear that political scientists have tended to examine international organizations through the theories related to international relations and regime (Bhandari 2010, 2011, 2012, 2014).

IV. CONCLUSION

To consider any organization as international there should be a formal instrument of agreement between the governments of nation states, including three or more nation states as parties to the agreement and possessing a permanent secretariat performing ongoing tasks. A formal technical and material organization should have: constitution, local chapters, physical equipment, mechanics, emblems, letterhead stationery, a staff, an administrative hierarchy and so forth (Duverger 1972 as cited by Archer 1992, p. 2).

According to political science literature, international organizations form to attain certain goals of the governments and have specified rules and regulations formulated by the governments. In this regard, IOs are closely associated with international relations theory, regime theory and globalization theory. There are various perspectives for analysis of political environment which includes positivism, constructivism, realism, neo-realism, liberalism, neo-liberalism, and globalism and so on.

The present paper is a following part of a cycle of papers devoted to the topic on development of the International Organization and Organizational Sociology Theories and Perspectives. The next part will be featured in the following paper of the Scientific Journal.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I acknowledge the input of Mrs. Prajita Bhandari, for creating a peaceful environment to complete this chapter and insightful comments and language editing. I would also like to thank to Prameya, Kelsey, Manaslu, Abhi for their insightful comments. I would also thank to Neena (our granddaughter who brought the joy in the family so, I was able to concentrate on my job). Especial thanks go to Professors Steven R. Brechin, Peter Ibarra, Marjory I would also like to thank the reviewer panel for their input and comments.

VI. REFERENCES

Archer, A. (1983) *Methods of Multilateral Management: The Interrelationship of International Organizations and NGOs, in the US, the UN, and the Management of Global Change*; Toby Trister Gati, United Nations, p.303, p.309

Archer, C. (1992). *International Organizations* (2nd Edition), Routledge, USA.

The complete list of references will be featured in the final paper of this Scientific Journal.