

Michael Strautmann



Interorganisational Coordination in Development Cooperation

How Communication at the Country Level Transforms
Fragmentation into Coherence and Complementarity



Nomos

The series
“Entwicklungstheorie und Entwicklungspolitik”

is edited by

Arnold-Bergstraesser-Institut (ABI), Freiburg
German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS), Bonn
Sektion „Entwicklungstheorie und Entwicklungspolitik“
der Deutschen Vereinigung für Politikwissenschaft (DVPW)
GIGA German Institute of Global and Area Studies, Hamburg
Institut für Entwicklung & Frieden (INEF), Duisburg
Zentrum für Entwicklungsforschung (ZEF), Bonn

Volume 24

Michael Strautmann

Interorganisational Coordination in Development Cooperation

How Communication at the Country Level Transforms
Fragmentation into Coherence and Complementarity



Nomos

This study was made possible through (financial) support from the University of Hamburg, the German Institute for Global and Area Studies, the Foundation of German Businesses (sdw), and the Übersee-Club e.V.

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>

a.t.: Hamburg, Univ., Diss., 2020

Original title: "Harmonization is Dead, Long Live Complementarity: An Explorative Study of Interorganizational Coordination for Aid Effectiveness in Development Cooperation in Indonesia and Madagascar"

ISBN 978-3-8487-8784-5 (Print)
978-3-7489-3426-4 (ePDF)

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-3-8487-8784-5 (Print)
978-3-7489-3426-4 (ePDF)

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Strautmann, Michael

Interorganisational Coordination in Development Cooperation

How Communication at the Country Level Transforms

Fragmentation into Coherence and Complementarity

Michael Strautmann

231 pp.

Includes bibliographic references.

ISBN 978-3-8487-8784-5 (Print)
978-3-7489-3426-4 (ePDF)



Onlineversion
Nomos eLibrary

1st Edition 2022

© Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden, Germany 2022. Overall responsibility for manufacturing (printing and production) lies with Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers. Under § 54 of the German Copyright Law where copies are made for other than private use a fee is payable to "Verwertungsgesellschaft Wort", Munich.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or refraining from action as a result of the material in this publication can be accepted by Nomos or the author.

Abstract

International development cooperation (DC) is provided by many different bi- and multilateral organizations through a multiplicity of different channels. This fragmentation of non-concerted and overlapping activities undermines the overall efficiency and effectiveness of DC, e.g. in the fight against extreme poverty. Therefore, the international community has committed itself to work towards higher aid effectiveness. This commitment is reflected in a series of international agreements – most prominently in the widely acknowledged Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. In these agreements, donors committed to harmonize their DC activities by engaging in joint activities and programmes. Over a decade later, respective progress is ambiguous at best. This study set out to better understand why the commitments to more interorganizational cooperation have not yielded results. Previous studies indicated that the success of coordination and cooperation between development organizations (DOs) depends on donors' national interests and informal processes. However, none of the previous studies are based on a rigorous theoretical framework that enables understanding of how the different levels of DC relate to and depend on each other. Even more critical: hardly any of the previous research collected data in partner countries, albeit numerous studies noted that this is essential to understand the failure and success of coordination and cooperation between DOs. Responding to these insufficiencies of existing research, a) an elaborated theoretical concept was developed using Luhmann's systems theory, and b) research was conducted in partner countries. Four case studies were carried out between October 2015 and May 2016. In both, Indonesia and Madagascar, data was collected in the environment and education sectors to analyze how cooperation between DOs works on the operative level, i.e. how relationships between DOs scale up from the individual to the organizational level. The field research revealed that donor countries and DOs have not translated their commitments on improved coordination and cooperation into practice. Accordingly, this study found that operational support for the comprehensive alignment and harmonization of activities has ceased – and that donor countries' national political and economic interests are increasingly dominating DC. It also revealed, however, that DO employees at partner country level mitigate the lack of organizational commitment, by re-connecting local activities to partner countries' needs –

Abstract

and thus to the global altruistic narrative of transnational solidarity. In quasi-formal meetings at the (sub)sectoral level, representatives of DOs coordinate to reduce overlap and to increase aid effectiveness, thereby arranging for the complementarity of their activities – the most efficient and effective form of cooperation possible. This pragmatic *modus operandi* aims at the thematic and/or geographic complementarity of DC activities and substantially contributes to overall efficiency and effectiveness. In addition, this study also identified the preconditions for more intensive forms of interorganizational cooperation. Accordingly, it concludes with a call for a decentralized and context-sensitive approach to interorganizational cooperation.

Acknowledgements

For Brigitte and Wolfgang, Lisa, and the entire family.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Cord Jakobeit, Wolfgang Hein, and Rolf von Lüde for their dedicated support and guidance, and to Stefan Kühl, Stefan Blaschke, and Rudolf Stichweh for comments and inspiration.

I would like to wholeheartedly thank Adrian Schäfer-Rollfs, Tom Töpfer, Sebastian Schirber, Maximilian Locher, Judith Muster, Eric Sobolewski, Vincent Zimmer, and all fellow researchers from GIGA's Doctoral Programme and Research Team 'Ideas and Agency' for their valuable feedback and moral support.

I want to also express my appreciation for the continuous support from the Graduate School team, especially Marisa Shabaz and Ulf Beckmann.

Special thanks are also owed to all interviewees in Indonesia and Madagascar that dedicated some of their precious time to openly elaborate on their experiences and opinions.

This study was made possible through the very generous and much valued (financial) support from the University of Hamburg, the German Institute for Global and Area Studies, the Foundation of German Businesses (sdw), and the Übersee-Club e.V.

Table of Contents

Abstract	5
Acknowledgements	7
List of Figures	13
List of Acronyms	15
1 Introduction:	
Does Development Cooperation Need more Cooperation?	17
2 Current State of Research:	
Previous Theoretical Analyses of Cooperation in DC	29
2.1 The Status Quo of Cooperation in DC	29
2.1.1 Fragmentation Renders DC Inefficient	29
2.1.2 Fragmentation is a Burden for Partner Countries	34
2.1.3 International Commitments for more Cooperation	36
2.1.4 International Commitments Fail	39
2.2 Theoretical Approaches to International Cooperation	43
2.2.1 Approaches from New Institutional Economics	45
2.2.2 Approaches from Neo-Institutionalism	54
2.2.3 Approaches from Anthropology	59
2.3 Research Design: Refined Research Questions	62
3 Theorization:	
Conceptualizing Cooperation Using Luhmann's Systems Theory	65
3.1 Luhmann's Systems Theory: The Framework for Analysis	66
3.1.1 Luhmann's Systems Theory vs. Neo-institutionalism	67
3.1.2 Luhmann's Systems Theory's Core Concepts	69
3.1.3 Luhmann's Systems Theory in Research on DC	72
3.2 Development Cooperation: A Multi-referential System	73
3.2.1 The Impact of Multiple Frames of Reference	79
3.2.2 The Impact of Decision Programs	87
3.3 Cooperation Initiatives: Networks of Reciprocity	87
3.3.1 The Impact of Trust in Interorganizational Networks	88

Table of Contents

3.3.2	The Impact of Informal Interactions in DOs	90
3.4	Research Design: Hypotheses for Field Research	95
3.4.1	Systems Theory and Actor-based Research	95
3.4.2	The Causal Process Hypothesis	96
4	Methods:	
	Research Approach towards Cooperation in Partner Countries	99
4.1	Methodological Paradigm	99
4.2	Field Research	103
4.2.1	Case Selection	104
4.2.2	Process Tracing Approach	112
4.3	Data Collection	117
4.3.1	Interview Modalities and Guide	118
4.3.2	Ego-centric Network Maps	125
4.4	Analysis	128
4.4.1	Reflections on the Researcher's Subjectivity	129
4.4.2	Qualitative Content Analysis	130
4.5	Research Design: Field Research Modalities	131
5	Analysis I:	
	Conflicting Motivations Drive Development Cooperation	133
5.1	The Case Studies' Contexts: Insufficient Cooperation	134
5.1.1	Indonesia: An Emerging Power	135
5.1.2	Madagascar: A Fragile State	137
5.2	The Field Research: Assumptions, Hypotheses, and Evidence	140
5.2.1	The Status Quo: Harmonization Commitments Failed	140
5.2.2	The Causal Process: Hypotheses at Country Level	142
5.3	Process Step 1: Employees Re-Connect Conflicting Interests	144
5.3.1	Conflicting Interests:	
	Global Altruistic Narrative vs. Donors' Objectives	145
5.3.2	Re-Connecting Interests:	
	The Disjuncture is Bridged at Partner Country Level	150
5.3.3	National Interests:	
	Political and Economic Goals are Predominant	153
6	Analysis II:	
	Regulations and Visibility Requirements Limit Cooperation	159
6.1	Process Step 2: Regulations and Routines are Incompatible	159

6.1.1	Rigid Regulations: Organizations are Bound to Individual Practices	161
6.1.2	No Operationalization: International Commitments are not Put into Practice	165
6.1.3	Fake Cooperation: Organizations Create Narrative to Meet Expectations	166
6.2	Process Step 3: Visibility is more Important than Cooperation	169
6.2.1	Multilaterals: Bureaucratic but Trusted Brokers	170
6.2.2	Bilaterals: Dynamic Actors with National Agenda	177
7	Analysis III: Quasi-Formal Meetings are Key for Coordination and Cooperation	181
7.1	Process Step 4: Leadership without Partner Country	181
7.1.1	Insufficient Capacity for Coordination	182
7.1.2	Insufficient Commitment to Coordination	184
7.2	Process Step 5: Quasi-formal Meetings are Intersystems	188
7.2.1	Quasi-formal Meetings: A Social System between Group and Organization	190
7.2.2	Quasi-formal Meetings Coordinate Complementarity	193
7.3	The Pre-Conditions for Different Forms of Cooperation	201
8	Conclusion: A Call for a Context-sensitive Approach to Cooperation	207
	Bibliography	215

List of Figures

1.1	Medicine Pathways in Tanzania	21
2.1	Fragmentation of Development Cooperation	31
2.2	The Institutional Landscape of Development	32
2.3	Number and Size of Projects	40
2.4	Ownership, Harmonization, Alignment	44
2.5	Transaction Cost in Interorganizational Cooperation	52
2.6	Transaction Costs' Benefit	53
3.1	The Function Systems of Society	75
4.1	The Methodological Approach	102
4.2	Interorganizational Cooperation in Regions	106
4.3	Case Selection Shortlist	107
4.4	Sectors in Case Study Countries	111
4.5	Process Tracing	114
4.6	Variables of the Causal Process	116
4.7	Ego-Centric Network Map	126
7.1	Pre-conditions for Coordination and Cooperation	204

List of Acronyms

ABD	Asian Development Bank
AFD	Agence Française de Développement
BMZ	German Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development
BS	general budget support
BRICS	Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CPA	country programmable aid
CPH	causal process hypothesis
CPC	causal process chain
CSO	civil society organization
DC	development cooperation
DO	development organization
EADI	European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes
EP	European Parliament
EU	European Union
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
GAVI	Global Alliance for Vaccination and Immunization
GDI	German Development Institute
GIZ	German Federal Enterprise for International Cooperation
GIGA	German Institute of Global and Area Studies
GPEDC	Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation
HDI	Human Development Index
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IAD	Institutional Analysis and Development framework
ICI	Interorganizational Cooperation Index
IGGI	Inter-Governmental Group on Indonesia
IT	information technology
IO	international organization
IORA	Indian Ocean Rim Association
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
LDC	least developed country

List of Acronyms

MDCD	most different cases design
NAM	Non-Aligned Movement
NGO	non-governmental organization
NIE	new institutional economics
PC	partner country
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
ODF	official development finance
OOF	other official flows
ODA	official development assistance
PBA	programme-based approach
PD	Paris Declaration
QA	qualitative content analysis
QNA	qualitative network analysis
RBA	result-based aid
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SWAp	sector-wide approach
UN	United Nations
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USD	United States Dollar
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

1 Introduction:

Does Development Cooperation Need more Cooperation?

International development cooperation (DC) faces high expectations. By adopting the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the international community committed itself to 17 common objectives. These include economic growth, mitigating climate change, and putting an end to extreme poverty.¹

However, DC has drawn manifold criticism from various disciplines across the social sciences. Such criticism has been directed against DC at several different levels. The post-development discourse that has emerged since the 1980s, for example, has challenged the whole idea of DC, arguing that its relationships remain vertical in nature and represent a quasi-continuation of colonial dominance.² Moreover, the rise of the BRICS countries and the increasingly multipolar world-order questioned the Western concept of development in general.

Some scholars, such as Moyo (2009), even claim that DC has a negative impact on the so-called developing countries, hereafter referred to as *partner countries*. In consequence, she argues, it should be phased out sooner rather than later. This notion has been controversially discussed, with the majority of scholars not agreeing.³ Burnside and Dollar (2000), for example, find that DC is effective - at least where governance quality is good.⁴ Yet, it needs to be mentioned that besides the reduction of extreme poverty in many world regions, there is no strong causal evidence for a positive impact of DC.

In spite of ambiguous evidence and controversial discussions, DC is not expected to be discontinued in the near future. Following the proclaimed goal of supporting the partner countries, *donor countries* have successively increased their contributions for official development assistance (ODA).⁵

1 UN 2015.

2 For example Yarrow and Venkatesan 2012: 4.

3 For example Sachs (2008); Hilary (2010). For a review of the wider “Great Foreign Aid Debate”, see Engel (2014).

4 Also Birchle and Michaelowa 2013.

5 This study intended to not use the term “donor” but the term “development partner” to account for a horizontal nature of relationships. However, the distinction between “partner countries” and “development partners” was not clear enough and thus led

In 2016 they reached an all-time high, in absolute terms, of \$142 billion.⁶ However, if in-donor refugee costs and humanitarian aid are deducted, DC funding has more or less stagnated since 2010.⁷ Against this backdrop, an efficient and effective delivery of DC is even more important to achieve development targets such as the SDGs.⁸

The efficient delivery of DC is increasingly difficult, as not only its funding stagnates but the number of actors in the DC universe also increases. Since “a whole range of public, private and hybrid actors” have entered the arena, the “institutional jungle” of DC has become more diverse.⁹ Correspondingly, Severino and Ray (2010: 7) argue that the multiplicity of actors, such as multilateral agencies, tends to further grow: “while dozens of such multilateral agencies have been created over the last decades, few have disappeared thus far: according to the OECD there are now 263 multilateral organizations active in development, i.e. [...] four to five times the number of developing countries they are meant to assist.”

In consequence, the number of parallel and overlapping projects and programs has also increased: “in 2006 the OECD reported over 81,000 active aid

to confusion. Moreover, during field research, the term “donor” was used by almost every interviewee, including representatives of the partner countries. Responding to this reality, and to avoid misconceptions, this study uses the established terms “donor” and “development organization” for those countries that provide DC, and “donor organization” for those bilateral, multilateral, civil society, and other entities that provide, manage, or implement DC activities (see section 4.3.2 for a more detailed description of this study’s scope). Thereby this study follows the practice of, for example, the Joint Evaluation of the Paris Declaration (Wood et al. 2011: xi).

6 OECD 2017b.

7 The DC activities examined in this study include neither humanitarian aid nor refugee support in donor countries, as their nature is fundamentally different from mid- to long-term DC projects and programs in partner countries. More detailed information on the scope of this study is provided in section 3.2

8 A wide-ranging academic discourse investigates the efficiency and effectiveness of DC. The discourse addresses this challenge from two different angles. To increase the impact of specific DC projects and interventions, some scholars explicitly focus on the effectiveness of DC activities, applying, for example, the concept of randomized clinic trial. Other scholars search for potential efficiency gains through pooling of funds and better cooperation between different actors. Overall, it needs to be noted that both concepts, efficiency and effectiveness, as well as the respective research is interdependent and cannot be fully separated from one another. Lawson (2009) elaborates, for example, that “to increase the effectiveness of aid, [international declarations] recognise that a first step in this direction would be to increase the efficiency of aid.”

9 Severino and Ray 2010: 5.

projects worldwide (up from 17,000 in 1996!), the median size of each activity representing only \$67,000.”¹⁰ This fragmentation “creates coordination problems and high overhead costs for both donors and recipients.”¹¹

Against the backdrop of this increasingly fragmented DC, I formulated this study’s leading research interest as follows: *in what ways do national interests and bureaucratic regulations impact on the behavior of development organizations (DOs) - and to what extent do they allow for interorganizational coordination and cooperation?*

A pluralism of actors and ideas is generally beneficial, as it allows for different ideas and approaches to compete, eventually revealing what works best. In this regard, looking at the health sector, Hein and Kickbusch (2010: 8), for example, note that the proliferation of actors has “not only added expertise and financial resources to the field [...] but has also contributed to a higher degree of flexibility.” This is echoed by Severino and Ray (2009: 6-7) who argue that the “bustling creativity of new development actors has [...] has unleashed a form of innovation,” while also recognizing that “the gains from having more actors involved are outstripped by the losses that stem from policy incoherence and coordination costs.” Correspondingly, Marquardt (2016: 200,212) acknowledges the effect of “positive pluralism”, but emphasizes that beyond a certain level it turns into “negative fragmentation”, a setup in which many similar projects co-exist without coordination. Barder (2009: 4) concludes that “competition and diversity are advantages, but only when the system drives out inefficient or ineffective organizations.”

For the case of DC, the negative effects of fragmentation outweigh its benefits, as this Introduction and the following Chapter 2 will demonstrate. The increasing number of actors undermines the already low collective efficiency of DC:¹² “the growing chaos generated by the proliferation of actors of development assistance [is] a major source of inefficiency.”¹³ The international DC system does not create any necessity to conflate its activities. Its excep-

10 Severino and Ray 2010: 24.

11 Easterly and Pfutze (2008: 3). While *fragmentation* describes through how many channels DC is provided to a partner country, the same data can be looked at from the opposite perspective: *Proliferation* describes the number of partner countries a particular donor deals with. Fragmentation and proliferation are highly correlated (Acharya et al. 2006: 6). Some scholars even use them synonymously, for example Klingebiel et al. (2013: 8) in a report for the European Parliament (EP). As this study zooms in on the partner country level, it only focuses on fragmentation.

12 The *collective efficiency* refers to the efficiency of the aggregate of all DC activities.

13 Severino and Ray 2010: 29.

tional configuration, characterized by the absence of market competition and hierarchy, does not sanction, and thus allows, inefficient behavior.¹⁴ However, the direct loss in efficiency and effectiveness is not the only negative impact stemming from the increasing fragmentation of activities.

Increasing fragmentation also carries a substantial burden for partner countries, as the following examples will illustrate. At partner country level, in Uganda, the government has “to deal with 684 different DC instruments and associated agreements for aid coming into the central budget alone.”¹⁵ In Kenya, the procurement of drugs involves a total of 20 DOs with 13 institutional bodies.¹⁶ In Tanzania, for example, the supply of medicines involves a total of 14 DOs - a complexity that is illustrated in figure 1.1, depicting just this single process of medicine procurement.

Manifold parallel structures like these, overwhelm partner countries’ bureaucracies because they have to comply with the individual communication, execution and reporting standards of each DO. In Tanzania, in total, officials have to complete 10,000 reports and host 1,000 donor missions per year.¹⁷ “Cambodia receives an average 400 donor-missions per year, Nicaragua 289 or Bangladesh 250, imposing a considerable strain on recipient countries that are not all equipped to cope.”¹⁸ This absorbs large parts of partner countries’ officials’ resources. In some cases up to 70 percent of their time.¹⁹ Officials thus often lack the capacity for their primary work duties. Correspondingly, the partner countries are at times literally overwhelmed with the management

14 It is acknowledged that competition is present to some extent, created for example through tender processes for implementation partners. However, there is no market competition that would drive unsuccessful donors or donor agencies out of the system, i.e. into bankruptcy (Barder 2009: 4). Or as Faust and Messner (2007: 4) put it: “Rivalry among donors centers on acquiring funds and responsibilities from upper levels of the delivery chain, rivalry does not drive the supply side toward efforts to more effectively and innovatively satisfy client preferences.” For further reflection on market-mechanisms and hierarchy in the DC system, see Beuselinck (2008b: 29-34).

15 Faust and Messner 2007: 6.

16 Commission of the European Communities 2007: 5.

17 Birdsall (2004: 21). According to Metz (2015: 79) each project is typically visited by the headquarters’ project leader, the head of the division, the head of the department, representatives from donor countries, representatives from partner countries, evaluators, and journalists.

18 Severino and Ray (2009: 6). The Commission of the European Communities (2007: 3) explains that, on average, each developing country receives 350 donor missions per year.

19 McKinsey & Company 2005: 22.

Figure 1.1: Complex pathways of medicine supply in Tanzania.

Source: Tanzanian Ministry of Health and Social Welfare 2008: 7.

of their DO relationships. In response, Tanzania, for example, had to suspend donor visits for several months:

“Over 2000-2002, the United States disbursed about USD 100 million of aid in Tanzania, financing fifty different projects at an average of just USD2 million apiece. With more than 1,300 projects altogether in that period, and an estimated 1,000 donor meetings a year and 2,300 reports to donors every quarter, Tanzania several years ago announced a four-month holiday during which it would not accept donor visits.” (Birdsall 2004: 21)

Since the first evaluations of DC, its fragmentation has regularly been criticized. The prominent reports of the Independent Commission for International Development, the so-called Pearson Report (1969: 22, 228) and the so-called Brandt Report (1980: 189), already highlighted that unnecessary overlap and duplication of activities create high costs, and thus called for more coherence. However, during the Cold War era, there was hardly any interest in international cooperation. The use of DC for foreign and security policy matters was paramount:²⁰ “a ‘race for influence’ took place in the South - one in which the economic performance of satellite nations served as a benchmark to assess the ideology of the patron.”²¹

After the end of the bipolar world order, the issue was increasingly addressed by the international community. To counter the fragmentation of DC and to thus reduce the overlap of activities, the donor community committed itself to better coordinate their activities. This process started in 2002 with the Monterrey Consensus. Then, in 2003, “the signatories to the Rome Declaration [made] clear their understanding of how disharmony impedes aid effectiveness: it is through efficiency losses.”²²

In 2005, the prominent Paris Declaration called for the *harmonization* of DC activities, i.e. joint design and implementation of projects and programs, to address incoherence and fragmentation.²³ However, five years later, in 2010, the evaluation of the Paris Declaration revealed that the gap between progress and targets was still substantial.²⁴ Hence, the donor countries reaffirmed their commitments in a number of additional international agreements (see section 2.1.3), calling for more coordination and cooperation.²⁵ The most recent agreement from 2016, the Nairobi Outcome Document, again re-affirmed

²⁰ For example Woods 2005: 396.

²¹ Severino and Ray 2009: 2.

²² Eyben 2007: 640-641.

²³ OECD 2005.

²⁴ Wood et al. 2011: 19.

²⁵ In line with, for example, Acharya et al. (2006: 15), and Klingebiel et al. (2013: 8), who, in a recent report for the EP, defines that “aid coordination comprises activities

that the international community will “improve harmonization of providers of development cooperation.”²⁶

Despite all the international commitments, recent research continues to show that the high-level norm-building initiatives have failed to reduce fragmentation and to increase coordination and cooperation. Even worse, fragmentation is rather increasing than decreasing.²⁷ The attempt to reduce overlap through *specialization*, instead of through harmonization, called upon donors to each focus on a limited number of countries and sectors only.²⁸ However, this strategy was not successful either.²⁹

It needs to be noted that the evaluations of the international agreements have shown that partner countries have progressed on their commitments to aid effectiveness than donors.³⁰ For some scholars, it is thus “becoming a source of considerable irritation that developing countries have made better progress on their commitments than donor countries.”³¹ Particularly, as the reform demands have been more demanding for partner countries than for donors.³² Therefore, this research focuses on the more pressing issue of interorganizational coordination and cooperation among DOs - and how overlap and duplication of their work can be reduced.

Summarizing what has been laid out so far, it can be stated that the predicament of fragmentation is critical and the need for improvement is widely acknowledged. However, it is poorly understood why the international commitments to more coherence are not followed by changes on the ground.

Since international commitments have not yielded notable results, it is necessary to re-assess the complexity of DC, and to understand how DOs can contribute to increase the collective efficiency of DC, to also lessen the burden for partner countries. This is all the more important, as least

[...] to harmonise their policies, programs, procedures, and practices,” this study understands coordination as a distinct, but less intensive form of cooperation, i.e. subsumes coordination under cooperation. While this connotation is common in the discourse on development cooperation, it is noted that this understanding varies across political science debates. In the international relations discourse, for example, intergovernmental cooperation often refers a legally formalized set of binding rules, i.e. the adoption of a treaty (see for example Paulo 2015: 12).

26 GPEDC 2016a.

27 For example Nunnenkamp et al. 2015.

28 See also section 2.1.1.

29 Nunnenkamp et al. 2011.

30 Wood et al. 2011: xiv; OECD (2011a: 15); Rogerson 2011: iv.

31 Barder 2009: 7.

32 Wood et al. 2011: xiii.

developed countries (LDCs) are least capable of managing their multiple DO relationships. In other words: it is particularly crucial to increase the coherence of DC, because those partner countries which are most fragile and vulnerable, and thus most in need of DC support, suffer the most from the prevailing incoherence.

Unfortunately, previous research has not provided sufficient evidence and insights to fully understand how DOs at the partner country level interact and cooperate. It has only provided anecdotal evidence, quantitative analyses using aggregated country level data, and it generally lacks a rigorous theoretical backing. In response, Severino and Ray (2010: 2) emphasize that it is important for aid effectiveness to understand and then improve “the management of this proliferation [of actors] in a way that addresses the faulty incentive structures of the actors of international cooperation.”

There is only limited research on the question of why interorganizational cooperation and harmonization has failed and fragmentation prevails.³³ The few scholars that have addressed the issue of fragmentation and coordination/cooperation either argue that cooperation is constrained by donor’s national interests or by bureaucratic constraints.³⁴ Regarding the bureaucratic constraints, Nicolas van de Walle (2005: 75), for example, argues that “the failure of donor coordination is almost entirely due to bureaucratic resistance within donor agencies”. Rogerson (2011: iv) agrees that “conflicting donor-side institutional incentives and attitudes to risk are behind” unclear strategies and ineffective DC. Regarding donors’ national interests, a systematic analysis of how these impact interorganizational cooperation in DC has not yet been conducted.

The link between organizational factors and cooperation between DOs has been systematically examined by only very few studies. The most prominent one was conducted by Elinor Ostrom and her team (2001). It focuses on the incentive system within the Swedish DC agency, pointing to several dysfunctional mechanisms such as long delegation chains.³⁵ Another early and important contribution to the discourse was commissioned by the OECD and conducted by Paolo de Renzio et al. (2004). It analyzes incentives and their impact on harmonization and alignment.

33 For example Gulrajani 2014: 90.

34 Regarding the influence of national interests, see, for example, Brown and Swiss (2013: 753) or section 2.1.4.

35 Ostrom et al.’s (2001) report was enriched with additional materials and then published as a book: see Gibson et al. (2005). Unfortunately, this book does not further expand on the issue of interorganizational cooperation.

Besides providing some valuable insights, those few studies that feature a rigorous theoretical backing share one common shortcoming: their research was almost exclusively conducted in the headquarters of DOs. Renzio et al. (2004: 27), for example, explicitly bewail this weakness of their study.³⁶ Hence, they could not examine how the international agreements have been translated to and impacted on the operational level. And more importantly, they could not make inferences about how cooperation works at the partner country level. Besides, both studies only looked at isolated factors, such as the incentive system, and how it impedes cooperation, but they did not systematically examine how communication and cooperation evolve.

It is important to understand the entire process of cooperation at partner country level. Recent studies show that this is critical as processes at this level are decisive, because this is where cooperation physically happens.³⁷ The critical relevance of research at partner country level is confirmed by Pfeiffer and Boussalis (2015: 57), who criticize that most of the literature examines DC, and respective allocation decisions, by only looking at aggregated country level data. Annen and Moers (2012: 1), for example, come to the conclusion that “agreements to better coordinate aid allocations are not implementable,” by solely conducting a quantitative analysis of country-level data.³⁸ Correspondingly, Messner et al. (2013: 4) emphasize that research ought to be conducted on “how cooperation scales up from the interpersonal to larger scales,” particularly as this “is a rarely examined area for which we have little direct evidence.”³⁹ And Lundsgaarde (2016: 76) confirms that the study of “fragmentation requires attention to how the cooperation systems are [...] organised.” Overall, the operational processes of interorganizational communication, coordination and cooperation are only poorly understood.⁴⁰ It particularly lacks systematic, theory-led research at partner country level

36 Renzio et al. (2004: 10) interviewed only a few employees from partner countries via telephone. And both Ostrom et al. (2001: Preface) and Gibson et al. (2005: 132) mainly focused on Stockholm-based SIDA employees.

37 For example International Development Association 2007: 13; Wood et al. 2011: xvi .

38 See Annen and Moers 2012: 5.

39 Messner et al. 2013: 27.

40 Many insightful studies which focus on international cooperation look at activities related to climate change (for example Keohane and Victor 2011; Ostrom 2012.) However, their findings cannot be transferred to the arena of development cooperation; mostly because DC mostly addresses distinct partner country issues and not an international common-pool resource. In other words, these issues are not dealt with at the same level. Furthermore, the climate-related discourse concentrates on a consensus-oriented negotiation process, whereas DC can also work bilaterally.

that exploratively seeks to understand the entire process of communication and cooperation between DOs.

Therefore, in an interdisciplinary effort, this study makes use of one of sociology's grand theories: Niklas Luhmann's systems theory. This theory connects the macro-, meso-, and micro-level and thus allows to understand how national policies and objectives shape bi- and multilateral DOs and how actions scale up from the individual to the organizational level.

This theory was chosen in the process of iteratively developing a qualitative research design which responds to the need for theory-backed research at the partner country level. First, previous studies on the internal dynamics of DOs and interorganizational cooperation were examined to thus identify the remaining gaps in existing research, and to accordingly formulate precise lead research questions. Second, a rigorous theoretical approach was developed to analyze DO interactions. This approach conceptualized DC interactions on the partner country, organizational, and global levels, as well as between these three levels. Third, the hypotheses, which were derived from this theorization, were scrutinized in four case studies. To this end, a process tracing approach was adopted for an in-depth investigation of the cooperation process, and to exploratively look beyond the hypotheses. Eventually, the empirical data was analyzed in a qualitative content analysis (QA), and recommendations were formulated.⁴¹

The following Chapter 2 presents the discourse on fragmentation and examines previous theoretical approaches to the challenge of interorganizational coordination and cooperation. Eventually, Chapter 2 derives two concrete lead research questions, which form the basis for this study's rigorous and novel theorization.

On the basis of the lead research questions, Chapter 3 applies Luhmann's systems theory for a comprehensive conceptualization of international DC in general and of interorganizational cooperation in particular. In the course of this theorization, hypotheses had been formulated and then logically clustered and sequenced to resemble one overarching causal process hypothesis. The resulting array of hypotheses was then operationalized into a questionnaire guiding the field research.

41 To clarify, this dissertation did not arithmetically assess any outcome of DC projects, programs or cooperation activities. All the same, it did not evaluate any particular countries' or organizations' commitments, contributions, or concessions. It generally analyzed interactions, processes, and structures of interorganizational cooperation at partner country level.

Chapter 4 subsequently delineates the methodological approach that led this research. It first describes in detail the criteria that determined the systematic selection of the two case study countries, such as the prevalence of cooperation activities and the ODA inflow. It then also elaborates the process tracing approach which this study adopted, as well as the qualitative methods that were used for data collection and analysis.

Chapters 5, 6, and 7 present in great detail the case studies' empirical evidence and the analysis' results. They showcase how interests differ on different levels of the DC system, and the crucial role of quasi-formal meetings at the partner country level, which balance these different interests. Eventually it is explained why complementarity is the best possible form of cooperation in most contexts, and what are the preconditions for other more intensive forms of interorganizational cooperation.

The concluding Chapter 8 eventually consolidates this study's essential results, highlights recommendations, and gives directions for further research.