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ABSTRACT

Economic sanctions are nowadays used as popular instruments of international governance. The international community tries to resolve conflicts as abominable as you can imagine by imposing economic sanction regimes to aggressive dictators. Strikingly, among seventy percent of the imposed sanction regimes appear to be ineffective. Still, it is used as the military alternative to war. How can the efficacy of economic sanction regimes be improved? What problems emerge when multiple states enter in a multilateral sanction regime? How can international cooperation be coordinated? What role is there for International Organizations in international sanction regimes? Is every International Organization to the same extent capable of coordinating international sanction regimes? What is the influence of the institutional designs on the capabilities of International Organizations to coordinate international cooperation efforts? These are the questions which I will answer in this thesis.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the recent years, imposing economic sanctions has become the most popular tool of international governance, and is often referred to as a possible solution to control certain acts of foreign governments and alter their behavior. The instrument is used to eventually resolve political conflicts. Sanctions have become ‘the virtual 911 of international decision makers anxious to enforce norms of justice and international peace’ (Lopez, 2000: 19). Economic sanctions are not intended to kill civilians of a target country (Drezner, 1998) and are therefore often regarded as ‘humane’ instruments of foreign policy (Allen & Lektzian, 2012). Moreover, sanctions are often treated as ‘the liberal alternative to military wars’ (Pape, 1997: 90). While all this sounds very utopian and interesting, the possibility of resolving political conflicts without actually possessing physical control over another territory is often questioned by scholars. Because many parties with various interests are involved in these conflicts and the basic human rights must be met, the international situation becomes a cumbersome and complex field of scrutiny where many scholars (most prominently: Drezner, 2000; Doxey, 1971; Galtung, 1967; Kirshner, 1997; Martin, 1994; Pape, 1997) dedicate their attention to. In the sanctions literature, most scholars look at the effectiveness of the economic sanctions; what are their outcomes? This is where it becomes interesting. In the field of international governance, economic sanctions are used to resolve afflictive conflicts. They are implemented with the stated intention of altering a foreign states behavior, to evoke acquiesce with international ethical norms. These conflicts are serious to the extent that the international society feels the need to intervene. Western countries are inclined to support pro-
democracy movements and aim to destabilize various corrupt dictators by using sanctions as economic instruments of coercion (Major, 2012). The problematic part of this trend is that if sanctions are being used as an alternative or substitute to military interventions, one may assume that this is an effective policy instrument.

Nevertheless, the empirical results from various studies are striking. Empirical evidence conducted by Hufbauer, Scott & Elliot in 1990, hereafter referred to as HSE, showed that only 30% of the economic sanctions episodes are classified as ‘effective’ (Lektzian & Souva, 2007). Indicating that the target state altered its behavior according to the wishes of the sender state. Putting it differently, according to this research, around 70% of the sanctions imposed by nations are ‘ineffective’. It appears that sanctions are rarely successful in this regard. Supporting this view, Galtung (1967: 407) argues that the ‘probable effectiveness of economic sanctions is, generally, negative’. Other prominent economic sanctions scholars such as Adler-Karlsson (1968), Baldwin (1985) Doxey (1972), Galtung (1967), Pape (1997) and Wallensteen (1968) share this negative view on the effectiveness of economic sanctions (Tsebelis, 1990).

Despite negative empirical evidence and negative scholarly attention, since the end of the Cold War the number of economic sanctions imposed between states has constantly increased. While, according to the leading scholars in the field, its effectiveness is heavily questioned. Therefore, we should ask ourselves why economic sanctions are still in use, when they prove to be most effective, and how they can be transformed in order to enhance the effectiveness of the diplomatic instrument. Here, I will dedicate my attention to the specific role of International Organizations as coordination mechanisms in the process of economic sanctioning. I follow Daniel Drezners (2000) conclusion that the effectiveness of economic sanctions can be increased when International Organizations are involved in the sanctioning procedures. Moreover, I will extend this view and look at organizations’ specific features which may contribute to the level of effectiveness.
PURPOSE

The purpose of this research is to exhibit the specific role of International Organizations (IOs) in the sanctioning process. In the sanctions literature this link is greatly ignored by prominent scholars. Most authors focus on the flaws and defects of economic sanctions (Pape, 1997) and do not look at ways that may improve this instrument of coercive diplomacy. This is not the way forward, as Kirshner (1997: 32) indicates: ‘the focus should not be on if sanctions work, but rather how they function’. Drezner (2000) is one of the authors who recognizes the possible crucial role of IOs in international sanctioning. He argues that international sanctions are more effective if there is strong backing and commitment of an International Organization. Moreover, Early and Spice (2014) refer to the presence IOs as a possible solution to control for backsliders and sanction busters in sanction agreements. I will explain more on this in chapter three. However, in both studies the authors stay on the surface by indicating that there indeed is a positive role for IOs as a coordinating mechanism in international sanction episodes. The specifics of this role, the variance between and within the capabilities of IOs and the different types of economic sanctions to be coordinated are not yet explored.

In the majority of International Relations’ theories the role of IOs in the international affairs is widely scrutinized. IOs are said to be institutions which are able to coordinate and facilitate international cooperation (e.g. Keohane, 1984). International Organizations are also associated with international conflict resolution, where they can serve as mediators or adjudicators (Mitchell, 2006). Moreover, the presence of international institutions in international cooperation makes it possible for states to anticipate each other’s expectations thereby influencing the behavior of states (Keohane, 1986). The presence of IOs may just be the coordination mechanism that could improve the process of international sanctioning. However, Mansfield (1995) argues that IOs all have a very distinct character and some IOs may implement more effective sanction regimes than others. To this day, little attention is paid to this gap in the sanction literature. Therefore, I aim to explore how different institutional designs affect the effectiveness of IOs as coordinating mechanisms for economic sanction episodes. I take the institutional designs of IOs as independent variables which may explain the outcome of sanctioning efforts. Because I believe that different institutional designs can contribute to the explanation of the variation and quality of international
cooperation efforts. The aim of my research is to find ways in which sanctioning can be more effective, instead of looking at flaws I look at ways for improvement. The relevance concerning this study is that if I can explore what specific roles IOs play in sanctioning procedures, future sanction efforts may be adapted to best practices and the overall effectiveness levels of sanctions could improve.

The thesis is organized in three main theoretical sections. The first part disaggregates economic sanctions and exhibits its various forms, in order to enlarge the understanding of the efficacy and procedures of economic sanctions. The focus of this thesis is to look for ways of improvement in international sanctioning so there should be a thorough understanding of the dynamics of economic sanctions. The second section explores the various problems associated with multilateral sanctioning and examines the link with international cooperation. Finally, the relationship between the presence of IOs and improved international cooperation is explained. When all this is discussed, I will conduct a comparative empirical analysis. Here, I dedicate my attention to the specific values of different IOs. I will look into the different characteristics of IOs, especially whether the organizations are internally divided or more homogenous in their institutional designs. I will compare the various institutional designs on the sanction outcomes, and find the effect of institutional differences on the efficacy of economic sanctions.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Defining Economic Sanctions

The reason why there are so many different articles, opinions and policy recommendations surrounding economic sanctions is the fact that it appears to be exceedingly difficult to define ‘economic sanction’. The grand variation on the assessment of whether economic sanctions are effective or not is greatly depending on the difference in definitions. Therefore in order to construct a valid research concerning ‘the effectiveness of economic sanctions’ I will now carefully discuss various definitions and implications of economic sanctions.

When discussing about economic sanctions, most authors refer to sanctions as
restrictions or limitations on intergovernmental trade, with the purpose of altering a foreign governments’ behavior. Barber (1979: 367) states: ‘Economic sanctions are economic measures directed to political objectives’. The state who imposes the economic sanction is referred to as ‘the sender’ and the nation receiving the sanction is mostly referred to as ‘the target’ or ‘the receiver’. The sender can impose a sanction to a target for various reasons and intentions. Cortright and Lopez (1995) argue that ‘sanctions seem to move freely – even simultaneously – between the world of preventive diplomacy and the world of coercive diplomacy’. The motives and rationales behind the international usage of economic sanctions parallel the three basic purposes of criminal law – ‘to punish, to deter, and to rehabilitate’ (Hufbauer & Elliot, 2007: 7). If there is perceived violation of international standards, international ethical norms or obligations one, or a combination, of the three options will be used by the sender. The sender and target of a sanction effort can be an individual country, an organization, various ad hoc groups of states, or a combination of states and organizations. In this thesis I will look at sanctions which are imposed to states as targets.

In her book, Margaret Doxey (1987: 4) defines economic sanctions as ‘penalties threatened or imposed as a declared consequence of the target’s failure to observe international standards or international obligations’. However, I do not see economic sanctions as a ‘causal consequence’ of a target’s failure to live up to certain international standards, sanctions are part of an active process of a state responding to a certain event or behavior of another state. John Galtung (1967: 379) uses a more normative definition and refers to economic sanctions as ‘actions initiated by one or more international actors in order to punish the targets by depriving them of some value and/or to make the targets comply with certain norms the senders deem to be important’. In this paper, when I refer to economic sanctions I use Tung’s (2002: 98) interpretation of sanctions as ‘the threat or act by a state or coalition of states, the sender, to disrupt customary economic exchange with another state, the target, in order to punish the target, force change in the target’s policies or demonstrate to a domestic or international audience the sender’s position on the target’s policies’. Moreover, I use ‘economic sanctions’ and ‘sanctions’ interchangeably. What also must be kept in mind is that economic sanctions do not include economic warfare, economic inducements and trade wars.
3.1.1 Sanction Success

When looking at the effectiveness and efficacy of economic sanctions there needs to be a definition of what a successful sanction episode actually is. When is a sanction regime ‘effective’ or ‘successful’? Pape (1997) argues that a sanction is successful when it extracts political concessions from the target state. Lopez and Cortright (2004) amplify this by arguing that sanctions can also be considered to be successful when ‘noncompliance is impossible’ for the target state. Hovi, Huseby and Sprinz (2005: 485) identify three reasons why imposed sanctions can possibly fail their purpose and do not reach compliance of the target state, thereby assuming that all nations involved are rational actors. Firstly, an imposed sanction regime could fail because the target country does not believe in the credibility of the sanction effort. Secondly, the target may regard the imposed sanction effects as the ‘better’ option compared to compliance to the proposed policy alterations, the **costs of yielding exceed the cost of the sanction**. The target state rather continues its behavior under a sanction regime than alter to compliance. Thirdly, a sanction effort may ‘fail’ because the target country does not believe that the sanction is lifted when the state decide to yield. In this case there is **no incentive** for the target state to change its behavior.

Of course whether or not a target chooses to yield depends on many factors: what type of sanction is imposed, who or what is the target or sender of the sanction, what does the sender state try to effectuate? In the next chapter I will explain what different types of economic sanctions exist and what effects economic sanctions may have on a target country.

3.2 The Types and Targets of Economic Sanctions

Economic sanctions take usually five different forms: ‘actions which disrupt the trade, aid, finance, currency and assets of the target state’ (Kirshner, 1997: 36). Firstly, trade controls are the most common economic sanctions. Examples are quotas or restrictive licenses on imports and exports, or boycotts and trade embargoes. These sanctions wield direct influence on the national economies. The aim of imposing trade controls is to divest the target states of any trade-related gains. Secondly, the suspension of aid is also a form of economic diplomacy. The extent to which aid is abolished, and what effects that has on the target country depends on numerous factors. Whether the target state is dependent on various forms of aid, who the sender nation is, and the level of interdependency between the sender and
target. If state A is fully dependent on state B, and state B decides to impose a sanction which eliminates the (financial) aid flowing to country A, this country will be ‘hit hard’ by the sanction. If there is minimal or no interdependence between the states, the effects will usually be limited. The third form of economic sanctions is the disruption in financial relations. Financial sanctions can be expressed in freezing the financial assets of target states, these financial assets can be bank assets of the target government or those of influential citizens. Interest, debt repayments and other transfer payments can also be frozen as an instrument of punishing the target nation (Tung, 2002). Fourthly, when economic sanctions are imposed, the essential aim is to destabilize the targets’ national economy. Therefore, a successful sanction is one which exerts a significant pressure on the national currency; causing inflation and increasing national debts. This is likely to change the behavior of the target state. The last form of economic sanctions described by Kirshner (1997: 37) is the ‘seizure of a target’s assets’. These types of economic sanctions exert effects on resources of the target state. The sender state may remove physical assets from the target state, freeze bank accounts, or eliminate securities. The ultimate aim is, again to, attenuate the target’s economy.

Most of the examples of sanctions stated above are ‘economic sanctions’, yet in order to present a valid analysis in assessing the effectiveness of sanctions a distinction between economic and non-economic sanctions is required. Economic sanctions are imposed with the aim of changing the policy behavior of the target state, and are therefore implemented to inflict pain and damage in the target states’ economy as a whole. Non-economic sanctions can be targeted at influential individuals or terrorist associated regime leaders. These sanctions do not cause severe consequences for the entire economy. They constrain ‘important’ individuals when, for example, flight bans are imposed. The effectiveness of both types of sanctions is discussed in the literature, and scholars argue that ‘the greater the cost of the sanctions to the target, the greater the likelihood they will succeed’ (Drury, 1998: 508). It essentially centers around the costs of both target and sender. Margaret Doxey claims that economic sanctions are most likely to be effective when the sender state puts ‘tremendous pressure’ on the target (Doxey, 1980: 78). This pressure Doxey talks about can be allocated to different parties or groups, here the distinction between ‘comprehensive sanctions’ and ‘smart sanctions’ becomes relevant.
3.2.1 Comprehensive versus Smart Sanctions

Right after the Cold War, economic sanctions were viewed as an instrument of global governance which could peacefully and mildly punish other states, as an ‘prelude or alternative to military intervention’ (Hufbauer et al., 2007: 54). However, as time told us, this ‘bloodless’ political instrument is in fact not as harmless as politicians thought. Reexaminations of several sanction periods have undermined this common view (Gordon, 1999). Taking the comprehensive sanctions imposed to Iraq in 1990 by the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) as an example, diplomats, politicians and scholars honestly believed that comprehensive sanctions would resolve the Iraqi political conflicts without causing unintended human suffering. This appeared not to be the case. In August 1990 comprehensive sanctions were imposed in Iraq on all imported goods, except for medicines. The sanctions had immediate impact on the health of the general population of the country. Studies estimate that ‘560,000 children under the age of five, and 1.2 million people (including the under fives) have died as a result of the sanctions by 1995’ (Garfield, 1999: 15). In addition, considering the effectiveness of the comprehensive sanctions imposed in Iraq, the national economy experienced excruciating pain but this did not resolve in political compliance by Saddam Hussein.

We may question whether Doxey’s ‘tremendous pressure’ (1980: 78) on the target’s national economy is indeed necessary to achieve compliance to the economic sanctions. Comprehensive sanctions are targeted at the civil population of a state. They put pressure on the local civilians to convince their national government to change their political path. The burden of pressure on the civil society of the targeted country is often extremely high. And severe human damage is caused through the implementation of these types of sanctions. Especially the poor, sick, elderly, women and children become victims of this coercive instrument of global governance. Scholars of economic sanctions argue that sanctions can be in fact ‘counterproductive’ and ‘financially and politically enrich the elites’ (Christiansen & Powers, 1993: 42). Sanctions often miss their target (Christiansen & Powers, 1993; Haas, 1997; Shagabudtinova & Berejikian, 2007) and cause undesirable effects. Doxey argues that the main burden is on the ‘civilian population who are unable to protect themselves and often have little or no influence on the politics which sanctions are intended to change’ (1999: 207). Another example of the negative effects of comprehensive sanctions is the arms embargo.
which was imposed in the former Yugoslavia territories in 1991 by the UN Security Council (UNSC). It was initially imposed to promote peace in the region by taking away the source of weaponry. However, since the Serbs and Croats already had great amounts of military weapons in stock, this sanction was felt the hardest by the Muslim population of Bosnia. The military imbalance caused the Muslim civilians to suffer excessively and the sanctions completely missed their target. The threat of military conflict was not eliminated by the sanctions, but encouraged. Furthermore, as a result of sanctions, target states are being isolated due to boycotts or embargoes and the repressive regimes may only strengthen due to joint discontentment to the outside world.

Because of the critique surrounding ‘comprehensive sanctions’, scholars started to question the sanction design and searched for a more ‘targeted’ or ‘smart’ way of sanctioning states. The sanctions had to be imposed to the ones who could actually make a difference, the ones who are in charge: the ruling elite and the powerful politicians. In the recent years there is a significant transformation in the usage of economic sanctions, and from 1995 on institutions such as the UNSC & UN, and states like the UK together with other European states only impose smart sanctions. The US is the only nation who still occasionally imposes unilateral comprehensive sanctions, but the majority of the sanctions used in international politics are smart sanctions. Examples of smart sanctions are ‘individual travel restrictions of political leaders, arms embargoes, trade sanctions on particular goods and financial sanctions on the assets of individuals and companies’ (Gordon, 2011: 315). Many scholars see smart sanctions as the ultimate moral solution as to allow economic coercion. However, the question remains whether smart sanctions are as effective as comprehensive sanctions since individual travel bans or frozen assets do not generate the same effects as a complete boycott. There may not be a ‘tremendous pressure’ (Doxey, 1980: 78) on the target, so how effective are these smart sanctions? Moreover, if smart sanctions appear rarely effective compared to comprehensive sanctions (Hufbauer et al., 2007), why do we still use them and how can they be transformed to a well-functioning policy tool for global governance. What is the role of International Organizations who have embraced the usage of smart sanctions, such as the EU or UN, on the sanctioning effectiveness? I will leave these questions aside for now and come back to them later. I will now turn to the difference between unilateral and multilateral sanctions and their effects on a target state.
3.2.2 Unilateral versus Multilateral Sanctions

Besides the difference in targeting sanctions, the literature reveals a lot of discussion about the difference in effectiveness of unilateral versus multilateral sanctions. When sanctioning became a popular instrument of global governance, sanctions were mostly enforced by single actors. Unilateral sanctions are imposed by one country to another. Whereas multilateral sanctions, as the name clearly indicates, is a sanction effort where multiple actors are involved, such as a coalition of states. Multilateral sanctions usually have one country which takes the initiative and is usually called the ‘primary sender’ or the ‘instigator’. The primary sender is most of the time also the state which bears the vast majority of the costs associated with the imposition of the sanction (I will explain more about the costs related to sanctions in chapter 4.4). When unilateral sanctions are imposed the sender country has to bear all the cost related to the economic embargo and is therefore often too expensive for states. Only countries with very large economies are able to impose effective sanctions regimes against their targets (Drezner, 2000). The US is the most prominent example of a country able to impose unilateral sanctions and its foreign policies are heavily reliant on this instrument of global governance. As illustration: from 1993 till 1996 America implemented unilateral sanctions in 35 different countries (Kaempfer & Lowenberg, 1999).

In the academic world, there is a vivid discussion on the effectiveness of both unilateral and multilateral economic sanctions; the (empirical) results are puzzling. Lisa Martin (1993) shows substantial empirical evidence that unilateral sanctions are more effective compared to multilateral sanctions. Her main argument is that it is considered to be very difficult to manage and coordinate the multilateral sanction action. As the number of senders increases, enforcement becomes rather difficult (Drezner, 2000; Thompson, 2006; Geis, 2007). States may initially agree to impose a multilateral sanction to a target state in order to force a foreign government to alter its political behavior, but will after all not keep their promise and backslide out of the multilateral sanction agreement. This brittleness of the sanction-coalition is often the reason why target states are not very eager to comply with the various proposed political alterations by the sender coalition. Moreover, the effectiveness of unilateral sanctions is also underpinned by various analyses based on the data in the HSE index, these studies indicate that the percentage of sanctions that was classified as ‘successful’
was the largest where there was no cooperation involved. (Bonetti, 1997; Drezner; 1999; Hufbauer et al. 1990; Kaempfer & Lowenberg, 1999;).

Other scholars argue that these empirical results do not reflect the truth, and take the opposite stance. They argue that multilateral sanctions are much more effective due to the greater terms-of-trade effects on the target nation which leads to greater economic damage (Haas, 1997; Kaempfer & Lowenberg, 1999). There is substantially more pressure on the targets’ economy when there are multiple countries boycotting the target. Furthermore, it might be too costly for the target country to search for alternative markets. In unilateral sanctioning the terms-of-trade of a target country will only be marginally reduced as neighboring countries might see opportunities to earn some extra profit by exporting boycotted products at higher prices. Also, taking into account the national security of a target state, when only one nation issues a sanction this may not be seen as a serious threat to the target states’ sovereignty. Of course, again, this depends on who sanctions who. If country A is fully dependent on country B, and B decides to boycott A, A has a substantial problem. Still, when a whole community congregates and collectively employs a sanction, this might be taken more seriously. ‘Using multilateral sanctions enhances the credibility to the senders’ commitment and improves the clarity and magnitude of the signal’ (Mansfield, 1995: 575). Thus, according to the literature there are two main advantages of employing multilateral sanctions: (1) it lends greater moral credence and (2) it increases the costs to the target (Drezner, 2000: 77). Still, multilateral sanction efforts do not emerge out of the blue. In order to implement a successful multilateral sanction episode, there should be intensive forms of international cooperation.

 Allegedly, an increased level of international cooperation is likely to strengthen any sanction regime. International cooperation is often required for international sanctions to be effective (Martin, 1993). When a number of states collectively strive to cooperate with each other they are likely to be able to ‘manage the international system and punish defections from the rules of the game’ (Drezner, 2000: 74). However, some authors claim that ‘the idea that international cooperation is a necessary ingredient in all sanctions cases is misplaced’ (Hufbauer et al., 1990: 85). This is the grand puzzle that Drezner (2000) tried to solve, as he extends this research and provides empirical evidence that multilateral imposed sanctions are more effective, only if, international institutions are involved. If this is not the case unilateral sanctions prove to be more effective according to him.
In chapter 3.4, I will elaborate more on the importance of international cooperation and how International Organizations can support this process. I will now focus on the problems related to multilateral sanctioning: what is so problematic about multilateral sanctioning, what are the difficulties in organizing multilateral sanctioning efforts, and how do IOs solve problems associated with multilateral sanctioning?

3.3 Problems with Multilateral Sanctioning

Here, we arrive at the difficulties associated with multilateral agreements, cooperation and simultaneously international bargaining and enforcement. In national societies there is a system which is responsible for judicial processes and the national law ‘punishes, deters or rehabilitates’ the ones who breach the law (Doxey, 1971: 89). In the international society there is no such thing as a world law or another comparable structure which will punish a state or an individual when it fails to live up to international standards or international ethical norms. The main problem with international cooperation and multilateral sanctioning is that there are more parties involved who have different motives to coalesce in the proposed sanction action. Drezner (2000) explains that there are two separate stages in which the difficulties arise in reaching sanctioning agreements: the bargaining stage and the enforcement stage.

3.3.1 Problems in the Bargaining stage

In the bargaining stage Daniel Drezner distinguishes between the bargaining phase between the primary sender and the target country and the bargaining phase between the primary sender and the secondary senders. All the players are better off if they can reach a bargain in order to prevent a deadlock where no player can move forward, as a deadlock will be very expensive for both sides of the bargain. In the first bargaining stage where the sender state reaches out to the target state, both states will evaluate the long term implications and the future payoffs. ‘The more significant the bargain is for future payoffs, the more resistant both sides will be to conceding, and the more incentive each actor will have for increasing the costs of deadlock for the other side’ (Drezner, 2000: 79). From the sender side, these costs to the target can be increased by aggravating the pressure. As a result, the sender starts to look for ways to impose multilateral sanctions.
When there is more cooperation among sender states concerning concerted sanctioning action, the terms-of-trade of the target county will become worse, and the costs of non-compliance will raise. Moreover, individual senders seldom ‘possess the market power needed to inflict substantial damage through unilateral actions’ (Mansfield, 1995: 575). Hence, generally the sender state will look for allies, and try to impose a multilateral sanction. The second part of the bargaining phase takes place now that the primary sender must cooperate with secondary states in order to reach a bargain. Concessions need to be made in order to reach an agreement. Nevertheless, it is problematic to reach these concessions and achieve a concerted action plan. The different states involved in the bargaining process may have different backgrounds, opposed value systems, different economic relations with the target country and possibly conflicting national interests. The common strategy for a sender state to attract more nations to the sanctioning coalition is to ‘look for shared norms, beliefs and principles’ (Drezner, 2000: 81). On this normative basis the coalition is able to form an entity that beyond its differences will act as one rational actor. Again problems emerge, the primary sender state must anticipate on the responds of the target state and simultaneously keep the coalition together. When norms are used as the glue which holds the coalition together, negotiation with the target country about conceding can be very challenging since no concessions at this side of the bargaining process can be made. If the primary sender would allow even minor concessions, the strength of the sanctioning coalition may decline significantly, because secondary sender states might feel that their beliefs or norms are being ignored or deprioritized. Therefore, states that cooperate on the basis of shared norms and beliefs will hold firm to their position, this may lead to an indefinite stalemate (when the sanction regime is not lifted and neither side is willing to yield) or a deadlock (Drezner, 2000). Since the essential aim of imposing international sanctions is to change the political behavior of a target state, this stubborn behavior of the sender states is far from ideal.

This ‘suborn behavior’ of states can be explained by looking at the normative dimension often referred to in sociological studies about ‘Group Theory’. It is believed that if individual members of a group have a common interest or objective, and that every individual of this group will be better off if this objective is achieved, that all the individuals that are rational and self-interested actors, act in order to achieve the common goal (Olson, 2002). However, it is not the case that if individuals start to cooperate with each other in a group, that they will try to achieve the ‘group objective’, their individual goals remain inherently more important. As Mancur Olson concludes in his research on ‘The logic of Collective Action’
(1965): ‘Individuals are led to act in a self-interested manner that interferes with any desire to work towards a collective goal’. If a coalition of states together in a ‘group’ decide to impose a sanction to country X, they may have a common goal and they see the need and benefits to cooperate with each other. Still, there is always a chance that individual members are not willing to acquiesce to reach an agreement, because of inflicting norms.

3.3.2 Problems in the Enforcement Stage

Let’s say that the prime sender was able to establish a steady coalition of states which would back up the sender to put pressure on a state which, for example, violates human rights. The bargaining stage reached the end point and agreements about the purpose and the imposition of the sanction to the target state are relatively clear. What follows is the enforcement stage. When applying a program of international economic sanctions, and a trade-sanction is implemented, there is ‘a need for coordination of effort and for effective national control systems which ensure that embargoed goods do not slip through the sanctions net’ (Doxey, 1971: 112). States enter a sanctioning coalition for various motives, still, they enter because they are self-interested (Olson, 1965) and want to gain something from the sanction. Therefore, there is always the chance that secondary states bust or backslide out of the agreement in order to enlarge their terms-of-trade (Early & Spice, 2014). States who bust the agreement might choose to cooperate with the targeted state and sell the embargoed goods in order to generate high profits. The challenge thus for primary sender is to control and prevent secondary states from backsliding from the agreement. Otherwise the sanction effort will be a worthless one since the target states’ national economy will not feel the necessary pressure to choose to alter its policy behavior. The chance that a secondary state will backslide out of an agreement is evidently not random. There are factors which contribute in the choice whether to stick at a sanction agreement or to bust. Depending on the consequences, costs, or opportunities related to the sanction agreement.

Putting it simply, Drezner (2000: 83) argues that ‘the pressure to defect from agreed-upon sanctions should be more accurate as the size of the sanctions coalition increases’. If there is a relatively small coalition of states: A, B and C who enter into a sanction agreement to target country D, the chance is very unlikely that one of the sender countries will bust the agreement. The interdependence between the three sender countries is probably high, as is
their individual importance in the sanctioning effort. When the sanction coalition increases, the importance of each state becomes less. Moreover, in order to reach a common goal, the members of the coalition need to be sure that they can trust each other. In a large group, there is probably less face-to-face contact, and the members are *ipso facto* not always familiar with each other. There is less social pressure and social incentive for an individual member to ‘make sacrifices on behalf of his group’s goals’ (Olson, 2002: 62). Early & Spice (2014) dedicate their attention to this phenomenon of backsliding and sanction busting, and point at International Organizations (IOs) as possible coordinating mechanisms reducing the chance of secondary states busting a sanction agreement. The authors argue that IOs are said to be capable to ‘solve cooperation challenges associated with multilateral sanctioning’ (*ibid.* p. 2), and are able to prevent secondary states from becoming ‘extensive trade-based sanctions busters’ (*ibid.* p. 14).

Having discussed and identified the problems that emerge when trying to implement multilateral sanction regimes, I will now turn to the possibility for IOs to function as a coordination mechanism to enhance international cooperation.

### 3.4 International Organizations and International Cooperation

A lot of the problems in both the bargaining stage and the enforcement stage can be diminished if we follow Drezner’s (2000) analysis. He strongly argues for the use of International Organizations in the sanctioning process. But then how do IOs improve international coordination, facilitate international cooperation and back up sanctioning agreements?

#### 3.4.1 International Organizations

Daniel Drezner uses International Organizations (IOs) and International Institutions (IIs) interchangeably. Simmons & Martin (2002: 194) also state that ‘the distinction between institutions and organizations is usually of secondary importance’. However, there is a distinction between the two: International Organizations are the ‘entities’ which are capable of coordinating, regulating and organizing international cooperation and International Institutions are understood as the ‘rules that stipulate the ways in which states should cooperate and compete with each other’ (Mearsheimer, 1994: 8). These rules describe what the desirable behavior for states is, and what will not be accepted by the international society.
Keohane (1989: 3) defines IOs as ‘persistent and connected sets of rules that prescribe behavioral roles, constrain activity, and shape expectations’. In this article my focus is on the role of IOs. When I talk about International Organizations I contemplate formal IOs such as the UN, EU, Arab League and other similar international entities which are able to influence and regulate ‘social, political and economic problems’ (Simmons & Martin, 2002: 335). Moreover, in this paper I will follow Drezner and Simmons & Martin and use IOs and IIs interchangeably.

Allegedly, we live in a world under anarchy, where there is no supranational governmental body and states are eager to cooperate in order to maximize their benefits. Here, I take a realist perspective by stating that a state is a rational actor which is aware of its external environment, and will act accordingly to this. A state’s behavior is likely to affect the behavior of other states; since every nation’s ultimate aim is to survive. Of course, within international cooperation there are various opinions, prospects and impetus’ for states to choose to cooperate with another nation, but what these states usually have in common is the intention to benefit from the deal more than other states, thereby maximizing their own gain. Referring to Olson (1965), even though there is a common goal and common normative grounds, it is not true that individual members of a group would always strive for the goal of the group (ibid. p. 1). Members of a group put their self-interest, thus their own norms and values before that of the group. The bodies that coordinate the international cooperation game are usually the international organizations, they are capable to ‘regulate the interactions, facilitate the information flows and monitor the mechanisms of conditional retaliation work’ (Fearon, 1998: 270). Extending this view, international organizations could possibly maintain world order through their presence in the use of multilateral imposed sanctions. International organizations can function as a ‘coordinating mechanism for reassurance and information, enabling governments to resist domestic pressures, and providing side payments to increase the value of continued cooperation’ (Drezner, 2000: 75). International organizations may ‘help solve the cooperation challenges associated with multilateral sanctions’ (Early & Spice, 2014: 2). According to Simmons & Martin (2002: 169) ‘IOs could be explained as a solution to the problem of international collective action’.

As I described in the previous chapter, the main problem in organizing multilateral sanction initiatives is to facilitate international cooperation among states. International Organizations are said to be capable to ‘monitor behavior, detect defection and punish defectors in ways that will in the end reduce incentives to defect’ (Acharya & Johnson, 2007:
It is generally recognized by IR scholars that the presence of IOs make international cooperation more likely (Keohane, 1984; Martin, 1994; Drury, 1998; Drezner, 2000; Michell, 2006; Bapat & Morgan, 2009; Early & Spice, 2014). International cooperation, defined as ‘any joint activity among states’ (Martin, 1994: 10) is being stimulated through the networks of international institutions, and accordingly have their effects on the imposition of economic sanctions to target states. IOs have several active functions which contribute in enhancing the level of international cooperation across the globe. The most important functions are that IOs: ‘Facilitate the negotiation and implementation of agreements, resolve disputes, manage conflicts, carry out operational activities like technical assistance, elaborate norms and shape international discourse’ (Abbott & Snidal, 1998: 5). Therefore, when looking at the role that IOs play in the dynamics of international sanctioning we should look at the dimensions of international cooperation.

3.4.2 International Cooperation

By now we have identified that IOs can help to manage areas of interstate relations, and that international cooperation can be established through use of international organizations. For all that, how do IOs influence the level of international cooperation exactly?

Various International Relations theories discuss the importance, possibilities and/or intentions of international cooperation. Realists such as Mearsheimer argue that International Institutions reflect power relationships in World Politics, and that ‘membership in IOs has no effect on states’ foreign policy behavior’. (Mitchell, 2006). Contrastingly, the Neoliberal paradigm accepts the positive relation between shared IO memberships and peaceful and cooperative relationships (Russett & Oneal, 2001). Neoliberals such as Keohane (1998) argue that interdependence between states can work, pointing at the importance for international institutions to maintain world order. They see IOs as mechanisms for more effective international negotiation and bargaining, however they do not believe in the capability of IOs to transform identities and interests of members . Constructivists do see the constitutive effects of IOs on its members. They see IOs as entities which are able to create the conditions for institutional formation; ‘IOs can shape state identities and interests’ (Schimmelfennig, 2003: 70)
Essentially, there are three main capabilities which make IOs capable to coordinate and facilitate international cooperation. Firstly, IOs possess a ‘solid organizational structure and an administrative apparatus managing collective activities’ (Abbott & Snidal, 1998: 5). This ‘structure’ is what makes IOs capable of coordinating concerted action initiatives such as the imposition of economic sanctions. For example, in the international law literature this role of IOs as stimulus for international cooperation has long been recognized. Mitchell (2006: 1) illustrates this in her paper, ‘If two countries recognize the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice (ICJ), than the ability for both sides to take disputes to the ICJ may enhance the change that they will reach an agreement out of court’ (Bilder, 1998). The structure and administrative apparatus of this IO make states cooperate in a peaceful manner. Secondly, Cohen (1972) argue that formal IOs are able to influence and transform political agendas and goals of states. IOs are thus capable of agenda setting and changing political stances of governments by steering or pushing them in a certain direction. Thirdly, IOs have important socializing influences, they can create meanings and identities (Olsen, 1997; Simmons & Martin, 2002). International Organizations can influence its members behavior by promoting democratization among its members (Pevehouse, 2002). Democracies have a positive effect on international cooperation and have a high level of interstate peace. According to the Democratic Peace Theory (Kant) democracies do not fight wars against each other. These three capabilities of IOs may help to overcome difficulties in international coordination in ways that it becomes beneficial for a sending coalition to include an international organization in the sanctioning process. Transaction costs, costs related to establish the sanction coalition, are being reduced and there is a higher degree of transparency possible. This may result in more effective cooperative rules where member states of the sanctioning coalition will comply with.

Managing international affairs can be challenging. However, when there is an institutional framework which is able to regulate and manage, to some extent, the behavior of states, it might be possible to manage expectations as well. The strength of international institutions is that they prove to be effective to the degree that they allow states to avoid ‘short-term temptations to renege, they thus realize available mutual benefits’ (Martin & Simmons, 2002: 16). This is also referred to as the Prisoners Dilemma. Now that IOs are involved in international cooperation, behavior of member states is constrained on normative grounds. Expectations of member states are formed by these norms and collective standards of behavior is established. It becomes feasible to coordinate collective state interactions.
Up until now I have treated ‘IOs’ as entities capable of the same actions to enhance international cooperation and possibly function as a coordinating mechanism in international sanction regimes. Their institutional structures will make negotiation and bargaining between and across states more effective and structured. IOs can influence agenda settings and are able to create meanings and identities. Moreover, the chance that one actor tries to backslide out of an agreement is reduced when an IO functions as a coordinator for international sanctioning. However, when one looks at the different purposes and setups of the various IOs I wonder if they have the same capabilities in functioning as a coordination mechanism for international sanctions. Do their institutional designs matter?

3.4.3 Institutional Designs

Obviously, it is not the case that every IO has the same ability to manage international coordinated actions. Various IOs have disparate purposes, contrasting modes of operation and different institutional designs. There are IOs which operate globally covering a very wide scope of issues, whereas on the other side of the spectrum there are IOs which are particularly interested in local and regional issues. Moreover, some IOs are established to regulate certain very specific, or technical, matters such as the ‘International Coffee Organization’. Others are not specified in one specific area but try to incorporate every matter associated with International Affairs, the UN is a great example of this. The most important factor what distinguishes one IO from the other, and thereby influences its efficacy, is whether the members of the IO have divergent or convergent preferences. Whether they are able to act as one uniform rational actor, or is there too much dissemination within the organization. Moreover, if the members of the IO are more ‘similar’ considering their norms, values, ideas and preferences, the IO is more likely to coordinate the cooperation efforts in a more effective manner (Simmons & Martin, 2002).

Strikingly, the economic sanction literature does not account for this variation between IOs. The variance in effectively coordinating sanction efforts is greatly ignored and in my view very remarkable. When looking outside of the sanctioning literature, one sees that ‘the effectiveness of an organization’ is a hot topic in for example the business literature. Various factors such as ‘flexibility’, ‘responsiveness’ and ‘adaptiveness’ are being connected to the levels of cooperation and coordination of organizations (Chayes & Chayes, 1998). I argue that this should also be done when assessing formal international organizations. Authors who do acknowledge the positive influence of IOs in the sanctioning process treat IOs as
homogeneous and equal entities. They are empirically threatened as an independent variable capable of explaining sanction success (Mansfield, 1995; Drezner, 2000). In the IR literature there are various authors which point at the importance of institutional designs and differences across institutions which influence their effectiveness. ‘States fight over institutional design because it ultimately affects outcomes’ (Koremos et al., 2001: 762). Governments dedicate a lot of attention to the institutional design of IOs to construct them in ways that the IOs are capable of impeding or advancing specific goals in the international economy, the environment and national security.

Formal institutions are organized in different ways. Some institutions are open to all members whereas others are very restrictive. The focus of institutions can also determine its institutional design, if an institution is globally oriented; it is likely that it is organized in a different way than a more locally oriented institution. Acharya and Johnson (2007) in their book ‘Crafting Cooperation’, take many different explanatory variables: membership, scope, formal rules, norms and ideology, mandate, type of cooperation problems, number of actors, identity, systemic and subsystemic power distribution, domestic politics, extra-regional institutions and non-state actors and history. All of these variables have some explanatory value considering the variation in institutional design of IOs. They argue that ‘institutional design does not occur in a vacuum’, indicating that it is a very complex matter that reflects ‘power realities, domestic politics, local circumstances and normative pressures’ (Acharya & Johnson, 2007: 264). Koremos et al. (2001) employ five core dimensions in their exploration of how institutions vary: membership rules, scope of issues covered, centralization of tasks, rules for controlling the institution, and flexibility of arrangement. All of these variables play part in the formation and outcomes of International Organizations, and influence the ease of international cooperation in various ways.

Having discussed the importance of institutional designs, the central question remains: “Which type of IO is generally better in coordinating international sanction episodes and promote international cooperation?” This is a question which I am specifically interested in. Up until now there is a gap in the theory of how international sanction efforts should be coordinated or monitored. The reason for this might be that there is not one ‘good’ or ‘efficient’ way to do this. There are many types and forms of economic sanctions, ranging from very intense sanctions with critical outcomes, for example the ending of an aggressive regime, or relatively minor sanctions such as freezing the assets of one influential citizen of
the target country. The complexity of each sanction regime is completely different because there is always a contextual difference. Sanctions are being imposed in different countries, with different responses and actions. All of these different types of sanctions require different monitoring and coordinating mechanisms. When, for example, the UN imposes economic sanctions to overthrow a deadly regime, it is very important that the member states of this sanction coalition, act as one unitary rational actor. If there is one member state who ignores the economic boycott, and wishes to earn a significant amount of money by for example trading with the target state, the sanction effort may be wrecked. The effectiveness of sanctions efforts is thus also determined whether it is a ‘dissentual’ or a ‘consensual' conflict (Simmons & Martin, 2002). If all the UN member states would have the same ideas how to manage a sanction episode, and have a clear vision how to achieve this, the chances are more likely that the sanction effort will be effective. When there is much dispersion between the members, and there is no consensus in how to solve a critical issue, it is very challenging to establish a mutually acceptable cooperative agreement.

This is where Doxey (1971: 90) also points at; she acknowledges the importance of shared goals of group members. When these goals coincide, collective action is easier to achieve and the level of commitment of the member states is likely to be a lot higher. Therefore when looking at IOs, it may be the case that more internally ‘similar’ organizations ultimately function better in monitoring sanction episodes than more internally different, or heterogeneous, organizations. Concerning the cooperation problems related to multilateral sanctions it might be rewarding to look at whether differences in institutional designs influence the outcomes of international sanctioning efforts of IOs. Do these institutional characteristics influence the level of cooperation in economic sanctioning? Which IOs are more effective than others? And what variables influence the efficacy of IOs? These questions all boil down to the final question: What is the most ideal type and institutional design for an IO to coordinate and monitor an international sanction effort. Here, I hypothesize that more homogeneous IOs are more likely to generate higher sanction successes compared to more internally divided, or heterogeneous IOs.
4. RESEARCH DESIGN

4.1 Database

To test this hypothesis, I will conduct a quantitative analysis of the factors influencing the institutional design compared to the success-rate of international sanction episodes. In this research I use the fourth edition of the Threats and Imposition of Economic Sanctions (TIES) database composed by Morgan et al. (2013, 2014) database. This dataset consists of 1412 cases of economic sanctions reported between 1945 until 2005, measured from their starting year. The data provides numerous details on economic sanctions such as its date of imposition, whether it was a unilateral or multilateral effort, the costs both for target and sender are measured, institutional involvement and its overall successfulness. The choice to use this specific database is not the most obvious one if you look in the sanctions literature. In the empirical economic sanctions literature there is one very influential database which is used to test hypotheses related to the effectiveness of economic sanctions; the HSE database, collected by Hufbauer et al. (1990, 2007). Although very influential, in order to conduct this specific research I choose to use an alternative database. The TIES database has many advantages compared to the HSE database. It includes more information such as the effect of ‘threatening’ with economic sanctions instead of actually imposing the sanctions. This may be relevant considering the fact that most sanction scholars argue that potential targets of economic sanctions can, and often will, adjust their political behavior when there is a chance that sanctions will be imposed (Drezner, 2003). Therefore, it is relevant to look at the threats of sanctions together with actually imposed economic sanctions in order to measure sanction effectiveness. Moreover, the TIES database is more up to date and is more specific, using many more independent variables which influence the overall effectiveness of sanction episodes. But the main reason to choose for the TIES database is the large number of cases included, where the HSE database only includes 170 cases, Morgan et al. (2013) include 1412 cases in their TIES database. A large N-study makes it possible to conduct thorough empirical research and possibly find reasons why some economic sanction episodes appear to be more effective than others.

4.2 Dependent Variable

The aim of this research is to find what influence IOs have on the successfulness of
economic sanctions, and whether there is a difference in the efficacy of different IOs. In order to measure my hypothesis I take the ‘Settlement Nature for Sender State’ variable from the TIES database as the dependent variable, since it measures the successfulness of the sanction on a scale. In chapter 3.1.1 I have described what sanction success entails. From now on I refer to the dependent variable as ‘SANCTIONOUTCOME’. I take this variable because it ‘represents the degree to which the sender accomplished its policy objectives’ (Morgan et al., 2013: 16). In the end, my objective is to find ways to enhance the sanctioning process and find ways that contribute to more effective international cooperation. Therefore, I look at the successfulness of the senders’ efforts to alter targets’ policy behavior. Morgan et al. (2013) measured this variable on a scale from 0-10, where 0 stands for complete failure and 10 reflect cases where total acquiescence by the target is accomplished.

4.3 Independent Variables and Hypotheses

In order to measure the variation within IOs, explaining either its homogeneity or heterogeneity, I use 5 different variables which can explain the design differences among the various IOs: Membership Rules (MS), Scope of Issues Covered (SCO), Decision Making Processes (DMP), Number of Actors (NoA), and Regionalism (REG). I transformed these variables into dummy variables (in the ‘Testing Hypotheses’ chapter on page 32 I will explain more about what dummies are) and why I use them in this study. In the next section I will explain why I chose these variables, how they are capable of explaining the variance between institutions, and what possible effect they might have on sanction outcomes.
In this research I use data from 113 cases of sanction episodes where there was one IO involved in the sanctioning process. In my sample I looked at 12 different IOs dispersed all over the world. They have different purposes, values, norms, members and backgrounds. As you can see in Exhibit 1, each IO is linked to a specific code. Coding is regularly used in organizational comparative research, and these codes are based on the Correlates of War IGO data (Pevehouse & Nordstrom, 2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Organization</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>SCO</th>
<th>DMP</th>
<th>NoA</th>
<th>REG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Economic Community (ECC)</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
<td>unintrusive</td>
<td>No consensus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union (EU)</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
<td>intrusive</td>
<td>No consensus</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund (IMF)</td>
<td>2880</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
<td>intrusive</td>
<td>No consensus</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Arab States</td>
<td>3450</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
<td>unintrusive</td>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
<td>intrusive</td>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)</td>
<td>3750</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
<td>intrusive</td>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization for African Unity (OAU)</td>
<td>3760</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
<td>unintrusive</td>
<td>No consensus</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPC)</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
<td>unintrusive</td>
<td>No consensus</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC)</td>
<td>3840</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
<td>unintrusive</td>
<td>No consensus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan American Union (OAS)</td>
<td>3900</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
<td>intrusive</td>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations (UN)</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
<td>intrusive</td>
<td>No consensus</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Trade Organization (WTO)</td>
<td>4580</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
<td>intrusive</td>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 1. International Organizations and the Independent Variables

MEMBERSHIP: Who can join the IO? Is the IO highly restrictive or very inclusive? This distinction often can be found in different purposes of the IOs. For example, the UN was initially designed to be of a very inclusive character, whereas on the other side of the spectrum we have the EU and NATO. This exclusiveness of these institutions emerged from the ‘basis of political, ideological and security considerations and criteria (Acharya & Johnson, 2007: 247). Membership rules influence the ease of international cooperation, and thus the probability of successful sanction episodes. I hypothesize that the more “exclusive” the IO is, the higher the success rate of international sanction episodes is. More exclusive organizations are more likely to have higher standards of member entrance, and thus use stricter rules considering member behavior. Organizations are often formed on the basis of shared norms, values and or similar ideas. Therefore, I expect that members of exclusive
organizations share more of the same viewpoints, and operate in a homogeneous manner. In the sample I labeled inclusive IOs = 0, and exclusive IOs = 1.

**H1: Exclusive IOs are more successful in coordinating and monitoring economic sanction episodes.**

**SCOPE:** Mansfield (1995) argues that ‘the scope of international institutions may influence their ability to promote cooperation on sanctions’. In his article he reviews both the works of Martin (1992) and Mastanduno (1992) and provides critique and recommendations. One of the biggest critiques is that both authors neglect institutional heterogeneity, and that the scope of an institution is a very important ‘determinant for explaining patterns of intra-institutional cooperation’ (Mansfield, 1995: 592). Different IOs are designed to commit to different controversies; leading to disparate purposes of IOs. Again, I state the obvious example that the UN is an example of a highly intrusive IO, indicating that the emphasis lies on democracy defense and expansion and securing domestic politics. Also the NATO and EU intervene in domestic political matters and protect fundamental civil rights of inhabitants of the EU. The Arab League, ironically, is the least involved in domestic affairs (Acharya & Johnson, 2007: 252). Economic sanctions are domestically and politically sensitive in the way that every sanctioning episode is completely different due to different domestic circumstances. Every sanction imposition needs a unique strategy tailored to the local circumstances and ultimate aim of the sanction effort. Therefore, I hypothesize that IOs which are familiar with the dispersion of democracy and/or the promotion of fair human rights possibly on a local scale; thus act as intrusive actors on the globe, are more likely to generate higher sanction success rates. I deem intrusive IOs as more capable of local adaptation to domestic circumstances than non-intrusive actors. In the sample I labeled non-intrusive IOs = 0, and intrusive IOs = 1.

**H2: Intrusive IOs are more successful in coordinating and monitoring economic sanction episodes.**

**DECISION MAKING PROCESSES:** In international sanction literature the presence IOs is linked to an increasing success rate of economic sanction episodes (Drezner, 2000). The main function of IOs, as we have explored in this paper, is to monitor and coordinate international cooperation. Different IOs have different ways of making decisions internally,
which will ultimately influence the way IOs behave in the international field. Organizations which make decisions based on consensus or organizations which adopt a majority-voting system make decisions in a different way, affecting their outcomes. Tjosvold & Field (1983) argue that ‘consensus decision-making can induce commitment to the decision in that the individuals’ and groups’ decisions are congruent’. Acharya & Johnson (2007: 253) argue that the preference for consensus is mostly found in IOs in Africa or the Third World. The ‘consensus/unanimity rule in IOs is meant to check any tendency toward a unitary state or supranationalism’ (Acharya & Johnson, 2007: 253). Putting it differently, consensus based organizations are actively monitoring each other, thereby reducing the chance that some members will try to backslide out of the agreement (Early & Spice, 2014). Therefore I hypothesize that IOs which use ‘consensus’ as the ruling decision-making technique, are more effective in controlling and coordinating sanction episodes. Because there is conformity in the endeavor of imposing an economic sanction to a target country. When there is ‘no-consensus’ voting principle, there is a higher probability that some member states who voted against the sanction proposition will ignore the imposed sanction, and may backslide out of the agreement (Early & Spice, 2014). What must be noted is that there exist more forms of decision-making, but for the purpose of this research I will leave these aside. In the sample I labeled non-consensus-based IOs = 0, and consensus-based IOs = 1.

H3: Consensus based IOs are more successful in coordinating and monitoring economic sanction episodes

NUMBER OF ACTORS: The leading theories (e.g., Drezner, 2000; Bapat & Morgan, 2009; Early & Spice, 2014) state that institutions make multilateral sanction efforts more effective by ‘helping countries overcome the challenges of cooperating with large number of actors’ (Early & Spice; 2014: 7). The coordination problems increase simultaneously when the number of members in an IO and the number of country actors in the multilateral sanctioning effort becomes larger. This independent variable is aimed to find the effect of a relatively large IO compared to a smaller IO which is more likely to be flexible and responsive to its environment. Communication within the IO becomes more problematic as the complexity of the IO increases. The behavior in both the IO and the attitude of the state involving in a sanction episode is likely to change when the number of actors increases.
When a relatively large IO such as the UN with 193 members decides to impose a sanction to a target state, or back-up a sanction regime, it is unlikely that all of the members agree to this and cooperate voluntarily. As Early & Spice (2014) also indicate, ‘it is a lot harder for international institutions to detect and report noncompliant behavior and hold member states accountable for it will decline as institutions grow significantly larger’. The probabilities that members will try to backslide out of the agreement will grow when the IO is becoming larger (Drezner, 2000). There is less of a direct connection of loyalty and trust between the states. Smaller institutions seem more capable to constrain their members from sanction busting. Of course there is no ‘rule of thumb’ to make the distinction of a ‘small’ organization compared to ‘large’ organization. However, order to dichotomize and create a dummy variable I take the lead of Early & Spice (2014), and take the EEC, EU, Arab League, NATO, OAPEC, and OPEC as the smaller institutions, and I take the IMF, OECD, OAU, OAS, UN and WTO as the large institutions. In the sample I labeled ‘large’ IOs = 0, and ‘small’ IOs = 1.

**H4: Smaller sized IOs are more successful in coordinating and monitoring economic sanction episodes.**

**REGIONAL: Keohane (1998) explains that complex institutions are usually less effective compared to more simple and linear institutions. Complexity in IOs increases when an IO becomes more global and needs to readjust to various global matters. Regional Organizations, such as the EU and Arab League, are mostly established to coordinate local disputes and they have initially similar ideas, norms and values. Therefore, the members of regional IOs generally share the same ideal. This makes it in most cases easier to achieve consensus among the members, and there is less aloofness among members. In large, conglomerate and global International Organizations, such as the UN, there is often a lot of disagreement about various issues. Consensus is fairly hard to achieve because of conflicting ideas and ideals. This is one reason why I hypothesize that Regional IOs are a better sanction coordinator than Global IOs. Another reason is that for each specific sanction episode, the sender country will look at the IO which ‘fits’ best. The Regional IOs are more likely to possess more specific ‘know-how’ in dealing with specific target states and specific matters. In the sample I labeled global IOs = 0, and regional IOs = 1.**
H5: Regional IOs are more successful in coordinating and monitoring economic sanction episodes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homogeneous Institutions (1)</th>
<th>Heterogeneous Institutions (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive membership policy</td>
<td>Inclusive membership policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrusive scope</td>
<td>Non-intrusive scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus based voting</td>
<td>Non-consensus based voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively small</td>
<td>Relatively big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate regionally</td>
<td>Operate globally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 2. Homogeneous Institutions versus Heterogeneous Institutions

4.4 Control Variables

The five dimensions above influence the institutional design that an IO has and can explain the variation between, within and among various IOs. In this thesis I will try to find their individual effects, and find what the best IO design is to coordinate and monitor sanction efforts. In order to find these effects, I will conduct an OLS regression analysis. With an OLS regression analysis it is possible to find the relationships between variables, detect multicollinearity, and find predictor variables for the dependent variable. This is initially what I am looking for. However, I will also look at three control variables which, are crucial in determining the successfulness of a sanction episode (Drezner, 2000; Drury, 1998; Doxey, 1980, Martin, 1993). I use control variables because I assume a relation between the independent variables and the dependent variables. But of course the independent variables may not be the decisive factor causing the sanction outcome. The outcomes of sanctions are affected by many different factors. Using control variables can be helpful when you look at possible predictors, and when using these variables you ‘control’ the outcomes by reflecting more reality in the model. Since control variables (when chosen well) strongly influence the value of the dependent variable: sanction success.

The control variables I used in this sample are the ‘anticipated sender cost’, ‘anticipated target cost’, and the ‘issue’. These three specific variables are chosen because in most articles they are described as being decisive factors, able to influence sanction outcomes. ‘The greater the costs of the sanction to the target the more pressure there is’ (Drury, 1998).
When costs for the target state are relatively high, the target state is more likely to comply with various demands of the sender state. Morgan (1995) and Morgan and Schwebach (1996) argue that sanctions are most effective when the costs to the ‘targets ruling coalition’ are relatively high, if this is the case, the chance is high that the targets government will capitulate (Drury, 1998: 499). Moreover, the more pressure there is on the target, the more likely the sanctions are more effective (Doxey, 1980: 77-79). A sender can cause this pressure by spending ‘substantial costs’ on the sanction, this will send the desired signal of a target state (Baldwin, 1985: 372). A higher sanction-related cost for the senders is associated with a more ‘credible signal’ to the target (Tung, 2002: 181). When the issue is more critical, the necessity of the sanction imposition is growing, sender states are more willing to reserve more financial resources to achieve acquiesce by the target. I will shortly explain the possible effects of the control variables on the successfulness of the sanction effort. However, I will not elaborate on this too much since it is not my aim to find these effects.

From the TIES data I subtracted three variables and turned them into dummy control variables, in order to make comparison across categories possible. ‘ANTICIPATED SENDER COSTS’ functions as a proxy for the commitment of the sender state. If the prime sender is negligent and is not fully motivated to impose a successful sanction episode, the anticipated sender costs are likely to be lower (Baldwin, 1985; Martin, 1992; Tung, 2002). Since the sender state is less eager to accomplish expensive policy alterations in the target state. The deterrence effects are lower when the costs related to the sanction are relatively low (Tung, 2002: 180). I created a dummy to find this effect, where ‘0’ = minor costs, indicating that the health of the senders’ economy will not be impacted too much by the actions of the sender, and ‘1’ = major and severe costs and impact to the senders’ economy.

The same holds for ‘ANTICIPATED TARGET COSTS’, but is then measured from the targets’ perspective. If the target costs are expected to be very high the target state is keener to yield. When the economic damage in the target state is tremendous, and especially aimed at the ruling coalition, a sanction is likely to be more successful (Drury, 1998: 499). If the costs are relatively low the target state might opt for a stalemate, ignoring the sanction. The sanction regime is not credible enough (Hovi, Huseby & Sprinz, 2005). The anticipated costs both by the sender and the target are influenced by the necessity of the sanction. As with the previous variable, I created a dummy variable, where ‘0’ referred to minor costs to the targeted and ‘1’ stands for major costs.
A severe conflict where for, example, innocent civilians are being murdered by their domestic brutal regime might raise the necessity for senders to impose a sanction regime in a target country. This is what is measured by the next variable. Economic sanctions are used as political instruments to resolve international political conflicts. These conflicts have many different causes and economic sanctions are deployed to solve a varied range of these ‘conflicts’. Accordingly, I look at the ‘ISSUE’ of the sanction. Ranging from relatively minor issues like illegal trade practices committed by the sender state, to dreadful political regimes where basic human rights are being violated. The more crucial the issue is, the more effort and resources will be used to push the target state to full acquiesce. Again, I created a dummy variable distinguishing between a very crucial issue and issues that are of less significance. There is no definition of a ‘very crucial issue’ or a measurement technique to find out which issue is more crucial than another. There exist a substantial grey area in what is crucial and what is not. Taking all this into account, in order to make comparison across variables possible, conduct quantitative research and in the end answer our research question, I labeled the cases which were limited in scope as ‘0’ and cases that were critical in scope ‘1’.

5. ANALYSIS

The focus of this research is to look at the specific role that IOs play in enhancing sanction regimes. Before I will look at the particulars of this relationship, and distinguish between the various organizations I will check whether my assumptions regarding economic sanctions fit in this sample. I followed Drezners (2000) theoretical assumptions where he argues that multilateral sanctions should be more effective compared to unilateral sanctions, since it facilitates and supports international cooperation between and among sender states. However, according to Drezners empirical research (based on the HSE database) successes are more common when unilateral sanctions were implemented. Unilateral sanctions appeared to be more successful compared to multilateral sanction efforts, but if ‘multilateral sanctions have the support of an international organization they are significantly more effective than unilateral efforts’ (Drezner, 2000: 98). Since this is my starting point I will first test whether this is true for my sample. Once I have confirmed this I can move on the focus of this research check my hypotheses.
From the 1412 cases included in the TIES dataset only 236 where multilateral efforts. This means that only 16.7% of all the sanctions issued where multilateral. I looked at the different outcomes of the economic sanction episodes, and I can conclude that multilateral sanctions appear to be related to a higher average score compared to unilateral sanction efforts. The average sanction outcome of the unilateral sanction cases is 4.77, where the multilateral sanction group scores an average of 5.71. Here, I measured the different means of the sanction outcome, the dependent variable. From the 236 cases of multilateral sanctioning 200 of these cases involved institutional involvement. A very high score, considering the fact that only in 359 of the 1412 in the entire TIES database there was institutional involvement. Testing Drezners (2000) assumptions we can conclude that the data mostly supports his findings. Here, we see that multilateral with IO (6.19) scores significantly higher than multilateral without the backing of an IO (4.77). However, in this sample unilateral sanctions do not score a higher success rate compared to multilateral sanction (no IO) efforts (both 4.77). This is not an issue, since my aim is to find how IOs contribute in enhancing multilateral sanction regimes.

Exhibit 3. Average scores sanction outcome

The aim of this research is to find the effects that various International Organizations have on multilateral sanction outcomes. In order to find this effect, I only looked at the cases in the TIES database where multilateral sanctions where issued with the backing of one International Organization. The remainder of the cases in the TIES database that did not meet these requirements where ignored. Of course there are many cases where there are multiple IOs involved in a sanction regime, I decided to ignore these cases because I am particularly interested in the differences between International Organizations. I transformed the data into 113 testable cases where all the information I needed was present. There are no missing values in the dataset, and the data is normally distributed. This refined sample is the data I used to test my hypotheses.
5.1 Testing Hypotheses

In order to test the hypotheses I will use the following formula:

\[
\text{SANCTIONOUTCOME} = \beta_1 \text{Sendercosts} + \beta_2 \text{Targetcosts} + \beta_3 \text{Issue} + \beta_4 \text{Membership} + \beta_5 \text{Scope} + \beta_6 \text{Decisionmaking} + \beta_7 \text{NumberOfActors} + \beta_8 \text{Regional}
\]

Because the dependent variable is measured on a scale ranging from 0 to 10, I will conduct an Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression analysis. This method is a generalized linear modeling technique that is used to ‘model a single responds variable which has been recorded on at least an interval scale’ (Hutcheson, 2011: 224). With this technique it is possible to identify the relationships between a continuous responds variable (Y) and a continuous explanatory variable (X). When conducting an OLS regression analysis it is possible to find how Y can be predicted by X. This technique is frequently used when using dummy variables. A dummy variable is an ‘artificial variable created to represent an attribute with two or more distinct categories or levels’ (Skrivanek, 2009). In regular regression analysis the variables are treated as numerical where comparison across variables is possible. Using categories or levels, it is not possible to allocate them on a numerical basis. Therefore dummies should be used to ‘trick’ the regression algorithm into correctly analyzing the attribution of values in the model. In my sample the dummy variables only had two categories; either homogenous or heterogeneous.

What must be kept in mind is that all of these variables in the model are somehow interrelated. Therefore, in order to design a multivariate model which is capable of explaining the variation among the dependent variable, the model should be checked on multicollinearity. Multicollinearity is a very high state of intercorrelations or inter-associations among the independent variables. When multicollinearity occurs it means that two or more of the variables are highly correlated, meaning that one variable can be linearly predicted from another variable in the sample. When this happens it indicates that some variables initially predict the same, this causes variables to become redundant. A model can be enhanced by eliminating the multicollinearity issues and focus on the ‘stronger’ predictors.

Putting it simply, on theoretical grounds it may not seem as a surprise that the chances are very likely that ‘Number of Actors’ (NOA) and ‘Regional Organizations’ (REGIONAL)
are highly interrelated. A regional IO is mostly smaller than a global IO, this is just common sense. Moreover, a small IO is likely to have more ‘similar’ members that share norms and values; it might therefore be easier to agree on certain topics and to move as one actor. As I predicted, the model shows very high multicollinearity (see Appendix 1). The Pearson Correlation Coefficient of NoA scores > 0.5 four times in the model, indicating that NoA has a high correlation with ‘REGION’, ‘DECISION-MAKING’, ‘SCOPE’, and ‘MEMBERSHIP’. Therefore I decided to eliminate ‘NoA’ from my sample to, hopefully, increase the explanatory value of the model. This is not the only variable which shows high signs of multicollinearity, but I choose not to get rid of more variables since the VIF scores of the renewed model are acceptable (see Exhibit 4). However, we must keep this in mind when interpreting the results. In Exhibit 4 we can conclude that the model performs quite alright; from the four independent explanatory variables I am particularly interested in, three have a significant effect on sanction outcome. The variables: Membership (p < 0.00), Decision-making (p < 0.085) and Regional (p < 0.005) are all significant predictor variables to our dependent variable. The overall explanatory capability of the entire model is also relatively high; having an R² of 0.399, so 39.3% of the variation within the model can be explained by the independent variables. Except from the control variable ‘ISSUE’ the other control variables are also significant. It may be because of standardization practices of the ‘ISSUE’ dummy that there is no direct causal link between the variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>6.025</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Target Costs</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>2.118</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>1.659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Sender Costs</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>2.777</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>1.608</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>1.488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>5.002</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>6.883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making Process</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>1.746</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>1.574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-0.738</td>
<td>-2.877</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>7.445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 4. Output Regression Analysis. Dependent variable = Sanction Outcome
Using the table we can now find the effects of the interesting independent variables on the dependent variables, and test the hypotheses. Taking into account that one variable of interest is deleted from the model due to multicollinearity issues, I will test four hypotheses in order to measure the effects of Institutional Design on the sanction outcome.

Firstly, I argued that the level of exclusiveness of the IO matters in determining sanction outcome. This hypothesis can be accepted because there is a very strong positive relationship. With dummies, you have to keep in mind how and why you coded the variable the way you did. I coded ‘inclusive IOs = 0’ and ‘exclusive IOs = 1’. A positive beta (0.675) suggest that inclusive IOs are consistently higher compared to exclusive IOs, on the dependent variable: sanction outcome. Thus, the more exclusive an organization is concerning their membership rules, the more likely they are to be a preferred sanction coordinator.

Secondly, I hypothesized that IOs which are intrusive in domestic issues, such as spreading democracy, are overall more successful in coordinating sanction episodes. Since they are capable to tailor their actions to specific domestic circumstances. In order to reach total acquiesce by the target state the demands of the sender state must be realistic and adjusted to local circumstances. In my sample I did not found evidence that this is the case. Therefore I should reject hypothesis 2, the p-value is not significant.

Thirdly, when decisions in IOs are made through consensus, I hypothesized that the International Organization will be a more successful sanction regime coordinator, and is likely to generate higher success. From this research, I can accept this hypothesis (beta = 0.206), and identify a moderate positive relationship between consensus-based IOs and successful sanction outcomes (no-consensus = 0; consensus = 1). This may be explained by the sought homogeneity within the organization. When consensus is achieved, the members of the IO are likely to cooperate and join their resources in order to achieve the desired outcome. If there is no consensus in the decision making procedures of an IO, but instead a majority vote system is adopted, there is a perceived form of competition among the members (Tjosvold & Field, 1983). This competition may result in uncooperative practices such as sanction busting (Early & Spice, 2014).
The fourth hypothesis aimed at explaining the extent of regionalism of the IO to the sanction outcome. Here, I hypothesized that regional IOs are better in managing successful sanction episodes due to the fact that they have generally better know-how of specific domestic circumstances of the target state. This variable correlated relatively high with all other variables. This is not very surprising, considering that regional IOs are often small (NoA), based on the same ideological viewpoints (DMP), and are most of the time considered to be exclusive (MS). However, I think it is valuable to include this variable in the research because I tend to believe that regional IOs function significantly better in coordinating sanction efforts than global organizations (Acharya & Johnston, 2007). Mainly due to their local know-how, higher level of flexibility and only a few actors which are involved in the bargaining processes. According to the analysis, unfortunately, we have to reject this hypothesis. On the basis of this sample one could say that the opposite is true. Global organizations such as the WTO or UN seem to generate higher successes on sanction outcomes (beta = -0.738), indicating a strong negative relationship between regional IOs and successful sanction outcomes.

In this study, I can accept two of my four interesting independent valuables, which means that I can partly adopt my overall hypothesis that homogeneous international organizations are more successful in coordinating international sanction regimes. International Organizations which make their decisions on a consensus basis generate higher successes. Also, International Organizations which are more exclusive in their membership decisions are likely to move as one actor and coordinate international cooperation in a constructive way. In the ‘Discussion’ at page 37 I will further elaborate what this means for international sanctioning.

6. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The model I used in this research has limitations. In order to find the effects of different institutional designs I used 4 independent variables to explain the variance. Of course there are many more factors influencing the organizational design. I standardized these variables into dummies, thereby making rigid decisions about how to divide the variables. However, in order to find any effects this needed to be done. Moreover, in the TIES database, Morgan et al. (2014) accounted for 58 control variables, to explain the sanction outcomes. I
only used the three, I deem, most important control variables: sender and target costs, and the issue. It is a reflection of the truth, but in order to construct a more valid analysis, more control variables should be included in the research. Another limitation concerning the quantitative analysis is that I only used the sanction cases where there was only one IO present. When more IOs were collectively cooperating to back up a sanction agreement I did not include these cases in the research. For the prime reason that I was particularly interested in the individual effects of one IO on the sanction procedure, and in order to measure the differences between the IOs. Future research could be dedicated on the effect of multiple IOs to sanction outcomes.

Furthermore, I recommend that more research should be conducted in this field, thereby especially looking at the differences in institutional designs in the efficacy of the IOs. I would say that there is much knowledge to gain, and maybe, as Chayes & Chayes (1998) propose, look more at lessons that could be learned from business practices. Assess how flexible and transparent an organization is, and whether the IO is capable to adapt to local circumstances. To my findings, there is not yet data where International Organizations are compared to each other concerning these matters. It may be useful to future sanction initiatives to attract IOs which can coordinate and manage sanction episodes in the most effective ways. This may resolve potential political conflicts easier and more efficient.

7. DISCUSSION

In the field of international governance we see that economic sanctions are the most popular tool to resolve afflictive conflicts across the world. Without actually possessing physical control over a certain territory we see that with the use of sanctions foreign governments are being constrained in their actions, and are ‘forced’ to change their political behavior. In the economic sanctions literature there is a vivid discussion about the ‘unsuccessfulness’ of economic sanctions. Most authors dedicate their attention to the flaws in economic sanctioning (Pape, 1997). This article focuses not on the flaws but on ways to improve sanctioning processes, thereby assessing the role of formal International Organizations.

This paper makes an important contribution to our understanding of the efficacy of economic sanctions. Following Drezners (2000) analysis, I started off with arguing that IOs
possibly play a crucial role in coordinating international cooperation. The specifics and implications of this role was not yet scrutinized, this is where I dedicated my attention to. I looked at the institutional designs of 12 different International Organizations, and hypothesized that homogeneous IOs are generally more effective in coordinating and monitoring economic sanctions. I used 5 explanatory variables to detect the difference among the IOs (Membership, Scope, Decision making, Number of Actors, and Regional), and together with my 3 control variables (Anticipated Target Costs, Anticipated Sender Costs, and Issue), I constructed a model which was able to explain 39.3% of the variation in de sanction outcomes. Indicating that the overall model is very strong.

Firstly, I expected that the more exclusive IOs are more effective in coordinating sanction efforts, since these IOs are usually based on normative aspects. Secondly, IOs which are more domestically intrusive are usually better in adapting their practices to local circumstances. Considering the grant variations in sanction impositions, the different types, pressures, and targets, a more flexible and adaptive IO is more likely to be the ‘better’ coordinator for economic sanctions. Thirdly, decision making procedures within the organization are also likely to affect the efficacy of IOs as coordinating mechanism. The extent to which an organization makes decisions in consensus, is likely to positively influence the decisiveness and strength of the organization. Since consensus based organizations already possess some sort of monitoring mechanism (Acharya & Johnson, 2007: 253), I deem that they are more effective in coordinating and monitoring sanction efforts. They act as one natural entity, and when there is a decision, the member states are more likely to actively cooperate to comply with the sanction requirements. In my research I decided to eliminate the fourth variable ‘Number of Actors’ since this correlated too much with the other variables. Smaller IOs are likely to be more regional, more exclusive, share more norms and values, and are more likely to make decisions on a consensus basis. I compared the data of number of actors and the extent of regionalism of the IO, and concluded that apart from 5 cases they generate the same outcomes. Lastly, the extent of regionalism of the IO influences whether one IO is more successful is more successful than another. I stated this hypothesis because I believe that more regional and smaller IOs are more flexible and transparent compared to cumbersome organizations such as the UN. Flexible and adaptive organizations are usually better in coordinating shared initiatives of members (Chayes & Chayes, 1998), such as the imposition of sanctions to a target state.
I looked at these four variables and conducted an OLS Regression to find out whether there have a significant effect on the dependent variable: sanction outcomes. According to my data I can accept two of my hypotheses. I can conclude that the presence of an exclusive IO who makes decisions on the basis of consensus, is the most likely to coordinate a successful sanction episode. On the basis of my sample only three of the twelve organizations meet these criteria: which are the NATO, OECD and the OAPEC. According to my data, these IOs are likely to be the most effective in coordinating a sanction episode. Exclusive IOs are likely to have shared norms and values, making it easier for the members of the IO to cooperate and together achieve a goal. This is also the case for IOs which base their decisions on consensus. These IOs are more internally homogeneous compared to inclusive and majority-based IOs.

It is very surprising that, according to my research, global IOs are better sanctioning coordinators compared to regional IOs. There is a significant positive effect between the presence of a global IO and sanction success. I checked whether this was because of the overall successfulness of the UN, since the UN is a fanatic sanction supporter. From my sample, when a global IO was involved in multilateral sanctioning, there was almost a 50% chance that it was the UN. Therefore I eliminated the UN from the sample to check whether this changed the outcomes. However, the results did not change. It may be because, as I explained in the ‘Testing Hypotheses’ chapter, this variable still showed signs of multicollinearity. Otherwise I cannot explain it, since I still firmly believe that regional IOs, since they usually more homogeneous than global IOs are more effective in coordinating sanction episodes. They are more flexible and have more know-how in regional practices (Acharya & Johnson, 2007)
8. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this research was to find the exhibit the specific role that International Organizations (IOs) play in international economic sanction procedures. Daniel Drezner (2000) pointed at the positive role of the presence of IOs in sanctioning episodes. The aim of this research was to extend this view, and look at the differences in the efficacy of various IOs. What makes one IO more effective to function as the coordinator of economic sanctions than others? Here, I looked at differences in institutional designs.

Nowadays, economic sanctions are used as instruments of economic coercion to intervene in foreign political matters. Thereby aiming to resolve various international afflictive conflicts, we should be confident in the instruments’ expediency… right? According to the economic sanctions literature the actual results of sanction impositions are very disappointing, indicating that the instrument is not successful in achieving policy alterations and compliance by the target state. The main problems with the efficacy of sanctions emerge when a group of states tries to impose a multilateral sanction. Multilateral sanctions are by most scholars regarded to be more effective compared to unilateral initiatives, due to the greater terms-of-trade effects on the target nation (Haas, 1997; Lowenberg, 1999). The pressure is usually higher on the target state when there is a multilateral sanction regime. However, difficulties arise when a sender state aims to establish a multilateral sanction effort together with other states. International cooperation problems emerge both in the bargaining stage and the enforcement stage of the economic sanction episode (Drezner, 2000). Because of different norms, values, backgrounds and ideas, states may have divergent ideas about how the sanction regime should be implemented and carried out. Sanction coalitions must act as a cohesive entity in order for the sanction to be effective, this reflects the credibility of the senders’ coalition commitment (Mansfield, 1995). Obviously, in multilateral sanction efforts there are multiple states with different motives involved. And as states ultimately act to maximize their own benefits, there is always a chance that states will defect from agreed-upon sanctions, and backslide out of the agreement (Early & Spice, 2014).

Drezner (2000) argues that International Organizations can be the solution to overcome these difficulties and reduce uncertainties in multilateral sanction efforts. IOs are capable of ‘monitoring behavior, detect defection and punish defectors in ways that will in the end reduce incentives to defect’ (Acharya & Johnson, 2007: 17). IOs can facilitate
international cooperation and thereby be the monitoring body when pursuing economic sanction episodes. However, what is greatly ignored in the sanctions literature, is the difference in efficacy of these IOs. Mansfield (1995) argues that in the literature IOs are seen as homogeneous entities capable of improving the level of international cooperation among states. He suggests to move beyond this line of reasoning and to look at the difference in capacities of IOs. I follow his lead and I argue that much can be achieved concerning this matter, considering the fact that not every organization has the same coordinating and monitoring capabilities. In this thesis I looked at the relationship of different institutional designs of IOs and sanction successes.

Based on this research I may conclude that institutional designs do influence the efficacy of IOs in coordinating multilateral sanction episodes. I found that the level of ‘exclusiveness’ is a very important indicator to assess whether an IO is a good coordinator of sanctions. When more exclusive organizations are involved in sanctions procedures, the sanction outcomes where significantly higher compared to sanction efforts with inclusive IOs. With exclusive IOs I mean organizations which are restrictive considering their membership rules. The NATO and EU are examples of exclusive IOs. Moreover, I found that the decision-making process of the organization influences the sanction outcomes. According to my data, IOs which make their decision on a consensus basis are more effective in coordinating and monitoring sanction episodes, and have higher sanction successes. IOs which use majority-voting systems are more prone to backsliding problems (Early & Spice, 2014). When there is more consensus and conformity within the organization it is more likely to act as one rational actor, and can be a more decisive entity in the sanctioning procedure. Although not all my hypotheses are accepted, based on the theories and my empirical outcomes; I partially found evidence that more homogeneous IOs are more successful than internally divided, or heterogeneous, IOs.

This research does not only apply to the efficacy of economic sanctions in relation to international cooperation. In many more levels IOs can function as coordinators in the establishment of international agreements. In the IB literature states are often viewed as rational actors which make decisions to cooperate in order to maximize their own gain in an agreement. When states aim to cooperate with each other there is a lot of insecurity from both sides that the other partner is only in the deal because it believes that it creates the opportunity to benefit more from the deal than the other state. Therefore, multilateral regimes, whether
they are sanction regimes or other ways of working together on various levels, prove to be very difficult. International organizations have the strengths to diminish some of these insecurities. By having IOs as coordinators in an international coordination agreement it affects the behavior of both states. Having an institutional framework in international cooperation proves to be effective to the degree that they allow states to avoid short-term temptations, and show the long-term benefits of working together to strive towards their collective goal.

All in all, economic sanctions remain very difficult to coordinate and achieve compliance by the target. There are many factors influencing whether a target country will comply to the senders’ wishes. Factors such as the sanction type, the commitment of the sender, the national economy, independency of the target country to a sanctioning state, and importance of the matter will determine the form and process of the sanction regime. International cooperation appears to play a bigger role than the scholars in the sanction literature might expect up-front. Working together and staying together in the international field requires a lot of effort and dedication. States with various norms, values, practices and backgrounds are able to work together and collectively strive to, for example, impose a sanction to punish an aggressive dictatorial regime in country X. The likelihood that such sanction regime will be effective, saying that the target country will yield, increases when an International Organization is present in the international sanctioning process. International cooperation can be facilitated, coordinated and supported by these IOs, and expectations can be managed. The design of these institutions does play a big role in assessing the efficacy of the IO as a sanction coordinator. Organizations which are internally more similar, sharing the same norms and values, are likely to be better sanctioning coordinators than IOs which are more heterogeneous. Still, more research should be dedicated to how institutional designs influence international cooperation processes.
# 9. APPENDIX 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Issuedummy</th>
<th>ASCdummy</th>
<th>ATCdummy</th>
<th>SANCTIONOUTCOME</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>NoA2</th>
<th>Decisionmaking</th>
<th>scope</th>
<th>membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.223**</td>
<td>0.203**</td>
<td>-0.177**</td>
<td>0.137**</td>
<td>0.338**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.470**</td>
<td>0.144**</td>
<td>0.242**</td>
<td>-0.316**</td>
<td>-0.273**</td>
<td>-0.392**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>0.359**</td>
<td>0.470**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>-0.311**</td>
<td>-0.316**</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.024**</td>
<td>-0.850**</td>
<td>-0.316**</td>
<td>-0.316**</td>
<td>-0.316**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>-0.177**</td>
<td>-0.153**</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>0.012**</td>
<td>-0.478**</td>
<td>-0.536**</td>
<td>-0.399**</td>
<td>-0.399**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>-0.497**</td>
<td>-0.237**</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.079**</td>
<td>-0.913**</td>
<td>-0.924**</td>
<td>-0.909**</td>
<td>-0.909**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>-0.339**</td>
<td>-0.302**</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
<td>-0.714**</td>
<td>-0.548**</td>
<td>-0.634**</td>
<td>-0.879**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
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