III. Research Methodology, Method, Research Design and Research Context

3.1. Introduction
This chapter aims to develop the methodological framework of this research setting which focuses on team and group work in an intergovernmental organisation, and will present the research methods used. The design of the study will be presented as well as a description of the sample and the research context.

3.2. Methodology: Grounded Theory

Strauss and Corbin (1994, p.273) defined grounded theory as a “general methodology for developing theory that is grounded in data systematically gathered and analysed”. The procedures of grounded theory are designed to develop a well integrated set of concepts that provide a thorough theoretical explanation of social phenomena under study (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). Directly linked to this methodology is the term constant comparative method which connotes an interrelated process of data collection and analysis, an interaction between theory and data and an interplay of deduction and induction.

There are many advantages in using grounded theory. The selection of this methodology for this research setting has been directed by the following three motives:

- Grounded theory helps to develop theoretical explanations of the situations being investigated and is so close to those studied that the theory is of use to them (Turner, 1981).
- The objective of this study is to build an integrative model of how team/group work is practised in an intergovernmental organisation. Since relatively little is known about “why” and “how” teams/groups work (or do not) in this specific context, the choice for grounded theory seems to be appropriate.
- Grounded theory as a practical method focuses on the interpretive process by analysing “the actual production of meanings and concepts used by social actors in real settings” (Gephart, 2004, p.457).

The process of theory building using grounded theory methodology can very briefly be described as follows: Grounded theory is all about discovery and grounds a theory in reality (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Therefore, the research begins with an area of study and a not well defined theory. As soon as the first data within this area of study is collected, analysis begins. In the following, data collection and analysis are interre-
lated processes. This parallel process enables the researcher to capture all potentially relevant aspects of the research topic. Each aspect discovered earns its way into the theory by repeatedly being present or by being significantly absent (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). In the next step, data is conceptualised by comparing incidents and naming them. These concepts may then be grouped into categories by comparing, reducing and specifying them. Over time, categories can become related to one another and form a theory (Corbin & Strauss, 1990).

3.2.2. Method – Case Study

Case studies are a useful research method when the research topic is well studied but a fresh perspective is needed, or when little is known of the phenomenon under study. Furthermore, a case study is a research strategy which aims to understand the dynamics within single settings (Eisenhardt, 1989). Thus, a case study can either involve single or multiple cases and numerous levels of analysis, e.g.: organisation and individual (Yin, 1984). Case studies allow for qualitative as well as quantitative data collection and analysis. Finally, case studies may be used to test theory (Pinfield, 1986) or to generate theory (Gersick, 1988). According to Eisenhardt (1989), at the beginning of a case study based on the methodology of grounded theory, it is important to start as theory free as possible. A researcher should of course identify a research area and should formulate a research question and possibly identify some potentially important variables. Yet, the researcher should avoid thinking about theories or relationships between variables as much as possible. When selecting a case, Stake (1995) describes a choice of three types of case studies: a) intrinsic cases which focus on the uniqueness of a particular case aiming to understand solely the case itself, b) instrumental cases which offer insight into a substantive issue and enable to advance theory and c) collective cases which investigate into several cases and allow a comparison between cases.

Having explained the characteristics of a case study, I believe that the study of team and group work in an intergovernmental organisation is predestined for a case study for the following reasons: Teams and groups have been extensively studied over the past decades but not in the specific context of intergovernmental organisations. To understand how individuals co-work in this specific environment justifies the application of a so called intrinsic case study. Qualitative research with embedded units of analysis will be applied to show whether existing theory in the context of multinational corporations proofs to be valid in the context of an intergovernmental organisation. Finally, a case study based on grounded theory will allow for new theory building.
3.2.3. Objectivity, reliability, validity, and generalisability

Qualitative research often has been criticised as lacking in objectivity, reliability, validity, and generalisibility as opposed to hypothesis falsification used in postpositivism (Gephart, 2004). However, respecting a consistency between methodology and method and a thorough application of qualitative research methods may weaken this criticism.

To deal with the weaknesses of interpretive research, I followed the recommendations by Hussey, & Hussey (1997), Yin (1984), Miles, & Huberman (1994).

- Thorough explanation of methods used in study
- Respecting and following the rules of applied methods
- Documentation of all study materials (interviews, memos, assumptions and interpretations during analysis etc.)
- Triangulation by using different sources of data
- Audit of entire study

To keep as much objectivity as possible is a challenge for the researcher conducting interpretive research. Therefore, to avoid biases during the interview and during analysis, attention was paid by thoroughly following the rules of the methods applied. Reliability refers to the extent to which the results obtained could be repeated by another researcher. Validity, the core indicator in qualitative research (Bortz & Döring, 2002), refers to the extent to which research findings accurately reflect the happenings in a specific context (Hussey & Hussey, 1997). Validity in this research setting could be provided by respecting the five rules mentioned above. Finally, generalisibility is not a main concern of qualitative studies as this research method values the integration of a specific context and there is no primary concern about conducting the same research in completely different contexts.

Triangulation by using different sources of data (internal reports, internal case studies, books and press reports) was vital to provide reliable results. Last but not least, discussions with experts in the field (e.g. supervisors, lecturers, and staff of the UN not included in the sample) helped the researcher to cross-check conclusions.

3.3. Research Design

The study was designed to identify

- What kind of team and group work in intergovernmental organisations exists and
Factors which are a barrier, a trigger, and/or influence team and group work.

Due to the fact that relatively little is known about team and group work in intergovernmental organisations a qualitative research approach was chosen. Qualitative research aims to explain social reality by learning from the people's experiences (Flick, Karl Dorff, & Steineke, 2000). Thus, qualitative research allows gathering deep insights by considering context and situational factors and as a result theory can be generated in a context in which little is known about the phenomena under investigation (Eisenhardt, 1989). Qualitative methods have been defined as procedures for “coming to terms with the meaning not the frequency” of a phenomenon by studying it in its social context (Van Maanen, 1983, p.9).

To set up this research design as a case study based on semi-structured in depth interviews has been driven by the arguments above as well as the underlying methodological assumptions.

The research design for this study comprises four iterative stages:

- field research: semi-structured interviews in 3 headquarters of an intergovernmental organisation
- desk research: literature review on teams and groups in multinational organisations
- data analysis using constant comparative method
- development of propositions and a model

3.3.1. Semi-structured interviews

Grounded theory research is typically associated with collecting data through interviews (Osland & Osland, 2001). In personal interviews the interviewer is the research instrument and the interview is an opportunity to enter the mind of another and to see the world as they see it (McCracken, 1988). Consequently, this technique proves to be a valid tool to gather a broad understanding of the context the interviewees act in as well as related phenomena.

Interviewing

Grounded theory demands the researcher to enter the field of study without having any pre-existing theoretical assumptions (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Although I argue that it is difficult to conceive of any researcher to start a study with a theory-free mind I conducted the first five interviews without reading related literature. The first interviews were general in nature and mostly consisted of an introductory question which aimed to form a brief overview of the topic under study. According to Mayring (2002) this narrative approach allows the inter-
viewee to openly and freely respond to the overall research question without being restricted by the interviewer. Following constant comparative method I analysed the interviews, linked them to literature and developed an interview guide for the next set of interviews. This basic list proved to be a helpful tool during interviews to make sure that all relevant topics were covered. However, a second round of interviews opened new views of the construct under investigation which I then again linked to literature and included in the interview guide. The final interview guide developed this way and has been used for the remaining sets of interviews (see appendix 2).

The interview comprised three main parts.

The first set of questions was aimed at the individual and his/her work environment. A short description of the people the interviewees work with usually led them to tell a related story. This made them feel comfortable and in the course of telling the story they naturally gave hints relating to the set of questions which was aimed at team work. Also, the interviewer could learn about the personality of the interviewee.

The second set of questions was designed to capture the role and set up of team work and to make the interviewee define what a ‘team’ means to him/her. An important aspect of this set of questions turned out to be the role of management that will be explained in more detail in the analysis of the data.

The third set of questions focused on the structure of the organisation and the impact of bureaucracy and red tape on the work place and team situation. Lastly, I asked the interviewees what they would wish to change in their work environment if they were in a position of power.

After the interview was over and the interviewee left, I immediately took notes on the demographics of the interviewee and the interview situation. The latter included observations made during the interview or remarks which seemed important to understand the context of the interview (see appendix 3).

Challenges

Applying the method of semi-structured interviews on the one hand makes sure to cover all areas of interest during the interview. The interview guide can be used to direct the conversation so that it stays on course. At the same time this technique leaves enough freedom for the interviewees to come up with unexpected descriptions and arguments. However, this technique challenges skills: the interviewer always needs to keep in mind the focus and goal of the interview. At the same time the interviewer should take advantage of the fact that most people like to talk about themselves (Bewley, 2002) and should keep the interviewee engaged and not constrained by persistent questioning. The interviewer constantly needs to find a balance between getting an answer to all questions and leaving the interviewee enough freedom to tell his/her story. Simulta-
neously, the interviewee needs to keep track of the content of the interviewee’s narratives and already formulate the next questions in her head.

Another challenge is to find interviewees who are willing to tell their story (Hermanowicz, 2002). Many people are willing to give an interview only if promised strict confidentiality (Bewley, 2002). The interviewer needs to assure confidentiality and anonymity in the introductory letter. It should engage the potential interviewees by making sure that their expert knowledge is needed and valued. During the interview it is important to create a comfortable atmosphere by asking introductory questions and by conducting small talk. As most people are busy, it is important to sustain their interest throughout the interview by maintaining eye contact and also by inviting the interviewee to bring up new topics (Bewley, 2002). Furthermore, the questions need to be formulated in a way that the interviewees can understand them, and the questions need to be about topics the interviewees can meaningfully respond to.

A further topic that needs to be handled with care is the recording of interviews. Interviewees must give permission for recording. Some people might not feel comfortable and this has to be respected by the interviewer. If interviewees do not mind being recorded, it still is advisable to take notes during and after the interview because the best equipment may fail and sometimes informants may change their minds about recording (Wilkinson & Young, 2004).

**Biases**

When interviewing, one always needs to keep in mind the biases which go hand in hand with this technique. In the following, I would like to point out the main biases which have to be taken into consideration for this research setting, namely the cross-cultural and context bias.

**Cross-cultural bias**

As this study is set in a multicultural intergovernmental organisation, the researcher might be tempted to interview a variety of people from different cultural backgrounds to cover as many views as possible. However, cross cultural interviews add another dimension to the already fairly difficult technique of interviewing: culture. If the interviewer has a different cultural background as the interviewee, there is the risk that both persons attribute different meanings and interpretations to the content of the interview. This so called construct bias occurs ‘if there is only partial overlap in the definitions of the construct across cultures’ (Van de Vijver & Tanzer, 1997) and it can only be avoided if both people in an interview situation belong to the same culture. Moreover, interviews across cultures are very likely to be held in languages other than the mother tongue. Either one part of the party or both parts need to express themselves in a second
language; hence, misunderstandings and misinterpretations are very likely to happen, and as a consequence interviewer and response biases arise. Overall ‘the choice and use of language as well as the researcher’s and the interviewee’s language skills affect the dynamics of the interview’ (Marschan-Piekkari & Reis, 2004). Furthermore, the interviewer also risks neglecting non-verbal communication. As a consequence, Fink et al., (2004) recommend refraining from conducting cross-cultural interviews to avoid cross-cultural biases unless the common third language is spoken fluently and both the researcher and interviewee are familiar with the second culture.

**Social desirability bias**
Social desirability can be explained as the tendency of individuals to describe themselves and the organisation they work for in a more attractive manner than they are in reality (Schwab, 1999). Especially personal or sensitive questions are prone for leading the respondent to answer socially desirable. In this research, cooperation with other individuals and work in teams/groups can be seen as a personal issue for interviewees. Consequently, related questions may be exposed to social desirability bias. Keeping this in mind is particularly vital during analysis and interpretation of the data.

**Context bias**
Context as specified by Cappelli & Sherer (1991, p.56) is ‘the surroundings associated with phenomena which help to illustrate that phenomena’. As widely acknowledged and also argued throughout the literature review, qualitative research -contrarily to quantitative research - is capable of capturing contextual factors (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 1994). Therefore, context is a vital part of qualitative research and makes models more accurate and the interpretation of results more robust (Schneider, 1985). Marschan-Piekkari, Welch & Tahvanainen (2004) suggest considering context at four different levels. Interview context being a potential source of bias will be explained first, followed by three other closely interwoven levels (individual context, organisational context, and external context).

The interview context as such can be described by situational variables such as the location in which the interview takes place, the time of the day, the amount of time the interviewee allows, the mood both parties are in and the interpersonal dynamics during the interview. While the location and time of the meeting can be arranged, the interviewer has no influence on interruptions during the meeting, last minute obligations on the side of the interviewee; not to mention the mood of the interviewer and interviewee the day the interview takes place. Furthermore, interviews are an arena of power relations. The interviewee might want to impose his or her meta-communicative norms on the interviewer (Yeung, 1995) which is particularly the case when interviewing elites. It is often
assumed that the more senior the interviewer the more he or she knows (MacDonald & Hellgren, 2004). Others argue that top management may not always know most about what is going on in the organisation and, therefore, suggest interviewing other staff in the hierarchy (e.g.: Macdonald & Hellgren, 2004). These aspects are part of the individual context of an interview referring to education, profession, hierarchical status and power of both the interviewee and the interviewer. Bewley (2002) for example reported that being a professor made interviewing very rewarding for him as interviewees paid a lot of respect to him because of the fact that he is academic. By contrast, my professor often argued that professors may represent a certain degree of authority which might intimidate some interviewees from answering the way they feel. They might fear of answering “un-academically” or they might assume that the professor is hiding his/her knowledge.

At the second level, the type of organisation under study (its size, structure, strategy, culture, and history) forms the organisational context of the interview (Marschan-Piekkari et al., 2004). A thorough consideration and description of the organisational context is suggested (Rousseau & Fried, 2001). The latter ones argue that organisational factors are very often taken for granted by the interviewer who fails to consider organisational influences during the interview. The same may also apply to interviewees who may personalise events and exclude organisational effects. Contrary to the organisational context, which is also known as inner context, the external (or outer) context encompasses the national culture, the political and economic environment in which organisations are embedded (Pettigrew, 1985). A constant consideration of the external context during analysis is recommended in order to avoid false assumptions.

To avoid biases, a rich description and consideration of context on all four levels during the interview as well as during analysis is highly recommended. This is even more so in qualitative research which demands a rich description of context.

### 3.3.2. Data Analysis – Constant Comparative Method

With the permission of interviewees, interviews were recorded, transcribed and linked to personal characteristics: demographic ones such as age, gender, education and functional characteristics such as position, experience.

The text material was fed into software Atlas.ti, Version 5, which helps to code, match and administer qualitative research data. It allows to quantify the findings and to draw network views. The software does assist in data analysis such as data reduction, categorisation and administration, but the actual analysis, interpretation and theory building is in the hands of the user of the software.
**Constant Comparative Method**

As described in the seminal work of Glaser & Strauss (1967) four stages of constant comparative method have been respected throughout the data analysis:

1. Comparing incidents applicable to each category
2. Integrating categories and their properties
3. Delimiting the theory
4. Writing the theory

Step 1: Comparing incidents applicable to each category

The beginning of analysis using constant comparative method is dominated by the discovery and creation of codes through interpretation of data. As explained by Hussey, & Hussey (1997) codes serve to enable the data to be segmented, compiled and organised. Strauss & Corbin (1990) talk about three different kinds of codes: open codes, axial codes and selective codes. Open codes are the basic form of codes which come from the researcher’s own imagination or from literature (vivo codes). In the course of open coding, the researcher assigns names to contexts, events, activities or stories found in the data. The analytic process of open coding leads to an identification of concepts which are the basis for the development of theory. In a next step, through axial coding, the researcher tries to make connections between categories. Once again this is an iterative process and the researcher goes back and forth between open and axial coding. In a last step, selective coding results in the development of a core code which is the central phenomenon that has emerged from axial coding.

The coding process involves both inductive and deductive thinking. Inductive thinking means that categories, themes and patterns emerge from the data material itself whereas deductive thinking verifies existing theory and frameworks against the data (Fink et al., 2004; Patton, 2002). Furthermore, coding and categorising shows a constant interplay between proposing and checking as explained by Glaser & Strauss (1967, p. 106): ‘While coding an incident for a category, compare it with the previous incidents in the same and different groups coded in the same category’

A constant comparison leads the researcher to generate theoretical properties: the researcher may eventually relate categories to each other and start to think in terms of the full range of types of categories, their dimensions and their major consequences.

After coding for a category for possibly several times, Glaser and Strauss (1967, p. 107) suggest stopping to code and, instead, to recording a memo of the researcher’s own ideas. ‘The analyst should take as much time as necessary to reflect and carry his thinking to its most logical (grounded in the data, not speculative) conclusion.’ Furthermore, it is advised to write memos throughout the process of analysis to illustrate the researcher’s ideas.
Step 2: Integrating categories and their properties
As the coding continues, constant comparison causes categories to become related to other categories and as a result accumulated knowledge is built up. As different categories become integrated, the researcher can start to develop theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 109).

Step 3: Delimiting the theory
This step is mostly characterised by reduction, which comprises bundling categories to a smaller set of higher level concepts. Consequently, reduction leads to a more precise terminology. Thus, the researcher complies with two requirements of theory: parsimony of variables and their formulation and scope in the applicability of the theory to a wide range of situations (Glaser & Strauss, 1979, p. 111).

Step 4: Writing theory
After having carefully respected the first three stages, the researcher finally arrives at writing a theory based on the categories developed, their relation to each other and their integration to a whole concept. The content behind the categories is provided by the memos which represent the major themes of the theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1979, p. 113).

3.3.3. Sample
As this study deals with team and group work and the conditions under which this type of work is enhanced (or not), I decided to conduct interviews at a macro-level unit of analysis. Hence, 50 semi-structured, face to face and individual interviews in three locations of five Organisations of the United Nations were conducted between June 2005 and June 2006. To avoid a cross-cultural bias, the decision was made to only interview Austrian and German employees. Contacts were made through networking and 50 interviews could be conducted. All interviews were conducted by the author and lasted between 45 minutes to 2 hours. The interviews mostly took place in the cafes of each of the three locations visited. With permission, interviews were recorded and taped. Total anonymity was promised in every case.
The demographics and functional characteristics among the people interviewed are very diverse and the sample represents a wide variety of staff members. Table 3 below summarises the characteristics of the interviewee sample:
Table 3: Demographics of the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics of sample</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No university degree</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of languages spoken</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time of tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 years</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department/Director</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Professional Officer</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Staff</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational unit</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAEA</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO</td>
<td>9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIPO</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*one person has been interviewed twice (before and after leaving the UN)

3.4. Research Context

The interviews took place in three locations of the United Nations, namely in Vienna, Geneva and New York. At a lower organisational level, five organisational units were chosen: the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in Vienna, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in New York, the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) in Vienna, the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) in New York, and the
World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) in Geneva. The reason for this choice was twofold: first, the huge body of principle organs of the United Nations System with its numerous related agencies, organisations and programmes cannot possibly be investigated by a single researcher within the limitations of a single research project. However, to get a broader understanding of the structure and culture of the United Nations Organisation it seemed necessary to conduct interviews in different types of units. Therefore, I aimed to conduct interviews in agencies, programmes and organisations with diverse functions, diverse structures, and diverse cultures and last but not least, diverse locations.

Second, within these units a sufficiently large number of German speaking staff who were willing to give interviews could be identified.

The following details aim to describe briefly the history of the United Nations Organisation and its structure as well as the diverse units under investigation.

Context

‘The United Nations Organisation (UN) is an international organisation bringing together 191 states which have committed themselves voluntarily to a mutual obligation to safeguard peace and humane living conditions for the people of the world’ (Gareis & Varwick, 2005).

In June 1945, in the aftermath of World War II, 50 founding members gave birth to the United Nations by signing the Charter of the United Nations in San Francisco. Over the years, a further 140 states have become members of this intergovernmental organisation.

The United Nations System consists of six primary organs which will briefly be explained in the following (source: (Gareis & Varwick, 2005):

- The General Assembly: intergovernmental forum for consultation and cooperation. All member states are represented equally by one vote per state.
- The Security Council: responsible for world peace and international security. 5 permanent and 10 non-permanent member states; meets on a daily basis.
- The Economic and Social Council: works together with General Assembly on economic and social topics; 54 members.
- The International Court of Justice: primary juridical organ of the UN, consist of 15 independent judges appointed by Security Council and General Assembly.
- The Secretariat: main administrative organ. The Secretary-General is elected by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council and serves for 5 years.
- Note: The Trusteeship Council: suspended its work in 1994 after the transition of the last trustee
Apart from these 5 main organs, the United Nations System also consists of various, sometimes independent, decentralised organisations and programmes, each with its own by-laws, membership, structure and budget (Gareis & Varwick, 2005).

**International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)**
The first United Nations Organisation to be located in Vienna was the IAEA in 1957. The IAEA counts as an autonomous, international organisation within the United Nations System and the two bodies consult each other. A special agreement between the UN and the IAEA governs their relationship with regards to reporting, exchange of information, cooperation, technical assistance, budgetary and financial agreements and personnel arrangements. The IAEA is responsible for international activities concerned with the peaceful uses of atomic energy. It finances itself out of regular budget resources and voluntary contributions. The IAEA reports to the Security Council and the General Assembly. (Source: [www.iaea.org] downloaded 15.05.2007)

**United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**
The UNDP emerged in 1965 as an independent instrument for the planning, financing and coordination of development projects. It specifically administers the technical part of these projects which aim to fight poverty and to improve living conditions. The funds for the projects are based on grants which do not have to be repaid by the developing countries. The UNDP has no formal membership. It is financed through the voluntary contributions of member states. The central office is in New York but it has offices in more than 130 countries and is involved in some 5,000 projects at any given time (Gareis & Varwick, 2005). UNDP reports directly to the General Assembly and has a non-subsidiary relationship with the Economic and Social Council.

**United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO)**
UNIDO was established in 1966 as an organ of the General Assembly. Like the IAEA, UNIDO functions as an autonomous organisation within the United Nations. Its permanent headquarters is in Vienna. UNIDO is represented in 50 developing countries (thereof predominantly in Africa). The two main areas of activities are to strengthen industrial capacities and to encourage cleaner and sustainable industrial development.
Funding for UNIDO activities is drawn from the regular budget, the operational budget, and voluntary contributions. (Source: [www.unido.org], downloaded 15.05.2007)
**United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)**

UNOPS was established as a self-financing unit at the beginning of 1995 and provides operational management services such as reduction of red tape, loan administration and supervision, but also protection of international waters and biodiversity or electoral assistance. The clients of UNOPS are United Nations System partners such as UNDP, UNICEF, UNESCO and country governments. UNOPS is self-financing and charges fees on estimates of the actual costs of rendering services to a client. UNOPS reports directly to the General Assembly. (Source: [www.unops.org], downloaded 15.05.2007)

**World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO)**

In 1967 WIPO was established by the WIPO Convention to promote the protection of Intellectual Property. The headquarters is located in Geneva. WIPO is a specialised agency of the United Nations dedicated to developing an accessible international intellectual property system among its member states. This includes development of international laws and treaties regarding patents, trademarks, and industrial designs, copyright and related issues. WIPO administers fee-based services based on international agreements which enable users in member countries to file international applications for patents and international registrations for trademarks, designs, and appellations of origin. WIPO is largely self-financing with 90 percent of the budget coming from earning from provided services. (Source: [www.wipo.int], downloaded 15.05.2007)

Table 4 summarises the main characteristics of the organisational units described. It shows that these five units differ in many ways: the choice of units covers a United Nations programme (UNDP), an office (UNOPS), an agency (IAEA), and two organisations (WIPO, UNIDO). The units not only differ by the status of the entities under investigation within the United Nations System but also in the way they are financed (self financing and/or regular budget), with regards to their main area of work (internal and/or external) and their function (technical and/or services). Last but not least, they are also located in different headquarters.
Table 4: Unit summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Reports to</th>
<th>Financed by</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAEA</td>
<td>Security Council, General Assembly</td>
<td>Self-financing because autonomous agency</td>
<td>Peaceful use of Atomic Energy technical</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>General Assembly</td>
<td>Voluntary contributions</td>
<td>Administers technical part of development programmes</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO</td>
<td>General Assembly</td>
<td>UN budget, operational budget, mainly voluntary contributions</td>
<td>Public and private sector services. Technical: design and implementation of programmes</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>General Assembly</td>
<td>Self-financing</td>
<td>Mainly UN internal services</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIPO</td>
<td>General Assembly</td>
<td>Self financing, charging of fees for services</td>
<td>Development of laws; registration of patents and trade marks (services)</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: author