

 <https://doi.org/10.47353/lawpass.v3i1.116>

Between Order and Disorder: Legal Authority and Social Legitimacy in Transitional Governance

Richard Kwadzo Doe-Dartey

University for Development Studies, Tamale, Ghana

*Corresponding author: doedart2000@gmail.com

Abstract

This article examines the relationship between legal authority and social legitimacy in transitional governance. Transitional societies often experience institutional fragility in which constitutional legality alone is insufficient to maintain political stability and public trust. Using a qualitative normative approach, this study analyzes how governance authority is negotiated between formal state institutions and socially embedded actors within contexts of political transition, post-conflict reconstruction, and institutional uncertainty. The findings indicate that legal authority frequently weakens when disconnected from social legitimacy, while informal governance structures may gain stronger societal recognition despite lacking formal constitutional status. The study introduces the concept of “legitimacy-fluid governance,” referring to the dynamic shift of authority between formal and informal institutions depending on political performance, public trust, and social acceptance. The article argues that sustainable transitional governance requires balancing institutional legality with inclusive participation and socially grounded legitimacy. This study contributes to governance and socio-legal scholarship by offering an interdisciplinary framework for understanding governance between order and disorder in contemporary transitional societies.

Keywords: Transitional Governance; Legal Authority; Social Legitimacy; Hybrid Governance; Rule of Law.

Introduction

Transitional governance has become one of the most critical issues in contemporary political and legal discourse due to the increasing number of states experiencing institutional instability, democratic regression, armed conflict, and constitutional transformation. In periods of political transition, governments often face profound challenges in maintaining social order while simultaneously establishing legitimacy among citizens. These transitional periods create a fragile political environment in which legal authority may formally exist but lacks sufficient public trust and societal recognition. Consequently, governance becomes situated between order and disorder, where institutional legality and social legitimacy continuously compete and interact.



<https://lawpass.org/>

Received: Mar 21, 2026 | Revised: Apr 9, 2026 | Accepted: Apr 24, 2026 | Publication: Apr 30, 2026

Copyright (c) 2026 Richard Kwadzo Doe-Dartey

 Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

In modern governance theory, legal authority generally refers to the capacity of institutions to exercise power based on constitutional norms, legal procedures, and formal regulatory systems (Tyler, 2006). Legal authority traditionally functions as the foundation of state sovereignty because it provides institutional predictability, administrative continuity, and mechanisms for enforcing collective rules. However, transitional societies frequently experience institutional fragmentation that weakens the effectiveness of formal legal systems. Under such circumstances, citizens may no longer perceive legal institutions as legitimate representatives of public interests.

This phenomenon has become increasingly visible in post-conflict and post-authoritarian societies. In countries such as Libya, Afghanistan, Sudan, and Syria, constitutional reforms and internationally sponsored democratic transitions often failed to establish sustainable political stability because legal institutions lacked deep social legitimacy (Chandler, 2019). Although formal governance structures were created through elections, constitutional drafting, and judicial reforms, many citizens continued to distrust state institutions due to corruption, exclusion, political violence, or external intervention. This demonstrates that legality alone cannot guarantee stable governance in transitional political environments.

The crisis of legitimacy in transitional governance is further intensified by the growing complexity of contemporary political order. Globalization, digital communication, migration, and transnational security threats have transformed the nature of state authority. Citizens increasingly evaluate governments not merely through legal procedures but through responsiveness, inclusion, transparency, and social justice (Habermas, 2020). As a result, governments are required not only to possess constitutional authority but also to secure moral and social recognition from diverse societal groups.

In fragile political environments, the absence of social legitimacy frequently produces alternative forms of governance beyond formal state institutions. Local communities may rely on religious authorities, customary courts, tribal leadership, civil society organizations, or informal security networks to maintain social order and resolve disputes. Risse (2018) argues that areas of limited statehood often develop governance arrangements that function outside formal state control while still maintaining social stability. This indicates that authority in transitional societies is not monopolized exclusively by the state but distributed among multiple actors with varying degrees of legitimacy.

The emergence of hybrid governance systems has therefore become a defining characteristic of transitional politics. Hybrid governance refers to the coexistence of formal institutions and informal social structures within the same political space (Mac Ginty, 2011). In many transitional societies, state institutions coexist with customary governance systems, local militias, NGOs, international agencies, and community organizations. These actors collectively influence governance outcomes by shaping public trust, participation, and access to justice. Consequently, governance cannot be understood solely through constitutional legality because social legitimacy plays an equally important role in sustaining political order.

The relationship between legal authority and social legitimacy has long been debated within political and legal theory. Contemporary legitimacy theory emphasizes that governance stability depends not only on coercive enforcement but also on voluntary compliance and public



acceptance. Beetham (2013) explains that legitimacy emerges when power is exercised according to accepted rules, justified through shared beliefs, and supported by public consent. Similarly, Tyler (2006) argues that citizens are more likely to obey laws when they perceive institutions as procedurally fair and morally credible.

Recent scholarship on fragile states and peacebuilding also demonstrates the limitations of purely institutional approaches to governance transition. International interventions frequently prioritize constitutional engineering, electoral systems, and rule-of-law reforms while neglecting local social structures and historical grievances (Paris, 2014). As a result, externally imposed institutions may satisfy international legal standards but fail to generate social trust at the local level. This disconnect between institutional legality and social legitimacy often contributes to governance failure and recurring instability.

Moreover, transitional governance frequently operates within conditions of contested sovereignty. In many fragile states, governments possess formal international recognition while lacking effective territorial control or domestic legitimacy. Krasner and Risse (2014) describe such contexts as “areas of limited statehood,” where state institutions cannot fully enforce laws or provide public services. Under these conditions, non-state actors frequently assume governance functions traditionally associated with the state. This reality challenges classical assumptions that sovereignty and authority are centralized exclusively within formal governmental institutions.

Another important issue concerns the tension between security and democratic participation during political transitions. Transitional governments often prioritize stability and order through centralized executive power, emergency regulations, and coercive security measures. Although such strategies may temporarily prevent institutional collapse, they may simultaneously undermine democratic legitimacy if citizens perceive governance as authoritarian or exclusionary. Pospisil (2019) argues that sustainable peace and governance cannot be achieved solely through institutional stabilization but require continuous political negotiation and social inclusion.

The increasing importance of social legitimacy in governance studies has also encouraged scholars to reconsider the role of public participation and local ownership in transitional politics. Gready and Robins (2017) emphasize that transitional justice and governance reforms become more effective when local communities actively participate in shaping institutional processes. Governance legitimacy therefore depends not merely on constitutional legality but on whether institutions are socially embedded and culturally recognized.

Despite extensive scholarship concerning governance transitions, important theoretical gaps remain unresolved. Many studies continue to separate legal authority from social legitimacy, treating them as independent rather than interconnected dimensions of governance. Legal scholarship often focuses on constitutionalism, institutional reform, and state-building, whereas sociological approaches emphasize identity, participation, and informal authority structures. Consequently, there remains limited theoretical integration explaining how legal authority and social legitimacy interact dynamically in transitional political environments.



Furthermore, existing governance literature often assumes that transitional societies move linearly toward stable liberal democracy. However, contemporary political realities demonstrate that many transitional states remain characterized by prolonged instability, fragmented sovereignty, and hybrid authority systems. This suggests that transitional governance should not merely be viewed as a temporary deviation from stable governance but as a distinct political condition shaped by continuous negotiation between institutional order and social disorder.

The novelty of this article lies in its effort to integrate legal and sociopolitical perspectives into a unified analytical framework for understanding transitional governance. This study introduces the concept of “legitimacy-fluid governance,” referring to governance systems in which authority continuously shifts between formal institutions and socially embedded actors depending on political performance, public trust, and crisis conditions. Unlike conventional governance theories that prioritize either institutional legality or social legitimacy, this framework emphasizes their mutual dependence and dynamic interaction.

This article argues that sustainable transitional governance cannot be achieved solely through legal institutionalization or coercive state authority. Instead, governance stability emerges when legal institutions are capable of incorporating social legitimacy through inclusive participation, procedural fairness, cultural sensitivity, and public trust-building mechanisms. Transitional governance therefore depends upon balancing legal authority with societal recognition within an evolving political environment.

Based on these arguments, this article seeks to answer the following research question: how do legal authority and social legitimacy interact in shaping transitional governance between order and disorder? By addressing this question, the study contributes theoretically to governance studies, political sociology, and legal theory while also offering practical insights for post-conflict reconstruction, constitutional reform, and democratic transition policies.

Method

This study employs a qualitative normative approach to examine the relationship between legal authority and social legitimacy in transitional governance. The research is conceptual and analytical in nature, focusing on the interpretation of legal and political theories related to governance, legitimacy, and institutional transformation. Rather than relying on quantitative measurement or statistical analysis, the study emphasizes theoretical exploration and critical examination of governance dynamics within transitional political contexts.

The normative legal approach is used to analyze the concept of legal authority within transitional governance systems. This approach focuses on legal principles, constitutional frameworks, rule-of-law mechanisms, and institutional legitimacy as the formal basis of political authority. Through normative analysis, the study evaluates how legal systems function during periods of political instability and institutional uncertainty. Legal authority is examined not only as a constitutional structure but also as a mechanism for maintaining social order, political accountability, and state continuity.



In addition to normative legal analysis, this study incorporates a socio-political approach to understand the role of social legitimacy in governance transitions. Social legitimacy is analyzed through theories of public trust, political participation, collective recognition, and social acceptance. This perspective is important because transitional governance frequently involves situations in which formal institutions lack public confidence, causing communities to rely on informal governance structures such as customary authorities, religious institutions, and civil society organizations. Therefore, governance is examined not merely as a legal phenomenon but also as a socially constructed process shaped by cultural and political interactions.

The research adopts an interdisciplinary framework by integrating perspectives from legal studies, political sociology, governance theory, and transitional justice scholarship. This interdisciplinary orientation is necessary because transitional governance cannot be adequately explained through a single disciplinary perspective. Legal institutions operate within broader social and political environments where legitimacy is continuously negotiated among state actors, communities, and non-state institutions.

The primary data source in this study consists of secondary legal and academic materials. These include books, peer-reviewed journal articles, international governance reports, and scholarly publications discussing transitional governance, state legitimacy, hybrid governance, constitutional transition, and post-conflict reconstruction. The study prioritizes contemporary academic literature published in reputable international journals and academic publishers to ensure theoretical relevance and analytical credibility.

The analytical method employed is qualitative interpretive analysis. This method aims to identify conceptual patterns, theoretical tensions, and governance dynamics concerning the interaction between legality and legitimacy. The analysis focuses on how legal authority and social legitimacy complement, compete, or conflict with one another during periods of political transition. Rather than seeking causal statistical relationships, the study seeks to construct a coherent theoretical explanation regarding governance instability and institutional adaptation in transitional societies.

To strengthen analytical validity, the research applies comparative conceptualization across multiple transitional contexts. Although this study does not use empirical case-study methods in a strict sense, examples from post-conflict states, fragile democracies, and post-authoritarian societies are used illustratively to support theoretical arguments. These examples function as contextual references for understanding recurring governance patterns in transitional political environments.

Furthermore, the study employs critical analysis to evaluate dominant assumptions in governance discourse. Many conventional governance theories prioritize formal institutions and constitutional legality while underestimating the importance of social legitimacy and informal authority structures. This research critically examines such assumptions by emphasizing that governance stability depends on the interaction between institutional legality and societal recognition.

The limitation of this methodology lies in its conceptual and non-empirical nature. Since the study does not involve field surveys, interviews, or quantitative datasets, its findings cannot



be generalized statistically. However, the methodological strength of this approach lies in its ability to provide theoretical synthesis and normative insight into the complexity of transitional governance. By combining legal analysis with socio-political legitimacy theory, this study offers a comprehensive framework for understanding governance between order and disorder.

Ultimately, the chosen methodology supports the article's objective of explaining transitional governance as a dynamic negotiation between formal legal authority and socially constructed legitimacy. Through qualitative and interdisciplinary analysis, this study seeks to contribute to broader discussions concerning governance resilience, institutional transformation, and political stability in transitional societies.

Legal Authority and the Crisis of Institutional Governance

One of the central findings of this study is that legal authority in transitional governance frequently experiences institutional fragility due to weak public trust, political instability, and contested sovereignty. Transitional political environments often emerge after violent conflict, authoritarian collapse, constitutional crises, or regime change, conditions in which legal systems lose their institutional continuity and social credibility. Although governments may retain constitutional authority formally, their capacity to exercise effective governance becomes limited when society no longer recognizes legal institutions as legitimate.

The analysis demonstrates that legality alone is insufficient to maintain political order during periods of transition. In many fragile states, constitutional frameworks and formal governance structures exist primarily at the procedural level but fail to function substantively within society. Elections, judicial reforms, anti-corruption institutions, and constitutional amendments often become symbolic mechanisms rather than effective instruments of governance. This problem is particularly visible in post-conflict states where institutional reconstruction is heavily influenced by external actors while local social realities remain inadequately represented.

The findings support the argument that legal authority depends not only on institutional validity but also on social acceptance. Tyler (2006) explains that citizens obey laws more willingly when they perceive institutions as fair, accountable, and morally credible. However, transitional governments frequently suffer from legitimacy deficits because state institutions are associated with previous authoritarian regimes, corruption, elite domination, or foreign intervention. As a result, citizens may formally recognize governmental authority while simultaneously distrusting the institutions exercising that authority.

This condition creates what can be described as "institutional duality," where formal legality exists alongside widespread informal governance practices. Citizens may continue interacting with official institutions for administrative purposes while relying on non-state actors for security, dispute resolution, and social coordination. Such dynamics reveal that governance authority in transitional societies is fragmented rather than centralized.

The study also finds that international state-building interventions frequently intensify legitimacy problems. International organizations commonly promote constitutionalism,



democratization, and rule-of-law reforms as universal solutions for transitional governance. However, these interventions often prioritize institutional design over social legitimacy. Chandler (2019) argues that externally imposed governance frameworks frequently fail because they do not adequately incorporate local political culture, historical memory, and societal expectations. Consequently, legal systems may satisfy international standards while remaining disconnected from the social foundations necessary for long-term legitimacy.

Another important issue concerns the relationship between coercion and legality. Transitional governments often attempt to compensate for weak legitimacy through coercive state mechanisms such as military enforcement, emergency regulations, surveillance, and executive centralization. While these measures may temporarily stabilize political order, they can also deepen public distrust if citizens perceive governance as authoritarian or exclusionary. This finding indicates that excessive reliance on coercive legality risks undermining democratic legitimacy and increasing social resistance.

The analysis therefore suggests that legal authority during transitional governance is inherently fragile when disconnected from societal recognition. Institutional legality cannot function effectively without public trust, participatory inclusion, and moral legitimacy. Transitional governance consequently requires more than constitutional procedures; it requires socially embedded institutions capable of generating collective acceptance.

Social Legitimacy and Informal Governance Structures

The findings further indicate that social legitimacy functions as an alternative and often more resilient source of authority in transitional societies. In contexts where state institutions are weak, fragmented, or distrusted, communities frequently transfer legitimacy toward informal governance structures that possess stronger social embeddedness.

Informal governance systems include customary authorities, tribal councils, religious institutions, local community leaders, non-governmental organizations, and civil society networks. These actors often provide essential governance functions such as conflict mediation, social welfare distribution, public security, and dispute resolution. Unlike formal institutions that derive authority from constitutional legality, informal governance structures derive legitimacy from cultural continuity, communal trust, historical recognition, and social participation.

Risse (2018) argues that governance in areas of limited statehood frequently depends upon non-state actors because formal institutions lack sufficient administrative capacity and social penetration. The present study confirms this argument by showing that transitional governance frequently operates through overlapping systems of authority rather than centralized state control.

The resilience of informal legitimacy demonstrates that governance cannot be understood exclusively through legal frameworks. Communities are more likely to recognize authority that responds effectively to local needs and reflects shared social values. This finding supports Beetham's (2013) theory that legitimacy depends upon socially justified power relations rather than institutional coercion alone.

However, the study also finds that social legitimacy possesses inherent limitations when



detached from formal legal structures. Informal governance systems may reinforce social inequality, ethnic exclusion, patriarchal norms, or localized power domination. For example, customary justice mechanisms may resolve disputes efficiently while simultaneously marginalizing women or minority groups. Similarly, local militias may provide security within specific communities while undermining national legal coherence and democratic accountability.

This dual character of social legitimacy reveals an important paradox within transitional governance. Informal institutions may generate stronger social trust than formal state institutions, yet they may also weaken universal legal protections and institutional consistency. Therefore, legitimacy without legality risks producing fragmented governance systems incapable of ensuring equal rights and long-term political stability.

The findings also demonstrate that legitimacy in transitional governance is dynamic rather than static. Public trust shifts continuously depending on institutional performance, crisis management, economic conditions, and political inclusion. Governments may gain legitimacy through effective public service delivery or lose legitimacy through corruption, repression, or exclusionary policies. Similarly, informal actors may strengthen or weaken their legitimacy depending on their responsiveness to societal expectations.

This dynamic nature of legitimacy suggests that authority in transitional governance is negotiated continuously between institutions and society. Governance stability therefore depends not on absolute control but on the capacity of institutions to maintain social recognition and political adaptability.

Hybrid Governance and the Emergence of Legitimacy-Fluid Governance

A major finding of this study is the emergence of hybrid governance systems characterized by overlapping formal and informal authorities. Hybrid governance reflects the reality that transitional societies rarely operate under a singular and centralized model of authority. Instead, governance functions are distributed among state institutions, customary actors, civil society organizations, international agencies, and local power networks.

The coexistence of these actors creates what this article conceptualizes as “legitimacy-fluid governance.” Legitimacy-fluid governance refers to governance systems in which authority shifts dynamically between formal institutions and socially embedded actors according to political performance, public trust, and contextual stability.

This concept differs from traditional state-centered governance theory because it recognizes that legitimacy is not permanently attached to any single institution. Transitional societies continuously renegotiate authority depending on which actors are perceived as most capable of maintaining order, justice, and social welfare.

For example, during humanitarian crises or political unrest, local communities may rely more heavily on religious institutions, customary leaders, or community organizations than on formal governmental agencies. Conversely, effective governance reforms and inclusive political participation may strengthen public trust in state institutions. Legitimacy therefore becomes fluid and contingent rather than fixed and monopolized.



The concept of legitimacy-fluid governance also explains why transitional governance often appears unstable despite the existence of constitutional institutions. Governance instability does not necessarily indicate the absence of authority but rather the coexistence of multiple competing sources of legitimacy. Formal institutions compete with informal actors for public trust and political influence, producing continuous negotiation between institutional order and societal expectations.

Mac Ginty (2011) argues that hybrid governance systems emerge because externally imposed state-building models fail to eliminate local governance practices. The findings of this study support this perspective by demonstrating that informal authority structures persist even when formal legal systems are reconstructed. Rather than disappearing, informal actors adapt and integrate into broader governance arrangements.

Importantly, the analysis reveals that hybrid governance should not automatically be interpreted as governance failure. In many transitional societies, hybrid arrangements actually enhance political resilience by allowing institutions to accommodate social diversity and local realities. Informal actors frequently provide governance functions in areas where state institutions lack capacity or legitimacy.

Nevertheless, hybrid governance also creates significant governance challenges. Overlapping authorities may produce legal ambiguity, inconsistent policy implementation, jurisdictional conflict, and accountability problems. Citizens may face uncertainty regarding which institutions possess legitimate authority to resolve disputes or enforce regulations. Consequently, transitional governance requires mechanisms capable of coordinating formal and informal authority structures within broader constitutional frameworks.

The findings therefore suggest that stable transitional governance depends upon institutional flexibility rather than rigid legal centralization. Governments must recognize the existence of informal legitimacy while simultaneously preserving constitutional accountability and legal coherence.

Governance Between Order and Disorder

The final finding of this study is that transitional governance fundamentally operates within a continuous tension between order and disorder. Transitional societies attempt simultaneously to restore institutional stability and accommodate social transformation. This dual objective creates inherent governance contradictions because efforts to centralize authority may undermine democratic participation, while excessive decentralization may weaken institutional coherence.

The study finds that governance instability often results not from the absence of legal institutions but from the inability to reconcile legality with legitimacy. Governments emphasizing procedural legality without social inclusion risk public alienation and political resistance. Conversely, governance systems relying exclusively on populist legitimacy without institutional regulation risk fragmentation and authoritarian personalization of power.

This tension explains why many transitional governments oscillate between democratization and authoritarian relapse. Political elites frequently justify centralized control as



necessary for maintaining stability during periods of crisis. However, prolonged concentration of power may erode public trust and weaken democratic legitimacy. Transitional governance therefore requires balancing security, participation, accountability, and institutional continuity simultaneously.

Another important finding concerns the role of public participation in legitimacy formation. Inclusive governance processes strengthen institutional legitimacy because citizens are more likely to recognize authority when they participate in decision-making processes. Greedy and Robins (2017) emphasize that local participation enhances the effectiveness of governance reform and transitional justice mechanisms. The present study confirms that legitimacy emerges more sustainably when governance institutions incorporate societal voices rather than imposing top-down authority structures.

Digital communication technologies also intensify legitimacy dynamics in transitional societies. Social media platforms accelerate public mobilization, criticism, and dissemination of political narratives. Governments can no longer rely solely on formal legality because legitimacy increasingly depends upon transparency, responsiveness, and public communication. This development contributes to the fluidity of governance legitimacy by enabling rapid shifts in public trust.

Ultimately, the findings indicate that transitional governance succeeds when institutions become adaptable enough to integrate legal authority with social legitimacy. Sustainable governance cannot be achieved solely through coercive state power or constitutional formalism. Instead, governance resilience depends upon institutional credibility, participatory inclusion, procedural fairness, and societal trust-building mechanisms.

Therefore, transitional governance should not be understood merely as a temporary deviation from stable statehood but as a dynamic political condition characterized by continuous negotiation between institutional order and social disorder. The interaction between legal authority and social legitimacy remains central to determining whether transitional societies move toward democratic consolidation or recurring instability.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that transitional governance is fundamentally shaped by the dynamic interaction between legal authority and social legitimacy. In periods of political transition, constitutional legality alone is insufficient to establish sustainable governance because institutional authority frequently lacks public trust, societal recognition, and moral credibility. Transitional societies therefore operate within a fragile political environment where governance continuously oscillates between institutional order and social disorder.

The findings reveal that legal authority remains essential for maintaining institutional continuity, constitutional accountability, and administrative coordination. However, legal systems cannot function effectively when detached from the social realities, cultural expectations, and participatory aspirations of society. Governments that rely excessively on procedural legality or coercive enforcement often encounter legitimacy crises, public distrust,



and governance instability. This condition is particularly evident in post-conflict and post-authoritarian states where formal institutions may exist constitutionally but fail to gain meaningful societal acceptance.

At the same time, the study shows that social legitimacy frequently emerges as an alternative source of governance authority in contexts of institutional fragility. Informal governance actors such as customary leaders, religious institutions, civil society organizations, and community networks often possess stronger social trust than formal state institutions. Their legitimacy derives from social embeddedness, cultural continuity, and collective recognition rather than constitutional codification. Nevertheless, social legitimacy without institutional regulation also carries risks, including legal fragmentation, unequal protection of rights, and weakened democratic accountability.

A significant contribution of this article is the concept of “legitimacy-fluid governance,” which explains how authority in transitional societies shifts dynamically between formal institutions and socially embedded actors depending on political performance, public trust, and contextual stability. This concept challenges conventional state-centered governance theories by emphasizing that legitimacy is not fixed within formal institutions but continuously negotiated through social interaction and institutional responsiveness.

The study further concludes that hybrid governance systems are not merely indicators of state weakness but represent adaptive political arrangements within transitional contexts. The coexistence of formal and informal governance structures reflects the practical realities of fragile political environments where multiple actors contribute to maintaining social order and political stability. Therefore, sustainable transitional governance requires institutional flexibility capable of integrating formal legality with socially grounded legitimacy.

Ultimately, stable governance emerges not through absolute legal control or unrestricted social pluralism, but through the balance between institutional authority and societal recognition. Transitional governance succeeds when legal institutions become participatory, inclusive, culturally sensitive, and publicly accountable. Accordingly, policymakers, constitutional reformers, and international actors should prioritize legitimacy-building mechanisms alongside institutional reconstruction in order to strengthen governance resilience in transitional societies.

References

- Beetham, D. (2013). *The legitimation of power* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-21500-3>
- Bell, C. (2008). *On the law of peace: Peace agreements and the lex pacificatoria*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199226833.001.0001>
- Börzel, T. A., & Risse, T. (2021). From the euro to the Schengen crises: European integration theories, politicization, and identity politics. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 28(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2020.1858935>



- Brinkerhoff, D. W. (2019). State fragility and governance: Conflict mitigation and subnational perspectives. *Development Policy Review*, 37(S1), O5–O23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12393>
- Call, C. T. (2012). *Why peace fails: The causes and prevention of civil war recurrence*. Georgetown University Press.
- Chandler, D. (2019). *Peacebuilding: The twenty years' crisis, 1997–2017*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-22038-9>
- Chesterman, S. (2021). Transitional administration, state-building, and the rule of law. *International Peacekeeping*, 28(3), 421–440. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13533312.2021.1887534>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- de Waal, A. (2015). *The real politics of the Horn of Africa: Money, war and the business of power*. Polity Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977*. Pantheon Books.
- Fukuyama, F. (2014). *Political order and political decay: From the industrial revolution to the globalization of democracy*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Gready, P., & Robins, S. (2017). Rethinking civil society and transitional justice. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 11(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijtj/ijw027>
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. International Publishers.
- Habermas, J. (1996). *Between facts and norms: Contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy*. MIT Press.
- Habermas, J. (2020). *The lure of technocracy*. Polity Press.
- Hameiri, S., & Jones, L. (2017). *Governing borderless threats: Non-traditional security and the politics of state transformation*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316338385>
- Heupel, M., & Zürn, M. (2017). Protecting the individual from international authority. *International Organization*, 71(4), 809–844. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818317000192>
- Krasner, S. D., & Risse, T. (2014). External actors, state-building, and service provision in areas of limited statehood. *Governance*, 27(4), 545–567. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12065>
- Mac Ginty, R. (2011). *International peacebuilding and local resistance: Hybrid forms of peace*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230307033>
- Mampilly, Z. C. (2015). *Rebel rulers: Insurgent governance and civilian life during war*. Cornell University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7591/9780801455675>
- Migdal, J. S. (2001). *State in society: Studying how states and societies transform and constitute one another*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511613204>
- Moe, L. W., & Simojoki, M. V. (2018). Custom, contestation and cooperation: Peacebuilding in Somalia. *Conflict, Security & Development*, 18(4), 305–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14678802.2018.1495101>
- OECD. (2020). *States of fragility 2020*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/ba7c22e7-en>



- Paris, R. (2014). *At war's end: Building peace after civil conflict* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107280367>
- Pospisil, J. (2019). Peace in political unsettlement: Beyond solving conflict. *Palgrave Communications*, 5(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-019-0271-9>
- Risse, T. (2018). Governance without a state? Policies and politics in areas of limited statehood. Columbia University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7312/riss18242>
- Scharpf, F. W. (2018). Legitimacy in the multilevel European polity. *European Political Science Review*, 10(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755773917000043>
- Tyler, T. R. (2006). *Why people obey the law* (2nd ed.). Princeton University Press.
- Wiener, A. (2018). Contestation and constitution of norms in global international relations. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316718774>
- Zaum, D. (2013). Can external actors build the state?. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203103730>
- Zürcher, C. (2017). *Fragile states and conflict management*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315186086>

