

## **LEGITIMACY IN GLOBAL GOVERNANCE**

Research Program funded by Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, 2016-2021

Jonas Tallberg, Karin Bäckstrand, Jan Aart Scholte (Steering Committee)  
Hans Agné, Magdalena Bexell, Lisa Dellmuth, Catia Gregoratti, Kristina Jönsson,  
Thomas Sommerer, Fredrik Söderbaum, Anders Uhlin, and Fariborz Zelli

Stockholm University, Lund University, and University of Gothenburg

The legitimacy of global governance institutions (GGIs) among state and societal actors has become a crucial issue in world politics. Legitimacy is required for global governance to handle major policy problems; however, since the 1990s GGIs have been substantially contested. This program investigates how legitimacy operates in global governance: why, how, and with what consequences do GGIs gain, sustain and lose legitimacy? This question is explored through three themes: sources of legitimacy; legitimation and delegitimation strategies; and consequences of legitimacy. The program promises three significant contributions. First, while most existing research on GGI legitimacy takes a normative approach, this program develops a sociological approach, examining the concrete social conditions of GGI legitimacy. Second, this program moves beyond the traditional focus on states as the principal legitimating audience of GGIs to consider a full spectrum of social actors. Third, while existing empirical research primarily has relied on single-case studies, this program has an ambitious comparative mixed-method design, combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. The program links three internationally prominent Swedish research groups with a track record of productive cooperation and excellent international networks.

## **1 Introduction**

Today's more global world requires substantial global governance. Consider climate change, Internet communications, epidemics, financial markets, cultural heritage, military security, trade flows, and human rights. All indicate the significant global quality of key contemporary societal problems. Meeting global challenges with national and local government alone is at best suboptimal and at worst disastrous. Shortfalls of global governance invite uncoordinated climate policies, a fragmented Internet, perennial financial crises, transcultural misunderstanding, arms proliferation, trade protectionism, and human rights abuses behind a screen of state sovereignty. Global governance is essential for a good society in the twenty-first century.

To make global governance operate effectively demands legitimacy: that is, the consent of those who are governed. Without legitimacy, an authority has to depend on coercion, secrecy and trickery – and policies are often less effective as a result. When citizens lack faith in global governance, it becomes more difficult to gain governments' support for ambitious policy goals, to secure national ratification of negotiated agreements, and to achieve effective compliance with rules and norms. Thus a lack of legitimacy means insufficient and ineffective global governance for today's global challenges.

Historical and contemporary examples abound. Plans for an International Trade Organization, European Defence Community, and Multilateral Agreement on Investment never materialized because of resistance in key countries. Danish, French, Irish and Dutch voters have rejected successive EU treaties, resulting in scaled back ambitions. Public skepticism toward the UN and the EU has led US and British governments to withhold funding for those institutions. Governments' anticipation of domestic reluctance to carry the costs of climate mitigation weakened the Kyoto Protocol and looks set to undermine its successor. Popular dissatisfaction with EU and IMF programs in Greece has brought a party to power that threatens to uproot internationally prescribed reforms.

The purpose of this research program is to offer the first systematic and comprehensive analysis of legitimacy in global governance. To what extent are global governance institutions (GGIs)

regarded as legitimate? What explains that legitimacy? By what processes are GGIs legitimated and delegitimated? What are the consequences of legitimacy (or its absence) for the functioning of GGIs? How are these legitimacy dynamics in global governance similar to or different from the dynamics of legitimacy in the nation-state and other forms of governance?

While legitimacy in global governance has generated growing interest in recent years, it has not yet been researched methodically by a coordinated team of specialists. We address the overarching question of *why, how, and with what consequences GGIs gain, sustain and lose legitimacy* by exploring three principal themes: (1) sources of legitimacy, (2) legitimation and delegitimation strategies, and (3) consequences of legitimacy. In the broadest sense, the program considers what systematic attention to legitimacy can tell us about world politics, and what experiences from world politics suggest for understanding legitimacy in contemporary politics generally.

This program promises three significant contributions to knowledge and policy on legitimacy in global governance. First, it develops a *sociological approach* to the subject. Existing research has been primarily normative, examining how far GGIs conform to philosophical standards such as justice and democracy. In contrast, this program investigates the social conditions of legitimacy – that is, actual acceptance of GGIs among state and societal actors. The focus is not on whether, in normative terms, GGIs ought to enjoy public support, but whether, how, and why they obtain this consent in practice. A sociological approach can reveal the processes through which subjects grant or withhold legitimacy vis-à-vis global governance.

Second, the program moves beyond the traditional focus on states as the principal audience of GGI legitimacy to consider a *full spectrum of actors*. In today's more globalized world politics, legitimacy for GGIs comes not only from governments, but also from civil society organizations, business associations, political parties, the media, and ordinary citizens. This program therefore conceptualizes the audiences of GGIs to encompass both state and societal actors.

Third, the program offers novel insights by pursuing ambitious *comparative research*. Existing empirical research on legitimacy in global governance has relied heavily on single-case studies.

In contrast, this program comparatively examines GGIs in different issue areas, performing different policy functions, with different institutional designs, and with different memberships. Moreover, the comparative analysis will employ both quantitative and qualitative methods in a coordinated and complementary fashion, thereby generating comparable data of extensive benefit to social and political research.

This application brings together the top scholars in Sweden – and some of the leading researchers internationally – on issues of global governance. The team has a track record of successful large-scale projects and builds on previous very productive collaboration between researchers in Lund, Stockholm, and Gothenburg. The scholars in the program publish with leading international journals and presses, have extensive international networks, and engage regularly with policy-makers. The program team is well balanced in terms of issue-area specialization, methodological competence, career stages, and gender.

The rest of this program proposal proceeds as follows. The next section reviews existing research on legitimacy in global governance. The third section presents the theoretical framework that guides the program. The fourth section elaborates research design and methods. The final section details program organization and budget.

## **2 The State of the Art**

Legitimacy is a topic with an enduring but marginal place in the study of world affairs (Clark 2005: 2; Hurd 2007: 11). Several classic approaches have touched on the importance of legitimacy in interstate politics. Yet there have been few attempts to (a) systematically and comparatively investigate the sources, mechanisms, and consequences of legitimacy, and (b) explore legitimacy in relation to a more comprehensive set of actors, including citizens. Moreover, existing scholarship on legitimacy in global governance has been dominated by normative approaches to the topic.

In the realist approach to world politics, legitimacy has usually been seen as a tool of power that states exploit to advance their interests, but that is not allowed to constrain their actions (e.g., Morgenthau 1948; Krasner 1999). In this vein, Carr (1946) emphasizes how strong states can further their interests externally by cloaking them in internationally acceptable principles. In contrast to realism, liberal theories have viewed legitimacy more positively, highlighting its functional usefulness to the collective of states (e.g., Buchanan and Keohane 2006; Alter 2008). For instance, Ikenberry (2001) suggests that the establishment of legitimate world orders after wars helps to reduce costs of enforcing the peace. More recently, constructivist theories have explored how notions of international legitimacy have been formed, shaped, and challenged in relations among states (e.g., Clark 2005; Clark and Reus-Smit 2007). For example, Hurd demonstrates how legitimacy is created, used, and contested in the UN Security Council (Hurd 2007; Cronin and Hurd 2008).

Legitimacy in global governance has also recently emerged as a topic in two specific sub-literatures. First, students of public opinion have treated public support for GGIs as an indicator of their legitimacy, and explored what factors lead citizens to accept or oppose GGIs (e.g., Norris 2000; Hooghe and Marks 2005; Ecker-Erhardt 2012; Maier et al. 2012; Dellmuth and Tallberg 2014). Second, a number of contributions have addressed how GGIs are legitimated or delegitimated through strategies aimed at boosting or undermining the acceptance of these institutions (e.g., Bernstein 2011; Brassett and Tsingou 2011; Zaum 2013; Binder and Heupel 2014). This newer work usually focuses on the legitimacy of GGIs in relation to a broader set of actors beyond states. However, none of this research has undertaken a larger systematic and comparative analysis.

As for the study of legitimacy in global governance, the dominant approach to date has been normative. In focus have been the ethical standards that should be used when evaluating GGIs' right to rule, and the extent to which these institutions meet those standards. One strand of research has explored normative values associated with the input side of global governance, such as participation, transparency and accountability (e.g., Held 1995; Dahl 1999; Archibugi et al. 2011; Scholte 2011). Another strand of scholars has emphasized normative values associated with the output side of global governance, assessing the extent to which GGIs produce outcomes

that contribute to efficiency, justice, and fairness (e.g., Pogge 2002; Buchanan and Keohane 2006; Keohane et al. 2009). However, this normative research has not looked at the ways and degrees that affected state and societal actors themselves view GGIs as legitimate.

This brief review suggests that the *social* legitimacy of global governance has so far not attracted the systematic attention it deserves. Classic approaches have only touched on the operation and consequences of legitimacy in interstate politics, while more recent scholarship has mainly debated the normative standards against which GGIs should be judged. In contrast, the present program asks whether, how, and with what consequences state and societal actors actually regard GGIs to be legitimate.

### **3 Framework of Analysis**

#### 3.1 Conceptualizing Legitimacy

Legitimacy has two alternative conceptual meanings: normative and sociological. Normative legitimacy refers to a right to rule based on conformity to certain philosophical values and principles. Sociological legitimacy refers to the actual acceptance of an authority's rule by a given audience (e.g., Fallon 2005; Buchanan and Keohane 2006; Beetham 2013). Normative and sociological enquiries are thus guided by different questions. Normative studies typically ask: "By what ethical standards should we evaluate institutions' right to rule, and how do individual institutions measure up against these standards?" In contrast, political-sociological inquiries ask: "To what extent, on what grounds, through what processes, and with what consequences are ruling institutions accepted by a given audience?"

Unlike most other research, this program examines legitimacy of global governance in the sociological sense. Legitimacy from this perspective lies with the beliefs and perceptions of audiences. We conceptualize the audiences of GGIs as including both state and societal actors, ranging from government elites to ordinary citizens. The social legitimacy of a GGI says little about the normative rightness or goodness of the institution; it refers exclusively to people's

acceptance of that institution. Legitimacy in the sociological sense is not a constant, but may vary over time and across subsets of its audience. Nor is the social legitimacy of a GGI necessarily based on a single logic, but may be shaped by multiple sources.

Of course, the social legitimacy of a GGI is likely to be influenced by the normative beliefs that prevail in society. The reasons why governments and citizens accept or oppose a GGI may be shaped by normative arguments for and against its right to rule. Hence, while analytically distinct, sociological and normative legitimacy may be empirically related (Keohane 2006; Bernstein 2011; von Staden 2012). This interconnection has three implications for this program.

First, legitimacy is not generated in a vacuum, but formed in a context of societal norms and beliefs about the appropriate exercise of authority. For this reason, we adopt Suchman's definition of legitimacy as "a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions" (1995: 574).

Second, legitimacy in the sociological sense is open to political manipulation (Suchman 1995; Finnemore and Sikkink 1998). Actors' norms and beliefs about the appropriateness of GGIs may be shaped by justifications and challenges. Thus proponents of GGIs may engage in legitimization strategies that seek to cultivate support among state and societal actors for these institutions' right to rule. Conversely, opponents of GGIs may engage in delegitimation strategies that aim to undermine the acceptance of these institutions.

Third, the relationship between normative justifications and societal acceptance is a matter for empirical investigation. It is important to establish whether and how normative conceptions of legitimacy affect actors' perceptions of the legitimacy of GGIs.

We now turn to the three principal themes of the program: namely, the sources, strategies, and consequences of legitimacy in global governance. In relation to each theme, we first examine the main lines of debate around the issue and then identify the contributions that our program will

make. Thereafter Part 4 specifies the research design and methods that will enable us to achieve these contributions.

As the outline of our planned contributions indicates, the program is committed to theoretical pluralism. Our ambition is to develop and test competing hypotheses drawn from alternative analytical perspectives. More specifically, we will assess and further develop theories on the role of institutional design, problem structure, power distribution, social norms, elite communication, discursive power, collective identity, and domestic political regimes in global legitimacy dynamics.

Across the entire investigation of the sources, strategies and consequences of legitimacy in global governance, the program will address the overarching theoretical question of whether the global context involves different dynamics of legitimacy compared to the domestic context.

### 3.2 Sources of Legitimacy

What makes actors accept or contest global GGIs? Exploring the sources of social legitimacy is imperative if we wish to understand when and why GGIs gain, sustain and lose the confidence of their audiences. This is the topic of our first theme.

#### 3.2.1 The Debate

Existing literature on the sources of social legitimacy of GGIs features two main positions (Scharpf 1999; Hurd 2007; Ecker-Erhardt and Wessels 2011; Schmidt 2012). Contributions that emphasize *input-oriented* sources of legitimacy posit that GGIs generate acceptance as a result of procedures that allow for *participation by* state and societal actors. In contrast, contributions that privilege *output-oriented* sources of legitimacy argue that GGIs gain acceptance by generating *benefits for* state and societal actors.

The premise of input legitimacy is that audiences form legitimacy beliefs based on GGIs' institutional arrangements for receiving and responding to state and societal demands. This



explanation suggests that procedural criteria around democratic participation and representation are important in explaining perceptions of legitimacy. “As long as rules are passed according to accepted procedures and by established authorities, people appear to accept them as legitimate, all else equal” (Hurd 2007: 71). In the conventional argument, the correctness of the procedure is defined by its democratic qualities. As Held puts it, “Democracy bestows an aura of legitimacy on modern political life: laws, rules, and policies appear justified when they are democratic” (1995: 1). In this vein, some scholarship has highlighted growing contestation of GGIs in recent decades, rooted in discontent with allegedly un-democratic modes of global policy-making (e.g., O’Brien et al. 2000; Della Porta and Tarrow 2005).

The premise of output legitimacy is that audiences form legitimacy beliefs based on the performance of GGIs. This perspective assumes that popular conceptions of legitimacy are informed by output-oriented standards – effectiveness and delivery – that contribute to general and individual welfare. This explanation suggests that substantive outcomes matter most: “[I]t is the ultimate distribution of payoffs from the institution that is important for its legitimation, and the process by which outcomes are determined is irrelevant” (Hurd 2007: 67). Output legitimacy is a prominent perspective in the study of national political institutions (e.g., Newton and Norris 2001; Gibson et al. 2003; Bühlmann and Kunz 2011). In the study of global governance, too, it is commonly claimed that GGIs earn their legitimacy primarily through the benefits they produce (Gabel 1998; Keohane et al. 2009).

### 3.2.2. Our Contribution

This research program posits that both input and output factors generate social legitimacy for GGIs. Empirical research must therefore explore when and how each set of factors contributes to the acceptance of GGIs among state and societal actors. More specifically, this program addresses three broad sets of questions regarding the sources of legitimacy.

As a first step, we explore the extent to which GGIs are currently perceived as legitimate. What levels of acceptance do different GGIs enjoy among state and societal actors? While existing literature is rich in assumptions about high, low, declining or growing legitimacy for GGIs, it is

poor in common yardsticks and comparable data. Survey data currently exist only for a very limited number of GGIs, and then in a non-comparable format. By introducing a novel survey of elite and public opinion, encompassing a broad range of GGIs, our program will be able to address questions to which we have so far lacked adequate answers: Which GGIs enjoy most and least acceptance? Are state and societal actors in some countries and world regions consistently more or less supportive of GGIs? Is there a systematic gap between political elites and ordinary citizens in perceptions of GGI legitimacy? To what extent is the ongoing power shift in world politics reflected in patterns of GGI legitimacy and illegitimacy among prevailing and rising state powers?

As a second step, we explore the criteria that underpin actors' evaluations of GGIs. What normative considerations are relevant as state and societal actors form legitimacy beliefs? While recognizing the merits of the distinction between input and output legitimacy, we do not expect it to capture the full range of relevant criteria. Contemporary justifications frequently go beyond democracy and effectiveness, and also include fairness, justice, human rights, maintenance of peace and security, and rule of law (Hurd 2007). Our ambition is to map empirically and develop theoretically the full range of motives that potentially inform evaluations of GGIs. As one component of this inventory, we will put the legitimacy of GGIs in a historical perspective: how similar or different are the normative criteria that underpin evaluations of authority in global governance today, as compared with the normative justifications of political rule that dominated in earlier times (cf. Weber 1922/1978)?

As a third step, we will explain central empirical patterns in the perceived legitimacy of GGIs. How do multiple sources of legitimacy interact to produce variation in the acceptance of GGIs? We will explain patterns of legitimacy along three dimensions: across GGIs; across countries; and across the elite-citizen divide. We will explore whether the sources of legitimacy vary across GGIs depending on the functions they perform, the issue areas they address, and the institutional design they have. Similarly, we will assess whether cross-country patterns in the legitimacy of GGIs are attributable to factors such as domestic regime type, social identity, and the extent to which existing institutions reflect power advantages for certain countries. Finally, we will evaluate variation in perceptions of GGI legitimacy between elites and the general public.

### 3.3 Strategies of Legitimation and Delegitimation

Next to sources of GGI legitimacy, a second theme of our program looks at strategies. What tools and tactics are available to GGIs in the pursuit of legitimacy, and to those who contest such claims? With strategies we highlight agency and deliberate attempts at legitimizing and delegitimizing GGIs. We ask *how* particular GGIs came to be viewed as legitimate or illegitimate, by exploring attempts to justify or challenge existing power relations (cf. Bernstein 2011; Brassett and Tsingou 2011).

#### 3.3.1 The Debate

Existing literature on this topic is dominated by studies of legitimation strategies by GGIs. This research primarily focuses on the discursive or rhetorical practices of GGIs, as revealed through official texts or speech acts. In this vein, Steffek (2003) argues that GGIs legitimize themselves through rational justifications of their policies and activities. Similarly, Halliday et al. (2010) show how GGIs through rhetorical repertoires spread legitimacy claims among different audiences. Such discursive justification of GGIs usually consists of references to the sources of legitimacy examined in our first theme, such as GGIs' democratic credentials and problem-solving effectiveness. Moving beyond discursive legitimation, a number of contributions have explored institutional practices of legitimation within GGIs. One recent volume examines a broad range of legitimation practices of GGIs, directed primarily at the member states of these institutions (Zaum 2013). Other studies have examined how GGIs in recent years have adopted public information policies and opened up to civil society actors (Grigorescu 2007; Scholte 2011; Tallberg et al. 2013).

Research on strategies of delegitimation is less common. Despite evidence that NGOs, social movements, and political parties frequently contest the authority of GGIs (e.g., Bandy and Smith 2005; Della Porta and Tarrow 2005), there are few studies that explore such challenges as delegitimation strategies. A notable exception is Paterson (2010), who demonstrates how critiques of climate governance have aimed to delegitimize governance arrangements by

challenging their “marketized” and “privatized” character. It should also be recognized that strategies which aim to legitimize GGIs may in practice have the opposite effect of delegitimizing these institutions. For instance, civil society involvement may delegitimize GGIs by exposing immorality, illegality or incompetence (Scholte 2007: 310; Dingwerth and Weise 2012; Bernauer and Gampfer 2013).

Existing literature is also underdeveloped in terms of the audiences considered. Most studies to date have conceptualized the relevant audiences of GGIs in terms of either member states or civil society actors (cf. Quack 2010; Symons 2011; Zaum 2013). No systematic analysis exists of legitimation and delegitimation attempts in relation to multiple audiences.

### 3.3.2 Our Contribution

This program will move beyond existing research in three main respects. First, the program will explore *both legitimation and delegitimation strategies*. What strategies do GGIs *and* their opponents use? Do these strategies vary depending on the authority, design, policy orientation, and membership of the GGI? We also move beyond an exclusive focus on discursive legitimation and delegitimation and examine also institutional practices. The latter include organizational reforms, public relations practices, ratings, and certifications. Relatedly, we will study what is being legitimized or delegitimized through these strategies. Do legitimacy claims and challenges focus on the overall authority of a GGI or on specific bodies, processes, or policies?

Second, the program will systematically explore *the audiences* at which legitimation and delegitimation strategies are directed. At whom are specific justifications and challenges of GGI legitimacy aimed? To what extent do the intended targets of legitimation and delegitimation strategies vary with the institutional and policy context of global governance? Indeed, how might these processes of legitimation help to constitute those very audiences? Existing research has not given sufficient attention to the mutual constitution of legitimacy-claiming and legitimacy-granting practices.

Third, the program will analyze the relative *success* of legitimation and delegitimation strategies in affecting different audiences' perceptions of GGIs. Under what circumstances are legitimation and delegitimation strategies able or unable to shape the legitimacy beliefs of the audiences they address? To what extent are there systematic differences across audiences, and how can such variation be explained? Is the relative success of different legitimation and delegitimation strategies primarily a result of the strategic framing of justifications and challenges, or dependent on other factors such as issue area and membership?

### 3.4 Consequences of Legitimacy

What are the consequences of GGIs possessing extensive or limited legitimacy? It is a long-established wisdom in domestic politics that legitimacy makes political institutions more effective (e.g., Weber 1968; Dahl and Lindblom 1992). Legitimate institutions make actors more willing to engage in political discussions, pool resources, and implement collective decisions. In contrast, political institutions whose legitimacy is weak must rely on coercion, compensation, and manipulation, which typically undermine their long-term effectiveness and sustainability. The third theme of the program systematically explores these issues as they relate to GGIs.

#### 3.4.1 The Debate

Past research features two main positions on the effects of legitimacy in global governance. One side of the argument maintains that the legitimacy of GGIs *does not affect* the behavior of state and societal actors. Realists traditionally assume that states act on the basis of self-interest and relative power rather than legitimacy (Waltz 1979; Mearsheimer 1994/1995). For realists, attention to legitimacy may even be dangerous, as it may lead actors to pursue policies that undermine their security (Morgenthau 1948). This skeptical position is shared by more general rationalist perspectives on the capacity of GGIs to affect the behavior of state and societal actors. According to proponents of the enforcement school, legitimacy does not improve the ability of GGIs to secure compliance with international rules. Instead, compliance is contingent upon GGIs possessing sufficient enforcement capacity, in terms of monitoring and sanctioning power (Downs et al. 1996).

In contrast, others maintain that the legitimacy of GGIs *does affect* the behavior of state and societal actors. From a constructivist perspective, actors conform to demands of legitimate GGIs for strategic reasons: by following the rules of a legitimate institution, actors can achieve their objectives in world politics at lower cost (Hurd 1999). In addition, say constructivists, actors conform to demands of legitimate GGIs for intrinsic normative reasons: the legitimacy of GGIs exercises a “compliance pull” (Franck 1990). It is also commonly suggested that legitimacy is particularly central to international institutions. Unlike domestic institutions, GGIs have few alternative means to secure compliance, such as coercion, making legitimacy particularly important for GGIs’ ability to affect actor behavior (Hurd 1999; Buchanan and Keohane 2006).

### 3.4.2 Our contribution

This program builds on the second position, namely, that legitimacy of GGIs does matter for the behavior of state and societal actors in world politics. The program moreover moves beyond existing research by analyzing the effects of legitimacy on three crucial outcomes for global governance.

First, the program will analyze when and how legitimacy makes a difference for the *policies* that GGIs pursue. By policy we mean the decisions, declarations, and resolutions that a GGI develops to solve problems (cf. Miles et al. 2002; Gutner and Thomson 2008). The expectation is that legitimacy (or its absence) affects the capacity of a GGI to respond effectively to societal problems. We will systematically analyze the factors that condition such effects and the nature of these effects. For instance, is the policy-making of GGIs composed of democratic members more sensitive to declines or crises in legitimacy?

Second, we will analyze when and how legitimacy affects *politics among* GGIs. By politics we mean institutional competition between GGIs for attention, members, and financial support (Keohane and Victor 2010; Zelli and van Asselt 2013). Choices by state and non-state actors to join, fund, and participate in GGIs are essential for GGIs to thrive and to survive. The expectation is that perceptions of legitimacy affect such choices: GGIs rich in legitimacy gain

central importance in their policy domains, while GGIs poor in legitimacy lose in standing relative to their competitors. We explore how and under what conditions legitimacy shapes the politics surrounding GGIs.

Third, the program will assess when and how legitimacy affects the *polities* of GGIs. By polity we mean the competences and procedures that constitute a GGI, as regulated by international treaties. Such competences and procedures define the authority of a GGI (Zürn 2012; Hooghe and Marks 2014). The expectation is that legitimacy affects the authority vested in a polity, as states will be more reluctant to confer power on GGIs seen as illegitimate. We explore the conditionality and mechanisms of this effect. For instance, does low legitimacy among government elites impose greater constraints on the empowerment of GGIs than low legitimacy among citizens?

#### **4 Research Design and Methods**

The program will achieve its objectives through a research design that is path-breaking in three important respects.

A first distinctive methodological strength of the program is its comparative orientation. Whereas existing research is dominated by single-case studies of individual GGIs, we will generate comparisons across a broad range of GGIs. The program will compare the sources, strategies, and consequences of legitimacy across GGIs in multiple issue-areas, with varying institutional designs, and with different memberships. In addition, we will engage in cross-national comparisons of legitimacy beliefs; compare public and elite opinion; and make longitudinal comparisons across time of the legitimacy dynamics of selected GGIs. This ambitious comparative design will allow us to draw unique conclusions about legitimacy in global governance.

Second and equally novel is the program's mixed-method approach to studying legitimacy in global governance. Existing literature is almost exclusively qualitative in its orientation. Yet

quantitative methods offer important additional contributions when investigating legitimacy. We therefore use a careful combination of complementary qualitative and quantitative methods. On the quantitative side, the program surveys public and elite opinion, conducts experiments, maps effects of legitimacy, and engages in descriptive and explanatory statistical analyses. On the qualitative side, the program undertakes in-depth case studies, using a broad set of techniques, including structured focused comparison, process-tracing and discourse analysis. Each side, qualitative and quantitative, informs and sharpens the other.

Third, the program will collect comprehensive empirical data on legitimacy in global governance that will be of extensive benefit to social and political research. Within each theme, we systematically gather comparable quantitative and qualitative data across our common sample of 16 GGIs, as explained in greater detail below. Such data have never previously been collected and allow us to make the most of the program's comparative mixed-method design.

#### 4.1 Selection of GGIs

All three themes of the program (sources, strategies, and consequences of legitimacy) will be examined with respect to the same four issue areas, in order to maintain focus, facilitate comparisons, and draw robust empirical and theoretical conclusions. We examine GGIs active in economic affairs (trade, finance, standardization), sustainable development (environment, health, poverty), security (international conflict, war crimes), and regional governance. Across these four areas, we have selected a sample of 16 GGIs for detailed investigation.

In the area of economic governance, the program examines the *International Monetary Fund* (IMF), a primary global institution for macroeconomic policy advice. We also cover the *World Trade Organization* (WTO), the global organization set to promote cross-border commerce. Our third economic institution is the *Group of 20* (G20), which brings together twenty of the most powerful governments in the world. Finally, we include the *Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers* (ICANN), a private governance institution regulating critical aspects of global Internet architecture.



In the area of sustainable development governance, the program examines the *United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change* (UNFCCC), the main forum for multilateral negotiations on combating climate change. We also study the *World Health Organization* (WHO), central to handling transborder pandemics. Our third institution in this area is the *World Bank*, the foremost multilateral development bank. Finally, we study the *Forest Stewardship Council* (FSC), a private global governance institution well-known for its sustainability certification of timber products.

In the area of security governance the program considers the *UN Security Council* (UNSC), a leading site of intergovernmental responses to violent conflicts. A second institution is the *North Atlantic Treaty Organization* (NATO), the western military alliance. We also include the *International Criminal Court* (ICC), set up in 2002 to prosecute war crimes. Finally, we examine the *Kimberley Process*, a public-private governance arrangement to stop trade in “blood diamonds.”

In the area of regional governance, the program investigates the principal multi-issue regional institutions in Europe, Africa, and Southeast Asia: *European Union* (EU), *African Union* (AU), and *Association of South East Asian Nations* (ASEAN). In addition, we include the *Union of European Football Associations* (UEFA), a well-known private governance arrangement with regional scope.

This sample of 16 GGIs is based on three main considerations. First, the selection covers GGIs that possess extensive political authority and are reasonably well-known to affected citizens and elites (Gallup International 2005). Legitimacy of GGIs is more important to explore when the institution in question exercises substantial authority, often at the expense of domestic democratic decision-making. Likewise, sociological legitimacy only becomes a substantial issue once publics are aware of an institution and have developed legitimacy beliefs in relation to it.

Second, our sample of GGIs covers both interstate and nonstate institutions. Previous research indicates that legitimacy dynamics may differ between these two forms (Bernstein and Cashore 2007; Fransen 2012; Take 2012). Thus in each issue area we have selected three

intergovernmental organizations and one transnational private arrangement. Even if certain nonstate governance arrangements may be less known to the broader public, they are important cases where legitimation and delegitimation efforts are directed at elites. In addition, we have specifically included four institutions with regional as opposed to global membership, which enables us to assess whether legitimacy dynamics are different in territorially delimited as opposed to worldwide arenas.

Third, we have chosen GGIs that allow us to profit from and add to a comprehensive dataset on the design and authority of GGIs that is being developed by the research group in Stockholm in cooperation with the Social Science Research Center in Berlin and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. This helps to ensure resource efficiency, cumulativeness, and synergies.

Needless to say, any selection of GGIs will leave out some potentially interesting institutions. However, our program covers a larger number and a greater breadth than any previous investigation of legitimacy in global governance, and resource constraints mean that the sample has to be capped at some point.

The sample of 16 GGIs will be subject to systematic data collection and comparative mixed-method research across the core themes of the program: sources, strategies and consequences of legitimacy. The next pages detail the execution of research in each of these three areas. The blending and timing of qualitative and quantitative methods varies depending on what most effectively addresses the issues in each area.

#### 4.2 Research Design for Theme 1: Sources of Legitimacy

Central to the *quantitative* part of the research on sources of legitimacy will be a comprehensive new survey of legitimacy beliefs. Our Social Legitimacy Survey (SLS) will be the first to generate cross-national data about mass and elite opinion on a broad range of GGIs. Existing large-scale survey data are either fragmented across disparate regional samples (e.g.

Eurobarometer, Afrobarometer), or do not include comparable data on different GGIs (e.g. World Values Survey). In addition, none of the existing surveys focuses on elite opinion alongside general public opinion. The SLS will address these problems and cover all 16 GGIs in the sample and thereby generate comparable data for a broad and important group of institutions with variation in policy orientation, institutional design, and membership.

The SLS will be conducted in ten countries, carefully selected based on two criteria. First, they should be democratic, since legitimacy for political institutions may mean different things to citizens of democratic and autocratic regimes (Jamal and Nooruddin 2010). Moreover, citizens in democracies and autocracies are likely to respond differently to public opinion surveys (van Deth 1998). Second, the selected countries are politically central in the selected GGIs, so that elite and public opinion are most likely to matter for the prospects and consequences of global governance. To assess legitimacy beliefs about regional interstate GGIs, the survey covers Germany and the UK in Europe, Indonesia and the Philippines in Southeast Asia, and Kenya and South Africa in Africa. For the survey of legitimacy beliefs vis-à-vis global GGIs, we extend the country selection to Brazil, India, Japan, and the USA – all politically central democracies in global governance, but with different stakes in the current global order as emerging or prevailing powers.

We will conduct the SLS in two parts: one aimed at general publics and the other at elites in the selected countries. Data on elite and public opinion will be collected simultaneously and through comparable questionnaires. The survey will be implemented twice during the program period, since this increases reliability, enables analysis of the dynamics between elite and public opinion, and can form the beginning of a unique over-time dataset on the legitimacy of GGIs. Substantively, the survey will measure confidence in GGIs and a number of possible explanatory factors for that confidence. It will also collect demographic information that makes it possible to assess whether legitimacy perceptions vary depending on age, gender, education, and economic status. In addition, the survey will include a survey experiment (Mutz 2011) to assess whether and how elite communication affects public opinion.

The public opinion survey will be directed at nationally representative samples of 1000 citizens in each of the ten selected countries, which is the recommended standard sample size. It will be undertaken with the assistance of YouGov, a well-reputed global survey company very frequently used by social scientists and known for its representative panels (Ansolabehere and Schaffner 2014). The research team has positive experiences working with YouGov from a pilot study carried out in December 2014. We will rely on web-based surveys in countries where Internet penetration is above 80 percent (Germany, Japan, UK, US), on telephone surveys where phone penetration is above 80 percent (Brazil, Philippines, South Africa), and face-to-face interviews through local sub-contractors in the remaining countries (India, Indonesia, Kenya). Mixing data-collection modes is common practice in cross-national surveys.

The elite opinion survey will be directed at representatives of societal and political elites in the same countries. Societal elites are leaders of civil society organizations, while political elites are prominent figures in political parties and government. The elite opinion survey will be conducted in-house at Stockholm University, where the research team has the necessary organizational experience and competence from previous in-house surveys of elites. (In a recently concluded project the group surveyed 900 representatives of business and civil society organizations worldwide, with a response rate of 74 percent in the telephone survey.) The elite opinion survey will rely on a combination of web- and telephone-based collection of data.

The dataset generated by these surveys will be subject to statistical analyses that address the program research questions. On the one hand the data will provide a unique and comprehensive descriptive picture of empirical patterns in the legitimacy of GGIs – across institutions, countries, and the elite-citizen divide. On the other hand, the dataset will enable a multivariate analysis of the social legitimacy of GGIs, both in general and among specific sub-audiences. The data will also make it possible to explore causal links between elite and public opinion.

The *qualitative* component of research on sources of legitimacy will consist of six case studies selected on the basis of the survey results. The purpose of the case studies is to dissect more precisely the dynamics that produce varying levels of social legitimacy for GGIs. Drawing on a rich variety of primary and secondary sources, the case studies will analyze in greater depth the

legitimacy sources of these institutions, as well as public debates in relation to these GGIs. Three pairs of GGIs will be selected to address variation in legitimacy across institutions, countries, and the elite-citizen divide.

A first pair of case studies will explore variation in the overall level of legitimacy enjoyed by GGIs. For this purpose, we will select the GGIs that have the highest and the lowest absolute levels of confidence in the survey. These extreme cases will help us to better understand the processes at work in generating divergent patterns of legitimacy in global governance. For instance, could the effectiveness of GGIs in solving societal problems help account for the difference, or does the explanation lie more with input factors?

A second pair of case studies will focus on variation across countries in the levels of legitimacy enjoyed by GGIs. To that end, we will select the GGI on which opinion differs the most across the ten surveyed countries, and the GGI on which opinion differs the least. This comparison will help us to better understand why some GGIs generate similar perceptions of legitimacy in different countries, while other GGIs enjoy highly varying levels of legitimacy across countries. For instance, could the respective levels of countries' influence in decision-making at the GGI play a role?

A third pair of case studies will address variation in the perceived legitimacy of GGIs across the elite-citizen divide. For this purpose, we will select the GGI on which mass and elite opinion differ the most, and the GGI on which they differ the least. These cases will help us to better understand what leads elites and citizens to take different or similar views of an institution. For instance, could the level of citizen involvement in policy-making at a GGI be part of the explanation?

#### 4.3 Research Design for Theme 2: Strategies of Legitimation and Delegitimation

Due to its focus on processes, the second theme of the program uses a reverse mixed-method design, beginning with a broad set of qualitative case studies, which are then complemented by quantitative analysis.

In order to explore strategies used to legitimize and delegitimize GGIs, the program will conduct in-depth *qualitative* case studies of all 16 GGIs in the sample. The case study method carries particular advantages for this type of analysis. For one thing, it permits analysis of contextual circumstances that are not easily captured in quantitative data. In addition, case studies allow us to trace developments over time from the establishment of a GGI to the present. Case studies also make it possible to examine a full spectrum of legitimation and delegitimation efforts, including discursive strategies as well as institutional reforms.

The case studies will address all three questions within this theme as set out earlier: namely, why specific legitimation and delegitimation strategies are selected by GGIs and their opponents; what audiences these strategies are directed at; and what factors account for variation in the success of legitimation and delegitimation strategies to affect audience perceptions of GGIs.

The case studies will rely on multiple methods. Structured comparison across the cases will be central (Lijphart 1971; George and Bennett 2005). More specifically, we will assess and compare the cases with regard to three types of strategies:

(a) *Institutional strategies* are manifested through changes in institutional procedures to increase transparency, broaden participation in policy-making, and enhance mechanisms for review and redress. Institutional strategies to raise legitimacy are observable through treaties, policy documents, internal and external policy evaluations, biographies, and secondary literature. Establishing the context and reasoning behind these strategies also requires supplementary material. In particular, interviews will be conducted with representatives of GGIs, national governments, and business and civil society organizations. Extensive experience of our researchers from interview-based projects suggests that semi-structured interviews are often highly rewarding in terms of identifying motives, informal political processes, and power structures. In addition, participant observation at meetings of GGIs, business associations, and civil society groups will be selectively employed to examine more closely the organizations' debates on institutional development and change. To capture causal mechanisms, we will rely on

process-tracing, specifically developed to investigate how initial conditions are transformed into outcomes (George and McKeown 1985).

(b) *Discursive strategies* are texts or speech acts that aim at legitimising or delegitimising a decision, policy or entire GGI (Schneider et al. 2007). These strategies are observable in GGIs' public relations communication, as well as in statements produced by GGI opponents. Relevant evidence will be gathered from political communication data available through GGI websites and paper archives. The material includes annual reports, policy evaluations, speeches, and other texts of self-presentation. It also includes position papers, reports, and social media appearances by opponents of GGIs. Text-analytical methods that have proven useful for the study of discursive strategies include analysis of strategic framing (Haunss 2007), critical discourse analysis (Vaara and Tienari 2008), and narrative analysis (Biegon 2013). These methods broaden the focus of the case studies beyond questions of causality to explore also the power relations and discursive tensions inherent in legitimation and delegitimation strategies (Fairclough 1995).

(c) *Behavioural strategies* are actions and events that aim at affecting audiences' perceptions of GGIs, such as protest meetings, demonstrations, rankings by third-party organizations, opinion polls, and performance reviews. Our study of such strategies draws on material from these actions and events, in addition to media reports and interviews with the actors involved.

The *quantitative* component of the research on strategies of (de)legitimation has been designed to complement the qualitative case studies. First, we will use quantitative content analysis to identify broader patterns in legitimation and delegitimation. The material for the content analysis of legitimation strategies will be drawn from the abovementioned political communication data. Correspondingly, delegitimation strategies will be studied through content analysis of the position papers, political texts, and social media messages by opponents of GGIs. The content analysis aims to map the substance of legitimacy claims, their frequency, and the precise objects of (de)legitimation, such as a specific policy, institutional change or organizational mission. The results will be compared across the 16 GGIs, allowing us to address the questions of where, when and why GGIs and their critics choose certain legitimation and delegitimation statements and not others.

Second, drawing on the SLS data, we will conduct unique survey experiments to assess the conditions under which legitimation and delegitimation strategies succeed or fail in shaping audience perceptions of GGIs. Specifically, we will test whether citizens are more susceptible to messages by some elites rather than others, to messages with a positive or a negative content, and to messages that emphasize strengths and weaknesses of GGIs in terms of input (democracy) or output (performance). For the survey experiment, respondents will be randomly assigned to a control group and treatment groups that receive different cues from different elites. Effects of legitimation and delegitimation are measured through statistically significant differences between the control group and the treatment groups.

#### 4.4 Research Design for Theme 3: Consequences of Legitimacy

The research design on legitimacy's consequences promises new answers on when and how legitimacy matters for the policies, politics and polities of GGIs. The *quantitative* part of research on this theme will identify patterns in the consequences of legitimacy across all 16 GGIs and over the time period 1990 to 2015. Such an analysis requires over-time data on legitimacy to be able to study the effects of decreases and increases in legitimacy. A time-sensitive design also makes it easier to show how legitimacy is causally linked to specific consequences. Importantly, it allows us to address the endogeneity problem of whether legitimacy affects the policies, politics and polities of GGIs – or the reverse.

Given that time-series of elite and public opinion on the legitimacy GGIs do not exist, we will collect relevant data in three ways. First, we will use the elite opinion survey of theme one. Using elites in the ten countries as expert informants, we will pose retrospective questions on perceived changes in the legitimacy of GGIs. In contrast to citizen respondents, elite respondents are better able to draw on the institutional memory of the government, parties, and organizations they represent. Second, we will identify scientific publications on specific GGIs and their legitimacy. On this basis, we will construct indicators for the occurrence, direction, and intensity of changes in the legitimacy of GGIs. Third, we will build a similar measure based on media coverage of specific GGIs. Using the database LexisNexis, we will conduct a content analysis of



newspaper articles to identify references to the occurrence, direction and intensity of changes in GGI legitimacy.

The statistical analysis will assess the consequences of increases and decreases in legitimacy on the policies and politics of GGIs. (The third component, politics, will only be included in the qualitative analysis.)

The analysis of policies of GGIs will focus on two dimensions: the number of policy-making acts (productivity) and the issues covered by those acts (agenda orientation). How and under what conditions does legitimacy affect the productivity and agenda orientation of GGIs? The data for policy output from 1990 to 2015 will be drawn from an ongoing project at Stockholm University on the effectiveness of GGIs. This project will generate data on the policy output of all GGIs in our sample.

The analysis of politics of GGIs will focus on delegation and pooling of power as two dimensions of an institution's authority. Delegation refers to a conditional grant of agenda-setting, decision-making, implementation or enforcement power to a GGI in a given policy area. Pooling refers to forms of majority decision-making that eliminate states' ability to veto international rules. We have secured access to data on delegation and pooling for all 16 GGIs through cooperation with Liesbet Hooghe and Gary Marks at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

On the basis of these data, we will assess which factors condition the effects of legitimacy on the policies and politics of GGIs. Existing scholarship suggests a number of candidates, including power distribution (Mearsheimer 1994/95), social identity (Risse 2010), accountability mechanisms (Scholte 2011), and domestic political regimes (Tallberg et al. 2013). We will also unpack legitimacy to assess which specific properties of legitimacy create these effects. For example, is support by elite audiences more consequential than support by the general public? Do the specific sources of that support, such as law, democracy, effectiveness, and distributive justice, matter for the consequences of legitimacy?

The *qualitative* part of the research design for the consequences theme complements the quantitative analyses of the effects of legitimacy on the policies and politics of GGIs. A qualitative approach will allow us to establish historically grounded causal explanations of these effects, to offer more careful contextual assessments of the properties of legitimacy for each GGI, and to theorize new consequences of legitimacy. In addition, the qualitative analysis allows us to study the consequences of legitimacy for the politics among GGIs, which could not be captured in the quantitative analysis.

The qualitative analysis will focus on cases where legitimacy should matter the most for political outcomes – instances of dramatic crises or consolidations in legitimacy (Reus-Smit 2007; Seabrooke 2007). What happens to the policies, politics and polity of GGIs when various audiences suddenly lose confidence in them or, alternatively, regard them much more positively?

We will select and compare two pairs of cases from the sample of 16 GGIs, based on descriptive patterns in legitimacy over time. We will also seek to include cases that speak to the four issue areas of the program. We will draw on primary and secondary sources, such as official documents, interviews, and existing empirical research, to trace the effects of changes in the legitimacy of each selected GGI over time.

A first pair of cases will focus on the consequences of legitimacy crises. For this purpose, we will select a GGI where a legitimacy crisis was followed by negative effects on policy, politics, and polity, and a second GGI where no negative effects, or even positive consequences, could be observed. These cases will help us to understand the processes at work in generating these divergent outcomes. For instance, what are the conditions that can turn a legitimacy crisis into something positive?

A second pair of cases will explore the consequences of consolidations in legitimacy. To that end, we will select one GGI for which the advancement in legitimacy had positive effects on policies, politics, and polity, and a second case for which positive effects were absent or delayed, or even negative consequences could be observed. These cases will help us to better understand

how an improvement in legitimacy translates into positive consequences. For instance, could the level of public accountability in a GGI be part of the explanation?

## **5 Organization of the Research Program**

### **5.1 Research Environment**

The Department of Political Science at Stockholm University is well established as a leading national and international environment for research on global governance. In 2011, and again in 2014, the department's research group on global and regional governance was selected as a leading area of research at the University. This research group recruits PhD students and post-doctoral researchers internationally, attracts extensive national and international funding, engages in collaboration with international partners, and generates publications in prominent peer-review journals and with prestigious academic presses. The research of this group is distinguished by its comparative orientation, its combination of positive and normative research, and its competence in both quantitative and qualitative methods. Thematically, this group pursues research on topics such as the power, legitimacy, and effectiveness of GGIs; the role and influence of transnational actors in global governance; and conditions for democracy beyond the nation-state. The location in the Swedish capital entails close contacts with practitioners and policy-oriented research centers.

The Department of Political Science at Lund University has long-standing specializations in global governance, multilateral negotiations, diplomacy, peace and conflict research, and international political theory. Ongoing research projects address topics such as transnational actors in global politics, international environmental politics, gender in world politics, and the role of identity, nationalism and religion in international affairs. The research group in International Relations at Lund has competence in a broad set of policy domains, including development, migration, trade, health, climate change, human rights, and security. The department's research reflects methodological diversity, breadth and depth – from interpretative and qualitative methods to formal and quantitative methods.

The School of Global Studies at the University of Gothenburg produces top-quality research, teaching and public engagement on today's key global challenges. The staff of over 100 faculty and PhD researchers examines global questions and their governance in areas such as cultural heritage, economy and finance, environmental sustainability, gender, human rights, migration, and peace and security. These issues are explored both generally and as they manifest in different regions, with a particular strength in comparative regionalism. SGS' work is striking for its highly international, cross-disciplinary, policy-relevant, and action-oriented character.

The research groups in Lund and Stockholm have a long-standing history of cooperation through collaborative projects, recruitment of personnel, exchanges of junior and senior scholars, and graduate teaching. Previously these groups collaborated productively within the research program "Democracy beyond the Nation State? Transnational Actors and Global Governance" (TRANSDemos), 2008-2013. In addition to its different research focus, the present application extends the cooperation to internationally prominent scholars in Gothenburg. Moreover, the contributing scholars from Lund and Stockholm have been adjusted to fit the competence required for the research on legitimacy.

## 5.2 Governance

The program steering committee is comprised of Jonas Tallberg (lead coordinator) and Karin Bäckstrand and Jan Aart Scholte (co-coordinators). All three have extensive experience of managing large projects.

Jonas Tallberg (PhD Lund 1999) is Professor of Political Science at Stockholm University. He has extensive experience as principal investigator in large collaborative research projects concerning global and regional governance, with grants *inter alia* from the European Research Council, the Swedish Research Council, Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, and the Nordic Research Academy. His work is published with top-ranked international book publishers and academic journals. In 2007 he was identified as the internationally most influential Swedish political scientist in terms of article impact, and in 2012 he was awarded the Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel

Research Award from the Humboldt Foundation. He currently serves on the Executive Committee of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) and on the Steering Committee of the ECPR Standing Group on the European Union.

Karin Bäckstrand (PhD Lund 2001) holds the new Chair as Professor in Environmental Social Science at the Department of Political Science, Stockholm University. She has previously been Professor at Lund University, visiting scholar at University of Oxford, and Wallenberg Postdoctoral Fellow at MIT. She has led several interdisciplinary research projects on environmental and climate politics funded by the Swedish Research Council for Environment and the Swedish Foundation for Strategic Environmental Research. She is a member of the board of the Climate Research Program of the Norwegian Research Council. Her work on global environmental governance, climate diplomacy, and democratic legitimacy of global governance has appeared with major international journals and book publishers.

Jan Aart Scholte (PhD Sussex 1990) is Faculty Chair of Peace and Development in the School of Global Studies at the University of Gothenburg. He has coordinated five earlier international research projects on global governance and was Co-Director of the Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation at the University of Warwick in 2003-7. His research on globalization, global governance, civil society in global politics, and democracy in global affairs has been published with leading journals and book publishers. He was lead editor of the international journal *Global Governance* in 2005-9. Scholte's advisory role on legitimacy issues has involved *inter alia* the International Monetary Fund, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, the United Nations, the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization.

Assisting the steering committee, an international scientific advisory board will provide essential feedback with new ideas and critical review throughout the research process. We plan frequent interaction, including biennial meetings, with this board, which includes some of the world's leading researchers on global governance, public opinion, and social movements, and draws competence from all major regions of the world. The following experienced and prominent scholars have accepted to serve on the international scientific advisory board:

- Steven Bernstein, Professor of Political Science, University of Toronto
- Donatella Della Porta, Professor, European University Institute
- Heba Raouf Ezzat, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Cairo University
- Liesbet Hooghe, W.R. Kennan Distinguished Professor, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- Ian Hurd, Associate Professor of Political Science, Northwestern University
- Robert Keohane, Professor of International Affairs, Princeton University
- Kishore Mahbubani, Dean, Lee Kwan Yu School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore
- Pippa Norris, Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University
- Adebayo Olukoshi, Director, United Nations Institute for Development and Planning, Dakar
- Jens Rydgren, Professor of Sociology, Stockholm University
- Diana Tussie, Head of International Relations Department, FLACSO Buenos Aires
- Yu Keping, Director, China Center for Global Governance, Beijing
- Michael Zürn, Professor of Political Science and Research Director, Social Science Research Center Berlin

### 5.3 Participants

Next to the steering committee, the program will involve nine further researchers as well as three postdoctoral researchers to be recruited.

Hans Agné (PhD Stockholm 2004) is Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at Stockholm University. His research on democracy beyond the nation-state has appeared in prominent peer-reviewed journals. His research has been funded by the Swedish Research Council, Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, and the European Research Council.

Magdalena Bexell (PhD Lund 2005) is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Science at Lund University. Her publications on global governance, democracy, human rights, and development have appeared with major international book and journal publishers. Bexell recently edited the volume *Global Governance, Legitimacy and Legitimation* (Routledge, 2015).

Lisa Dellmuth (PhD Mannheim 2011) is postdoctoral researcher at the Stockholm Resilience Centre at Stockholm University. Her work focuses on public opinion toward international organizations. She has published in several leading journals and received multiple prizes for her research, including the SAGE Award for the best article in *European Union Politics* in 2012.

Catia Gregoratti (PhD Manchester 2010) is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Science at Lund University. Her research, published in several major journals and edited volumes, focuses on business and multi-stakeholder initiatives in global governance. She coordinates a transnational network in IPE and serves on the boards of two open-access journals.

Kristina Jönsson (PhD Lund 2002) is Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at Lund University. Her work on global governance of health has been published in journals such as *Globalizations*, *Health Policy*, and *Third World Quarterly*. She has acted as expert to the World Health Organization.

Thomas Sommerer (PhD Konstanz 2009) is Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at Stockholm University. His work focuses on the design and effectiveness of international organizations, and environmental politics. He has published in several top journals, including *International Organization*, and with leading academic presses.

Fredrik Söderbaum (PhD Gothenburg 2003) is Professor at the School of Global Studies, University of Gothenburg. He has played a lead role in many international research projects, and published extensively on regional integration, African politics, and the legitimacy of regional and global governance.

Anders Uhlin (PhD Lund 1995) is Professor of Political Science at Lund University. His research on democratization, civil society, and global governance – particularly as it relates to South East Asia – has appeared in many international peer-review journals. Recent publications include *Civil Society and the Governance of Development: Opposing Global Institutions* (Palgrave, 2015).

Fariborz Zelli (PhD Tübingen 2010) is Associate Professor at the Department of Political Science, Lund University. His work on global environmental governance, international development, global trade, and institutional complexity has been published by top-ranked journals and presses. He has received multiple awards and grants for his research.

In sum, the program brings together the top researchers in Sweden on issues of global governance. The scholars in the program publish with leading international journals and presses, have received many awards for their research, can draw on extensive international networks, frequently engage with policy-makers, and have been trained at both Swedish and international universities. The program includes three of the top six political scientists in Sweden in terms of international article impact, and two of the top three researchers in the age span up to 50, according to a recent evaluation. The group is well balanced in terms of issue-area specialization, methodological competence, career stage, and gender.

#### 5.4 Work Plan

We propose a highly integrated program, in which all researchers work with the same overarching research problem in an ambitious comparative and mixed-method research design.

More specifically, the work will be conducted in sub-groups organized along two dimensions. On the one hand, three groups will be organized around the central program themes: sources of legitimacy; strategies of legitimation and delegitimation; and consequences of legitimacy. Each of these groups will engage in comparative research within their respective themes across the 16 GGIs. On the other hand, cross-cutting groups will be organized around the four broad issue-areas of the program: economic affairs; sustainable development; security; and regional integration. These groups will pool the issue-area expertise of program scholars and look more carefully at the legitimacy dynamics of specific GGIs. Theme and issue area groups are coordinated mainly by mid-career scholars with expert competence in the respective fields.



The organization of the program emphasizes continual close cooperation across the thematic and issue-area groups. This interplay is partly achieved since each researcher is a member of both a thematic group and an issue-area group. In addition, the program foresees regular joint workshops and seminars.

The program will further integrate already ongoing research by several of the participants. For example, several existing projects concern non-state actors in global environmental governance (Bäckstrand), the performance of international organizations (Tallberg), institutional complexity in global climate governance (Zelli), and global democracy (Scholte).

The thematic research groups are composed as follows:

- Sources of Legitimacy: Dellmuth (coordinator), Söderbaum, Tallberg, and recruited postdoc.
- Strategies of Legitimation and Delegitimation: Bexell (coordinator), Bäckstrand, Gregoratti, Jönsson, Scholte, Uhlin, and recruited postdoc.
- Consequences of Legitimacy: Sommerer (coordinator), Agné, Zelli, and recruited postdoc.

The issue-area research groups are composed as follows:

- Economic Governance: Gregoratti (coordinator), Dellmuth, Scholte, and recruited postdoc.
- Sustainable Development Governance: Zelli (coordinator), Bäckstrand, Jönsson, and recruited postdoc.
- Security Governance: Agné (coordinator), Bexell, Sommerer, and recruited postdoc.
- Regional Integration Governance: Uhlin (coordinator), Söderbaum, and Tallberg.

The program is planned over six years with distinct phases and milestones. Each theme of the program moves through four phases: specification of research design; data collection; analysis; and synthesis and dissemination.

The first two years of the program will concentrate on specifying the research design and conducting the early data collection. Reflecting their specific mixed-method designs, themes 1 and 3 will during this phase focus on quantitative data collection, while theme 2 will initiate the qualitative case studies. At this initial stage of the program, we will also organize (a) a first meeting with the international scientific advisory board, to get early feedback on the direction of the program; and (b) a workshop with external participants aimed at an edited volume that will review the research front and set the agenda for the program. We will also recruit the three postdocs, expected to start in January 2017.

In years 3 and 4 the program work will shift toward a second phase of data collection analysis, as well as early synthesis and outputs. During the second phase themes 1 and 3 will conduct qualitative case studies to complement the quantitative work of the first phase. Conversely, theme 2 will start to gather quantitative data to complement the case studies underway. Synthesis of the findings will begin and result in joint papers and work on co-authored monographs. A second meeting with the international scientific advisory board will be held in year 4 for an interim review of progress.

In years 5 and 6, the program will concentrate on synthesis, publication, and dissemination in all three themes. Work on joint publications will intensify and be supplemented by workshops with academics and policy-makers. A concluding conference with the international scientific advisory board and other external participants will be held in year 6, intended to review the program's primary scientific contributions and to identify next steps for research on legitimacy in global governance.

### 5.5 Deliverables, Impact, and Communication Strategy

Journal articles, edited volumes, and monographs are the principal deliverables of the program. These outputs will be thematic as well as issue-based, theoretical as well as empirical. Joint publications will be the norm. In addition, conferences, workshops, and seminars will be arranged to involve scholars as well as practitioners.

While it is difficult to predict precisely the amount and dates of deliverables, the publication records of the participating researchers vouch for the dissemination and impact of results from the program. The participating researchers regularly publish in leading international journals, such as *European Journal of International Relations*, *European Union Politics*, *Global Environmental Politics*, *Global Governance*, *Government and Opposition*, *International Organization*, *International Studies Quarterly*, and *Review of International Studies*. As far as books are concerned, leading publishers such as Cambridge University Press, Oxford University Press, Palgrave Macmillan, and Routledge are well represented in the publication records of the participating researchers. The track record from earlier cooperation is very solid: the TRANSDEMOS program (involving some members of the current team) resulted in 8 monographs, 10 volumes, 58 peer-reviewed journal articles, and 63 anthology contributions, excluding contributions still under review.

All journal articles and datasets from the Legitimacy in Global Governance program will be published with open access, either in open access journals or through parallel publishing. When possible, books and book chapters will also be made freely available on the program website.

Both senior and junior researchers in the program have a long tradition of disseminating research results through active participation in international conferences and workshops. For instance, the participants frequently organize panels and workshops at major international conferences, such as the International Studies Association, the American Political Science Association, and the European Consortium for Political Research.

Communication, dialogue, and outreach to non-academic audiences are also integral to the program. The participating researchers have good media contacts, offer regular advice to policy circles, publish popular-science works, and participate in various public events.

These ‘third mission’ activities of the program will also be pursued through a coordinated communication and outreach strategy. An interactive website will contain a presentation of the program, a calendar of program events, online publication of all program outputs, short

pedagogical web-based documentaries on key findings, and an invitation to the public, journalists, and policymakers to engage in dialogue with the program.

The program will also invite policy-makers, journalists and civil society activists to take part in workshops. The structured involvement of non-academic practitioners in the program will ensure that the research engages with society's evolving knowledge needs. Practitioner workshops are important as a data source and part of the review of ongoing research, as well as for the broader dissemination of results.

#### 5.6 Promotion of Gender Equality, Young Researchers, and Internationalization

The program seeks to promote gender equality through multiple measures. The team of researchers is evenly gender balanced and includes women in senior positions. This composition not only benefits the substantive interests of the program, through the competence of its many successful female collaborators, but also helps to ensure the availability of role models and mentors for younger researchers. The program further seeks to ensure family-friendly work structures, for instance, by organizing internal workshops in ways that minimize time away from home.

The program involves researchers at various stages of their academic career. This combination of experience and renewal should be emphasized. The program includes three new postdoc positions to be advertised during the course of the program, and four promising young researchers with recent PhDs.

To promote internationalization the program will encourage participants to make shorter or longer stays abroad. Drawing on the extensive international academic networks of the senior program participants and the advisory board, younger participants will be provided with opportunities to be visiting researchers at leading institutions in different parts of the world. As a source of inspiration and new ideas, visiting researchers from abroad will also be invited to Sweden for several months every year.

## 5.7 Budget

We apply for salary support for the twelve named participants, as well as for the three postdocs to be recruited. Reflecting differences in the share of research in professorships and lectureships, full professors will be funded at the level of 20 percent, and senior lecturers and researchers at 40 percent, throughout the program. The three postdoc positions involve two-year contracts with 75 percent research.

A program assistant (50 percent) will provide administrative and research support, e.g., by coordinating workshops, transcribing interviews, and assisting in the implementation of the in-house elite survey. Cost: 220,000 SEK annually.

Travel costs constitute an important non-salary budget item, in order to cover the costs of internal workshops, field research for the case studies, and participation in and organization of international workshops and conferences. 30 000 SEK annually will be allocated to every project participant, including the postdocs. Cost: 360,000 – 450,000 SEK annually.

We have budgeted for three workshops with the international scientific advisory board. Two of these workshops will be organized in conjunction with program conferences, so as to maximize board inputs to the program. Cost: 400,000 SEK in total.

In respect of the survey work, the budget includes 2,2 million SEK for the public opinion survey (conducted in cooperation with YouGov) and 0,8 million SEK for the elite opinion survey (conducted in-house at Stockholm University). Cost: 3,0 million SEK in total.

## References

- Alter, Karen (2008) "Agents or Trustees? International Courts in their Political Context." *European Journal of International Relations* 14, 1: 33-63.
- Ansolabehere, Stephen and Brian F. Schaffner (2014) Does Survey Mode Still Matter? Findings from a 2010 Multi-Mode Comparison, *Political Analysis* 22, 3: 285-303.
- Archibugi, Daniele, Mathias Koenig-Archibugi and Raffaele Marchetti (eds) (2011) *Global Democracy: Normative and Empirical Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandy, Joe and Jackie Smith (eds) (2005) *Coalitions across Borders: Transnational Protest and the Neoliberal Order*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Beetham, David (2013) *The Legitimation of Power*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave..
- Bernstein, Steven (2011) "Legitimacy in Intergovernmental and Non-state Global Governance." *Review of International Political Economy* 18, 1: 17-51.
- Bernstein, Steven and Benjamin Cashore (2007) "Can Non-state global Governance be Legitimate? An Analytical Framework." *Regulation & Governance* 1: 237-371.
- Bernauer, Thomas and Robert Gampfer (2013) "Effects of Civil Society Involvement on Popular Legitimacy of Global Environmental Governance." *Global Environmental Change* 23: 439-449.
- Biegon, Dominika (2013) "Specifying the Arena of Possibilities: Post-structuralist Narrative Analysis and the European Commission's **Legitimation Strategies**." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 51, 2: 194-211.
- Binder, Martin and Monika Heupel (2014) "The Legitimacy of the UN Security Council: Evidence from Recent General Assembly Debates." *International Studies Quarterly* FirstView.
- Brassett, James and Eleni Tsingou (2011) "The Politics of Legitimate Global Governance." *Review of International Political Economy* 18, 1: 1-16.
- Buchanan, Allen, and Robert O. Keohane (2006) "The Legitimacy of Global Governance Institutions." *Ethics and International Affairs* 20, 4: 405-437.

- Bühlmann, Marc, and Ruth Kunz (2011) "Confidence in the Judiciary: Comparing the Independence and Legitimacy of Judicial Systems." *West European Politics* 34, 2: 317–345.
- Carr, Edward Hallet (1946) *The Twenty-Years Crisis*. London: Macmillan. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition.)
- Clark, Ian (2005) *Legitimacy in International Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clark, Ian and Christian Reus-Smit (eds) (2007) "Resolving International Crises of Legitimacy." *International Politics* 44, 2-3. (Special Issue)
- Cronin, Bruce and Ian Hurd (eds) (2008) *The UN Security Council and the Politics of International Authority*. London: Routledge.
- Dahl, Robert A (1999) "Can International Organizations Be Democratic? A Skeptic's View." In Ian Shapiro and Casiano Hacker-Cordón (eds) *Democracy's Edges*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahl, Robert A and Charles Lindblom (1992) *Politics, Markets, and Welfare*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition.)
- della Porta, Donatella, and Sidney J. Tarrow (eds.) (2005) *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Dellmuth, Lisa M. and Jonas Tallberg (2014) "The Social Legitimacy of International Organizations: Interest Representation, Institutional Performance, and Confidence Extrapolation in the United Nations." *Review of International Studies* FirstView.
- Dingwerth, Klaus and Tobias Weise (2012) Legitimitätspolitik jenseits des Staats: Der Beitrag nichtstaatlicher Akteure zum Wandel grenzüberschreitender Legitimitätsnormen. In Anna Geis, Frank Nullmeier, and Christopher Daase (eds) *Der Aufstieg der Legitimitätspolitik: Rechtfertigung und Kritik politisch-ökonomischer Ordnungen (Leviathan, Sonderband 27)*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Downs, George W, David M Roche, and Peter N Barsoom (1996) "Is the Good News about Compliance Good News about Cooperation?" *International Organization* 50, 3: 379-406.
- Ecker-Erhardt, Matthias. (2012) "Cosmopolitan Politicization: How Perceptions of Interdependence Foster Citizens Expectations in International Institutions." *European Journal of International Relations* 18, 3: 48-508.

- Ecker-Erhardt, Matthias and Bernhard Wessels (2011) Input- oder Output-Politisierung internationaler Organisationen? Der kritische Blick der Bürger auf Demokratie und Leistung. Unpublished paper. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin.
- Fairclough, Norman (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis. A Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- Fallon, Richard H (2005) "Legitimacy and the Constitution." *Harvard Law Review* 118, 6: 1787–1853.
- Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink (1998) "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." *International Organization* 52, 4: 887-917.
- Franck, Thomas (1990) *The Power of Legitimacy among Nations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fransen, Luc (2012) "Multi-stakeholder Governance and Voluntary Programme Interactions: Legitimation Politics in the Institutional Design of Corporate Social Responsibility." *Socio-Economic Review* 10: 163-192.
- Gabel, Mathew and Kenneth Scheve (2007) "Estimating the Effect of Elite Communications on Public Opinion Using Instrumental Variables." *American Journal of Political Science* 51, 4: 1013-1028.
- Gallup International Association (2005) Voice of the People. ICPSR04636-v1. Zürich: Gallup International Association.
- George, Alexander L and Andrew Bennett (2005) *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- George, Alexander L and Timothy J McKeown (1985) "Case Studies and Theories of Organizational Decision Making." *Advances in Information Processing in Organizations* 2: 21-58.
- Gibson, James L., Gregory A. Caldeira, and Lester Kenyatta Spence (2003) "Measuring Attitudes toward the United States Supreme Court." *American Journal of Political Science* 47, 2: 354–367.
- Grigorescu, Alexandru (2007) "Transparency of Intergovernmental Organizations: The Roles of Member States, International Bureaucracies, and Nonstate Actors." *International Studies Quarterly* 51, 3: 625-648.



- Gutner, Tamar and Alexander Thompson (2018) The Politics of IO Performance: A Framework. *Review of International Organizations* 5: 227-248.
- Halliday, Terrence C, Susan Block-Lieb and Bruce G Carruthers (2010) “Rhetorical Legitimation: Global Scripts as Strategic Devices of International Organizations.” *Socio-Economic Review* 8: 77-112.
- Haunss, Sebastian (2007) “Challenging Legitimacy: Repertoires of Contention, Political Claims-Making, and Collective Action Frames.” In Achim Hurrelmann, Steffen Schneider and Jens Steffek (eds) *Legitimacy in an Age of Global Politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Held, David (1995) *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks (2005) “Calculation, Community and Cues. Public Opinion on European Integration.” *European Union Politics* 6, 4: 419–43.
- Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks (2014) “Delegation and Pooling in International Organizations.” *Review of International Organizations* FirstView.
- Hurd, Ian (1999) “Legitimacy and Authority in International Politics.” *International Organization* 53, 2: 379-408.
- Hurd, Ian (2007) *After Anarchy: Power and Legitimacy in the United Nations Security Council*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ikenberry, G John (2001) *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order after Major Wars*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jamal, Amaney and Irfan Nooruddin (2010) The Democratic Utility of Trust: A Cross-national Analysis, *Journal of Politics* 72, 1: 45-59.
- Keohane, Robert O. (2006) “The Contingent Legitimacy of Multilateralism.” GARNET Working Paper 9.
- Keohane, Robert O., Stephen Macedo, and Andrew Moravcsik (2009) “Democracy-Enhancing Multilateralism.” *International Organization* 63, 1: 1–31.
- Keohane, Robert, and David Victor (2010) “The Regime Complex for Climate Change.” *Perspectives on Politics* 9(1): 7-23.
- Krasner, Stephen D (1999) *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Lijphart, Arend (1971) "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method." *American Political Science Review* 65: 683-693.
- Maier, Michaela, Silke Adam, and Jürgen Maier (2012) "The Impact of Identity and Economic Cues on Citizens' EU Support: An Experimental Study on the Effects of Party Communication in the Run-up to the 2009 European Parliament Elections." *European Union Politics* 13, 4: 580–603.
- Mearsheimer, John J (1994/1995) "The False Promise of International Institutions." *International Security* 19, 3: 5-49.
- Miles, Edward L, Steinar Andresen, Elaine M Carlin, Jon Birger Skærseth, Arild Underdal, and Jørgen Wettestad (2002) *International Regime Effectiveness: Confronting Theory with Evidence*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Morgenthau, Hans J (1948) *Politics Among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Knopf.
- Mutz, Diana C. (2011) *Population-Based Survey Experiments*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Newton, Kenneth and Pippa Norris (2001) "Confidence in Public Institutions: Faith, Culture or Performance?" In Susan J. Pharr and Robert D. Putnam (eds) *Disaffected Democracies: What's Troubling the Trilateral Countries?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Norris, Pippa (2000) "Global Governance and Cosmopolitan Citizens." In Joseph S. Nye Jr. and Elaine Kamarck (eds) *Governance in a Globalizing World*. Washington D.C.: Brookings.
- O'Brien, Robert, Anne M Goetz, Jan A Scholte, and Michael Williams (2000) *Contesting Global Governance: Multilateral Economic Institutions and Global Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paterson, Matthew (2010) "Legitimation and Accumulation in Climate Change Governance." *New Political Economy* 15, 3: 345-368.
- Pogge, Thomas W (2002) *World Poverty and Human Rights: Cosmopolitan Responsibilities and Reforms*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Quack, Sigrid (2010) "Law, Expertise and Legitimacy in Transnational Economic Governance: an Introduction." *Socio-Economic Review* 8: 3-16.
- Reus-Smit, Chris (2007) "International Crises of Legitimacy." *International Politics* 44: 157-174.

- Risse, Thomas (2010) *A Community of Europeans? Transnational Identities and Public Spheres*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Scharpf, Fritz. (1999) *Governing in Europe: Effective and Democratic?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schlipphak, Bernd and Timo Menniken (2011) "Assessing Attitudes towards Regional Integration Processes." In Philippe De Lombaerde, Renato Flores, Lelio Iapadre and Michael Schulz (eds) *The Regional Integration Manual: Quantitative and Qualitative Methods*. London: Routledge.
- Schmidt, Vivien A (2012) "Democracy and Legitimacy in the European Union Revisited: Input, Output and 'Throughput'." *Political Studies* 61, 1: 2-22.
- Schneider, Steffen, Frank Nullmeier, and Achim Hurrelmann (2007) "Exploring the Communicative Dimension of Legitimacy: Text Analytical Approaches." In Achim Hurrelmann, Steffen Schneider and Jens Steffek (eds) *Legitimacy in an Age of Global Politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Scholte, Jan Aart (2007) "Civil Society and the Legitimation of Global Governance." *Journal of Civil Society* 3, 3: 305-326.
- Scholte, Jan Aart (2011) *Building Global Democracy: Civil Society and Accountable Global Governance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seabrooke, Leonard (2007) Legitimacy Gaps in the Global Economy: Explaining the Sources of the IMF's Legitimacy Crisis. *International Politics* 44: 250-268.
- Steffek, Jens (2003) "The Legitimation of International Governance: A Discourse Approach." *European Journal of International Relations* 9, 2: 249-275.
- Suchman, Mark C (1995) "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches." *Academy of Management Review* 20, 3: 571-610.
- Symons, Jonathan (2011) "The Legitimation of International Organisations: Examining the Identity of the Communities that Grant Legitimacy." *Review of International Studies*, 37: 2557-2583.
- Take, Ingo (2012) "Legitimacy in Global Governance: International, Transnational and Private Institutions Compared." *Swiss Political Science Review* 18, 2: 220-248.

- Tallberg, Jonas, Thomas Sommerer, Theresa Squatrito and Christer Jönsson (2013) *The Opening Up of International Organizations: Transnational Access in Global Governance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vaara, Eero and Janne Tienari (2008) “A Discursive Perspective on Legitimation Strategies in Multinational Corporations.” *Academy of Management Review* 33, 4: 985-993.
- Waltz, Kenneth N (1979) *Theory of International Politics*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- van Deth, Jan W. (1998) “Equivalence in Comparative Political Research, in Jan W. van Deth (ed) *Comparative Politics: The Problem of Equivalence*, London: Routledge.
- Weber, Max (1922/1978) *Economy and Society*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- von Staden, Andreas (2012) “Introduction to Special Issue: Toward Greater Interdisciplinarity in Research on the Legitimacy of Global Governance.” *Swiss Political Science Review* 18, 2: 149-157.
- Zaum, Dominik (ed.) (2013) *Legitimizing International Organizations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zelli, Fariborz and Harro van Asselt (eds.) (2013) “The Institutional Fragmentation of Global Environmental Governance.” Special Issue of *Global Environmental Politics* 13.
- Zürn, Michael, Martin Binder, and Matthias Ecker-Erhardt (2012) “International Political Authority and Its Politicization.” *International Theory* 4, 1: 69–106.