JOURNAL OF GLOBAL AFFAIRS
AND INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE
Vol. 1 No. 4 (2026)

REBUILDING TRUST IN A FRAGMENTED WORLD: INSTITUTIONAL LEGITIMACY AND INCLUSIVE GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

Rafey Konain
BS English Literature, Institute of English Studies (IES), University of the Punjab Lahore.
Email: rafeykonain965@gmail.com

Abstract
Global governance institutions face a legitimacy challenge as geopolitical competition, unequal representation, overlapping mandates, and fragmented information environments complicate collective action. This article examines how institutional legitimacy can be strengthened without assuming that a single reform can resolve the crisis of multilateral cooperation. It uses qualitative, interpretive document analysis to connect scholarship on institutional collaboration and fragmented multilateralism with the United Nations' 2024 Pact for the Future. The article organises the problem around four dimensions: representation, procedural fairness, performance, and accountability. It argues that legitimacy is relational: institutions must not only produce outcomes but also explain whose priorities shape those outcomes, how decisions are made, and how affected communities can challenge failures. The analysis identifies three priorities: broaden meaningful participation, coordinate institutions around clearly assigned responsibilities, and make implementation measurable through public reporting and independent review. Digital cooperation and data governance should be treated as core institutional concerns rather than technical add-ons. The article does not claim to test causal effects empirically; instead, it develops a policy-oriented framework for future comparative research. The framework is especially relevant to states in the Global South, whose formal sovereign equality may coexist with unequal access to agenda-setting, finance, expertise, and institutional influence.

Keywords: *global governance; multilateralism; institutional legitimacy; Global South; accountability; institutional cooperation; United Nations*

1. Introduction

Many contemporary policy problems cross borders while the authority to address them remains divided among states, international organisations, regional bodies, private actors, and civil-society networks. Climate change, armed conflict, public-health risks, digital technologies, financial instability, and forced displacement require coordination, yet cooperation is often weakened by geopolitical rivalry and disagreement over who should bear costs. These tensions do not mean that multilateral institutions have become irrelevant. Rather, they raise the question of whether existing arrangements can command sufficient trust to coordinate collective responses.

The United Nations' Pact for the Future, adopted by the General Assembly in September 2024, links renewal of multilateralism with effectiveness, preparedness, equitable representation, inclusion, interconnectedness, and predictable financing (United Nations General Assembly, 2024). The Pact is significant as a statement of shared commitments, but agreement on principles does not itself guarantee implementation. Institutions must translate declarations into decision procedures, budgets, responsibilities, and mechanisms through which progress can be assessed.

Recent scholarship describes a more fragmented institutional landscape. Formal international organisations coexist with informal and hybrid groupings, while states sometimes pursue cooperation through arrangements outside established universal institutions. Such plurality can create flexibility, but it may also produce duplication, unequal access, and competing standards (Cooper, Parlar Dal, & Dipama, 2025). Research on collaboration among international organisations similarly argues that

effectiveness should be assessed not only through outcomes but also through relationship management and collaborative processes (World Development, 2025).

This article asks: How can global governance institutions strengthen legitimacy and practical coordination in a fragmented international environment? It advances three arguments. First, legitimacy depends on the combination of representation, fair procedures, performance, and accountability. Second, institutional plurality should be managed through transparent coordination rather than treated as inherently beneficial or harmful. Third, reform should be evaluated through observable implementation indicators and opportunities for affected groups to provide feedback. The article is conceptual and document-based; it proposes a framework for further empirical testing rather than claiming to establish causal relationships.

2. Conceptual Framework and Literature Review

2.1 Institutional legitimacy

Institutional legitimacy refers here to the belief that an institution has an acceptable basis for making decisions and that its authority is exercised through procedures and purposes that can be publicly justified. Legitimacy should not be equated with popularity or with the mere existence of a treaty mandate. An institution may possess formal authority yet struggle to gain trust if its decision-making is opaque, its benefits are unevenly distributed, or its commitments are repeatedly unmet.

For analytical purposes, this article distinguishes four dimensions. Representation concerns who participates and whose interests are heard. Procedural fairness concerns transparency, consistency, access to information, and the opportunity to contest decisions. Performance concerns whether institutions deliver on agreed objectives. Accountability concerns whether decision-makers explain outcomes, disclose failures, and face credible review or corrective action. These dimensions interact: performance without representation may be viewed as technocratic domination, while inclusive procedures without delivery can produce frustration and declining confidence.

2.2 Fragmented multilateralism and institutional plurality

Institutional fragmentation occurs when authority and activity are distributed across multiple bodies whose mandates, memberships, and procedures overlap or diverge. Fragmentation can allow smaller coalitions to act when universal agreement is difficult. Regional or issue-specific organisations may develop expertise and adapt policies to local conditions. However, fragmentation can increase transaction costs, create inconsistent rules, and allow powerful actors to select forums that best serve their preferences.

Cooper, Parlar Dal, and Dipama (2025) situate contemporary fragmentation within Global North–Global South debates and examine interactions between formal organisations, informal groupings, and geopolitical change. This suggests that fragmentation should be analysed as a governance condition rather than simply as institutional failure. The relevant question is whether multiple institutions are connected through clear responsibilities, shared standards, and meaningful accountability.

2.3 Collaboration as process and outcome

Inter-organisational collaboration is often discussed as though it were a single activity. In practice, cooperation, coordination, partnership, and convening may involve different levels of commitment and authority. A 2025 study in World Development proposes clearer conceptual distinctions and a framework that combines effectiveness with attention to relationship management (World Development, 2025). An initiative may produce a short-term output while failing to create durable cooperation, or may build trust and shared procedures before its outcomes become visible.

2.4 Representation and the Global South

Formal equality among states does not necessarily translate into equal influence over agendas, technical standards, financing, or institutional staffing. States with limited fiscal and diplomatic

capacity may face greater costs in attending negotiations, preparing technical submissions, and implementing complex agreements. Inclusive governance therefore requires more than an invitation to participate: it requires accessible documentation, predictable consultation, capacity support, and clear explanations of how contributions affect decisions.

This article does not treat the Global South as a uniform bloc. Developing states differ in economic structure, regional priorities, political institutions, and negotiating positions. A credible legitimacy framework should make room for these differences while examining whether institutional arrangements systematically exclude less-resourced participants.

3. Methodology

The article uses qualitative, interpretive document analysis. Its core documentary source is the United Nations General Assembly resolution adopting the Pact for the Future (A/RES/79/1), including its emphasis on institutional effectiveness, inclusion, preparedness, interconnectedness, representation, and financing. It also draws on two recent scholarly discussions: Cooper, Parlar Dal, and Dipama's analysis of fragmented multilateralism and a 2025 World Development article on evaluating collaboration among international organisations. These sources were selected because they directly address institutional reform, fragmentation, and cooperation.

The analysis follows three steps. First, it identifies recurring governance problems in the documents: unequal participation, overlapping mandates, weak implementation, and difficulties in assessing collaboration. Second, it groups these problems under the four legitimacy dimensions established in the conceptual framework. Third, it derives practical design principles and indicators that could be used in future comparative case studies.

This method has limitations. The article does not include interviews, original survey data, or a systematic review of every international organisation. Official documents state commitments rather than independently proving that those commitments have been implemented. Scholarly sources provide analytical perspectives but do not represent all positions in international relations research. Accordingly, the findings should be read as a structured conceptual synthesis and policy framework, not as a causal evaluation of the United Nations or any other institution.

4. Analysis and Discussion

4.1 Representation must influence decisions

Participation becomes meaningful when it can shape agendas, deliberations, and implementation priorities. Consultation that occurs after major choices have already been made may improve communication but does little to address legitimacy concerns. Institutions should disclose how agendas are set, provide sufficient time for technical review, and publish explanations of how member-state and stakeholder submissions were considered.

Capacity disparities require practical responses. Support may include translation, accessible technical briefings, training, travel assistance where appropriate, and funding for independent expertise. Such measures should be designed transparently to avoid creating new dependencies or privileging selected organisations. Representation should be assessed at multiple levels: formal state participation, participation by affected communities, and the ability of under-resourced delegations to engage substantively.

4.2 Coordination should clarify responsibility

Institutional plurality is not automatically inefficient. Different bodies may have distinct legal mandates, regional expertise, or operational capacities. Problems arise when responsibilities are unclear, reporting requirements conflict, or institutions compete for visibility without sharing relevant information. A practical coordination framework should identify a lead institution for each task, supporting partners, decision rights, shared data standards, and a process for resolving disputes.

Coordination should not become an excuse for centralising all authority in one organisation. A single centre may be unable to accommodate diverse contexts and may become a bottleneck. A better approach is subsidiarity with accountability: decisions should be made at the most appropriate level, while common standards and transparent reporting make it possible to assess whether local, regional, and global actions contribute to agreed objectives.

4.3 Performance needs transparent indicators

Declarations are important for setting direction, but legitimacy is weakened when commitments cannot be tracked. Institutions should distinguish inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes. A budget allocation is an input; a meeting is an activity; an agreed protocol is an output; and a measurable improvement in the problem addressed is an outcome. Confusing these categories can allow institutions to report activity as if it were evidence of success.

A compact public dashboard could report progress against a limited number of agreed indicators, identify the responsible body, explain data limitations, and record corrective actions. Indicators should be adapted to the mandate and should not reward easily counted activity at the expense of difficult but important objectives. Independent review and periodic revision are necessary because metrics can create perverse incentives when treated as ends in themselves.

4.4 Accountability should include explanation and correction

Accountability is more than publishing annual reports. It requires institutions to explain decisions, identify where implementation has fallen short, and show what will change as a result. A credible process includes accessible reporting, independent evaluation where feasible, channels for complaints or challenge, and follow-up on recommendations. Confidentiality may be necessary in diplomacy or security contexts, but exceptions should be justified and narrowly applied.

Accountability should also be proportionate. Not every policy failure reflects misconduct; some arise from uncertainty, resource constraints, or changing circumstances. A learning-oriented review can distinguish unavoidable setbacks from avoidable negligence and deliberate non-compliance. This distinction supports institutional learning while preserving the possibility of corrective action.

4.5 Digital governance is institutional governance

Digital systems influence how evidence is collected, how public narratives circulate, and how institutions communicate with citizens and member states. Fragmented information environments can make it harder to establish shared facts and can expose decision-making to misinformation and disinformation. The Global Digital Compact, adopted as an annex to the Pact for the Future, reflects growing recognition that digital cooperation requires international coordination (United Nations General Assembly, 2024).

Institutions should publish clear data-governance rules, explain how automated tools inform decisions, protect sensitive information, and maintain human responsibility for consequential judgments. Digital inclusion also matters: if consultation takes place only through systems that some communities cannot access, technological modernisation may deepen rather than reduce exclusion.

4.6 A practical reform framework

The analysis supports a staged framework. First, institutions map overlapping mandates and identify groups that face barriers to participation. Second, they publish responsibility matrices and minimum standards for consultation, data-sharing, and reporting. Third, they agree on a small set of outcome indicators and establish a periodic review process. Fourth, they disclose lessons learned and revise procedures in response to evidence and stakeholder feedback.

This framework should be tested rather than adopted as a universal template. Institutions differ in legal authority, resources, membership, and exposure to political conflict. A regional development body may be able to publish detailed project indicators, while a diplomatic forum may need to protect

sensitive negotiations. The common requirement is not identical procedure but publicly explainable rules and a credible relationship between commitments and follow-through.

5. Policy Recommendations

1. **Institutionalise meaningful participation.** Publish consultation schedules, provide accessible documents, explain how submissions are considered, and support participation by under-resourced delegations and affected communities.
2. **Clarify mandates and decision rights.** Use responsibility matrices for joint initiatives, identify lead and supporting organisations, and create procedures for resolving overlap and disagreement.
3. **Track commitments transparently.** Separate inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes; publish context-appropriate indicators; and disclose data limitations.
4. **Strengthen independent review and learning.** Use periodic evaluation, publish responses to recommendations, and distinguish unavoidable uncertainty from preventable failures.
5. **Adopt responsible digital-governance practices.** Set rules for data access, privacy, transparency, human oversight, and inclusion when digital tools inform policy or institutional decisions.
6. **Measure legitimacy as well as efficiency.** Assess not only whether a programme delivered results but also who participated, who benefited, who bore costs, and whether affected groups could challenge decisions.

6. Limitations and Future Research

The framework is conceptual and rests on a focused set of documents. It does not establish that the proposed reforms will increase trust or improve outcomes in every institutional setting. Future research could compare institutions across issue areas, using interviews with officials and civil-society participants, process tracing of selected initiatives, and publicly available implementation data.

A comparative design could test whether stronger participation procedures are associated with greater perceived legitimacy, whether clearer responsibility matrices reduce duplication, and whether public reporting leads to more effective correction of failures. Researchers should account for alternative explanations, including resource availability, geopolitical power, institutional mandate, and the severity of the problem being addressed. Survey-based work should explain sampling, question wording, and uncertainty; case studies should distinguish official claims from independently observed outcomes.

7. Conclusion

Global governance is challenged not only by disagreement among states but also by questions about representation, institutional coordination, information, and implementation. The Pact for the Future provides a significant statement of commitment to a more inclusive and effective multilateral system, but durable legitimacy depends on how such commitments are translated into practice. This article has argued that legitimacy is strongest when representation, procedural fairness, performance, and accountability reinforce one another.

Institutional fragmentation should neither be romanticised as flexibility nor treated as proof that multilateralism has failed. Its effects depend on whether institutions clarify responsibilities, share information appropriately, and remain answerable for their decisions. A practical reform agenda combines meaningful participation, transparent coordination, measurable implementation, independent review, and responsible digital governance. These proposals require empirical testing across institutional contexts. Their central principle is straightforward: institutions are more likely to sustain cooperation when they can explain not only what they do, but whose interests they serve, how decisions are reached, and what happens when commitments are not met.

References

Cooper, A. F., Parlar Dal, E., & Dipama, S. (2025). Fragmented multilateralism and international institutions: Between complexities and challenges. Third World Quarterly, 46(15), 1825–1837. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2025.2562908

United Nations General Assembly. (2024). The Pact for the Future (A/RES/79/1). United Nations. https://www.un.org/pact-for-the-future/en

Conceptualizing and evaluating how international organizations collaborate. (2025). World Development, 186, Article 106789. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2024.106789

Morse, J. C. (2025). Information fragmentation and global governance in hard times. Ethics & International Affairs. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0892679425100130