

# Research Terms of Reference

Public Authority and Legitimacy Making (PALM): host-refugee relations in urban Jordan and Lebanon

JOR1810

Jordan

March 2019

V1

**IMPACT** Shaping practices  
Influencing policies  
Impacting lives

## 1. Executive Summary

<b>Country of intervention</b>	Jordan		
<b>Type of Emergency</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural disaster	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conflict
<b>Type of Crisis</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sudden onset	<input type="checkbox"/> Slow onset <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protracted
<b>Mandating Body/ Agency</b>	Institute of Development Studies (IDS) at the University of Sussex (back donor: Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO))		
<b>Project Code</b>	13iAIO		
<b>Overall Research Timeframe</b> (from research design to final outputs / M&E)	23/ 11/ 2018 to 23/ 08/ 2019		
<b>Research Timeframe</b> Add planned deadlines (for first cycle if more than 1)	1. Start collect data: 10/06/2019		5. Preliminary presentation: 15/07/2019
	2. Data collected: 24/06/2019		6. Outputs sent for validation: 20/07/2019
	3. Data analysed: 25/06/2019		7. Outputs published: 01/08/2019
	4. Data sent for validation: 30/06/2019		8. Final presentation: 01/08/2019
<b>Number of assessments</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single assessment (one cycle)	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Multi assessment (more than one cycle) [Describe here the frequency of the cycle]	
<b>Humanitarian milestones</b> Specify <b>what</b> will the assessment inform and <b>when</b> e.g. The shelter cluster will use this data to draft its Revised Flash Appeal;	<b>Milestone</b>		<b>Deadline</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Donor plan/strategy	Endusers will be identified at a later stage
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Inter-cluster plan/strategy	-- / -- / --
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cluster plan/strategy	-- / -- / --
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NGO platform plan/strategy	Unknown
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Global Alliance for Urban Crisis Conference	07/08/2019
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Knowledge Platform Security & Rule of Law	Unknown
	<b>Audience type</b>		<b>Dissemination</b>

<b>Audience Type &amp; Dissemination</b> Specify <i>who</i> will the assessment inform and <i>how</i> you will disseminate to inform the audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategic <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Programmatic <input type="checkbox"/> Operational <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Product Mailing (e.g. mail to NGO consortium; HCT participants; Donors) <input type="checkbox"/> Cluster Mailing (Education, Shelter and WASH) and presentation of findings at next cluster meeting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Presentation of findings (e.g. at HCT meeting; Cluster meeting) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Website Dissemination (Relief Web & REACH Resource Centre) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> blog entry	
<b>Detailed dissemination plan required</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
<b>General Objective</b>	To contribute towards a wider IDS-led research project with the aim of generating evidence-based lesson learning on the nature of legitimacy-making practices 'of public authorities <sup>2</sup> , and their role in managing peaceful host refugee relations in urban areas, to support human security, inclusive governance and peaceful cities. Additionally, evidence will be collated on assumptions of donors regarding the role of public authorities <sup>3</sup> in maintaining peaceful relations in cities of Jordan and Lebanon. <sup>4</sup>			
<b>Specific Objective(s)</b>	<p><i>Below we present the overall project objectives (numbered) and IMPACT's specific objective which feeds into them (bulleted):</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conduct a comparative analysis of local processes of legitimacy generation and maintenance by a range of public authorities operating in urban areas of Lebanon and Jordan.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Conduct a comparative secondary data analyses on pre-existing datasets for Jordan stratified by urban settings (rural, peri-urban and urban)</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Identify in what ways and why such legitimacy processes lead to more or less inclusive urban governance, stability and peaceful relations between refugees and host populations.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Generate information from public authorities active in Jordan through KIIs to feed into the overall objective</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Critically analyze and where necessary challenge assumptions regarding such legitimacy processes held by international actors, to advance more effective humanitarian/development interventions.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identify donors who have actively addressed the issue of legitimacy of public authorities to inform effective program design in the context of Jordan and Lebanon. Conduct directed literature review and KIIs with select donors to strengthen information.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Generate and widely share evidence-based practical recommendations for practitioners, donors, and other actors in the urban humanitarian/development nexus on the role of, and ways to more effectively engage public authorities.</li> </ol>			

<sup>1</sup> The process through which various actors and institutions attempt to legitimize actions (Lund, 2006, p. 693)

<sup>2</sup> An instance of power which seeks a minimum of voluntary compliance and thus is legitimized in some way. (Lund, 2006, p. 678)

<sup>3</sup> The empirical approach focuses on the perceptions and acts of consent between the subordinates in society and those with power (Podder, 2017, p. 687)

<sup>4</sup> Annexure 1; Key concepts and definitions pertinent to PALM

<b>Research Questions<sup>5</sup></b>	<i>Below we present the overall project research questions (A, B, C etc.)) and IMPACT's specific research questions which feeds into them (I, ii, iii etc.):</i>		
	<div>A. Through what practices and processes do public authorities in urban Jordan and Lebanon<sup>6</sup> seek to gain and maintain legitimacy?<div>i. What is the perception of Jordanians and refugees of public authority in rural, peri urban and urban settings of Jordan?</div></div> <div>B. In what ways, and why, have public authorities attempted to manage social relations between refugees and host community with what stability, human security and wellbeing outcomes?<div>i. What are the perceptions of Jordanians and refugees on municipal authorities, safety and security and wellbeing in Jordan?<sup>7</sup></div><div>ii. How have public authorities sought to manage social relations between refugees and the communities</div><div>iii. What are the perceptions of Jordanians and refugees of govenrment response to citizen needs?</div></div> <div>C. What are Jordanian perceptions on the effects of the Syrian refugee crisis in their community? What assumptions do agencies in the urban humanitarian/ development nexus take regarding the role of public authorities in urban governance processes?<div>i. To what extent do donors/agencies consider the importance of inclusive political processes and legal structures in perceptions of state legitimacy? Has there been an evolution of programming strategies over time?</div><div>ii. How do these assumptions manifest in donor strategies, proposal calls, programming etc.? To what extent are state and non-state public authorities factored into donor priority setting and programming? In particular, how are local legitimation processes factored into donor interventions around legitimate urban governance and stability?</div><div>iii. Do donors/agencies engage with state and non-state public authorities and if so, how?</div></div>		
<b>Geographic Coverage</b>	<i>Jordan and Lebanon<sup>8</sup></i>		
<b>Secondary data sources</b>	<div><div><div>• Academic and grey literature on assumptions regarding public authorities held by international donors and agencies operating in Lebanon and Jordan</div><div>• Global and country specific ToC's, M&amp;E Frameworks, Multi year strategies of major donors</div><div>• Jordan Emergency Services and Social Resilience Project (ESSRP), 2017 endline data set</div><div>• USAID CITIES: Implementing Transparent, Innovative and Effective Solutions, Jordan, Baseline data set 2018</div><div>• USAID Community Engagement Project, Endline dataset , April 2018</div></div></div>		
<b>Population(s)</b> <i>Select all that apply</i>	<div><div><div><input type="checkbox"/> IDPs in camp</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> IDPs in informal sites</div></div><div><div><input type="checkbox"/> IDPs in host communities</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> IDPs [Other, Specify]</div></div><div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Refugees in camp</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Refugees in informal sites</div></div><div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Refugees in host communities</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Refugees [Other, Specify]</div></div><div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Host communities</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]</div></div></div>		

<sup>5</sup> Annexure 2; research question framework

<sup>6</sup> KII's for the public authorities active in Lebanon will be conducted by other consortium members (Occlude and ACTED)

<sup>7</sup> Perception surveys can provide insights into the degree of legitimacy an authority enjoys (McCullough, 2015)

<sup>8</sup> Information on donor perceptions in context to Lebanon will be included in the Directed Literature Review

<b>Stratification</b> <i>Select type(s) and enter number of strata</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geographical #: <u>2</u> Population size per strata is known? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Group #: Refugee and host community Population size per strata is known? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	[Other Specify] #: Rural, peri urban and urban Population size per strata is known? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Data collection tool(s)</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Secondary data analyses (Quantitative)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Semi-structured (Qualitative)	
		<b>Sampling method</b>			<b>Data collection method</b>	
<b>Semi-structured data collection tool (s) # 1</b> <i>KIIs</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Purposive <input type="checkbox"/> Snowballing <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Key informant interview (Target #): 35 <input type="checkbox"/> Individual interview (Target #): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Focus group discussion (Target #): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] (Target #): _____	
<b>Target level of precision if probability sampling</b>		__ % level of confidence NA			__ +/- % margin of error NA	
<b>Data management platform(s)</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	IMPACT		<input type="checkbox"/>	UNHCR	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other, Specify]				
<b>Expected output type(s)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Situation overview #: __	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Report #: 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	KII transcripts #: 35
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Secondary dataset analyses report #: <u>1</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Presentation (Final) #: 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Blog entry #: 1
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Interactive dashboard #: __	<input type="checkbox"/>	Webmap #: __	<input type="checkbox"/>	Map #: __
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other, Specify] #: __				
<b>Access</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public (available on REACH resource center and other humanitarian platforms)				
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on REACH or other platforms)				
<b>Visibility</b> <i>Specify which logos should be on outputs</i>		IMPACT, IDS				

## 2. Background & Rationale

### 2.1. Rationale

Over the years, hundreds of thousands of Syrians, Palestinians and others have found refuge in urban Lebanon and Jordan, but face impoverishment and significant human insecurity. Competition for housing, jobs and access to services is fierce and has resulted in conflicts, yet overall, host-refugee relations appear remarkably stable. In fragile urban settings, typically, a mix of state and non-state public authorities provide security, welfare and representation to support inhabitants. The Public Authority and Legitimacy Making (PALM) research will investigate in what ways diverse public authorities have contributed (or not contributed) to peaceful host-refugee relations. It will further investigate what assumptions regarding such public authorities underlie mainstream humanitarian and development interventions, which until now have largely focused on supporting municipalities. Effective urban humanitarian action requires better knowledge and practical recommendations on how to engage diverse public authorities. Working closely with end-users, the PALM study seeks to identify and widely circulate evidence-based advice for humanitarian and development practitioners and policymakers with the aim of advancing peaceful host-refugee relations, inclusive and legitimate governance and strengthened human security.

- Specifically, this study contributes to a wider IDS-led research with the aim of generating evidence based lesson learning on the nature of legitimacy-making practices on public authorities , and their role in managing peaceful

host refugee relations in urban areas, to support human security, inclusive governance and peaceful cities. Additionally, evidence will be collated on assumptions of donors regarding the role of public authorities in maintaining peaceful relations in cities of Jordan and Lebanon.

- **Focus 1** - What evidence do we have of how governing authorities build and maintain legitimacy?
- **Focus 2** - How are the assumptions that underpin current interventions seeking to promote legitimate governance related to local processes of legitimation?

The Public Authorities and Legitimacy-Making (PALM) project will use mixed methods approaches to understand what everyday practices bestow legitimacy on state and non-state actors attempting to exercise public authority in the most fragile urban settings in Lebanon and Jordan. Drawing from IMPACT's array of information and networks in Amman, IMPACT will support PALM by conducting a series of Key Informant Interviews with public authority officials and the international donor community, as well as comparing and analyzing unpublished datasets from surveys previously conducted by IMPACT and REACH. This findings from IMPACT's analysis and support will produce two separate reports, literature review and a comparative analysis of datasets, and will be presented at the GUAC Conference<sup>9</sup> and on the NWO Knowledge Platform<sup>10</sup>.

This overall project will be implemented by a consortium of actors, led by IDS, including IMPACT, ACTED Lebanon and Occlude. Below we detail the specific activities that IMPACT itself will undertake, which will feed into the final project outputs.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Methodology overview

Drawing from IMPACT's array of information and networks in Amman, IMPACT will support PALM with three separate outputs:

- **Output 1:** Analyses of existing datasets  
Drawing from datasets in previous studies, IMPACT will analyze datasets and provide an analyses on proxy indicators selected by IDS.
- **Output 2:** Transcripts from Key informant interviews  
IMPACT will design and conduct a series of key informant interviews with officials of public authority, including civil society organizations, municipal leadership, and public authority representatives along with major international and Gulf donors
- **Output 3:** Directed literature Review Report  
IMPACT will develop a literature review in which we analyze the assumptions within the donor community that underpin current interventions aimed at promoting legitimate governance practices. This will include an analysis on strategic documents including Donor Strategies, Action Plans, Theories of Change, M&E Frameworks. This will be followed by a series of Key Informant Interviews with major donors<sup>11</sup> identified through the literature review in the region.

#### 2.1. Population of interest

For the overall project, PALM seeks to explore how the local urban politics of establishing and maintaining legitimate rule affects host-refugee relations. It will look specifically at refugees and host communities in urban populations in Lebanon and Jordan. In regards to the support provided by IMPACT, please refer to the table below.

Table: Population of Interest PALM

	Population of Interest
Output 1: Datasets	Jordanian, living in urban settings; Refugees, living in the host community
Output 2: Qualitative Data	Public authorities, civil society organizations, municipal leadership living and working in urban settings in Jordan.
Output 3: Grey literature review	International community, including multilateral and bilateral donors active in Lebanon and Jordan.

<sup>9</sup> Joint event with the Global Alliance for Urban Crisis; 7 August 2019

<sup>10</sup> Knowledge Platform. Security & Rule of Law, <https://www.kpsrl.org/>

<sup>11</sup> The major donors will be identified through the JORRIS platform and through the literature review, both international and Gulf donors with active presence in Jordan and Lebanon will be targeted.

## 2.2. Dataset Analysis

IMPACT will draw on pre-existing monitoring, baseline and endline survey datasets and focus group discussion transcripts in two pre-identified urban contexts<sup>12</sup>. The thematic areas of focus will include perception on municipal/ government services, safety and security of respondents, trust in public authorities within the community related to various authorities that people seek assistance from; security; social tensions; etc.

Through a preliminary review of indicators, IMPACT and IDS have identified the following assessments as the main sources of data:

- Jordan Emergency Services and Social Resilience Project (JESSRP)
- USAID Community Engagement Project Assessment (USAID CEP)
- USAID CITIES: Implementing Transparent, Innovative, and Effective Solutions Assessment (USAID CITIES)

According to a report by McCullough, perception surveys can provide insights into the degree of legitimacy an authority projects.<sup>13</sup> As such, the indicators in the above datasets, reflecting perceptions of respondents towards social welfare, safety and security, municipal services and government response within their community, were selected as an indication of legitimacy in the municipality.

While the data was collected at the municipal level, analysis will be conducted by disaggregating respondents according to whether they reside in urban, peri-urban or rural settlements. To do this, the geo-coordinates of the surveyed individuals/households were overlaid with information from the night-time light data captured by DMSP/OLS<sup>14</sup>. The determination of urban, peri-urban and rural categories was based on the visual comparison of lighting data with the satellite imagery. The identification of these categories will enable the analyses of the outcomes across urban, peri-urban and rural settings in Jordan.

The final output will be data tables displaying the absolute and proportional data disaggregated by urban, peri-urban and rural settings.

## 2.3. Key Informant Interviews (local actors)

- iv. IMPACT will conduct a minimum of 25 Key Informant Interviews with public authorities in two urban contexts, including municipality leadership, mayors, Civil society organisations and representatives of public authorities. The key informants will be identified by IMPACT and IDS (who are leading the systematic literature review focusing on Jordan). The main objective of the KII is to understand the role public authorities play in the governance of the selected neighbourhood, which in turn will address the research question on how public authorities have sought to manage social relations between refugees and the communities. These interviews will be transcribed, with salient quotes identified by IMPACT, and provided to IDS for analysis.

	Amman	Irbid
Civil Society Organisations	3	3
Public Authority Representatives	5	5
Municipal Leadership	2	2
Community leaders	2	2

## 2.4. Directed Literature Review

<sup>12</sup> The locations of the case studies are to be decided by IDS, in consultation with REACH.

<sup>13</sup> McCullough, A. (2015). The legitimacy of states and armed non-state actors: Topic guide. Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham.

<sup>14</sup> <https://ngdc.noaa.gov/eog/dmsp/downloadV4composites.html>



IMPACT seeks to explore the assumptions that international and donor agencies in the urban humanitarian/development nexus take regarding the role of public authorities in urban governance processes. In order to do so, IMPACT will adopt a multiphase approach which will include a 1) general literature review; 2) directed literature review; 3) key informant interviews.

#### 2.4.1. Literature Review

IMPACT will conduct a general literature review of academic and grey literature. The publications selected will be reviewed to understand the broader perspective of donor assumptions towards public authority in global strategies, and the evolution of this thinking. The review will not be systematic, but will be targeted toward pre-identified existing documentation on this topic. Through the initial review, we will identify major donors in the region for further in-depth study. This selection process will be complemented by a mapping of the largest donors providing humanitarian<sup>15</sup> and development funds in Jordan and Lebanon.<sup>16</sup> The directed literature review will target donor strategic documents, including international and national country strategies, regional strategies, action plans, programme plans, theories of change, M&E frameworks, etc. to assess the extent to which, and how, these donors consider the role of local legitimization processes in their interventions within the context of Jordan and Lebanon. With support from IDS, IMPACT will additionally review articles written on the subject in scholarly journals and through various research institutions.

#### 2.4.2. KIIs (Donors)

Following the identification of major donors, and preliminary research regarding their activities in Lebanon and Jordan, IMPACT will conduct a series of Key Informant Interviews (KIIs). The aim will be to interview major international and western bilateral donors, as well as major Gulf Donors on their strategic priorities and assumptions regarding state and non-state public authorities and how they factor into donor strategies in Jordan and Lebanon. Following the interviews, IMPACT will draft a final report on the results of the directed literature review, including findings from the KIIs.

#### 2.5. Data Processing and Analyses

Quantitative datasets will then be analysed using statistical computer software (STATA) that will allow for the performance of statistical tests such as correlation analysis and significance tests, wherever relevant and appropriate. Data generated through KIIs and FGDs will be analyzed by IDS.

### 3. Roles and responsibilities

Table 2: Description of roles and responsibilities

<b>Task Description</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Accountable</b>	<b>Consulted</b>	<b>Informed</b>
<i>Research design</i>	<i>Assessment Officer</i>	<i>Assessment Manager</i>	<i>IDS Focal point Research HQ Research Design Unit</i>	<i>IDS Focal Point</i>

<sup>15</sup> <https://fts.unocha.org/countries/114/summary/2018>

<sup>16</sup> Special consideration should be given to Gulf state donors.

Supervising data collection	Assessment Officer	Assessment Manager	Data Analysis Unit	Assessment Manager
Data processing (checking, cleaning)	Assessment Officer	Assessment Manager	Data Analysis unit	Assessment Manager, IDS Focal Point
Data analysis	Assessment Officer	Assessment Manager	Data Analysis Unit	Assessment Manager
Output production	Assessment Officer	Assessment Manager	Reporting Unit	Assessment Manager, IDS Focal Point
Dissemination	Assessment Officer	Assessment Manager	Communication Officer	Assessment Manager, IDS Focal Point
Monitoring & Evaluation	Assessment Officer	Assessment Manager	Assessment manager, Research Design Unit	IDS Focal Point
Lessons learned	Assessment Officer	Assessment Manager	IDS Focal Point, Reporting Unit, Research Design Unit	IDS Focal Point

**Responsible:** the person(s) who executes the task

**Accountable:** the person who validates the completion of the task and is accountable of the final output or milestone

**Consulted:** the person(s) who must be consulted when the task is implemented

**Informed:** the person(s) who need to be informed when the task is completed

## 4.Data Analysis Plan

Example 1: Research Questions addressed with semi-structured tool (s)

Research questions	SUBQ #	Sub-question	Questionnaire QUESTION	Probes	Data collection method	Key disaggregations (Group types)
1. What assumptions do agencies in the humanitarian/development nexus take regarding the role of public authorities in urban governance processes	1.3	To what extent are state and non-state public authorities factored into donor priority setting and programming? In particular, how are local legitimization processes factored into donor interventions around urban	What type of organizations do you prefer to work with as implementing partners in Jordan/Lebanon	NGO's? INGO's? Royal NGO's Islamic Charities Secular Organizations Local government bodies Non-state actors	KII	Location: Jordan and Lebanon Donor Type: Western and Gulf Donors



		governance and stability?			
		Do you provide assistance to non-state organizations in country? If so, what types of organizations do you provide assistance to?	Monetary? Capacity building? Infrastructure?	KII	Location: Jordan and Lebanon Donor Type: Western and Gulf Donors
		Does your organization or implementing partners engage with local public authorities during program design and implementation? If so, How?	municipal councils, mayors, tribal leaders, parliamentarians, regional committees, community based organizations, NGOs, and political parties	KII	
1.4.	Do donors/agencies engage with state and non-state public authorities and if so, how?	Are non-state public authorities factored into donor priority setting and programming?	host tribal authorities, refugee tribal authorities, Islamic NGOs, secular NGOs, tribal politicians, party politicians		
		Are there some local organizations which have the capacity to engage with donor programming, but who the donor chooses not to work with? Why?	Hezbollah associated charities, particularist parties, Islamist parties	KII	
		Does your organization have a policy position on how you deal with non-state public authorities either directly or indirectly in areas of programming?			

		Please share document if possible			
--	--	-----------------------------------	--	--	--

## 5. Data Management Plan

Available upon request

## 6. Monitoring & Evaluation Plan

IMPACT Objective	External M&E Indicator	Internal M&E Indicator	Focal point	Tool	Will indicator be tracked?
<b>Humanitarian stakeholders are accessing IMPACT products</b>	Number of humanitarian organisations accessing IMPACT services/products  Number of individuals accessing IMPACT services/products	# of downloads of x product from Resource Center	Country request to HQ	User_log	x Yes
		# of downloads of x product from Relief Web	Country request to HQ		X Yes
		# of downloads of x product from Country level platforms	Country team		□ Yes
		# of page clicks on x product from REACH global newsletter	Country request to HQ		□ Yes
		# of page clicks on x product from country newsletter, sendingBlue, bit.ly	Country team		□ Yes
		# of visits to x webmap/x dashboard	Country request to HQ		x Yes
<b>IMPACT activities contribute to better program implementation and coordination of the humanitarian response</b>	Number of humanitarian organisations utilizing IMPACT services/products	# references in HPC documents (HNO, SRP, Flash appeals, Cluster/sector strategies)	Country team	Reference_log	<i>Findings to be presented in the Global Alliance for Urban Crisis Workshop</i>
		# references in single agency documents			
<b>Humanitarian stakeholders are using IMPACT products</b>	Humanitarian actors use IMPACT evidence/products as a basis for decision making,	Perceived relevance of IMPACT country-programs	Country team	Usage_Feed back and Usage_Survey template	<i>The findings will be presented at the Global Alliance for Urban Crisis Workshop, targeting donors and implementing partners</i>

	aid planning and delivery	Perceived usefulness and influence of IMPACT outputs			
	Number of humanitarian documents (HNO, HRP, cluster/agency strategic plans, etc.) directly informed by IMPACT products	Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs			
		Perceived capacity of IMPACT staff			
		Perceived quality of outputs/programs			
		Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs			
<b>Humanitarian stakeholders are engaged in IMPACT programs throughout the research cycle</b>	Number and/or percentage of humanitarian organizations directly contributing to IMPACT programs ( <i>providing resources, participating to presentations, etc.</i> )	# of organisations providing resources (i.e.staff, vehicles, meeting space, budget, etc.) for activity implementation	Country team	Engagement _log	x Yes
		# of organisations/clusters inputting in research design and joint analysis			x Yes
		# of organisations/clusters attending briefings on findings;			x Yes

# A note on public authority, legitimacy and legitimacy making for PALM project partners

Dolf te Lintelo, Amy Baggott (IDS)  
8 March 2019

## Contents

What is (public) authority? Who exercises it? .....	8
Legitimacy and public authority .....	9
From legitimacy to legitimacy-making .....	12
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>15</b>

### What is (public) authority? Who exercises it?

‘By authority is meant an instance of power which seeks at least a minimum of voluntary compliance and thus is legitimated in some way’ (Lund, 2006a, p. 678). The element of public refers to two associated elements: impersonal administrative operations, and confrontations, discussions and action that are ‘not secret’.

Much of the literature on public authority and related conceptualizations originates from studying fragile settings in Africa. However, these are increasingly found to have good purchase to study the political dynamics between state and non-state actors in other geographical contexts, from insurgency politics in Sri Lanka (Frerks and Terpstra, 2018), to land claims (van Kerkhove, add) and urban street vendors in India (te Lintelo, 2017), urban informal settlements in Bangladesh (Suykens, 2015) and urban Palestinian camps in Lebanon (Stel, 2016; Yassin et al., 2016).

Most authors recognize that authority is not something that one either has or has not. The capacity to wield authority waxes and wanes because it is contested. Public authority hence needs to be re-asserted on an everyday basis to maintain its potency.

The state is not the single analytical entity exercising authority; it is exercised by potentially a wide range of actors and institutions, formal or informal. Examples include non-state armed actors, including guerrilla formations, paramilitaries, militias and even criminal mafias (Stepputat, 2018); gangs offering or imposing protection in urban slums; chiefs and other traditional authorities and clan elders in lineage systems; customary and magistrates courts and dispute resolution bodies, recognized and unrecognized; community policing bodies; secret societies; women’s associations and young men’s groups; churches, mosques, religious brotherhoods and enforcers of religious morality (Bagayoko et al., 2016); and others. Lund (2006b, p. 676) looks at ‘the blurred boundary between state and non-state’ to note that institutions or groups of actors — such as mayors, district chief executives, district commissioners, magistrates, chiefs, ‘strong-men’, and professional associations, societies, parties, home town and youth associations, churches, revolutionary defense committees, development projects, and so forth — all take an active interest in local politics and the shaping of governance, and in defining and enforcing collectively-binding decisions and rules. Various authors consider the role of humanitarian and development agencies as exercising public authority, with the refugee camps as an archetypal setting (Turner, 2005, in Hansen and Stepputat).

The literature locates the proliferation of diverse institutions exercising public authority against the backdrop of two major trends. Firstly, the withdrawal of the state, through globalization, neoliberal policies of privatization, and decentralization on the one hand, and on the other hand, the involuntary withdrawal, collapse and failure of states in other, often fragile contexts.

The boundaries of which organizations and collectives can be deemed to exercise public authority and which do not, are however quite under-defined. Some authors underline the actual and prospective use of violence as being foundational to public authority (Hansen, 2018; Hansen and Stepputat, 2005, 2001; Stepputat, 2018).

One prominent way in which wielders of authority are conceptualized is as (formal and informal) institutions. Lund (2006a) articulates 'twilight institutions', whose capacity to exercise public authority varies, and who operate in the twilight between state and society, between public and private. However, this approach is located in a wider family of concepts, which emphasize the contingent, constructed and contested nature of governance, security and public authority (Bagayoko et al., 2016, p. 6). Other related conceptualizations include the notion of 'real governance' (de Sardan), 'negotiated states' (Menkhaus), 'mediated states' and 'institutional multiplicity', 'governscapes' (Stepputat, 2018) and hybrid political orders (Boege).

The notion of **hybridity** underlines the complex and shifting interrelations and interactions amongst formal and informal institutions at multiple sites where authority and governance is negotiated and enacted (Bagayoko et al., 2016). A useful stylized approach to analyzing the nature of interactions between formal and informal institutions is proposed by Helmke and Levitsky (year): '(1) as complementary, with informal institutions reinforcing formal institutions to achieve shared goals; (2) as mutually accommodating, with informal institutions diverging from formal institutions without necessarily undermining them; (3) as competing, when informal institutions not only diverge from formal ones, but also undermine them; (4) as substituting, when informal institutions fill in for absent or ineffective formal institutions, by doing what the latter should have been doing—for instance when non-state actors provide public goods, including health, education, justice and security in place of an absent or under-achieving state' (Bagayoko et al, 2016, add page)

Informal institutions thus continually mix with and negotiate a relationship with formal institutions. This blurring of boundaries is perhaps at its most expansive in the security sector in a number of African states. Here 'the boundaries between state and non-state security institutions have eroded to the point where they have become almost indistinguishable and their personnel are virtually interchangeable' (Bagayoko et al, 2016).

Lund shows that this mixing of institutions involves two dynamic countervailing processes. Whereas institutions of public authority seek to increase predictability and coherence of the decisions made by regularization and formalization, simultaneously, people reinterpret or manipulate rules to generate a measure of unpredictability, informalisation, inconsistency, paradox and ambiguity, and institutional incongruence. Both types of processes are generally at work simultaneously (Lund, 2006c, p. 699). Accordingly, in African fragile settings, we witness both an informalisation of the state, as well as political elites' capture and instrumental use of the formal aspects of the state to influence and shape the behavior of informal institutions (Bagayoko et al., 2016). Consequently, 'there is no neat dichotomy of formal/government on the one hand, and informal/non-government on the other. Reality is messier' (Lund, 2006c, p. 699).

#### Legitimacy and public authority

Legitimacy is a crucial aspect of all power relations. Without legitimacy, power is exerted through coercion; with legitimacy, power can be exerted through voluntary or quasi-voluntary compliance. Quasi-voluntary compliance involves a willingness to comply but backed up by coercion, particularly coercion that ensures that others will obey the law (Levi & Sacks, 2009, in McCullough, 2015, p.3).

Max Weber (1958) has been particularly influential in conceptualizing legitimacy. He argued that legitimacy was the decisive element which differentiated between mere power and political authority. The legitimacy of a ruling group/ruler was based on the population's sense of obligation to submit to its order, not out of fear but out of willingness. He thus described *legitimitätsglaube*-the belief in legitimacy- as the defining feature of legitimacy itself.

Weber outlined three types of legitimacy. The first, traditional legitimacy, includes monarchy and tribalism and describes authority which is claimed on the basis of historical precedent and societal custom. The second, charismatic legitimacy, is based on the appeal and ideas of a popular leader who can win over the 'hearts and minds' of the people to encourage them to submit to his or her rule. Finally, rational-legal legitimacy is based on a system of formalized institutional procedure and bureaucracy whereby authority is claimed by following a set of rules.

Legitimacy is commonly conceptualized using a normative or empirical approach. The normative approach assesses legitimacy through a set of 'right standards' whilst the empirical approach focuses on the perceptions and acts of consent between the subordinates in society and those with power (Podder, 2017, p.687). The normative approach to legitimacy describes the concept of political legitimacy as it 'ought to be' whilst an empirical approach describes it as it 'is' (Netelenbos (2016, pp.4-5). Similarly, Beetham (1991, p.6) described the normative approach as the domain of the moral or political philosopher, arguing that the social scientist should take an empirical approach, conceptualizing legitimacy in a way applicable to any social context, not just the ideal one.

Weber claimed that the development of states would inevitably involve a transition from informal, traditional or charismatic forms of authority to the establishment of the 'ideal type' - formal, rational-legal authority. Although Weber advocated for legitimacy to be understood empirically, his rational-legal ideal type has powerfully charged thinking in international development circles. Interventions in fragile, conflict and post-conflict settings have until quite recently been predominantly guided by normative models of legitimacy, judging state legitimacy through the lens of the modern, Western model (OECD, 2010). This led to an emphasis on building and supporting state institutions, aiming to promote good governance, human rights, rule of law, democratic values, and liberal theories of justice (Netelenbos, 2016) (Podder, 2017).

Normative definitions often deem states illegitimate if they are non-democratic or have imperfect or exclusionary democracies, despite this being a reality for many functioning, stable states (Kane and Patapan, 2010, p. 598). Moreover, these definitions typically fail to pay attention to traditional, local authorities and non-state actors in local governance (OECD, 2010). Simultaneously, such approaches judged the legitimacy of local forms of authority by normative international standards, divorced from context, unrelated to local norms and beliefs, and potential popular support. Consequently, non-state, armed groups are considered inherently unlawful and so their claims to legitimacy, despite their role in underpinning (part of) their power, frequently go unanalysed (Podder, 2017, p.686) (Schneckener and Schlichte, 2015). In sum, normative approaches to legitimacy are at risk of having little practical relevance, when they refuse to engage with the reality of the relationships between rulers and ruled in many contexts around the world (Williams et al., 2016).

McCullough (2015, p. 3) explains the difference between the normative and empirical approach as a difference in who is considered able to judge legitimacy. Under the normative approach an outside evaluator can form the judgement based on their own established values, whereas the empirical approach focuses on the judgement formed by the population over which an actor exerts authority.

Williams et al. (2016, p.1) hence note that empirical definitions also intrinsically entail normative dimensions, as subordinates to a power will consider it legitimate when they have reason to believe it rests on rightful authority and that its actions are justifiable based on accepted principles. For that reason, Schneckener and Schlichte (2015) claim that legitimacy is 'a descriptive concept about normative judgements, but it is not itself a normative concept', unlike in the more normative conceptualisations of legitimacy discussed above. An authority that is considered legitimate in the eyes of its people will not necessarily meet a globally accepted conception of normative legitimacy, while a power which can be rationally considered normatively legitimate may not necessarily be considered legitimate by its subordinates (Williams et al., 2016, p. 1). Stepputat (2018, p. 400) thus notes that "we should look more carefully at the norms that emerge in the accommodations between what is and what ought to be in the international order".

Kane and Patapan (2010) argue that rigid adoption of a normative approach carries the risk of moral absolutism, conversely, the empirical approach may lead to relativism (anything goes), and the emptying legitimacy of moral content.

Many contemporary theoretical approaches to legitimacy have involved attempts to find a middle-ground between an understanding that is entirely normative or entirely empirical. David Beetham's (1991) influential contribution to the



legitimacy debate, claimed that power is legitimate when it is obtained and exercised according to established rules based on shared beliefs amongst those governed. Beetham (1991) outlined three, qualitatively distinct elements of legitimacy. The first was a conformity to established rules; the second was the justification of these rules based on beliefs shared by both dominant and subordinate groups and the third was evidence of the subordinate groups consenting to the authority. Kane and Patapan (2010) argue that the defining feature of legitimacy is justice, in the Aristotelian sense of giving each member of society 'their proper due.' A just authority would not jeopardise 'consent' 'stability' and 'the common good'.

The idea that legitimacy is based on categorisable elements, but that these elements can be expressed differently in different societies and times, is one used in many of the approaches.

Bruce Gilley (2009) gave three categories for legitimacy- legality, justification and consent- with an understanding that these were subjective terms. Based on these principles, his empirical study of legitimacy in 72 states concluded that countries with governments which differ from the Western, liberal ideal- such as Egypt and China- could still be considered highly legitimate.

McCullough (2015) claims that 'there is still little agreement on what the specific regulative content of the principles of legitimacy.' Establishing the principles of legitimacy is very dependent on whether a normative or empirical approach is taken. Regardless, several aspects are worth mentioning: legality, consent, the common good, moral validity/rightfulness; references to the common good; representation; and output.

Originally, legitimacy meant having the legal right to rule (Kane and Patapan, 2010, p.590). Beetham (1991) and Gilley (2009) both explicitly mention '**legality**' as a fundamental component of legitimacy. In short, the law provides 'the authority to authorise' (Hansen and Stepputat, 2001)

The idea that '**consent**' is integral to legitimacy is widespread (See Alagappa, 1995; Gilley, 2009; Häikiö, 2007, p. 2150; OECD, 2010). Kapidžić (2018, p.128) explains that a lack of consent to rule will undermine legitimacy and require coercive rule, requiring 'a continuous and costly use of violence and intimidation.' Beetham notes that consent contributes to legitimacy in two ways. Firstly, it creates a 'subjectively binding force' creating a normative commitment between the ruled and ruling, and secondly a public declaration of consent, in whatever form it takes, serves as a confirmation of an actor's legitimacy which can be presented as evidence to third parties who are not part of the relationship.

A belief that authority serves the '**common good**' is key to consent. In her study on urban governance, (Häikiö, 2007) finds that the ability for actors, both state and non-state, to justify themselves as serving the common good contributes a crucial part of their legitimacy. Conversely, Gilley (2009, p. 4) goes so far as to say that in societies with significant disagreement about what constitutes the common good, legitimacy is impossible.

A power can only be considered legitimate if it represents the interests of the people under its control (Parkinson, 2003). Democracies institutionalize **representation** through electoral procedures. However, from an empirical perspective there are many ways an actor can be considered representative beyond being elected. McCullough (2015, p. 18) describes how shared tradition, religion, nationality, ethnicity and ideology are all used as a basis for an actor's legitimacy in different contexts around the world. Non-state actors frequently claim legitimacy on the basis that they alone represent the issues of a marginalized group (Podder 2013, p. 19). In this respect, Lentz (in (Lund, 2006b, p. 693)) notes that powerful groups build legitimacy by referencing tradition, history, claims of autochthony and belonging; and by underlining divisions between the local and non-local. Many institutions of public authority frame their cause and *raison d'être* in terms of space and locale.

Representation also alludes to shared values and shared beliefs as component of legitimacy (e.g. Alagappa (1995); Beetham (1991); Stillman (1974). In both empirical and normative conceptualisations of legitimacy does **moral validity** play an extremely important role. As Crook (1987, p. 553) described, 'legitimacy is commonly defined as the moralization of political authority.' Likewise, Schneckener and Schlichte (2015, p.413) define legitimacy as 'the belief in the justification or the moral validity of a political organization and its activities.' For the political or moral philosopher, legitimacy can be judged according to rationally defensible ethical principles such as 'justice' and 'rightfulness' (Beetham, 1991, p.5). This does not mean morality is not a key element of most empirical definitions, however. The difference is that from an empirical perspective, an authority is judged from the perspective of those it claims power over, not an outside evaluator. According to Suchman, legitimacy is 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, p. 574).’ Similarly, Alagappa (1995, p.2) wrote, ‘the legitimation of power relies on the conviction of the governed that their government (whether democratic, monarchic, communist, theocratic, or authoritarian) is morally right, and they are duty-bound to obey it.’ Beetham (1991) described legality as ‘the rules of the game,’ explaining it does not just encompass constitutional laws, but also non-legislative regulations and even social convention. The OECD (2010, p.25) explain how input legitimacy entails not just legally enforceable formal rules, as is usually the case in modern, Western states, but also customary law and practice.

A last aspect of legitimacy to note concerns **output**, or performative legitimacy: ‘the performance, effectiveness and quality of services and goods that the state delivers’ (OECD, 2010, p.23). While at times the literature prefers to make a distinction between legitimacy and effectiveness (Alagappa, 1995, p. 22; Boedeltje et al., 2004, p. 6), many authors do link the two concepts. McCullough (2015) notes the inconclusive evidence about the complex relation between effective service delivery and public perceptions of legitimacy. Legitimacy is affected by expectations of what services the state should provide, subjective assessments of impartiality and distributive justice, the ease of attributing performance to the state, and the characteristics of particular services. Better service delivery through state channels will thus not necessarily increase the perceived legitimacy of the state.

### From legitimacy to legitimacy-making

Anthropological investigations have made significant contributions to the empirical approach to legitimacy, to show that what is legitimate varies between and within cultures and over time. A central starting point for the investigation of legitimacy-making is hence the notion that legitimacy is not a fixed absolute quality against which actual conduct could be measured. Instead, it is more fruitful to investigate the processes through which various actors and institutions attempt to legitimate actions (Lund, 2006c, p. 693).

The anthropological literature notes that legitimacy needs to be continually produced and reproduced and is an outcome of contestation, struggle and negotiation.

Legitimate authority must be vindicated and legitimated through a broad array of political practices, and through actions, language, symbols and signs (Hansen and Stepputat, 2001). Authority is contested at particular points in time through interactions between traditional, personal, kin-based or clientelistic logics interact with modern, imported, rational actor and other logics (Bagayoko et al., 2016). Accordingly, ‘the political practices that constitute public authority are played out on several different registers, ranging from the use of subtle idioms to more heavy handed means—often in paradoxical conjunction’ (Lund, 2006c, p. 690).

Not only does an institution have to be legitimate to exercise authority, the actual exercise of authority itself involves a specific claim to legitimacy (Lund, 2006c, p. 693). Conversely, ‘when an institution authorizes, sanctions or validates certain rights, the respect or observance of these rights by people, powerful in clout or numbers, simultaneously constitutes recognition of the authority of that particular institution’ (Lund, 2006a, p. 675).

Legitimacy is generated by non-state institutions and actors by referencing the *idea* of the state, and by mimicking attributes and practices of the state, being one of the most powerful forms of political organization. Lund, following Abrams (Abrams, 1977)() and Blom Hansen and Stepputat (2001), offers the critical distinction between the idea of the state, and the state institutions. Lund (2006a, p. 676) thus posits that ‘no institution is state as such; ‘state’ is, rather, the quality of an institution being able to define and enforce collectively binding decisions on members of society.’ Hence, while we tend to reserve state qualities for government institutions, the idea of the state informs the organizing practices of everyday politics by state and non-state institutions. A range of other institutions attempt to exercise authority by alluding to state, law and the bureaucracy, adopting official language and the paraphernalia of modern statehood (Lund, 2006a, p. 677). Thus, many of ‘the faculties, symbols and governmental technologies traditionally associated with the state—from flags and uniforms to systems of taxation, civil registers and public services, all of which have circulated between states—are spreading well beyond state institutions’ (Stepputat, 2018, p. 400). This is what Blom Hansen and Stepputat (2001) have called **stateness**. The competing for public authority can then paradoxically involve for non-state institutions an ambiguous process of both ‘being and opposing the state’ (Lund, 2006c, p. 689). Indeed, particularly in areas where the state has a limited presence,

including in urban areas, hybrid governance is likely to occur (Frerks et al. (2017)(Schuberth's (2018). Stepputat (2018, p. 400) thus notes where many of today's peacebuilding programmes unfold, sub-, trans- and supranational forms of authority challenge or complement the authority of the central state while projecting images of stateness.

Blom Hansen and Stepputat (2001) identify two key aspects that must combine to forge a 'state': on the one hand, exercising authority entails the conduct of core functions ('languages of governance'):

- Exercising territorial sovereignty through a monopoly on violence. This takes the shape of for instance policing, provision of security, provision of justice
- Gathering and controlling knowledge about the population in such territories
- Generating resources, managing economies and supporting wellbeing of inhabitants
  - E.g. provision of essential services (health, education, housing, etc)

On the other hand, the authors identify three ways in which states exercise authoritative power ('languages of authority'):

- The institutionalization of law and legal discourse, providing the state with the authority to authorise, and to express itself in an authoritative manner
- The materialization of the state through a series of permanent signs and signals: buildings, monuments, letterheads, road signs, fences, uniforms and other material expression of the state
- The inscribing of a (national) history and a shared community onto landscapes and cultural practices

In the table 1 below, we set out a list of non-exhaustive examples of these 'languages of authority' (Hansen and Stepputat, 2005, 2001, Lund, 2006c, 2006b).

**Table: Examples of discursive, material and symbolic 'languages of authority'**

Discursive	Materiality	Symbols
Speech	Fences	Rituals
Slogans	Security patrols	Leadership cults
Propaganda	Checkpoints	Folklore
Writings	Taxation	Songs
Media campaigns	Administrative offices	Emblems
Educational materials, curricula	Deeds, contracts	Notion of the motherland
	Stamps	Flags
Mobilizing support from diasporic or transnational religious communities	Stationary, letter headed paper	Banners
Law	Cartographies/maps	Graffiti
	Architecture	Signs
	Monuments	Parades, marches
	Hierarchies of rank	National bird, flower, tree

	Bureaucratic procedures	Systems of etiquette, including social hierarchies
	Policing territorial boundaries	Martyrdom
	Authorizing marriages and births, issue death certificates	rules of reciprocity: normative and transactional basis for solidarity
	Establishing 'diplomatic relations' with international organizations	

Examples drawn from: Stepputat 2018; Lund, 2006a,b; Bagayoko et al, 2016;

## Bibliography

- Abrams, P., 1977. Notes on the Difficulty of Studying the State (1977). *Journal of Historical Sociology* 1, 58–89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6443.1988.tb00004.x>
- Alagappa, M., 1995. *Political Legitimacy in Southeast Asia: The Quest for Moral Authority*. Stanford University Press.
- Bagayoko, N., Hutchful, E., Luckham, R., 2016. Hybrid security governance in Africa: rethinking the foundations of security, justice and legitimate public authority. *Conflict, Security & Development* 16, 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14678802.2016.1136137>
- Beetham, D., 1991. *The Legitimation of Power*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Boedeltje, M., Cornips, J., Netherlands Institute for Government (NIG), 2004. Input and output legitimacy in interactive governance. NIG Annual Work Conference, Rotterdam.
- Crook, R.C., 1987. Legitimacy, Authority and the Transfer of Power in Ghana. *Political Studies* 35, 552–572. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1987.tb00205.x>
- Frerks, G., Terpstra, N., 2017. Rebel Governance and Legitimacy: Understanding the Impact of Rebel Legitimation on Civilian Compliance with the LTTE Rule AU - Terpstra, Niels. *Civil Wars* 19, 279–307. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698249.2017.1393265>
- Frerks, G., Terpstra, N., Kasfir, N., 2017. Introduction: Armed Groups and Multi-layered Governance. *Civil Wars* 19, 257–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698249.2017.1419611>
- Gilley, B., 2009. *The Right to Rule: How States Win and Lose Legitimacy*. Columbia University Press.
- Häikiö, L., 2007. Expertise, representation and the common good: Grounds for legitimacy in the urban governance network. *Urban Studies* 44, 2147–2162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980701518982>
- Hansen, T.B., 2018. Whose Public, Whose Authority? Reflections on the moral force of violence. *Modern Asian Studies* 52, 1076–1087. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0026749X17000282>
- Hansen, T.B., Stepputat, F., 2005. Introduction, in: *Sovereign Bodies: Citizens, Migrants, and States in the Postcolonial World*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 1–36.
- Hansen, T.B., Stepputat, F. (Eds.), 2001. *States of imagination: ethnographic explorations of the postcolonial state, Politics, History and Culture*. Duke University Press, Durham, N.C.
- Kane, J., Patapan, H., 2010. Recovering justice: Political legitimacy reconsidered. *Politics and Policy* 38, 589–610. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-1346.2010.00250.x>
- Kapidžić, D., 2018. Public authority beyond hybrid governance: creating throughput legitimacy in Northern Uganda. *Peacebuilding* 6, 127–143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21647259.2018.1449187>
- Lund, C., 2006a. Twilight Institutions: An Introduction. *Development and Change* 37, 673–684. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2006.00496.x>
- Lund, C., 2006b. Twilight Institutions: An Introduction. *Development and Change* 37, 673–684. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2006.00496.x>

- Lund, C., 2006c. Twilight Institutions: Public Authority and Local Politics in Africa. *Development and Change* 37, 685–705. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2006.00497.x>
- McCullough, A., 2015. The legitimacy of states and armed non-state actors (Topic Guide). Governance and Social Development Resource Centre (GSDRC).
- Netelenbos, B., 2016. *Political Legitimacy beyond Weber: An Analytical Framework*. Springer.
- OECD, 2010. *The State's Legitimacy in Fragile Situations, Conflict and Fragility*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264083882-en>
- Parkinson, J., 2003. Legitimacy Problems in Deliberative Democracy. *Political Studies* 51, 180–196. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.00419>
- Podder, S., 2017. Understanding the Legitimacy of Armed Groups: A Relational Perspective. *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 28, 686–708. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09592318.2017.1322333>
- Schneckener, U., Schlichte, K., 2015. Armed Groups and the Politics of Legitimacy. *Civil Wars* 17, 409–424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698249.2015.1115573>
- Schuberth, M., 2018. Hybrid security governance, post-election violence and the legitimacy of community-based armed groups in urban Kenya. *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 12, 386–404. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17531055.2018.1457277>
- Stel, N., 2016. Languages of Stateness in South Lebanon's Palestinian Gatherings: The PLO's Popular Committees as Twilight Institutions. *Development and Change* 47, 446–471. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12232>
- Stepputat, F., 2018. Pragmatic peace in emerging governscapes. *International Affairs* 94, 399–416. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iix233>
- Stillman, P.G., 1974. The Concept of Legitimacy. *Polity* 7, 32–56.
- Suykens, B., 2015. The Land that Disappeared: Forceful Occupation, Disputes and the Negotiation of Landlord Power in a Bangladeshi Baste. *Development and Change* 46, 486–507. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12165>
- te Lintelo, D.J.H., 2017. Enrolling a goddess for Delhi's street vendors: The micro-politics of policy implementation shaping urban (in)formality. *Geoforum* 84, 77–87.
- Weber, M., 1958. *The three types of legitimate rule*. Berkeley Publications in Society and Institutions 4.
- Williams, M.S., Chan, J., Shin, D.C., 2016. Political Legitimacy in East Asia: Bridging Normative and Empirical Analysis, in: *East Asian Perspectives on Political Legitimacy: Bridging the Empirical-Normative Divide*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316466896.002>
- Yassin, N., Stel, N., Rassi, R., 2016. Organized Chaos: Informal Institution Building among Palestinian Refugees in the Maashouk Gathering in South Lebanon. *JOURNAL OF REFUGEE STUDIES* 29, 341–362. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/few016>

## ANNEX 2: RESEARCH QUESTION MATRIX

	Research Question		Sub-research question	Research method	Questionnaire Section	Indicator
A	Through what practices and processes do public authorities in urban Jordan and Lebanon seek to gain and maintain legitimacy?	1	What is the perception of Jordanians and refugees of public authority in rural, peri urban and urban settings of Jordan?	Secondary data analysis of USAID Community Engagement Project, Endline Evaluation, April 2018	Perception of respondents towards municipal/government services in the community	<p>To what extent are you satisfied with the following in your community:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Solid waste management</li> <li>Water supply service</li> <li>Sanitation services</li> <li>Street Lighting</li> <li>Road building and maintenance</li> <li>Government Health services</li> <li>Transportation</li> </ul> <p>To what degree does the municipality respond to citizen needs in our community</p>



				Secondary data analysis of USAID CITIES: Implementing Transparent, Innovative and Effective Solutions, Jordan, Baseline Study Report, February 2018	Perception of respondents on municipal capacities in resolving problems	How able has the municipality been to resolve problems in the following areas over the past year:- Maintenance of streets Cleanliness of public spaces Solid waste management Street lighting Livelihoods/development projects Sanitation services Issuing permits and statements
					Communication with municipalities	What is the most commonly used method/channel by members of your community to communicate with the municipality:- Regular meetings Social Media Visit to the municipality Community leaders Local council members Personal relations

				Secondary data analysis of Jordan Emergency Services and Social Resilience Project (ESSRP), Project evaluation Report, December 2017	Community Outreach: respondents coping mechanisms	During the last 6 months, how many times did your household have to employ one of the following strategies to cope with community related issues:- Complained to the community leader Complained to the religious leader Complained to local organizations/NGOs Complained to media
B	In what ways, and why, have public authorities attempted to manage social relations between refugees and hosts , with what stability, human security and wellbeing outcomes?	1	What are the perceptions of Jordanians and refugees on municipal authorities, safety and security and wellbeing in Jordan?	Secondary data analysis of USAID Community Engagement Project, Endline Evaluation, April 2018	Perception of respondents towards safety and security	How safe do you feel in your community  During the last 4 years, have any of the following caused you to feel unsafe in your community:- Lack of respect by citizens for the rule of law Poor enforcement of the rule of law Lack of social justice Increased unemployment Syrian refugee influx

					perception of respondents towards social welfare	<p>How strong is your relationship with the following groups:-  Immediate family  Extended family  Members of your tribe  neighbors  District elected officials  Municipal Council members</p> <p>Do What degree do you trust the following groups:-  Immediate family  Extended family  Members of your tribe  neighbors  District elected officials  Municipal Council members</p>
		2	How have public authorities sought to manage social relations between refugees and the communities	Key Informant interviews with Public authorities in Amman and Irbid	Tool to be designed; Key themes identified are:- What are the key activities that you are responsible for in the community? What are the major challenges you face in	

					<p>terms of delivery of services?</p> <p>What are the resources required to mitigate the challenges faced?</p> <p>What is your perception of refugees in your community? Do you feel there are issues around social cohesion?</p> <p>What measure have you taken to reduce the tensions in your community, how effective have they been?</p> <p>Who do you perceive to be the most effective actor in resolving issues of community tension?</p>	
		3	What are the perceptions of	Secondary data analysis	Perception of respondents on	Did you participate in the last municipal elections

			Jordanians and refugees on government response to citizen needs?	of USAID Community Engagement Project, Endline Evaluation, April 2018	government responses to citizen needs	To what degree does the municipality respond to citizen needs in our community Municipal council members Parliament members Mayor Directorate of Health Directorate of Education Directorate of Police
		4	What are Jordanian perceptions on the effects of the Syrian refugee crisis in their community?	Secondary data analysis of USAID Community Engagement Project, Endline Evaluation, April 2018	Jordanians perceptions of the Syrian Refugee Crisis	Since the onset of the Syrian Crisis, as Syrians have come to Jordan to seek refuge, has this affected the following in the community:- Job security Quality of medical treatment Quality of education Your family and neighborhood security
	What assumptions do agencies in the urban humanitarian/development nexus take regarding the role of public authorities in urban governance processes?	1	To what extent do donors/agencies consider the importance of inclusive political processes and legal structures in	Directed Literature Review		

			perceptions of state legitimacy? Has there been an evolution of programming strategies over time?			
C		2	How do these assumptions manifest in donor strategies, proposal calls, programming etc.?	Directed Literature Review		
		3	To what extent are state and non-state public authorities factored into donor priority setting and programming? In particular, how are local legitimization processes factored into donor interventions around legitimate urban governance and stability?	Directed Literature Review		
				KIIs with donors	Annex 4	

		4	Do donors/agencies engage with state and non-state public authorities and if so, how?	Directed Literature Review		
				KIIs with donors	Annex 4	



## INTRODUCTION المقدمة

## A. Facilitator's welcome, introduction and instructions to participant [5 minutes]

## A. ترحيب الميسر والمقدمة والتعليمات المشاركين [5 دقائق]

Introduce interviewer, introduce PALM –

أعرف عن نفسي وعن مشروع ال PALM –

Thank respondent for her/his time –

[] أشكر الشخص المقابل (المستجيب) على وقته / وقتها –

This discussion will help inform a wider assessment we are conducting in collaboration with IDS (Institute of Development Studies), ACTED, Occlude. - Share the project summary with respondents (Arabic or English) –

[] ستساعد هذه المناقشة في إثراء تقييم أوسع نقوم به بالتعاون مع IDS (معهد دراسات التنمية) و ACTED و Occlude مبظمة مشاركه بالدراسه بلبنان – سنقوم بمشاركة ملخص المشروع مع المستجيبين (العربية أو الإنجليزية)

This discussion is part of a study to understand how public authority is exercised in low-income urban areas in both Lebanon and Jordan and with what effects on residents' wellbeing. This discussion will help point us toward the people and the organizations that are most important to your neighbourhood, and how they maintain relationships of trust with residents, so we can interview them later. –

[] هذه المناقشة هي جزء من دراسة لفهم كيفية ممارسة السلطة العامة في المناطق الحضرية المنخفضة الدخل في كل من لبنان والأردن وما هي الآثار على رفاهية السكان. ستساعد هذه المناقشة في توجيهنا نحو الأشخاص والمنظمات الأكثر أهمية في منطقتك ، وكيفية الحفاظ على علاقات الثقة مع السكان ، حتى نتمكن من إجراء مقابلات معهم لاحقاً.

Explain what we mean by public authorities and their various forms –

[] اشرح ما نعنيه بالسلطات العامة وأشكالها المختلفة –

**Anonymity:** I would like to assure you that all that is said as part of this discussion will be as confidential and we will anonymize the speakers in our research reports and databases, such that no-one can relate any comments made to specific people that participate in the interviews. If there are any questions or discussions that you do not wish to answer or participate in, you do not have to do so; however please try to answer and be as involved as possible. –

[] عدم الكشف عن هويته: أود أن أؤكد لكم أن كل ما يقال كجزء من هذه المناقشة سيكون سرياً وسنعمل على إخفاء هوية المتحدثين في تقاريرنا البحثية وقواعد البيانات ، بحيث لا يمكن لأحد أن يربط أي تعليقات لأشخاص محددين المشاركة في المقابلات. إذا كان هناك أي أسئلة أو مناقشات لا ترغب في الإجابة عليها أو المشاركة فيها ، فلا يتعين عليك القيام بذلك ؛ ومع ذلك ، يرجى محاولة الإجابة والمشاركة قدر الإمكان.

May I tape the discussion to facilitate its recollection? (if yes, switch on the recorder and record explicit consent) –

[] –

–

– هل يمكنني أن أسجل المناقشة لتسهيل تذكرها؟ (إذا كانت الإجابة بنعم ، فقم بتشغيل المسجل وتسجيل الموافقة الصريحة)

The discussion will take no more than 1-1.5 hours

لن تستغرق المناقشة أكثر من 1-1.5 ساعة

## **.B Objectives**

### **.B الأهداف**

The overarching objective of the interview is to improve understanding of the ways in which, and why, public authorities have attempted to manage peaceful social relations between refugees and host community in this urban neighbourhood.

We wish to understand what the outcomes have been for the wellbeing and human security of host groups and refugees.

الهدف الأسمى للمقابلة هو تحسين فهم الطرق التي حاولت السلطات العامة إدارة العلاقات الاجتماعية السلمية بين اللاجئين والمجتمع المضيف في هذا الحي الحضري ، ولماذا؟. نود أن نفهم النتائج التي تم تحقيقها من أجل رفاهية وأمن الإنسان للمجموعات المضيفة واللاجئين.

## **.C KII GUIDE**

### **.C دليل مقابلة المعرف الرئيسي**

#### **.1 BASIC INFORMATION**

1.1 Neighborhood

1.2 Organization

1.3 Position/Function

1.4 What are the services/ aid provided by you/ your organization? Who are your target beneficiaries?

ما هي الخدمات / المساعدات المقدمة عن طريقك/ مؤسستك؟ من هم المستفيدون المستهدفون؟.

#### **1. المعلومات الأساسية**

1.1 الحي

1.2 الاسم

1.3 المنظمة

1.4 المنصب / الوظيفة

#### **.2 Neighborhood information**

##### **2. معلومات الحي**

2.1 Can you tell me about the neighbourhood, in general: how would you describe it to someone who has never been here? In what ways has it seen any change in the past 5 years?

2.1 بشكل عام، هل يمكن أن تخبرني عن الحي: كيف تصفه لشخص لم يسبق له أن أتى هنا؟ بأي طرق شهدت أي تغيير في السنوات الأخيرة؟

2.2 What are the major communities in the area? [probes: Refugees, specific tribes, Palestinians etc.]

2.2 ما هي المجتمعات الرئيسية في المنطقة؟ [تحقيقات: اللاجئين ، القبائل المحددة ، الفلسطينيين ، إلخ.]

2.3 Who are the most influential people or organizations shaping important aspects of public life in the neighbourhood? Are they in any way setting rules and make decisions for the community? Of what kind?

2.3 من هم الأشخاص أو المنظمات الأكثر نفوذاً الذين يشكلون جوانب مهمة من الحياة العامة في الحي؟ هل يضعون القواعد بأي شكل من الأشكال ويتخذون قرارات للمجتمع؟ من أي نوع؟

2.4 What people and/or organizations mediate conflict within the community

2.4 . من الناس و / أو المنظمات (أو المنظمات الدولية) التي تتوسط في الصراع داخل المجتمع؟

2.5 Are there any grass roots social movements active in the area? On what issues?

2.5 هل هناك أي حركات اجتماعية شعبية تنشط في المنطقة؟ على أي قضايا؟

### 3 . Role of public authorities

#### دور السلطات العامة

3.1 In what ways do people or organizations exercising power and authority in your neighbourhood seek to gain and maintain legitimacy? [probes: ask about these organization: tribal leaders, municipal leaders, cbo's, Islamic charities, NGO's that are very active. To explain legitimacy: how do public authorities seek to gain the trust of the community or to reflect the values of the community. Give examples through elections; through providing services; through listening to the people at dawaween; etc.]

3.1 ما هي الطرق التي يسعى بها الأشخاص أو المنظمات التي تمارس القوة والسلطة في منطقتك إلى اكتساب الشرعية والحفاظ عليها؟ اسأل عن كل من: زعماء القبائل، قادة البلديات، منظمات المجتمع المدني، الجمعيات الخيرية الإسلامية، المنظمات غير الحكومية النشطة للغاية. لتوضيح معنى الشرعية: كيف تسعى السلطات العامة إلى اكتساب ثقة المجتمع أو لتعكس قيم المجتمع. أعط أمثلة من خلال الانتخابات؛ من خلال تقديم الخدمات؛ من خلال الاستماع إلى الناس في الديوان؛ إلخ.]

3.2 Which groups of people do you want to see you as a legitimate authority?

3.2 أي مجموعات من الناس تريد أن تنظر اليك كسلطة شرعية؟

3.2 How do newcomers in the area (Jordanian or others) get to know about such people and organizations?

3.3 كيف يمكن للوافدين الجدد في المنطقة (أردنيون أو غيرهم) التعرف على هؤلاء الأشخاص والمنظمات؟

3.3 Are there any visual projections of power by local public authorities on the streets, markets or buildings in the neighbourhood? [probes: parades, posters, graffiti, banners, pictures, art objects, etc.] Please give several examples, for each explaining who seeks to assert authority.

3.3 هل هناك أي رموز مرئية للقوة من قبل السلطات العامة المحلية ظاهره في الشوارع أو الأسواق أو المباني في الحي؟ [الملصقات، الكتابة على الجدران، اللافتات، الصور، التحف الفنية، إلخ.] يرجى تقديم عدة أمثلة لكل تفسير ممن يسعى إلى تأكيد السلطة.

3.4 Do local or international organizations/donors, seeking to implement, or implementing humanitarian projects in the area, take advice from local public authorities? Do you think this is important in terms of success of the projects, and if so, why?

3.4 هل تأخذ المنظمات / الجهات المانحة المحلية أو الدولية، التي تسعى إلى تنفيذ أو تنفيذ مشاريع إنسانية في المنطقة، مشورة من السلطات العامة المحلية؟ هل تعتقد أن هذا مهم من حيث نجاح المشروعات، وإذا كان الأمر كذلك، فلماذا؟

3.5 What do you think are the key strengths of PAs in the area? Are there also weaknesses or areas of concern? [interviewer can summarize what has been said in terms of PAs in the area so far]

3.5 ما هي برأيك نقاط القوة الرئيسية للسلطات العامة في المنطقة؟ هل هناك أيضاً نقاط ضعف أو مجالات للقلق؟ [يمكن للباحث تلخيص ما قيل من حيث السلطات العامة في المنطقة حتى الآن]

3.6. Are there any instances of multiple public authorities competing with one another in his area? Please explain what happened.

3.6 هل هناك أي حالات ؛ تتنافس فيها سلطات عامة متعددة مع بعضها البعض في منطقته؟ يرجى توضيح ما حدث.

3.7. Do you wish to add anything?

3.7 هل ترغب في إضافة أي شيء؟

#### 4. Can you tell me about your Organization?

4. هل من الممكن أن تخبرني عن منظمك؟

4.1 Do you liaise with people and agencies of the local or national government? For what reasons? What are the benefits/challenges of this?

4.2 هل تتواصل مع أشخاص ووكالات الحكومة المحلية أو الوطنية؟ لأي أسباب؟ ما هي فوائد / تحديات هذا؟

4.3 Does your organization consider itself part of the state, or outside the state? And why?

4.3 هل تعتبر مؤسستك نفسها جزءاً من الحكومة أو خارج الحكومة؟ ولماذا؟

4.4 Are you/your organization making efforts to manage peaceful social relations between refugees and hosts? Of what kind? [probes: community outreach, mass communication campaigns, communicating with tribal leaders, forming cooperatives, mutasarif]

4.4 هل تبذل أنت / منظمك جهوداً لإدارة العلاقات الاجتماعية السلمية بين اللاجئين والمضيفين؟ من أي نوع؟ [تحقيقات: التواصل مع المجتمع ، وحملات الاتصال الجماهيري ، والتواصل مع زعماء القبائل ، وتشكيل التعاونيات ، المتصرف]

4.5 Could you tell us what kind of funding allows your organization to provide the services you have explained us about? (Probes: western donors, gulf donors, contributions from local community, Jordanian national contributions, charge for services, Jordanian government, formal taxation, informal taxation)

4.5 هل يمكن أن نخبرنا ما هو نوع التمويل الذي يسمح لمؤسستك بتقديم الخدمات التي قمت بتوضيحها لنا؟ (تحقيقات: المتبرعون الغربيون ، المتبرعون الخليجيون ، مساهمات المجتمع المحلي ، المساهمات الوطنية الأردنية ، رسوم الخدمات ، الحكومة الأردنية ، الضرائب الرسمية ، الضرائب غير الرسمية)

#### 5. Safety, Security and social relations

4. السلامة والأمن والعلاقات الاجتماعية

5.1 How safe and secure do you think your neighborhood is? Do you think there are reasons that may compromise the safety and security of residents? [probes: lack of law enforcement, lack of social justice, Syrian refugee influx, extremism, unemployment, corruption, gun violence, spread of narcotics, armed robbery].

5.1 ما مدى الأمان والأمان في رأيك في منطقتك (حيك)؟ هل تعتقد أن هناك أسباباً قد تهدد سلامة وأمن السكان؟ [تحقيقات: الافتقار إلى تنفيذ القانون ، وعدم العدالة الاجتماعية ، وتدفق اللاجئين السوريين ، والتطرف ، والبطالة ، والفساد ، والعنف المسلح ، وانتشار المخدرات ، والسرقة المسلحة].

5.2 Could you tell us about the nature of the relations between Syrian refugees and Jordanian hosts in this neighbourhood? [prompts: trust, respect, conflicts occurred around what issues]

5.2. هل يمكن أن نخبرنا عن طبيعة العلاقات بين اللاجئين السوريين والمضيفين الأردنيين في هذا الحي؟ [تحقيقات: الثقة، الاحترام، الصراعات وقعت وحدثت حول أي نوع من القضايا]

5.3. Which people or organizations provide safety and security, and conflict mediation services in the neighbourhood? [Probes. Tribal leaders, family meetings, community consultations; mokhtar].

5.3. من هم الأشخاص أو المنظمات الذين يوفرّون السلامة والأمن ، وخدمات الوساطة في النزاعات في الحي؟ [التحقيقات: زعماء القبائل ، اجتماعات الأسرة ، مشاورات المجتمع. المختار].

5.4. What kinds of conflicts are successfully resolved and which are not? Can you give some examples of both [interviewer: record in detail]? How often do you think this occurs here?

5.4. ما هي أنواع الصراعات التي تم حلها بنجاح والتي لم يتم حلها بنجاح؟ هل يمكنك إعطاء بعض الأمثلة لكليهما (مدون الملاحظات والميسر: سجل بالتفصيل)؟ كم عادة برأيك يحدث هذا هنا؟

## 6. Municipal services

### 5. الخدمات البلدية

خلال أعضاء المجلس

6.1. (For municipal members) Are there services that are within the municipal mandate (as defined by municipal law) but are currently not being provided by your municipality? Could you specify where and why these services are not being provided? [Probes: lack of funds for material, lack of capacity, lack of well trained staff]

6.1. (لأعضاء البلدية) هل هناك خدمات تقع ضمن ولاية البلدية (كما هو محدد بموجب القانون البلدي) ولكن لا توفرها حالياً البلدية الخاصة بك؟ هل يمكنك تحديد مكان وسبب عدم تقديم هذه الخدمات؟ [تحقيقات: نقص الأموال المادية ، نقص القدرات ، نقص الموظفين المدربين تدريباً جيداً]

## CONCLUSION

### الخاتمة

- We have now come to the end of our discussion. Thank you for participating. We hope you found it interesting.
- □ لقد وصلنا الآن إلى نهاية مناقشتنا. شكراً لمشاركتك. نأمل أن تكون قد وجدت أنها مثيرة للاهتمام.
- This has been a very successful discussion. Your opinions will be a valuable asset to the study.
- □ لقد كانت هذه مناقشة ناجحة للغاية. آرائكم ستكون رصيذاً قيماً للدراسة.
- I would like to remind you that any comments featuring in this report will be anonymized.
- □ أود أن أذكرك بأنه سيتم إخفاء هويتك عن أي تعليقات تظهر في هذا التقرير.

## ANNEX 4: DONOR KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW TOOL

**PALM Donor Key Informants****Semi-Structured Interview Guide**

---

**INTRODUCTION****Facilitator's welcome, introduction and instructions to key informant [5 minutes]**

1. This discussion will help inform a wider assessment we are conducting in partnership with IDS (Institute of Development Studies).
2. We at REACH Jordan, are currently partnered with the Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, ACTED Lebanon and Occlude, on a research project entitled Public Authority and Legitimacy Making (PALM). This project seeks to contribute to a research program on "Security and Rule of Law" funded by NOW-WOTRO (The Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research; WOTRO Science for Global Development)
3. The project seeks to contribute to understanding what everyday practices bestow legitimacy on state and non-state actors, attempting to exercise public authority in the most fragile urban settings in Lebanon and Jordan. This study investigates how the local urban politics of establishing and maintaining legitimate rule effects host-refugee relations, whether directly or indirectly, to produce human security and wellbeing outcomes. One of our objectives is to analyze the assumptions regarding legitimacy process held by international actors, including donors active in Jordan and Lebanon. It further investigates in what ways international agencies in the humanitarian/development nexus have considered the role of the local legitimation processes in their interventions towards legitimate governance and stability.
4. **Anonymity:** I would like to assure you that this interview will be anonymous, if requested. If there are any questions that you do not wish to answer, you do not have to do so.
5. The interview will take no more than 1-1.5 hours.

**KEY INFORMANT GUIDE****1. Key Informant information**

- 1.1. Organization
- 1.2. Position

**2. Survey of donor involvement with public authorities**

- 2.1. What types of organizations do you prefer to work with as implementing partners in Jordan? (probes: NGOs, INGO's, Royal NGO's, Islamic charities, secular organizations, local government bodies, non-state actors)
- 2.2. Is there a reason you prefer the above mentioned implementing partners to others? What are the benefits to working with them? (Probe: Better access, more efficient processes, strong relationship with community, strong outreach)
- 2.3. Do you provide assistance to non-state organizations in country? If so, what types of organizations do you provide assistance to? (Probes: monetary, capacity building, infrastructure)
- 2.4. Does your organization or implementing partners engage with local public authorities during program design and implementation? If so, How? (probes: Public authorities are the diverse organizations operating at the local level which depend upon the consent of the governed. Frequently they provide services that may otherwise be typically associated with the state, such as security, representation and meeting basic needs. They may be within or outside of the state, compete or collaborate with the state. The edges of the state are often blurred as the state is personalized and informalized by the penetration of public authorities. Examples in Jordan include: municipal councils, **mayors**, **tribal leaders**, parliamentarians,

regional **committees**, community based organizations, NGOs, and **political parties**. Each of these organizations are public authorities to the extent that they make a claim to govern an area of public life, and therefore must produce legitimacy for themselves.)

- 2.5. Are non-state public authorities factored into donor priority setting and programming? (probes: host tribal authorities, refugee tribal authorities, Islamic NGOs, secular NGOs, tribal politicians, party politicians)
- 2.6. Are there some local organizations which have the capacity to engage with donor programming, but who the donor chooses not to work with? Why? (Probe: Hezbollah associated charities, particularist parties, Islamist parties)
- 2.7. What, in your opinion, is the role that non-state public authorities have in low-income areas in managing peaceful social relations between hosts and refugees?? (probes: if the answer is not related to host refugee relations or community engagement, probe them in that direction. Ask them about community perceptions of projects targeted toward refugees.)

### 3. **Donors and local legitimacy-making**

- 3.1. Does your organisation have a policy position on how you deal with non-state public authorities either directly or indirectly in areas of programming? Please share document if possible. (Establish to what extent the donor is involved in programming in urban low-income areas. Ask them about any major programs or projects, In these projects/programmes)
- 3.2. Have you come across situations where the distribution of services or assistance provided (by yourself or implementing partner) has been questioned or challenged by host or refugee populations? On what grounds or on the basis of what values did this happen? Across what cleavages was the distribution challenged (probe: Jordanian-Syrian, tribe to tribe)? How did you or your implementing partner respond?
- 3.3. What lessons can be learned from the ways in which grassroots urban social movements and civil society organisations engage public authorities in Jordan?
- 3.4. If you have funded projects providing capacity building to local actors, such as municipalities, community based organizations and royal NGOs, what existing patterns of legitimacy-making have you (the donor) encountered? (probes: providing employment to members of a powerful tribe, hosting tribal councils or royal visits, elections, claiming a mandate from the king or a ministry, providing services to a favored community, providing efficient, equitable services). How do you respond to/challenge/accommodate this?
- 3.5. In projects advising local partners, if the partner's legitimacy is dependent on exclusive patterns of resource provision, how has the donor responded? For example, some public authorities may depend on providing services through personalized networks, called *wasta*, to maintain legitimacy. (Probe: If and how have your strategies and proposal calls responded to legitimacy making by exclusive service provision.)

### 4. **Donors and state legitimacy-making**

- 4.1. How have donors responded to the transition from normative to more empirically rounded legitimacy thinking towards peace and stability

The key informant portion of this research is accompanied by a literature review of grey literature. We are seeking country specific theories of change, M&E frameworks and Multi-Year Strategies to provide information on donor assumptions regarding public authorities. If you can provide any such documents, they would be a great asset to your study. All documents provided will be processed anonymously and not released under any circumstances.

## CONCLUSION

1. We have now come to the end of the interview. Thank you for participating. We hope you found it interesting



2. This has been a very successful interview. Your contributions will be a valuable asset to the study.
3. I would like to remind you that any comments featuring in this report will be anonymous.