

The Symbiotic Relationship Between Institutions and Governance: A Critical Analysis of Power, Legitimacy, and Democratic Performance

Marc Jacquinet

May 2025

Abstract

This essay examines the intricate relationships between institutions and governance, exploring how formal and informal institutional arrangements shape governmental effectiveness, democratic legitimacy, and policy outcomes. Through a comprehensive analysis of theoretical frameworks, empirical evidence, and comparative case studies, this work demonstrates that institutions serve as both constraining and enabling structures that fundamentally determine the quality of governance. The analysis reveals that while strong institutions can enhance democratic performance and state capacity, institutional design choices reflect underlying power dynamics and can perpetuate inequalities. This investigation contributes to ongoing debates about institutional reform, democratic consolidation, and the optimization of governance systems in diverse political contexts.

Keywords: institutions, governance, democracy, state capacity, institutional design, political economy

1. Introduction

The relationship between institutions and governance constitutes one of the most fundamental questions in political science and public administration. Institutions, broadly defined as "the rules of the game in a society" (North, 1990, p. 3), provide the structural foundation upon which governance systems operate. These formal and informal constraints shape human interaction, determine the distribution of power, and establish the parameters within which political actors make decisions. Understanding this relationship is crucial for comprehending why some governments perform effectively while others fail, why democratic systems consolidate or collapse, and how societies can design institutions to promote better governance outcomes.

The significance of this inquiry extends beyond academic interest. In an era marked by democratic backsliding, institutional fragility, and governance crises across diverse political systems, the need to understand how institutions shape governance has never been more pressing. From the erosion of democratic norms in established democracies to the challenges facing developing nations in building effective state capacity, the institutional foundations of governance remain central to contemporary political challenges.

This essay argues that institutions and governance exist in a symbiotic relationship characterized by mutual constitution and recursive causation. Institutions shape governance by establishing rules, procedures, and incentive structures that influence political behavior and policy outcomes. Simultaneously, governance processes shape institutions through reform, interpretation, and the creation of new institutional arrangements. This dynamic relationship is mediated by power relations, historical legacies, and environmental pressures that create both opportunities for institutional change and sources of institutional persistence.

2. Theoretical Foundations

2.1 Defining Institutions and Governance

The conceptualization of institutions has evolved considerably across disciplinary boundaries. North's (1990) seminal definition emphasizes institutions as constraints that structure human interaction, distinguishing between formal rules (constitutions, laws, property rights) and informal constraints (norms, conventions, codes of conduct). This perspective, rooted in new institutional economics, emphasizes the role of institutions in reducing transaction costs and providing predictability in human interaction.

Political science approaches to institutions offer additional dimensions. Historical institutionalists emphasize path dependence and the enduring effects of institutional choices (Pierson, 2000). Rational choice institutionalists focus on how institutions structure strategic interactions and solve collective action problems (Shepsle, 2006). Sociological institutionalists highlight the constitutive effects of institutions on actor identities and preferences (March & Olsen, 1989).

Governance, meanwhile, encompasses the processes, structures, and traditions that determine how power is exercised, how decisions are made, and how citizens have their say (Graham, Amos & Plumptre, 2003; Rahman et al 2025). This concept extends beyond government to include the broader constellation of actors, institutions, and processes involved in collective decision-making. Good governance is typically characterized by participation, transparency, accountability, effectiveness, and the rule of law (Kaufmann, Kraay & Mastruzzi, 2010).

2.2 Institutional Theory and Governance Performance

The relationship between institutions and governance performance has been theorized through several complementary frameworks. The "institutions matter" thesis, popularized by North (1990) and subsequently developed by Acemoglu and Robinson (2012), argues that institutional quality is the fundamental determinant of long-term economic and political development. According to this view, inclusive institutions that protect property rights, enforce contracts, and limit executive power create incentives for investment, innovation, and broad-based participation in economic and political life.

Conversely, extractive institutions that concentrate power and wealth in the hands of elites create perverse incentives that undermine economic growth and democratic governance. This framework has been influential in explaining cross-national variations in development outcomes and has informed international development policy and democracy promotion efforts.

However, this institutional determinism has faced criticism from scholars who emphasize the importance of agency, context, and power relations. Leftwich (2000) argues that a focus on "good governance" and institutional reform often obscures the political nature of development and the role of power in shaping institutional outcomes. Similarly, Khan (2007) contends that institutional prescriptions derived from advanced economies may be inappropriate for developing countries with different political settlements and state capacities.

2.3 The Co-evolution of Institutions and Governance

A more nuanced understanding of institution-governance relationships recognizes their co-evolutionary nature. Institutions shape governance by creating opportunity structures, defining legitimate authority, and establishing procedural rules. However, governance processes also shape institutions through interpretation, reform, and the creation of new arrangements. This recursive relationship suggests that institutions and governance should be understood as mutually constitutive rather than as independent variables affecting each other.

Mahoney and Thelen's (2010) theory of gradual institutional change provides insights into how this co-evolution occurs. They identify four modes of change: displacement (removal of existing rules and introduction of new ones), layering (addition of new rules on top of existing ones), drift (changed impact of existing rules due to shifts in the environment), and conversion (changed enactment of existing rules due to their strategic redeployment). These mechanisms demonstrate how institutional change can occur through governance processes even in the absence of formal reform.

3. Empirical Evidence and Case Studies

3.1 Cross-National Evidence on Institutions and Governance

Extensive cross-national research has documented strong correlations between institutional quality and governance outcomes. The World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators, measuring voice and accountability, political stability, government effectiveness, regulatory quality, rule of law, and control of corruption, show consistent patterns across countries and time periods (Kaufmann, Kraay & Mastruzzi, 2010).

Countries with higher scores on measures of institutional quality, such as constraints on executive power, judicial independence, and bureaucratic autonomy, tend to perform better on governance indicators. For example, Scandinavian countries, consistently ranking high on measures of institutional quality, also score highly on governance effectiveness and low on corruption indices. This correlation extends to economic outcomes, with institutionally strong countries generally exhibiting higher per capita incomes, greater economic complexity, and more sustainable growth patterns.

However, these correlations raise important questions about causation and endogeneity. Do strong institutions cause good governance, or do successful governance systems create strong institutions? The answer likely involves both directions of causation, operating over different time horizons and in interaction with other factors such as economic development, social capital, and international influences.

3.2 Comparative Case Studies

3.2.1 The United States: Constitutional Design and Governance Challenges

The United States provides a paradigmatic case of how institutional design shapes governance outcomes. The constitutional framework established in 1787 created a system of separated powers, checks and balances, and federalism designed to prevent the concentration of power while maintaining governmental effectiveness. These institutions have demonstrated remarkable durability, surviving civil war, economic crises, and political upheavals.

However, contemporary American governance reveals tensions inherent in the institutional design. The separation of powers system, combined with increased political polarization, has contributed to gridlock and difficulty in addressing complex policy challenges (Mann & Ornstein, 2012). The federal structure creates coordination challenges and policy fragmentation, while the presidential system lacks mechanisms for resolving conflicts between branches of government.

Recent developments have highlighted the importance of informal institutions and norms in maintaining democratic governance. The erosion of norms regarding executive restraint, legislative comity, and respect for electoral outcomes has strained the formal institutional framework (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018). This case illustrates how governance outcomes

depend not only on formal institutional design but also on the informal norms and practices that give life to formal rules.

3.2.2 Germany: Federal Institutions and Consensus Democracy

Germany's post-war institutional development provides insights into how institutional design can promote both democratic stability and effective governance. The Basic Law of 1949 established a federal parliamentary system with strong constitutional courts, designed to prevent the concentration of power that had enabled the Nazi regime. The federal structure balances central coordination with regional autonomy, while the parliamentary system ensures closer executive-legislative coordination than presidential systems.

The German model exemplifies what Lijphart (1999) terms "consensus democracy," characterized by power-sharing institutions, proportional representation, and inclusive decision-making processes. These institutions have contributed to political stability, economic success, and effective policy-making, particularly in areas requiring long-term planning and stakeholder coordination.

However, the German case also reveals challenges associated with consensus-oriented institutions. Decision-making can be slow and incremental, making it difficult to respond rapidly to changing circumstances. The federal structure can create policy fragmentation and coordination problems, while the emphasis on consensus can marginalize minority voices and limit policy innovation.

3.2.3 Singapore: Developmental State and Institutional Capacity

Singapore represents a distinctive model of institution-governance relationships, combining authoritarian political institutions with highly effective administrative capacity. The People's Action Party has maintained political dominance since independence while building professional, merit-based bureaucratic institutions that have delivered impressive economic development and public service provision.

The Singapore model demonstrates that governance effectiveness can be achieved through different institutional arrangements than those typically associated with liberal democracy. The emphasis on bureaucratic professionalism, long-term planning, and technocratic decision-making has enabled effective policy implementation and adaptation to changing economic conditions (Campos & Root, 1996).

However, this model raises questions about sustainability and legitimacy. The concentration of power in dominant party institutions may limit adaptability and innovation over time. The lack of competitive political institutions may reduce accountability and responsiveness to citizen preferences. These tensions illustrate the complex trade-offs involved in institutional design and the importance of context in determining appropriate institutional arrangements.

4. Critical Analysis and Contemporary Debates

4.1 The Problem of Institutional Determinism

While the "institutions matter" thesis has been influential in academic and policy circles, it faces several important criticisms. First, institutional determinism may overstate the causal role of institutions while understating the importance of agency, leadership, and contingent events. Historical cases demonstrate that similar institutional arrangements can produce different outcomes depending on the political actors involved and the specific circumstances they face.

Second, the focus on institutional quality may reflect a Western bias that privileges liberal democratic institutions over alternative arrangements that may be more appropriate in different contexts. The Singapore case, among others, suggests that effective governance can be achieved through institutional arrangements that differ significantly from the liberal democratic template.

Third, institutional determinism may underestimate the role of power relations and political settlements in shaping institutional outcomes. Khan's (2010) analysis of political settlements emphasizes that institutional reforms will be ineffective unless they align with the underlying distribution of power in society. This perspective suggests that institutional change requires attention to political dynamics and power relations, not just technical institutional design.

4.2 The Challenge of Institutional Reform

The relationship between institutions and governance raises important questions about the possibilities and limits of institutional reform. If institutions shape governance outcomes, then improving governance requires institutional change. However, the path-dependent nature of institutional development and the interests of actors who benefit from existing arrangements create obstacles to reform.

The literature on transitional justice and post-conflict institution-building provides insights into these challenges. While international actors often promote comprehensive institutional reform as a solution to governance problems, the results have been mixed. Success cases like post-war Germany and Japan involved extensive external intervention and favorable circumstances that may not be replicable elsewhere.

More generally, the experience of international development assistance and democracy promotion efforts suggests that institutional transplantation is difficult and often unsuccessful. Institutions that function well in one context may fail when transplanted to different settings with different political settlements, social structures, and cultural norms.

4.3 Digital Governance and Institutional Innovation

Contemporary technological developments are creating new possibilities and challenges for institution-governance relationships. Digital technologies enable new forms of citizen participation, transparency, and service delivery that can enhance governance effectiveness and democratic responsiveness. Estonia's digital governance model, for example, demonstrates how technological innovation can improve public service delivery and citizen engagement.

However, digital technologies also create new governance challenges that existing institutions may be ill-equipped to address. Issues such as data privacy, algorithmic bias, and platform power require new forms of regulation and accountability that existing institutional frameworks may not provide. The global and networked nature of digital technologies also challenges traditional territorial and jurisdictional boundaries that underpin existing institutional arrangements.

These developments suggest that the institution-governance relationship is not static but continues to evolve in response to technological, social, and economic changes. Understanding these dynamics requires attention to both continuity and change in institutional arrangements and their effects on governance outcomes.

5. Implications for Theory and Practice

5.1 Theoretical Implications

This analysis suggests several important theoretical implications for understanding institution-governance relationships. First, the co-evolutionary nature of these relationships requires analytical frameworks that can account for mutual causation and recursive dynamics. Simple unidirectional models that treat institutions as independent variables affecting governance outcomes are inadequate for capturing these complex relationships.

Second, the importance of context in mediating institution-governance relationships suggests that universal theories may be less useful than middle-range theories that account for contextual variation. The effectiveness of particular institutional arrangements depends on factors such as economic development level, social structure, cultural norms, and international environment.

Third, the role of informal institutions and norms in shaping governance outcomes suggests that formal institutional analysis must be supplemented by attention to informal constraints and practices. The American case, in particular, demonstrates how the erosion of informal norms can undermine formal institutional arrangements.

5.2 Policy Implications

For policy-makers and development practitioners, this analysis suggests several important considerations for institutional reform efforts. First, institutional reform should be based on careful analysis of existing political settlements and power relations rather than abstract institutional blueprints. Reforms that ignore existing political dynamics are likely to fail or produce unintended consequences.

Second, institutional reform should be understood as a long-term process rather than a one-time intervention. The path-dependent nature of institutional development means that change occurs gradually and requires sustained effort over extended periods.

Third, institutional reform should pay attention to both formal and informal institutions. While formal institutional change may be necessary, it is not sufficient without corresponding changes in norms, practices, and expectations.

Finally, institutional reform should be tailored to specific contexts rather than based on universal templates. While there may be general principles of good governance, their institutional expression will vary depending on local conditions and constraints.

6. Conclusion

The relationship between institutions and governance is complex, dynamic, and context-dependent. While institutions clearly matter for governance outcomes, their effects are mediated by political settlements, social structures, and environmental conditions. The co-evolutionary nature of institution-governance relationships means that causation runs in both directions, with institutions shaping governance and governance processes shaping institutional development.

This analysis has several important implications. Theoretically, it suggests the need for more sophisticated analytical frameworks that can account for mutual causation, contextual variation, and the importance of both formal and informal institutions. Practically, it suggests that institutional reform efforts should be based on careful analysis of local conditions and political dynamics rather than universal blueprints.

The contemporary challenges facing democratic governance worldwide make these insights particularly relevant. From the erosion of democratic norms in established democracies to the difficulties of building effective institutions in developing countries, understanding institution-governance relationships remains crucial for addressing contemporary political challenges.

Future research should continue to develop more sophisticated theories of institutional change and governance effectiveness while paying greater attention to contextual variation and the role of power relations. Comparative case studies that examine how similar institutional

arrangements produce different outcomes in different contexts can contribute to this theoretical development.

Additionally, the emergence of new technologies and global challenges creates new research opportunities for understanding how institution-governance relationships evolve in response to changing conditions. The COVID-19 pandemic, climate change, and digital transformation all pose challenges that require institutional innovation and governance adaptation.

Ultimately, the relationship between institutions and governance reflects broader questions about power, democracy, and social organization. While institutions can enhance governance effectiveness and democratic legitimacy, they also reflect and potentially perpetuate existing power relations and inequalities. Understanding these relationships requires attention to both the technical aspects of institutional design and the political dynamics that shape institutional development and reform.

The symbiotic relationship between institutions and governance suggests that improving governance requires not just better institutions but also better understanding of how institutions and governance processes interact in specific contexts. This understanding can inform more effective approaches to institutional reform and governance improvement that are sensitive to local conditions while drawing on comparative insights about what works where and why.

References

- Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown Publishers.
- Campos, J. E., & Root, H. L. (1996). *The key to the Asian miracle: Making shared growth credible*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Graham, J., Amos, B., & Plumptre, T. (2003). *Principles for good governance in the 21st century* (No. 15). Institute on Governance.
- Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A., & Mastruzzi, M. (2010). The worldwide governance indicators: Methodology and analytical issues. *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law*, 3(2), 220-246.
- Khan, M. H. (2007). Governance, economic growth and development since the 1960s. In J. A. Ocampo, K. S. Jomo, & R. Vos (Eds.), *Growth divergences: Explaining differences in economic performance* (pp. 285-323). Zed Books.
- Khan, M. H. (2010). Political settlements and the governance of growth-enhancing institutions. *Research Paper Series on Growth-Enhancing Governance*. UNRISD.

- Leftwich, A. (2000). *States of development: On the primacy of politics in development*. Polity Press.
- Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How democracies die*. Crown Publishers.
- Lijphart, A. (1999). *Patterns of democracy: Government forms and performance in thirty-six countries*. Yale University Press.
- Mahoney, J., & Thelen, K. (Eds.). (2010). *Explaining institutional change: Ambiguity, agency, and power*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mann, T. E., & Ornstein, N. J. (2012). *It's even worse than it looks: How the American constitutional system collided with the new politics of extremism*. Basic Books.
- March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1989). *Rediscovering institutions: The organizational basis of politics*. Free Press.
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pierson, P. (2000). Increasing returns, path dependence, and the study of politics. *American Political Science Review*, 94(2), 251-267.
- Rahman, F. N., Sen, K. K., Karmaker, S. C., & Saha, B. B. (2025). Good governance and energy justice: Pathways to human development. *Utilities Policy*, 94, 101897
- Shepsle, K. A. (2006). Rational choice institutionalism. In R. A. W. Rhodes, S. A. Binder, & B. A. Rockman (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political institutions* (pp. 23-38). Oxford University Press.
- Yitbarek, T. W., Wilson, J. R., & Dehnen-Schmutz, K. (2025). Investigating tree planting in Ethiopia and the extent to which scheme implementation aligns with good governance practices. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 373, 123475.