

Towards a Multifaceted Measure of Perceived Legitimacy of Participatory Governance

Tessa Haesevoets^{1,2}, Arne Roets², Kristof Steyvers³, Bram Verschuere¹ & Bram Wauters⁴

¹ Department of Public Governance and Management; Ghent University

(tessa.haesevoets@ugent.be; bram.verschuere@ugent.be)

² Department of Developmental, Personality and Social Psychology; Ghent University

(arne.roets@ugent.be)

³ Centre for Local Politics; Department of Political Science; Ghent University

(kristof.steyvers@ugent.be)

⁴ GASPAR; Department of Political Science; Ghent University

(bram.wauters@ugent.be)

All authors contributed equally to this work

Submission date (revision): April 18, 2023

Word count (total): 8,837

Declarations

Funding information: This research is part of the larger project “The changed face of local democracy? The impact of citizen participation on roles, relationships and legitimacy perceptions of democratic institutional stakeholders” (funded by Ghent University Special Research Fund - BOF21/GOA/008). More information: <https://participatievedemocratie.be>.

Competing interest: The authors have no relevant (non-)financial interests to disclose.

Ethical approval: Ethical approval for this research project was obtained from the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration at Ghent University (Ref: UG-EB 2022-A).

Data availability: The data are available upon request from the corresponding author.

Informed consent: Informed consent was obtained from all participants included in the study.

Corresponding author: Tessa Haesevoets, Department of Public Governance and Management, Ghent University, Apotheekstraat 5, 9000 Gent, Belgium. Email: tessa.haesevoets@ugent.be.

Abstract

Policy decision-making modes in governance contexts have become increasingly participatory. This raises questions about legitimacy, and how to measure this concept. The current article advances a multifaceted measurement of perceived legitimacy of policy decision-making modes in participatory governance, capturing the three components of legitimacy (input, throughput, and output) with two items each. This six-item measure was tested in a vignette survey (total $N = 4,583$), which was administered among four types of democratic stakeholders: politicians, civil servants, civil society, and citizens. Respondents completed the scale for four different policy decision-making modes (representative, consultative, co-decisive, and decisive). Our six-item scale shows excellent internal consistency as an encompassing measure, while at the same time also allowing for fine-grained analyses on difference patterns in the input, throughput, and output components of legitimacy. As such, it provides a relevant and parsimonious tool for future research that requires a multifaceted measurement of the perceived legitimacy of participatory governance.

Keywords: multifaceted measurement; perceived legitimacy; policy decision-making modes; democratic stakeholders; vignette survey

1. Introduction

In present-day democracy, determining public policy becomes increasingly complex. Many problems can no longer be addressed adequately and solely through the electoral chain of command and control that is central in the representative model of government. In response to this, besides politicians, other actors have increasingly been allowed to the policy decision-making table. In this regard, Denters (2011, p. 313) has noted that contemporary democratic governance can be depicted as “a more or less polycentric system in which a variety of actors are engaged in (...) public decision-making processes.” Indeed, a multitude of interdependent players, coming from different tiers of both government and society, are shaping collective action in the public realm through a range of different decision-making mechanisms (Sørensen & Torfing, 2018). This also includes innovative attempts to expand and deepen the involvement of citizens (Smith, 2009), which occurs through various instruments, such as citizen panels, participatory budgets, and referenda (Elstub & Escobar, 2019). These instruments have been employed at many levels (particularly the local level), so that contemporary democracy is often denoted as being increasingly participatory in nature (Hertting & Kugelberg, 2019).

But questions arise about how public policy decisions should be made, and to what extent a certain decision-making mode is accepted by different democratic stakeholders. In the associated value frameworks for democratic governance, ‘legitimacy’ is often at the core (Hendriks, 2022). This concept generally refers to the extent to which policy decision-making processes and outcomes “are acceptable to and accepted by the citizenry” (Schmidt, 2013, p. 9-10). Decisions are legitimate when considered as morally binding for and voluntarily complied by the public. Specific applications in participatory democracy come to similar assertions of perceived legitimacy as the “degree to which a decision can be accepted” (Arnesen, 2017, p. 151), the “idea of political power rightfully held and exercised” (Strebel et al., 2019, p. 2) or the “belief that a political decision-making process (is) proper and just and that the decisions produced (...) ought to be accepted” (Werner, 2021, p. 23).

The measurement of this concept in empirical research has been subject to discussion: Perceived legitimacy is often operationalized with only one single item, and it is almost exclusively tested in surveys among one group of stakeholders at the time, mostly citizens. In this article, we present an alternative approach, that adopts a broader and innovative perspective on legitimacy perceptions of participatory governance. First, we consider different aspects of the three components of (application-level) legitimacy (i.e., input, throughput, and output legitimacy). More specifically, we developed a measure in which each of these components is measured with two items, resulting in a six-item scale of perceived legitimacy. Secondly, we empirically tested this measure in the context of four different policy decision-making modes (i.e., a representative, consultative, co-decisive, and decisive decision-making mode), which are characterized by an increasing level of citizen involvement.¹ Thirdly, our measure was examined through the eyes of four different democratic stakeholders (i.e., politicians, civil servants, civil society, and citizens), because in real-life decision-making each of these stakeholders is affected in one way or another by the introduction of participatory instruments.²

We explore our measure with data gathered in a large-scale vignette study (total $N = 4,583$) among the four stakeholders mentioned above in Flanders (Belgium), in an endeavor to develop and explore an empirically and theoretically sound multifaceted measurement of perceived legitimacy. This way, we aim to advance the methodological understanding of how to conceptually and operationally grasp a layered phenomenon in a governance context that is increasingly participatory in terms of policy decision-making modes. More specifically, we tested our newly developed six-item legitimacy measure in the context of a local policy

¹ Although our study focuses on the more innovative participatory modes of governance, we did include a representative decision-making mode as a baseline condition. This refers to elections that delegate decision-making authority to mandatories accountable to the public, without much further or more specific citizen involvement. This traditional mode of decision-making can be considered as the benchmark for alternatives extending the scope of decisional authority for citizens.

² From the perspective of normative democratic theory, perceptions of civil servants may be considered as less relevant compared to perceptions of the citizenry. However, the literature on politico-administrative relations (e.g., Hood & Lodge, 2005; Demir, 2009), as well as many empirical accounts (e.g., Migchelbrink & Van de Walle, 2022) highlight the sometimes crucial position and role of civil servants in policy decision-making.

decision, which concerned the (hypothetical) repurposing of an abandoned school building. The local level is often described by political theorists as an ideal arena for the empowerment of citizens and as an important learning school for democracy (Bailey, 1999; Bryan, 2003; Oliver et al., 2012), and is therefore considered particularly suited to study the perceived legitimacy of participatory governance. Our research questions are threefold:

RQ1 pertains to whether the three theoretical legitimacy components can also be empirically distinguished: Do the three components of legitimacy (input, throughput, and output) empirically represent separate dimensions, or do they rather constitute one unitary factor?

RQ2 addresses whether it is possible to reduce the legitimacy construct to a single item: Does a composed indicator (comprising the three legitimacy components) provide more explanatory power for the perceived overall favorability of certain modes of policy decision-making than the individual legitimacy items?

RQ3 relates to whether there are meaningful differences in how the three legitimacy components are scored across the different policy decision-making modes: Do different policy decision-making modes derive their legitimacy from the same component(s), or from different components? Is, for instance, one component considered more important in policy decision-making modes with limited involvement of citizens and another one more in modes with far-reaching decisional discretion for citizens?

Our findings suggest that the three components form a unitary measure of perceived legitimacy: All items load on the same underlying factor and comprise a reliable scale (**RQ1**). Democratic stakeholders thus tend to perceive a mode of policy decision-making as less or more legitimate at large. However, this does not imply that it suffices to measure only one item (or one component) to grasp their legitimacy perceptions. Indeed, our additional analyses reveal that the composed indicator (consisting of the average of the six legitimacy items) better explains the

overall favorability assessment of a mode of policy decision-making than any of the six individual legitimacy items on their own (**RQ2**). Our results, furthermore, demonstrate that perceived legitimacy also varies considerable across different modes, but notably less across democratic stakeholders. Particularly interesting in this regard is that some legitimacy components were found to be more sensitive than others for particular characteristics of the different policy decision-making modes (**RQ3**). Specifically, of the three components, output was found to be the most important component within modes with limited levels of citizen influence (i.e., the representative mode), whereas input was found to be the most important component within modes with high levels of citizen influence (i.e., the decisive mode).

2. Legitimacy: Three Components

In his seminal work, Scharpf (1999) distinguished between two components of legitimacy: input legitimacy and output legitimacy. Moving beyond this dichotomy, other scholars (e.g., Hendriks, 2022; Schmidt, 2013) have refined this sequence by adding throughput as a third component. Below, we will elaborate in detail on each of these three components.

Legitimacy from the angle of *input* centers around values such as inclusion and equal input of people and positions. The key question is how open and sensitive policy decision-making is for diverse inputs and societal signals in a diverse citizenry (Scharpf, 1999; Schmidt, 2013; Van Meerkerk et al., 2015; Hendriks, 2022). In other words: Do (all) citizens have access to policy-makers and opportunities to become involved, and are policy-makers willing to bring in (all) citizens and take their interests into account (Schmidt & Wood, 2019)?³ Legitimacy from the angle of *throughput* is concerned with values such as deliberation and enlightened understanding, transparency and openness, due justification and impartial treatment, integrity and incorruptibility and accountability. Here, the key question is how (much) policy decision-

³ Of course, *opportunities* and *willingness* are deliberately chosen nouns. No political system can incorporate every group or each disposition (let alone its individual members or holders) for all decisions (without the risk of overload). The key issue is the chance of incorporation must exist (albeit distributed more or less equal).

making is attuned to proper process and procedural fairness (De Fine Licht et al., 2014; Schmidt, 2013; Van Meerkerk et al., 2015; Jäske, 2019; Beyers & Arras, 2021; Hendriks, 2022; Jacobs & Kaufman, 2021). Finally, legitimacy from the angle of *output* evokes values such as efficiency and consequentiality, economy, (cost-)efficiency, and effectiveness. Here, the key question is how (much) policy decision-making is capable of delivering quality, effective and efficient outputs (i.e., public provisions and services) and outcomes (i.e., solutions for collective problems), and to what extent these outputs and outcomes are accepted by citizens (Scharpf, 1999; Schmidt, 2013; Van Meerkerk et al., 2015; Gundelach et al., 2017; Strebel et al., 2019; Hendriks, 2022).

In the present study, we thus particularly focus on the input, throughput, and output component of the legitimacy concept. Although the input-throughput-output sequence is a sensible and practical way of distinguishing values relevant to democratic innovations at the application-level (Hendriks, 2022), it must be mentioned that another type of relevant values concerns the system-level. Because the present study particularly focuses on examining legitimacy perception in the context of a highly localized and tangible issue (namely, the repurposing of an abandoned school building), we did not take such system-level values into consideration (for detailed information on the application-level/system-level distinction; see Hendriks, 2014, 2022; Hendriks & Drosterij, 2012).

3. Problems with Measuring ‘Legitimacy’ of Participatory Governance

Despite growing attention for the legitimacy of democratic decision-making in a governance context with increasing participation of citizens (Garry et al., 2021), two particular gaps in the extant literature remain which both evoke a broader perspective on the phenomenon at hand. The first gap concerns the difference between conceptual-theoretical and operational-empirical approaches of perceived legitimacy (Weatherford, 1992), whereas the second gap relates to the kind of democratic stakeholder that is the subject of empirical research.

3.1 Mismatch Between Theoretical and Empirical Approaches (Gap 1)

In conceptual-theoretical approaches (cf. supra), legitimacy is increasingly conceived as an integrated sequence of input, throughput, and output. Decisions are deemed acceptable and accepted when evaluated as responsive to citizen concerns (input), proper and just in process (throughput), and effective in policy output and outcomes (output). This ‘triad’ denotes distinct theoretical components under a shared conceptual umbrella. It comprises various aspects of the same phenomenon, that do not necessarily coincide. Such theorization also opens queries on their potential interplay. Moreover, for each component several evaluation criteria can be developed. Hence, for a comprehensive and integrated understanding of legitimacy we need to measure perceptions from each of those three angles. This is in line with recent calls in the literature on participatory democracy and democratic innovations (Geissel & Newton, 2012; Pogrebinschi & Ryan, 2017; Smith, 2019).

However, empirical contributions to those fields have not followed suit. Seminal contributions determine levels of legitimacy via the mere observed presence of certain procedures, such as accountability mechanisms and transparent procedures (Weatherford, 1992). Other studies rely on objective or factual data on, for instance, (voter) turnout or diversity of participants (Binnema & Michels, 2021; Caluwaerts & Reuchamps, 2018). But most research tries to determine levels of legitimacy by measuring perceptions via surveys with democratic stakeholders, mostly citizens. Among these studies, two approaches can be discerned.

A first set of studies uses a general and straightforward indicator to capture legitimacy as a one-dimensional concept. In these studies, legitimacy is typically measured with responses to a single survey question. These studies often rely on the juxtaposition of good versus bad: Respondents are simply asked whether they evaluate a policy decision-making process as good or as bad (Garry et al., 2021; Pilet et al., 2020; Rojon & Pilet, 2021). Some related approaches rely on variations of this comparison, with assessment ranging from ‘not at all desirable’ to ‘very desirable’ (Junius et al., 2020;), or by measuring the level of ‘support’ for institutions or

processes (Mohrenberg et al. 2021; Werner & Jacobs, 2022). Given that these kind of measures are very general and comprehensive, it is not entirely clear which components of legitimacy they are covering, and even whether they are covering legitimacy at all. Note that such a single-item approach has not only largely been employed to measure legitimacy perceptions, but also to capture related concepts such as for instance satisfaction with democracy (see Singh & Mayne, 2023, for a recent review of indicators for measuring satisfaction with democracy).

A second set of studies uses specific indicators related to one of the three components of legitimacy. Some of these studies use one of the components as a proxy for legitimacy in general (Beyers & Arras, 2021; Jacobs & Kaufmann, 2021; Werner & Marien, 2022). Notably, the operationalization of procedural fairness, developed by De Fine Licht and colleagues (2014) has been highly inspirational for many researchers. Although this operationalization can be linked to one specific component (i.e., throughput legitimacy), it is considered to be a good indicator to measure legitimacy in general (and is often used for these purposes by researchers). Other studies use one of the components (input, throughput, or output) because they are particularly interested in that specific component. Examples of studies focusing on *input* legitimacy are Devillers et al. (2021) and Esaiasson et al. (2017) who measure perceptions of inclusiveness and responsiveness among respectively non-participants and citizens in general. An example of studying *throughput* legitimacy is provided by Van Meerkerk et al. (2015) who measure the evaluation of items like the provision of information to participants, the transparency of the participatory decision-making, and the extent to which the process includes opportunities for debate and discussion. Studies that focus on *output* legitimacy are, for instance, those with attention to the so-called winner-loser gap (Esaiasson, 2011; Marien & Kern, 2018; Nadeau et al., 2021). This gap entails that citizens who do not obtain what they want in elections and referenda have a harder time to accept the final decision, and evaluate the political system and the policy decision-making process less favorable. Other studies measuring output legitimacy focus on effectiveness, or the realization of concrete results (depending on the project

at stake), by asking respondents about the impact of citizen participation (e.g., whether people's needs are better perceived and addressed; Gundelach et al., 2017).

In sum, whereas many studies have either used a (single-item) general assessment of legitimacy or a highly specific assessment focused on a particular legitimacy component, we aim to incorporate the three legitimacy components into a comprehensive measure.

3.2 Consideration of the Various Stakeholders (Gap 2)

Traditional research on perceived legitimacy typically focuses on citizens' perceptions. However, particularly in participatory models of governance, perceived legitimacy becomes a more focal topic of interest for other stakeholders in the democratic process as well. How legitimate people perceive a mode may differ according to the kind of stakeholder under study, and the extent to which their discretion is affected by a particular mode of policy decision-making. In the traditional conception of representative democracy, decisional authority is handed over by a large group of citizens to a limited set of politicians and civil servants. Legitimacy then rests upon the acceptability and acceptance of the process and the outcome of these decisions made *for the people*. In this model, citizens are often the sole focus of legitimacy studies. However, in a participatory democracy, politicians and civil servants render part of their decisional authority to (organized) citizens. Policy-making transpires *with and by the people*. This broadens the scope of legitimacy. The latter not only rests on the condition that (organized) citizens perceive the decision-making by their fellow citizens as acceptable. It also requires that politicians and civil servants (ceding part of their authority) accept the (increasingly participatory) mode of policy decision-making. Participatory democracy thus implies multiple stakeholders (citizens, civil society, politicians, and civil servants) likely to hold varying perceptions of legitimacy.

However, in the literature such encompassing accounts are largely missing. The focus predominantly remains on one actor at the time: either citizens (Arnesen, 2017; Jacobs & Kaufman, 2021; Rojon & Pilet, 2021) or politicians (Heinelt, 2013; Junius et al., 2020) or civil

servants (Migchelbrink & Van de Walle, 2020); for an account involving multiple stake-holders, see Garry et al. (2021). Moreover, existing approaches also tend to be concerned with specific instruments of citizen participation in policy decision-making. We anticipate that the aforementioned shift comes in several shapes and shades. Participatory governance implies various dispositions with modes of decision-making that are more or less participatory. Our contribution therefore encloses the perspectives of all actors involved, and takes into account different modes of policy decision-making with varying levels of discretion handed over by politicians to citizens.

4. An Empirical Test of a Complex Concept

The gap between the complexity of the concept and the (often) one-dimensionality of its empirical measurement may surprise, given that input, throughput, and output are increasingly assumed to be distinct components of one underlying concept of legitimacy. Indeed, the overview of the research on legitimacy in democratic governance shows that the conceptual complexity is not often reflected in its empirical measurement. This was recently also observed by Werner and Marien (2022) who posit that, in order to grasp legitimacy perceptions more comprehensively, a combination of process and outcome perceptions should be used. In other words, throughput and output components should be combined. A similar but slightly different approach was undertaken by Jäske (2019) who measured legitimacy perceptions by looking at items covering input and throughput legitimacy. We take the discussion one step further by incorporating all three components of legitimacy (input, throughput, and output), and simultaneously consider various stakeholders' perceptions.

4.1 Operationalizing Legitimacy for our Purposes

As shown in Table 1, we selected six legitimacy items (two per component), and one item that measures the overall favorability of a particular policy decision-making mode. This overall favorability item could alternatively be considered as a general indicator of perceived

legitimacy. As mentioned above, such an approach is often used in the literature to capture legitimacy in a one-dimensional way, but it can also be contested whether it really captures the broad legitimacy construct.

TABLE 1. Multifaceted measurement of perceived legitimacy.

Concept	Item
Favorability	I find this is a good way to decide (...).
Legitimacy	This way of deciding (...):
Input	1. Allows as many points of view and interests as possible to be taken into account (In1) 2. Gives citizens from all walks of life the opportunity to be heard (In2)
Throughput	3. Gives everyone a clear view on how the decision is made (Tr1) 4. Is a fair way of decision-making (Tr2)
Output	5. Provides a solution that will work (Ou1) 6. Provides an efficient solution (Ou2)

Note. The items were preceded by the following question: “To what extent do you agree with the following statement(s)” (0 = completely disagree; 10 = completely agree).

The selection of our six items was guided by the aim to strike a balance between sufficient scope (three components) and necessary depth (multiple aspects per component), without presenting too many items. Together, they comprise a range of legitimacy aspects that is more encompassing than in the existing literature, in which general legitimacy perceptions are quite often being gauged using only one item. Our approach is thus innovative in that it develops a multifaceted measure covering the whole of the aforementioned sequence (input-throughput-output). In developing our items, we were inspired by the approaches and formulations in earlier research. From a theoretical stance, we combined the normative frameworks of Hendriks (2022) and Schmidt (2013), which have proposed that legitimacy consists of three components. To capture the diversity of each component, these normative frameworks were complemented by empirical contributions dealing with particular aspects of legitimacy in the input-throughput-output sequence (see *supra* for details). In doing so, we tried to focus on different aspects of the same component in our formulations. As shown in Table 1, our first input item (In1) focuses on representation of different interests and perspectives

(‘perspective inclusiveness’), while our second item (In2) takes into account the inclusion of all kinds of citizens (‘demographic inclusiveness’). Our first throughput item (Tr1) focuses on ‘transparency’ and our second item (Tr2) on ‘fairness’ of the decision-making process. Finally, our first output item (Ou1) focuses on capturing ‘effectiveness’ and our second item (Ou2) on capturing ‘efficiency’ of policy outcomes.

Note that none of the items explicitly refers to the notion of ‘legitimacy’, as it is considered conceptually elusive (particularly abstract to grasp for specific types of respondents). Items are rather stated to cover the variety of features placed under the label of legitimacy by the literature (see discussion above). The wording of the items reflects the equilibrium sought by the research team between theoretical accuracy and empirical accessibility. Bearing the intended comparison of various types of stakeholders in mind, the latter has been a particular concern for non-expert citizens as respondents. Different formulations have been piloted consecutively, each round informing towards our eventual items. The clarity and readability of the eventual set of items was piloted among all subgroups of respondents (i.e., politicians, civil servants, civil society, and citizens).

5. Method

Our operationalization of legitimacy (see Table 1 above) was tested in a large-scale vignette survey in Flanders (Belgium), which was conducted among four different types of respondents (total $N = 4,583$): politicians (including local councilors, mayors, and aldermen), ‘leading’ civil servants (i.e., civil servants who hold a managerial position), representatives of local civil society organizations, and lay citizens.⁴ All of these respondents are important actors in (local) governance processes. They each may hold distinct legitimacy perceptions and

⁴ Politicians, civil servants, and citizens answered the survey from their perspective as an individual; representative of civil society organizations answered the survey from the perspective of their organization. The response rates ranged from 15% to 23%.

potentially demonstrate alternative patterns in these perceptions, which provides an encompassing test among different actors for the measurement that we propose.

Politicians and civil servants were recruited by making use of the Pinakes database (www.pinakes.be). To recruit civil society organizations, we relied on a representative sample of 14 municipalities, which were randomly drawn from 300 Flemish municipalities in light of the Civil Society Innovation project (www.middenveldinnovatie.be). Finally, a broad and representative sample of Dutch-speaking citizens of the Belgian (Flemish) population was recruited through the research company Bilendi (www.bilendi.be). The survey was conducted in the period February-April 2022. Table 2 presents the basic demographic characteristics of each subsample and of the total, aggregated sample. Given that our representativeness tests showed that our four different subsamples were all approximately representative of the research populations (for politicians there was a small overrepresentation of female respondents, whereas for citizens there is a small underrepresentation of low educated respondents; see Tables A1-A4 of Appendix A for details), we decided not to employ a weighting strategy.

TABLE 2. Demographics of the four subsamples and the total sample.

	<i>N</i>	Age	Gender			Education	
			Male	Female	Other	Low	High
Politicians	1156	50.57 (13.00)	61.4%	38.2%	0.4%	19.7%	80.3%
Civil servants	949	45.81 (9.92)	47.1%	52.2%	0.7%	5.9%	94.1%
Civil society	273	-	-	-	-	-	-
Citizens	2205	48.58 (17.55)	49.4%	50.3%	0.2%	54.6%	45.4%
Total sample	4583	48.51 (15.07)	52.1%	47.5%	0.3%	34.5%	65.5%

Note. The politicians sample consists of 820 local councilors, 65 mayors, and 271 aldermen. For age, the means (and standard deviations) are reported. Low education = did not graduate, primary education, or secondary education. High education = university college or university. The representatives of the civil society organizations did not answer these demographical variables. These variables are less relevant for them, as they answered on behalf of their organization.

All respondents were presented with four variations of a local policy decision-making scenario: The repurposing of an abandoned school building. They first received a vignette describing the decision being made through the traditional ways of representative democracy, in which the local government makes plans, discusses these in the city council, and then makes a

decision (labeled *representative mode*). Next they received three variations of the case in random order, reflecting different modes of participatory decision-making. These variations included citizens providing direct advice to the local government (*consultative mode*), citizens and local government making the decision together (*co-decisive mode*), and citizens having full control and deciding themselves (*decisive mode*).⁵ Appendix B illustrates how this information was exactly communicated to the respondents.

Respondents were asked to rate each of these four policy decision-making modes (i.e., representative, consultative, co-decisive, and decisive) on the newly developed legitimacy measure (see Table 1 above), using Likert scales ranging from 0 (*completely disagree*) to 10 (*completely agree*). Also, for each of the policy decision-making modes, respondents were asked to give a general evaluation (which we labelled above ‘favorability’), answering the statement: “I find this a good way to decide what happens with the building” (0 = *completely disagree*; 10 = *completely agree*).

6. Results

6.1 Legitimacy as a Reliable, Unitary Measure (RQ1)

First, for each of the four policy decision-making modes, we ran an exploratory factor analysis (using the Principal Axis Factoring method) on the legitimacy measure for the total sample. This analysis demonstrated that a single factor emerged. As summarized in Table 3, this single factor had an Eigenvalue ranging between 4.28 and 4.58, explaining between 71.3% and 76.3% of the variance. All item factor loadings were larger than .78. In the total sample, for none of the policy decision-making modes a possible second factor reached the Eigenvalue threshold of 1.00. Similar results were also obtained for each of the four different subsamples (see Table 3). We subsequently computed Cronbach’s alpha of the total six-item legitimacy

⁵ We additionally also manipulated whether these three variations were initiated by either the government or citizens. Because this additional two-level between-subjects manipulation did not reveal any substantial effects, we decided to collapse the data across these two initiators in all reported analyses.

measure for each of the four policy decision-making modes. Here too, analyses were conducted for the total sample as well as for the different subsamples. The legitimacy measure displayed excellent internal consistency, with reliability indexes all ranging between .89 and .95 (see Table 3).

TABLE 3. Percentage explained variance and alphas of the subsamples and the total sample.

		Representative	Consultative	Co-decisive	Decisive
Politicians	% explained var	74.63	73.49	75.43	70.14
	Alpha	.93	.93	.93	.91
Civil servants	% explained var	65.31	69.46	71.54	65.07
	Alpha	.89	.91	.92	.89
Civil society	% explained var	81.13	76.48	80.98	72.77
	Alpha	.95	.94	.95	.92
Citizens	% explained var	71.15	73.54	77.35	72.22
	Alpha	.92	.93	.94	.92
Total sample	% explained var	71.79	72.75	76.34	71.27
	Alpha	.92	.92	.94	.92

Note. For civil servants, arguably a second factor emerged for the decisive mode (Eigenvalue = 1.21; % explained variance = 18.67). Yet, after rotation the Eigenvalue of this second factor fell below the 1.00 threshold (Eigenvalue = 0.92; % explained variance = 15.27).

Based on the exploratory factor analyses and the Cronbach's alpha values in both the individual subsamples and the total sample—and across all policy decision-making modes—we can conclude that the newly developed legitimacy measure is a reliable and empirically one-dimensional scale. In other words, in light of our first research question (**RQ1**), it can be concluded that the three components (input, throughput, and output legitimacy) form part of a unitary factor of perceived legitimacy. However, as we demonstrate in the following sections, this does not imply that the scale and construct can be reduced to a single meaning or item.

6.2 Predictive Validity of the Legitimacy Scale Compared to Single Item Approaches (RQ2)

We next tested the predictive validity of the legitimacy scale (i.e., the average score of the six legitimacy items), compared to that of its individual items. Given that past research has often relied on single-item measures of legitimacy, mostly about how 'fair' a decision-making process is (De Fine Licht et al., 2014), the comparison with Item 4 of the scale ("Is a fair way of

decision-making”) is particularly interesting, exactly because this item taps into fairness. As a dependent variable for our predictive power test, we used the overall favorability item (“I think this is a good way to decide what happens with the building”) that was also assessed for each of the four policy decision-making modes.

Table 4 presents the standardized Beta-values in the total sample for the six-item scale, as well as for each of its individual items, signaling their predictive value as single-item measurement in explaining overall favorability. With the exception of two comparisons (out of 24), the legitimacy scale showed to be significantly more predictive for the overall favorability assessment of the different policy decision-making modes, compared to any individual item. Notably, this was also consistently the case for the fairness item (Item 4), which has often been used in the literature as a single-item measure of legitimacy, as well as for the items of effectiveness and efficiency (Items 5 and 6). It is noteworthy that in general the differences in effect between the legitimacy scale and the individual items are smaller for the output items and for the fairness item. This seems to suggest that respondents’ overall favorability assessment is more strongly guided by considerations of ‘efficiency’ and ‘effectiveness’ as well as ‘fairness’, than by ‘demographic inclusiveness’ and ‘perspective inclusiveness’, or, in other words, more by output and throughput considerations than by input considerations, which corresponds with the claim made by Werner and Marien (2022).

Similar analyses were also conducted for the four different subsamples. These analyses (of which the results are summarized in Tables C1-C4 of Appendix C) revealed that in 81 (out of 96) comparisons the legitimacy scale was significantly more predictive than the individual items. Importantly, in none of the 96 comparisons the individual items were significantly more predictive than the legitimacy scale.

TABLE 4. Predictive value of the individual items compared to the full scale (based on the total sample).

		β	$\Delta\beta$	Z_H
Representative	SCALE	.824		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.674	-.150	-30.84***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.641	-.183	-35.91***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.586	-.238	-40.59***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.791	-.033	-7.93***
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.781	-.043	-9.91***
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.735	-.089	-17.15***
Consultative	SCALE	.831		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.626	-.205	-37.35***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.567	-.264	-42.97***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.656	-.175	-35.07***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.812	-.019	-4.94***
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.808	-.023	-5.92***
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.798	-.033	-7.94***
Co-decisive	SCALE	.831		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.676	-.155	-33.78***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.636	-.195	-39.70***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.677	-.154	-35.60***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.797	-.034	-9.69***
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.801	-.030	-7.25***
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.784	-.047	-10.28***
Decisive	SCALE	.809		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.599	-.210	-38.33***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.524	-.285	-45.06***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.591	-.218	-40.82***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.784	-.025	-6.44***
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.801	-.008	-1.72†
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.806	-.003	-0.63

Note. $\Delta\beta = \beta_{\text{item}} - \beta_{\text{scale}}$. Z_H = An updated version of Steiger's Z test (for testing the statistical significance of the difference between dependent correlations). † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.


In sum, with regard to our second research question (**RQ2**), we can conclude that there is clear confirmation that a composed indicator (i.e., the average score of the six legitimacy items) provides more explanatory power than the individual legitimacy items for the overall favorability of each of the different modes of policy decision-making.

6.3 Meaningful Differences in Item Scores Across the Policy Decision-Making Modes (RQ3)

Although the newly developed scale (which is based on the average score of the six legitimacy items) can be considered as a reliable, one-dimensional instrument with significantly higher predictive power compared to the individual items, we argue that this does not mean that the item content and the theoretical distinction between input, throughput, and output legitimacy is irrelevant. In fact, nothing about the one-dimensional nature of the scale prevents particular items to be more sensitive than others for particular characteristics of the different policy decision-making modes under scrutiny.

To test this, we examined whether substantial differences in input, throughput, and output legitimacy items could be observed, depending on the policy decision-making mode that was judged. As can be seen in Figure 1, the most apparent differences occur in the two extreme modes: In the representative mode, output legitimacy ('effectiveness' and 'efficiency') was judged significantly higher (all $ps < .001$) compared to throughput legitimacy ('transparency' and 'fairness') and especially input legitimacy ('perspective inclusiveness' and 'demographic inclusiveness'); whereas the exact opposite is found for the decisive mode (see Table D1 of Appendix D for more detailed statistics). As visualized in Appendix E (Figure E1-E4), this pattern of results emerged in each of the different subsamples of stakeholders. Importantly, however, even though the representative mode scores higher on output legitimacy than on input legitimacy, of the four investigated policy decision-making modes, this mode is clearly the one which is perceived as least legitimate in terms of all three legitimacy components (see Figure 1).

FIGURE 1. Legitimacy scores in function of the different policy decision-making modes (based on the total sample). Error bars represent standard errors. The two items per component were averaged for visualization purposes.



These findings indicate that, even within the one-dimensional scale, respondents differentially appraise distinct aspect of legitimacy across different policy decision-making modes. In light of our third research question (**RQ3**), we can conclude that some legitimacy components are indeed more sensitive than others for particular characteristics of the different policy decision-making modes. As such, at the component level (input, throughput, output), valuable information about people's appreciation for different policy decision-making modes can be obtained, which would be lost when using only a single item (or one component) to measure legitimacy.

7. Discussion

The starting point of our research was the observation that there is a mismatch between the theoretical conceptualization of legitimacy in three components (input, throughput, and output) and its empirical operationalization (in which often one single item, frequently referring to 'fairness', is used). We argued and demonstrated, based on our analysis of over 4500

respondents, that legitimacy perceptions can best be measured with multiple items (in our case, six items; two per component). Our approach allows the construction of a scale to measure the overall legitimacy perception across democratic stakeholders, acknowledging the multifaceted nature of legitimacy and allowing to detect specific patterns of legitimacy according to the type of policy decision-making mode. As such, empirical and theoretical endeavors about legitimacy perceptions can be brought more in line with each other.

7.1 Main Findings

In light of our first research question (**RQ1**), it can be concluded that the three legitimacy components form a unitary factor of perceived legitimacy. This one-dimensional structure emerged across the different policy decision-making modes and the different democratic stakeholders, attesting to its generalizability. From a purely conceptual perspective, this might be a surprising result, given that theoretically the three proposed components of legitimacy each capture a distinct aspect of legitimacy. In the perception and assessment of respondents, however, there is a remarkable coherence in judging these different components of legitimacy. Indeed, people who score a particular policy decision-making mode *relatively* highly on one component, are also more likely to score it *relatively* highly on the other components, which suggest that people work with general clues when assessing legitimacy. In this vein, it may be sensible that people (implicitly) make a connection between different components, and that those who consider a policy decision-making mode as high in input legitimacy are more likely to also judge that mode higher in throughput and output legitimacy (compared to those who consider it low on input legitimacy). As such, it can be concluded that people seem to consider the overall legitimacy concept more holistically than is assumed in conceptual-theoretical approaches.

Strikingly, although one might expect such a holistic perception primarily to be present among lay people (i.e., ordinary citizens), the same pattern emerged for stakeholders that can be assumed politically more literate (i.e., politicians, civil servants, and civil society actors). This

seems to indicate that even those who may be assumed to have more experience and professional affinity with policy-making, also approach the legitimacy issue in a similar holistic way. We can therefore conclude that when it comes to perceptions of legitimacy, across the board, the three components empirically form a multifaceted but one-dimensional construct. Critically, however, the findings related to our other two research questions immediately warn against an ill-advised simplification of the construct merely based on its one-dimensional factor structure.

Addressing the second research question (**RQ2**), our analyses demonstrate that the composed legitimacy scale provides significantly more explanatory power compared to the individual items, including the frequently-used ‘fairness’ item. Although our test of the predictive power was limited to only the overall favorability of each policy decision-making mode, the empirical results were again highly consistent across the four different democratic stakeholders (although with a few instances where the difference did not reach statistical significance). This consistently superior predictive power of the full scale compared to its individual items not only attests to the generalizability of the effect, but also clearly indicates that a multifaceted approach and measurement of legitimacy is warranted.

A closer look at the predictive power of the individual items provides more insight into their respective relationships with the overall favorability assessment, showing consistent differences between the items, most noticeable between the input and the output items. In particular, the observed relationships seem to indicate that when democratic actors assess a certain process of policy decision-making as good on the overall favorability item, their judgment is more strongly guided by considerations of ‘efficiency’ and ‘effectiveness’, as well as ‘fairness’ of the policy decision-making mode. This assertion, which was recently also put forward by Werner and Marien (2022), may be most relevant for further empirical testing, to gain a better understanding of what ‘good’ policy decision making means for citizens and other political actors, and which role different legitimacy perceptions play in this judgment.

Finally, the results concerning the third research question (**RQ3**) additionally provide an important argument to avoid a too simplistic view on the legitimacy concept and measurement merely based on its one-dimensional structure. In particular, nothing about the one-dimensional nature of the scale prevents particular components to be more sensitive than others for particular characteristics of the different policy decision modes under scrutiny. Indeed, for all stakeholders, we found that judgments for the policy decision-making modes at the ‘extremes’ of the democratic participation range (the representative mode on the hand, and the decisive mode on the other hand) showed particular patterns that attest to the importance of considering the theoretical distinction between input, throughput, and output legitimacy, even in a one-dimensional scale. In particular, decision-making within a purely representative mode is judged more poorly in terms of input legitimacy compared to its assessment in terms of output legitimacy. The exact opposite pattern is found for a decision-making mode in which citizens have maximal autonomy in deciding on policies.

As such, it can be concluded that, although people clearly adopt a rather holistic assessment of legitimacy (as evidenced by the one-dimensional nature of the measure), they do not consider input, output, and throughput legitimacy as interchangeable, but evaluate particular policy decision-making modes on their merits for each of these components, resulting in distinctive ‘legitimacy patterns’. In other words, people do appreciate that different policy decision-making modes can derive their legitimacy from different sources to different degrees. Whereas modes purely dependent on representation derive their (modest) perceived legitimacy more from output characteristics, modes that let citizens decide autonomously derive their (high) legitimacy relatively more strongly from their input characteristics. For consultative and co-decisive modes, however, the sources of legitimacy are more balanced between input, throughput, and output characteristics.

7.2 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

Like all studies, our research is not without limitations. A first limitation is that our research questions were tested through a vignette about the repurposing of an abandoned building. We chose this case because it provides a realistic example of participation in the local context, and its relatively ‘neutral’ nature invites respondents to focus on the different modes of decision-making, rather than be guided by potential ideological stances based on the topic. Nevertheless, an important avenue for future research would be to also test our approach for highly salient or contested issues (such as issues related to healthcare or immigration; see Hare & Monogan, 2020; Bechtel et al., 2015).

Another limitation of the present research is that we particularly focused on the local governmental level, which is often considered to be an important “training school for democracy” (Bailey, 1999, p. 5). Although democratic innovations (and especially deliberative processes such as citizen panels and citizen assemblies) have been used most often at the local level, they are now being used on all levels of government (Peña-López, 2020). Therefore, we strongly encourage future research to examine whether the obtained findings also hold for other governmental levels, such as the regional (state) level and the national (federal) level.

When future research focuses on less localized and/or more contentious issues, it is warranted that, in addition to the input-throughput-output sequence, such studies also consider system-level values (like resilience and counterbalance), in order to capture the legitimacy concept in a comprehensive way for these contexts (see Hendriks, 2014, 2022). Such studies can also be helpful in determining whether the lower perceived legitimacy score of the representative mode (relative to that of the three participatory modes) that we found in our study can be ascribed to a specific design feature (namely, the omission of system-level values in our legitimacy measure and/or the localized or non-contentious nature of the issue at hand) or a structural difference.

Because of the hypothetical character of the employed repurposing scenario, respondents in our study were asked to state their abstract opinion on whether the decision-making process

will, according to them, result in an effective and an efficient solution. As such, in this hypothetical case, the two output items tap into expectations about efficiency and efficacy based on the decision-making mode, while in reality effective and efficient policies not only depend on modes of policy decision-making, but also on processes within the public administration apparatus that are posterior and potentially independent from decision-making. We therefore encourage future research to also test the reliability of our measure in the context of real-life cases.

Finally, our results suggest that there might be a difference in the relative importance of the three components, with input legitimacy being less important, and output legitimacy and fairness being more important for the general evaluation (in terms of its overall favorability) of the policy decision-making modes. Future research could further explore how important each of the components of legitimacy are. This is especially relevant for policy-makers as it can inform them about which aspects they should prioritize when designing participatory projects when aiming to maximize perceptions of legitimacy across the different stakeholders: Should they first and foremost try to ensure that as many different layers of society as possible are heard (input), or should their priority rather be that policy output can be realized in an effective and efficient way (output)?

8. Conclusion

Keeping in mind its purpose, a six-item scale was developed to reliably measure overall perceived legitimacy as an overarching construct, while seeking a balance between parsimony, and the content richness and multifaceted nature of the broad construct. Regarding our first research question (**RQ1**), it can be concluded that the three legitimacy components form a unitary factor of perceived legitimacy. In light of our second research question (**RQ2**), clear confirmation was found that a composed indicator (consisting of the average score of the six legitimacy items) provides more explanatory power than any individual legitimacy item for the

overall favorability of each of the different modes of policy decision-making. Finally, concerning our third research question (**RQ3**), it was found that the different components of legitimacy were appraised differently across the different policy decision-making modes, with output being more important than input and throughput in the representative decision-making mode, and with input being more important than throughput and output in the decision-making mode where citizens can decide themselves.

Taken these findings together, it can be concluded that our newly developed scale demonstrates excellent internal consistency and predictive power as an encompassing measure, but also still allowed a meaningful, more fine-grained analysis on difference patterns in the input, throughput, and output components of legitimacy. Moreover, given that the measure performed equally well capturing the perceptions of citizens, politicians, civil servants, and civil society actors alike, we believe the scale can provide a particularly relevant tool for future research that requires a relatively parsimonious, but multifaceted and versatile measurement of perceived legitimacy of different policy decision-making modes across actors in governance contexts that are increasingly participatory.

References

- Arnesen, S. (2017). Legitimacy from Decision-Making Influence and Outcome Favourability: Results from General Population Survey Experiments. *Political Studies*, 65, 146-161.
- Bailey, S. (1999). *Local Government Economics: Principles and Practice*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Bechtel, M. M., Hainmueller, J., Hangartner, D., & Helbling, M. (2015). Reality bites: The limits of framing effects for salient and contested policy issues. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 3, 683-695.
- Beyers, J., & Arras, S. (2021). Stakeholder consultations and the legitimacy of regulatory decision-making: A survey experiment in Belgium. *Regulation & Governance*, 15, 877-893.
- Binnema, H., & Michels, A. (2021). Does Democratic Innovation Reduce Bias? The G1000 as a New Form of Local Citizen Participation. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 1-11.
- Bryan, F.M. (2003). *Real Democracy: The New England Town Meeting and How it Works*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Caluwaerts, D., & Reuchamps, M. (2018). *The legitimacy of citizen-led deliberative democracy: The G1000 in Belgium*. London: Routledge.
- De Fine Licht, J., Naurin, D., Esaiasson, P., & Gilljam, M. (2014). When Does Transparency Generate Legitimacy? Experimenting on a Context-Bound Relationship. *Governance*, 27, 111-134.
- Demir, T. (2009). Politics and administration: Three schools, three approaches, and three suggestions. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 31, 503-532.
- Denters, B. (2011). Local Governance. In M. Bevir (Ed.). *The Sage Handbook of Governance* (pp. 252-270). Sage: London.

- Devillers, S., Vrydagh, J., Caluwaerts, D., & Reuchamps, M. (2021). Looking in from the Outside: How Do Invited But Not Selected Citizens Perceive the Legitimacy of a Minipublic? *Journal of Deliberative Democracy*, *17*, 149-159.
- Esaiasson, P. (2011). Electoral losers revisited – How citizens react to defeat at the ballot box. *Electoral Studies*, *30*, 102-113.
- Esaiasson, P., Gilljam, M., & Persson, M. (2017). Responsiveness Beyond Policy Satisfaction: Does It Matter to Citizens? *Comparative Political Studies*, *50*, 739-765.
- Elstub, S. & Escobar, O. (2019). *Handbook of Democratic Innovation and Governance*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Garry, J., Pow, J., Coakley, J., Farrell, D., O'Leary, B., & Tilley, J. (2021). The Perception of the Legitimacy of Citizens' Assemblies in Deeply Divided Places? Evidence of Public and Elite Opinion from Consociational Northern Ireland. *Government and Opposition*, 1-20.
- Geissel, B. & Newton, K. (Eds.) (2012). *Evaluating Democratic Innovations: Curing the Democratic Malaise?* London: Routledge.
- Gundelach, B., Buser, P., & Kübler, D. (2017). Deliberative democracy in local governance: the impact of institutional design on legitimacy. *Local Government Studies*, *43*, 218-244.
- Hare, C., & Monogan, J. (2020). The democratic deficit on salient issues: Immigration and healthcare in the states. *Journal of Public Policy*, *40*, 116-143.
- Heinelt, H. (2013). Councillors' notions of democracy, and their role perception and behaviour in the changing context of local democracy. *Local Government Studies*, *39*, 640-660.
- Hendriks, F. (2014) Understanding good urban governance: essentials, shifts, and values. *Urban Affairs Review*, *50*, 553–576.
- Hendriks, F. (2022). Key values for democratic governance innovation: Two traditions and a synthesis. *Public administration*, *100*, 803-820.

- Hendriks, F. & Drosterij, G. (Eds.). (2012) *De Zucht naar Goed Bestuur in de Stad*. The Hague: Boom/Lemma.
- Hertting, N. & Kugelberg, C. (Eds.) (2019). *Local Participatory Governance and Representative Democracy Institutional Dilemmas in European Cities*. London: Routledge.
- Hood, C., & Lodge, M. (2006). *The Politics of Public Service Bargains*. Oxford: OUP.
- Jacobs, D., & Kaufmann, W. (2021). The right kind of participation? The effect of a deliberative mini-public on the perceived legitimacy of public decision-making. *Public Management Review*, 23, 91-111.
- Jäske, M. (2019). Participatory innovations and maxi-publics: The influence of participation possibilities on perceived legitimacy at the local level in Finland. *European Journal of Political Research*, 58, 603-630.
- Junius, N., Matthieu, J., Caluwaerts, D., & Erzeel, S. (2020). Is It Interests, Ideas or Institutions? Explaining Elected Representatives' Positions Toward Democratic Innovations in 15 European Countries. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 2.
- Marien, S., & Kern, A. (2018). The Winner Takes It All: Revisiting the Effect of Direct Democracy on Citizens' Political Support. *Political Behavior*, 40, 857-882.
- Migchelbrink, K., & Van de Walle, S. (2020). When Will Public Officials Listen? A Vignette Experiment on the Effects of Input Legitimacy on Public Officials' Willingness to Use Public Participation. *Public Administration Review*, 80, 271-280.
- Migchelbrink, K., & Van de Walle, S. (2022). A systematic review of the literature on determinants of public managers' attitudes toward public participation. *Local Government Studies*, 48, 1-22.
- Mohrenberg, S., Huber, R. A., & Freyburg, T. (2021). Love at first sight? Populist attitudes and support for direct democracy. *Party Politics*, 27, 528-539.

Nadeau, R., Daoust, J.-F., & Dassonneville, R. (2021). Winning, Losing, and the Quality of Democracy. *Political Studies*.

Oliver, J.E., Ha, S.E., & Callen, Z. (2012). Local Elections and the Politics of Small-Scale Democracy. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Peña-López, I. (2020). Innovative citizen participation and new democratic institutions: Catching the deliberative wave.

Pilet, J.-B., Talukder, D., Sanhueza, M. J., & Rangoni, S. (2020). Do Citizens Perceive Elected Politicians, Experts and Citizens as Alternative or Complementary Policy-Makers? A Study of Belgian Citizens. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 2.

Pogrebinschi, T. & Ryan, M. (2017). Moving Beyond Input Legitimacy: When Do Democratic Innovations Affect Policy Making. *European Journal of Political Research*, 57, 135-152.

Rojon, S., & Pilet, J.-B. (2021). Engaged, Indifferent, Skeptical or Critical? Disentangling Attitudes towards Local Deliberative Mini-Publics in Four Western European Democracies. *Sustainability*, 13, 10518.

Scharpf, F. (1999). *Governing in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schmidt, V. (2013). Democracy and Legitimacy in the European Union Revisited: Input, Output and 'Throughput'. *Political Studies*, 61, 2-22.

Schmidt, V. & Wood, M. (2019). Conceptualizing Throughput Legitimacy: Procedural Mechanisms of Accountability, Transparency, Inclusiveness and Openness in EU Governance. *Public Administration*, 97, 727-740.

Singh, S. P., & Mayne, Q. (2023). Satisfaction with Democracy: A Review of a Major Public Opinion Indicator. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, nfad003.

Smith, G. (2009). *Democratic Innovations. Designing Institutions for Citizen Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Smith, G. (2019). Reflections on the theory and practice of democratic innovations. In S. Elstub & O. Escobar (Eds.), *Handbook of Democratic Innovation and Governance* (pp. 572-582). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Sørensen, E. & Torfing, J. (2018). Governance on a bumpy road from enfant terrible to mature paradigm. *Critical Policy Studies*, 12, 350-359.
- Strebel, M., Kübler, D. & Marcinkowski, F. (2019). The Importance of Input and Output Legitimacy in Democratic Governance: Evidence From a Population-Based Survey Experiment in Four West European Countries. *European Journal of Political Research*, 58, 488-513.
- Van Meerkerk, I., Edelenbos, J., & Klijn, E.-H. (2015). Connective management and governance network performance: the mediating role of throughput legitimacy. Findings from survey research on complex water projects in the Netherlands. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 33, 746-764.
- Weatherford, M. S. (1992). Measuring Political Legitimacy. *American Political Science Review*, 86, 149-166.
- Werner, H. (2021). *Pragmatic Citizens. A Bottom-Up Perspective on Participatory Politics*. Leuven: KUL (PhD-Thesis).
- Werner, H., & Jacobs, K. (2022). Are Populists Sore Losers? Explaining Populist Citizens' Preferences for and Reactions to Referendums. *British Journal of Political Science*, 52, 1409-1417.
- Werner, H., & Marien, S. (2022). Process vs. Outcome? How to Evaluate the Effects of Participatory Processes on Legitimacy Perceptions. *British Journal of Political Science*, 52, 429-436.

Funding information: This research is part of the larger project “The changed face of local democracy? The impact of citizen participation on roles, relationships and legitimacy perceptions of democratic institutional stakeholders” (funded by Ghent University Special Research Fund - BOF21/GOA/008).

Appendix to

Towards a Multifaceted Measure of Perceived Legitimacy of Participatory Governance

Contents

Appendix A: Results of the representativeness check (for each subsample).....2

 Table A1. Description of the politicians sample (vs. research population).....2

 Table A2. Description of the civil servants sample (vs. research population).....3

 Table A3. Description of the civil society sample (vs. research population).....4

 Table A4. Description of the citizens sample (vs. research population).....5

Appendix B: Local policy decision case (translated from Dutch).....6

Appendix C: Predictive value of the individual items compared to the full scale (for each subsample).....8

 Table C1. Results of the politicians sample.....8

 Table C2. Results of the civil servants sample.....9

 Table C3. Results of the civil society sample.....10

 Table C4. Results of the citizens sample.....11

Appendix D: Differences between the six legitimacy items.....12

 Table D1. Results of pairwise comparisons (based on the total sample).....12

Appendix E: Legitimacy scores in function of the different policy decision-making modes (for each subsample).....14

 Figure E1. Politicians.....14

 Figure E2. Civil servants.....14

 Figure E3. Civil society.....14

 Figure E4. Citizens.....14

APPENDIX A

Results of the representativeness check (for each subsample)

TABLE A1. Description of the politicians sample (vs. research population).

		Local councilors (legislative politicians)		Mayors and aldermen (executive politicians)	
		Sample	Population	Sample	Population
Demographics	Male	62%	71%	60%	66%
	Female	38%	29%	40%	34%
	Age (in years)	50.88	/	49.80	/
	Low education	21%	/	17%	/
	High education	79%	/	83%	/
Party family	CD&V (Christian Democrats)	21%	24%	32%	31%
	Groen (Greens)	12%	5%	4%	3%
	N-VA (Regionalists)	23%	19%	17%	17%
	Open VLD (Liberals)	8%	10%	12%	12%
	PVDA (Extreme Left)	1%	0%	0%	0%
	Vooruit (Socialists)	7%	5%	8%	4%
	Vlaams Belang (Extreme Right)	4%	5%	0%	0%
	Local party	19%	25%	22%	22%
Cartel party	6%	8%	5%	10%	
Province	Antwerp	25%	24%	28%	23%
	Flemish Brabant	20%	22%	16%	21%
	West-Flanders	22%	20%	21%	21%
	East-Flanders	21%	21%	22%	21%
	Limburg	12%	14%	13%	14%

Note. The population data were retrieved from the Pinakes database. Additionally, we also relied on a response to a parliamentary question (Vlaams Parlement, 2020. Schriftelijke vraag nummer 37 van Kurt De Loor aan minister Bart Somers. <https://www.vlaamsparlement.be/nl/parlementaire-documenten/schriftelijke-vragen/1439727>) to identify some of the population characteristics.

TABLE A2. Description of the civil servants sample (vs. research population).

		Sample	Population
Function	Managing Director	10%	9%
	Deputy Managing Director	2%	2%
	Financial Director	10%	9%
	Head of a municipal department	50%	47%
	Municipal responsible person or coordinator	28%	33%
Demographics	Male	47%	48%
	Female	53%	52%
	Age (in years)	45.81	/
	Low education	6%	/
	High education	94%	/
Province	Antwerp	26%	24%
	Flemish Brabant	14%	19%
	West-Flanders	25%	21%
	East-Flanders	20%	21%
	Limburg	15%	15%

Note. The population data were retrieved from the Pinakes database.

TABLE A3. Description of the civil society sample (vs. research population).

		Sample	Population
Organizational characteristics	Established in a pillar tradition	44%	32%
	Part of a larger organizations	59%	53%
Judicial status	Non-profit	58%	50%
	Foundation	1%	1%
	CVBA/CVBA-SO	0%	10%
	group, no judicial status	35%	15%
	no info	2%	7%
	Other	5%	18%
Province	Antwerp	26%	28%
	Flemish Brabant	19%	14%
	West-Flanders	17%	17%
	East-Flanders	28%	22%
	Limburg	11%	19%

Note. The population data are based on 1,500 organizations from 14 representative local municipalities.

TABLE A4. Description of the citizens sample (vs. research population).

		Sample	Population
Demographics	Male	49%	50%
	Female	50%	50%
	18-34 years	29%	27%
	35-54 years	33%	35%
	55+	38%	38%
	Low education	55%	63%
	High education	45%	38%
Province	Antwerp	27%	28%
	Flemish Brabant	17%	17%
	West-Flanders	17%	18%
	East-Flanders	24%	23%
	Limburg	14%	14%

Note. The population data were provided by Bilendi.

APPENDIX B

Local policy decision case (translated from Dutch)

Case Description

Please imagine this fictional situation:

“In the center of your community, a former high school has been vacant for several years. The building is owned by the municipality. Currently, it is unclear what should be done with this building. There are many possibilities, for example: a library, office spaces, a meeting center, a shopping center, a youth center, a residential care home, housing facilities, etc. Local government funds are available to realize this repurposing. The decision as to what will happen to the vacant school building can come about in several ways.”

Case Variations

Please imagine that this decision is made as follows:

1. Representative mode:

“The local government takes the initiative to think about the repurposing: They develop a plan themselves. Afterwards, the local government itself also decides what will happen with the school building.”

2. Consultative mode:

Government initiative:

“The local government takes the initiative to think about the repurposing: They ask residents of the municipality to give advice. Afterwards, the local government itself decides what will happen with the school building.”

Citizens' initiative:

“Residents of the municipality take the initiative to approach the local government with an idea for the repurposing of the building. The local government receives the advice of the residents. Afterwards, the local government itself decides what will happen with the school building.”

3. Co-decisive mode:

Government initiative:

“The local government takes the initiative to think about the repurposing: They invite the residents of the municipality to develop concrete plans. Afterwards, these residents decide together with the local government what will happen with the school building.”

Citizens' initiative:

“Residents of the municipality take the initiative to approach the local government with an idea for the repurposing of the building. These residents are given the opportunity to develop concrete plans. Afterwards, these residents decide together with the local government what will happen with the school building.”

4. Decisive mode:

Government initiative:

“The local government takes the initiative to think about the repurposing: They invite the residents of the municipality to develop concrete plans. Afterwards, the residents themselves decide what will happen with the school building. The local government then formally approves the decision.”

Citizens' initiative:

“Residents of the municipality take the initiative to approach the local government with an idea for the repurposing of the building. These residents are given the opportunity to develop concrete plans. Afterwards, these residents themselves decide what will happen with the school building. The local government then formally approves the decision.”

APPENDIX C

Predictive value of the individual items compared to the full scale (for each subsample)

TABLE C1. Results of the politicians sample.

		β	$\Delta\beta$	Z_H
Representative	SCALE	.874		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.779	-.095	-13.42***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.734	-.140	-17.32***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.642	-.232	-22.13***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.822	-.052	-7.48***
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.807	-.067	-9.30***
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.759	-.115	-12.92***
Consultative	SCALE	.833		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.629	-.204	-18.94***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.582	-.251	-21.00***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.664	-.169	-17.71***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.805	-.028	-3.65***
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.811	-.022	-2.83*
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.812	-.021	-2.66*
Co-decisive	SCALE	.804		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.613	-.191	-19.07***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.602	-.202	-19.73***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.634	-.170	-17.89***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.753	-.051	-6.49***
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.815	.011	1.29
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.795	-.009	-0.94
Decisive	SCALE	.771		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.551	-.220	-18.91***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.499	-.272	-20.59***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.537	-.234	-20.14***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.743	-.028	-3.24**
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.781	.010	0.97
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.786	.015	1.39

Note. † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

TABLE C2. Results of the civil servants sample.

		β	$\Delta\beta$	Z_H
Representative	SCALE	.790		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.626	-.164	-12.73***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.572	-.218	-15.50***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.482	-.308	-18.81***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.710	-.080	-6.79***
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.778	-.012	-1.15
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.689	-.101	-7.46***
Consultative	SCALE	.823		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.637	-.186	-15.51***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.574	-.249	-18.89***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.581	-.242	-18.86***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.783	-.040	-4.17***
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.806	-.017	-1.76†
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.776	-.047	-4.37***
Co-decisive	SCALE	.801		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.639	-.162	-14.01***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.551	-.250	-19.83***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.599	-.202	-17.66***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.787	-.014	-1.59
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.781	-.020	-1.84†
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.748	-.053	-4.33***
Decisive	SCALE	.775		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.542	-.233	-17.53***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.429	-.346	-21.15***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.511	-.264	-19.05***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.766	-.009	-0.90
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.781	.006	0.48
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.780	.005	0.38

Note. † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

TABLE C3. Results of the civil society sample.

		β	$\Delta\beta$	Z_H
Representative	SCALE	.847		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.774	-.073	-4.80***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.760	-.087	-8.13***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.686	-.161	-9.15***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.824	-.023	-4.10***
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.781	-.066	-6.69***
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.756	-.091	-7.49***
Consultative	SCALE	.855		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.691	-.164	-7.96***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.651	-.204	-9.30***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.736	-.119	-6.82***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.802	-.053	-3.84***
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.816	-.039	-3.00**
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.786	-.069	-4.65***
Co-decisive	SCALE	.866		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.755	-.111	-7.62***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.716	-.150	-9.22***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.806	-.060	-5.06***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.837	-.029	-2.62**
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.804	-.062	-4.28***
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.767	-.099	-5.53***
Decisive	SCALE	.809		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.614	-.195	-8.98***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.544	-.265	-10.66***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.601	-.208	-9.95***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.768	-.041	-2.86**
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.811	.002	0.11
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.799	-.010	-0.52

Note. † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

TABLE C4. Results of the citizens sample.

		β	$\Delta\beta$	Z_H
Representative	SCALE	.800		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.612	-.188	-23.93***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.591	-.209	-26.71***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.572	-.228	-26.84***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.806	.006	0.99
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.765	-.035	-5.05***
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.731	-.069	-8.75***
Consultative	SCALE	.830		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.616	-.214	-26.65***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.559	-.271	-30.31***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.665	-.165	-23.29***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.828	-.002	-0.38
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.805	-.025	-4.59***
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.799	-.031	-5.36***
Co-decisive	SCALE	.843		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.705	-.138	-21.93***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.654	-.189	-27.13***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.702	-.141	-23.79***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.809	-.034	-7.03***
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.796	-.047	-8.35***
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.779	-.064	-10.35***
Decisive	SCALE	.821		
	Item 1 (perspective inclusiveness)	.620	-.201	-25.73***
	Item 2 (demographic inclusiveness)	.522	-.299	-32.70***
	Item 3 (transparency)	.618	-.203	-27.48***
	Item 4 (fairness)	.793	-.028	-5.09***
	Item 5 (effectiveness)	.805	-.016	-2.60**
	Item 6 (efficiency)	.808	-.013	-2.02*

Note. † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

APPENDIX D

Differences between the six legitimacy items

TABLE D1. Results of pairwise comparisons (based on the total sample).

	I	J	ΔM	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
Representative	Item 1	Item 2	.384	.024	<.001	.337	.431
		Item 3	-.913	.042	<.001	-.995	-.831
		Item 4	-.961	.041	<.001	-1.042	-.880
		Item 5	-1.450	.041	<.001	-1.530	-1.370
		Item 6	-1.830	.045	.000	-1.917	-1.742
	Item 2	Item 3	-1.297	.041	<.001	-1.376	-1.217
		Item 4	-1.345	.043	<.001	-1.429	-1.261
		Item 5	-1.834	.043	.000	-1.917	-1.750
		Item 6	-2.214	.046	.000	-2.304	-2.123
	Item 3	Item 4	-.048	.043	.256	-.132	.035
		Item 5	-.537	.044	<.001	-.622	-.452
		Item 6	-.917	.046	<.001	-1.008	-.826
	Item 4	Item 5	-.489	.031	<.001	-.549	-.428
		Item 6	-.869	.033	<.001	-.933	-.804
	Item 5	Item 6	-.380	.022	<.001	-.424	-.337
Consultative	Item 1	Item 2	.136	.021	<.001	.094	.178
		Item 3	.591	.030	<.001	.532	.649
		Item 4	.481	.031	<.001	.421	.541
		Item 5	.484	.030	<.001	.426	.543
		Item 6	.436	.030	<.001	.376	.495
	Item 2	Item 3	.455	.032	<.001	.393	.516
		Item 4	.345	.034	<.001	.278	.412
		Item 5	.348	.033	<.001	.283	.413
		Item 6	.300	.034	<.001	.234	.366
	Item 3	Item 4	-.110	.026	<.001	-.160	-.059
		Item 5	-.106	.028	<.001	-.161	-.052
		Item 6	-.155	.029	<.001	-.211	-.098
	Item 4	Item 5	.003	.019	.875	-.035	.041
		Item 6	-.045	.021	.034	-.087	-.003
	Item 5	Item 6	-.048	.014	<.001	-.076	-.021

Table C1 continued

	I	J	ΔM	SE	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
Co-decisive	Item 1	Item 2	.400	.020	<.001	.362	.439
		Item 3	.173	.021	<.001	.132	.214
		Item 4	.049	.021	.019	.008	.090
		Item 5	.426	.025	<.001	.377	.475
		Item 6	.655	.028	<.001	.601	.709
	Item 2	Item 3	-.227	.022	<.001	-.270	-.185
		Item 4	-.351	.025	<.001	-.400	-.303
		Item 5	.026	.029	.373	-.031	.083
		Item 6	.255	.030	<.001	.196	.315
	Item 3	Item 4	-.124	.019	<.001	-.162	-.086
		Item 5	.253	.025	<.001	.205	.302
		Item 6	.482	.026	<.001	.431	.534
	Item 4	Item 5	.377	.020	<.001	.338	.417
		Item 6	.606	.023	<.001	.562	.651
	Item 5	Item 6	.229	.015	<.001	.200	.258
Decisive	Item 1	Item 2	.008	.025	.749	-.041	.058
		Item 3	.120	.026	<.001	.068	.171
		Item 4	.580	.028	<.001	.526	.635
		Item 5	1.024	.033	<.001	.959	1.088
		Item 6	1.273	.035	<.001	1.205	1.341
	Item 2	Item 3	.111	.026	<.001	.060	.163
		Item 4	.572	.031	<.001	.511	.633
		Item 5	1.015	.037	<.001	.943	1.088
		Item 6	1.265	.038	<.001	1.191	1.339
	Item 3	Item 4	.461	.027	<.001	.409	.513
		Item 5	.904	.032	<.001	.840	.968
		Item 6	1.154	.034	<.001	1.088	1.219
	Item 4	Item 5	.443	.025	<.001	.394	.493
		Item 6	.693	.027	<.001	.640	.745
	Item 5	Item 6	.250	.016	<.001	.218	.282

Note. ΔM = I minus J. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Least Significant Difference (LSD).

APPENDIX E

Legitimacy scores in function of the different policy decision-making modes (for each subsample)

FIGURE E1. Politicians




FIGURE E2. Civil servants




FIGURE E3. Civil society




FIGURE E4. Citizens

