



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

**What makes authorities legitimate in the eyes of citizens? : an investigation of perceived legitimacy in different political regimes**  
Mazepus, H.

**Citation**

Mazepus, H. (2016, September 14). *What makes authorities legitimate in the eyes of citizens? : an investigation of perceived legitimacy in different political regimes*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/42940>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License:

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/42940>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/42940> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

**Author:** Mazepus, Honorata

**Title:** What makes authorities legitimate in the eyes of citizens? : an investigation of perceived legitimacy in different political regimes

**Issue Date:** 2016-09-14

**What makes authorities legitimate in the eyes of citizens?**

**An investigation of perceived legitimacy in different political regimes**

Cover design by Florian van Leeuwen

Printed by EZBook

# **What makes authorities legitimate in the eyes of citizens?**

## **An investigation of perceived legitimacy in different political regimes**

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van

de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,

op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,

volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties

te verdedigen op woensdag 14 September 2016

klokke 16:15 uur

door

Honorata Mazepus

geboren te Słupsk (Polen) in 1985

Promotor:

Prof. dr. A.W.M. Gerrits

Co-promotor:

Prof. dr. I.C. van Biezen

Promotiecommissie:

Prof. dr. H. te Velde

Dr. M.F. Meffert

Prof. dr. V. A. Schmidt, Boston University

Dr. Guy Ben-Porat, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

## Abstract

The thesis ‘What makes authorities legitimate in the eyes of citizens? An investigation of perceived legitimacy in different political regimes’ presents a comparative study into political legitimacy. The thesis examines what factors contribute to perceiving political authorities as legitimate by individuals socialized in different political regimes. Using experimental vignettes and original survey data, the thesis investigates to what extent normative qualities of political authorities (moral features) play a role in citizens’ evaluations of these authorities. Moreover, this thesis challenges the claim that citizens in non-democratic regimes have unique or special expectations about political authorities. It does so by comparing the factors influencing perceived legitimacy of governments in different political regimes: two post-Soviet non-democracies (Russia and Ukraine) and old and new democracies in Europe (France, Netherlands, and Poland). The findings in all five countries support the theoretical model of a citizen who is concerned with both her personal material well-being and the fairness of authorities. The factor that had the largest positive effect on perceived legitimacy across countries was distributive justice—fairness in providing goods and services across the individuals in a society. Furthermore, respondents’ beliefs about what makes political authorities legitimate were similar across the five countries and suggest that for evaluating legitimacy, the output aspects of governing (e.g. welfare, order, and stability) are less important than the input (e.g. elections, trust, representation) and throughput aspects (e.g. fair procedures, legality, transparency, and integrity of authorities).

## Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisors, André Gerrits and Ingrid van Biezen, for giving me the opportunity to set off for this academic adventure. Secondly, I would like to thank my colleagues and fellow PhD candidates who helped me to become a better scholar and to feel at home in Leiden. Big thanks to Elisabeth Dieterman and Anne Heyer for our stimulating discussions about legitimacy, their help with coding the results and reading my texts, and most importantly, their friendship. For sharing their academic and private time I thank also Wouter Veenendaal, Mariano Alvarez, Mariana Perry, Camila Jara Ibarra, Håvar Solheim, Soledad Valdivia Rivera, Margarida Borges, Michelle Carmody, Luzia Helfer, Femke Bakker, and Natasha and Tatyana.

For reading and discussing parts of my project and for encouraging me to go forward with it, I would like to thank Michael Meffert, Carsten Sauer, Jojanneke van der Toorn, Tom Louwerse, Daniela Stockman, Patricio Silva, Peter Schmidt, and Lee Seymour. I would like to thank Magnus Feldmann for his excellent and inspiring course on Comparative Research Design at the University of Bristol and for our continuing collaboration.

Collecting data in different countries takes a lot of planning, translating, recruiting, coordinating, printing, stapling, distributing, scanning, and data entering. For their enormous help in these matters I would like to thank Agata Mazepus, Marcin Piechocki, Paweł Stachowiak, Paweł Laidler, Marcin Grabowski, Justyna Zadarko (Polish sample), Henk Kern, Femke Bakker, Niels van Willigen, Adriaan van Veldhuizen, Max Bader (Dutch sample), Tadeq Quillien, Helena Miton, Florian van Leeuwen (French sample), Olena Czemodanova, Oleksandr Pronkevych, Jaroslav Dansyenko (Ukrainian sample), Ekaterina Dergunova, Ekaterina Lytkina, Alexis Belyanin, Inna Devyatko, Mikhail Mironyuk, Svetlana Bankovskaya, Valeri Ledyayev, Tatiana Karabchuk (Russian sample), Lauri van Oosterom, and Tessa van Valen (Dutch and French samples).

To my parents, Jadwiga and Jerzy, and sister, Agata, who have supported and encouraged me throughout the process: *dziękuję!* Our online conversations always make me feel like I'm closer to home. I also thank my new family: Peter for taking me for runs to stay fit, Bärbel for Kaffee und Kuchen to recover, and Nienke, Vincent, Ivo, and Rosa for all the fun times.

And finally, I thank the person without whose support and criticism this project wouldn't be possible—Florian van Leeuwen. Thank you for believing in me and for sharing your thoughts, ideas, and skills.



## Contents

List of Figures.....	vi
List of Tables .....	viii
Introduction .....	1
Legitimacy: concept and relevance .....	1
Comparing perceived legitimacy in different regimes .....	3
Perceived legitimacy, trust, or support? .....	5
Three ways to explore factors influencing perceived legitimacy .....	7
Chapter 1. Perceived Legitimacy: The Concepts and Theories .....	9
1.1. Approaches to legitimacy, levels of analysis, and dimensions of legitimacy ....	12
Normative and descriptive approaches to legitimacy .....	12
Levels of analysis in social sciences and dimensions of legitimacy .....	14
Democratic bias and research into legitimacy .....	20
1.2. Concept definition and theories of legitimacy .....	26
Definitions of the concept .....	26
Theory of legitimacy: Legitimacy among other resources of power.....	28
1.3. Perceived legitimacy and its antecedents: theoretical model and hypotheses ...	31
Factors influencing perceived legitimacy: a causal model .....	34
Perceived legitimacy in different regimes: a comparative model .....	43
Summary of research questions and hypotheses .....	46
Chapter 2. Methodology .....	49
2.1. Comparative study of perceived legitimacy .....	49
Hybrid regimes: Russia and Ukraine.....	49
Democracies: Poland, Netherlands, and France .....	52
2.2. Sample .....	55
2.3. Survey.....	56
Experimental vignette.....	59
Open question study .....	62
Correlational study .....	68
Chapter 3. Comparative Study of Factors Influencing Perceived Legitimacy across Different Political Regimes .....	69

3.1. Theory, definitions and hypotheses .....	70
3.2. Experimental vignette method.....	72
3.3. Results of the experiments.....	74
Netherlands.....	74
France .....	78
Poland.....	81
Ukraine .....	86
Russia .....	90
3.4. Comparative analysis.....	97
3.5. Discussion .....	104
3.6. Conclusion.....	107
Chapter 4. What makes political authority legitimate? An analysis of ideas about legitimacy in the Netherlands, France, Poland, Ukraine, and Russia .....	110
4.1. Results .....	114
Results of representational coding.....	114
4.2. Comparison of the representational codes.....	121
4.3. Comparison of the hypothesis-guided codes .....	129
4.4. Conclusions .....	131
Chapter 5. Cross-country study of perceived legitimacy of the current political authorities .....	136
5.1. Comparative descriptive data .....	140
5.2. Multiple regression analysis .....	145
5.3. The Netherlands.....	145
5.4. France .....	150
5.5. Poland.....	155
5.6. Ukraine .....	161
5.7. Russia .....	167
5.8. Comparative discussion and conclusions .....	173
Chapter 6. General discussion and conclusions.....	181
Summary of results.....	181
Main results .....	181
Differences between individuals socialized in different regimes .....	185

Theoretical and methodological contributions .....	188
Implications for further research .....	190
References .....	193
Appendices .....	206
APPENDIX A. Definitions of legitimacy .....	207
APPENDIX B: Survey .....	217
APPENDIX C: Participant instruction .....	222
APPENDIX D. Comparison of the online and pen-and-paper samples .....	223
APPENDIX E. Higher education institutions attended by Russian respondents....	226
APPENDIX F. Versions of the vignette .....	242
APPENDIX G. Coding scheme development and inter-coder reliability establishment .....	275
APPENDIX H: Manipulation checks .....	283
APPENDIX I: Factor analysis of perceived legitimacy items.....	284
APPENDIX J: Assessment of the homogeneity of variance .....	285
APPENDIX K: Frequency tables for analysis in Chapter 4. ....	286
APPENDIX L: Cronbach's $\alpha$ for the 3-item SES scales. ....	296
APPENDIX M: Effects of manipulation from the vignette experiment on perceived legitimacy of the real institutions .....	297
Nederlandse Samenvatting .....	299
Curriculum vitae .....	304

## List of Figures

Figure 1.1. Levels of legitimacy assessment.

Figure 1.2. Factors determining the type of power transfer.

Figure 1.3. Factors influencing perceived legitimacy tested in this study: economic rewards (outcome favourability), dependence, distributive justice (based on the principles of need and equality), procedural justice (voice), and socialization (in different countries).

Figure 3.1. Factors influencing perceived legitimacy tested in this study: personal outcome, dependence, distributive justice, procedural justice, and socialization (in different countries).

Figure 3.2. The Netherlands: Mean perceived legitimacy for all 16 conditions.

Figure 3.3. Mean perceived legitimacy scores to describe the distributive justice  $\times$  positive outcome interaction.

Figure 3.4. Mean perceived legitimacy scores to describe the distributive justice  $\times$  procedural justice interaction.

Figure 3.5. Mean perceived legitimacy scores to describe the procedural justice  $\times$  dependence  $\times$  positive outcome interaction.

Figure 3.6. France: Mean perceived legitimacy for all 16 conditions.

Figure 3.7. Mean perceived legitimacy scores to describe the procedural justice  $\times$  distributive justice interaction.

Figure 3.8. Mean perceived legitimacy scores to describe the distributive justice  $\times$  positive outcome interaction.

Figure 3.9. Poland: Mean perceived legitimacy for all 16 conditions.

Figure 3.10. Mean perceived legitimacy scores to describe the distributive justice  $\times$  positive outcome interaction.

Figure 3.11. Mean perceived legitimacy scores to describe the dependence  $\times$  positive outcome interaction.

Figure 3.12. Mean perceived legitimacy scores to describe the dependence  $\times$  positive outcome  $\times$  procedural justice interaction.

Figure 3.13. Mean perceived legitimacy scores for all 16 conditions to describe the procedural justice  $\times$  distributive justice  $\times$  dependence  $\times$  positive outcome interaction.

Figure 3.14. Ukraine: Mean perceived legitimacy for all 16 conditions.

Figure 3.15. Mean perceived legitimacy scores to describe the procedural justice  $\times$  distributive justice interaction effect.

Figure 3.16. Mean perceived legitimacy scores to describe the positive outcome  $\times$  distributive justice interaction effect.

Figure 3.17. Mean perceived legitimacy scores to describe the positive outcome  $\times$  dependence interaction effect.

Figure 3.18. Russia: Mean perceived legitimacy for all 16 conditions.

Figure 3.19. Mean perceived legitimacy scores to describe the procedural justice  $\times$  distributive justice interaction effect.

Figure 3.20. Mean perceived legitimacy scores to describe the distributive justice  $\times$  positive outcome interaction effect.

Figure 3.21. Mean perceived legitimacy scores to describe the dependence  $\times$  positive outcome interaction effect.

Figure 3.22. Mean perceived legitimacy scores to describe the dependence  $\times$  distributive justice interaction effect.

Figure 3.23. Mean perceived legitimacy scores to describe the interaction of dependence  $\times$  positive outcome  $\times$  distributive justice interaction effect.

Figure 3.24. Mean perceived legitimacy scores to describe the dependence  $\times$  distributive justice  $\times$  procedural justice interaction effect.

Figure 3.25. Mean perceived legitimacy scores across all conditions in five countries.

Figure 3.26. Mean difference between perceived legitimacy score when procedural justice was present and when procedural justice was absent in five countries.

Figure 3.27. Mean difference between perceived legitimacy score when distributive justice was present and perceived legitimacy score when distributive justice was absent in five countries.

## List of Tables

Table 1.1. Levels of analysis and dimensions of legitimacy

Table 1.2. Dimensions of legitimacy according to David Beetham and operationalization by Bruce Gilley.

Table 1.3. Resources of power and the type of power transfer.

Table 2.1. Comparison of regimes: evaluations by different institutions and projects

Table 2.2. Numbers of answers to the open question.

Table 2.3. List of representational and hypothesis-guided codes (used in the last coding phase).

Table 2.4. Hypothesis guided codes: representational codes according to input, throughput, output criteria.

Table 3.1. Results of factorial ANOVA for perceived legitimacy (N = 379, adjusted  $R^2 = .300$ ).

Table 3.2. Factorial ANOVA for perceived legitimacy (N = 323, adjusted  $R^2 = .217$ ).

Table 3.3. Factorial ANOVA for perceived legitimacy (N = 437, adjusted  $R^2 = .221$ ).

Table 3.4. Factorial ANOVA for perceived legitimacy (N=425, adjusted  $R^2=.466$ ).

Table 3.5. Factorial ANOVA for perceived legitimacy (N=929, adjusted  $R^2=.243$ ).

Table 3.6. Results of factorial ANOVAs for each country (full model).

Table 3.7. Factorial ANOVA for perceived legitimacy on the merged dataset (N = 2493, adjusted  $R^2 = .268$ ).

Table 4.1. Rank orders of codes (all answers).

Table 4.2. Ten most frequent answers in the Netherlands, France, Poland, Ukraine, and Russia (answers from all positions).

Table 4.3. Ten most frequent first answers in the Netherlands, France, Poland, Ukraine, and Russia (the most important characteristic of legitimate authorities).

Table 4.4. Frequency of dimensions per country (answers from first positions only).

Table 4.5. Frequency of legitimacy dimensions per country (answers from all positions).

Table 5.1. Items measuring perceived legitimacy of the government, parliament, courts, and president.

Table 5.2. Independent variables: survey questions.

Table 5.3. Scale consistency and mean scores for perceived legitimacy for the government, parliament, courts, and president in the Netherlands, France, Poland, Ukraine, and Russia.

Table 5.4. Means and standard deviations for predictors in all samples.

Table 5.5. The Netherlands: Linear model of predictors of the current government's perceived legitimacy.

Table 5.6. The Netherlands: Linear model of predictors of the current parliament's perceived legitimacy.

Table 5.7. The Netherlands: Linear model of predictors of the current courts' perceived legitimacy

Table 5.8. France: Linear model of predictors of the current government's perceived legitimacy

Table 5.9. France: Linear model of predictors of the current parliament's perceived legitimacy

Table 5.10. France: Linear model of predictors of the current courts' perceived legitimacy

Table 5.11. France: Linear model of predictors of the current president's perceived legitimacy

Table 5.12. Poland: Linear model of predictors of the current government's perceived legitimacy

Table 5.13. Poland: Linear model of predictors of the current parliament's perceived legitimacy

Table 5.14. Poland: Linear model of predictors of the current courts' perceived legitimacy

Table 5.15. Poland: Linear model of predictors of the current president's perceived legitimacy

Table 5.16. Ukraine: Linear model of predictors of the current government's perceived legitimacy

Table 5.17. Ukraine: Linear model of predictors of the current parliament's perceived legitimacy

Table 5.18. Ukraine: Linear model of predictors of the current courts' perceived legitimacy

Table 5.19. Ukraine: Linear model of predictors of the current president's perceived legitimacy

Table 5.20. Russia: Linear model of predictors of the current government's perceived legitimacy

Table 5.21. Russia: Linear model of predictors of the current parliament's perceived legitimacy

Table 5.22. Russia: Linear model of predictors of the current courts' perceived legitimacy

Table 5.23. Russia: Linear model of predictors of the current president's perceived legitimacy

Table 5.24. Comparison of "specific" predictors across countries (see text for explanation).

Table 5.25. Comparison of "general" predictors across countries (see text for explanation).