



Universiteit
Leiden

The Netherlands

Open government and public trust: a new revaluation of the citizen perspective

Witkam, M.

Citation

Witkam, M. (2024, October 8). *Open government and public trust: a new revaluation of the citizen perspective*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4094590>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4094590>

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

OPEN GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC TRUST

A new revaluation of the citizen perspective

Mathilde Witkam

OPEN GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC TRUST
A new revaluation of the citizen perspective

© Mathilde Witkam, the Netherlands, 2024

Cover design: Mathilde in association with ziggyzazoe.com

Photo: Paula Strijbis

Layout: Mathilde Witkam

Printing: druk-24h.com.pl

OPEN GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC TRUST

A new revaluation of the citizen perspective

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van
de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden
op gezag van rector magnificus prof.dr.ir. H. Bijl,
volgens besluit van het college voor promoties
te verdedigen op dinsdag 8 oktober 2024
klokke 11.30 uur

door

Mathilde Witkam
geboren te Leiden in 1982

Promotor: Prof. dr. A. Kutsal Yesilkagit

Co-promotor: Dr. Carola J.A. van Eijk

Promotiecommissie

Voorzitter: Prof. mr. dr. Erwin R. Muller

Leden: Dr. Koen P.R. Bartels (University of Birmingham)

Dr. Petra E.A. van den Bekerom

Prof. dr. Caelesta H.J.M. Braun

Prof. dr. ing. Bram J. Klievink

Prof. dr. Albert Meijer (Universiteit Utrecht)

*To my children Zoey, Zara-Lily, Floris and Philip,
that you may always stay curious*

Preface: curiosity

While writing a dissertation, one searches for a balance between aligning with what already exists and bringing something new to the table. A balance between scientific jargon and understandable language – that is, if you want the message to come across in and outside of academia. I have made an effort to do so, broadening not only my own view but hopefully yours as well. Any dissertation is a baby step in the advancement of science. But as any parent knows, baby steps can feel huge. As my father always says, *“Curiosity is the beginning of science.”* This is the beginning of my exploration of public trust. Are you curious?

Table of contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Introduction | 12 |
| 1.1 The problem of trust | 15 |
| 1.2 Open government and trust: knowledge gaps | 16 |
| 1.3 Problem statement and research question | 18 |
| 1.4 Research design and context | 19 |
| 1.5 Practical relevance | 22 |
| 1.6 Structure of the study | 24 |
| | |
| 2. Literature review | 25 |
| 2.1 What is public trust? | 25 |
| 2.1.1 The meaning and importance of trust | 25 |
| 2.1.2 Defining public trust | 28 |
| 2.2 What is open government? | 30 |
| 2.3 Open government and public trust | 33 |
| 2.3.1 Transparency and trust | 33 |
| 2.3.2 Data insight and trust | 39 |
| 2.3.3 Participation and trust | 43 |
| 2.4 Other determinants of public trust | 49 |
| 2.4.1 Performance | 49 |
| 2.4.2 Exogenous determinants of public trust | 50 |
| 2.5 Remaining puzzles | 52 |
| 2.5.1 Why is the effect of transparency on trust ambiguous? | 52 |
| 2.5.2 When does participation enhance public trust? | 55 |
| 2.5.3 Does combined institutional openness enhance trust? | 57 |
| 2.6 Conclusion | 58 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 3. Building a theoretical framework | 59 |
| 3.1 Public trust: perceived competence, benevolence, and integrity | 59 |
| 3.2 Open government: transparency, data insight, and participation | 62 |
| 3.3 Hypotheses | 63 |
| 3.3.1 Institutional transparency | 63 |
| 3.3.2 Data insight by government | 69 |
| 3.3.3 Participation possibilities | 71 |
| 3.3.4 Open government | 74 |
| 3.3.5 The role of performance | 75 |
| 3.4 Research model | 76 |
| | |
| 4. Methodology | 79 |
| 4.1 Introduction: mixed method design | 79 |
| 4.2 Research context | 81 |
| 4.2.1 Local government | 81 |
| 4.2.2 Introducing the empirical domain | 82 |
| 4.2.3 The population: homeowners | 82 |
| 4.3 Designing the survey study | 83 |
| 4.3.1 Why (two) surveys? | 83 |
| 4.3.2 Survey administration | 84 |
| 4.4 Measuring public trust | 88 |
| 4.4.1 From definitions to survey items | 88 |
| 4.4.2 Control variables | 92 |
| 4.5 Measuring open government | 95 |
| 4.5.1 Survey administration | 95 |
| 4.5.2 Open government indicators | 96 |
| 4.6 Focus groups | 98 |
| 4.6.1 Topic list and coding | 99 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 4.6.2 Facilitating the focus groups | 100 |
| 4.6.3 Sample selection | 101 |
| 4.7 Interviews | 102 |
| 4.7.1 Topic list and coding | 103 |
| 4.7.2 Examining different modes of participation | 105 |
| 4.7.3 Sample selection | 106 |
| 5. A survey study on the relationship between openness and trust | 108 |
| 5.1 Descriptive statistics and correlations | 108 |
| 5.1.1 Descriptives | 108 |
| 5.1.2 Are openness and public trust correlated? | 112 |
| 5.2 Is openness an adequate trust predictor? | 114 |
| 5.2.1 Does institutional openness affect public trust? | 114 |
| 5.2.2 Does perceived openness affect public trust? | 119 |
| 5.3 Auxiliary findings | 122 |
| 5.4 Reflecting on the results: new puzzles | 125 |
| 5.4.1 Ambiguous effects of institutional transparency | 125 |
| 5.4.2 Discrepancy between practices and perceptions | 127 |
| 5.4.3 Interrelationship between participation and trust | 129 |
| 5.4.4 Exchange of public values? | 131 |
| 6. The formation of public perceptions of local government | 133 |
| 6.1 Which mechanisms influence the effect of transparency on trust? | 133 |
| 6.1.1 Transparency disuse | 134 |
| 6.1.2 Disappointment with transparency | 141 |
| 6.1.3 Concluding remarks on the transparency-trust relationship | 146 |
| 6.2 Tax payers' perspectives on openness and trustworthiness | 147 |
| 6.2.1 Openness perceptions | 147 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 6.2.2 Perceptions of trustworthiness | 154 |
| 6.2.3 Trust antecedents: to what do people attribute their trust? | 158 |
| 6.3 Which new insights and puzzles do the focus groups bring? | 166 |
| 7. Public encounters and public trust | 170 |
| 7.1 Getting to know the participants: self-efficacy and expectations | 171 |
| 7.1.1 Ease and self-efficacy | 171 |
| 7.1.2 External efficacy | 172 |
| 7.2 Trust: differences between formal and informal participants | 174 |
| 7.2.1 Trust prior to participation | 174 |
| 7.2.2 Trust change | 175 |
| 7.3 Satisfaction: a matter of distributive or procedural justice? | 178 |
| 7.3.1 Procedural aspects | 179 |
| 7.3.2 The effect of terms | 180 |
| 7.3.3 Perceived fairness | 181 |
| 7.3.4 Distributive aspects | 184 |
| 7.4 Why does trust change after an encounter with government? | 186 |
| 7.5 Concluding remarks on public encounters and trust | 189 |
| 8. Conclusions and discussion | 192 |
| 8.1 Answering the research questions | 192 |
| 8.2 Contributions to the research field | 197 |
| 8.2.1 Discrepancy between practices and perceptions | 197 |
| 8.2.2 Understanding transparency and its ambiguous effects | 200 |
| 8.2.3 So what is public trust and how does it originate? | 202 |
| 8.3 Limitations | 207 |
| 8.3.1 Generalizability | 207 |
| 8.3.2 Research design choices | 210 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 8.4 Suggestions for further research | 211 |
| 8.4.1 Discrepancy between conceptualisations | 211 |
| 8.4.2 Valorisation and the citizen perspective | 212 |
| 8.5 Implications of new insights for practice | 213 |
| 8.5.1 Continuous attention to citizens' perceptions | 213 |
| 8.5.2 Realistic expectations of institutional transparency | 216 |
| 8.5.3 The potential of going informal | 217 |
| Bibliography | 219 |
| Appendix 4.1 Example Trust Survey Flyer | 248 |
| Appendix 4.2 Trust Survey (English & Dutch) | 249 |
| Appendix 4.3 Open Government Survey (English & Dutch) | 259 |
| Appendix 4.4 Open Government Scorecard and its rationale | 267 |
| Appendix 4.5 Interview questions objectors (English & Dutch) | 275 |
| Appendix 5.1 PCA perceived trustworthiness | 279 |
| Appendix 5.2 Complete analysis institutional openness | 280 |
| Appendix 5.3 Full ANOVA results on public trust | 297 |
| Appendix 5.4 Regression renters | 301 |
| Appendix 5.5 Regression participants | 304 |
| Nederlandse samenvatting (Dutch Summary) | 307 |
| Acknowledgements | 328 |
| About the Author | 331 |