

Trust in Government: Findings from Public Budgeting Consultations

Lisa M. PytlikZillig,¹ Alan J. Tomkins,¹ Mitchel N. Herian,¹ and Rick D. Hoppe²

*Draft, for comment only, and for presentation at the
Transatlantic Conference on Transparency Research,
Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands
June 7-9, 2012*

Draft Date: April 2012

¹University of Nebraska Public Policy Center, Lincoln, Nebraska, USA

²Office of the Mayor, Lincoln, Nebraska, USA

lpytlikz@nebraska.edu

atomkins@nebraska.edu

mnherian@nebraska.edu

RHoppe@lincoln.ne.gov

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Lisa M. PytlikZillig or Alan J. Tomkins, University of Nebraska Public Policy Center, 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite 401, Lincoln, NE, USA 68588-0228. We want to acknowledge the assistance of Tarik Abdel-Monem of the Public Policy Center and Deadric Williams of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Department of Sociology for their assistance in analyzing data and writing portions of the Final Report (Public Policy Center, 2011) that presents the public budgeting engagement activities, measures, and outcomes in greater depth than are presented in this paper. The public engagement activities are funded by the City of Lincoln. The related research activities are supported by awards from the U.S. National Science Foundation (SBE-0965465 and SES-1061635). Any opinions, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of our funders.

Abstract

Regular public input into a city's budget is mostly associated with Brazil's successes, but American communities are adopting the practice to varying degrees. This paper presents data obtained from a public budgeting discussion in 2011, one discussion in a five-year old participatory budgeting program taking place in the capitol of what is thought of as a very politically conservative state in the U.S. The face-to-face, deliberative discussions resulted in residents recommending that taxes be increased in order to preserve programs. In an era of concern that the American public will not willingly pay for tax increases, the recommendation was surprising. Our work finds that the public welcomes the invitation to participate in governance, has high levels of trust and confidence in government, and is willing to endorse policy options that have been thought to be unpopular among the American public. In this paper, we examine the relationships among trust and confidence, procedural fairness, and support (i.e., legitimacy, loyalty, and satisfaction) variables, asking whether trust and confidence is impacted by public budgeting and what aspects of trust and confidence, if any, make a difference when it comes to supporting city government and funding city services. The results revealed most residents' trust/confidence and perceptions of procedural fairness increased over the course of the day-long, budgeting discussion. Not only did residents generally increase in unspecified confidence, but their specific perceptions of city government trustworthiness (i.e., competence and benevolence) also increased, as did specific perceptions of procedural fairness (government neutrality, sense of voice, and being treated with respect). On the other hand, there was little evidence for pre-post discussion increases in either diffuse or specific support for city government or city services. We provide possible explanations for these findings, as well as discuss future directions for research.

Lincoln, the capital city of what is thought of as a very politically conservative state, Nebraska, is one of a handful of U.S. cities routinely using a public input process as part of its budget decisionmaking.¹ In 2011, residents of Lincoln were invited to give budget input to Lincoln officials by participating in a “Community Conversation,” a day-long, deliberative discussion (University of Nebraska Public Policy Center, 2011). As part of that discussion, residents were asked to identify which programs to eliminate in order to balance the City’s budget. Balancing the budget is a state law requirement. Surprisingly, after considering the budget cut options, the residents recommended that taxes be increased in order to preserve programs. In an era of concern that the American public will not willingly pay for tax increases, the recommendation was surprising.

In this paper, we present findings from our empirical study of the 2011 participatory budgeting discussions in Lincoln. Since 2007, Lincoln residents have been invited to provide input to City officials, and at the same time the residents have participated in research designed to give insights into their decisionmaking and the public participation process. Our work to date indicates the public welcomes the invitation to participate in governance and responds positively by giving online input as well as in face-to-face, all day discussions. In addition, the members of the public who participate in Lincoln’s budgeting input activities have high levels of trust and confidence in government; they are mostly satisfied with how government is performing; and, as noted, they willingly select policy options (e.g., revenue increases) that have been thought to be unpopular among the American public by most in the media and in politics (Herian, Hamm, Tomkins, & PytlikZillig, in press; Herian & Tomkins, 2012; PytlikZillig, Tomkins, Herian, Hamm, & Abdel-Monem, 2012; Tomkins, Hoppe, Herian, PytlikZillig, Abdel-Monem, & Shank, in press; Tomkins, PytlikZillig, Herian, Abdel-Monem, & Hamm, 2010). In this paper we examine

¹ Lincoln is a town of about 250,000. It is the state’s second largest city, after Omaha, and it is capitol of the state of Nebraska. Nebraska is a large state (almost 77 million square miles) with a small population (approaching only 2 million people, according to the most recent census in 2010), and one of least densely populated states in the nation (23.8 persons per square mile) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). It is politically conservative, with an historical antipathy to paying taxes and a political concern about government being too big, doing too much, or expending too many of its citizens’ valuable economic capital.

the extent to which these observations are related and may be attributed to the use of public budgeting processes.

The Porto Alegre public budgeting initiative (*Orçamento Participativo*, or participatory budgeting) that was started pursuant to enactment of the 1988 Citizen's Constitution in Brazil is generally identified as the first meaningful (and sustained – the practice continues today) effort to involve residents in determining municipal budget issues (see, e.g., Abers, 1998; Abers, 2000; Baierle, 1998; Sousa, 1998; Wampler, 2004; Wampler & Avritzer, 2004). Subsequently, the practice has been repeated in other Brazilian cities (e.g., Cornwall, Romano, & Shankland, 2008; Nylén, 2002). It has been a successful practice, spreading across the globe and prompting valuable policy and theory developments (e.g., Cabannes, 2004; Ebdon & Franklin, 2004; Franklin, Ho, & Ebdon, 2009; Kluvers & Pillay, 2009; Robbins, Simonsen, & Feldman, 2008; Shah, 2007; Sintomer, Herzberg, & Röcke, 2008).

One value underlying public budgeting is that it embodies participatory democracy. Another value is the belief that it enhances the public's trust and confidence in government (e.g., Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, 2009; Wang & Wan Wart, 2007; Yetano, Royo, & Acerete, 2010). Researchers have hypothesized that part of the increase in trust/confidence is probably will increase due to citizens' feelings that, through participatory budgeting processes, the government is acting in a fair and transparent manner, that they are being treated with dignity and respect and so on (e.g., Herian et al., in press; Markell & Tyler, 2008; see also Yetano et al.). Surprisingly, however, there is little empirical inquiry into whether public budgeting activities have the assumed laudatory impacts on trust and confidence in government. Indeed, there is evidence from other contexts that perhaps trust stems less from participation in decisionmaking than other factors (e.g., Mizrahi, Vigoda-Gadot, & Cohen, 2010).

In addition to the question of whether trust/confidence is impacted, is the question of which facets of trust/confidence may be impacted by public budgeting. Trust is commonly viewed as a

multidimensional construct, and there are many facets to trust and confidence in governmental institutions. We investigate three main categories of trust-related variables in this paper, each of which we assessed within the face-to-face, public discussions held in Lincoln in the spring of 2011. First, we investigate *trust and confidence* variables. These variables include the endorsement of direct expressions of trust/confidence which often do not specify the bases of that trust² (Hamm, PytlikZillig, Tomkins, Herian, Bornstein, & Neeley, 2011), as well as perceptions of trustworthiness, which most often include perceptions of competence, integrity, and benevolence (e.g., Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 2006). Second, we consider indicators of *procedural fairness*. These indicators include perceptions of having a say or a voice in decisions made by the institution, perceptions of neutrality of the institution, and perceptions of respectful treatment (e.g., Herian et al., in press; Lind & Van den Bos, 2002; Markell & Tyler, 2008; Tyler, 2006b). Third, we consider indicators of *institutional support*. These include both general or more “diffuse” support for the institution, and more specific support for the City’s programs and services offered by City government. Perceptions of the legitimacy of institutions are sometimes equated with diffuse support, as are loyal attitudes or willingness to remain loyal and offer support to an institution even when dissatisfied (e.g., Gibson, 2008; Gibson, Caldeira, & Spence, 2005; Tyler, 2006a, 2006b). Meanwhile, satisfaction is sometimes referred to as an indicator of more specific and transient support that varies over time and situations (e.g., Gibson, Caldeira, & Spence, 2005).

As we investigate these three classes of variables, we ask not only whether these trust-related variables are impacted by public budgeting, but what aspects of trust and confidence, if any, make a difference when it comes to supporting city government and funding city services. That is, we look at the relationship between trust/confidence, procedural fairness, and institutional support variables, in order to see whether these variables might explain critical budgeting determinations, such as whether

² This is sometimes referred to as “unspecified trust.”

residents feel the city should maintain or decrease city services. In times of budget austerity, this issue is one fundamental to governance and has significant impact on quality of life for residents (both in terms of services that might be available to residents as well as taxes that residents will pay). As previously indicated, the research we report on in this paper stems from data we have collected at the same time we engaged in a public budgeting exercise for residents in Lincoln (University of Nebraska Public Policy Center, 2011). In these analyses we ask whether there are certain specific facets of trust and confidence in Lincoln City government, or other trust-related variables, that are especially likely to be responsible for people's willingness to support preservation of the City's services.

Only a handful of researchers have focused on the conceptualization, measurement, and/or development of trust and confidence (e.g., Cook & Gronke, 2005; Earle & Siegrist, 2006; Fehr, 2009; Gibson, Caldeira, & Spence, 2003; Hamm et al., 2011; Hardin, 2006a, 2006b; Levi & Stoker, 2000; Tyler, 2006b; Tyler & Huo, 2002). This lack of attention is a critical weakness in the trust/confidence literature (e.g., Nannestad, 2008). Moreover, the issue of trust and confidence has not been extensively examined in the participatory budget context. In this paper, we also contribute to our understanding of trust-and-confidence related constructs within the participatory budget context. Specifically, we examine trust and confidence factors (unspecified confidence, trustworthiness), procedural fairness, and institutional support (legitimacy, loyalty, and satisfaction). The research we have and others have conducted suggests we should find increases in the public's trust/confidence in city government in our participatory budgeting study, because this is an instance in which the public is invited to meaningfully contribute to fundamental policymaking (Herian et al., in press; PytlikZillig et al., 2012; Tomkins et al., in press; Tomkins et al., 2010; Wang & Want Wart, 2007; Yetano et al., 2010).

Methods

Participants

Participants were invited to attend a “Community Conversation” about the City’s budget when they completed an online survey about the same topic (University of Nebraska Public Policy Center, 2011). A total of 281 online survey respondents indicated they would consider attending the Community Conversation, a day-long public deliberation, dialogue, and information/education³ session. Those individuals were contacted by e-mail, letter, and telephone, and asked to confirm their participation. A total of 70 people confirmed their intention to attend prior to the event, and 60 individuals actually attended. Of the total attendees, 61% were male, 98% were white, 76% had a college degree (this includes 36% who also had a graduate or professional degree) and the average age was 54 years (standard deviation = 18 years). Although Nebraska is typically viewed as a conservative state, the majority of those attending the Community Conversation identified as liberal (57%) rather than as conservative (18%) or centrist (26%).

Procedures

The Community Conversation on the budget was held on a Saturday in June 2011 at City Hall. Upon arrival at the meeting, residents were randomly assigned to one of eight small discussion groups, each one facilitated by a trained discussion moderator who had been recruited from organizations that routinely provide facilitation for public or private purposes. The format for the Community Conversation was based on the Deliberative Polling model, a public engagement method which has been used successfully in a variety of other municipalities across the globe (see generally, Center for Deliberative Democracy, 2012; Fishkin, Luskin, & Jowell, 2000; Luskin, Fishkin, & Jowell, 2002). Deliberative Polling measures changes in opinions and knowledge about a public policy issue among individuals after having

³ As part of the day, residents were provided information about the city’s budget, taxes, and relevant information about city services that were in jeopardy of being reduced or cut, along with the costs associated with preserving them (University of Nebraska Public Policy Center, 2011).

had an opportunity to learn more about the issue and discuss it with others. As opposed to a survey, Deliberative Polling thus provides individuals with an opportunity to consider their ideas with others, and make decisions informed by other perspectives (Fishkin & Luskin, 2005).

Participants completed a pre-event survey at the beginning of the day. The Community Conversation was then composed of the following activities: 1) A large group session in which the Mayor provided a presentation about the City's budget and City services; 2) a small group session in which participants identified questions for City department heads about the budget and services; 3) a large group session featuring a presentation by a business professor from a local university concerning tax revenue and local economic development; 4) a question and answer session with City department heads responding to participants' questions; 5) a small group session in which participants ranked the select City services in order of importance and identified whether they should be preserved or eliminated from the budget; and, finally, 6) a large group session in which participants reported back on their discussion results. In addition, throughout the day, residents were given the opportunity to video-record individual messages that they would like the Mayor and City Directors to hear. The large group sessions were also videotaped and played on the City's television channel. Finally, at the end of the day, participants completed a post-event survey containing many of the same questions asked on the pre-event survey.

Measures

Numerous *trust-and-confidence-related constructs* were assessed on both the pre and post surveys. Table 1 lists the constructs, items, and reliabilities of scales assessing each related construct. These items were drawn or adapted from existing sources such as the General Social Survey (GSS) and other studies of trust-related constructs (e.g., Gibson et al, 2003; Hamm et al., 2011; PytlikZillig et al., 2012; Tomkins et al., 2011; Tyler, 2006b; Tyler & Huo, 2002). As shown in Table 1, we assessed *unspecified confidence* using three items that represented general expressions of confidence without reference to the bases for that confidence (PytlikZillig et al., 2012). Perceived *trustworthiness* was

assessed with items pertaining to specific perceptions of *integrity*, *benevolence*, and *competence*, the three components most often cited as important to assessing trustworthiness (e.g., Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Mayer et al., 2006). Perceptions of procedural fairness included assessments of whether residents felt they had *voice* in government, whether officials were *neutral* (vs. biased), and whether they treated residents with *respect*, in line with other research identifying components of procedural fairness (e.g., Tomkins, 2007-2008; Tyler, 2006b; Tyler & Huo, 2002).

Assessment of support for City government was based on conceptualizations offered by theorists such as Gibson and Tyler (e.g., Gibson et al., 2003; Tyler & Huo, 2002). Gibson, for example, equates specific support for institutions with satisfaction with the institution's performance and policies, and distinguishes specific support from a more "diffuse" support that represents a deeper and more stable commitment to support the institution (Gibson et al., 2003; cf., Easton, 1965). In this study, as in our past studies (PytlikZillig et al., 2012; Tomkins et al., 2011), we assess two forms of diffuse support: acknowledgement of the legitimacy of the institution in terms of its rightful holding and use of power, and loyal attitudes reflecting a willingness to support the institution even in the face of non-preferred policies or disagreement with the institution. In addition, we assess two forms of specific support: satisfaction with City government, and a specific *willingness to support City services*. This latter construct (not listed in Table 1)⁴ was assessed in two ways: (1) as the total number of City programs that participants were willing to fund, and (2) as the total cost of the programs implied by their program choices. To assess these variables, residents were given a list of nine services,⁵ descriptions of the usage of each service, their costs, and some of the impacts of cutting each service (University of Nebraska

⁴ The support for city services questions were, in full form, quite long due to the provision of background information about the services. These questions are available from the authors upon request.

⁵ These services were: (1) Neighborhood libraries, (2) Fire station, (3) Neighborhood pools, (4) Tree maintenance, (5) Economic development, (6) City bus routes, (7) Nature Center, (8) Senior volunteer programs, (9) Non-injury accident investigations by police officers.

Public Policy Center, 2011). They were asked to indicate, yes or no, whether they would like to keep funding or stop funding for each service.

Table 1
Trust and Confidence-Related Constructs, Items, and Internal and Temporal Reliabilities

Construct	Items	Cronbach's α (<i>r</i>)
TRUST & CONFIDENCE		
Unspecified Confidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lincoln residents can count on the City government to get the job done. Lincoln City government can usually be trusted to make decisions that are right for the residents as a whole. I have a lot of confidence in Lincoln City government. 	.71, .90 (.80)
Trustworthiness		.91, .89 (.78)
<i>Integrity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most Lincoln City government officials are honest. Most Lincoln City officials lack integrity. (reversed) 	.78, .66 (.73)
<i>Benevolence</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lincoln City government officials have residents' best interests in mind when they make decisions. For the most part, the decisions made by Lincoln City government are made out of care and concern for Lincoln City residents. Lincoln City government officials are motivated more out of self-interest than out of concern for Lincoln residents. (reversed) 	.81, .88 (.68)
<i>Competence</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most Lincoln City government officials are competent to do their jobs. The Lincoln City government is made up of highly qualified individuals. The Lincoln City government is not very competent. (reversed) 	.80, .87 (.62)
PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS		
Voice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public officials in Lincoln City government care about what people like me think. Residents have a great say in important Lincoln City government decisions. Citizens can influence the Lincoln City government's decisions. 	.82, .91 (.83)
Neutrality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The decisions made by the Lincoln City government are biased. (reversed) Lincoln City government officials base their decisions on the facts, not their personal interests. Lincoln City government is overly influenced by special interest groups. (reversed) 	.82, .89 (.70)
Respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lincoln City government officials treat residents with respect. 	n/a (.71)
INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT		
Legitimacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lincoln City government officials are chosen using fair and appropriate methods. The Lincoln City government is a legitimate governing body. The Lincoln City government uses its power appropriately. 	.77, .57 (.71)

Construct	Items	Cronbach's α (r)
Loyalty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lincoln City government usually has good reasons for its decisions, even when those decisions are not popular. Citizens should support the Lincoln City government even if they disagree with some of its specific decisions or policies. Even when I disagree with a decision made by the Lincoln City government, I still believe the government deserves respect. The Lincoln City government is greatly in need of reform. (reversed) 	.69, .81 (.79)
Satisfaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am satisfied with the Lincoln City government. 	n/a (.74)

Notes. Responses were on a 5-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Reversed items were recoded so that 5=1, 4=2, 2=4, and 1=5. For the Cronbach's alphas, Time 1 alpha is listed first and Time 2 alpha is listed second. The test-retest correlation (r) is in parentheses after the alpha values. All test-retest correlations are significant at the $p < .01$ level or higher. $Ns = 55$ to 58 .

RESULTS

Was there a change in perceptions and attitudes over time?

Our first set of analyses investigates the impact of the participatory budgeting activities by examining changes in our three types of variables (trust & confidence, procedural fairness, institutional support), over time. To determine whether Lincoln residents' trust/confidence in their City's government increased over time, we looked both at the average increase or decrease on specific trust/confidence-related constructs, and the numbers of persons whose trust/confidence increased or decreased. Table 2 shows the pre and post average scores on the primary trust and fairness measures. As shown, nearly all of the indicators of trust and confidence in government and perceptions of procedural fairness moved in a positive direction. The main exception was *perceived integrity of City government*, which did increase, but not significantly. However, it may have been difficult to observe changes in the integrity measure due to ceiling effects (Lincoln City government was already rated quite high in integrity prior to the deliberation).

Table 2

Change in participant trust and confidence and procedural fairness variables, from before to after day-long public deliberation and dialogue

Constructs	Mean	N	SD	Mean change	SD change	t	df	p
TRUST & CONFIDENCE								
Unspecified Confidence								
post-deliberation	3.80	57	.71	.26***	.43	4.53	56	.000
pre-deliberation	3.54	57	.60					
Trustworthiness								
post-deliberation	3.98	57	.62	.18**	.40	3.49	56	.001
pre-deliberation	3.79	57	.58					
Integrity								
post-deliberation	4.10	56	.76	.12	.54	1.61	55	.113
pre-deliberation	3.98	56	.68					
Benevolence								
post-deliberation	3.82	57	.75	.20*	.57	2.57	56	.013
pre-deliberation	3.62	57	.69					
Competence								
post-deliberation	4.04	57	.60	.21**	.51	3.15	56	.003
pre-deliberation	3.83	57	.56					
PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS								
Voice								
post-deliberation	3.73	57	.73	.20***	.41	3.75	56	.000
pre-deliberation	3.52	57	.70					
Neutrality								
post-deliberation	3.73	57	.73	.66***	.56	8.94	56	.000
pre-deliberation	3.06	57	.71					
Respect ^a								
post-deliberation	4.00	55	.69	.15*	.49	2.21	54	.031
Pre-deliberation	3.85	55	.52					

^aAssessed with a single item. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Because average score results can sometimes be affected by extreme changes of relatively few individuals, we also examined the number of persons who increased, decreased, and did not change in their trust in City government. First, we computed overall trust in government by averaging across all of the individual trust and confidence items used in the scales reported in Table 2 at Time 1 (before the deliberative and dialogue activities) and Time 2 (at the end of the day, after the activities) (Cronbach's alphas = .93, .94, at Time 1 and Time 2 respectively).

The mean change score was .24, and the standard deviation of the change score was .40 (range of scores = -1.00 to +1.14). We used .10 as a potentially meaningful amount of change and classified those with 0 +/- .10 changes as no change, those with > +.10 as increasing in trust, and those < -.10 as decreasing in trust. Using this definition, Table 3 shows that only 9 people decreased in trust (15% of the sample). One-fifth of the sample did not change, and over half of the sample (64%) increased in trust.⁶

Table 3
Number of persons increasing or decreasing in levels of trust

			Frequency	Percent
Change in Trust & Confidence	Decreased	(< -.10)	9	16.4
	No Change	(-.10 < and < +.10)	11	20.0
	Increased	(> +.10)	35	63.6
	Total		55	100.0

Notes: Change in trust and confidence was assessed by averaging across all 14 of the trust and confidence variables items administered at each time point and then subtracting the Time 1 score from the Time 2 score.

We next examined whether change in the diffuse and specific support variables also increased pre to post the deliberation and dialog activities. As Table 4 shows, the results were the inverse of the trust/confidence and procedural fairness results: Most of the support variables did not change significantly from pre to post deliberation. Only one of the institutional support variables (loyalty) increased significantly.

Table 4
Change in participant support for City government and City programs, from before to after day-long public deliberation and dialogue

Constructs	Mean	N	SD	Mean change	SD change	t	df	p
SUPPORT								
Legitimacy								
post-deliberation	4.02	57	.58	.03	.45	.49	56	.623
pre-deliberation	3.99	57	.59					
Loyalty								
post-deliberation	3.83	57	.65	.15**	.39	2.94	56	.005
pre-deliberation	3.68	57	.56					
Satisfaction ^a								
post-deliberation	3.79	56	.87	.13	.60	1.55	55	.128

⁶ In absolute terms, 10 persons decreased, 3 received a change score of exactly zero, and 42 increased.

Constructs	Mean	N	SD	Mean change	SD change	t	df	p
pre-deliberation	3.66	56	.82					
Proportion of total programs funded								
post-deliberation	.75	54	.24	.03	.16	1.56	53	.124
pre-deliberation	.72	54	.26					
Total cost of programs funded								
post-deliberation	2655.19	54	918.55	154.07	589.48	1.92	53	.060
pre-deliberation	2501.11	54	921.42					

^a Assessed with a single item. ** $p < .01$

What, if any, aspects of trust and confidence relate to the support of City government and support of City services?

We were interested in the meaningfulness of the change in trust as it pertained to support for city government or support for city programs. As shown in Table 5, both the trust and confidence and procedural fairness variables were significantly correlated with diffuse and specific support for City government, including support for City programs. This was true whether trust/confidence and support was assessed before (Time 1) or after (Time 2) the deliberation and dialogue activities.

Table 5
Correlations between trust variables and support for City programs at pre and post deliberative and dialogue activities

Component	PRE-DELIBERATION SUPPORT					POST-DELIBERATION SUPPORT				
	Legitimacy	Loyalty	Satisfaction	Total programs funded	Tot programs cost	Legitimacy	Loyalty	Satisfaction	Total programs funded	Tot programs cost
PRE-DELIBERATION										
<i>Trust & Confidence</i>										
Unspecified confidence	.73***	.74***	.71***	.42**	.38**	.57***	.74***	.68***	.38**	.35**
Trustworthiness ^a	.78***	.78***	.74***	.48***	.42**	.65***	.77***	.70***	.35**	.34*
Integrity	.72***	.72***	.72***	.34*	.30*	.66***	.76***	.78***	.35**	.34*
Benevolence	.69***	.71***	.64***	.41**	.36**	.59***	.69***	.55***	.28*	.28*
Competence	.74***	.69***	.68***	.53***	.46***	.55***	.66***	.63***	.32**	.30*
<i>Procedural Fairness</i>										
Voice	.71***	.71***	.65***	.50***	.42**	.59***	.74***	.75***	.50***	.47***
Neutrality	.75***	.76***	.75***	.53***	.45**	.59***	.73***	.64***	.36**	.33*
Respect ^b	.68***	.59***	.54***	.41**	.36**	.70***	.73***	.70***	.44**	.41**
<i>Institutional Support</i>										
Legitimacy	--	.65***	.61***	.48***	.41**	.71***	.71***	.69***	.44**	.42**
Loyalty	.65***	--	.73***	.43**	.38**	.59***	.80***	.67***	.42**	.40**

Component	PRE-DELIBERATION SUPPORT					POST-DELIBERATION SUPPORT				
	Legitimacy	Loyalty	Satisfaction	Total programs funded	Tot programs cost	Legitimacy	Loyalty	Satisfaction	Total programs funded	Tot programs cost
Satisfaction ^b	.61***	.73***	--	.25	.15	.54***	.72***	.74***	.22	.18
Total programs funded	.48***	.43**	.25	--	.96***	.30*	.39**	.30*	.80***	.75***
Total programs cost	.41**	.38**	.15	.96***	--	.24	.35*	.24	.81***	.80***
POST-DELIBERATION										
Trust & Confidence										
Unspecified confidence	.73***	.78***	.67***	.45**	.42**	.67***	.84***	.82***	.49***	.46***
Trustworthiness ^a	.76***	.70***	.71***	.39**	.35*	.75***	.82***	.86***	.43**	.42**
Integrity	.63***	.53***	.63***	.29*	.22	.62***	.60***	.68***	.35**	.33*
Benevolence	.73***	.73***	.67***	.42**	.40**	.68***	.83***	.79***	.43**	.43**
Competence	.64***	.56***	.60***	.31*	.26	.70***	.74***	.85***	.34**	.34**
Procedural Fairness										
Voice	.66***	.68***	.56***	.42**	.38**	.57***	.72***	.75***	.47***	.44**
Neutrality	.66***	.68***	.56***	.42**	.38**	.57***	.72***	.75***	.47***	.44**
Respect ^b	.66***	.62***	.61***	.29*	.27	.69***	.74***	.83***	.26	.26
Institutional Support										
Legitimacy	.71***	.59***	.54***	.30*	.24	--	.75***	.67***	.35**	.34**
Loyalty	.71***	.80***	.72***	.39**	.35*	.75***	--	.81***	.38**	.37**
Satisfaction ^b	.69***	.67***	.74***	.30*	.24	.67***	.81***	--	.33*	.31*
Total programs funded	.44**	.42**	.22	.80***	.81***	.35**	.38**	.33*	--	.97***
Total programs cost	.42**	.40**	.18	.75***	.80***	.34**	.37**	.31*	.97***	--

Notes. $N = 52$ to 59 . ^aIncludes the components of integrity, benevolence, and competence. ^bSingle item measures.
 * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Change Correlations

While Table 5 gave the simple cross-sectional and temporal correlations between our trust-related variables and measures of support, and suggest that the two are related, we were especially interested in the possibility that changes in trust-related-variables might relate to changes in support from Time 1 to Time 2. Table 6 shows the correlations between the Time 1 and Time 2 changes in trust, procedural fairness, and support variables.

As shown, changes in different aspects of trust/confidence and procedural fairness related to changes in the forms of diffuse and specific support that were assessed. Specifically, changes in more

diffuse support for City government (legitimacy and loyalty) was most highly related to changes in perceptions of competence of City government. However, changes in perceptions of benevolence or caring were also important to changes in reported loyalty, but not to changes in viewing City government as legitimately holding and using its power. Pre-post deliberation changes in satisfaction with City government were related to the trust/confidence variables (except integrity, which did not change significantly from pre to post), and to perceived neutrality. Finally, changes in specific support for the funding of City programs (when assessed as the total number of programs funded, not as the total cost of programs) was most related to changes in perceived neutrality of City government and, to a lesser degree, to changes in perceived trustworthiness and voice. Perceptions of voice only related to support for specific programs and not to any of the other support variables.

Table 6

Correlations between change in trust-related constructs and change in support variables

	Legitimacy	Loyalty	Satisfaction	Total programs funded	Total programs cost
TRUST & CONFIDENCE					
Unspecified confidence	.17	.18	.43**	.13	.09
Trustworthiness ^a	.21	.37**	.41**	.30*	.23
Integrity	.06	-.01	-.02	.18	.17
Benevolence	.03	.29*	.39**	.22	.14
Competence	.34**	.44**	.45**	.26	.22
PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS					
Voice	.07	.02	.21	.27*	.15
Neutrality	.10	.19	.56***	.35**	.27
Respect ^b	.04	.07	.22	-.09	-.08
SUPPORT					
Legitimacy	--	.23	.09	.09	.02
Loyalty	.23	--	.35**	-.04	-.05
Satisfaction ^b	.09	.35**	--	.02	-.05

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. ^aIncludes the components of integrity, benevolence, and competence. ^bSingle item measures.

DISCUSSION

The present study advances research on trust-related constructs in deliberative (specifically, participatory budgeting) public engagement contexts by looking at specific facets of trust/confidence,

perceptions of procedural fairness, and institutional support as they change and relate to one another over time. We find support for the idea that most residents' trust/confidence and perceptions of procedural fairness increased from pre to post the participatory budgeting activities. In fact, not only did residents generally increase in unspecified confidence, but their specific perceptions of City government trustworthiness (i.e., competence and benevolence) also increased, as did their specific perceptions of government neutrality, and their sense of having a voice and being treated with respect.

On the other hand, our study found little evidence for pre-post deliberation increases in either diffuse or specific support for City government or City services. Given that the trust and procedural fairness variables are significantly correlated with support, engagement planners may wonder if increasing trust/confidence or perceptions of fairness might also increase willingness to support City services and even tax increases. This did not appear to be the case in our study. It is possible that, in our study, support levels simply started out so high that it was difficult to go higher. In exploratory follow-up analyses we divided our sample into those who came into the engagement with relatively high, medium or low levels of trust in City government prior to the deliberative activities. We found that the third of the sample with the greatest trust in City government prior to the deliberation was already supporting (on average) more than 80% of the total programs. Thus, among this group, support for City services was already quite high, and it would have been difficult to increase it further. When we restricted our analyses to only those who began the deliberation with low to moderate trust in City government (and lower initial support for services), there was a significant pre-post change in support when examining the proportion of programs funded.

The only institutional support variable that significantly increased pre to post deliberation was loyalty, defined as support for the institution even in the face of unpopular policies or personal disagreement with the institution. This could be a potentially important finding because it might at least partially explain why, even in the absence of increased support for City programs over the course of the

deliberation, there was little resistance to an increase in taxes to support City services. That is, although support for City services did not explicitly increase, *willingness to accept* (rather than resist) the City's decisions to continue those services may have increased.

Finally, the present study also explored the trust/confidence and procedural fairness variables most likely to correspond to changes in diffuse and specific forms of support. A number of our findings were consistent with prior research and theory. For example, satisfaction with City government appeared to relate to most of the other variables (see Table 6, middle column), supporting the idea that satisfaction is an easily influenced and situationally-volatile indicator of transient institutional support (Gibson et al., 2003). In addition, unspecified expressions of confidence was more closely related to this transient satisfaction than loyalty and legitimacy, which were expected to be indicators of a more diffuse and stable form of support (as also argued by Gibson et al., 2003). We add to this literature, however, the finding that increases in perceptions of the legitimate holding and using of power by an institution relate more closely to increases in judgments of the institution's competence than to judgments of other aspects of trust/confidence or procedural fairness. In contrast, increases in loyal acceptance of potentially dissatisfactory policies and decisions seem to depend more broadly on increases in perceptions of both competence and benevolent motives of the institution (in this case, City government). Meanwhile, when considering changes in support for very specific aspects of City government, such as support for the services they provide, we found that increases in support for those services were most likely to only be generally related to increases in perceived trustworthiness, and even more related to increased perceptions of City government neutrality and having a voice in City government.

Because our study did not use experimental methods such as random assignment to treatment and control groups, and no inclusion of a group that did not engage in the participatory activities for comparison, these findings are necessarily preliminary. Future directions for research include

experimental studies attempting to manipulate specific variables that we assessed, and examining the impact of these variables on different forms of support. For example, research might manipulate perceptions of voice and neutrality and assess support for services, manipulate perceptions of competence and assess legitimacy, and/or manipulate perceptions of benevolence and assess loyalty.

Despite the preliminary nature of the research findings, our work does provide support for several important issues raised in the literature. The results are consistent with those who argue that public participation in governance in general, and in budgeting in particular, have a positive impact on the public's trust and confidence, at least on some (critical) aspects of trust/confidence and related variables. Our research findings provide more impetus to better understand the relationships of trust/confidence, procedural fairness, and institutional support variables. Finally, this study along with our other research supports the position that it will benefit the field to focus on the conceptualization, measurement, and/or development of trust, confidence, and related constructs.

References

- Abers, R. (1998). From clientelism to cooperation: Local government, participatory policy, and civic organizing in Porto Alegre, Brazil, *Politics and Society*, 26, 511-537.
- Abers, R. N. (2000). *Inventing local democracy: Grassroots politics in Brazil*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Baierle, S. G. (1998). The explosion of citizenship: The emergence of a new ethical-political principal in popular movements in Porto Alegre, Brazil. In S.E. Alvarez, E. Dagnino, & A. Escobar (Eds.), *Cultures of politics/politics of cultures: Revisioning Latin American social movements* (pp. 118-138). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Cabannes, Y. (2004). Participatory budgeting: A significant contribution to participatory democracy. *Environment and Urbanization*, 16, 27-46.
- Center for Deliberative Democracy. (2012). *Center for Deliberative Democracy* [online]. Stanford University. Available online at <http://cdd.stanford.edu/>
- Cook, T. E., & Gronke, P. (2005). The skeptical American: Revisiting the meanings of trust in government and confidence in institutions. *Journal of Politics*, 67, 784-803.
- Cook, F. L., Jacobs, L. R., & Kim, D. (2010). Trusting what you know: Information, knowledge, and confidence in Social Security. *Journal of Politics*, 72, 397-412.
- Cornwall, A., Romano, J. & Shankland, A. (2008, December). *Brazilian experiences of participation and citizenship: A critical look*. (IDS Discussion Paper 389). Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex. Available online at <http://www.ids.ac.uk/files/Dp389.pdf>
- Earle, T. C. & Siegrist, M. (2006). Morality information, performance information, and the distinction between trust and confidence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36, 383-416.
- Easton, D. (1965). *A systems analysis of political life*. New York: Wiley.
- Ebdon, C., & Franklin, A. L. (2004). Citizen participation in budgeting theory. *Public Administration Review*, 66, 437-447.

- Fehr, E. (2009). On the economics and biology of trust. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 7, 235-266.
- Fishkin, J. S., & Luskin, R. C. (2005) Experimenting with a democratic ideal: Deliberative polling and public opinion. *Acta Politica*, 40, 284-298.
- Fishkin, J. S., Luskin, R. C., & Jowell, R. (2000). Deliberative polling and public consultation. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 53, 657-666.
- Franklin, A. L., Ho, A. T., & Ebdon, C. (2009). Participatory budgeting in Midwestern states: Democratic connection or citizen disconnection? *Public Budgeting and Finance*, 29 (3), 52-73.
- Gibson, J. L. (2008) Challenges to the impartiality of state supreme courts: Legitimacy theory and “new-style” judicial campaigns. *American Political Science Review*, 102, 59-75.
- Gibson, J. L., Caldeira, G. A., & Spence, L. K. (2003). Measuring attitudes toward the United States Supreme Court. *American Journal of Political Science*, 47, 354-367.
- Gibson, J. L., Caldeira, G. A., & Spence, L. K. (2005). Why do people accept public policies they oppose? Testing legitimacy theory with a survey-based experiment. *Political Research Quarterly*, 58, 187-201.
- Hamm, J. A., PytlikZillig, L. M., Tomkins, A.J., Herian, M. N., Bornstein, B. H., & Neeley, E. N. (2011). Exploring separable components of institutional confidence. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 29, 95-115.
- Hardin, R. (2006a). The street-level epistemology of trust. In R. M. Kramer (Ed.), *Organizational trust: A reader* (pp. 21-47). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hardin, R. (2006b). *Trust*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Herian, M. N., Hamm, J. A., Tomkins, A. J., & PytlikZillig, L. M. (in press). Public participation, procedural fairness and evaluations of local governance: The moderating role of uncertainty. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. doi: 10.1093/jopart/mur064

- Herian, M.N., & Tomkins, A.J. (2012). Citizen satisfaction survey data: A mode comparison of the derived-importance performance approach. *American Review of Public Administration*, 42(1), 66-86.
- Hetherington, M. J., & Nugent, J. D. (2001). Explaining support for devolution: The role of political trust. In J. R. Hibbing & E. Theiss-Morse (Eds.), *What is it about government that Americans dislike?* (pp. 134-151). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoy, W. K., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools: The omnibus T-Scale. In W. K. Hoy & C. Miskel (Eds.), *Studies in leading and organizing schools* (pp. 181-208). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Kluvers, R., & Pillay, S. (2009). Participation in the budgetary process in local government. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 68, 220–230.
- Levi, M., & Stoker, L. (2000). Political trust and trustworthiness. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3, 475-507.
- Lind, E. A., & Van den Bos, K. (2002). When fairness works: Toward a general theory of uncertainty management. In B. M. Staw & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 24, pp. 181-223). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Lubell, Mark. (2007). Familiarity breeds trust: Collective action in a policy domain. *The Journal of Politics*, 69, 237-250.
- Luskin, R. C., Fishkin, J. R., & Jowell, R. (2002). Considered opinions: Deliberative polling in Britain. *British Journal of Political Science*, 32, 455-487.
- Markell, D. L., & Tyler, T. (2008). Using empirical research to design government citizen participation processes: A case study of citizens' roles in environmental compliance and enforcement. *University of Kansas Law Review*, 57, 1-38.

- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (2006). An integrative model of organizational trust. In R. M. Kramer (Ed.), *Organizational trust: A reader* (pp. 82-108). New York: Oxford University Press. (Reprinted from *Academy of Management Review*, 1995, 20, 709-734)
- Mizrahi, S., Vigoda-Gadot, E., & Cohen, N. (2010). Trust, participation and performance: The case of the Israeli National Insurance Institute. *Public Management Review*, 12, 99-126.
- Nannestad, P. (2008). What have we learned about generalized trust, if anything? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11, 413-436.
- Nylen, W. R. (2002). Testing the empowerment hypothesis: the participatory budget in Belo Horizonte and Betim, Brazil. *Comparative Politics*, 34, 127-145.
- Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development. (2009). *Focus on citizens: Public engagement for better policy and services*. OECD Publishing. Available online at http://www.oecd.org/document/25/0,3746,en_2649_33735_42216857_1_1_1_1,00.html
- PytlikZillig, L. M., Tomkins, A. J., Herian, M. N., Hamm, J. A., & Abdel-Monem, T. (2012). Public input methods impacting confidence in government. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, 6, 92-111.
- Robbins, M., Simonsen, B., & Feldman, B. (2008). Citizens and resource allocation: Improving decision making with interactive web-based citizen participation. *Public Administration Review*, 68, 564-575.
- Shah, A. (2007). (Ed.). *Participatory budgeting*. Washington, DC: World Bank
- Sintomer, Y., Herzberg, C., Röcke, A. (2008). Participatory budgeting in Europe: Potentials and challenges. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 32, 164-178.
- Sousa, B. S. (1998). Participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre: Toward a redistributive democracy. *Politics and Society*, 26, 461-509.

- Tomkins, A. J. (Ed.). (2007-2008). *Procedural justice* [Special issue]. *Court Review*, 44(1/2), 1-84. Available online at <http://aja.ncsc.dni.us/courtrv/cr44-1/CR44-1-2.pdf>
- Tomkins, A. J., Hoppe, R. D., Herian, M. N., PytlikZillig, L. M., Abdel-Monem, T., & Shank, N. C. (in press). Public input for city budgeting using e-input, face-to-face discussions, and random sample surveys: The willingness of an American community to increase taxes.
- Tomkins, A. J., PytlikZillig, L. M., Herian, M. N., Abdel-Monem, T., & Hamm, J. A. (2010). Public input for municipal policymaking: Engagement methods and their impact on trust and confidence. In S. A. Chun, R. Sandoval, & A. Philpot (Eds.), *The Proceedings of the 11th Annual International Conference on Digital Government Research, Public Administration Online: Challenges and Opportunities* (pp. 41-50). New York: ACM Digital Library, Digital Government Society of North America. Available online at <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1809885&jmp=cit&coll=GUIDE&dl=GUIDE&CFID=98220794&CFTOKEN=99331109#CIT>
- Tyler, T. R. (2006a). Psychological perspectives on legitimacy and legitimation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 375-400.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006b). *Why people obey the law: Procedural justice, legitimacy, and compliance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Reissue; originally published in 1990)
- Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. J. (2002). *Trust in the law: Encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts*. New York: Russell-Sage Foundation.
- University of Nebraska Public Policy Center. (2011). *Taking Charge 2011: A study of the 2011 budgeting priorities of the residents of Lincoln, Nebraska*. Lincoln, NE: Author. Available online at <http://ppc.nebraska.edu/userfiles/file/Documents/mayorsproject/TakingCharge2011FinalReport.pdf>

U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). *Nebraska QuickFacts from the US Census Bureau*. Available online at <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/31000.html>

Wampler, B. (2004). Expanding accountability through participatory institutions: Mayors, citizens, and budgeting in three Brazilian municipalities. *Latin American Politics and Society*, 46, 73-99.

Wampler, B., & Avritzer, L. (2004). Participatory publics: Civil society and new institutions in democratic Brazil. *Comparative Politics*, 36, 291-312.

Wang, X., & Wan Wart, M. (2007). When public participation in administration leads to trust: an empirical assessment of managers' perceptions. *Public Administration Review*, 67, 265-278.

Yetano, A., Royo, S., & Acerete, B. (2010). What is driving the increasing presence of citizen participation initiatives? *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 28, 783-802. Available online at <http://www.envplan.com/epc/fulltext/c28/c09110.pdf>