White Rose Research Online

eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk
Universities of Leeds, Sheffield and York

Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/232641/

Version: Accepted Version

Book Section:
Wijethilake, C., Kimani, D. and Soobaroyen, T. (2026) How citizen participation facilitates trust in public institutions: a cross-national analysis of South Asia. In: Cockerham, J. and Cockerham, A., (eds.) Contemporary Political Participation and its Countervailing Effects on Civic Culture. Series in Politics. Vernon Press. ISBN: 9798881904418.

This is a draft version of a chapter in the book, Contemporary Political Participation and its Countervailing Effects on Civic Culture, edited by James Cockerham & Alexandra Cockerham published in 2026 by Vernon Press, link: https://vernonpress.com/book/2554

Reuse
Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown
If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS
University of Sheffield
UNIVERSITY of York

Chapter 7: How Citizen Participation Facilitates Trust in Public Institutions: A Cross-National Analysis of South Asia

Chaminda Wijethilake*
Essex Business School
University of Essex
Colchester, United Kingdom
Email: c.wijethilake@essex.ac.uk

Danson Kimani
Sheffield University Management School
University of Sheffield
Sheffield, United Kingdom
Email: Danson.Kimani@sheffield.ac.uk

Teerooven Soobaroyen
Aston Business School
Aston University, United Kingdom
Email: t.soobaroyen@aston.ac.uk

Abstract

We examine how citizen participation in public protests, public voting, official engagements, and political participation moderates the relationship between perceived public service quality and trust in public institutions in South Asia. Drawing on the South Asian Barometer Survey, we propose that in countries with mature democracies, citizen participation moderates the relationship between perceived public service quality and trust in public institutions more strongly compared to late democratic adopters. Contrary to our expectations, perceived public service quality shows a significant negative impact on trust in public institutions in both mature and late democratic adopters in South Asia. We demonstrate that in countries with mature democracies, citizen participation moderates the relationship between perceived public service quality and public trust in public institutions more strongly compared to late democratic adopters. Policymakers and practitioners should consider the contextual differences that influence citizens' participation as a means of enhancing trust in public institutions.

Keywords: Citizen participation, Perceived public service quality, Trust in public institutions, South Asia

Introduction

In recent decades, there has been a notable emergence of what can be described as critical citizens (Kim, 2010). Such citizens are not only seeking improved public service provision (Herian et al., 2012) but also exhibit an increasing desire to participate in government decision-making processes (or involvement in the delivery of public services (Lassou et al., 2024). Although the literature on this subject is sparse, it reveals contrasting perspectives on the relationship between citizen participation and trust in public institutions (e.g., Kettl, 2017). Nevertheless, research suggests that democratic societies are more likely than non-democratic ones to empower citizens to participate in public decision making (Krah & Mertens, 2023; Lassou et al., 2024) The stealth theorists' perspective argues that a lack of trust in government is what drives citizen participation, whereas those who adopt a deliberative democracy perspective contend that citizen participation stems from greater trust in government (Lee & Schachter, 2019). These mixed findings suggest that prior evidence concerning the impact of citizen participation on trust in government is far from conclusive. Not least, Van Ryzin (2011) notes that prior research has primarily focused on government-related results and outcomes when examining public trust in the former, and thus calls for more research to gain insight into the extent to which contextual contingencies influence public trust. For instance, Pestoff (2006) argues that citizen participation provides a suitable lens through which to understand the missing links between democratic and welfare state reforms. Citizen participation in Global South countries can also be manipulated by non-democratic governments, which often appear open to participation while controlling who can be involved, or they may involve citizens in decision-making but manipulate or distort their input (Owen, 2020). Thus, recent studies have further emphasised the need for more research to understand how cultural and sociopolitical realities in various countries influence citizen participation outcomes (e.g., Lassou et al., 2024; Lee & Schachter, 2019).

In view of the above background, our study makes at least two important contributions. Firstly, the paper provides novel insights into the moderating impact of citizen participation on the relationship between perceived public service quality and public trust in various public service institutions, including the civil service, courts, police, head of state, and military forces. Secondly, our findings extend prior literature on the relationship between citizen participation and public trust in public institutions by adding insights from a cross-country comparative analysis of South Asia, a context that has hitherto received little empirical and theoretical exploration. Therefore, this paper aims to contribute to a better understanding of citizen participation in public services and extent to which such participation may enhance trust in public institutions in an underrepresented global south context.

We conduct a quantitative analysis of the Wave 2 South Asian Barometer Survey data. Our sample comprises 10,617 responses collected from citizens of five South Asian countries: India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal. The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 provides an overview of extant literature on citizen participation, perceived public service quality, and public trust in public institutions. Section 3 pertains to hypotheses development. Section 4 elaborates on the public sector context in South Asia. Section 5 details the research methods employed in this paper. Section 6 presents the empirical results, while Section 7 discusses the findings and draws conclusions.

Background literature

This discussion performs a literature review concerning citizen participation and its impact on perceived public service quality and trust in public institutions. In this discussion, citizen participation refers to the involvement of individuals or groups in the public decision-making process. Perceived service quality reflects citizens' satisfaction with government-provided public services, while public trust concerns the collective trust of citizens in government, its institutions, and public sector workers.

In one of the few studies focusing on non-Western contexts, Kim (2010) examines public trust in Japan and South Korea, utilising the Asia Barometer Survey. The author subsequently reports that public trust in government across the two countries is influenced by three key factors: government performance, citizen participation and citizen empowerment. More research on public trust in public institutions in the Asian context is thus imperative (see also Mahmud, 2021). Accordingly, Van Ryzin (2011) analysed factors affecting public trust in civil service across 33 countries and found that citizens tend to prioritize government processes over performance when assessing the trustworthiness of institutions like the civil service, courts, and police. This finding suggests that citizens prioritise procedures over outcomes because they believe that effective public sector processes are more likely to produce better government outcomes. Another study by Foster and Frieden (2017), analysing European data, found that occupation and education levels significantly impact public trust in government. They concluded that highly educated individuals tend to trust the government more, while those with lower levels of education and lower job status have lower trust. The authors conclude by proposing that future studies should investigate the role of contextual contingencies, such as social and economic indicators, including social cohesion and income inequality, in understanding how these characteristics influence trust in government (Foster & Frieden, 2017). Moreover, Vu (2021), drawing on insights from the COVID-19 pandemic, found that the government's handling of the health crisis and associated social and economic impacts influenced citizens' trust in public institutions. The author further concluded that high citizens' trust was associated with increased compliance with policy measures that were instituted to curb the spread of the COVID-19 disease. These findings from Vu's (2021) research suggest that perceived public service quality may have a bearing on citizens' trust in government.

As reflected in bottom-up voluntary citizen participation (Aven & Renn, 2010; Haustein & Lorson, 2021), we focus on citizens proactive participation in terms of demonstrating public protests, public voting, official public engagements, and participating in political discussions as a means of influencing government policy and decision making (e.g., Brandsen et al., 2018). In so doing, we argue that citizens' participation impacts and strengthens trust in public institutions. Moreover, Marschall (2004, p. 232, emphasis in original) points out that, "the purpose of citizen participation is as much to communicate preferences and influence policymaking as to assist in the implementation of the public good and to contribute to its preservation and continuation". As proposed in our study, it is worth noting that the impact of citizen participation on trust in public institutions, through the perceived quality of public services, depends on the country's democratic maturity. This view is based on the observation that citizens' rights are better protected in democratic contexts compared to countries with restricted democracy space and social rights (Michels, 2006).

Along the same vein, the changing nature of citizen participation in democratic societies has received scant attention in the literature (Ariely, 2013). Notwithstanding this, existing research

suggests that democratic societies are likely to promote citizen participation in public decision-making (Brugué & Gallego, 2003; Economist Intelligence Unit, 2020). For example, exploring the case of childcare in European countries, Pestoff (2006) argues that citizen participation provides a suitable lens through which to understand the welfare state in developing and renewing democracies. Research further suggests that democratic societies create more opportunities for beneficiaries or service recipients to actively take part in public service delivery (e.g., Brinkerhoff & Wetterberg, 2016). Consistent with these findings, a study by Zhao and Hu (2017) examining public trust in China revealed that citizens have lower trust in both local and central governments compared to those in Japan and South Korea. We thus argue that countries that are more democratic or those that have embraced democratic principles for a longer period are more likely to empower citizen participation compared to relatively less democratic countries or late adopters of democracy (Economist Intelligence Unit, 2020). It is also observed that, traditionally, citizens' participation in many countries has largely been predicated on exercising their voting rights in elections (Brinkerhoff & Wetterberg, 2016). However, there has been calls to widen avenues for citizen participation in public service delivery (e.g., Nabatchi et al., 2017), to ensure that citizens are offered opportunities to "mould the shapes and contents of public value, reflecting their expectations and needs in public sector entities' decisions and operations" (Palumbo & Manesh, 2023, p. 1348).

The key issues emerging from the above discussion of the literature are as follows. Firstly, the existing literature on trust in public institutions has predominantly focused on Western countries – mainly the US and Europe – apart from a limited effort in a small number of industrialised East Asian countries, such as China, Japan, and South Korea (see Kim, 2010; Zhao & Hu, 2017). Research on this topic is scarce in less developed countries of the Global South (e.g., South Asia). Secondly, prior research has mostly focused on the effect of government outcomes on public trust (e.g., see Lodge & Taber, 2013). Nevertheless, there is limited scrutiny into how citizen participation in government decision making shapes trust in public institutions. This is despite emerging evidence showing that citizens also consider government processes when forming opinions about trust in public institutions (see, for instance, Van Ryzin 2011; Herian et al., 2012). Thirdly, prior researchers investigating public trust in government have dwelled extensively on government performance and as a result little attention has been paid to perceived public service quality (e.g., De Waele et al., 2021; Kim, 2010; Houston et al., 2016). The present study enhances our understanding of trust in public institutions by examining perceived public service quality across five countries in the South Asian region. Fourthly, recent evidence suggests that contextual factors have a potential impact on how citizens express themselves or participate in government processes (see Houston et al., 2016). Hence, our analysis in this paper is broadened to consider various contextual features that influence citizens' participation, including country political climate and sociocultural factors.

Hypotheses Development

While it is argued that providing high-quality public services will enhance trust in public institutions (Wickramasinghe et al., 2025), it remains unclear how and/or whether citizens' voices are considered in the process. Despite the fact that public participation can influence public institutions to focus on ensuring fairness in public service delivery (Herian et al., 2012; Kim, 2010; Pedersen et al., 2017), there is a lack of knowledge about the extent to which citizen participation

influences public institutions to deliver their services in accordance with expectations. For instance, fairness will ensure a lack of bias and favouritism while fulfilling public expectations (Van Ryzin, 2011). Similarly, citizens' vigilance may help to ensure that public services and benefits are delivered evenly, in a way that recognises the genuine and truly needy sectors of society. Citizens can also make their voices heard to ensure that respect, courtesy and responsiveness prevail in the delivery of public services. Additionally, citizens' voices can help to minimise corruption and 'red tape', thereby enhancing the perceived service quality in the public sector and trust in public institutions.

Citizens whose views are given consideration when laws are designed have more confidence in judicial processes, even when they subsequently experience unfavourable court outcomes (Tyler, 1990). This view is partly shared by Hibbing and Theiss-Morse (2002), who claim that participatory democracy[1] might have negative consequences for government processes and outcomes. This is because the diversity of opinions held by different people can make it difficult to reach a viable consensus, thereby contributing to apathy and mistrust in government (Hibbing & Theiss-Morse, 2002; see also Ianniello et al., 2019). However, parliamentary democracy permits people to make their voices heard through the elected political representatives and empowers freedom of expression. The longer the country's tradition of parliamentary democracy, the more likely citizens are to partake in bottom-up voluntary activities that impact public perceived service quality and, in turn, trust in public institutions (Aven & Renn, 2010; Haustein & Lorson, 2021; Osborne et al., 2016).

Recent research has provided valuable insights into how citizens' participation in government procedures and their ability to contribute to their design influence trust in public institutions. For example, Herian et al. (2012) found that citizen involvement in budget preparation and policy design by the City of Lincoln government (Nebraska) significantly affected more favourable attitudes among residents towards the city administration. In turn, trust in government is also enhanced when information reaches other people that public input has been sought during government decision-making (Herian et al., 2012). Moreover, a cross-national analysis of 21 countries in North America and Europe revealed a positive association between citizen trust and public administration (Houston et al., 2016). The authors reported that factors such as low unemployment, low levels of corruption, and inflation contribute to increased citizen trust in government, and vice versa. Nevertheless, Houston et al. (2016) found considerable variation in public trust levels across different countries. They attribute this to the peculiarities of individual countries' institutional configurations, including socioeconomic disparities and religious diversity. Whilst Houston et al. (2016) provide useful insights concerning the effect of national contexts on public trust, it is unclear from their findings whether opportunities to participate in government processes are considered by citizens when forming trust judgments about public institutions.

Nonetheless, citizens may also decline to engage in activities and processes associated with a government that they hold in low regard, even when such opportunities are available. For example, Lee and Schachter (2019), analysing data from Wave 6 of the World Values Survey with US respondents, found that high trust in government is associated with increased political participation, such as voting and signing petitions, and vice versa. The authors also argue that citizens are more likely to vote and sign petitions when they "trust in the government […] and expect support for their petition from trustworthy public officials" (Lee & Schachter, 2019, p.

[1] Hibbing and Theiss-Morse (2002) use the term participatory democracy

411). Furthermore, Abner et al. (2020) argue that trust in government should be differentiated between public trust in government institutions and public trust in civil servants. As a result, Abner et al. (2020) recommend further research on the impact of public trust on various public services beyond education, especially in non-US contexts. The present study thus contributes to this call by examining public trust in South Asian public institutions, including the civil service, courts, police, the head of state, and military forces. As extant literature demonstrates, mature democracies tend to have more inclusive governance systems and stronger institutional frameworks compared to less mature democracies (Gaventa & Barrett, 2012). As a result, citizen participation is more likely to be institutionalised, thus resulting in enhanced trust in public institutions (Stals et al., 2022). This further suggests that mature democracies offer greater opportunities for citizen participation, which may lead to increased trust in public institutions (Haustein & Lorson, 2021). Along the same vein, less democratic countries or late adopters of democracy may face challenges in establishing robust mechanisms for citizen participation, which could potentially lead to lower levels of trust in these institutions and processes (see Houston et al., 2016; Lassou et al., 2024).

The relationship between perceived quality of service and public trust in government, on one hand, and between citizen participation and trust in public institutions, on the other hand, is a complex topic that can be seen as somewhat of a chicken-and-egg situation (refer to Wagle, 2000). The literature suggests that a perceived high quality of public service can lead to high citizen trust in government, stemming from satisfaction with the way the government meets citizens' needs (Bovaird & Loffler, 2009). For instance, citizens may view high public service quality as efficient utilisation of their tax funds, subsequently leading to high trust in the government. Evidence further suggests that high public trust in government can be a significant motivator for participation, as citizens are likely to have more confidence that public officials will consider and address their views. As Warren (2001) observes, lower levels of trust in government can discourage citizen participation due to concerns that public officials may not genuinely attend to citizens' needs. Furthermore, evidence has shown that opportunities for citizen participation can enhance trust in public institutions (Yang & Pandey, 2011). However, a recent empirical study of Norwegian municipalities has curiously challenged prior findings, reporting a negative association between participation and trust (see Holum, 2023). This contrasting evidence, for example, suggests that citizen participation may have varying effects on public trust in public institutions at both local and national levels. Still, the relationship between public-perceived service quality and citizen satisfaction has received considerable attention in both theory and practice (Van de Walle & Van Ryzin, 2011). Yet, unlike in the private sector context, measuring perceived service quality in the public sector constitutes a challenging task due to various factors such as the nature of public services, the complexity of the stakeholders and institutions involved, agency relationships, variations in service standards, the approach to welfare, and political and policy influences (e.g., Palumbo & Manesh, 2023; Witesman & Walters, 2014). It is also possible that the direction and strength of the relationship between citizen participation, public service quality, and trust in government may vary depending on the context and level of analysis. To put this into context, Fisk and Cherney (2017) argue that "citizens are considerably more likely to interact with local police and local government bodies or be a participant in the judicial system, than encounter central government officials or witness the operations of the often-remote central government [e.g., head of the state, and military forces]". This implies that trust in various public institutions might vary depending on proximity to the citizens. Notably, there is a scarcity of research that has considered such nuances of public sector institutions. Accordingly, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 1: Perceived public service quality is positively associated with trust in public institutions: Civil Service (H1a), Courts (H1b), Police (H1c), Head of State (H1d), and Military Forces (H1e)

Hypothesis 2: In countries with mature democracies (e.g., India and Sri Lanka) citizen participation moderates the relationship between perceived public service quality and trust in public institutions (e.g., Civil Service: H2a, Courts: H2b, Police: H2c, Head of State (H2d), and Military Forces (H2e)) more strongly compared to late democratic adopters (e.g., Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nepal).

Research Context: Public Sector in South Asia

South Asia presents a unique setting for investigating the contextual significance of citizen participation, perceived public service quality and trust in public institutions (Joshi & Moore, 2004). The region encompasses diverse constitutional and political systems, which are shaped by varied historical, cultural, and demographic factors (Huque, 2001). For decades, South Asia has struggled with deep-rooted issues related to politicised bureaucracy, corruption and poor governance systems (Huque, 2001; Pena et al*.,* 2000). Issues of accountability and transparency associated with public institutions such as the police, judiciary, and civil service have been widely discussed in both academic literature and policy debates. Since the 1990s, South Asian countries have been demanding public sector structural institutional reforms to enhance the transparency and accountability of public services (e.g., Prakash, 1996). However, various initiatives have been introduced in an attempt to promote trust in public institutions (e.g., introducing good governance, ethics, rules, regulations, and policies) (Pena et al., 2000), yet the effectiveness of such efforts remains a contested topic. One of the commonly highlighted concerns in this process is the lack of opportunities for citizens to influence government decision-making processes.

Many South Asian countries face significant socio-economic challenges, including high levels of corruption, rampant poverty, high unemployment and low literacy levels (Haque, 2001). These socioeconomic issues have the potential to affect the quality of public services provided by governments, thereby influencing public trust in public administration. While terrorism is identified in the literature as constituting the biggest security challenge in South Asia, other security threats in this region include civil strife, organised crime and religious extremism (Caiden, 2013). Both external (e.g., India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh) and internal (e.g., Sri Lanka and Nepal) conflicts have had significant implications for the responsibilities of various public agencies, including the courts and the police (Caiden, 2013; Haque, 2001). For instance, Pena et al. (2000, p. 131) claim that, in South Asia, "poor delivery of key public services is of particular concern, ranging from health and education to legal services and road maintenance. While formal institutional mechanisms exist for promoting public accountability (including oversight by parliamentary committees, auditor-generals, anti-corruption agencies and legislation), in practice these have been ineffective". Similarly, the concentration of power within an extremely small group of people has been a major impediment to public sector independence (Haque, 2001).

Several contextual factors have influenced public sector reforms, such as the expanding middle classes, international pressure to ensure good governance after the Asian financial crisis,

continuing economic liberalisation, democratic movements aimed at increasing the power of local and provincial governments, the presence of vibrant local and international NGOs, and recent moves towards parliamentary democracy by Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nepal (Pena et al., 2000). Nevertheless, both India and Sri Lanka adopted parliamentary democracy more than seven decades ago. India, the largest democracy in the world, and Sri Lanka, the oldest democracy in Asia, share similar features that are not evident in their counterparts, the late democratic adopters, i.e., Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Nepal. Appendix 1 provides several demographic and governance indicators for these five South Asian countries.

Methods

5.1 South Asian Barometer Survey

The study utilises the Wave 2 South Asian Barometer Survey data, which were collected from citizens of five South Asian countries: India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal (Asian Barometer, 2020). The Wave 2 survey data were released in May 2017. The Asian Barometer Survey uses multi-stage stratified random sampling to select the respondents from each country. As a countrywide representative survey, the sample is stratified geographically and controlled in terms of respondents' age and gender. The sample consists of 10,617 responses in total, comprising 3,058 from India, 2,487 from Pakistan, 1,424 from Bangladesh, 1,703 from Sri Lanka, and 1,945 from Nepal. The surveys were conducted using face-to-face interviews.

5.2 Variables and measurements

Dependent variable: Trust in five public institutions was measured by the following question: "I'm going to name a number of institutions. For each one, please tell me how much trust you have in them? [civil service, courts; police; head of state, military]", where 1 = a great deal of trust; 2 = quite a lot of trust; 3 = not very much trust; 4 = not at all; 8 = cannot say; and 9 = no response. Similarly, prior studies have referred to both local and national governments to assess public trust in government (Kim, 2010).

Independent variable: We measure the quality of public services from the 'responsiveness' perspective as discussed in the prior literature. The quality of responsiveness is defined as "the willingness to help customers and provide prompt service" (Donnelly et al., 1995, p. 17). In turn, the perceived public service quality was rated using four measures in response to the following question: "Based on your experience, how easy or difficult is it to obtain the following services? Or have you never tried to get these services from government?" (a) An identity document (such as a voter card, ration card, passport); (b) Admission to a government primary school for a child; (c) Medical treatment at a nearby government clinic/hospital; and (d) Help from the police when you need it: where 4 = very easy; 3 = easy; 2 = difficult; 1 = very difficult; 5 = never tried; 8 = cannot say; and 9 = no response. Prior studies have also employed similar measures to assess perceived service quality in the public sector (e.g., Kim, 2010). The Cronbach's alpha value was 0.72.

The existing literature suggests that public satisfaction with specific public services is higher than that with public services in general or the public sector as a whole (Van de Walle, 2017). In

turn, the general public's trust in government is likely to be lower than their satisfaction with public services (Goodsell, 1994; Kelly & Swindell, 2002). This is because citizens have certain predetermined judgements and predispositions about the public sector. The term halo effect refers to the phenomenon where citizens express their views, satisfaction, attitude, or trust towards public services as a whole, rather than specifying a particular public service. Drawing on a sample of 600 public sector managers and employees, Bellé et al. (2017) conclude that the halo effect is systematically biased towards public sector performance evaluations. In a recent study, Chang (2022) reveals that citizens' overall perception of police service creates a positive halo effect in evaluating the performance of police courtesy, equal treatment, and honesty. In this study, we propose that citizens' attitudes towards public services and trust in public institutions are likely to be driven by the halo effect; therefore, we do not intend to examine the alignment between individual public service items and public trust in the respective public institutions. More specifically, citizens are likely to hold similar attitudes towards most public services, despite their individual merits, as all are part of the broader public sector realm (Marvel, 2016).

Moderating variables: We used four variables to assess the impact of citizen participation: (i) public protests, (ii) public voting, (iii) official engagements, and (iv) political participations. First, the study used two measurements to evaluate citizen participation in public protests: "Here is a list of actions that people sometimes take as citizens. For each of these, please tell me whether you, personally, have once, more than once, or never done any of these things during the past three years": where, (a) Got together with others to raise an issue or sign a petition; and (b) Attended a demonstration or protest march, where 1= once; 2 = more than once; 0 = never done; 8 = cannot say; and 9 = no response. Second, citizen participation in public voting was measured by asking the question: "In talking to people about elections, we often find that some people were able to vote while others were not able to vote. Talking of the last (specify the year) parliamentary/presidential elections (as the case may be), were you able to vote or not able to vote? where 1= able to vote; 2=not able to vote; 8=don't remember; and 9=not applicable. Third, citizen participation in political engagements was measured referring to the question of "when you go together with your family members or friends, how often do you discuss political matters? where, 1=frequently; 2=occasionally, and 3=never, 8=don't know, and 9=no response. Finally, citizens' official engagements were measured referring to the questions of "In the past three years, have you once, or more than once, never done that following because of personal, family of neighbourhood problems, or problems with government officials and policies?" where, (a) contacted government officials, (b) contacted elected officials or legislative representatives at any level, (c) contacted officials of political parties or other political organisations, (d) contacted traditional/community leaders, and (e) contacted other influential person, where 1=once, 2=more than once, 0=never done, 8= can't say, 9=no response. These measures are aligned with definitions of citizen participation from prior studies (Michels, 2006). Similarly, Kim (2010) has referred to public self-expression as the right to gather and demonstrate, as well as the right to criticise the government.

Control variables: The study used the following six control variables: citizens' age, gender, religion, education, locality and media usage. Participants were asked to indicate their age in years. Gender was classified as either male or female. Religion was categorised as: Hindu, Islam, Christian, Sikh, Buddhist and Other. Participants' education was categorised as follows: non-literate, informal education, school education from grade one to twelve, bachelor's degree,

postgraduate, and professional education. Respondents' locality was classified as residing in a village, town (below 1 lakh[2]), city (above 1 lakh) or big city (above 10 lakh). The following question was used to assess citizens' media usage: "In an ordinary week how regularly do you watch news on TV?: Daily/almost every day = 1; at least 3-4 times a week = 2; at least once a week = 3; and never = 4". Extant literature on public administration has often controlled for these variables when examining public trust in government (e.g., Kim, 2010).

5.3 Analysis

Before the analysis was carried out, data were checked for normality and to ensure there were no extreme or missing values. The study used SPSS 25 software to run the statistical analysis. Harman's one-factor test confirmed the absence of common method variance (Podsakoff et al., 2003). A moderated hierarchical multiple regression is commonly used to examine statistical models with interaction terms (Cortina, 1993). Before testing the moderating impact, Friedrich's (1982) standardised variable approach was employed to check for multicollinearity. Following Baron and Kenny (1986), the study used hierarchical moderated linear regression analysis to test the hypotheses. As the first step, we tested the control variables and the independent variable in the first model. The moderating impact of citizen participation on the perceived public service quality and trust in public institutions was assessed in Model 2. The maximum Variance Inflation Factor value recorded was below 2. This confirms the absence of multicollinearity between independent variables. Survey responses recorded as "8 = cannot say" and "9=no response" were treated as missing values and replaced with the corresponding means.

Results

Appendix 2 provides the demographic profile of citizens who participated in the study. More than 76 per cent of the study participants were under 50 years old. Notably, the study reveals equal gender participation in all countries. In terms of religion, the majority of the participants identified as Hindu or Islam, with 43 per cent each. Seventy per cent of the respondents had a school education between grade one and grade twelve, while 17 per cent revealed that they were illiterate. Sixty-four per cent of the respondents were from local villages, and it was found that 47 per cent watched television daily. The demographic profile of the participants in the South Asian Barometer survey provides a fair reflection of the national statistics in each country. Tables 1 and 2 display the means, standard deviations and correlations of the tested variables in India and Sri Lanka, respectively. As depicted, most of the tested variables are correlated at a $p < .01$ significance level, and there are no significant concerns regarding multicollinearity.

[INSERT TABLES 7.1 AND 7.2 ABOUT HERE]

Table 7.3 presents the comparative findings of the moderated hierarchical linear regression analysis for mature democratic countries: India and Sri Lanka.

[2] A *lakh* is a unit of measurement in the South Asian numbering systems equal to one hundred thousand.

[INSERT TABLE 7.3 ABOUT HERE]

India: As depicted in Model 1, participants' gender shows a significant positive impact on public trust in the courts, head of state and military; however, a significant negative impact on trust in police. It was also revealed that citizens' locality exerts a significant negative impact on trust in civil services and police; however, it has a positive impact on trust in the head of state. As shown in Model 1, in contrast to our proposition, the impact of perceived public service quality on trust in public institutions was significant and negative for all five public institutions considered in the study: H1a: civil service (β=-.107, p=.001, t=-5.88); H1b: courts (β=-.161, p=.001, t=-8.88), H1d: head of state (β=-.124, p=.001, t=-6.83), and H1e: military forces (β=-.092, p=.001, t=-5.04). However, as predicted, perceived public service quality shows a significant positive impact on trust in the police H1c: (β=.677, p=.001, t=50.19). As predicted, Model 2 reveals that citizen participation in public protests and in official engagements positively moderates the relationship between perceived public service quality and public trust in H2a: civil service (β=.043, p=.05, t=2.03); and H2c: police (β=.030, p=.10, t=1.92), respectively. However, citizen participation in official engagements negatively moderates the relationship between perceived public service quality and public trust in H2a: civil service (β=-.058, p=.05, t=-2.74).

Sri Lanka: Model 1 depicts that the locality of Sri Lankan citizens' has a positive and significant impact on public trust in all five categories of public institutions assessed in the study. In contrast, religious beliefs show a negative impact on trust in all public institutions. It was also shown that citizens' gender and media usage have a negative impact on trust in the head of state. We acknowledge that in the South Asian context, being male or female is likely to have an impact on trust in public institutions. For instance, in certain public services, such as education and civil service, female involvement is likely to be high, while in other services, such as courts and police, male involvement is likely to be higher. Notably, Kim (2010) reports mixed findings of the impact of gender on trust in governments. We assume that, depending on the nature of public service, gender is likely to have a positive impact. As shown in Model 1, in contrast to our prediction, the impact of perceived public service quality on trust in public institutions was negative in all cases, where, H1a: civil service (β=-.122, p=.001, t=-5.01), H1b: the courts (β=-.060, p=.05, t=-2.45), H1c: police (β=-.159, p=.001, t=-6.68), H1d: the head of state (β=-.131, p=.001, t=-5.73), and H1d: the military forces (β=-.089, p=.001, t=-4.31). As predicted, in Sri Lanka, citizen participation in public voting and in political participation positively moderates the relationship between perceived public service quality and public trust in H2a: courts (β=.042, p=.10, t=1.75); H2e: military (β=.037, p=.10, t=1.69), respectively. Contrary to our prediction, citizen participation in official engagements negatively moderates the relationship between perceived public service quality and trust in H2d: head of state (β=.059, p=.05, t=-2.28) and H2e: military forces (β=.040, p=.10, t=-1.71).

Tables 7.4, 7.5, and 7.6 display the means, standard deviations, and correlations of the tested variables in Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Nepal, respectively. As depicted, most of the tested variables are correlated at a $p < .01$ significance level, and there are no significant concerns regarding multicollinearity.

[INSERT TABLES 7.4, 7.5 AND 7.6 ABOUT HERE]

Table 7.7 presents the findings of the moderated hierarchical linear regression analysis for late democratic countries: Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nepal.

[INSERT TABLE 7.7 ABOUT HERE]

Pakistan: Model 1 shows that the gender of Pakistani citizens has a significant positive impact on public trust in the civil service, courts, and the head of state. While locality was found to have a positive impact on public trust in courts, police, and the military, media usage has a significant positive impact on public trust in police and the head of state. As shown in Model 1, contrary to our hypothesis 1, perceived public service quality has a significant negative impact on public trust in H1a: civil service (β=-.084, p=.001, t=-4.19): H1b: the courts (β=-.110, p=.05, t=-5.49), H1d: the head of state (β=-.141, p=.001, t=-7.06), and the military forces H1d: (β=-.068, p=.001, t=-3.37). Model 2 reveals that, in Pakistan, citizen participation in public protests negatively moderates the relationship between perceived public service quality and public trust in the military forces H2e: (β=-.062, p=.05, t=-3.09), and citizen participation in public voting negatively moderates the relationship between perceived public service quality and public trust in courts (H2b): (β=-.046, p=.05, t=-2.32).

Bangladesh: As revealed in Model 1, in Bangladesh, citizens' locality has a significant positive impact on public trust in all five public institutions. While age has a significant positive impact on public trust in the courts and the military, education has a positive impact on trust in civil services, the courts, and the police. Model 1 also demonstrates that the impact of perceived public service quality on trust in public institutions is negative and significant: H1a: civil service (β=-.231, p=.001, t=-8.72), H1b: the courts (β=-.112, p=.001, t=-4.15), H1c: police (β=-.217, p=.001, t=-8.24), and H1d: the head of state (β=-.116, p=.001, t=-4.29). As shown in Model 2, in Bangladesh, citizen participation in official engagements positively moderates the relationship between perceived public service quality and trust in H2a: civil service (β=.083, p=.01, t=2.87), H2c: police (β=.091, p=.05, t=3.16) and H2d: the head of state (β=.122, p=.001, t=4.15). Similarly, citizen participation in public voting positively moderates the relationship between perceived public service quality and trust in H2a: police (β=.065, p=.01, t=2.53), and H2c: military forces (β=.053, p=.05, t=1.97). However, citizen participation in public protests negatively moderates the relationship between perceived public service quality and trust in H2a: civil service (β=-.096, p=.01, t=-3.33), H2b: courts (β=-.100, p=.01, t=-3.42), H2c: police (β=-.077, p=.05, t=-2.69), and H2d: the head of state (β=-.123, p=.001, t=). While the citizens' political participation has a positive moderating impact on trust in H2d: the head of state (β=.049, p=.10, t=1.71), on the other hand, there is a negative moderating impact on the public trust in H2c: police (β=-.054, p=.10, t=-1.93).

Nepal: In Nepal, citizens' religious affiliation has a positive impact on public trust in the courts, the police, the head of state, and the military forces. While it was shown that citizens' locality and media usage have a significant positive impact on trust in civil services, there is a negative impact on trust in military forces. As depicted in Model 1, the quality of Nepalese public services has a negative impact on all five public institutions considered in the study: H1a: civil service (β=-.121, p=.001, t=-5.39), H1b: the courts (β=-.076, p=.01, t=-3.34), H1c: police (β=-

.090, p=.001, t=-3.98), H1d: the head of state (β=-.064, p=.01, t=-2.82), and H1d: the military forces (β=-.064, p=.01, t=-2.87). In Nepal, citizen participation in political protests negatively moderates the relationship between perceived public service quality and trust in the courts: H2b (β=-.051, p=.05, t=-2.06).

Discussion and Conclusion

Drawing on the South Asian Barometer Survey, this study examined the moderating impact of citizen participation on the relationship between perceived public service quality and trust in public institutions, such as the civil service, courts, police, head of state, and military forces. More specifically, we propose that in countries with mature democracies (e.g., India and Sri Lanka) citizen participation moderates the relationship between perceived public service quality and trust in public institutions more strongly compared to late democratic adopters (e.g., Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nepal). We examined the citizen participation in terms of public protests, public voting, official public engagements and political discussions.

In contrast to our proposition, the findings demonstrated that the citizens' perceived quality of public services in the South Asian region has a significant negative impact on trust in public institutions. This finding is consistent in both mature and late democratic adopters. The cross-county comparative analysis showed that the citizens' participation in public protests in India has a positive moderating impact on the relationship between perceived service quality and trust in civil services. In Sri Lanka, citizen participation in public voting strengthens the relationship between perceived service quality and trust in courts. However, in both countries, citizen participation in official engagement is likely to negatively influence the relationship between perceived service quality and trust in public institutions (e.g., in India, civil services, and in Sri Lanka, military forces and the head of state). Citizens' political participation also showed a positive moderating impact on trust in military forces in Sri Lanka. Among late democratic adopters, we find that only Bangladeshi citizens' participation in voting, official engagements, and political discussions is likely to strengthen the relationship between perceived public service quality and trust in public institutions. In the case of Pakistan and Nepal, there was no significant positive moderating impact. However, citizen participation in public protests has shown a negative moderating impact on the relationship between perceived service quality and trust in public institutions in Pakistan (military forces), Bangladesh (civil service, courts, police and head of state) and Nepal (courts).

Our findings reflect several contextual factors that can explain the underlying assumptions about why citizen participation is more likely to have a positive significant moderating impact in mature democratic countries compared to late democratic adopters. First, India and Sri Lanka have maintained parliamentary democracy for more than seven decades, since their independence. However, parliamentary democracy is relatively new in Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nepal. Having previously been ruled by military dictatorships, both Pakistan (since 2003) and Bangladesh (since 1991) have shifted to parliamentary democracy in recent history (Caiden, 2013). Nepal has been in the process of transforming from an absolute monarchy to a constitutional monarchy, and finally adopted parliamentary democracy in the early 1990s. Parliamentary democracy enables people to make their voices heard through elected political representatives and promotes freedom of expression. In support of this view, the Economist Intelligence Unit 2019 democratic index

categorised India and Sri Lanka as 'flawed democracies' and Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nepal as 'hybrid regimes'. As hypothesised, the study shows that the longer the period for which a country has been governed by parliamentary democracy (e.g., India and Sri Lanka), the more likely people are to participate in bottom-up voluntary activities that influence perceived public service quality and, in turn, trust in public institutions (Aven & Renn, 2010; Garlatti et al., 2019; Haustein & Lorson, 2021; Jayasinghe et al., 2023;Osborne et al., 2016). As depicted in Appendices 1 and 2, South Asia has a diverse population with varied heritage and sociocultural values. For instance, cultural factors such as religion, language, societal norms, and values have the potential to influence the willingness and/or desire of citizens to initiate bottom-up, voluntary citizen participation. In particular, there are fewer opportunities for marginalised communities and vulnerable ethnic minorities to initiate voluntary bottom-up actions that influence public sector decision-making. We thus recommend that public sector policymakers in South Asia ensure a safe space for equal citizen participation, despite cultural and ethnic diversity.

Second, compared to countries that are late adopters of democracy, the ability of India and Sri Lanka's judicial system, court rulings, and high courts to challenge the politicised bureaucracy has been positively recognised by Transparency International (Pena et al., 2000). The extent to which the judicial system is reliable assures that the public can predict justice in a transparent manner. In turn, this motivates people to express their concerns about the quality of public services and enhances trust in public institutions. According to Transparency International, India's (41/100) and Sri Lanka's (38/100) corruption perception scores rank highest among South Asian countries, followed by Nepal (34/100), Pakistan (32/100), and Bangladesh (26/100). However, when viewed as a whole, all South Asian countries are below the average of 43/100. Pena et al. (2000, p. 131) claim that, in most South Asian countries, "government employees are often perceived as aloof and unresponsive, viewing themselves more as public officials than civil servants". In response to this allegation, governments need to pay more careful attention to understanding the importance of enhancing public services through voluntary activities, which can empower citizens' participation and collaborative development.

Third, India and Sri Lanka (and Nepal[3]) recorded the highest level of internet users (34 per cent) in the region (World Bank, 2017). However, the rate in Pakistan and Bangladesh is significantly lower than this figure (15 percent). Internet usage is important because the internet provides various avenues (e.g., social media) through which people can express concerns about public services, and in turn, influence the transparency and accountability of public institutions. A lack of infrastructure, a low level of education, and the absence of a right to information may limit public access to information. Thus, South Asia as a region needs to take appropriate action to enhance its telecommunication and technological facilities in order to improve perceived public service quality and trust in public institutions. Facilitating affordable online and offline avenues through which citizens can actively participate in government processes and other government matters may enhance public trust in the sector (e.g., Kim, 2010). Policy makers should therefore regard public participation as a constituent element of promoting trust in public institutions rather than as a destructive activity.

Also, the South Asian context is one of the most culturally and religiously diverse regions of the world. Many of the world's major religions, such as Buddhism, Islam, Hinduism, and

[3] Nepal's internet usage has rapidly increased from 19.5 percent (2016) to 34 percent (2017). This study was conducted before 2017.

Christianity, as well as a host of other traditional religions, are practised by people across the region. It should be noted that historical and sociocultural disparities can lead to social polarisation along ethnic and/or religious lines. In this regard, some individuals may be mistrustful of public sector workers, such as those working in judicial agencies or the police. It is also probable that some members of the public could interpret well-intentioned government procedures as attempts to victimise them if the public sector officials involved in those procedures come from a different ethnic tribe, caste, or even practise a different religion. Furthermore, the literature suggests that ethnic diversity and religious plurality may have a negative impact on trust within a society, as they can create social divisions (Houston et al., 2016). It is also important to note that several developments continue to occur in the South Asian context, including reforms in local governance that have gained momentum over the last two decades. Besides, South Asian countries have continued to set up and expand social safety nets (i.e. cash transfer programmes) aimed at poverty alleviation and boosting various human development indicators, including access to health and education. At the same time, South Asian countries have recorded significant strides in promoting the welfare of women and women's political rights. Therefore, taken together, these factors have the potential to promote citizen participation and trust in public institutions.

Public trust is a function of national institutional factors which should be considered in the design and implementation of public sector reforms, as well as in the adoption of international protocols (e.g., Kettl, 2017). This study contributes to the existing evidence on the relationship between public participation and public trust in government. Public trust is a complex concept that encompasses transparency, fairness, and accountability in public administration (Kettl, 2017; Kim, 2010; Lee & Schachter, 2019; Pedersen et al., 2017). A decline in public trust is thus potentially a matter of concern for bureaucrats and policy makers alike, whether under normal or emergency circumstances (Kim, 2010; Lee & Schachter, 2019; Pedersen et al*.,* 2017). This study shows that citizen participation has a significant positive impact on strengthening trust in public institutions. Public trust in public institutions is of utmost importance as they are key stakeholders responsible for delivering public services (e.g., Van de Walle et al., 2008). This is particularly significant in relation to essential public services such as the civil service, the courts and the police. Thus, if public institutions fail to deliver high-quality public services, it could affect public trust in the government. While many other factors influence the quality of public services and trust in public institutions, this study highlights the importance of considering citizens' voluntary participation as a means of enhancing trust in public institutions. In response to the call for cross-national (Pestoff et al., 2006) and comparative quantitative studies on co-production (see Verschuere et al., 2012), this study provides novel insights into the impact of democratic maturity on the role played by citizen participation in ensuring trust in public institutions across the South Asian region (see Kim 2010; Samaratunge et al., 2008).

The results of this study should be interpreted with the following limitations in mind. First, while the study reports satisfactory R-squared in several models (e.g., public trust in police in India and public trust in the military in Sri Lanka), most models report relatively marginal values. While we have controlled for several demographic variables, we acknowledge that there are many other variables that may directly or indirectly influence these relationships, which may not have been considered in this study. Given that R-squared values are relatively low, caution should be exercised in interpreting the results of this study. Second, as the study relies on cross-sectional data, it is challenging to measure the effect of causal evidence on perceived public service quality, as various other factors, such as a country's political climate and government performance, may

also influence public trust in the civil service, the courts, and the police. While the study controlled for several variables (citizens' age, gender, education, religion, locality and media usage), it is not possible to predict many other factors that might affect trust in public institutions. Third, using cross-sectional data may raise concerns about the direction of causality. To minimise this effect, future researchers should utilise longitudinal data where possible. Fourth, the study is based on data collected from five developing countries in the South Asian region. While there is scant evidence of the impact of public trust in the civil service in non-Western contexts, caution should be taken in generalising the findings of the present paper to other contexts. Fifth, although the study compares data across five countries, the survey administrators cannot guarantee that the survey participants in different countries understood the survey questions in the same way due to language, cultural, and lifestyle differences. Next, the study refers to public institutions, including the civil service, courts, police, the head of state, and military forces. It should be noted that citizens may perceive the quality of these services differently depending on whether they have experienced favourable or unfavourable outcomes in their dealings with them, rather than in terms of the nature and process of each service. Finally, as the South Asian Barometer survey data were collected prior to the COVID-19 pandemic (in 2013/2014), it would be interesting to compare citizen participation and trust in public institutions before and after the pandemic. Noting the crucial role played by public services in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic, future studies should explore how such actions have influenced trust in public institutions.

References

Abner, G., Perry, J. L., & Fucilla, L. (2020). Experiments on the effects of positive and negative perceptions of a public sector profession. *Public Performance & Management Review*, *43*(5), 1025-1052

Ariely, G. (2013). Public administration and citizen satisfaction with democracy: Cross-national evidence. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *79*(4), 747–766.

Asian Barometer. (2020), *The Asian Barometer Survey Data*. http://www.asianbarometer.org/data/data-release. [Accessed March 02, 2020]

Aven, T., & Renn, O. (2010). *Risk management and governance: Concepts, guidelines and applications* (Vol. 16). Springer Science & Business Media.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *51*(6), 1173.

Bellé, N., Cantarelli, P., & Belardinelli, P. (2017). Cognitive biases in performance appraisal: Experimental evidence on anchoring and halo effects with public sector managers and employees. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *37*(3), 275–294.

Brandsen, T., Steen, T., & Verschuere, B. (2018). *Co-production and co-creation: Engaging citizens in public services* (p. 322). Taylor & Francis.

Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Wetterberg, A. (2016). Gauging the effects of social accountability on services, governance, and citizen empowerment. *Public Administration Review*, *76*(2), 274–286.

Brugué, Q., & Gallego, R. (2003). A democratic public administration? Developments in public participation and innovations in community governance. *Public Management Review*, *5*(3), 425-447.

Caiden, G. (2013). Public Administration in Asia, *Public Administration Review*,*73 (*3).540-546.

Chang, A. (2022). Halo effects and public evaluation of police service. *The Social Science Journal*, 1–14.

Cortina, J. M. (1993). Interaction, nonlinearity, and multicollinearity: Implications for multiple regression. *Journal of Management*, *19*(4), 915-922.

De Waele, L., Polzer, T., Van Witteloostuijn, A., & Berghman, L. (2021). "A little bit of everything?" Conceptualising performance measurement in hybrid public sector organisations through a literature review. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, *33*(3), 343-363.

Donnelly, M., Wisniewski, M., Dalrymple, J. F., & Curry, A. C. (1995). Measuring service quality in local government: the SERVQUAL approach. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, *8*(7), 15–20.

Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU). (2020), *Democracy Index 2019: A Year of Democratic Setbacks and Popular Protest:* Retrieved September 11th, 2020, from https://www.eiu.com/topic/democracyindex

Fisk, K., & Cherney, A. (2017). Pathways to institutional legitimacy in post-conflict societies: perceptions of process and performance in Nepal. *Governance*, *30*(2), 263–281.

Foster, C., & Frieden, J. (2017). Crisis of trust: Socio-economic determinants of Europeans' confidence in government. *European Union Politics*, *18*(4), 511-535.

Friedrich, R. J. (1982). In defense of multiplicative terms in multiple regression equations. *American Journal of Political Science*, 797–833.

Gaventa, J., & Barrett, G. (2012). Mapping the outcomes of citizen engagement. *World Development*, *40*(12), 2399–2410.

Garlatti, A., Fedele, P., Iacuzzi, S., & Garlatti Costa, G. (2019). Coproduction and cost efficiency: a structured literature review. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, *32*(1), 114-135.

Goodsell, C.T. (1994). *The case for bureaucracy: a public administration polemic*. 3rd ed. Chatham: Chatham House Publishers Inc.

Haque, M. S. (2001). Pride and performance in the public service: Three Asian cases. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *67*(1), 99–115.

Haustein, E., & Lorson, P. C. (2021). Co-creation and co-production in municipal risk governance–A case study of citizen participation in a German city. *Public Management Review*, *25*(2), 376–403.

Herian, M. N., Hamm, J. A., Tomkins, A. J., & Pytlik Zillig, L. M. (2012). Public participation, procedural fairness, and evaluations of local governance: The moderating role of uncertainty. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *22*(4), 815–840.

Hibbing, J. R., & Theiss-Morse, E. (2002). *Stealth democracy: Americans' beliefs about how government should work*. Cambridge University Press.

Holum, M. (2023). Citizen participation: Linking government efforts, actual participation, and trust in local politicians. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *46*(13), 915–925.

Houston, D. J., Aitalieva, N. R., Morelock, A. L., & Shults, C. A. (2016). Citizen trust in civil servants: A cross-national examination. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *39*(14), 1203–1214.

Huque, A. S. (2001). Governance and public management: The South Asian context. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *24*(12), 1289-1297.

Jayasinghe, K., Wijesinghe, C., Wijethilake, C., & Prasanna, R. (2022). Collaborative public service provision archetypes in healthcare emergencies: A case of COVID-19 administration in Sri Lanka. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, *34*(3), 391-410.

Kelly, J. M., & Swindell, D. (2002). A multiple–indicator approach to municipal service evaluation: Correlating performance measurement and citizen satisfaction across jurisdictions. *Public Administration Review*, *62*(5), 610–621.

Kettl, D. F. (2017). *Can governments earn our trust?*. John Wiley & Sons.

Kim, S. (2010). Public trust in government in Japan and South Korea: Does the rise of critical citizens matter?. *Public Administration Review*, *70*(5), 801–810.

Krah, R., & Mertens, G. (2023). Financial transparency, trust and willingness to pay in local governments of sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, *35*(6), 100–120.

Lassou, P. J., Ostojic, M., Barboza, J. U., & Moses, O. (2024). Participatory budgeting in francophone Africa: a comparative perspective between Benin and Niger. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, *36*(1), 81–104.

Lee, Y., & Schachter, H. L. (2019). Exploring the relationship between trust in government and citizen participation. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *42*(5), 405–416.

Lodge M., Taber C. S. (2013). *The rationalizing voter*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mahmud, R. (2021). What explains citizen trust in public institutions? Quality of government, performance, social capital, or demography. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, *43*(2), 106-124.
Marschall, M. J. (2004). Citizen participation and the neighbourhood context: A new look at the coproduction of local public goods. *Political Research Quarterly*, *57*(2), 231–244.
Marvel, J. D. (2016). Unconscious bias in citizens' evaluations of public sector performance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *26*(1), 143–158.
Michels, A. M. (2006). Citizen participation and democracy in the Netherlands. *Democratization*, *13*(02), 323–339.
Nabatchi, T., Sancino, A., & Sicilia, M. (2017). Varieties of participation in public services: The who, when, and what of coproduction. *Public Administration Review*, *77*(5), 766–776.
Osborne, S. P., Radnor, Z., & Strokosch, K. (2016). Co-production and the co-creation of value in public services: a suitable case for treatment?. *Public Management Aeview*, *18*(5), 639-653.
Owen, C. (2020). Participatory authoritarianism: From bureaucratic transformation to civic participation in Russia and China. *Review of International Studies*, *46*(4), 415–434.
Palumbo, R., & Manesh, M. F. (2023). Travelling along the public service co-production road: a bibliometric analysis and interpretive review. *Public Management Review*, *25*(7), 1348–1384.
Pedersen, M. J., Stritch, J. M., & Taggart, G. (2017). Citizen perceptions of procedural fairness and the moderating roles of 'belief in a just world' and 'public service motivation' in public hiring. *Public Administration*, *95*(4), 874–894.
Pena, J., Guasch, J., and Escribano, A. (2000). *Reforming Public Institutions and Strengthening Governance: A World Bank Strategy.* Washington DC: The World Bank.
Pestoff, V. (2006). Citizens and co-production of welfare services: Childcare in eight European countries. *Public Management Review*, *8*(4), 503–519.
Pestoff, V., Osborne, S. P., & Brandsen, T. (2006). Patterns of co-production in public services: Some concluding thoughts. *Public Management Review*, *8*(4), 591–595.
Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies—*Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(5), 879.
Prakash, T. (1996). Public expenditure management in Asian countries (1). *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, *10*(2), 255–278.
Samaratunge, R., Alam, Q., & Teicher, J. (2008). Public sector reforms and accountability: the case of south and Southeast Asia. *Public Management Review*, *10*(1), 101-126.
Stals, L., Isac, M. M., & Claes, E. (2022). Political trust in early adolescence and its association with intended political participation: A cross-sectional study situated in Flanders. *Young*, *30*(4), 377–399.
Tyler, T. (1990). *Procedural Justice, Legitimacy and Compliance. Tyler T. Why Do People Obey the Law? Yale University Press, New Haven*.
Van de Walle, S., & Van Ryzin, G. G. (2011). The order of questions in a survey on citizen satisfaction with public services: Lessons from a split-ballot experiment. *Public Administration*, *89*(4), 1436-1450.
Van de Walle, S., Van Roosbroek, S., & Bouckaert, G. (2008). Trust in the public sector: Is there any evidence for a long-term decline?. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *74*(1), 47–64.

Van Ryzin, G. G. (2011). Outcomes, process, and trust of civil servants. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *21*(4), 745-760.

Verschuere, B., Brandsen, T., & Pestoff, V. (2012). Co-production: The state of the art in research and the future agenda. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, *23*(4), 1083–1101.

Vu, V. T. (2021). Public trust in government and compliance with policy during COVID-19 pandemic: empirical evidence from Vietnam. *Public Organization Review*, *21*(4), 779-796.

Wagle, U. (2000). The policy science of democracy: The issues of methodology and citizen participation. *Policy Sciences*, *33*(2), 207–223.

Warren, M. E. (2001). *Democracy and trust.* Cambridge University Press.

Wickramasinghe, D., Wijethilake, C., & Herath, N. (2025). Counter-accounts of the absent state: accounting for violence, silence and resistance. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 1-33.

Witesman, E., & Walters, L. (2014). Public service values: A new approach to the study of motivation in the public sphere. *Public Administration*, *92*(2), 375–405.

World Bank. (2017). Individuals using the internet (% of population) Accessed on 23 March 2022. Available at: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IT.NET.USER.ZS

Yang, K., & Pandey, S. K. (2011). Further dissecting the black box of citizen participation: When does citizen involvement lead to good outcomes?. *Public Administration Review*, *71*(6), 880-892.

Zhao, D., & Hu, W. (2017). Determinants of public trust in government: Empirical evidence from urban China. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *83*(2), 358–377.

Table 7.1: Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations – India

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.Perceived public service quality	2.95	.78	1									
2. Public protests	0.39	.61	-.065**	1								
3. Public voting	1.11	.31	.007	-.027	1							
4. Political participation	2.33	.64	.005	-.311**	.018	1						
5. Official engagements	0.52	.56	-.013	.457**	-.086**	-.296**	1					
6. The courts	1.89	.87	-.103**	-.040*	.011	.032	.002	1				
7. Civil service	2.17	.83	-.163**	-.013	.034	.048**	-.046*	.448**	1			
8. Police	2.59	.97	.675**	.037*	-.053**	-.030	.074**	-.077**	-.124**	1		
9. Head of the state	1.74	.81	-.124**	-.035	.093**	.000	-.040*	.289**	.371**	-.139**	1	
10. Military	1.52	.77	-.096**	.024	.019	.009	-.023	.268**	.315**	-.051**	.250**	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 7.2: Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations – Sri Lank

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.Perceived public service quality	3.03	.71	1									
2. Public protests	0.20	.46	-.069**	1								
3. Public voting	1.09	.28	.044	-.047	1							
4. Political participation	2.17	.68	.068**	-.204**	.082**	1						
5. Official engagements	0.54	.57	-.059*	.351**	-.137**	-.330**	1					
6. The courts	1.79	.71	-.077**	-.013	.015	-.046	-.006	1				
7. Civil service	2.06	.72	-.129**	-.024	.029	-.041	-.009	.429**	1			
8. Police	2.21	.87	-.170**	.088**	.008	-.096**	.083**	.339**	.344**	1		
9. Head of the state	1.94	.87	-.185**	.076**	.005	-.106**	.101**	.348**	.355**	.364**	1	
10. Military	1.85	.96	-.177**	.062*	-.008	-.092**	.150**	.338**	.287**	.435**	.518**	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 7.3: Results from Hierarchical Regression Analysis – Mature Democracies

	India					Sri Lanka				
	Civil service	**Courts**	**Police**	**Head of the state**	**Military**	**Civil service**	**Courts**	**Police**	**Head of the state**	**Military**
Model 1										
Age	.037*	.000	.011	.003	.033[a]	-.005	-.009	-.059*	.000	-.019
Gender	.029	.045*	-.045**	.036*	.065**	-.024	-.039	-.066***	-.108***	-.026
Religion	.019	-.011	-.010	-.029	.009	-.068**	-.112***	-.090***	-.297***	-.520***
Education	.000	.008	-.020	-.017	-.039*	.030	.033	.037	.062*	.037[a]
Locality	-.081***	.028	-.076***	.126***	.027	.089***	.105***	.084***	.067**	.069**
Media usage	.037[a]	-.036[a]	.034[a]	-.002	-.027	.023	-.005	.034	-.060***	-.038[a]
Perceived public service quality (H1)	-.107***	-.161***	.677***	-.124***	-.092***	-.122***	-.060*	-.159***	-.131***	-.088***
R2	.018	.030	.463	.032	.020	.033	.034	.058	.147	.311
Adjusted R2	.016	.028	.462	.030	.018	.029	.030	.054	.143	.308
F	7.91***	13.64***	376.04***	14.32***	8.81***	8.14***	8.60***	14.80***	41.65***	109.38***
Model 2										
Age	.043*	.009	-.001	.025	.041*	-.003	-.005	-.054*	.006	-.016
Gender	.017	.037[a]	-.028*	.032[a]	.071***	-.028	-.040	-.047[a]	-.090***	-.001
Religion	.023	-.008	-.011	-.031[a]	.008	-.070**	-.119***	-.087***	-.297***	-.516***
Education	.002	.011	-.021	-.017	-.041*	.027	.033	.029	.053*	.024
Locality	-.085***	.021	-.058***	.112***	.027	.088***	.102***	.085***	.069**	.078***
Media usage	.048*	-.025	.019	.004	-.036[a]	.023	-.006	.027	-.069**	-.047*
Perceived public service quality	-.117***	-.163***	.687***	-.123***	-.089***	-.129***	-.067**	-.154***	-.129****	-.089***
Public protests	-.052*	.016	.052**	-.028	.049*	-.045[a]	-.031	.045[a]	.024	-.006
Voting	.026	.031[a]	-.045**	.089***	.029	.031	.007	.017	.024	.023
Political discussion	.029	.030	-.002	-.015	-.021	-.032	-.043	-.045[a]	-.056*	-.035
Official engagement	.022	-.031	.042*	-.006	-.026	-.014	-.021	.031	.032	.105***
Perceived service quality * Public protests(H2)	.043*	.034	.010	-.007	-.015	-.035	.003	.023	.004	-.005
Perceived service quality * Voting(H2)	.000	.011	-.014	.000	.004	-.009	.042[a]	.012	-.009	-.027
Perceived service quality * Official engagements(H2)	-.058*	-.022	.030[a]	.025	.016	.024	-.018	-.028	-.059*	-.040[a]
Perceived service quality* Political activeness	.001	.010	.011	-.004	.017	.040	.042	.003	.013	.037[a]
R^2	.025	.034	.473	.041	.024	.039	.041	.066	.157	.328
Adjusted R^2	.020	.029	.470	.036	.019	.030	.033	.057	.150	.322
F	5.15***	7.16***	181.68***	8.59***	4.90***	4.54***	4.87***	7.89***	20.95***	55.01***

n=India 3,058; Sri Lanka 1,703

p<.10; *p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

b H1 = Civil Service (H1a), Courts (H1b), Police (H1c), the Head of State (H1d), and Military (H1e)

c H2 = Civil Service (H2a), Courts (H2b), and Police (H2c), the Head of State (H2d), and Military (H2e)

Table 7.4: Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations – Pakistan

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.Perceived public service quality	2.50	.79	1									
2. Public protests	0.65	.65	.039	1								
3. Public voting	1.81	.39	-.041*	-.066**	1							
4. Political participation	1.96	.63	-.026	-.192**	.047*	1						
5. Official engagements	0.72	.59	.072**	.361**	-.070**	-.182**	1					
6. The courts	2.27	.94	-.117**	-.114**	-.009	.108**	-.101**	1				
7. Civil service	2.49	.86	-.086**	-.095**	-.036	.034	-.147**	.314**	1			
8. Police	2.92	.97	.031	-.128**	-.019	-.048*	-.108**	.212**	.248**	1		
9. Head of the state	2.32	.91	-.137**	-.125**	.022	.060**	-.115**	.272**	.420**	.236**	1	
10. Military	1.95	.93	-.075**	.039	-.011	.112**	.100**	.242**	.146**	-.030	.137**	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 7.5: Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations – Bangladesh

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.Perceived public service quality	3.20	.73	1									
2. Public protests	0.26	.53	-.141**	1								
3. Public voting	1.11	.31	-.089**	.028	1							
4. Political participation	2.28	.64	.186**	-.377**	-.040	1						
5. Official engagements	0.47	.59	-.167**	.449**	-.023	-.366**	1					
6. The courts	2.36	.89	-.163**	-.009	.067*	-.158**	.039	1				
7. Civil service	2.63	.89	-.262**	.014	.096**	-.196**	.036	.689**	1			
8. Police	2.90	.91	-.255**	.022	.087**	-.163**	.003	.503**	.628**	1		
9. Head of the state	2.04	.91	-.154**	-.013	.086**	-.136**	-.023	.568**	.572**	.445**	1	
10. Military	1.87	.83	-.007	-.014	0.016	-.081**	.030	.427**	.370**	.280**	.431**	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 7.6: Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations – Nepal

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.Perceived public service quality	3.16	.70	1									
2. Public protests	0.35	.55	-.018	1								
3. Public voting	1.18	.38	-.013	-.007	1							
4. Political participation	2.48	.60	.037	-.369**	-.059**	1						
5. Official engagements	0.92	.41	-.032	.373**	-.016	-.389**	1					
6. The courts	1.87	.71	-.075**	-.005	.025	.051*	-.054*	1				
7. Civil service	2.34	.80	-.130**	.108**	.062**	-.039	.044	.333**	1			
8. Police	2.23	.78	-.094**	.029	.056*	.038	-.039	.319**	.369**	1		
9. Head of the state	2.12	.73	-.065**	.035	.076**	.079**	-.043	.349**	.269**	.189**	1	
10. Military	2.00	.75	-.054*	-.073**	.021	.131**	-.092**	.289**	.188**	.590**	.222**	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 7.7: Results from Hierarchical Regression Analysis – Late Democratic Adopters

	Pakistan					Bangladesh					Nepal				
	Civil service	Courts	Police	Head of the state	Military	Civil service	Courts	Police	Head of the state	Military	Civil service	Courts	Police	Head of the state	Military
Model 1															
Age	.020	.001	.022	-.001	-.006	.031	.057*	.009	.044	.085*	-.012	.030	-.050[a]	-.043	-.022
Gender	.057*	.056**	.028	.078***	-.014	.009	-.020	-.033	-.036	.017	-.085***	.046[a]	-.007	.051*	.149***
Religion	-.042*	-.009	-.032	-.035[a]	-.043*	.000	.022	-.040	.053*	.075*	.027	.062**	.043[a]	.049*	.060**
Education	.030	.009	.002	.071***	.013	.077*	.084*	.068*	.021	.012	.006	.076**	-.015	.022	.008
Locality	-.074***	.058**	.043*	-.030	.082***	.076*	.180***	.117***	.098**	.097**	.067**	-.032	.015	.050*	-.052*
Media usage	.019	-.008	.108***	.064*	-.073***	.057[a]	-.055[a]	.044	.069*	.047	.062*	-.024	-.035	-.037	-.068**
Perceived public service quality (H1)	-.084***	-.110***	.024	-.141***	-.068**	-.231***	-.112***	-.217***	-.116***	.028	-.121***	-.076**	-.090***	-.064**	-.064**
R2	.018	.021	.015	.033	.019	.089	.060	.096	.048	.023	.037	.014	.013	.014	.039
Adjusted R2	.015	.018	.013	.030	.016	.084	.055	.091	.044	.018	.034	.010	.010	.010	.035
F	6.41***	7.60***	5.50***	12.00***	6.87***	19.65***	12.84***	21.42***	10.26***	4.75***	10.70***	3.88***	3.76***	3.92***	11.15***
Model 2															
Age	.011	-.006	.018	-.005	-.003	.045	.069*	.020	.058*	.084*	.007	.040	-.032	-.018	-.012
Gender	-.013	-.008	-.033	.016	.017	.028	.006	-.034	-.047[a]	.037	-.075*	.026	-.014	.040	.125***
Religion	-.036	.000	-.025	-.030	-.037[a]	.020	.038	-.026	.074*	.083*	.023	.058*	.039[a]	.043[a]	.057*
Education	.038	.019	.011	.081***	.008	.069*	.074*	.065*	.017	.006	-.007	.104**	-.006	.039	.043
Locality	-.061	.074***	.052*	-.019	.085***	.049[a]	.156***	.094**	.076*	.080*	.060*	-.044[a]	.003	.033	-.065**
Media usage	.020	.011	.095***	.070**	-.045*	.026	-.090*	.036	.070*	.029	.061*	-.016	-.031	-.030	-.059*
Perceived public service quality	-.086	-.113***	.025	-.139***	-.082***	-.225***	-.106***	-.238***	-.114***	.027	-.124***	-.081***	-.094***	-.069**	-.066**
Public protests	-.048	-.081***	-.119***	-.091***	.021	-.093*	-.103**	-.054[a]	-.091*	-.063*	.089***	.024	.062*	.083**	.003
Voting	-.053	-.028	-.027	.005	-.008	.070*	.065*	.062*	.074*	.011	.057*	.023	.049[a]	.065**	.021
Political discussion	.007	.088***	-.052*	.044*	.122***	-.167***	-.162**	-.103**	-.097*	-.096*	.030	.060*	.046[a]	.103**	.091**
Official engagement	-.137	-.059**	-.104***	-.070*	.128***	-.025	.013	-.071*	-.073*	.015	-.006	-.061*	-.046[a]	-.032	-.029
Perceived service quality *Public protests(H2)	-.039	-.033	-.017	.004	-.062*	-.096**	-.100**	-.077*	-.123***	-.042	-.017	-.051*	-.035	-.006	-.020
Perceived service quality *Voting(H2)	-.061	-.046*	.005	.020	-.011	.018	.015	.065*	.015	.053*	.010	.006	.025	-.005	-.002
Perceived service quality *Official engagements(H2)	.008	.007	.013	-.019	.007	.083**	-.044	.091*	.122***	.012	-.009	-.013	-.004	.021	.015
Perceived service quality* Political activeness	-.014	-.010	-.015	.010	-.002	-.005	.043	-.054[a]	.049[a]	-.028	-.013	.018	.017	-.003	.041
R2	.045	.045	.044	.052	.049	.123	.090	.125	.091	.034	.046	.023	.022	.030	.049
Adjusted R2	.039	.039	.033	.046	.043	.114	.080	.115	.081	.023	.039	.016	.015	.022	.042
F	7.70***	7.67***	7.56***	9.04***	8.53***	13.13***	9.26***	13.34***	9.35***	3.27***	6.25***	3.09***	2.94***	3.94***	6.63***

n=Pakistan 2,487; Bangladesh 1,424; Nepal 1,945
ap<.10; *p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001
bH1 = Civil Service (H1a), Courts (H1b), Police (H1c), the Head of State (H1d), and Military (H1e)
cH2 = Civil Service (H2a), Courts (H2b), and Police (H2c), the Head of State (H2d), and Military (H2e)

Appendix 7.1: South Asia: Demographic Profile

Country	Population (Millions)	Life expectancy (Years)	Human Development Index	Inequality adjusted HDI	Skilled labour Force (% of labour force)	Employment to population ratio	Internet users (% of population)	Expected years of schooling (Years)	Democratic index (out of 10)	Corruption score (out of 100)
India	1,352.6	69.4	.647	.538	17.6	50.6	34.5	12.3	6.90	41
Pakistan	212.2	67.1	.560	.386	27.9	51.7	15.5	8.5	4.25	32
Bangladesh	161.4	72.3	.641	.465	25.8	56.2	15.0	11.2	5.88	26
Sri Lanka	21.2	76.8	.780	.686	38.1	50.2	34.1	14	6.27	38
Nepal	28.1	70.5	.579	.430	41.9	81.9	n.d	12.2	5.28	34

Source: Human Development Reports (2019); The Economist Intelligence Unit (2019); Transparency International (2020)

Appendix 7.2: Demographic Profile of Citizens Participated in the Study

	India		Pakistan		Bangladesh		Sri Lanka		Nepal		All countries	
Sample size	3,058		2,487		1,424		1,703		1,945		10,617	
Age	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
18-30 years	942	30.8	1,072	43.1	400	28.1	327	19.2	432	22.2	3,175	29.9
31-50 years	1,295	42.3	1,282	51.5	693	48.7	740	43.5	814	41.9	4,824	45.4
51-70 years	681	22.3	131	5.3	262	18.4	544	31.9	602	31.0	2,220	20.9
Above 70	140	4.6	2	0.1	69	4.8	92	5.4	97	5.0	398	3.7
Gender												
Male	1,667	54.5	1,242	49.9	692	48.6	745	43.7	894	46.0	5,240	49.4
Female	1391	45.5	1,245	50.1	732	51.4	958	56.3	1,051	54.0	5,377	50.6
Religion												
Hindu	2,426	79.3	7	0.3	128	9.0	418	24.5	1,564	80.4	4,543	42.8
Islam	435	14.2	2,463	99.0	1,205	84.6	260	15.3	200	10.3	4,563	43.0
Christian	61	2.0	16	0.6	17	1.2	133	7.8	55	2.8	282	2.7
Sikh	82	2.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	64	3.3	147	1.4
Buddhist	19	0.6	-	-	61	4.3	876	51.4	31	1.6	987	9.3
Others	35	1.1	1	0.0	13	0.9	16	0.9	31	1.6	95	0.9
Education												
Non-literate	762	24.9	-	-	262	18.4	43	2.5	733	37.7	1,800	17.0
Informal education	35	1.1	12	0.5	69	4.8	32	1.9	351	18.0	499	4.7
Grade 1-12	1,719	56.2	2,475	99.5	948	66.6	1547	90.8	749	38.5	7,438	70.1
Bachelor's degree	381	12.5	-	-	34	2.4	72	4.2	90	4.6	577	5.4
Postgraduate	115	3.8	-	-	75	5.3	7	0.4	22	1.1	219	2.1
Professional	46	1.5	-	-	36	2.5	2	0.1	-	-	84	0.8
Locality												
Village	2,008	65.7	705	28.3	1,028	72.2	1,358	79.7	1,667	85.7	6766	63.7
Town (below 1 Lakh)	308	10.1	797	32.0	120	8.4	200	11.7	-	-	1425	13.4
City (above 1 Lakh)	342	11.2	582	23.4	113	7.9	145	8.5	-	-	1182	11.1
Big city (above 10 Lakhs)	400	13.1	403	16.2	163	11.4	-	-	278	14.3	1244	11.7
Media usage												
Daily/almost everyday	1,157	37.8	1,466	58.9	591	41.5	1,048	61.5	607	31.2	4,869	45.9
At least 3-4 times in a week	590	19.3	546	22.0	341	23.9	298	17.5	311	16.0	2,086	19.6
At least once a week	315	10.3	253	10.2	177	12.4	177	10.4	164	8.4	1,086	10.2
Never	996	32.6	222	8.9	315	22.1	180	10.6	863	44.4	2,576	24.3