

Citizen Participation and Democratic Legitimacy: Exploring the Nexus in Ghana's Fourth Republic

Kate Addo, Ph.D^a, Patrick Tandoh-Offin, Ph.D^b, Ekua Arhinfoa Ansah^c, Samuel Owusu-Ansah, Ph.D^d

^a Parliament of Ghana, Accra. Email: kamardai123@gmail.com | <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-1713-0884>

^b School of Public Service and Governance, Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration (GIMPA), Ghana. Email: ptandoh@gimpa.edu.gh

^c Centre for African and International Studies, University of Cape Coast, Ghana. Email: arhinfoa2@gmail.com | <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-4452-1778>

^d Balme Library, University of Ghana, Legon, Accra, Ghana. Email: sowusu-ansah@ug.edu.gh | samsfire555@gmail.com | <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4551-6126>

Keywords:

Citizen participation
democratic legitimacy
participatory democracy theory
Ghana.

ABSTRACT

Citizen participation and democratic legitimacy are foundational concepts in democratic governance, reflecting the extent to which a government is responsive to the will and needs of its citizens and the degree to which citizens feel their participation in governance is meaningful and impactful. Through a qualitative methodology and interview method of data collection, our study investigates how citizen involvement in the legislative process contributes to inclusivity, a sense of ownership in the development process, and ultimately, the overall quality of democratic governance. Utilizing participatory democracy theory, our article evaluates the nexus between citizen participation and democratic legitimacy and accountability in Ghana, assess the impact of citizen participation on the quality of governance and public trust in Ghana's 4th Republic and to develop a citizens' participation model that promotes the legislative process in Ghana's 4th republican parliament. Findings highlight the importance of citizen Participation and Democratic Legitimacy in Ghana's Fourth Republican Parliament. The study underscores the need to advocate for institutional reforms within the Ghanaian Parliament to create formal mechanisms for citizen engagement. This could include establishing citizen advisory panels, public hearings, or participatory budgeting processes that allow citizens to provide input on legislative decisions.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the discourse on democratic governance has increasingly emphasized the importance of citizen participation as a cornerstone of political legitimacy. Citizen participation is often heralded as a vital component of a vibrant democracy, fostering inclusivity, ownership, and accountability within the legislative process. Ghana, with its storied transition through multiple republics, offers a unique context to examine these dynamics, especially under its Fourth Republic, which has witnessed significant political and social transformations since its inception in 1992 (Bekkers & Edwards, 2016).

Democratic legitimacy, fundamentally, is derived from the perceived rightfulness of a government's authority, which is, in turn, significantly bolstered by the active engagement of its citizens (Lauth, 2020). When citizens are involved in the legislative process, they are more likely to feel a sense of ownership and responsibility towards the outcomes of governance. This participation can take various forms, including voting in elections, engaging in public consultations, partaking in civic organizations, and even direct involvement in legislative advocacy (Nabatchi & Leighninger, 2015). The underlying assumption is that such involvement enhances the responsiveness and accountability of elected officials, thereby strengthening democratic legitimacy (Diamond & Morlino, 2004).

However, the nexus between citizen participation and democratic legitimacy is not without challenges. In Ghana, while there is a constitutional framework that encourages citizen engagement, actual participation levels often reflect significant disparities based on socioeconomic status, geographical location, and educational attainment (Michels & De Graaf, 2010). The problem statement that this article seeks to address revolves around these disparities and their implications for democratic governance. Specifically, it investigates how inclusive the legislative process is in practice and whether citizen involvement translates into a genuine sense of ownership and improved governance outcomes. The Ghanaian context presents a paradox. On one hand, the Fourth Republic has been marked by a stable political environment and regular electoral processes, which are critical indicators of democratic health. On the other hand, there are persistent issues related to political exclusion, particularly of marginalized groups such as women, youth, and rural communities. This exclusion undermines the quality of

democratic governance and raises questions about the true inclusivity of the participatory mechanisms in place (Isma'ila, 2016).

Against this backdrop, this article aims to explore the extent to which citizen participation in Ghana's legislative process is inclusive and how this participation impacts the perceived legitimacy of the democratic system. By examining specific legislative initiatives and their engagement processes, this study will provide a comprehensive understanding of the current state of citizen participation in Ghana. As Ghana continues to evolve politically, understanding the dynamics of citizen participation and its impact on democratic legitimacy will be crucial for fostering a more inclusive and robust democratic system. Therefore, the study seeks to;

To evaluate the nexus between citizen participation and democratic legitimacy and accountability in Ghana.

To assess the impact of citizen participation on the quality of governance and public trust in Ghana's 4th Republic.

To develop a citizens' participation model that promotes the legislative process in Ghana's 4th republican parliament.

Our article is structured as follows for the remaining part of it: related literature, the methodology is presented with a theoretical model that draws on participatory democracy theory, findings, conclusion, its limitation and suggestions for further research.

RELATED LITERATURE

Citizen Participation and Democratic Legitimacy

The relationship between citizen participation and democratic legitimacy remains central to scholarship on democratic governance. Democratic legitimacy concerns the justification and public acceptance of the exercise of political authority, with citizen participation constituting an important basis through which such legitimacy is established and sustained (Lord, 2017). Meaningful participation can strengthen citizens' perceptions that political institutions are responsive, accountable, and attentive to public preferences, thereby fostering confidence in democratic institutions (Fung, 2015; Glass & Newig, 2019). When citizens perceive that their views are acknowledged and can influence public decisions, participation can also generate a sense of political ownership and strengthen the perceived legitimacy of governance outcomes (Singer, 2018).

A key contribution of citizen participation to democratic legitimacy lies in its potential to improve the responsiveness of public policy. Participatory mechanisms such as public consultations, community forums, and deliberative processes provide opportunities for citizens to communicate their needs, preferences, and concerns to decision-makers (Nabatchi, 2010). Such mechanisms can enhance the substantive quality of policies by incorporating perspectives that may otherwise be excluded from conventional decision-making processes. More importantly, policy decisions that emerge from inclusive participation may acquire greater procedural legitimacy because citizens have opportunities to contribute to their formulation and deliberation (Lafont, 2015).

Citizen participation also strengthens the accountability and transparency dimensions of democratic legitimacy. Through monitoring, public scrutiny, and social accountability mechanisms, citizens can assess government performance and demand explanations for public decisions and resource use (Fox, 2015). Community scorecards and public expenditure tracking, for example, can provide mechanisms through which citizens monitor public institutions and contribute to improved transparency and accountability (Brinkerhoff & Wetterberg, 2016). These processes can strengthen the relationship between citizens and public institutions by creating opportunities for reciprocal scrutiny and institutional responsiveness.

Beyond accountability and policy responsiveness, participation can contribute to social cohesion and community empowerment. Civic engagement can generate networks, trust, and shared norms that facilitate collective action and cooperation among citizens (Bartoletti & Faccioli, 2016; Warren et al., 2015). Social capital developed through civic participation can consequently reinforce democratic practices and strengthen citizens' capacity to engage collectively with public institutions (Villalonga-Olives & Kawachi, 2017). However, these outcomes are not automatic. The legitimacy-enhancing effects of participation depend substantially on the inclusiveness, quality, and influence of participatory processes.

Several conditions can constrain this relationship. Socioeconomic inequalities, limited access to education and information, and inadequate political platforms can prevent marginalized groups from participating effectively (Fung, 2015; Eriksen et al., 2021). Consequently, participation that systematically excludes particular social groups may reproduce existing inequalities rather than strengthen democratic legitimacy. Similarly, tokenistic participation, in which citizens are consulted without having meaningful opportunities to influence decisions, can generate frustration and distrust (Arnstein, 1969; Mawomo, 2019). Resource limitations, weak institutional capacity, and difficulties in managing competing interests may further constrain effective participation, particularly in developing democratic contexts (Horgan & Dimitrijević, 2019; Gaventa & Barrett, 2010).

Overall, the literature indicates that citizen participation can strengthen democratic legitimacy through improved policy responsiveness, accountability, transparency, and social cohesion. However, the relationship is contingent on whether participation is inclusive, meaningful, adequately supported, and capable of influencing decision-making. For Ghana's Fourth Republican Parliament, this perspective provides an important basis for examining whether existing participatory structures enable citizens not only to express their views but also to see those views reflected in parliamentary deliberation and legislative processes. Such an assessment is essential for understanding how citizen participation contributes to the legitimacy and responsiveness of Ghana's parliamentary democracy.

Impact of citizen participation on the quality of governance

Citizen participation is widely recognized as a fundamental component of democratic governance and an important determinant of governance quality. Active citizen engagement can strengthen accountability, responsiveness, transparency, and social cohesion within public institutions. Through participation, citizens are better positioned to scrutinize public officials, influence policy decisions, and demand explanations for governmental actions (Fox, 2015). Evidence suggests that participatory mechanisms, including public audits, community scorecards, and public expenditure tracking, can strengthen social accountability and contribute to reducing corruption (Talò et al., 2014; Björkman & Svensson, 2009).

Citizen participation can also enhance government responsiveness by enabling public institutions to incorporate citizens' needs and preferences into policy and resource allocation. Fung (2015) argues that meaningful participation improves the capacity of governments to respond to public priorities. Participatory budgeting provides an important illustration, as citizen involvement in budgetary decisions can promote more equitable and needs-based allocation of public resources (Wampler, 2010). Evidence from Porto Alegre, Brazil, demonstrates how participatory budgeting can redirect public investment towards underserved communities (Nabatchi, 2010).

Transparency represents another important dimension through which participation can improve quality of governance. Public consultations and open government initiatives provide citizens with access to information necessary for monitoring government activities and holding public officials accountable (Gaventa, 2023). Similarly, digital governance and e-governance initiatives can expand opportunities for citizen engagement while improving access to public information and strengthening administrative transparency (Brockmyer & Fox, 2015).

Beyond institutional outcomes, citizen participation can contribute to social cohesion and community empowerment by strengthening social capital, including networks, trust, and shared norms that facilitate collective action (Lovan et al., 2017). Such relationships can enhance citizens' capacity to work collectively with public institutions and contribute to the resilience and sustainability of governance systems (Brinkerhoff & Wetterberg, 2016).

However, the governance benefits of citizen participation depend largely on the quality and inclusiveness of participatory processes. Socioeconomic inequality, limited education, inadequate access to information, and weak political platforms may prevent marginalized groups from participating meaningfully (Fox, 2015; Holmes, 2011). There is also a risk of tokenism, whereby participation creates an appearance of inclusion without providing citizens with meaningful influence over decisions (Arnstein, 1969). Such practices can generate frustration and undermine trust in public institutions (Gaventa & Barrett, 2012). Resource constraints and competing interests may further limit the effectiveness of participatory governance, particularly where institutions lack adequate financial, technical, and human capacity (Fung, 2014; Parvin, 2018).

Overall, the literature indicates that meaningful citizen participation can enhance accountability, responsiveness, transparency, and social cohesion, thereby contributing to improved governance quality. However, these benefits depend on participatory mechanisms that are inclusive, adequately resourced, transparent, and capable of translating citizen input into substantive decision-making outcomes.

Citizens' Participation Models that Promote the Legislative Process

Citizen participation in the legislative process is an important dimension of democratic governance because it provides opportunities for individuals and organized groups to contribute to the formulation, deliberation, and implementation of laws and public policies (Isma'ila, 2016). Literature identifies several approaches through which citizens can engage legislative institutions, among which deliberative democracy, co-governance, and digital democracy are particularly relevant. Although these models differ in their mechanisms and intensity of participation, they share the objective of creating opportunities for citizens to influence public decision-making.

The deliberative democracy model emphasizes reasoned discussion and exchange of views among citizens and between citizens and their representatives. Its underlying premise is that inclusive and informed deliberation can improve the quality and legitimacy of public decisions (Aloryito & Aloryito, 2019; Holmes, 2011). Mechanisms such as citizens' assemblies, public forums, and participatory budgeting provide opportunities for citizens to deliberate on policy issues and communicate their preferences to decision-makers (Fung, 2015). Evidence suggests that citizens' assemblies can generate informed recommendations on complex policy questions and provide legislators with perspectives that may otherwise be absent from conventional representative processes (Meijer et al., 2012). The Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review similarly illustrates how structured citizen deliberation can contribute to more informed public consideration of legislative proposals (Gastil et al., 2014). However, the effectiveness of

deliberative mechanisms depends on the representativeness of participants, the quality of information available, and the extent to which decision-makers respond to citizens' recommendations.

The co-governance model provides a more institutionalized approach to citizen participation by incorporating citizens into continuing structures of consultation, deliberation, and decision-making. Rather than treating participation as an occasional activity, co-governance seeks to embed citizen engagement within formal institutional arrangements, including participatory councils, advisory bodies, and participatory budgeting mechanisms (Wampler, 2010). Evidence from Brazil indicates that institutionalized participation can improve transparency, accountability, and the responsiveness of public resource allocation (Avritzer, 2017). Participatory councils in Porto Alegre demonstrate how structured interaction between citizens and public authorities can create sustained opportunities for citizens to articulate community priorities and influence public decisions (Kiani & Sartipi, 2016). Nevertheless, institutionalization alone does not guarantee meaningful participation, particularly where citizens have limited influence over final decisions or where participatory structures are dominated by more resourceful groups.

The emergence of digital democracy has further expanded the opportunities available for citizen engagement in legislative processes. Digital democracy employs online platforms and technologies such as e-petitions, online consultations, virtual public forums, and social media to connect citizens with legislative institutions (Chadwick, 2009). These mechanisms can reduce geographical barriers and provide additional channels through which citizens can communicate their views to policymakers. Online consultations and parliamentary e-petition systems, for example, can broaden access to legislative discussions and facilitate direct communication between citizens and political institutions. However, the effectiveness of digital participation is constrained by unequal access to digital technologies, differences in digital literacy, misinformation, and concerns regarding online security and the quality of digital deliberation (Garrisson Smith, 2017).

Taken together, the literature suggests that no single participation model is sufficient to capture the complexity of contemporary legislative engagement. Deliberative democracy emphasizes the quality of citizen dialogue, co-governance emphasizes the institutionalization and continuity of participation, while digital democracy emphasizes the accessibility and scalability of engagement. These approaches are therefore complementary rather than mutually exclusive. Their effectiveness depends not only on the availability of participatory mechanisms but also on whether citizens have meaningful opportunities to influence legislative processes and whether institutions demonstrate responsiveness to citizen input.

For the Ghanaian parliamentary context, an integrated approach combining these models provides a useful basis for examining citizen participation. Public hearings and consultations can support deliberation, constituency and parliamentary structures can provide institutional channels for sustained engagement, while digital platforms can extend participation beyond physical and geographical boundaries. The effectiveness of these mechanisms ultimately depends on their inclusiveness, accessibility, transparency, and capacity to translate citizen input into legislative consideration. This integrated perspective provides a useful foundation for assessing the structures and processes through which citizens participate in Ghana's Fourth Republican Parliament.

Theoretical Foundation

Our article is grounded in participatory democratic theory, which emphasizes the importance of active citizen engagement in political processes as a cornerstone of democracy (Pateman, 1970). According to this theory, democratic legitimacy extends beyond procedural aspects like elections to include substantive participation in decision-making processes. Citizen engagement in legislative processes helps shape policies that affect their lives, thereby enhancing policy legitimacy and governmental authority (Lord, 2017)

Bianchi (2021) identifies various mechanisms for engagement, such as voting, public consultations, and involvement in civic organizations (Fung, 2015). Active participation fosters a sense of ownership, leading to more sustainable governance outcomes. However, significant barriers to participation exist, including socio-economic, educational, and

geographical factors (Norris, 2002). In Ghana, these barriers often exclude marginalized groups from meaningful political engagement, challenging the inclusivity and legitimacy of the democratic system (Sossou, 2011).

This literature review examined key studies on citizen participation and democratic legitimacy, focusing on Ghana's Fourth Republic. It highlights how existing research addresses the benefits and challenges of citizen participation, setting the stage for a deeper investigation into Citizen Participation and Democratic Legitimacy in Ghana. By integrating empirical data, this review aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the impact of citizen involvement on democratic legitimacy in Ghana.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopted a qualitative research design to explore citizen participation and its relationship with democratic legitimacy and accountability within Ghana's Fourth Republican Parliament. A qualitative approach was considered appropriate because the study sought to understand the experiences, perceptions, practices, and institutional processes associated with citizen participation rather than to measure the phenomenon statistically. The design enabled the researcher to obtain detailed accounts from stakeholders directly involved in, or affected by, parliamentary and citizen engagement processes. As Creswell and Poth (2018) explain, qualitative research is appropriate for examining complex social phenomena in their natural settings and for understanding meanings that participants attach to their experiences.

The study was situated within an interpretivist orientation, recognising that citizens, parliamentarians, civil society actors, and media practitioners may experience and interpret participation in different ways. The design therefore provided an opportunity to examine both the formal mechanisms established for citizen participation and how these mechanisms are experienced and perceived by relevant stakeholders.

Participant Selection and Sampling

Participants were selected using purposive sampling. Purposive sampling was appropriate because the study required participants with direct knowledge, experience, or involvement in citizen participation and parliamentary legislative processes. Rather than seeking statistical representation of the Ghanaian population, the sampling strategy focused on obtaining information-rich accounts from stakeholder groups relevant to the research objectives (Patton, 2015).

A stakeholder mapping process was undertaken to identify categories of participants who could provide complementary perspectives on citizen participation in the legislative process. Four stakeholder categories were identified: parliamentarians, civil society organisation representatives, citizens with experience or knowledge of parliamentary participation, and media practitioners. These groups were selected because they occupy different positions within the legislative participation ecosystem and could provide perspectives on formal participation mechanisms, citizen experiences, institutional practices, and public communication.

The final sample comprised 30 participants: nine parliamentarians, six civil society organisation representatives, twelve citizens, and three media practitioners. Participants were approached based on their relevance to the study, knowledge of parliamentary processes, experience with citizen engagement, or involvement in communicating legislative affairs. The inclusion of participants from these four categories allowed the study to incorporate institutional, civil society, citizen, and media perspectives.

The sample size was determined by the information richness of the interviews and the point at which additional interviews were no longer generating substantially new themes relevant to the research questions. The principle of data saturation was therefore used as a guide rather than as a predetermined numerical requirement. Guest et al. (2006) note that saturation occurs when additional data produce little or no new information relevant to the study. The researcher maintained a reflexive journal throughout the sampling and data collection processes to document sampling decisions, emerging issues, methodological

reflections, and potential researcher assumptions (Noble & Smith, 2015).

DATA COLLECTION

Data were collected from November to December 2025 through semi-structured, in-depth interviews. Semi-structured interviews were selected because they provided a consistent set of questions across participants while allowing the researcher to probe issues that emerged from individual participants' experiences and responses. This approach was particularly suitable for examining perceptions of citizen participation, institutional mechanisms, barriers to engagement, and the extent to which participation contributes to democratic legitimacy and accountability.

An interview guide was developed around the study objectives and covered four broad areas: forms and levels of citizen engagement in the legislative process; institutional structures and mechanisms for participation; factors enabling or constraining participation; and participants' perceptions of democratic legitimacy and accountability. The same broad areas were explored across the four stakeholder categories, while follow-up questions were adapted to participants' roles and experiences.

Interviews were conducted in English, which was the language used by all participants during the interviews. Participants were informed about the purpose of the study and the voluntary nature of their participation before the interviews. The researcher also sought clarification and elaboration where participants raised issues requiring further exploration. This process enabled the researcher to obtain detailed accounts while maintaining consistency across interviews.

Data Analysis

The interview data were analysed thematically following the principles of thematic analysis outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006). The analysis involved systematic familiarisation with the interview data, identification of meaningful segments, generation of initial codes, development of candidate themes, review and refinement of themes, and definition and naming of the final themes.

The analysis was both deductive and inductive. Deductive coding was informed by the research objectives and the study's theoretical perspectives, particularly concepts relating to citizen participation, democratic legitimacy, accountability, and institutional mechanisms. At the same time, inductive coding allowed issues that emerged directly from participants' accounts to be incorporated into the analysis rather than being restricted to predetermined categories.

The researcher first reviewed the interview transcripts repeatedly to develop familiarity with the data. Relevant statements and passages were then coded according to their substantive meaning. Related codes were subsequently grouped into broader categories and themes. The themes were reviewed against the coded extracts and the complete dataset to ensure that they accurately represented participants' accounts and addressed the research objectives.

Triangulation was also used to enhance the credibility of the findings. Perspectives from parliamentarians, civil society organisation

representatives, citizens, and media practitioners were compared to identify areas of convergence and divergence. Relevant documentary and institutional information was also considered alongside interview accounts where appropriate. This process enabled the researcher to examine the phenomenon from multiple stakeholder perspectives rather than relying on a single source of evidence.

Trustworthiness of the Study

The trustworthiness of the qualitative findings was addressed through credibility, dependability, confirmability, and reflexivity. Credibility was enhanced through the purposive selection of information-rich participants, prolonged engagement with the interview data, systematic thematic analysis, and comparison of perspectives across stakeholder groups. Dependability was supported by maintaining a clear record of sampling, data collection, coding, and thematic development processes.

The researcher maintained a reflexive journal throughout the research process to document methodological decisions, emerging interpretations, personal assumptions, and reflections on the researcher-participant relationship. This reflexive practice supported confirmability by encouraging the researcher to distinguish participants' accounts from personal interpretations. The use of multiple stakeholder perspectives further strengthened the credibility of the interpretations.

Overall, the methodological approach was designed to ensure consistency between the qualitative research design, purposive participant selection, semi-structured interviews, thematic analysis, and interpretation of participants' experiences of citizen participation in Ghana's Fourth Republican Parliament.

RESULTS

In table 1, the study involved 30 participants drawn from four stakeholder categories relevant to citizen participation in Ghana's Fourth Republican Parliament. The participants comprised nine parliamentarians (30.0%), six civil society organisation representatives (20.0%), twelve citizens (40.0%), and three media practitioners (10.0%). In terms of gender, 20 participants (66.7%) were male and 10 (33.3%) were female. Regarding marital status, 15 participants (50.0%) were married, 10 (33.3%) were divorced, and five (16.7%) were single.

The participants represented different age groups. Four participants (13.3%) were aged 18 to 24 years, eight (26.7%) were aged 25 to 34 years, twelve (40.0%) were aged 35 to 44 years, and six (20.0%) were above 44 years. With respect to educational attainment, one participant (3.3%) had secondary education, 24 (80.0%) held a bachelor's degree, and five (16.7%) held master's degrees.

The background characteristics indicate that the study captured perspectives from four relevant stakeholder groups: parliamentarians, civil society representatives, citizens, and media practitioners. This stakeholder diversity is important because citizen participation in the legislative process involves interactions among institutional actors, organised civil society, citizens and information intermediaries. The inclusion of these groups therefore provides a broader basis for understanding participation and democratic legitimacy rather than relying exclusively on parliamentary perspectives.

Table 1 Participant's demographic background

Variable	Category	n	%
Stakeholder group	Parliamentarians	9	30.0
	Civil Society Organisations	6	20.0
	Citizens	12	40.0
	Media Practitioners	3	10.0
Gender	Male	20	66.7
	Female	10	33.3
Marital status	Single	5	16.7
	Divorced	10	33.3

	Married	15	50.0
Age	18–24	4	13.3
	25–34	8	26.7
	35–44	12	40.0
	Above 44	6	20.0
Education	Secondary	1	3.3
	Bachelor's degree	24	80.0
	Master's degree	5	16.7
Total		30	100.0

Source: Field work (2026)

Democratic legitimacy and accountability in Ghana

The themes identified included Democratic legitimacy and accountability, Citizen Participation and democratic legitimacy and accountability and Improving democratic legitimacy and accountability. Participants' exact quotes are used to describe the themes that were discovered.

Democratic legitimacy and accountability

Recognizing the core ideas behind democratic legitimacy and accountability as well as how they function within democratic systems is necessary to comprehend these ideas. According to one response, the basis of democratic legitimacy is the consent of the governed, which gives the government authority. Remarks from media personnel;

Democratic legitimacy relies on government authority being based on the consent of the governed, typically through free and fair elections. Leaders must reflect the people's will and maintain their trust to remain legitimate (R20).

A citizen also had this to say:

In a democracy, accountability involves answerability—explaining and justifying actions—and consequences—facing repercussions for misconduct or failure. Effective accountability ensures that public officials are held responsible for their conduct (R12).

Democratic legitimacy, in the opinion of the responders, is based on the notion that the consent of the governed bestows authority on the government. Two components of responsibility that are necessary in a democratic environment are answerability and repercussions. Additional pillars of democratic legitimacy are constitutionalism and the rule of law, which specify legal norms and procedures for governance and impose limits on the power of political institutions. To ensure transparency, accountability, and oversight, democracies rely on a variety of structures and practices. The ombudsman offices, election commissions, anti-corruption organizations, and judicial systems are a few examples of these independent legislative entities.

Citizen Participation, democratic legitimacy and accountability

Increased transparency, responsiveness, and citizen involvement in governance processes are all made possible by citizen participation, which is essential to improving democratic legitimacy and accountability. Governments are motivated to be more transparent about their policies, practices, and decision-making processes when citizens are involved, according to one responder. What one government official stated was as follows:

Citizen participation promotes government transparency and accountability by allowing direct engagement, access to information, and involvement in decision-making. This scrutiny helps identify abuses of power and corruption (R5).

Another respondent who is a citizen stated;

Citizen participation enhances accountability by allowing public oversight through mechanisms like public hearings and advisory boards. This engagement helps ensure officials act in the public interest and address concerns about misconduct (Interview, Mrs. Magdalen Osei, 12th January 2024).

In conclusion, public participation in the legislative process promotes representation, civic empowerment, openness, and high-calibre policies all of which enhance the legitimacy and accountability of democracy. The participants stated that by ensuring that a range of opinions are heard, citizen participation enhances representation in the legislative process. Participation of the public in the legislative process promotes transparency and accountability in the creation of public policy. By applying the collective knowledge and experience of the public, citizen participation enhances the quality of law. Democracy is strengthened when citizens participate in the legislative process and gain more knowledge and authority.

Improving democratic legitimacy and accountability

Actively engaging in democratic processes includes things like volunteering in the community, attending public gatherings, and casting a ballot in elections. According to one response;

Active engagement in democracy—through voting, attending meetings, and participating in community initiatives—helps citizens make informed decisions and hold officials accountable (R24).

Joining civil society organizations helps citizens collectively advocate for change and hold governments accountable, promoting transparency in decision-making (R16).

Supporting transparency and access to information—such as demanding open data and public records—helps ensure government actions align with democratic principles and serve the public interest (R7).

Participants stated that citizens may contribute to enhancing democratic legitimacy and accountability by actively engaging in democratic processes, such as voting in elections, attending public events, and working on neighbourhood initiatives. By taking part in civil society organizations, people can express their concerns and work for change collectively. Examples of these organizations include advocacy groups, NGOs, and grassroots movements. By taking part in civil society organizations, people can express their concerns and work for change collectively. Examples of these organizations include advocacy groups, NGOs, and grassroots movements. Promoting civic education and awareness initiatives that teach individuals the knowledge and skills they need to actively participate in democratic processes.

Finally, the study question examined Ghana's democratic legitimacy and accountability. Three themes were found: citizen participation and democratic legitimacy and accountability; improving democratic legitimacy and accountability; and democratic legitimacy and accountability.

The impact of citizen participation on the quality of governance and public trust in Ghana's 4th Republic

Several themes were found, such as the effect of citizen engagement on the governing process, citizen engagement and citizens' trust in their government, and barriers that prevent citizens from participating effectively in politics. We summarize the themes that were found using verbatim statements from the participants.

Effect of citizen engagement on the governing process

Enhanced Accountability and Transparency, according to one participant is one effect of citizen engagement in the governance process in Ghana since the inception of the 4th Republic. Her words;

Citizen participation boosts accountability and transparency by enabling concerns to be voiced and government activities to be monitored through town hall meetings, public consultations, and social media. For example, the Right to Information (RTI) Act of 2019, driven by public advocacy, grants citizens legal access to information from public institutions, enhancing transparency (R9).

Active citizen engagement is key to policy reforms and social change. Grassroots movements and advocacy groups have influenced policies in education, health, and social justice, such as the Free Senior High School policy of 2017. Public participation also played a role in establishing the Office of the Special Prosecutor to combat corruption (R19).

Participants underlined how greater accountability and openness in governance had resulted from citizen participation. People can express their concerns, hold their leaders accountable, and keep an eye on government operations by using tools like town hall meetings, public consultations, and social media. Once more, civil society organizations, advocacy groups, and grassroots movements have played a significant role in influencing laws about social justice, health care, and education.

Citizen engagement and citizens' trust in their government

When citizens actively participate in governance processes, it fosters a sense of ownership and responsibility and increases trust through reporting mechanisms. One said;

Active citizen involvement in governance fosters a sense of ownership and responsibility. Public forums, town hall meetings, and participatory budgeting enable accountability, increase transparency, and build trust in government by ensuring citizens' voices are heard and concerns are addressed (R13).

Another respondent stated;

Citizen participation empowers individuals and communities, leading to a more engaged and informed populace. Initiatives like community policing, which involves collaboration with law enforcement, build trust in security agencies. Tangible results, such as improved public services and infrastructure, further strengthen trust in government institutions (R12).

Active citizen participation helps reduce corruption and improve governance by exposing corrupt practices through civil society, watchdog groups, and the media. Institutions like the Office of the Special Prosecutor, established due to public demand, enhance oversight and boost confidence in the government's commitment to ethical governance, thereby increasing public trust (R26).

Participants said that a sense of ownership and responsibility is created when citizens actively participate in governance processes. A more involved and knowledgeable public has resulted from citizen involvement, which has given people and communities the confidence to actively participate in governance. People's trust in law enforcement and other security agencies has been strengthened by programs like community policing, in which residents work with the police to keep the community safe. One of the most important things that has helped to improve governance and decrease corruption is active citizen participation. Corrupt officials are brought to justice and their actions are exposed by the media, watchdog groups, and civil society organizations.

Barriers that prevent citizens from participating effectively in politics

Enhancing citizen participation to improve the quality of governance in Ghana's 4th Republic faces several challenges which one participant pointed out Limited Access to Information and Technology. His words;

Limited access to information and technology, especially in rural areas, hampers effective citizen participation in governance. The digital divide restricts engagement in online platforms and access to

government information, reducing citizens' ability to stay informed, participate in policy-making, and hold leaders accountable (R30).

Political and institutional barriers, such as bureaucratic red tape, lack of political will, and inadequate legal frameworks, can hinder effective citizen participation. Resistance from government officials, who may view increased participation as a threat, can result in tokenistic engagement, where citizens' inputs are not genuinely considered, discouraging meaningful involvement (R28).

Participants brought up the issue of many citizens' restricted access to technology and information, especially in rural regions, which makes it difficult for them to engage in government effectively. Due to the digital divide, not everyone has easy access to government information or internet platforms. Effective public engagement can also be hampered by institutional and political constraints. These obstacles consist of insufficient legal frameworks that do not encourage or facilitate citizen engagement, political will lessness, and bureaucratic red tape.

To sum up, the study question addressed how public trust and the standard of governance in Ghana's Fourth Republic are affected by citizen engagement. These themes such as the impact of citizen involvement on the political process, the relationship between citizen engagement and public trust in government, and the obstacles that stand in the way of citizens' effective political participation were developed via the research. These topics were investigated in great detail.

The model that promotes the legislative process in Ghana's 4th Republican Parliament

The study highlights that public hearings, community workshops, surveys, parliamentary committees, and civil society engagement are crucial for linking citizen participation with democratic legitimacy and accountability. Challenges such as limited engagement opportunities, inadequate civic education, and partisan polarization create a disconnect between citizens and the legislative process. To address this, strategies such as improving civic education, promoting media literacy, and enhancing public participation are recommended to strengthen democratic engagement and governance.

Effective use of social media, town hall meetings, and public consultations can help citizens monitor government operations and hold officials accountable. Civil society organizations and advocacy groups have significantly influenced laws related to social justice, healthcare, and education. Programs like community policing have fostered trust in law enforcement. However, limited access to technology and information in rural areas remains a barrier to effective participation.

DISCUSSIONS

Democratic legitimacy and accountability in Ghana

Our study pointed out that, democratic legitimacy is rooted in the idea that a government's authority derives from the consent and active participation of its citizens. According to Wiechnik (2013), legitimacy is achieved when government actions align with the values and expectations of the populace, and when government institutions are perceived as both effective and fair. In Ghana, democratic legitimacy is upheld through regular elections, which provide citizens with the opportunity to choose their representatives and hold them accountable for their actions. However, legitimacy extends beyond electoral processes; it also involves consistent adherence to constitutional principles and the rule of law (Mena & Palazzo, 2012).

Citizen participation is fundamental to both democratic legitimacy and accountability. Driscoll (2022) argues that active citizen engagement in the legislative process enhances the legitimacy of democratic institutions by ensuring that laws and policies reflect the needs and preferences of the populace. Participatory mechanisms such as public consultations, town hall meetings, and citizen petitions allow individuals to contribute to policy discussions and decision-making processes. This involvement not only validates governmental decisions but also fosters a sense of ownership and trust among citizens.

Improving democratic legitimacy and accountability requires addressing several key challenges. One major challenge is the need for greater inclusivity in governance. Ensuring that all segments of society, including marginalized groups, have opportunities to participate in the democratic process is crucial for enhancing legitimacy. According to

Amakye-Boateng et al., (2021), reforms such as the expansion of public consultation processes and the implementation of participatory budgeting can help achieve greater inclusivity and responsiveness in governance.

Impact of citizen participation on the quality of governance and public trust in Ghana's 4th Republic

Citizen engagement has played a crucial role in shaping governance processes in Ghana. Active participation by citizens in political and legislative processes ensures that government actions reflect the needs and preferences of the populace. Driscoll (2022) highlights that public consultations and town hall meetings are platforms through which citizens influence policy decisions. These forums allow citizens to voice their opinions, provide feedback, and propose solutions to issues affecting their communities. As a result, policies developed through such participatory processes are more likely to be effective and widely accepted.

Moreover, the involvement of civil society organizations and grassroots movements has been instrumental in advocating for policy reforms and social justice which the data indicates. These organizations mobilize public opinion, hold government officials accountable, and ensure that the interests of marginalized groups are considered in governance. For instance, the advocacy efforts leading to the implementation of the Free Senior High School policy demonstrate the power of citizen engagement in driving significant policy changes (Gready & Robins, 2017).

Despite the positive impacts of citizen engagement, several barriers prevent effective participation in Ghana. One significant barrier is the limited access to information and communication technologies, particularly in rural areas which the data points out. This digital divide restricts the ability of many citizens to engage with government processes and access important information. Gyampo (2018) notes that without access to digital platforms, a significant portion of the population remains excluded from participatory governance initiatives.

Additionally, political and institutional barriers, such as bureaucratic inefficiencies and lack of political will, hinder citizen participation. Turnhout et al., (2010) point out that some government officials may resist citizen engagement due to perceived threats to their authority or power. This resistance can manifest in inadequate legal frameworks that fail to support or facilitate meaningful public participation. Addressing these barriers requires comprehensive reforms to create an inclusive environment that promotes active civic engagement.

The model that promotes the legislative process in Ghana's 4th republican parliament

A key model that promotes the legislative process in Ghana is the participatory legislative process, which emphasizes the involvement of various stakeholders, including civil society organizations, interest groups, and the general public. This model enhances the quality of legislation by incorporating diverse perspectives and expertise into the law-making process. According to Nelimarkka et al., (2014), public consultations and town hall meetings are integral components of this model, providing platforms for citizens to contribute to legislative debates and discussions. By engaging the public, lawmakers can ensure that proposed laws address the actual needs and concerns of the populace, thereby increasing the relevance and acceptance of legislation.

Another important model in Ghana's legislative process is the emphasis on oversight and accountability. The Parliament of Ghana exercises its oversight functions through various committees that scrutinize government actions and expenditures. This model ensures that the executive branch remains accountable to the legislature, thus promoting transparency and good governance. Khan & Hoque (2016) highlight that the Public Accounts Committee (PAC) plays a crucial role in examining the audited accounts of government ministries, departments, and agencies. Through public hearings and detailed reports, the PAC helps to uncover instances of mismanagement and corruption, thereby strengthening legislative oversight and accountability.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that citizen participation is closely connected to perceptions of democratic legitimacy and accountability within Ghana's Fourth Republican Parliament. The findings indicate that meaningful citizen engagement can strengthen transparency, responsiveness, representation, civic empowerment, and public trust by creating opportunities for citizens to contribute to legislative processes and scrutinize public decisions. However, the study also identifies important barriers, particularly limited access to relevant information, inadequate inclusivity, especially for marginalised groups, and institutional constraints affecting participatory practices.

These challenges limit the extent to which existing participation mechanisms can translate citizens' engagement into meaningful influence within legislative governance. The study therefore highlights the importance of strengthening accessible and inclusive channels of parliamentary engagement and creating institutional conditions that support meaningful citizen input. Overall, effective citizen participation remains an important dimension of democratic governance, with implications for strengthening accountability, responsiveness, and legitimacy in Ghana's Fourth Republic.

Implication of the Study

The study implies that strengthening citizen participation is important for improving democratic legitimacy, accountability, transparency, and public trust in Ghana's Fourth Republican Parliament. Effective participation requires accessible information, inclusive mechanisms that accommodate marginalized groups, and institutional arrangements that enable citizens to contribute meaningfully to legislative processes. The findings further imply that Parliament and relevant stakeholders should strengthen formal avenues for public engagement, including public hearings, citizen advisory mechanisms, and other participatory processes. Addressing institutional resistance and improving the implementation of relevant legal frameworks, including the Right to Information Act, may enhance citizens' capacity to participate and contribute to more responsive, accountable, and legitimate democratic governance in Ghana.

Limitation and Future Studies

One primary limitation is the scope of data collection, which largely relies on qualitative methods such as interviews and surveys. While these methods offer rich, detailed insights, they may not capture the full spectrum of citizen experiences and opinions across diverse regions of Ghana. Expanding the research to include a broader range of geographic and demographic contexts could provide a more comprehensive view of how participation affects democratic legitimacy.

To build on these findings, future research should incorporate quantitative methods to complement the qualitative data. Statistical analyses could offer more generalized insights and identify broader trends in citizen participation. Comparative studies with other democracies, both within Africa and globally, could also provide valuable perspectives on effective strategies for enhancing engagement and legitimacy.

Lastly, an in-depth analysis of institutional dynamics, including the causes of resistance to citizen participation and the effectiveness of current legal frameworks, could provide actionable recommendations for improving engagement. Evaluating the impact of specific policies, such as the Right to Information Act, would also help refine these initiatives to better achieve their goals.

REFERENCES

- Aloryito, G. K., & Aloryito, G. K. (2019). Linking Participation and Economic Advancement. Ghana Civil Society Platform on the IMF Programme: Case Study.
- Amakye-Boateng, K., Adu-Gyamfi, S., Yartey, H. T., & Frimpong, J. O. (2021). Democratic Stability in Sub-Saharan Africa: Reflections on the Fourth Republic of Ghana. *African Renaissance*, 18(3), 277.
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216-224.
- Avritzer, L. (2017). Participatory budgeting as a democratic innovation: origins, expansion and limits: promises and limits of democratic participation in Latin America. In *The Two Faces of Institutional Innovation* (pp. 46-74). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Bartoletti, R., & Faccioli, F. (2016). Public engagement, local policies, and citizens' participation: An Italian case study of civic collaboration. *Social Media+ Society*, 2(3), 2056305116662187.

- Baum, J. R. (2011). *Responsive democracy: Increasing state accountability in East Asia*. University of Michigan Press.
- Bekkers, V., & Edwards, A. (2016). Legitimacy and democracy: A conceptual framework for assessing governance practices. In *Governance and the democratic deficit* (pp. 35-60). Routledge.
- Bianchi, C. (2021). Fostering sustainable community outcomes through policy networks: A dynamic performance governance approach. In *Handbook of collaborative public management* (pp. 349-372). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Björkman, M., & Svensson, J. (2009). Power to the people: evidence from a randomized field experiment on community-based monitoring in Uganda. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(2), 735-769.
- Botchway, T. P. (2018). Civil society and the consolidation of democracy in Ghana's fourth republic. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 4(1), 1452840.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Brinkerhoff, J. M. (2011). Public-private partnerships: Perspectives on purposes, publicness, and good governance. *Public administration and development*, 31(1), 2-14.
- 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.
- Brockmyer, B., & Fox, J. A. (2015). Assessing the evidence: The effectiveness and impact of governance-oriented multi-stakeholder initiatives. *Transparency & Accountability Initiative*, September.
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods*. Oxford University Press.
- Chadwick, A. (2009). Web 2.0: New challenges for the study of e-democracy in an era of informational exuberance. *I/S: a Journal of Law and Policy for the Information Society*, 5(1), 9-41.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage publications.
- Cuppen, E. (2012). Diversity and constructive conflict in stakeholder dialogue: considerations for design and methods. *Policy sciences*, 45(1), 23-46.
- Debrah, E. (2014). The politics of decentralization in Ghana's Fourth Republic. *African Studies Review*, 57(1), 49-69.
- Eriksen, S., Schipper, E. L. F., Scoville-Simonds, M., Vincent, K., Adam, H. N., Brooks, N., ... & West, J. J. (2021). Adaptation interventions and their effect on vulnerability in developing countries: Help, hindrance or irrelevance? *World Development*, 141, 105383.
- Fox, J. A. (2015). Social accountability: what does the evidence say? *World Development*, 72, 346-361.
- Fung, A. (2015). Putting the public back into governance: The challenges of citizen participation and its future. *Public Administration Review*, 75(4), 513-522.
- Garrison Smith, T. (2017). *Politicizing digital space: Theory, the Internet, and renewing democracy* (p. 154). University of Westminster Press.
- Gastil, J., Richards, R. C., & Knobloch, K. (2014). Vicarious deliberation: How the Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review influenced deliberation in mass elections. *International Journal of Communication*, 8, 62-89.
- Gaventa, J. (2023). Repertoires of citizen action in hybrid settings. *Development Policy Review*, 41, e12663.
- Gaventa, J., & Barrett, G. (2010). So what difference does it make? Mapping the outcomes of citizen engagement. *IDS Working Papers*, 2010(347), 01-72.
- Gaventa, J., & Barrett, G. (2012). Mapping the outcomes of citizen engagement. *World Development*, 40(12), 2399-2410.
- Glass, L. M., & Newig, J. (2019). Governance for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals: How important are participation, policy coherence, reflexivity, adaptation and democratic institutions? *Earth System Governance*, 2, 100031.
- Gready, P., & Robins, S. (2017). Rethinking civil society and transitional justice: lessons from social movements and 'new civil society'. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 21(7), 956-975.
- Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods*, 18(1), 59-82.
- Holmes, B. (2011). *Citizens' engagement in policymaking and the design of public services*. Canberra: Parliamentary Library.
- Horgan, D., & Dimitrijević, B. (2019). Frameworks for citizens participation in planning: From conversational to smart tools. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 48, 101550.
- Htun, M., & Ossa, J. P. (2013). Political inclusion of marginalized groups: indigenous reservations and gender parity in Bolivia. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, 1(1), 4-25.
- Isma'ila, Y. U. S. U. F. (2016). *Malpractices in Nigeria's Fourth Republic elections: Challenges of democratic governance* (Doctoral dissertation, Doctoral dissertation), Universiti Utara Malaysia).
- Khan, I. A. (2015). Ethical considerations in educational research: a critical analysis. *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science*, 13(2), 1-8.
- Khan, S. H., & Hoque, Z. (2016). Changes in the public accounts committee of a less developed democratic country: A field study. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 32(1), 80-103.
- Kiani, A., & Sartipi, H. (2016). Functions of election in a democratic system. *International Research Journal of Interdisciplinary & Multidisciplinary Studies, IRJIMS*, 2(9), 20-35.
- Kim, E. M., & Yang, S. (2016). Internet literacy and digital natives' civic engagement: Internet skill literacy or Internet information literacy? *Journal of Youth Studies*, 19(4), 438-456.
- Kim, S., & Lee, J. (2012). E-participation, transparency, and trust in local government. *Public Administration Review*, 72(6), 819-828.
- Kuokkanen, K. (2011). Urban governance and citizen participation: an analysis from the perspectives of effectiveness and democracy. *Urban governance in Europe*, 49-70.
- Lafont, C. (2015). Deliberation, participation, and democratic legitimacy: Should deliberative mini-publics shape public policy? *Journal of political philosophy*, 23(1), 40-63.
- Lauth, H. J. (2020). Legitimacy and legitimation. *The SAGE Handbook of*, 833.
- Lee-Geiller, S., & Lee, T. D. (2019). Using government websites to enhance democratic E-governance: A conceptual model for evaluation. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(2), 208-225.
- Lord, C. (2017). The democratic legitimacy of co-decision. In *Legislative Codecision in the European Union* (pp. 116-133). Routledge.
- Lovan, W. R., Murray, M., & Shaffer, R. (2017). *Participatory governance: planning, conflict mediation and public decision-making in civil society*. Routledge.
- Mawomo, K. (2019). *The dynamics of community participation: evidence from practice* (Doctoral dissertation, Keele University).
- Meijer, A. J., Curtin, D., & Hillebrandt, M. (2012). Open government: connecting vision and voice. *International review of administrative sciences*, 78(1), 10-29.
- Mena, S., & Palazzo, G. (2012). Input and output legitimacy of multi-stakeholder initiatives. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 22(3), 527-556.
- Michels, A., & De Graaf, L. (2010). Examining citizen participation: Local participatory policy-making and democracy. *Local government studies*, 36(4), 477-491.
- Moser, A., & Korstjens, I. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 3: Sampling, data collection and analysis. *European journal of general practice*, 24(1), 9-18.
- Munck, G. L. (2016). What is democracy? A reconceptualization of the quality of democracy. *Democratization*, 23(1), 1-26.
- Nabatchi, T. (2010). Addressing the citizenship and democratic deficits: The potential of deliberative democracy for public administration. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 40(4), 376-399.
- Nabatchi, T., & Leighninger, M. (2015). *Public participation for 21st-century democracy*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Nelimarkka, M., Nonnecke, B., Krishnan, S., Aitumurto, T., Catterson, D., Crittenden, C., ... & Goldberg, K. (2014). Comparing Three Online Civic Engagement Platforms using the Spectrum of Public Participation.
- Noble, H., & Smith, J. (2015). Issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research. *Evidence-based nursing*, 18(2), 34-35.
- O'donnell, G., Cullell, J. V., & Iazzetta, O. M. (Eds.). (2016). *The quality of democracy: theory and applications*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Parvin, P. (2018). Democracy without participation: A new politics for a disengaged era. *Res Publica*, 24, 31-52.
- Pateman, C. (1970). *Participation and democratic theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*. Sage publications.
- Poortinga, W. (2012). Community resilience and health: The role of bonding, bridging, and linking aspects of social capital. *Health & place*, 18(2), 286-295.
- Romano, A. (Ed.). (2010). *International journalism and democracy: Civic engagement models from around the world*. Routledge.
- Singer, M. (2018). Delegating away democracy: How good representation and policy successes can undermine democratic legitimacy. *Comparative Political Studies*, 51(13), 1754-1788.
- Slidders, C. (2019). *The emerging right to directly participate in local governance: enhancing the social inclusion of minorities and the politically alienated* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Sossou, M. A. (2011). We do not enjoy equal political rights: Ghanaian women's perceptions on political participation in Ghana. *Sage Open*, 1(1), 2158244011410715.
- Talò, C., Mannarini, T., & Rochira, A. (2014). Sense of community and community participation: A meta-analytic review. *Social indicators research*, 117, 1-28.
- Turnhout, E., Van Bommel, S., & Aarts, N. (2010). How participation creates citizens: participatory governance as a performative practice. *Ecology and Society*, 15(4).
- Villalonga-Olives, E., & Kawachi, I. (2017). The dark side of social capital: A systematic review of the negative health effects of social capital. *Social science & medicine*, 194, 105-127.
- Wampler, B. (2010). *Participatory budgeting in Brazil: Contestation, cooperation, and accountability*. Penn State Press.
- Warren, A. M., Sulaiman, A., & Jaafar, N. I. (2015). Understanding civic engagement behaviour on Facebook from a social capital theory perspective. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 34(2), 163-175.
- Wiechnik, S. (2013). Political legitimacy and values. *Small Wars Journal*, 9(11).
- Williams, D. R., & Cooper, L. A. (2019). Reducing racial inequities in health: using what we already know to take action. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 16(4), 606.