

Social research number: 17/2026

Publication date: 11/02/2026

# Measuring and monitoring democratic health in Wales: A Delphi study – Annexes

Mae'r ddogfen yma hefyd ar gael yn Gymraeg.

This document is also available in Welsh.

# Measuring and monitoring democratic health in Wales: A Delphi study – Annexes

Authors: Alma Economics



Full Research Report: Alma Economics (2026). Measuring and Monitoring Democratic Health in Wales: A Delphi study – Annexes. Cardiff: Welsh Government, GSR report number 17/2026.

Available at: <https://www.gov.wales/democratic-health>

Views expressed in this report are those of the researcher and not necessarily those of the Welsh Government.

For further information please contact:

Emma Wallace

Public Services and Local Government

Knowledge and Analytical Services

Welsh Government

Cathays Park

Cardiff

CF10 3NQ

Email: [Research.PublicServices@gov.wales](mailto:Research.PublicServices@gov.wales)

## Table of contents

List of tables .....	2
Annex A – Complete List of Democratic Health Indicators Resulting from the Literature Review .....	5
Annex B – Quality Assessment Framework .....	21
Annex C – Performance of Indicators in Delphi Round 2 .....	23
Electoral dimension indicators performance .....	23
Participatory dimension indicators performance .....	26
Deliberative dimension indicators performance .....	29
Egalitarian dimension indicators performance .....	30
Institutional responsiveness dimension indicators performance .....	31
Transparency and media freedom dimension indicators performance .....	34
Annex D – Analytical Overview of the Final 6 Shortlisted Indicators .....	37
Indicator 1 .....	37
V-Dem .....	37
PEI .....	41
Indicator 2 .....	41
Indicator 3 .....	42
Indicator 4 .....	42
Indicator 5 .....	42
Indicator 6 .....	43
Annex E – Research Tools .....	47
Discussion guide for initial expert workshops .....	47
Delphi questionnaire round 1 script .....	48
Delphi questionnaire 2 script .....	60
Part 1 .....	61
Part 2 .....	70
Delphi questionnaire 3 script .....	74

# List of tables

Table 1: Democratic health indicators identified during the literature review, April 2025 .....	5
Table 2: Quality Assessment Framework .....	21
Table 3: Indicator Electoral-A: Electoral competitiveness. Do voters have meaningful choices between candidates? Performance against quality assessment criteria ....	23
Table 4: Indicator Electoral-B: Electoral integrity: Overall, thinking about voting in election(s), how would you rate the ease of participating? Performance against quality assessment criteria .....	23
Table 5: Indicator Electoral-C: Electoral integrity: How confident, if at all, are you that you know how to go about voting at an election? Performance against quality assessment criteria .....	24
Table 6: Indicator Electoral-D: Electoral integrity: How confident, if at all, are you that you know how to go about registering to vote? Performance against quality assessment criteria .....	25
Table 7: Indicator Electoral-E: Electoral competitiveness: Did the electoral process allow for a fair playing field for all candidates, including equitable access to media and campaign financing? Performance against quality assessment criteria .....	25
Table 8: Indicator Participatory-A: Turnout in elections (official statistics): Turnout of votes in General, Senedd and Local elections. Performance against quality assessment criteria .....	26
Table 9: Indicator Participatory-B: Engagement with formal politics: Have you contacted your local councillor in the past 12 months, for example with an enquiry, complaint or problem? Performance against quality assessment criteria .....	26
Table 10: Indicator Participatory-C: Engagement with formal politics: Have you contacted your Members of the Senedd (MSs) in the past 12 months, for example with an enquiry, complaint or problem? Performance against quality assessment criteria ..	27
Table 11: Indicator Participatory-D: Engagement with formal politics: Have you ever attempted to influence a decision or decisions made by the council? Performance against quality assessment criteria.....	28
Table 12: Indicator Participatory-E: Engagement with informal politics: Active global citizenship in Wales. Performance against quality assessment criteria.....	28
Table 13: Indicator Deliberative-A: Use of reasoned justifications among politicians in debate (Welsh Parliament): Do politicians provide clear, well-reasoned justifications	

for their policy positions during debates? Performance against quality assessment criteria .....	29
Table 14: Indicator Deliberative-B: Respect for counterarguments and opponents among politicians (Welsh Parliament): Do politicians acknowledge and engage with counterarguments or alternative perspectives presented during debates? Performance against quality assessment criteria .....	29
Table 15: Indicator Deliberative-C: Respect for counterarguments and opponents among politicians (Welsh Parliament): Are opposing views fairly represented, or are they distorted or misrepresented to undermine them? Performance against quality assessment criteria .....	30
Table 16: Indicator Egalitarian-A: Equality of political engagement & balanced demographic representation in candidates: Socio-demographic characteristics of candidates. Performance against quality assessment criteria .....	30
Table 17: Indicator Egalitarian-B: Equality of political engagement & balanced demographic representation in government and legislators: Demographic characteristics of elected candidates. Performance against quality assessment criteria .....	31
Table 18: Indicator Institutional-A: Citizens' satisfaction with government and the political system: On the whole, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way that democracy works in: a) the UK as a whole; b) Wales? Performance against quality assessment criteria .....	31
Table 19: Indicator Institutional-B: Citizens' satisfaction with government and the political system: To what extent do you think your local council(s) act(s) on the concerns of local residents? Performance against quality assessment criteria .....	32
Table 20: Indicator Institutional-C: Citizens' belief in their ability to influence politics: To what extent do you agree or disagree that you can influence decisions affecting your local area? Performance against quality assessment criteria .....	32
Table 21: Indicator Institutional-D: Citizens' trust in the government. Performance against quality assessment criteria .....	33
Table 22: Indicator Transparency-A: Government transparency: Can decision-makers be identified and held accountable for major policy and spending decisions? Performance against quality assessment criteria. ....	34
Table 23: Indicator Transparency-B: Government transparency: Is there a formal anti-corruption or public integrity strategy in place, and does it include measurable objectives with regular monitoring? Performance against quality assessment criteria. ....	34

Table 24: Indicator Transparency-C: Media freedom: To what extent are media outlets free to report critically on the government without fear of censorship or retaliation?	
Performance against quality assessment criteria. ....	35
Table 25: Indicator Transparency-D: Government transparency: Freedom of Information (FOI) responsiveness and success rates. Performance against quality assessment criteria .....	35

# Annex A – Complete List of Democratic Health Indicators Resulting from the Literature Review

Table 1: Democratic health indicators identified during the literature review, April 2025

Democratic Health Dimensions	Measures available in Wales	Existing measures currently not available in Wales
<b>Electoral</b> (Free and fair elections and strong civil rights, in WCPP report)	<u><b>Electoral integrity</b></u>  Not Available <u><b>Electoral competitiveness</b></u>  Not Available <u><b>Civil right protections</b></u>  Not Available	<p>All indicators within this dimension will require <b>expert analysis and review</b>, as they are grounded in objective facts rather than public sentiment. More specifically:</p> <p><u><b>Electoral integrity</b></u></p> <p>Fairness and transparency of the electoral process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electoral Laws: "Are the electoral laws equitable for all political actors, including smaller parties and independent candidates?" (Perceptions of Electoral Integrity (PEI) 1; Freedom House A3)</li> <li>• Voting Process Accessibility: "Was the process of voting clearly communicated to all eligible voters, ensuring no significant barriers to participation?" (PEI 2.1, 2.2)</li> <li>• Share of population with suffrage: "What share of adult citizens as defined by statute has the legal right to vote in national elections?" (V-Dem v2x_suffr; Freedom House A3)</li> <li>• Voter Registration and Turnout: "To what extent does the voter registration process ensure accuracy and inclusiveness, and how effective was outreach to underrepresented groups (disabled)?" (PEI 4_4; V-Dem v2elrgstry)</li> </ul>

- Vote Counting Transparency: "Were the vote counting procedures transparent, secure, and free from any external influence?" (PEI 8; V-Dem v2elirreg)
- **Election Outcomes:** Do losing parties and candidates accept the result of this national election? Were there effective procedures for citizens to make complaints about the electoral process? (PEI 9, 10; V-Dem v2elaccept)

### **Electoral competitiveness**

- Voter options: "Do voters have meaningful choices between candidates?" (V-Dem v2elmulpar; PEI 8-4)
- Competitiveness: "Is there a realistic opportunity for the opposition to gain influence through elections? (Freedom House B2)
- Level playing field: "Did the electoral process allow for a fair playing field for all candidates, including equitable access to media and campaign financing?" (PEI 6; V-Dem v2eldonate, v2elfrcampv, 2elpdcamp, v2elpaidig)
- Campaign Finance Integrity: "How are campaign finance rules enforced, and do they allow for a fair contest?" (PEI, 7; V-Dem v2elpubfin)

### **Civil right protections**

- Political Freedoms: "Are political freedoms, such as freedom of speech, assembly, and association, respected during elections?" (V-Dem v2x\_freexp, v2caassemb)
- Political freedoms to all: "Do various segments of the



	<p>population (including ethnic, racial, religious, gender, sexuality, etc.) have full political rights?” (Freedom House B4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Voter Equality: “Are there any instances of voter suppression, intimidation?” (V-Dem v2elintim, v2elpeace; PEI 8-1, 8-2)</li><li>• Protection from external influences: “Are there adequate safeguards to prevent foreign or external interference in the election process, particularly through financial means?” (Adapted from V-Dem’s v2svdomaut – “Is the state autonomous from the control of other states with respect to the conduct of domestic policy?” and Freedom House B3 “Are the people’s political choices free from domination by forces that are external to the political sphere, or by political forces that employ extrapolitical means?”)</li></ul> <p><b>Expert evaluation</b> of electoral democracy in Wales would involve assembling a diverse panel of independent specialists with expertise in electoral law, campaign finance, media regulation, civil rights, and Welsh electoral systems. Each expert would independently assess a set of clearly defined indicators, using a standardised rubric informed by international frameworks, such as V-Dem and the Electoral Integrity Project (EIP). Their evaluations would be based on documented evidence, including relevant legislation, regulatory outputs, media content, and campaign data.</p> <p>In addition to expert reviews, <b>practitioner insights</b> can offer a</p>
--	--

		valuable perspective on how electoral processes function in practice. Following the methodology proposed by Garnett and James (2020), a survey similar to the <a href="#">Electoral Management Survey</a> (EMS) could be administered to electoral officials in Wales, in order to gather information on operational aspects of election delivery.
<b>Participatory</b> (Widespread citizen engagement, awareness, and participation, in WCPP report)	<p><b><u>Turnout in elections</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">General Elections results 2024</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Turnout of votes by country and region.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Welsh Parliament Elections results 2021</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Turnout of votes by region and constituency.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Local elections results 2022</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Turnout of votes by Local Authority and Ward.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">National Survey for Wales</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Question: ‘In the Welsh local council elections in May 2022, a lot of people didn’t manage to vote. How about you – did you manage to vote in the Welsh local council elections?’ (2022-23)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>Engagement with formal politics</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">National Survey for Wales</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Question: ‘Have</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<p>you contacted your local councillor in the past 12 months, for example, with an enquiry, complaint or problem?’ (2021-22)</p> <p><b><u>Engagement with informal politics</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Welsh Election Study 2016</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Well-being of Wales: National indicators</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Active global citizenship in Wales</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>Political interest and knowledge</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">National Survey for Wales</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Question: ‘To what extent do you agree or disagree... I have a good understanding of what my local councillor does for my local community.’ (2021-22)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Welsh Election Study</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Assessment of knowledge regarding devolved politics in Wales and UK politics at Westminster, measured on a 0-10 scale.</li> <li>○ Familiarity with political leaders’ names.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--	--

<p><b>Deliberative</b> (Reasoned and constructive political deliberation, in WCPP report)</p>	<p><b>Not Available</b></p>	<p>Deliberative indicators would require expert discourse analysis, as the unit of analysis is the quality of political discourse and reasoning in both the public sphere and parliamentary debates. These indicators should be theoretically grounded and thoroughly cross-checked to provide an unbiased overview of political practices and the structures of debate. More specifically:</p> <p><b><u>Use of reasoned justifications among politicians in debate (Welsh Parliament)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity of Justifications: "Do politicians provide clear, well-reasoned justifications for their policy positions during debates?" (V-Dem v2dlreason; DQI, Level of Justification)</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Use of justifications for decisions among politicians that appeal to common good (Welsh Parliament)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy Justification: "When important policy changes are being considered, i.e., before a decision has been made, to what extent do political elites give public and reasoned justifications for their positions?" (V-Dem v2dlconstl, v2dlengage)</li> <li>• Appeal to the Common Good: "Do politicians justify their decisions with reference to the common good?" (V-Dem v2dlcommon)</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Respect for counterarguments and opponents among politicians (Welsh Parliament)</u></b></p>
---	-----------------------------	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engagement with Counterarguments: "Do politicians acknowledge and engage with counterarguments or alternative perspectives presented during debates?" (V-Dem v2dlcountr)</li> <li>• Fair Representation of Opposing Views: "Are opposing views fairly represented, or are they distorted or misrepresented to undermine them?" (Deliberative Quality Index (DQI), Participation Equality)</li> <li>• Respect in Tone: "Do politicians respond to opposing views in a respectful manner, avoiding interruption, hostility, or ad hominem attacks?" (DQI, Respect, Participation Equality)</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Quality of deliberation in the public sphere</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pluralistic policy: "How many welfare programs are means-tested and how many benefit all (or virtually all) members of the polity?" (V-Dem v2dlencmps, v2dlunivl)</li> </ul> <p>Expert evaluation of deliberative democracy in Wales would involve <b>assembling a panel of independent specialists</b> with backgrounds in political communication, democratic theory, public discourse, and Welsh parliamentary procedures. <b>To ensure quality assurance and non-bias, all transcripts should be reviewed by multiple coders</b>, with inter-coder reliability checks and calibration exercises carried out before analysis begins.</p> <p><b>The primary source of evidence could be parliamentary debate</b></p>
--	--	--

		<p><b>transcripts from the Senedd, analysed through systematic discourse analysis.</b> Particular attention should be given to how politicians frame the concept of the common good. In line with the DQI definition, it is important to distinguish between utilitarian appeals, emphasising benefits to society as a whole, and Rawlsian appeals, which prioritise the interests of the least advantaged. Reviewers should be able to <b>weigh these different modes</b> of reasoning to assess the normative orientation of the deliberation (<a href="#">Bächtiger et al., 2022</a>).</p> <p>The <b>quality of deliberation in the Welsh public sphere</b> could be assessed through expert analysis of media content, public consultations, and civic forums, focusing on the breadth, independence, and inclusiveness of public debate during key policy discussions. Using tools such as <b>argument mining</b>, analysts can systematically identify the presence of counterarguments, reasoning structures, and opportunities for dissenting views to be expressed and considered.</p> <p><b><u>Is it feasible to assess political discourse without expert analysis?</u></b></p> <p>Assessing the quality of political discourse often depends on expert coding due to the complexity and context-specific nature of political language. Experts are equipped to interpret subtle rhetorical strategies, symbolic content, and implicit meanings, and to situate statements within their broader social and historical context. Their interpretive judgement should also be supported by theoretical frameworks and structured coding protocols, in order</p>
--	--	---

		<p>to ensure consistency, reliability, and validity in their evaluation. Expert analysis is widely referenced in the literature as the standard method for such assessments.</p> <p>Official statistics are unavailable for this, and polling is not a well-suited method. Surveys tend to capture surface-level perceptions of political discourse rather than its actual deliberative quality. While they reflect aggregated opinions about politicians' behaviours, they cannot assess the interactive, reasoned processes that define deliberation. Additionally, many citizens may lack the information or political knowledge needed to offer fully informed responses. Sampling and response biases further limit the reliability of survey data in this context. Surveys could only be used to ask citizens directly about their perceptions, provided their limitations are clearly acknowledged and accounted for.</p> <p>Nevertheless, progress can be made by applying novel deep learning methods to automate the analysis of political discourse. Several studies have explored this approach. For instance, Bilbao-Jayo and Almeida (<a href="#">2018</a>) used multi-scale convolutional neural networks (CNNs) to automatically identify topics in political texts across 7 languages, successfully testing their model on Spanish politicians' Twitter posts from the 2015–2016 elections. Similarly, Behrendt et al (<a href="#">2024</a>) developed AQuA, an additive deliberative quality score that combines multiple indicators of online discussion quality, using</p>
--	--	--

		<p>adapter models trained on 20 distinct facets of deliberation.</p> <p>However, these methods have limitations. Most analyses focus solely on text, excluding speech, and their reliability remains a concern. For example, Garg et al (<a href="#">2024</a>) found that while fine-tuned GPT models outperformed zero-shot approaches in discourse analysis for learning analytics, they still fell short of the reliability needed for fully automated coding. Human oversight remains essential to ensure accuracy and trustworthiness in these tasks.</p>
<p><b>Egalitarian</b> (Political, social, and economic equality, in WCPP report)</p>	<p><b><u>Equality of political engagement &amp; Equality of access to politics</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Local Government Candidate Survey</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sociodemographic characteristics of candidates.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Local elections results 2022 (House of Commons Library)</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Gender of (elected) candidates.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>Policy congruence with different social groups</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Welsh Election Study</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ People are asked to rank their views on a range of issues—such as whether the government should cut taxes and significantly reduce spending on health and social services, prioritise environmental protection over</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	



	<p>economic growth, abolish the Senedd and return to pre-devolution arrangements, or protect the UK's sovereignty—using a scale from 0 to 10. They are then asked to place Welsh Labour, the Welsh Conservative Party, and Plaid Cymru on the same scale for each issue. Depending on which party is in government, these responses can be used as a <b>proxy measure</b> of policy congruence between citizens and the governing party.</p> <p><b><u>Balanced demographic representation in government and legislators</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Local Government Candidate Survey</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sociodemographic characteristics of elected candidates.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Welsh Election results 2021 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Gender of elected candidates.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Local elections results 2022</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Gender of elected candidates.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--

<p><b>Institutional responsiveness</b> (Responsive government, reflecting citizens' wants and needs, in WCPP report)</p>	<p><b><u>Citizens' satisfaction with government and the political system</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#"><u>National Survey for Wales</u></a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Question: 'Now thinking about the Welsh Government, how satisfied are you with the way it is doing its job?' (2021-22)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Welsh Election Study</u></a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Question: 'On the whole, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way that democracy works in: a) the UK as a whole; b) Wales.'</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>Citizens' belief in their ability to influence politics</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#"><u>National Survey for Wales</u></a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Question: 'To what extent do you agree or disagree... I can influence decisions affecting my local area.' (2021-22)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Well-being of Wales: National indicators</u></a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Percentage of respondents who feel able to influence decisions affecting their local area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>Government consultation with citizens and civil society</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>Citizens' belief in their ability to influence politics (measured through representative polling)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Internal political efficacy:</b> Measuring individuals' confidence in their own abilities to understand and participate effectively in politics. The <b>European Social Survey (ESS)</b> measures this through the following questions (<a href="#"><u>ESS, 2025</u></a>): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ "How able do you think you are to take an active role in a group involved with political issues?"</li> <li>○ "How confident are you in your own ability to participate in politics?"</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>External political efficacy:</b> Assessing individuals' beliefs about the responsiveness of political institutions to citizens' concerns. The <b>ESS</b> captures this through the following questions (ibid): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ "How much would you say the political system in your country allows people like you to have a say in what the government does?"</li> <li>○ "How much would you say that the political system in your country allows people like you to have an influence on politics?"</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>Policy congruence with public opinion (measured through representative polling)</u></b></p>
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">National Survey for Wales</a></li> </ul> <p>Question: ‘To what extent do you agree or disagree... My local councillor works closely with my local community.’ (2021-22)</p>	<p>Policy congruence with public opinion can be measured through <b>representative polling</b>, such as the <a href="#">British Social Attitudes (BSA)</a> survey, by asking citizens about their specific policy preferences and their perceptions of government or party positions on those policies. The difference between these preferences and perceived positions quantifies alignment. The gap between public preferences and perceived policy positions can be used to measure alignment (<a href="#">Ares and Häusermann, 2023</a>). More specifically, alignment can be explored through the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment with public preferences: “To what extent do recent government policies reflect the preferences of the Welsh public?”</li> <li>• Responsiveness over time: “When public opinion on a specific issue shifts, how consistently does policy follow within a reasonable timeframe?”</li> <li>• Representation across groups: “Are the policy preferences of different demographic and socioeconomic groups—such as young people, low-income households, or Welsh speakers—equally reflected in government decisions?”</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Government consultation with citizens and civil society (requires expert analysis)</u></b></p> <p>A framework to assess government <b>consultation with citizens and</b></p>
--	--	---

		<p><b>civil society</b>, as outlined in the IWA reports on democratic innovations and best practices for Wales (<a href="#">Elias et al, 2025</a>), could be employed to assess the democratic innovations and participatory mechanisms, <b>following <a href="#">Participedia's</a> structure</b>, which examines design integrity, sound deliberation, influential conclusions, and long-term impacts as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutionalised engagement: “To what extent are mechanisms such as citizen assemblies, participatory budgeting, or advisory panels embedded in policymaking processes?”</li> <li>• Inclusiveness of democratic innovations: “Do participatory initiatives systematically include a diverse and representative cross-section of the population, particularly marginalised or seldom-heard groups?”</li> <li>• Procedural quality: “Are consultations conducted with transparency, clear objectives, accessible materials, and adequate time for deliberation and response?”</li> </ul> <p>Influence on outcomes: “How frequently do citizen-led deliberative processes or consultations result in observable changes to proposed or final policies?”</p>
<p><b>Transparency and media freedom</b> (Open access to accurate information through transparent government and a strong, independent media, in</p>	<p><b>Not Available</b></p>	<p><b><u>Government transparency</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Integrity Frameworks: “Is there a formal anti-corruption or public integrity strategy in place, and does it include measurable objectives with regular monitoring?” (Adapted from T-Index, De Jure indicators)</li> <li>• Policymaking Accountability: “Can decision-makers be</li> </ul>

<p><b>WCPP report)</b></p>		<p>identified and held accountable for major policy and spending decisions?” (Adapted from T-Index, De Facto indicators)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal Oversight: “Are internal audit bodies and ethics units adequately resourced and empowered to act on integrity breaches?” (Adapted from T-Index, Q6: Is the annual report of the Supreme Audit Institution public?)</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Media freedom</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Editorial Independence: “To what extent are media outlets free to report critically on the government without fear of censorship or retaliation?” (V-Dem v2mecenefm, v2mecenef, v2smgovshut, v2smgovsmalt)</li> <li>• Pluralism of Ownership and Voices: “Is media ownership sufficiently diverse to ensure access to a wide range of political opinions and perspectives? (V-Dem v2xme_altinf; Press Freedom Index Q12)”</li> <li>• Government Interference and Censorship: “Are journalists protected from harassment, and is political censorship of content rare or absent?” (V-Dem v2meharjrn, v2smgovsmmon)</li> <li>• Self-Censorship: “Do journalists refrain from covering sensitive topics due to fear of legal, political, or economic consequences, even without direct coercion?” (V-Dem v2meslfcen)</li> </ul>
----------------------------	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Media Bias: “Is there systematic bias in media coverage against opposition parties or candidates, particularly around election periods?” (V-Dem v2mebias, v2mecorrpt, v2merange)</li> </ul>
--	--	--

# Annex B – Quality Assessment Framework

To ensure the Framework is suitable to assess both Welsh-specific and indicators currently collected outside of Wales, we developed a list of assessment criteria for these 2 categories (indicators collected in Wales and indicators not collected in Wales), filtered through a screening question.

The Quality Assessment Framework was finalised during the workshops with stakeholders and was used to determine the final list of measures and indicators as part of the second round of the Delphi study. During this round, the level of consensus across all criteria per indicator determined its usability and relevance in a Welsh context.

**Table 2: Quality Assessment Framework**

**Screening Question: Is the indicator already collected in Wales (via surveys or official statistics)?**

Quality assessment criteria for an indicator already collected in Wales	Quality assessment criteria for an indicator <u>not</u> currently collected in Wales
<p><b>A. Granularity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The indicator is disaggregated by relevant characteristics (e.g., geography, age, gender, income).</li> <li>b. This level of disaggregation is sufficient.</li> </ul> <p><b>B. Tracking Over Time</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The indicator has been collected consistently over time.</li> </ul> <p><b>C. Frequency of Collection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The indicator is collected regularly.</li> <li>b. There are more than 2 data points available.</li> </ul> <p><b>D. Sample Representativeness</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The sample is representative of the population in Wales.</li> <li>b. There are appropriate data collection methods used.</li> <li>c. There are <u>no</u> known sources of bias.</li> </ul> <p><b>E. Data Accessibility</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The data is publicly available.</li> <li>b. It is easy to access the data.</li> </ul> <p><b>F. Cost</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The indicator is <u>not</u> expensive to collect or update.</li> </ul>	<p><b>A. Relevance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in Wales.</li> </ul> <p><b>B. Sample Availability &amp; Representativeness</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. There is a sample in Wales that could be used to collect this data.</li> <li>b. This sample is representative of the population in Wales.</li> </ul> <p><b>C. Objectivity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The indicator would <u>not</u> be subject to bias.</li> </ul> <p><b>D. Feasibility of Quality Assurance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The indicator has been quality assessed in other contexts.</li> <li>b. It is feasible to conduct a quality assessment for this indicator in Wales.</li> </ul> <p><b>E. Integration into Existing Surveys</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The indicator could be feasibly included in an existing Welsh survey.</li> </ul> <p><b>F. Comparability Over Time</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The indicator could be tracked consistently over time.</li> </ul>

**G. Cost of Implementation**

- a. The indicator would not be expensive to implement through an existing Welsh survey (incl. subsequent analysis).
- b. The indicator would not be expensive to implement through a bespoke survey (incl. subsequent analysis).

**H. Sensitivity of Data**

- a. The data required for this indicator would not be sensitive or raise privacy concerns.



## Annex C – Performance of Indicators in Delphi Round 2

This annex presents detailed tables showing each indicator's performance against the quality assessment criteria. The tables display the combined total of “strongly agree” and “agree” responses for each criterion.

For indicators not currently available in Wales, respondents were given the option to answer from either a Welsh perspective or that of another country. Where other countries were referenced, these are included as notes under each table.

Note: The symbols (++) refer to Wales or to other relevant countries. 'N' is the number of responses received per indicator, disaggregated by country where relevant.

### Electoral dimension indicators performance

**Table 3: Indicator Electoral-A: Electoral competitiveness. Do voters have meaningful choices between candidates? Performance against quality assessment criteria**

Quality Assessment Criteria	Wales perspective (N=11)	Other country perspective (n=5)
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the national level.	100%	80%
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the local level.	100%	100%
It is feasible to conduct a quality assessment for this indicator in ++.	91%	80%
The indicator could be tracked consistently over time.	73%	100%
There is a sample in ++ that could be used to collect this data.	55%	60%
The indicator has been quality assessed in other contexts.	45%	60%
The indicator would not be subject to bias.	36%	60%

[NOTE] Includes other country perspectives from the UK, Canada, Germany, and the US.

**Table 4: Indicator Electoral-B: Electoral integrity: Overall, thinking about voting in election(s), how would you rate the ease of participating? Performance against quality assessment criteria**

Quality Assessment Criteria	Wales perspective (N=11)
The data is publicly available.	70%

There are more than 2 data points available.	60%
The indicator is disaggregated by relevant characteristics (e.g., geography, age, gender, income).	60%
There are appropriate data collection methods used.	60%
The indicator has been collected consistently over time.	40%
The sample is representative of the population in Wales.	40%
This level of disaggregation is sufficient.	30%
The indicator is collected regularly.	30%
It is easy to access the data.	30%
There are no known sources of bias.	30%
The indicator is not expensive to collect or update.	20%

**Table 5: Indicator Electoral-C: Electoral integrity: How confident, if at all, are you that you know how to go about voting at an election? Performance against quality assessment criteria**

<b>Quality Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Wales perspective (N=11)</b>
There are more than 2 data points available.	78%
There are appropriate data collection methods used.	78%
The data is publicly available.	67%
The indicator is disaggregated by relevant characteristics (e.g., geography, age, gender, income).	67%
The sample is representative of the population in Wales.	56%
This level of disaggregation is sufficient.	44%
The indicator has been collected consistently over time.	44%
The indicator is collected regularly.	44%
There are no known sources of bias.	33%
It is easy to access the data.	33%
The indicator is not expensive to collect or update.	22%

**Table 6: Indicator Electoral-D: Electoral integrity: How confident, if at all, are you that you know how to go about registering to vote? Performance against quality assessment criteria**

<b>Quality Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Wales perspective (N=11)</b>
There are more than 2 data points available.	78%
There are appropriate data collection methods used.	78%
The indicator is disaggregated by relevant characteristics (e.g., geography, age, gender, income).	67%
The indicator has been collected consistently over time.	67%
The data is publicly available.	67%
The sample is representative of the population in Wales.	67%
This level of disaggregation is sufficient.	56%
The indicator is collected regularly.	44%
There are no known sources of bias.	33%
It is easy to access the data.	33%
The indicator is not expensive to collect or update.	22%

**Table 7: Indicator Electoral-E: Electoral competitiveness: Did the electoral process allow for a fair playing field for all candidates, including equitable access to media and campaign financing? Performance against quality assessment criteria**

<b>Quality Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Wales perspective (N=11)</b>	<b>Other country perspective (n=5)</b>
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the national level.	75%	75%
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the local level.	67%	100%
It is feasible to conduct a quality assessment for this indicator in ++.	50%	75%
The indicator could be tracked consistently over time.	50%	75%
There is a sample in ++ that could be used to collect this data.	33%	50%
The indicator has been quality assessed in other contexts.	33%	25%
The indicator would not be subject to bias.	8%	75%

[NOTE] Includes other country perspectives from Canada, Germany, and the US.

## Participatory dimension indicators performance

**Table 8: Indicator Participatory-A: Turnout in elections (official statistics): Turnout of votes in General, Senedd, and Local elections. Performance against quality assessment criteria**

Quality Assessment Criteria	Wales perspective (N=10)
The indicator is collected regularly.	90%
The data is publicly available.	90%
It is easy to access the data.	90%
The indicator has been collected consistently over time.	90%
There are more than 2 data points available.	80%
The sample is representative of the population in Wales.	70%
There are appropriate data collection methods used.	70%
The indicator is not expensive to collect or update.	60%
There are no known sources of bias.	60%
This level of disaggregation is sufficient.	50%
The indicator is disaggregated by relevant characteristics (e.g., geography, age, gender, income).	40%

**Table 9: Indicator Participatory-B: Engagement with formal politics: Have you contacted your local councillor in the past 12 months, for example, with an enquiry, complaint, or problem? Performance against quality assessment criteria**

Quality Assessment Criteria	Wales perspective (N=8)
The indicator is collected regularly.	88%
The indicator is disaggregated by relevant characteristics (e.g., geography, age, gender, income).	75%
There are more than 2 data points available.	75%
The sample is representative of the population in Wales.	75%
There are appropriate data collection methods used.	75%
The data is publicly available.	75%
It is easy to access the data.	75%

This level of disaggregation is sufficient.	63%
The indicator has been collected consistently over time.	63%
There are no known sources of bias.	50%
The indicator is not expensive to collect or update.	25%

**Table 10: Indicator Participatory-C: Engagement with formal politics: Have you contacted your Members of the Senedd (MSs) in the past 12 months, for example, with an enquiry, complaint, or problem? Performance against quality assessment criteria**

<b>Quality Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Wales perspective (N=11)</b>	<b>Other country perspective (n=4)</b>
The indicator could be feasibly included in an existing survey.	82%	100%
The indicator could be tracked consistently over time.	73%	75%
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the national level.	64%	75%
The indicator would not be expensive to implement through an existing survey (incl. subsequent analysis).	64%	50%
The data required for this indicator would not be sensitive or raise privacy concerns.	64%	50%
There is a sample in ++ that could be used to collect this data.	55%	50%
It is feasible to conduct a quality assessment for this indicator in ++.	55%	75%
The indicator would not be expensive to implement through a bespoke survey (incl. subsequent analysis).	45%	50%
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the local level.	44%	75%
This sample is representative of the population in ++.	36%	50%
The indicator would not be subject to bias.	36%	50%
The indicator has been quality assessed in other contexts.	27%	50%

[NOTE] Includes other country perspectives from Canada, Germany, and the US.

**Table 11: Indicator Participatory-D: Engagement with formal politics: Have you ever attempted to influence a decision or decisions made by the council? Performance against quality assessment criteria**

<b>Quality Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Wales perspective (N=9)</b>
The indicator is disaggregated by relevant characteristics (e.g., geography, age, gender, income).	56%
This level of disaggregation is sufficient.	56%
There are appropriate data collection methods used.	56%
The indicator is collected regularly.	44%
There are more than 2 data points available.	44%
The sample is representative of the population in Wales.	44%
The indicator has been collected consistently over time.	33%
There are no known sources of bias.	33%
The data is publicly available.	33%
It is easy to access the data.	33%
The indicator is not expensive to collect or update.	33%

**Table 12: Indicator Participatory-E: Engagement with informal politics: Active global citizenship in Wales. Performance against quality assessment criteria**

<b>Quality Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Wales perspective (N=9)</b>
The sample is representative of the population in Wales.	67%
There are appropriate data collection methods used.	67%
The data is publicly available.	67%
There are more than 2 data points available.	56%
The indicator is disaggregated by relevant characteristics (e.g., geography, age, gender, income).	44%
This level of disaggregation is sufficient.	44%
The indicator has been collected consistently over time.	44%
The indicator is collected regularly.	44%
There are no known sources of bias.	44%
It is easy to access the data.	44%
The indicator is not expensive to collect or update.	33%

## Deliberative dimension indicators performance

**Table 13: Indicator Deliberative-A: Use of reasoned justifications among politicians in debate (Welsh Parliament): Do politicians provide clear, well-reasoned justifications for their policy positions during debates? Performance against quality assessment criteria**

Quality Assessment Criteria	Wales perspective (N=12)	Other country perspective (n=4)
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the national level.	83%	100%
There is a sample in ++ that could be used to collect this data.	58%	25%
The indicator could be tracked consistently over time.	58%	75%
The indicator has been quality assessed in other contexts.	42%	25%
It is feasible to conduct a quality assessment for this indicator in ++.	33%	75%
The indicator would not be subject to bias.	9%	50%

[NOTE] Includes other country perspectives from Canada, Germany, and the US.

**Table 14: Indicator Deliberative-B: Respect for counterarguments and opponents among politicians (Welsh Parliament): Do politicians acknowledge and engage with counterarguments or alternative perspectives presented during debates? Performance against quality assessment criteria**

Quality Assessment Criteria	Wales perspective (N=12)	Other country perspective (n=4)
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the national level.	75%	100%
There is a sample in ++ that could be used to collect this data.	50%	25%
The indicator could be tracked consistently over time.	50%	75%
The indicator has been quality assessed in other contexts.	42%	25%
It is feasible to conduct a quality assessment for this indicator in ++.	33%	50%
The indicator would not be subject to bias.	9%	50%

[NOTE] Includes other country perspectives from Canada, Germany, and the US.

**Table 15: Indicator Deliberative-C: Respect for counterarguments and opponents among politicians (Welsh Parliament): Are opposing views fairly represented, or are they distorted or misrepresented to undermine them? Performance against quality assessment criteria**

Quality Assessment Criteria	Wales perspective (N=12)	Other country perspective (n=4)
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the national level.	83%	100%
There is a sample in ++ that could be used to collect this data.	42%	25%
The indicator could be tracked consistently over time.	42%	75%
The indicator has been quality assessed in other contexts.	33%	25%
It is feasible to conduct a quality assessment for this indicator in ++.	33%	100%
The indicator would not be subject to bias.	9%	25%

[NOTE] Includes perspectives from Canada, Germany, and the US.

## Egalitarian dimension indicators performance

**Table 16: Indicator Egalitarian-A: Equality of political engagement & balanced demographic representation in candidates: Socio-demographic characteristics of candidates. Performance against quality assessment criteria**

Quality Assessment Criteria	Wales perspective (N=7)
The indicator is disaggregated by relevant characteristics (e.g., geography, age, gender, income).	86%
This level of disaggregation is sufficient.	86%
The data is publicly available.	57%
The indicator is collected regularly.	43%
There are more than 2 data points available.	43%
The indicator has been collected consistently over time.	29%
The sample is representative of the population in Wales.	29%
There are appropriate data collection methods used.	29%
There are no known sources of bias.	29%
It is easy to access the data.	29%
The indicator is not expensive to collect or update.	29%



**Table 17: Indicator Egalitarian-B: Equality of political engagement & balanced demographic representation in government and legislators: Demographic characteristics of elected candidates. Performance against quality assessment criteria**

<b>Quality Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Wales perspective (N=6)</b>
The indicator is disaggregated by relevant characteristics (e.g., geography, age, gender, income).	100%
There are no known sources of bias.	83%
The data is publicly available.	83%
It is easy to access the data.	83%
This level of disaggregation is sufficient.	67%
The indicator is collected regularly.	67%
The sample is representative of the population in Wales.	67%
There are appropriate data collection methods used.	67%
The indicator has been collected consistently over time.	50%
The indicator is not expensive to collect or update.	50%
There are more than 2 data points available.	33%

## **Institutional responsiveness dimension indicators performance**

**Table 18: Indicator Institutional-A: Citizens' satisfaction with government and the political system: On the whole, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way that democracy works in: a) the UK as a whole; b) Wales? Performance against quality assessment criteria**

<b>Quality Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Wales perspective (N=7)</b>
There are appropriate data collection methods used.	86%
The indicator is disaggregated by relevant characteristics (e.g., geography, age, gender, income).	71%
This level of disaggregation is sufficient.	71%
The data is publicly available.	71%
The indicator has been collected consistently over time.	57%
The indicator is collected regularly.	43%
There are more than 2 data points available.	43%

The sample is representative of the population in Wales.	43%
It is easy to access the data.	43%
There are no known sources of bias.	29%
The indicator is not expensive to collect or update.	29%

**Table 19: Indicator Institutional-B: Citizens' satisfaction with government and the political system: To what extent do you think your local council(s) act(s) on the concerns of local residents? Performance against quality assessment criteria**

Quality Assessment Criteria	Wales perspective (N=6)
The indicator is disaggregated by relevant characteristics (e.g., geography, age, gender, income).	67%
This level of disaggregation is sufficient.	67%
The sample is representative of the population in Wales.	67%
There are appropriate data collection methods used.	67%
The indicator has been collected consistently over time.	50%
The indicator is collected regularly.	50%
There are more than 2 data points available.	50%
There are no known sources of bias.	50%
The data is publicly available.	50%
It is easy to access the data.	50%
The indicator is not expensive to collect or update.	17%

**Table 20: Indicator Institutional-C: Citizens' belief in their ability to influence politics: To what extent do you agree or disagree that you can influence decisions affecting your local area? Performance against quality assessment criteria**

Quality Assessment Criteria	Wales perspective (N=6)
The data is publicly available.	86%
There are appropriate data collection methods used.	86%
The indicator is disaggregated by relevant characteristics (e.g., geography, age, gender, income).	71%
This level of disaggregation is sufficient.	71%

The sample is representative of the population in Wales.	71%
It is easy to access the data.	71%
The indicator has been collected consistently over time.	43%
The indicator is collected regularly.	43%
There are more than 2 data points available.	43%
There are no known sources of bias.	43%
The indicator is not expensive to collect or update.	29%

**Table 21: Indicator Institutional-D: Citizens' trust in the government. Performance against quality assessment criteria**

Quality Assessment Criteria	Wales perspective (N=7)	Other country perspective (n=3)
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the national level.	100%	67%
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the local level.	86%	100%
It is feasible to conduct a quality assessment for this indicator in ++.	71%	67%
The indicator could be feasibly included in an existing survey.	71%	67%
The indicator could be tracked consistently over time.	71%	100%
There is a sample in ++ that could be used to collect this data.	57%	67%
This sample is representative of the population in ++.	57%	33%
The data required for this indicator would not be sensitive or raise privacy concerns.	57%	67%
The indicator would not be subject to bias.	43%	33%
The indicator has been quality assessed in other contexts.	43%	33%
The indicator would not be expensive to implement through an existing survey (incl. subsequent analysis).	43%	67%
The indicator would not be expensive to implement through a bespoke survey (incl. subsequent analysis).	14%	67%

[NOTE] Includes other country perspectives from the US and other unspecified countries.

## Transparency and media freedom dimension indicators performance

**Table 22: Indicator Transparency-A: Government transparency: Can decision-makers be identified and held accountable for major policy and spending decisions? Performance against quality assessment criteria**

Quality Assessment Criteria	Wales perspective (N=7)	Other country perspective (n=3)
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the national level.	86%	67%
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the local level.	86%	67%
The indicator could be tracked consistently over time.	71%	0%
It is feasible to conduct a quality assessment for this indicator in ++.	57%	0%
There is a sample in ++ that could be used to collect this data.	43%	0%
The indicator would not be subject to bias.	43%	0%
The indicator has been quality assessed in other contexts.	29%	33%

[NOTE] Includes other country perspectives from the US and other unspecified countries.

**Table 23: Indicator Transparency-B: Government transparency: Is there a formal anti-corruption or public integrity strategy in place, and does it include measurable objectives with regular monitoring? Performance against quality assessment criteria**

Quality Assessment Criteria	Wales perspective (N=7)	Other country perspective (n=3)
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the national level.	86%	100%
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the local level.	71%	100%
There is a sample in Wales that could be used to collect this data.	57%	33%
It is feasible to conduct a quality assessment for this indicator in ++.	57%	33%
The indicator could be tracked consistently over time.	57%	67%
The indicator would not be subject to bias.	29%	33%
The indicator has been quality assessed in other contexts.	14%	67%

[NOTE] Includes other country perspectives from the US and other unspecified countries.

**Table 24: Indicator Transparency-C: Media freedom: To what extent are media outlets free to report critically on the government without fear of censorship or retaliation? Performance against quality assessment criteria**

Quality Assessment Criteria	Wales perspective (N=7)	Other country perspective (n=3)
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the national level.	86%	100%
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the local level.	86%	100%
It is feasible to conduct a quality assessment for this indicator in ++.	71%	100%
The indicator could be tracked consistently over time.	71%	100%
There is a sample in ++ that could be used to collect this data.	43%	67%
The indicator would not be subject to bias.	29%	100%
The indicator has been quality assessed in other contexts.	29%	100%

[NOTE] Includes other country perspectives from the US and other unspecified countries.

**Table 25: Indicator Transparency-D: Government transparency: Freedom of Information (FOI) responsiveness and success rates. Performance against quality assessment criteria**

Quality Assessment Criteria	Wales perspective (N=7)	Other country perspective (n=3)
There is a sample in ++ that could be used to collect this data.	71%	67%
The indicator could be tracked consistently over time.	71%	67%
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the national level.	57%	67%
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in ++ at the local level.	57%	67%
This sample is representative of the population in ++.	57%	33%
The indicator would not be subject to bias.	57%	0%
It is feasible to conduct a quality assessment for this indicator in ++.	57%	33%
The indicator would not be expensive to implement through an existing survey (incl. subsequent analysis).	57%	33%

The data required for this indicator would not be sensitive or raise privacy concerns.	43%	67%
The indicator has been quality assessed in other contexts.	29%	0%
The indicator could be feasibly included in an existing survey.	29%	0%
The indicator would not be expensive to implement through a bespoke survey (incl. subsequent analysis).	14%	33%

[NOTE] Includes other country perspectives from the US and other unspecified countries.

# Annex D – Analytical Overview of the Final 6 Shortlisted Indicators

Below, we present a detailed analytical overview of each shortlisted indicator, including the corresponding data collection method, scales, and measurements. This analysis aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the methodologies and metrics underpinning each indicator.

## Indicator 1

**Question: Do voters have meaningful choices between candidates?**

The assessment of electoral competitiveness relies on expert analysis. Among recognised and validated tools employed for this purpose are the V-Dem dataset and the PEI index.

### V-Dem

The core component comes from the Elections multiparty (v2elmulpar) variable, which is measured as follows:

**Question: Was this national election multiparty?**

**Responses:**

- 0: No. No-party or single-party, and there is no meaningful competition (includes situations where a few parties are legal, but they are all de facto controlled by the dominant party).
- 1: Not really. No-party or single-party (defined as above), but multiple candidates from the same party and/or independents contest legislative seats or the presidency.
- 2: Constrained. At least one real opposition party is allowed to contest, but competition is highly constrained—legally or informally.
- 3: Almost. Elections are multiparty in principle, but either one main opposition party is prevented (de jure or de facto) from contesting, or conditions such as civil unrest (excluding natural disasters) prevent competition in a portion of the territory.
- 4: Yes. Elections are multiparty, even though a few marginal parties may not be permitted to contest (e.g., far-right/left extremist parties, anti-democratic religious or ethnic parties).

Scale: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.

Cross-coder aggregation: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).

Used more comprehensively, we can draw a Freedom of Association Index (recommended). A Freedom of Association Index (thick) [v2x\_frassoc\_thick] is comprised of 6 V-Dem Components:

- Party ban (v2psparban)
- Barriers to parties (v2psbars)
- Opposition parties' autonomy (v2psoppaut)
- Elections multiparty (v2elmulpar)
- CSO entry and exit (v2cseeorgs)
- CSO repression (v2csreprss)

### **Party ban (v2psparban)**

**Question: Are any parties banned? Clarification: This does not apply to parties that are barred from competing for failing to meet registration requirements or support thresholds.**

#### **Responses:**

- 0: Yes. All parties except the state-sponsored party (and closely allied parties) are banned.
- 1: Yes. Elections are non-partisan, or there are no officially recognised parties.
- 2: Yes. Many parties are banned.
- 3: Yes. But only a few parties are banned.
- 4: No. No parties are officially banned.

Scale: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.

Cross-coder aggregation: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).

### **Barriers to parties (v2psbars)**

**Question: How restrictive are the barriers to forming a party? Clarification: Barriers include legal requirements such as requirements for membership or financial deposits, as well as harassment.**

#### **Responses:**

- 0: Parties are not allowed.
- 1: It is impossible, or virtually impossible, for parties not affiliated with the government to form (legally).
- 2: There are significant obstacles (e.g., party leaders face high levels of regular political harassment by authorities).
- 3: There are modest barriers (e.g., party leaders face occasional political harassment by authorities).
- 4: There are no substantial barriers.

Scale: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.

Cross-coder aggregation: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).



### **Opposition parties' autonomy (v2psoppaut)**

**Question: Are opposition parties independent and autonomous of the ruling regime?**

**Clarification: An opposition party is any party that is not part of the government, i.e., that has no control over the executive.**

#### **Responses:**

- 0: Opposition parties are not allowed.
- 1: There are no autonomous, independent opposition parties. Opposition parties are either selected or co-opted by the ruling regime.
- 2: At least some opposition parties are autonomous and independent of the ruling regime.
- 3: Most significant opposition parties are autonomous and independent of the ruling regime.
- 4: All opposition parties are autonomous and independent of the ruling regime.

Scale: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.

Cross-coder aggregation: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).

### **Elections multiparty (v2elmulpar)**

As discussed above.

### **CSO entry and exit (v2cseeorgs)**

**Question: To what extent does the government achieve control over entry and exit by Civil Society Organisation (CSOs) into public life?**

#### **Responses:**

- 0: Monopolistic control. The government exercises an explicit monopoly over CSOs. The only organisations allowed to engage in political activity, such as endorsing parties or politicians, sponsoring public issues forums, organising rallies or demonstrations, engaging in strikes, or publicly commenting on public officials and policies, are government-sponsored organisations. The government actively represses those who attempt to defy its monopoly on political activity.
- 1: Substantial control. The government licenses all CSOs and uses political criteria to bar organisations that are likely to oppose the government. There are at least some citizen-based organisations that play a limited role in politics independent of the government. The government actively represses those who attempt to flout its political criteria and bars them from any political activity.
- 2: Moderate control. Whether the government ban on independent CSOs is partial or full, some prohibited organisations manage to play an active political role. Despite its ban on organisations of this sort, the government does not or cannot repress them, due to either its weakness or political expedience.

- 3: Minimal control. Whether or not the government licenses CSOs, there exist constitutional provisions that allow the government to ban organisations or movements that have a history of anti-democratic action in the past (e.g., the banning of neo-fascist or communist organisations in the Federal Republic of Germany). Such banning takes place under strict rule of law and conditions of judicial independence.
- 4: Unconstrained. Whether or not the government licenses CSOs, the government does not impede their formation and operation unless they are engaged in activities to violently overthrow the government.

Scale: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.

Cross-coder aggregation: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).

### **CSO repression (v2csreprss)**

**Question: Does the government attempt to repress CSOs?**

**Responses:**

- 0: Severely. The government violently and actively pursues all real and even some imagined members of CSOs. They seek not only to deter the activity of such groups but to effectively liquidate them. Examples include Nazi Germany, Stalinist Russia, and Maoist China.
- 1: Substantially. In addition to the kinds of harassment outlined in responses 2 and 3 below, the government also arrests, tries, and imprisons leaders of and participants in oppositional CSOs who have acted lawfully. Other sanctions include disruption of public gatherings and violent sanctions of activists (beatings, threats to families, destruction of valuable property). Examples include Mugabe's Zimbabwe, Poland under Martial Law, and Serbia under Milosevic.
- 2: Moderately. In addition to material sanctions outlined in response 3 below, the government also engages in minor legal harassment (detentions, short-term incarceration) to dissuade CSOs from acting or expressing themselves. The government may also restrict the scope of their actions through measures that restrict the association of CSOs with each other or political parties, bar CSOs from taking certain actions, or block international contacts. Examples include post-Martial Law Poland, Brazil in the early 1980s, and the late Franco period in Spain.
- 3: Weakly. The government uses material sanctions (fines, firings, denial of social services) to deter oppositional CSOs from acting or expressing themselves. They may also use burdensome registration or incorporation procedures to slow the formation of new civil society organisations and sidetrack them from engagement. The government may also organise Government-Organised Non-Governmental Organisations (GONGOs) to crowd out independent organisations. One example would be Singapore in the post-Yew phase or Putin's Russia.
- 4: No. CSOs are free to organise, associate, strike, express themselves, and to criticise the government without fear of government sanctions or harassment.

Scale: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.

Cross-coder aggregation: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).

## PEI

The dataset is drawn from a rolling survey of 5,605 expert assessments of electoral integrity across 643 elections in 170 countries around the world. The cumulative study covers national presidential and parliamentary elections from July 1, 2012, to December 7, 2024.

An expert is defined in this survey as a political scientist (or social scientist in a related discipline, such as law, sociology, economics, anthropology, mathematics, or statistics) who has published on (or who has other demonstrated knowledge of) the electoral process in a particular country. Specifically, demonstrated knowledge is defined by the following criteria: (1) membership of a relevant research group, professional network, or organised section of such a group; (2) existing publications on electoral or other country-specific topics in books, academic journals, or conference papers; and/or (3) employment at a university or college as a teacher. A minimum of 40 experts per country (where available) were contacted for each election, including both domestic and international experts.

**Cases with fewer than 2 survey responses were dropped from the dataset** so that any index scores would not rely only on one expert.

The core component comes from the Choice (8\_4) variable, which is measured as follows:

**Question/Statement: Voters were offered a genuine choice at the ballot box:**

**Options:**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Don't know
- Not Applicable

Several additional variables within the PEI questionnaire can be linked to construct related indicators. However, officially, the question above is used solely to measure the deliberation principle, which encompasses access to information, the availability of meaningful choices between candidates, and the overall quality of deliberation.

## Indicator 2

**Question: Voter turnout in General, Senedd, and Local elections**

**Measurement:** % of turnout in each election, namely the share of eligible voters who actually cast a ballot, based on official records.

**Source:** Official registers. Data available for Wales:

- General elections: <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-10009/>
- Senedd Elections: <https://research.senedd.wales/research-articles/election-2021-how-many-people-voted/>
- Local Elections: <https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/research-reports-and-data/our-reports-and-data-past-elections-and-referendums/report-may-2022-elections-wales>

### Indicator 3

**Question:** Have you contacted your local councillor in the past 12 months, for example, with an enquiry, complaint, or problem?

**Response options:**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know (spontaneous only)

**Source:** The above survey question is included in the [National Survey for Wales](#) (Last Wave: [2021-2022](#)).

**Measurement:** % of citizens who have responded "Yes."

### Indicator 4

**Question:** Equality of political engagement & balanced demographic representation in government and legislators: demographic characteristics of elected candidates.

**Sources:**

- Local Candidates survey: Local elected candidates' profile: <https://www.gov.wales/local-government-candidates-survey-2022>
- Official registers: Senedd elected candidates' profile: <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-9282/>

**Measurement:**

- Sociodemographic characteristics of local elected candidates.
- Gender and ethnicity of Senedd elected candidates.

### Indicator 5

**Question:** On the whole, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way that democracy works in: a) the UK as a whole; b) Wales?'

### Response options:

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Don't know

**Source:** Welsh Election study, 2019:

<https://beta.ukdataservice.ac.uk/datacatalogue/studies/study?id=8774#!/details>

**Estimated measurement:** % of satisfied (very+fairly) citizens.

## Indicator 6

**Question: Can decision-makers be identified and held accountable for major policy and spending decisions?**

The approach applies the T-Index methodology for assessing transparency, drawing specifically on the [Corruption Perceptions Index](#). The measure is based on 14 expert-coded questions. The questionnaire is presented below (14 points aggregated throughout, meaning absolute transparency and 0 absolute lack of transparency):

Q1: Are past public expenditures published online? (1 point)

- Last fiscal year expenditure report is accessible online in its detailed form = 1
- Last fiscal year expenditure report is accessible online with limited detail = 0.5
- Not available online or too generic (only aggregated data) = 0

Note: Expenditure reports are considered as fully detailed if they are at least disaggregated by agency AND object of expenditure, allowing citizens to understand how money was spent and not just how much money was spent in a specific domain. Reports are considered as having limited detail if they are disaggregated in other forms but not by expenditure object. The time frame for analysis adopts the same criteria as the Open Budget Survey, and reporting on the last fiscal year is considered timely when information is made available within 12 months of the end of the fiscal year.

Q2: Are current public expenditures published online? (1 point)

- Data is available through an online tracking system with itemised expenditures (e.g., copy machine) = 1
- Data is available through an online tracking system that is not itemised OR through fairly detailed budget execution reports = 0.5
- Not available online or too generic (only aggregated data) = 0

Note: Reports are considered to be fairly detailed when they include data disaggregated by agency AND object of expenditure. Current public expenditures should be published online within a maximum of 6 months of their occurrence for a country to score in this question.

Q3: Is there a centralised public procurement portal where both tenders and contract awards are posted? (1 point)

- Calls for bids and award notices are published = 1
- Only call for bids or award notices are published = 0.5
- No procurement portal exists, or information published is minimal (selected procedures only) = 0

Note: A full score requires that award notices include at least the winner's name and contract value.

Q4: Is there an online land cadastre where property ownership is disclosed? (1 point)

- Cadastre data is fully accessible online = 1
- Cadastre data is partial, or limited in geographic coverage, or access requires payment = 0.5
- Not available online = 0

Q5: Is there a register of commerce where shareholders and main data of companies is published? (1 point)

- Business registry is fully and freely available online = 1
  - With 1 point, also when the register is run by a private company.
- Information is partial, or access to relevant information is paid = 0.5
- Not available online = 0

Q6: Is the annual report of the Supreme Audit Institution publicly posted? (1 point)

- Annual report is available online with detailed information on individual audit results = 1
  - Cases where the report is not comprehensive, but all individual reports are easily accessible, are granted a full point as well.
- Annual report has information on selected audits (and audit results are not available elsewhere) = 0.5
- No (current) report is available online = 0

Q7: Are supreme court hearing schedules public and accessible online? (1 point)

- All court information available online = 1
- Not all information is public, politically sensitive cases are not available = 0.5
- Not available online = 0

Note: For countries where multiple superior courts exist, the court considered the highest is the court of appeal. The schedule is considered public when published at least one day in advance of the court's session. If the ruling dates are provided only on a case basis (no full schedule available), the score is 0.5 points. If there is information on the dates in which the court will have its sessions, but without listing the cases that will be decided, the information is considered insufficient, and the score is 0.

Q8: Are supreme court sentences published online? (1 point)

- All court sentences available online = 1
- Not all information is public, politically sensitive cases are not available = 0.5
- Not available online = 0

Note: For countries where multiple superior courts exist, the court considered the highest is the court of appeal. Sentences are considered published when accompanied by their reasoning/justification. A full point is also given if sentences are visible via case-search with public access.

Q9: Are financial disclosures of officials publicly available online? (1 point)

- Available for all officials required to declare = 1
- Available only for part of the officials required to declare (e.g., top officials) = 0.5
- Not available online (or only upon request) = 0

Q10: Are conflict of interest disclosures of officials publicly available online? (1 point)

- Available for all officials required to declare = 1
- Available only for part of the officials required to declare (e.g., top officials) = 0.5
- Not available online (or only upon request) = 0

Note: In cases where no specific interest disclosure is required but relevant information is included in the financial disclosures (e.g., shares in companies, financial disclosure of relatives) AND those are public, the criteria for this question are also considered as fulfilled.

Q11: Are incoming and outcoming donor funds' allocations published? (1 point)

- Incoming/outcoming donor funds (or both whenever applicable) are available.
- Only incoming or outcoming donor funds are available in a situation when there should be both = 0.5
  - A half point is also given if information is partial.
- Not available online = 0

Note: A full score requires that aid allocations specify amounts disaggregated at least by donor/recipient country.

Q12: Are mining concessions publicly posted? (1 point)

- Information on mining concessions/licenses/titles is fully available = 1
- Information on mining concessions/licenses/titles is partially available, or access is paid = 0.5
- Not available online = 0

Note: A full score requires that data on mining concessions specify at least the location, beneficiary, and time frame of the concession. Cases in which the information is available but not fully up to date are granted a 0.5 point – given the usual long timeframe of mining concessions, the information is still considered relevant to the public.

Q13: Are construction permits in the country's capital city publicly posted? (1 point)

- Information on issued construction permits is fully available = 1
- Information on issued construction permits is partially available, or access is paid = 0.5
- Not available online = 0

Note: A full score is given when at least the address and the name of the applicant are published. In case there is an electronic portal for applying for construction permits, but it does not publish the awarded permits, the information is considered insufficient, and the score is zero.

Q14: Is there an online gazette or a government portal which publishes all official legislation for everybody to access? (1 point)

- Yes = 1
- Yes, but the access is paid, or the information is only partially provided = 0.5
- No = 0



# Annex E – Research Tools

## Discussion guide for initial expert workshops

### Warm-up (3 minutes; Cumulative: 8 minutes)

1. To get to know each other, would everyone be happy to briefly introduce themselves, saying their name, job role, and what their professional responsibilities are?

### Part 1: Measures and indicators related to democratic health

#### Presentation (10 minutes; Cumulative: 18 minutes)

- Policy background – 5 minutes
- Overview of each dimension – 5 minutes

#### Discussion (60 minutes; Cumulative: 78 minutes)

We will be starting with the deliberative, information access & institutional responsiveness dimensions, given they are the most ambivalent, but also briefly cover the remaining 3 dimensions after that.

1. **WHAT TO RULE OUT:** In your opinion, which of these are less effective in measuring the health of democracy in Wales, and why?
  - a. *Prompt A:* Are there any indicators that would be challenging to implement in the Welsh context? – e.g., due to cost implications, geography, existing expertise, logistics, etc.
  - b. *Prompt B:* Are there any indicators that would not be applicable in a Welsh context? Why is that?
2. **WHAT TO PRIORITISE:** Of the remaining indicators, which ones do you think should be prioritised and why?
  - a. *Prompt A:* Could you choose 3 from the list (i.e., per dimension, but where multiple options are provided within sub-categories, make sure some are shortlisted), which can be most effective in measuring democratic health in Wales, and explain why?
  - b. *Prompt B:* How well do you think the proposed priorities fit with Welsh citizen priorities in relation to democratic health?
3. **WHAT TO ADD:** Are there any other indicators that are not on the list, and you think should be included?

- a. *Prompt:* Do the following indicators cover all parts of [name dimension]? Is there anything else missing with regard to [name dimension], which will mean that democratic health cannot be comprehensively measured?

## Part 2: Assessment of measures and indicators

### Discussion (10 minutes; Cumulative: 88 minutes)

[Notes to facilitator: share Quality Assessment Framework on screen]

4. **WHAT TO ADD:** Are there any considerations missing?
  - a. *Follow-up:* Should anything be added to the assessment criteria to help us evaluate whether an indicator can effectively measure democratic health in Wales specifically?
5. **WHAT TO PRIORITISE:** Are there any assessment criteria that stand out for you as the most important, or at least more important than others?
  - a. *Prompt:* If you had to shortlist 3 assessment criteria from the Yes and 3 from the No list, which would these be?
6. **WHAT TO RULE OUT:** Are there any assessment criteria you would remove from each list? If so, why?

### Wrap-up (2 minutes; Cumulative: 90 minutes)

7. Do you have any other questions or comments before we wrap up the workshop?

## Delphi questionnaire round 1 script

### Participant information

The following information helps us understand the possible correlation between your area of work/expertise and the views expressed. We will only be asking information about your job sector and possibly the country in which you work. We understand that your experience may span multiple sectors, so please answer where your experience best lies.

1. What sector do you work in?
  - Academia/ research
    - What country are you based in?
      - Wales
      - England
      - Scotland
      - Northern Ireland
      - Outside the UK
        - Name of country you are based in: (text box)
  - Public sector
    - Which sub-sector do you work in?

- Government/Civil Service
- Regulatory/Oversight Body
  - [For both options]
  - Policy and governance
  - Research
  - Other (text box)
- Political party
- NGOs, think tanks, and third-sector organisations
  - What country are you based in?
    - Wales
    - England
    - Scotland
    - Northern Ireland
    - Outside the UK
      - Name of country you are based in: (text box)
- Other (text box)

## Methods for measuring democratic health

Previous research (<https://wcpp.org.uk/publication/defining-measuring-and-monitoring-democratic-health-in-wales/>) has identified 6 key dimensions of democratic health that capture different aspects of how democracy functions in practice. These are outlined throughout the questionnaire, along with a long list of indicators and/or ways of measuring democracy for each dimension.

The indicators we suggest are drawn either from existing administrative and survey data available in Wales or by adapting established international measures of democratic health:

- **Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem):** Provides granular indices on multiple dimensions of democracy, such as electoral integrity, civil liberties, political participation, public deliberation, and equality. It draws on expert assessments and historical data to reflect the full complexity of democratic systems. More information is available at: <https://www.v-dem.net/>
- **Perceptions of Electoral Integrity (PEI):** Provides expert-based assessments of how well elections meet international standards of electoral integrity, covering aspects such as electoral procedures, voter registration, campaign environment, and results. More information is available at: <https://www.electoralintegrityproject.com/pei>
- **Discourse Quality Index:** Measures the substantive features of public deliberation, such as respect for diverse viewpoints, use of evidence and justification, as well as reflexivity, by coding of parliamentary speech. More information is available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/palgrave.cep.6110002>
- **Government Transparency Index (T-Index):** Assesses government openness through criteria like proactive disclosure of documents, clarity of Freedom of Information (FOI) procedures, and responsiveness to information requests, enabling comparison across jurisdictions and time. More information is available at: <https://www.againstcorruption.eu/ercas-projects/transparencyindex/>

In addition, we have included some indicators directly suggested by experts who attended a series of workshops preceding this study, to further inform the list of indicators provided here.

For each of the 6 key dimensions of democratic health, you will be asked to rank a list of indicators from the *most appropriate* (top of the list) to the *least appropriate* (bottom of the list) for measuring democratic health in Wales in particular.

How to do this? As you hover over the options provided, you should see up and down arrows. Click the up arrow if you'd like to move this option up in ranking, and the down arrow if you'd like to move it down in ranking. Alternatively, you can drag and drop each option in the order of your preference.

Within this context, we ask you to determine the level of 'appropriateness' by considering how efficiently each indicator can measure the dimension indicated (i.e., whether the indicator is known to provide accurate/trustworthy measurements, whether it is suited to the Welsh context, etc.).

You will be able to add any comments, thoughts, or considerations you would like us to take into account alongside your ranking at the end of each dimension.

Please do not consider the feasibility of using the indicators within the Welsh context at this stage, as this will be addressed in the second round of the Delphi study, where we will screen the shortlisted indicators against the criteria of the Quality Assessment Framework created specifically for the purposes of developing a set of measures and indicators to track, monitor, and assess different components of democracy in Wales.

Note: All options under each dimension are provided in a random order.

## **Electoral democracy**

Electoral democracy is a core aspect of democratic health, assessing the fairness, accessibility, and competitiveness of elections. It examines whether all citizens can vote freely, if elections are transparent and reflect the electorate's will, and whether elected officials are accountable and responsive.

*This section includes indicators both available in Wales and internationally. Please rank the following indicators from most appropriate (top of the list) to least appropriate (bottom of the list) for an electoral democracy in Wales.*

- **Electoral integrity:** How confident, if at all, are you that you know how to go about voting at an election? – Options to select from are: Very confident; Fairly confident; Not very confident; Not at all confident; Don't know. *(taken from the Electoral Commission: Public opinion questions, which are asked across the UK, but with a sufficient sample to be reported for Wales)* / How confident, if at all, are you that you know how to go about registering to vote? – Options to select from are: Very confident; Fairly confident; Not very confident; Not at all confident; Don't know. *(taken from the Electoral Commission: Public opinion questions, which are asked across the UK, but with a sufficient sample to be reported for Wales)*

- **Electoral integrity:** How confident, if at all, are you that you know how to go about registering to vote? – Options to select from are: Very confident; Fairly confident; Not very confident; Not at all confident; Don't know. *(taken from the Electoral Commission: Public opinion questions, which are asked across the UK, but with a sufficient sample to be reported for Wales)*
- **Electoral integrity:** How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the system of registering to vote in Great Britain? – Options to select from are: Very satisfied; Fairly satisfied; Fairly dissatisfied; Very dissatisfied; Don't know/no opinion. *(taken from the Electoral Commission: Public opinion questions, with a sufficient sample to be reported for Wales)*
- **Electoral integrity:** To what extent do you agree/disagree with the following statement? "I believe the votes are counted accurately at elections in Great Britain." – Options to select from are: Agree strongly; Tend to agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Tend to disagree; Disagree strongly; Don't know. *(taken from the Electoral Commission: Public opinion questions, with a sufficient sample to be reported for Wales)*
- **Electoral integrity:** Do losing parties and candidates accept the result of this national election? Were there effective procedures for citizens to make complaints about the electoral process? *(taken from V-Dem)*
- **Electoral integrity:** Overall, thinking about voting in election(s), how would you rate the ease of participating? Even if you have never voted, please think about how easy or difficult you think it would be – measured on a 1-5 scale where 1 = 'Not easy at all' and 5 = 'Very easy.' *(taken from the Electoral Commission: Public opinion questions, which are asked across the UK, but with a sufficient sample to be reported for Wales)*
- **Electoral integrity:** Overall, thinking about voting in election(s), how would you rate the security of voting? Even if you have never voted, please think about how secure or not you think it would be – measured on a 1-5 scale where 1 = 'Not at all secure' and 5 = 'Very secure.' *(taken from the Electoral Commission: Public opinion questions, which are asked across the UK, but with a sufficient sample to be reported for Wales)*
- **Electoral competitiveness:** Do voters have meaningful choices between candidates? *(taken from V-Dem)*
- **Electoral competitiveness:** Did the electoral process allow for a fair playing field for all candidates, including equitable access to media and campaign financing? *(taken from V-Dem)*
- **Electoral competitiveness:** How are campaign finance rules enforced, and do they allow for a fair contest? *(taken from V-Dem)*

- **Electoral competitiveness:** Thinking about the funding of political parties and campaigners, how open and transparent do you think information on this is? – measured on a 0-10 scale where 0 = not transparent, 10 = Fully transparent. *(taken from the Electoral Commission: Public opinion questions, which are asked across the UK, but with a sufficient sample to be reported for Wales)*

### Optional comments

- Would you like to explain or provide any caveats for your ranking (e.g., where 2 or more indicators you have ranked are of the same value or importance to you)?

(text box)

- Are there any key indicators missing from the list? If so, which?

(text box)

### Participatory democracy

Participatory democracy focuses on citizens' active engagement in decision-making beyond voting. It includes both formal political activities (e.g., contacting representatives, joining parties) and informal actions (e.g., protesting, petitioning).

*This section is mainly focused on the range of measures and indicators already available in Wales. Please rank the following indicators from most appropriate (top of the list) to least appropriate (bottom of the list) for measuring a participatory democracy in Wales.*

- **Turnout in elections (official statistics):** Turnout of votes in General, Senedd, and Local elections *(taken from General, Welsh Parliament, and Local elections results respectively)*
- **Turnout in [Senedd / Local] elections (attitude):** As you may know, on [latest Senedd election date] there were elections. We often find that a lot of people were not able to vote because they were sick, did not have the time, or were just not interested. How about you - did you manage to vote? – Options to select from are: Yes; No; Don't know. *(taken from Electoral Commission: Post-election survey)* In the Welsh local council elections in [latest election date], a lot of people didn't manage to vote. How about you – did you manage to vote in the Welsh local council elections? (taken from National Survey for Wales)
- **Turnout in local elections (attitude):** In the Welsh local council elections in [latest election date], a lot of people didn't manage to vote. How about you – did you manage to vote in the Welsh local council elections? *(taken from National Survey for Wales)*
- **Engagement with formal politics:** Have you contacted your local councillor in the past 12 months, for example, with an enquiry, complaint, or problem? *(taken from National Survey for Wales)* Have you contacted your Members of the

Senedd (MSs) in the past 12 months, for example, with an enquiry, complaint, or problem? (additional expert suggestion)

- **Engagement with formal politics:** Have you contacted your Members of the Senedd (MSs) in the past 12 months, for example, with an enquiry, complaint, or problem? *(additional expert suggestion)*
- **Engagement with formal politics:** Have you ever attempted to influence a decision or decisions made by the council? *(taken from Data Cymru)*
- **Engagement with informal politics:** Active global citizenship in Wales *(taken from Well-being of Wales: National indicators)*
- **Political interest and knowledge:** To what extent do you have a good understanding of what your local councillor does for your local community? *(reworded from the National Survey for Wales)*
- **Political interest and knowledge:** Assessment of knowledge regarding devolved politics in Wales and UK politics at Westminster, measured on a 0-10 scale. *(taken from the Welsh Election Study)*
- **Political interest and knowledge:** Which of these statements best describes your attitude towards voting at General Elections/Senedd elections/local council elections? – Options to select from are: I always vote; I sometimes vote; I never vote; I've not been eligible in the past to vote. *(taken from the Public Attitudes Survey)*
- **Political interest and knowledge (Senedd Elections):** Thinking about the election(s) on [latest Senedd election date], overall, how much, if anything, did you feel you knew about the election(s) in your area? – Options to select from are: A great deal; A fair amount; Not very much; I knew it was happening but didn't know anything about it; I didn't know it was happening; Don't know. *(taken from Electoral Commission: Post-election survey)*To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement? "I had enough information on candidates to be able to make an informed decision." – Options to select from are: Strongly agree; Tend to agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Tend to disagree; Strongly disagree; Don't know. *(taken from Electoral Commission: Post-election survey)*
- **Political interest and knowledge (Candidates):** To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement? "I had enough information on candidates to be able to make an informed decision." – Options to select from are: Strongly agree; Tend to agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Tend to disagree; Strongly disagree; Don't know. *(taken from Electoral Commission: Post-election survey)*
- **Political interest and knowledge:** How much do you think UK politics has an impact or makes a difference to your everyday life? *(taken from Public Attitudes Survey)*

## Optional comments

- Would you like to explain or provide any caveats for your ranking (e.g., where 2 or more indicators you have ranked are of the same value or importance to you)?

(text box)

- Are there key indicators missing from the list? If so, what?

(text box)

## Deliberative democracy

Deliberative democracy centres on the quality of political discussion, valuing informed, respectful, and reasoned debate over mere participation. It seeks decisions based on shared values and public reasoning, aiming to strengthen democratic legitimacy through thoughtful consideration of diverse perspectives.

*There are currently no indicators measuring this in Wales; therefore, we have gathered indicators used internationally and recommended by experts. Please rank the following indicators from most appropriate (top of the list) to least appropriate (bottom of the list) for measuring a deliberative democracy in Wales.*

- **Use of reasoned justifications among politicians in debate (Welsh Parliament):** Do politicians provide clear, well-reasoned justifications for their policy positions during debates? *(taken from V-Dem)*
- **Use of justifications for decisions among politicians that appeal to common good (Welsh Parliament):** Do politicians justify their decisions with reference to the common good? *(taken from V-Dem)*
- **Respect for counterarguments and opponents among politicians (Welsh Parliament):** Do politicians acknowledge and engage with counterarguments or alternative perspectives presented during debates? *(taken from V-Dem)*
- **Respect for counterarguments and opponents among politicians (Welsh Parliament):** Are opposing views fairly represented, or are they distorted or misrepresented to undermine them? *(taken from Discourse Quality Index)*
- **Respect for counterarguments and opponents among politicians (Welsh Parliament):** Do politicians respond to opposing views in a respectful manner, avoiding interruption, hostility, or ad hominem attacks? *(taken from Discourse Quality Index)*
- **Quality of deliberation in the public sphere:** How many welfare programmes are means-tested and how many benefit all (or virtually all) members of the polity? *(taken from V-Dem)*



## Optional comments

- Indicators on justifications and counterarguments/opponents above clarify that data on these are restricted to the Welsh Parliament, as these indicators are meant to examine institutionalised speech, while it can also be challenging to monitor meetings taking place across local councils in Wales. However, we welcome any thoughts or suggestions you may have about expanding these indicators to monitor the local government as well.

(text box)

- Would you like to explain or provide any caveats for your ranking (e.g., where 2 or more indicators you have ranked for you are of the same value or importance)?

(text box)

- Are there key indicators missing from the list? If so, what?

(text box)

## Egalitarian democracy

Egalitarian democracy emphasises equal access to political participation and representation. It assesses whether all citizens, including marginalised groups, can engage in political processes and whether diverse demographics are fairly represented in decision-making.

*This section is mainly focused on the range of measures and indicators already available in Wales. Please rank the following indicators from most appropriate (top of the list) to least appropriate (bottom of the list) for measuring an egalitarian democracy in Wales.*

- **Equality of political engagement & balanced demographic representation in candidates:** socio-demographic characteristics of candidates (*taken from Local Government Candidate Survey and Senedd Candidates Diversity Survey*).
- **Equality of political engagement & balanced demographic representation in government and legislators:** demographic characteristics of elected candidates (*taken from Local elections results & Welsh Election results*).
- **Alignment of policies with various social groups:** People are asked to rank their views on a range of issues including whether the government should cut taxes and significantly reduce spending on health and social services, prioritise environmental protection over economic growth, abolish the Senedd and return to pre-devolution arrangements, or protect the UK's sovereignty (using a scale from 0 to 10). They are then asked to place Welsh Labour, the Welsh Conservative Party, and Plaid Cymru on the same scale for each issue. Depending on which party is in government, these responses can be used as a proxy measure of policy congruence between citizens and the governing party (*taken from the Welsh Election Study*).

## Optional comments

- Would you like to explain or provide any caveats for your ranking (e.g., where 2 or more indicators you have ranked for you are of the same value or importance)?

(text box)

- Are there key indicators missing from the list? If so, what?

(text box)

## Institutional responsiveness

Institutional responsiveness measures how effectively political institutions respond to citizens' needs and concerns. It includes public consultation, incorporation of citizen input, and political efficacy, which is the belief that they can influence decisions; therefore, indicating whether citizens feel heard and represented in policymaking.

*This section is mainly focused on the range of measures and indicators already available in Wales. Please rank the following indicators from most appropriate (top of the list) to least appropriate (bottom of the list) for measuring institutional responsiveness in Wales.*

- **Citizens' satisfaction with government and the political system:** How satisfied are you with how the Welsh Government is doing its job? *(reworded from National Survey of Wales)*
- **Citizens' satisfaction with government and the political system:** On the whole, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way that democracy works in: a) the UK as a whole; b) Wales? *(taken from the Welsh Election Study)*
- **Citizens' satisfaction with government and the political system:** How much do you agree or disagree that the people who win elections and are in charge of the country care about people like you? *(taken from the National Resident Survey - Wales)*
- **Citizens' satisfaction with government and the political system:** To what extent do you think your local council(s) act(s) on the concerns of local residents? *(taken from the National Resident Survey - Wales)*
- **Citizens' belief in their ability to influence politics:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that you can influence decisions affecting your local area *(reworded from National Survey for Wales; Well-being of Wales: National indicators)*
- **Government consultation with citizens and civil society:** To what extent do you agree or disagree that your local councillor works closely with your local community *(reworded from National Survey of Wales)*

- **Policy congruence with public opinion:** To what extent do recent government policies reflect the preferences of the Welsh public? (*reworded from British Social Attitudes Survey*)

### Optional comments

- Would you like to explain or provide any caveats for your ranking (e.g., where 2 or more indicators you have ranked for you are of the same value or importance)?

(text box)

- Are there key indicators missing from the list? If so, what?

(text box)

### Access to information

Freedom of information supports democratic health by promoting transparency and accountability. It involves public access to official information, open policymaking, and protections for independent journalism, enabling scrutiny and informed debate that strengthen other democratic functions.

*There are currently very few indicators measuring this in Wales; therefore, this section is mostly focused on indicators used internationally and recommended by experts. Please rank the following indicators from most appropriate (top of the list) to least appropriate (bottom of the list) for measuring access to information in Wales.*

- **Government transparency:** Is there a formal anti-corruption or public integrity strategy in place, and does it include measurable objectives with regular monitoring? (*adapted from T-Index*)
- **Government transparency:** Can decision-makers be identified and held accountable for major policy and spending decisions? (*adapted from T-Index*)
- **Government transparency:** Are internal audit bodies and ethics units adequately resourced and empowered to act on integrity breaches? (*adapted from T-Index*)
- **Government transparency:** Freedom of Information (FOI) responsiveness and success rates. (*additional expert suggestion*)
- **Government transparency:** Overall, how well-informed do you think your local council(s) keeps residents about the services and benefits it provides? (*taken from the National Resident Survey - Wales*)
- **Media freedom:** To what extent are media outlets free to report critically on the government without fear of censorship or retaliation? (*taken from V-Dem*)
- **Media freedom:** Is media ownership sufficiently diverse to ensure access to a wide range of political opinions and perspectives? (*taken from V-Dem*)

- **Media freedom:** Are journalists protected from harassment, and is political censorship of content rare or absent? *(taken from V-Dem)*/Do journalists refrain from covering sensitive topics due to fear of legal, political, or economic consequences, even without direct coercion? *(taken from V-Dem)*
- **Media freedom:** Do journalists refrain from covering sensitive topics due to fear of legal, political, or economic consequences, even without direct coercion? *(taken from V-Dem)*
- **Media freedom:** Is there systematic bias in media coverage against opposition parties or candidates, particularly around election periods? *(taken from V-Dem)*
- **Public perceptions:** How many times per week do you notice the Senedd getting mentioned in media (mainstream and social) in Wales and the UK? *(reworded from additional expert suggestion)*

### Optional comments

- Would you like to explain or provide any caveats for your ranking (e.g., where 2 or more indicators you have ranked for you are of the same value or importance)?

(text box)

- Are there key indicators missing from the list? If so, what?

(text box)

### Reflection on all dimensions (optional questions)

Now that you have ranked the indicators provided within each dimension, we would like to invite you to reflect on the 6 dimensions themselves (electoral, participatory, deliberative, egalitarian, institutional responsiveness, and access to information).

- Do you think that this set of 6 dimensions effectively captures democracy in Wales?

(text box)

- Do you consider any of these 6 dimensions more critical for being able to track, monitor, and assess different components of democracy in Wales?

(text box)

- Is there anything else you would like to add about any of the dimensions or indicators presented?

(text box)

### Challenges (all questions in this section mandatory)

The indicators presented throughout this questionnaire are drawn from 3 complementary data sources:

1. **Polling:** Public opinion surveys that ask citizens directly about their political attitudes and behaviours.
2. **Official Statistics:** Routinely collected administrative records, such as voter registration lists, turnout figures, maintained by electoral bodies and government agencies.
3. **Expert analysis:** Systematic coding of political phenomena (e.g., election integrity, media freedom) by subject-matter specialists.

*Each of those sources offers unique insights and challenges. In this final section of the first round of the Delphi study, we would welcome your expert insights on each source. Please respond to the question below for each, noting any challenges you anticipate and suggestions for improvement. If you feel that you do not have the expertise to answer one or more of the following questions, or you would prefer not to respond, please select the relevant option to indicate so.*

**Polling:** How can polling become more inclusive so that the perspectives of people who do not normally participate in politics (such as people not registered to vote, marginalised communities, etc.) can be captured through this method?

Would you like to answer this question?

- Yes
  - (text box)
- No
- I don't feel I have the expertise to do so

**Official statistics:** What procedures would you recommend for improving the accuracy, consistency, and promptness of administrative indicators?

Would you like to answer this question?

- Yes
  - (text box)
- No
- I don't feel I have the expertise to do so

**Expert analysis:** Which safeguards around expert selection, training, and aggregation do you find most effective at reducing bias and ensuring comparability over time when coding democratic indicators?

Would you like to answer this question?

- Yes

- (text box)
- No
- I don't feel I have the expertise to do so

## Delphi questionnaire 2 script

### Participant information

The following information helps us understand the possible correlation between your area of work/expertise and the views expressed. We will only be asking information about your job sector and possibly the country in which you work. We understand that your experience may span multiple sectors, so please answer where your experience best lies.

#### 2. What sector do you work in?

- Academia/ research
  - What country are you based in?
    - Wales
    - England
    - Scotland
    - Northern Ireland
    - Outside the UK
      - Name of country you are based in: (text box)
- Public sector
  - Which sub-sector do you work in?
    - Government/Civil Service
    - Regulatory/Oversight Body
 [For both options]
    - Policy and governance
    - Research
    - Other (text box)
- Political party
- NGOs, think tanks, and third-sector organisations
  - What country are you based in?
    - Wales
    - England
    - Scotland
    - Northern Ireland
    - Outside the UK
      - Name of country you are based in: (text box)
- Other (text box)

## Part 1

### Electoral democracy

Electoral democracy is a core aspect of democratic health, assessing the fairness, accessibility, and competitiveness of elections. It examines whether all citizens can vote freely, if elections are transparent and reflect the electorate's will, and whether elected officials are accountable and responsive.

1. Electoral competitiveness: Do voters have meaningful choices between candidates?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above?

For context, this indicator is measured through expert analysis and is currently **not** available in Wales. It is based on V-Dem's Election multiparty indicator (v2elmulpar): <https://www.v-dem.net/>

[Screening questions for not-existing indicator]

The questions asked below specifically for this indicator focus on the feasibility of introducing this in Wales. Would you like to proceed with these questions that are specific to Wales, or would you like to answer the questions using the perspective/example of another country?

- Answer the questions specific to Wales (direct to option A).
- Answer the questions from the perspective of another country.
  - Which country do you have in mind for answering these questions? (open textbox)
  - (direct to option B)

[Option A reduced table for not-existing indicator & expert analysis (all statements mandatory)]

Statement	Strong agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strong disagree
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in Wales at the <b>national</b> level.					
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in Wales at the <b>local</b> level.					

There is a sample in Wales that could be used to collect this data.					
The indicator would <u>not</u> be subject to bias.					
The indicator has been quality assessed in other contexts.					
It is feasible to conduct a quality assessment for this indicator in Wales.					
The indicator could be tracked consistently over time.					

[Option B reduced table for not-existing indicator & expert analysis (statements optional)]

<b>Statement</b>	<b>Strong agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strong disagree</b>
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in <i>[chosen country]</i> at the <b>national</b> level.					
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in <i>[chosen country]</i> at the <b>local</b> level.					
There is a sample in <i>[chosen country]</i> that could be used to collect this data.					
The indicator would <u>not</u> be subject to bias.					
The indicator has been quality assessed in other contexts.					
It is feasible to conduct a quality assessment for this indicator in <i>[chosen country]</i> .					
The indicator could be tracked consistently over time.					



2. Electoral integrity: Overall, thinking about voting in election(s), how would you rate the ease of participating? Even if you have never voted, please think about how easy or difficult you think it would be.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator **is** currently available in Wales: <https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/research-reports-and-data/public-attitudes/public-attitudes-2025>

[Screening questions for existing indicator]

We understand that your expertise may not be specific to Wales, and thus, you may not be able to answer the questions relevant to this indicator.

Would you like to answer specifically to the Welsh context or provide more general expertise?

- Welsh context (direct to option A)
- More general expertise (direct to option B)

[Option A full table for existing indicator (all statements mandatory)]

Statement	Strong agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strong disagree
The indicator is disaggregated by relevant characteristics (e.g., geography, age, gender, income).					
This level of disaggregation is sufficient.					
The indicator has been collected consistently over time.					
The indicator is collected regularly.					
There are more than 2 data points available.					
The sample is representative of the population in Wales.					
There are appropriate data collection methods used.					
There are <u>no</u> known sources of bias.					

The data is publicly available.					
It is easy to access the data.					
The indicator is <u>not</u> expensive to collect or update.					

[Option B for existing indicator (optional)]

Are there any key considerations you would make when testing or quality assessing this indicator? (e.g., granularity and frequency of the relevant data collected, sample representativeness, data accessibility, objectivity, cost of implementation, etc.)

(text box)

3. Electoral integrity: How confident, if at all, are you that you know how to go about voting at an election?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator **is** currently available in Wales: <https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/research-reports-and-data/public-attitudes/public-attitudes-2025>

[Screening questions for existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A full table for existing indicator (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B for existing indicator (optional)]

4. Electoral integrity: How confident, if at all, are you that you know how to go about registering to vote?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator **is** currently available in Wales: <https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/research-reports-and-data/public-attitudes/public-attitudes-2025>

[Screening questions for existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A full table for existing indicator (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B for existing indicator (optional)]

5. Electoral competitiveness: Did the electoral process allow for a fair playing field for all candidates, including equitable access to media and campaign financing?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator is measured through expert analysis and is currently **not** available in Wales. It is based on V-Dem's Election Qualities

media access and campaign indicators (v2eldonate, v2elfrcampv, 2elpdcamp, v2elpaidig):  
<https://www.v-dem.net/>

[Screening questions for not-existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A reduced table for not-existing indicator & expert analysis (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B reduced table for not-existing indicator & expert analysis (statements optional)]

### **Reflections (optional)**

6. Do you have any reflections on your ratings, or would you like to provide any caveats for your answers?

(text box)

### **Participatory democracy**

Participatory democracy focuses on citizens' active engagement in decision-making beyond voting. It includes both formal political activities (e.g., contacting representatives, joining parties) and informal actions (e.g., protesting, petitioning).

7. Turnout in elections (official statistics): Turnout of votes in General, Senedd, and Local elections.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator **is** currently available in Wales:  
General elections: <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-10009/>

Senedd Elections: <https://research.senedd.wales/research-articles/election-2021-how-many-people-voted/>

Local Elections: <https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/research-reports-and-data/our-reports-and-data-past-elections-and-referendums/report-may-2022-elections-wales>

[Screening questions for existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A full table for existing indicator (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B for existing indicator (optional)]

8. Engagement with formal politics: Have you contacted your local councillor in the past 12 months, for example, with an enquiry, complaint, or problem?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator **is** currently available in Wales:  
<https://www.gov.wales/national-survey-wales-results-viewer>

[Screening questions for existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A full table for existing indicator (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B for existing indicator (optional)]

9. Engagement with formal politics: Have you contacted your Members of the Senedd (MSs) in the past 12 months, for example, with an enquiry, complaint, or problem?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator is currently **not** available in Wales.

[Screening questions for not-existing indicator]

[Option A full table for not-existing indicator (all statements mandatory)]

Statement	Strong agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strong disagree
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in Wales at the <b>national</b> level.					
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in Wales at the <b>local</b> level.					
There is a sample in Wales that could be used to collect this data.					
This sample is representative of the population in Wales.					
The indicator would <u>not</u> be subject to bias.					
The indicator has been quality assessed in other contexts.					
It is feasible to conduct a quality assessment for this indicator in Wales.					
The indicator could be feasibly included in an existing Welsh survey.					
The indicator could be tracked consistently over time.					

The indicator would <u>not</u> be expensive to implement through an existing Welsh survey (incl. subsequent analysis).					
The indicator would <u>not</u> be expensive to implement through a bespoke survey (incl. subsequent analysis).					
The data required for this indicator would <u>not</u> be sensitive or raise privacy concerns.					

[Option B full table for not-existing indicator (statements optional)]

<b>Statement</b>	<b>Strong agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strong disagree</b>
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in <i>[chosen country]</i> at the <b>national</b> level.					
The indicator is relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in <i>[chosen country]</i> at the <b>local</b> level.					
There is a sample in <i>[chosen country]</i> that could be used to collect this data.					
This sample is representative of the population in <i>[chosen country]</i> .					
The indicator would <u>not</u> be subject to bias.					
The indicator has been quality assessed in other contexts.					
It is feasible to conduct a quality assessment for this indicator in <i>[chosen country]</i> .					
The indicator could be feasibly included in an existing survey.					

The indicator could be tracked consistently over time.					
The indicator would <u>not</u> be expensive to implement through an existing survey (incl. subsequent analysis).					
The indicator would <u>not</u> be expensive to implement through a bespoke survey (incl. subsequent analysis).					
The data required for this indicator would <u>not</u> be sensitive or raise privacy concerns.					

10. Engagement with formal politics: Have you ever attempted to influence a decision or decisions made by the council?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator **is** currently available in Wales:

<https://www.dataunitwales.gov.uk/national-resident-survey-info>

[Screening questions for existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A full table for existing indicator (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B for existing indicator (optional)]

11. Engagement with informal politics: Active global citizenship in Wales.

This indicator was added to the shortlist to be tested based on feedback to the last questionnaire.

Some comments in the first round raised that participants were not familiar with this indicator, therefore, more information is provided below:

*This national well-being indicator **is** currently available in Wales and collected through the National Survey by asking people about what activities they have done to help with international issues such as poverty, human rights, war, refugees, or climate change. The indicator measures the percentage of people who have taken 3 or more of the following actions within given timeframes: donated or raised money, campaigned, volunteered, or changed what they buy.*

More information can be found at: <https://www.gov.wales/wellbeing-wales-national-indicators>

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above?

[Screening questions for existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A full table for existing indicator (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B for existing indicator (optional)]

**[Replicate reflections optional question]**

**Deliberative democracy**

Deliberative democracy centres on the quality of political discussion, valuing informed, respectful, and reasoned debate over mere participation. It seeks decisions based on shared values and public reasoning, aiming to strengthen democratic legitimacy through thoughtful consideration of diverse perspectives.

12. Use of reasoned justifications among politicians in debate (Welsh Parliament): Do politicians provide clear, well-reasoned justifications for their policy positions during debates?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator is currently **not** available in Wales. It is measured in V-Dem's (<https://www.v-dem.net/>) Reasoned Justification index (v2dlreason) and in the Discourse Quality index's Level of Justification component (<https://academic.oup.com/book/44646/chapter/378695331>).

[Screening questions for not-existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A reduced table for not-existing indicator & expert analysis MINUS THE LOCAL LEVEL STATEMENT (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B reduced table for not-existing indicator & expert analysis MINUS THE LOCAL LEVEL STATEMENT (statements optional)]

13. Respect for counterarguments and opponents among politicians (Welsh Parliament): Do politicians acknowledge and engage with counterarguments or alternative perspectives presented during debates?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator is currently **not** available in Wales. It is based on V-Dem's *Respect counterarguments* indicator (v2dlcountr): <https://www.v-dem.net/>

[Screening questions for not-existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A reduced table for not-existing indicator & expert analysis MINUS THE LOCAL LEVEL STATEMENT (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B reduced table for not-existing indicator & expert analysis MINUS THE LOCAL LEVEL STATEMENT (statements optional)]

14. Respect for counterarguments and opponents among politicians (Welsh Parliament):  
Are opposing views fairly represented, or are they distorted or misrepresented to undermine them?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator is currently **not** available in Wales. It is based on the Discourse Quality Index's Respect component:

<https://academic.oup.com/book/44646/chapter/378695331>

[Screening questions for not-existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A reduced table for not-existing indicator & expert analysis MINUS THE LOCAL LEVEL STATEMENT (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B reduced table for not-existing indicator & expert analysis MINUS THE LOCAL LEVEL STATEMENT (statements optional)]

**[Replicate reflections optional question]**

## **Part 2**

### **Egalitarian democracy**

Egalitarian democracy emphasises equal access to political participation and representation. It assesses whether all citizens, including marginalised groups, can engage in political processes and whether diverse demographics are fairly represented in decision-making.

15. Equality of political engagement & balanced demographic representation in candidates: socio-demographic characteristics of candidates.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator **is** currently available in Wales.

Senedd candidates <https://www.gov.wales/diversity-and-inclusion-guidance-registered-political-parties-html>

Local candidates: <https://www.gov.wales/local-government-candidates-survey-2022>

[Screening questions for existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A full table for existing indicator (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B for existing indicator (optional)]

16. Equality of political engagement & balanced demographic representation in government and legislators: demographic characteristics of elected candidates.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator **is** currently available in Wales.



Local elected candidates' profile: <https://www.gov.wales/local-government-candidates-survey-2022>

Senedd elected candidates' profile: <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-9282/>

[Screening questions for existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A full table for existing indicator (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B for existing indicator (optional)]

### **[Replicate reflections optional question]**

#### **Institutional responsiveness**

Institutional responsiveness measures how effectively political institutions respond to citizens' needs and concerns. It includes public consultation, incorporation of citizen input, and political efficacy, which is the belief that they can influence decisions; therefore, indicating whether citizens feel heard and represented in policymaking.

17. Citizens' satisfaction with government and the political system: On the whole, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way that democracy works in: a) the UK as a whole; b) Wales?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, **can decision-makers be identified and held accountable for major policy and spending decisions?**

[Screening questions for existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A full table for existing indicator (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B for existing indicator (optional)]

18. Citizens' satisfaction with government and the political system: To what extent do you think your local council(s) act(s) on the concerns of local residents?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator **is** currently available in Wales:

<https://www.dataunitwales.gov.uk/national-resident-survey-info>

[Screening questions for existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A full table for existing indicator (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B for existing indicator (optional)]

19. Citizens' belief in their ability to influence politics: To what extent do you agree or disagree that you can influence decisions affecting your local area?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator **is** currently available in Wales (although reworded): <https://www.gov.wales/influencing-decisions-local-area-national-survey-wales-april-2021-march-2022>

[Screening questions for existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A full table for existing indicator (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B for existing indicator (optional)]

20. Citizens' trust in the government: In thinking about why you do or do not trust government in general, please specify where you think it falls on the scale between the 2 sets of opposing descriptions (Set A: between 'Serves the interests of only certain groups of people' and 'Serves the interests of everyone equally and fairly'; Set B: between 'Overall, its actions are hurting my quality of life' and 'Overall, its actions are improving my quality of life').

*This indicator was newly introduced to the short-list to be tested based on feedback to the last questionnaire. The indicator is currently **not** available in Wales, and it is based on the measurement on government grievance from the Edelman Trust Barometer (page 59):*

[https://www.edelman.com/sites/g/files/aatuss191/files/2025-01/2025%20Edelman%20Trust%20Barometer%20Global%20Report\\_01.23.25.pdf](https://www.edelman.com/sites/g/files/aatuss191/files/2025-01/2025%20Edelman%20Trust%20Barometer%20Global%20Report_01.23.25.pdf)

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above?

[Screening questions for not-existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A full table for not-existing indicator (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B full table for not-existing indicator (statements optional)]

**[Replicate reflections optional question]**

### **Access to information**

Freedom of information supports democratic health by promoting transparency and accountability. It involves public access to official information, open policymaking, and protections for independent journalism, enabling scrutiny and informed debate that strengthen other democratic functions.

21. Government transparency: Can decision-makers be identified and held accountable for major policy and spending decisions?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator is measured through expert analysis and is currently **not** available in Wales. It is adapted from the T-Index's methodology for measuring transparency: <https://corruptionrisk.org/t-index-methodology/>

[Screening questions for not-existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A reduced table for not-existing indicator & expert analysis (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B reduced table for not-existing indicator & expert analysis (statements optional)]

22. Government transparency: Is there a formal anti-corruption or public integrity strategy in place, and does it include measurable objectives with regular monitoring?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator is measured through expert analysis and is currently **not** available in Wales. It is adapted from the T-Index's methodology for measuring transparency: <https://corruptionrisk.org/t-index-methodology/>

[Screening questions for not-existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A reduced table for not-existing indicator & expert analysis (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B reduced table for not-existing indicator & expert analysis (statements optional)]

23. Media freedom: To what extent are media outlets free to report critically on the government without fear of censorship or retaliation?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator is measured through expert analysis and is currently **not** available in Wales. It is based on V-Dem's Media indicators (v2mecenefm, v2mecenef, v2smgovshut, v2smgovsmalt): <https://www.v-dem.net/>

[Screening questions for not-existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A reduced table for not-existing indicator & expert analysis (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B reduced table for not-existing indicator & expert analysis (statements optional)]

24. Government transparency: Freedom of Information (FOI) responsiveness and success rates.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the specific indicator listed above? For context, this indicator is currently **not** available in Wales. It was suggested by experts in preparatory workshops for the Delphi study.

[Screening questions for not-existing indicator]

[REPLICATE Option A full table for not-existing indicator (all statements mandatory)]

[REPLICATE Option B full table for not-existing indicator (statements optional)]

## Delphi questionnaire 3 script

### Participant information

The following information helps us understand possible correlation between your area of work/expertise and views expressed. We will only be asking information about your job sector and possibly the country in which you work. We understand that your experience may span multiple sectors so please answer where your experience best lies.

3. What sector do you work in?

- Academia/ research
  - What country are you based in?
    - Wales
    - England
    - Scotland
    - Northern Ireland
    - Outside the UK
      - Name of country you are based in: (text box)
- Public sector
  - Which sub-sector do you work?
    - Government/Civil Service
    - Regulatory/Oversight Body
  - [For both options]
    - Policy and governance
    - Research
    - Other (text box)
- Political party
- NGOs, think tanks, and third-sector organisations
  - What country are you based in?
    - Wales
    - England
    - Scotland
    - Northern Ireland
    - Outside the UK
      - Name of country you are based in: (text box)
- Other (text box)

### Shortlisted indicators

#### Electoral democracy

- Shortlisted indicator: **‘Electoral competitiveness: Do voters have meaningful choices between candidates?’**

This indicator is currently **not** available in Wales.

It requires expert analysis to assess whether voters had genuine options to choose from in an election. V-Dem (<https://www.v-dem.net/>) measures this through its 'Elections multiparty' variable, while the Perceptions of Electoral Integrity project evaluates whether voters were offered a real choice at the ballot box.

In Round 2 of the study, this indicator achieved consensus (70+% agreement) on the following quality aspects:

- Being relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in Wales at the national level.
  - Being relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in Wales at the local level.
  - Its feasibility for conducting a quality assessment.
  - Its feasibility for consistent tracking over time.
1. [Mandatory question] Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement: 'This indicator should be used to measure and monitor democratic health in Wales.'
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

2. [Optional question] Would you like to explain your rating above?

(text box)

3. [Optional question] Some respondents in Round 2 raised that this indicator can be **subject to bias**. This can include how the data is interpreted or how the data is collected in the first place. How can this be addressed for the specific indicator?

(text box)

5. [Optional question] There was some discrepancy between the **confidence of quality assessing** this as a newly-introduced indicator in Wales **and the track record of quality assessing** this indicator in other contexts. If introduced, how would you suggest this indicator is quality assessed in Wales? Do you have any successful quality assessment examples to share from other contexts as examples?

(text box)

6. [Optional question] Some respondents in Round 2 raised concerns that there might **not be a sample in Wales that can be used to collect this data**. How can this be addressed for the specific indicator?

(text box)

### Participatory democracy

- Shortlisted indicator: **‘Turnout in elections (official statistics): Turnout of votes in General, Senedd and Local elections.’**

This indicator **is** currently available in Wales.

It measures the share of eligible voters who actually cast a ballot, based on official records:

- General elections: <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-10009/>
- Senedd Elections: <https://research.senedd.wales/research-articles/election-2021-how-many-people-voted/>
- Local Elections: <https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/research-reports-and-data/our-reports-and-data-past-elections-and-referendums/report-may-2022-elections-wales>

In Round 2 of the study, this indicator achieved consensus (70+% agreement) on the following quality aspects:

- Being collected regularly.
  - Its data being publicly available.
  - Being easy to access the data.
  - Being collected consistently over time.
  - Having more than two data points available.
  - Reflecting a sample representative of the population in Wales.
  - Using appropriate data collection methods.
7. [Mandatory question] Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement: ‘This indicator should be used to measure and monitor democratic health in Wales.’
- Strongly Agree
  - Agree
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree
  - Disagree

- Strongly Disagree

8. [Optional question] Would you like to explain your rating above?

(text box)

9. [Optional question] Some respondents in Round 2 raised that this indicator can be **subject to bias**. This can include how the data is interpreted or how the data is collected in the first place. How can this be addressed for the specific indicator?

(text box)

10. [Optional question] Some respondents in Round 2 raised that **data disaggregation for this indicator may not be sufficient**. What key characteristics should be captured as part of the data collection so this indicator can be useful and inclusive?

Note: Currently, the data is disaggregated by Country and Region (General Elections), Region (Senedd Elections), and Councils (Local Elections).

[text box]

- Shortlisted indicator: **‘Engagement with formal politics: Have you contacted your local councillor in the past 12 months, for example, with an enquiry, complaint or problem?’**

This indicator is currently available in Wales.

It measures whether people actively interact with elected representatives, via a survey question: <https://www.gov.wales/national-survey-wales-results-viewer>

In Round 2 of the study, this indicator achieved consensus (70+% agreement) on the following quality aspects:

- Being collected regularly.
- Being disaggregated by relevant characteristics.
- Having more than 2 data points available.
- Reflecting a sample representative of the population in Wales.
- Using appropriate data collection methods.
- Its data being publicly available.
- Being easy to access the data.

11. [Mandatory question] Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement: ‘This indicator should be used to measure and monitor democratic health in Wales.’

- Strongly Agree

- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

12. [Optional question] Would you like to explain your rating above?

(text box)

13. [Optional question] Some respondents in Round 2 raised that this indicator can be **subject to bias**. This can include how the data is interpreted or how the data is collected in the first place. How can this be addressed for the specific indicator?

(text box)

14. [Optional question] Some respondents in Round 2 raised that **how frequently or consistently the data was collected** could act as a barrier for using this indicator. For using this specific indicator, how frequently should the relevant data be collected, and what should be the minimum time span for data comparison?

Note: The data comes from the National Survey for Wales, which surveys approximately 12,000 people across Wales each year, from 2012 onwards. The relevant question is included in the 2021-2022 (<https://www.gov.wales/sites/default/files/statistics-and-research/2022-05/national-survey-for-wales-questionnaire-april-2021-to-march-2022.pdf>) and the 2024-2025 (<https://www.gov.wales/sites/default/files/statistics-and-research/2024-10/national-survey-for-wales-questionnaire-april-2024-to-march-2025.pdf>) questionnaires.

(text box)

15. [Optional question] Some respondents in Round 2 raised that **data disaggregation for this indicator may not be sufficient**. What key characteristics should be captured as part of the data collection so this indicator can be useful and inclusive?

Note: As a large-sample survey, it provides a sample of approximately 600 respondents per local authority (<https://www.gov.wales/sites/default/files/statistics-and-research/2019-02/generating-aggregate-statistics-from-national-survey-data-2012.pdf>). The questionnaire also collects a wide range of demographic information (including sex, age, marital status, education, ethnicity, economic status, and sexual orientation) allowing the data to be disaggregated accordingly (<https://www.gov.wales/sites/default/files/statistics-and-research/2022-08/national-survey-wales-questionnaire-guidance-2022-23.pdf>).

(text box)



## Egalitarian democracy

- Shortlisted indicator: **‘Equality of political engagement & balanced demographic representation in government and legislators: demographic characteristics of elected candidates.’**

This indicator **is** currently available in Wales.

It looks at whether elected officials reflect the diversity of society, in terms of socio-demographic characteristics like gender, age, ethnicity, disability, etc. (typical representation):

- Local elected candidates’ profile: <https://www.gov.wales/local-government-candidates-survey-2022>
- Senedd elected candidates’ profile: <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-9282/>

In Round 2 of the study, this indicator achieved consensus (70+% agreement) on the following quality aspects:

- Being disaggregated by relevant characteristics.
- Having no known sources of bias.
- Its data being publicly available.
- Being easy to access the data.

16. [Mandatory question] Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement: ‘This indicator should be used to measure and monitor democratic health in Wales.’

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

17. [Optional question] Would you like to explain your rating above?

(text box)

18. [Optional question] Some respondents in Round 2 raised that **how frequently or consistently the data was collected** could act as a barrier for using this indicator. For using this specific indicator, how frequently should the relevant data be collected, and what should be the minimum time span for data comparison?

- Senedd: Gender data is available from 1999 onwards. Ethnicity data for ethnic minorities is available from 2016 (<https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-9282/CBP-9282.pdf>).
- Local candidates survey: Three waves (2012: <https://www.gov.wales/local-government-candidates-survey-2012>; 2017: <https://www.gov.wales/local-government-candidates-survey-2017>; 2022: <https://www.wlga.gov.uk/candidates-survey>).

(text box)

19. [Optional question] Some respondents in Round 2 raised that **data disaggregation for this indicator may not be sufficient**. What key characteristics should be captured as part of the data collection so this indicator can be useful and inclusive?

Note: The key characteristics already being collected are:

- Local elected candidates: Previous experience as a (county/community councillor), party affiliation, sex, gender, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, education, employment status, disability, caring responsibilities.
- Senedd elected candidates: Political party, gender, and ethnicity.

(text box)

20. [Optional question] Some respondents in Round 2 raised concerns that the **current sample is not representative** of the population in Wales. How can this be addressed for the specific indicator?

(text box)

### Institutional responsiveness

- Shortlisted indicator: **‘Citizens’ satisfaction with government and the political system: On the whole, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way that democracy works in: a) the UK as a whole; b) Wales?’**

This indicator **is** currently available in Wales.

It measures how positively or negatively people perceive the functioning of the political system through a survey question:

<https://beta.ukdataservice.ac.uk/datacatalogue/studies/study?id=8774#!/details>

In Round 2 of the study, this indicator achieved consensus (70+% agreement) on the following quality aspects:

- Using appropriate data collection methods.
- Being disaggregated by relevant characteristics.

- The level of disaggregation being sufficient.
- Its data being publicly available.

21. [Mandatory question] Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement: 'This indicator should be used to measure and monitor democratic health in Wales.'

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

22. [Optional question] Would you like to explain your rating above?

(text box)

23. [Optional question] Some respondents in Round 2 raised that this indicator can be **subject to bias**. This can include how the data is interpreted or how the data is collected in the first place. How can this be addressed for the specific indicator?

(text box)

24. [Optional question] Some respondents in Round 2 raised that **how frequently or consistently the data was collected** could act as a barrier for using this indicator. For using this specific indicator, how frequently should the relevant data be collected, and what should be the minimum time span for data comparison?

Note: This question was included in the 2019 Welsh Election Study:

<https://welsh-election-study-cymru.wordpress.com/>.

(text box)

25. [Optional question] Some respondents in Round 2 raised concerns that the **current sample is not representative** of the population in Wales. How can this be addressed for the specific indicator?

(text box)

### Transparency/media freedom

- Final shortlisted indicator: '**Government transparency: Can decision-makers be identified and held accountable for major policy and spending decisions?**'

This indicator is currently **not** available in Wales.

It uses expert judgement to assess whether major policy and spending decision-makers are publicly identifiable. This indicator is based on the T-Index's methodology for measuring transparency (<https://corruptionrisk.org/t-index-methodology/>), which uses 14 questions on whether key information, such as budgets, procurement, court decisions, officials' disclosures, permits, and laws, is publicly available online.

In Round 2 of the study, this indicator achieved consensus (70+% agreement) on the following quality aspects:

- Being relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in Wales at the national level.
- Being relevant to assessing the current state of democracy in Wales at the local level.
- Its feasibility for consistent tracking over time.

26. [Mandatory question] Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement: 'This indicator should be used to measure and monitor democratic health in Wales.'

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

27. [Optional question] Would you like to explain your rating above?

(text box)

28. [Optional question] Some respondents in Round 2 raised that this indicator can be **subject to bias**. This can include how the data is interpreted or how the data is collected in the first place. How can this be addressed for the specific indicator?

(text box)

29. [Optional question] There was some discrepancy between the **confidence of quality assessing** this as a newly-introduced indicator in Wales **and the track record of quality assessing** this indicator in other contexts. If introduced, how would you suggest this indicator be quality assessed in Wales? Do you have any successful quality assessment examples to share from other contexts as examples?

(text box)

30. [Optional question] Some respondents in Round 2 raised **concerns that there might not be a sample in Wales that can be used** to collect this data. How can this be addressed for the specific indicator?

(text box)

### Final reflections

31. [Mandatory question] Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement:

**‘The 6 indicators provided above together provide a good set of measurements for democratic health in Wales.’**

As a reminder, the shortlisted indicators are:

- A. Electoral dimension – Electoral competitiveness: Do voters have meaningful choices between candidates?
- B. Participatory dimension – Turnout in elections (official statistics): Turnout of votes in General, Senedd, and Local elections.
- C. Participatory dimension – Engagement with formal politics: Have you contacted your local councillor in the past 12 months, for example, with an enquiry, complaint or problem?
- D. Egalitarian dimension – Equality of political engagement & balanced demographic representation in government and legislators: demographic characteristics of elected candidates.
- E. Institutional responsiveness – Citizens’ satisfaction with government and the political system: On the whole, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way that democracy works in: a) the UK as a whole; b) Wales?
- F. Transparency/media freedom – Government transparency: Can decision-makers be identified and held accountable for major policy and spending decisions?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

32. [Optional question] Do you have any final comments you would like to share regarding **the use of the given set of 6 indicators** for measuring and monitoring democratic health in Wales? Particularly if you selected Disagree or Strongly Disagree above, please let us know why.