

**PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING RESEARCH:  
ANNOTATED LIST OF ACADEMIC JOURNAL ARTICLES, REPORTS & BOOKS**

*Access note: While some of these articles are behind pay walls, many articles and books included below are 'open access.' They can be searched and downloaded easily online.*

Baiocchi, G., & Ganuza, E. (2014). Participatory budgeting as if emancipation mattered. *Politics & Society, 42*, 29–50.

Participatory Budgeting has by now been widely discussed, often celebrated, and is now instituted in at least 1,500 cities worldwide. Some of its central features—its structure of open meetings, its yearly cycle, and its combination of deliberation and representation—are by now well known. In this article, however, we critically reflect on its global travel and argue for more careful consideration of some of its less well known features, namely the coupling of the budgeting meetings with the exercise of power. We disaggregate PB into its communicative and empowerment dimensions and argue that its empowerment dimensions have usually not been part of its global expansion—and this is cause for concern from the point of view of emancipation. We thus discuss the specific institutional reforms associated with empowerment in the original version as well as its analytic dimensions. We also address some of the specific dangers of a communication-only version of PB as well as some suggestions for reintroducing empowerment.

Baiocchi, G., & Lerner, J. (2007). Could participatory budgeting work in the United States? *The Good Society, 16*, 8-13.

Intro text: The town of Lawrence, original home of the Bread and Roses strike of 1912, sits on the Merrimack River, about thirty miles North of Boston. Once a relatively well-to-do center of textile manufacturing, today Lawrence presents a typical scenario of urban blight. De-industrialization, white flight and declining tax revenues have left the town with sparse resources and a more marginalized population. By 2005, Lawrence had become the 23rd poorest community in the United States. Roughly 3/4 of residents are Latino or Black and 1/3 live below the poverty line. Like other poor towns in otherwise wealthy New England states, Lawrence's fortunes were tied to earlier economic modes. Today, the town finds itself divided between a dwindling white minority and a growing immigrant population that is neither adequately served by local services nor represented in city council.

Bateman, G. (2019). Introduction. *The transformative potential of participatory budgeting: Creating an ideal democracy*. Routledge.

First paragraph: The purpose of this research monograph is to identify the potential benefits of participatory budgeting (PB), learn how they might be realized, and explore the implications of achieving these benefits. PB is a process where people gather in neighborhood assemblies to decide how to spend a portion of their municipal budget,

which has proven to be successful and very popular since its invention in 1989 (Baiocchi & Ganuza, 2012). It is a form of local direct democracy. The PB process decides which public goods and services to purchase and how these goods and services will be distributed, within the bounds that city officials have authorized.

Bretas, P. R. (1996). Participative budgeting in Belo Horizonte: Democratization and citizenship. *Environment and Urbanization*, 8, 213-222.

Summary: This paper describes how a government elected to power in Belo Horizonte in 1993 introduced a participative budget. This not only meant a much greater involvement by citizens and community organizations in determining priorities but also a more transparent and accountable form of government. The paper describes also how this innovation changed the priorities in public spending.

Brun-Martos, M. I. & Lapsley, I. Democracy, governmentality and transparency: Participatory budgeting in action. *Public Management Review*, 19, 1006-1021.

This paper examines initiatives in participatory budgeting (PB) in a city in the United Kingdom, a country which is a slow adopter of PB. While there are UK initiatives on PB, these are developmental. Nevertheless, this study underlines the potential of PB in an Anglo-Saxon context. The finance of local government and cities is notoriously opaque. PB has the potential to enhance both democratic accountability and effective city management through transparency. This study reveals a city which is profitably engaged with democratizing its budgetary activities and seeking to achieve greater transparency for its citizens and managers through the modernization of established practice.

Cabannes, Y. (2004). Participatory budgeting: A significant contribution to participatory democracy. *Environment & Urbanization*, 16, 27-46.

Abstract: Local political leaders as well as international organizations have embraced participatory budgeting in response to problems of political exclusion and citizens' dissatisfaction with representative democracy. This article provides a framework to highlight important aspects of the politics of participation. The framework allows scholars to explore how factors external to spaces of participation interact with aspects of participation within them. The framework conceptualizes participatory budgeting as political spaces, whose boundaries are shaped by ideologies, interests, and patterns of social exclusion. In dynamic spaces, such boundaries are constantly renegotiated and contestation helps maintain their openness. In static spaces, by contrast, predefined boundaries are imposed on participants who may accept or reject them. Empirical examples of participatory budgeting illustrate the usefulness of this framework. The article ends by discussing key avenues for further research.

Cabannes, Y. (2015). The impact of participatory budgeting on basic services: Municipal practices and evidence from the field. *Environment and Urbanization*, 27, 257-284.

Abstract: In 2013, over 1,700 local governments in more than 40 countries were practising participatory budgeting (PB), which entails citizens meeting to agree on priorities for part of the local government budget for their neighbourhood or the city as a whole, and helping to oversee project implementation. This paper reviews PB in 20 cities in different continents, ranging from small urban centres to Chengdu, China, with over 17 million inhabitants, and examines 20,000 recently funded projects worth over US\$ 2 billion. It finds that PB has contributed significantly to improving basic service provision and management, with projects that are usually cheaper and better maintained because of community control and oversight. While in most cases PB improves governance and the delivery of services, it does not often fundamentally change existing power relations between local governments and citizens. The paper also discusses challenges and solutions for PB's effectiveness and scaling up.

Calabrese, T., Williams, D., & Gupta, A. (2020). Does participatory budgeting alter public spending? Evidence from New York City. *Administration & Society*, 52, 1382–1409.

Abstract: Participatory budgeting is described as a direct-democracy approach to resource allocation decision making. Theories assume it changes how public resources are spent by moving decisions from elected officials to citizens. The literature does not consider how earmarking—in which legislators direct parts of public budgets directly—might affect the impact of such policy devices. New York City's participatory budgeting process which uses earmarks is analyzed to determine spending changes. Officials involved fund more projects at lower average amounts than those not involved but do not change the areas of funding, all of which is expected in systems of budgetary earmarks controlled by legislators.

Campbell, M., Escobar, O., Fenton, C., & Craig, P. (2018). The impact of participatory budgeting on health and wellbeing: A scoping review of evaluations. *BMC Public Health*, 18, 1-11.

Background: Participatory budgeting (PB), citizens deliberating among themselves and with officials to decide how to allocate funds for public goods, has been increasingly implemented across Europe and worldwide. While PB is recommended as good practice by the World Bank and the United Nations, with potential to improve health and wellbeing, it is unclear what evaluations have been conducted on the impact of PB on health and wellbeing.

Methods: For this scoping review, we searched 21 databases with no restrictions on publication date or language. The search term 'participatory budget' was used as the relevant global label for the intervention of interest. Studies were included if they reported original analysis of health, social, political, or economic and budgetary outcomes of PB. We examined the study design, analysis, outcomes and location of included articles. Findings are reported narratively.

Results: From 1458 identified references, 37 studies were included. The majority of evaluations (n = 24) were of PB in South America, seven were in Europe. Most evaluations were case studies (n = 23) conducting ethnography and surveys, focusing on political outcomes such as participation in PB or impacts on political activities. All of the quantitative observational studies analysing population level data, except one in Russia, were conducted in South America.

Conclusion: Despite increasing interest in PB, evaluations applying robust methods to analyse health and wellbeing outcomes are scarce, particularly beyond Brazil. Therefore, implementation of PB schemes should be accompanied by rigorous qualitative and quantitative evaluation to identify impacts and the processes by which they are realised.

Célérier, L., & Cuenca Botey, L. E. (2015). Participatory budgeting at a community level in Porto Alegre: A Bourdieusian interpretation. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 28, 739–772.

Abstract: Purpose: The purpose of this paper is to explore how accountability practices can enable sociopolitical emancipation.

Design/methodology/approach: The authors explore the emancipatory potential of accountability from a Bourdieusian perspective. The study is informed by a two-month socio-ethnographic study of the participatory budgeting (PB) process in Porto Alegre (Brazil). The field study enabled us to observe accountability and participatory practices, conduct 18 semi-structured interviews with councillors, and analyze survey data gathered from budgeting participants.

Findings: The paper demonstrates how PB both strengthened the dominants in the Porto Alegrense political field and changed the game played in this field; was characterized by accountability practices favouring the election of councillors with distinctive capitals, who were “dominated-dominants dominating the dominated”; brought emancipatory perspectives to councillors and, by doing so, opened the path to social change but also widened the gap with ordinary participants.

Research limitations/implications: The research supports Shenkin and Coulson’s (2007) thesis by demonstrating that accountability, when associated with participative democracy, can create substantial social change. Significantly, by investigating the emancipatory potential of accountability, the authors challenge the often taken-for-granted assumption in critical research that accountability reinforces asymmetrical power relations, and the authors explore alternative accountability practices. Doing so enables us to rethink the possibilities of accountability and their practical implications.

Originality/value: The authors study the most emblematic example of participatory democracy in South America; and the authors use Bourdieu’s theoretical framework to approach accountability at a community level.

Chirenje, L., Giliba, R. A., & Musamba, E. B. (2013) Local communities' participation in decision-making processes through planning and budgeting in African countries. *Chinese Journal of Population Resources and Environment*, 11, 10-16.

Community participation and community based management are topical themes in current policy and discussion revolving around decision-making processes especially those dealing with natural resources management. This review shows that while governments have accepted the need to either cede or devolve control and management of natural resources to the local communities, the communities are not part and parcel of the planning and budgeting which are crucial in decision making. Communities were seen to be more involved in the implementation of natural resource management programs but lacked ownership of the projects. This causes lack of commitment to the programs and at times hostile reaction from the communities. The communities are always at the receiving end when it pertains to losses in the exchange. Community participation was shown to be effective when the local population is involved not as co-operating users but as natural resource managers or owner managers.

Choi J.M., Murphy J.W., Dahab R., Holkenbrink-Monk C. (2019) Community-based funding and budgeting: Participatory budgeting as a transformative act. In: Arxer S., Murphy J. (eds) *Community-Based Health Interventions in an Institutional Context. International Perspectives on Social Policy, Administration, and Practice*. Springer.

Chapter Abstract: Jung Min Choi, John W. Murphy, Ramsey Dahab, and Charlene Holkenbrink-Monk, in this chapter, explore the issue of funding and budgeting. Often funds are directed to community organizations in ways that are either irrelevant or difficult to use. Additionally, budgets are formulated by agencies that are disconnected from the communities where services are needed. Community-based funding and budgeting, accordingly, are beginning to receive serious attention. Communities, accordingly, are given the latitude in some cases to establish budgets and spending strategies, along with identifying and pursuing sources of funds that are consistent ethically with these priorities and desires. Community-based funding and budgeting, in this way, are vital to supporting interventions in a community-sensitive manner.

de Sousa Santos, B. (1998). Participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre: Toward a redistributive democracy. *Politics & Society*, 26, 461-510.

Intro text: The hegemonic processes of globalization are bringing about the intensification of social exclusion and marginalization of large bodies of population all over the world. Such processes are being met with resistances, grassroots initiatives, community innovations, and popular movements that try to counteract social exclusion, opening up spaces for democratic participation, for community building, for alternatives to dominant forms of development and knowledge-in sum, for social exclusion. They are, in general, very little known because they do not speak the language of hegemonic globalization and

often times present themselves as promoting the case against globalization. They are of very different kinds or else their diversity has become more apparent after the collapse of the models of grand-scale social transformation that the old Communist Manifesto, celebrating in 1998 its 150th anniversary, portrayed so well (revolution, socialism, communism). Today's forms of counterhegemonic globalization occur in rural as well as urban settings, involve common citizens or especially vulnerable groups, and deal with issues as diverse as land rights, urban infrastructure, drinking water, labor rights, sexual equality, self-determination, biodiversity, environment, community justice, and so on. Finally, they may entertain a wide variety of relations with the state, from no relation at all to complementarity or confrontation.

Dias, N. (Organizer) (2014). *Hope for democracy: 25 years of participatory budgeting worldwide*.

Introductory text: This book represents the effort of more than forty authors and many other direct and indirect contributors that spread across different continents seek to provide an overview on the Participatory Budget (PB) in the World. They do so from very different backgrounds. Some are researchers, others are consultants, and others are activists connected to several groups and social movements. The texts reflect this diversity of approaches and perspectives well, and we do not try to influence that.

Dias, N. Enriquez, S. & Julio, S. (Organizers) (2019). *Participatory Budgeting World Atlas*. Epopeia and Oficina.

From the introduction: The World Atlas of Participatory Budgeting represents the widest compilation of data, to date, on the situation of these processes on the planet. This is the result of collaborative work and the enormous generosity of more than 70 authors, who voluntarily made themselves available to collect and analyse information that would enable to understand the reality of these initiatives in very diverse quadrants.

Ebdon, C. & Franklin, A. L. (2006). Citizen participation in budgeting theory. *Public Administration Review*, 66, 437–447.

Abstract: Citizen participation in government budgeting processes is a topic that has received attention for many decades. Despite prescriptive exhortations to cities, research in this area has significant limitations. We identify four elements that are believed to influence the participation process. The variables within each element have received attention in the empirical literature, but no systematic effort has been made to uncover interaction effects and extend theory to make it more robust. We consider the weaknesses of our knowledge, suggest an impact model of citizen participation in budgeting, and identify hypotheses that may be tested in future research.

Facilitating Power, Movement Strategy Center, & the National Association of Climate Resilience Planners (Year?). Community engagement to ownership: Tools for the field with case

studies of four municipal community-driven environmental and racial equity committees. *Urban sustainability Directors Network Fund*, 1-91.

Introductory text: Framework: Why Community Engagement to Ownership?

The key to closing equity gaps and resolving climate vulnerability is the direct participation by impacted communities in the development and implementation of solutions and policy decisions that directly impact them. This level of participation unleashes much needed capacity but also requires initial capacity investments across multiple sectors to achieve systems changes and culture shifts needed. Community-based organizations play a critical role in cultivating community capacity to participate in and lead decision-making processes that meet community needs and maximize community strengths. Staff and electeds within local government have essential roles to play in helping to facilitate systems changes to increase community voice and decrease disproportionate harms caused to low-income communities and communities of color. Philanthropic partners have a role to play in partnering with impacted communities to balance uneven power dynamics and ensure adequate resourcing of essential community capacities. Finally, third-party facilitators and evaluators can help cultivate the conditions for collaboration and participation across sectors while assessing and documenting progress towards practice goals and community solutions.

Ganuza, E. & Baiocchi, G. (2012). The power of ambiguity: How participatory budgeting travels the globe. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 8(2), 1-15.

Abstract: From its inception in Brazil in the late 1980s, Participatory Budgeting has now been instituted in over 1500 cities worldwide. This paper discusses what actually travels under the name of Participatory Budgeting. We rely on science studies for a fundamental insight: it is not enough to simply speak of “diffusion” while forgetting the way that the circulation and translation of an idea fundamentally transform it (Latour 1987). In this case, the travel itself has made PB into an attractive and politically malleable device by reducing and simplifying it to a set of procedures for the democratization of demand-making. The relationship of those procedures to the administrative machinery is ambiguous, but fundamentally important for the eventual impact of Participatory Budgeting in any one context.

Gastil, J. (2020). *Hope for democracy: How citizens can bring reason back into politics*. Oxford University Press.

Book description: 'Hope for Democracy' recognizes the primary problems that plague contemporary democracy and offers a solution. It tells the story of one civic innovation, the Citizens' Initiative Review (CIR), which asks a small group of citizens to analyze a ballot measure and then provide recommendations on that measure for the public to use when voting. It relies on narratives of the civic reformers who developed and implemented the CIR and the citizens who participated in the initial review. Coupled with extensive

research, the text uses these stories to describe how the review came into being and what impacts it has on participants and the public.

Gilman, H. (2016). Engaging citizens: Participatory budgeting and the inclusive governance movement within the United States. *Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation*.

From the editor: This paper provides a brief overview of the genesis of participatory budgeting and its current incarnations in the United States. It situates the participatory budgeting process within a larger context of civic innovation strategies occurring across America. The paper outlines the institutional challenges and proposes assessment criteria to be considered when implementing civic and social innovations such as participatory budgeting.

Gilman, H. (2016). *Democracy reinvented.: Participatory budgeting and civic innovation in America*. Brookings Institution Press.

Book description: *Democracy Reinvented* is the first comprehensive academic treatment of participatory budgeting in the United States, situating it within a broader trend of civic technology and innovation. This global phenomenon, which has been called “revolutionary civics in action” by the New York Times, started in Brazil in 1989 but came to America only in 2009. Participatory budgeting empowers citizens to identify community needs, work with elected officials to craft budget proposals, and vote on how to spend public funds.

*Democracy Reinvented* places participatory budgeting within the larger discussion of the health of U.S. democracy and focuses on the enabling political and institutional conditions. Author and former White House policy adviser Hollie Russon Gilman presents theoretical insights, indepth case studies, and interviews to offer a compelling alternative to the current citizen disaffection and mistrust of government. She offers policy recommendations on how to tap online tools and other technological and civic innovations to promote more inclusive governance.

While most literature tends to focus on institutional changes without solutions, this book suggests practical ways to empower citizens to become change agents. *Democracy Reinvented* also includes a discussion on the challenges and opportunities that come with using digital tools to re-engage citizens in governance.

Gilman, H. (2016). *Participatory budgeting and civic tech: The revival of citizen engagement*. Georgetown University Press.

Description: In a time when citizens are deeply dissatisfied with the basic institutions and elected officials that govern them, the participatory budgeting movement empowers citizens to get results for pressing community needs. It creates a transparent process



where citizens can propose projects through traditional community meetings or use civic technologies to provide input online, work with elected officials to craft budget proposals, and vote on where and how to spend public funds. Unlike other forms of civic engagement, participatory budgeting involves spending real public money on the priorities that the community identifies.

In this brief work, Hollie Russon Gilman explains the history and concepts of participatory budgeting. First used abroad, participatory budgeting has been piloted in Chicago, New York City, Boston, and several other cities across the United States since 2009. She relates participatory budgeting to other forms of civic innovation and proposes ways for new digital tools to increase entry points for civic engagement. This brief and accessible work is an ideal introduction to participatory budgeting for students, scholars, and practitioners.

Goldfrank, B. (2006). Lessons from Latin American experience in participatory budgeting.

Within a relatively short period, from 1990 to 2005, “participatory budgeting” (PB), or *orçamento participativo* in the original Portuguese, has evolved dramatically. What was once an obscure process of popular participation championed by a few parties on the left in South America as a step towards reinventing socialism has become a “best practice” in the mainstream international development community’s toolkit for reducing poverty and practicing good governance. Depending on how strictly one defines PB, it has expanded from about a dozen cities mostly in Brazil to somewhere between 250 and 2,500 locales throughout Latin America alone. The smaller figure would include those cities where PB began as a local government initiative, while the larger figure would include all the municipal governments recently required by national laws to consult civil society organizations on budget priorities, such as Bolivia’s 327 municipalities, Nicaragua’s 153 municipalities, and Peru’s 1,821 districts, 194 provinces, and 25 regions. Whether this diffusion of PB is seen as cause for celebration or cause for alarm should depend on both how PB is interpreted and how it is being implemented in its new environs. Interpretations of PB, especially as practiced in Porto Alegre, the Brazilian city that named and publicized it, abound. Yet studies of how PB is practiced, especially outside of Brazil, are only beginning to emerge. Most importantly, systematic comparisons of the variety of ways in which PB is designed and implemented in practice remain exceptional.

Then later in the introduction: Nonetheless, a few general lessons do emerge. First, national legal mandates for PB have not created widespread local success in encouraging citizen participation, fiscal transparency, and effective municipal government. This is partially because designers of national laws had other goals in mind (possibly in addition to these goals) and partially because of local obstacles, including reluctant mayors or opposition parties, weak fiscal and administrative capacity of municipal governments, and fragmented, conflict-ridden civic associations. Second, despite the foregoing, PB has succeeded along the dimensions listed above in some remarkably diverse locales, from small, poverty-stricken, indigenous, rural villages to major cities with residents of various

ethnic, sectoral, and class identities. While carefully identifying necessary and/or sufficient conditions will require further study, success seems correlated with several factors in varying combinations: the mayor is either indigenous or from a party on the left (or both), opposition from local political elites is weak or non-existent, project funding and/or technical assistance are provided by national or international aid organizations, the municipality has revenues sufficient to make significant investments in public works or programs, and there is a tradition of participation and cooperation within and among local civic associations and/or indigenous customary organizations that has not been destroyed by guerrilla warfare or clientelist politics.

Third, even where PB succeeds on some dimensions, it does not dramatically reduce poverty (especially in terms of income) on its own, which is a key shared goal of all its promoters. For this to occur in the future, fundamental principles of participatory budgeting as originally conceived – transparency, direct participation, redistribution towards the poor – would need to be applied not only to national levels of government but to international policy-making institutions as well, and under conditions similar to those associated with the local success cases. While at first glance these conditions seem unlikely in the near future, one may find countervailing signals in the current wave of left-leaning presidents in much of Latin America, the democratizing pressure from social movements organizing in venues such as the World Social Forum, and the recent moves towards re-thinking on the part of international financial institutions and aid agencies.

Goldfrank, B. (2012). The World Bank and the globalization of participatory budgeting. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 8, 1-18.

This article addresses the long-standing controversy over the World Bank's role in the promotion of participatory budgeting (PB). Some on the left have celebrated the Bank's funding and advocacy for PB as signifying the legitimacy or mainstream success of the process, while others see the Bank's endorsement of PB as a sign that participatory budgeting is becoming watered down and losing its transformative potential, if it ever had such potential. This debate has mostly been an ideological one, and little research has been done to provide evidence to either side. The article is the first to address what the Bank is doing to promote PB and why. It makes six main points. First, the originators of participatory budgeting, the Workers' Party in Brazil, is not promoting it as strongly as it used to. Second, the World Bank has become the most active promoter of PB (perhaps alongside the United Nations Development Program). Third, within the Bank, some promote PB as part of its fairly standard pro-market agenda, while others share many of the same goals as PB's originators. Fourth, though the Bank has become very important for the diffusion of PB, overall PB remains marginal within the Bank. Fifth, the Bank has little influence over the eventual outcomes of PB in different countries because it has little or no control over many of the factors that affect PB in practice. And sixth, because PB's effects have strong potential to be positive, the Bank's role in promoting PB should be encouraged.

Godwin, M. L. (2018). Studying participatory budgeting: Democratic innovation or budgeting tool? *State and local government review*, 50, 132–144.

Participatory budgeting (PB) is increasingly being used by local governments. The first American PB process was in Chicago in 2009 and built upon processes developed in Brazil. The adoption of PB programs in the United States has been closely tied to deliberative democracy and public engagement scholarship. As a result, PB research has benefited from detailed evaluations conducted as the first PB programs were implemented. This review essay also identifies research findings and topics for additional research. Public administration scholars and practitioners can especially contribute to this emerging literature by examining budget outcomes and the perspectives of public sector employees.

Gordon, V., Osgood, J. J. L., & Boden, D. (2016). *Participatory budgeting in the United States: A guide for local governments*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Book description: Although citizen engagement is a core public service value, few public administrators receive training on how to share leadership with people outside the government. *Participatory Budgeting in the United States* serves as a primer for those looking to understand a classic example of participatory governance, engaging local citizens in examining budgetary constraints and priorities before making recommendations to local government. Utilizing case studies and an original set of interviews with community members, elected officials, and city employees, this book provides a rare window onto the participatory budgeting process through the words and experiences of the very individuals involved. The central themes that emerge from these fascinating and detailed cases focus on three core areas: creating the participatory budgeting infrastructure; increasing citizen participation in participatory budgeting; and assessing and increasing the impact of participatory budgeting. This book provides students, local government elected officials, practitioners, and citizens with a comprehensive understanding of participatory budgeting and straightforward guidelines to enhance the process of civic engagement and democratic values in local communities.

Hagelskamp, C., Silliman, R., B. Godfrey, E., & Schleifer, D. (2020). Shifting priorities: Participatory budgeting in New York City is associated with increased investments in schools, street and traffic improvements, and public housing. *New Political Science*, 42, 171–196.

Abstract: In participatory budgeting (PB), residents instead of public officials decide how public money is spent. PB may reveal that residents prioritize different investments than public officials, which could lead to more socially just spending. However, little research has examined whether and how PB shifts spending priorities. This study leverages publicly available records on New York City council districts' capital project allocations over ten years (2009 through 2018), comparing spending within and across PB and non-PB districts. Multi-level regression models show that, on average, when council districts

adopted PB, greater proportions of their discretionary capital budgets were allocated to schools, streets and traffic improvements, and public housing. PB was associated with decreases in spending on parks and recreation projects and housing preservation and development projects. The article shows that priorities shift when residents are directly involved in budgeting. Implications for equity and community well-being, and directions for future research are discussed.

Hagelskamp, Rinehart, Siliman & Schleifer (2016). *Public spending, by the people: Participatory budgeting in the United States and Canada in 2014-15*. Public Agenda.

Evaluation report. From the executive summary: A total of 46 jurisdictions across 13 cities in the U.S. and Canada undertook PB between July 2014 and June 2015.<sup>1</sup> During that time, public officials allocated nearly US\$50 million to PB projects.<sup>2</sup> Over 70,000 residents participated and more than 350 projects won public funding. Only six years earlier, just one council ward in Chicago and a large public housing community in Toronto were doing PB.

This report provides an unprecedented summary of key facts and figures of the 2014–15 PB cycle in the U.S. and Canada. It highlights the size and scope of PB in 2014–15 and illustrates substantial variability in how communities implemented and participated in PB. With this publication, we seek to inform and significantly further ongoing debates about and practices of PB in the U.S. and Canada.

Hagelskamp, C., Schleifer, D., Rinehart, C., & Silliman, R. (2018). Participatory budgeting: Could it diminish health disparities in the United States? *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 95, 766–771.

Abstract: Participatory budgeting (PB)—a democratic process where ordinary residents decide directly how to spend part of a public budget—has gained impressive momentum in US municipalities, spreading from one pilot project in Chicago’s 49thward in 2009 to 50 active PB processes across 14 cities in 2016–2017. Over 93,600 US residents voted in a PB process in 2015–2016, deciding over a total of about \$49.5 million and funding 264 projects intended to improve their communities. The vast majority of US PB processes take place in large urban centers (e.g., New York City, Chicago, Seattle, Boston), but PB has also recently spread to some smaller cities and towns [1]. Figure 1 illustrates the growth of PB processes in the USA, and within New York City and Chicago council districts specifically. PB constitutes a rare form of public engagement in that it typically comprises several distinct stages that encourage residents to participate from project idea collection to project implementation (see Fig. 2). The decisive public vote in US PB is practically binding as elected officials commit to implementing the public decision at the outset of the process. Moreover, all current PB processes in the USA have expanded voting rights to residents under 18 years old and to non-citizens. Under President Obama, the White House recognized PB as a model for open governance. Participatory Budgeting Project, a nonprofit organization that advocates for PB, won the 2014 Brown Democracy Medal,

which recognizes the best work being done to advance democracy in the USA and internationally. PB has been lauded for its potential to energize local democracy, contribute to more equitable public spending and help reduce inequality [2, 3]. Social justice goals have been explicit in US PB from the start. Grassroots advocates, technical assistance providers, and many elected officials who have adopted it emphasize that PB must focus on engaging underrepresented and marginalized communities [2, 4, 5]. PB steering committees have specified equity and inclusiveness goals in PB rule books [6, 7]. The most conclusive research so far on PB's potential to reduce social inequalities, however, comes from Brazil, where PB started in 1989. In Brazil, PB has been associated with a reduction in extreme work with other community members—have a different impact on individuals than participation at the voting stage only. As the former offer residents more sustained engagement opportunities, they should have more impact on psychological empowerment. Finally, empowerment theory suggests that individual health benefits in municipalities that regularly implement PB might go beyond effects on the most engaged participants to greater well-being for residents generally, by means of living in this politically more empowering context [11].

Harnecker, M. (1999). El presupuesto participativo en Porto Alegre: Delegando poder el la gente.

From the description: El Presupuesto Participativo, teoría y práctica, se hace en cada página más claro, más vivo, gana movimiento, emociona. Al intervenir con sus preguntas en los momentos exactos, la autora cambia el rumbo del discurso político, ayuda a disipar dudas, estimula la imaginación de los actores, concentra el debate sobre lo fundamental. El Presupuesto Participativo se hace transparente y deja ver lo que hay de fascinante e innovador en su desafío. Eso en todos los azimutes: decisión política, participación, problemas humanos, cuestiones administrativas, sociales, ideológicas, etcétera.

Holdo, M. (2020). Contestation in participatory budgeting: Spaces, boundaries, and agency. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 64, 1348–1365.

Abstract: Local political leaders as well as international organizations have embraced participatory budgeting in response to problems of political exclusion and citizens' dissatisfaction with representative democracy. This article provides a framework to highlight important aspects of the politics of participation. The framework allows scholars to explore how factors external to spaces of participation interact with aspects of participation within them. The framework conceptualizes participatory budgeting as political spaces, whose boundaries are shaped by ideologies, interests, and patterns of social exclusion. In dynamic spaces, such boundaries are constantly renegotiated and contestation helps maintain their openness. In static spaces, by contrast, predefined boundaries are imposed on participants who may accept or reject them. Empirical examples of participatory budgeting illustrate the usefulness of this framework. The article ends by discussing key avenues for further research.

Innes, J. E. & Booher, D. E. Reframing public participation: Strategies for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 4, 419-436.

Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (1998). Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 19, 173-202.

Abstract: Community-based research in public health focuses on social, structural, and physical environmental inequities through active involvement of community members, organizational representatives, and researchers in all aspects of the research process. Partners contribute their expertise to enhance understanding of a given phenomenon and to integrate the knowledge gained with action to benefit the community involved. This review provides a synthesis of key principles of community-based research, examines its place within the context of different scientific paradigms, discusses rationales for its use, and explores major challenges and facilitating factors and their implications for conducting effective community-based research aimed at improving the public's health.

Jabola-Carolus, I., Elliot-Negri, L., Jasper, J. M., Malbacher, J., Weisskircher, M. & Zhelnina, A. (2018). Strategic interaction sequences, The institutionalization of participatory budgeting in New York City. *Social Movement Studies*, 19, 640-656.

Abstract: This article makes the case that legally required participation methods in the US not only do not meet most basic goals for public participation, but they are also counterproductive, causing anger and mistrust. Both theory and practice are dominated by ambivalence about the idea of participation itself. Both struggle with dilemmas that make the problems seem insoluble, such as the conflict between the individual and collective interest or between the ideal of democracy and the reality that many voices are never heard. Cases are used to draw on an emerging set of practices of collaborative public engagement from around the world to demonstrate how alternative methods can better meet public participation goals and how they make moot most of the dilemmas of more conventional practice. Research shows that collaborative participation can solve complex, contentious problems such as budget decision making and create an improved climate for future action when bitter disputes divide a community. Authentic dialogue, networks and institutional capacity are the key elements. The authors propose that participation should be understood as a multi-way set of interactions among citizens and other players who together produce outcomes. Next steps involve developing an alternative practice framework, creating forums and arenas, adapting agency decision processes, and providing training and financial support.

Kasdan, A., & Markman, E. (2017). Participatory budgeting and community-based research: principles, practices, and implications for impact validity. *New Political Science*, 39, 143–155.

Abstract: Research and evaluation is an integral part of the Participatory Budgeting (PB) process. Since PB in New York City (PBNYC) is designed to be a democratic and community-based initiative that is grounded in the values of equity and inclusion, it is important that the research and evaluation methods used to study the process and its participants adhere to the same principles. For the past five years, a team of community-based researchers, academics, and PB participants have designed research questions and instruments, implemented data collection, analyzed and shared data with PB participants and practitioners, and issued reports to the wider public. Like PB, the research design is rooted in the communities where PB is operating. The research is not intended to sit on a shelf but is actively used by participants and practitioners to help reflect on the process, improve deliberation in decision-making, and strengthen the process and outcomes of PB. This article will discuss Participatory Action Research principles used by the Community Development Project of the Urban Justice Center, explore the applicability of these principles to the Participatory Budgeting research context, and explain how these practices have helped to deepen and improve the process and outcomes of PBNYC.

Koonings, K. (2004). Strengthening citizenship in Brazil's democracy: Local participatory governance in Porto Alegre. *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 21, 79-99.

Abstract: In Latin America, and particularly Brazil, inequality and social exclusion continue to plague the quality of democracy despite two decades of transition and consolidation. Still, in Brazil, the Workers' Party has been remarkably successful over the past decade, explicitly addressing the problem of social exclusion and 'incomplete citizenship'. This paper provides an analysis of the case of Porto Alegre covering the four Workers' Party municipal administrations from 1989 to the present in order to assess the significance of social incorporation and citizenship for the quality of democracy in Brazil. The paper discusses some conceptual notions that are relevant for the question of democracy in Brazil, particularly the role of citizenship and civil society in 'deepening' democracy. Then the paper goes into the evolution and dynamics of Porto Alegre's system of 'participatory budgeting'. The paper's assessment of this experience with respect to its performance, depth and robustness shows that 'participatory budgeting' has had positive effects with respect to the provision of public goods services, the quality of governance, and citizens' participation in what is seen as a new 'public space' shared by the local state and grass roots organizations. The paper concludes by relating the case experience to the question of citizenship, civil society and democracy and by reflecting upon its wider implications for the current and future quality of democracy in Brazil.

Krenjova, J., & Raudla, R. (2013). Participatory budgeting at the local level: Challenges and opportunities for new democracies.

Abstract: The main goals of this paper are to examine the existing models of participatory budgeting (PB), to match the various models to different constellations of contextual variables and to investigate the applicability of PB in the new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE). First, the article gives an overview of the different (Western)

European PB models put forth in the existing literature (Porto Alegre adapted for Europe, proximity participation, consultation on public finance, multistakeholder participation, and community participatory budgeting) and outlines the main environmental variables (financial autonomy, political culture, the size, heterogeneity and prosperity of the local government (LG) units) that are likely to influence the applicability and feasibility of PB in different LGs. As a second step, the paper analyses the links between different PB models and the environmental variables: it examines under which conditions each of the PB models would be applicable and advisable. As a third step, the article discusses the applicability of different PB models in the new democracies in the CEE region. As the analysis shows, limited financial autonomy of the local governments and the prevailing political culture (combined with weak civil society) are likely to constitute the main challenges to implementing PB in CEE countries, especially if the implementation of the Porto Alegre model is considered. At the same time, PB could be used to encourage the development of participatory culture in the region and to foster genuine decentralisation.

Lerner, J. (2011). Building community agreement around tough budget decisions. *National Civic Review*, 30-35.

Intro text, middle headlines, outro: In Chicago's Rogers Park neighborhood, April 10, 2010, was a day of reckoning. Over the past year, dozens of community members had been organizing an experiment in democracy—ordinary residents were going to decide directly how to spend city budget dollars. Not just give their opinions, but actually make decisions. The organizers showed up early in the morning to the large school cafeteria that was hosting the final public vote. No one knew, though, if people would really turn out...Reinventing democracy in Brazil...From Porto Alegre to the world...Putting democracy on the menu in Chicago: If citizens have enough time, information, and support, they will make good budget decisions. And if elected officials agree to carry out these decisions, people will turn out and come together. By giving up some power, Alderman Moore gained more public support, recently winning reelection with 72 percent of the vote. Several other Chicago aldermen have also pledged to implement PB, and politicians from New York to California are considering launching their own initiatives. With enough political will, a new kind of grassroots democracy may be sprouting up.

Lerner, J. (2016). The people's budget. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. (Book review of Hollie Russon Gilman's *Democracy Reinvented: Participatory budgeting and civic innovation in America*)

Summary: Review of Hollie Russon Gilman's *Democracy Reinvented: Participatory budgeting and civic innovation in America*. Mostly agreeing with book, wishes there was more evidence in the US context provided to back up the conclusions. Lerner's biggest critique is that Gilman seems to think technology will drive civic engagement instead of deliberate organizing on the left.



Lerner, J. (2017). Conclusion: Time for participatory budgeting to grow up. *New Political Science*, 39, 156–160.

Abstract: Only a few years ago, participatory budgeting (PB) in the US was in its infancy, a tiny experiment in democracy. After a five-year growth spurt, PB has entered its awkward adolescence, full of bold achievements, flashes of potential, and some stumbles. PBNYC's innovation has raised new questions for participatory democracy, as the contributors to this special issue highlight. In this article, I lift up the key impacts and challenges that they discuss, and their practical implications. I argue that for PBNYC and other PB processes to grow up, city leaders need to invest in equity, expand project eligibility and funding, and scale PB up to the city level.

Lerner, J., & Secondo, D. (2012). By the people, for the people: Participatory budgeting from the bottom up in North America. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 8, 1-9.

Abstract: In the pilot year of Participatory Budgeting in New York City, around 8,000 people decided how to spend almost \$6 million across four city districts. After years advocating for participatory budgeting (PB) in the US, our organization - The Participatory Budgeting Project (PBP) - served as lead technical assistance partner. In this article, we share some of the lessons learned from our work in New York and other North American cities. Two main concerns have haunted PB in the US (and elsewhere) - that it will only attract the "usual suspects" and that it will merely be a token effort. We argue for tackling these challenges by crafting PB around four key principles - strategic funds, grassroots leaders, accessible design, and targeted outreach. Through this bottom-up approach, PB can better achieve its potential to transform democracy and build social justice - in North America and beyond.

Lerner, J. & Van Wagner, E. (2006). Participatory budgeting in Canada: Democratic innovations in strategic spaces. *Transnational Institute; unedited chapter in forthcoming book "Progressive Cities" edited by Daniel Chavez and Einaar Braathen.*

Research and evaluation is an integral part of the Participatory Budgeting (PB) process. Since PB in New York City (PBNYC) is designed to be a democratic and community-based initiative that is grounded in the values of equity and inclusion, it is important that the research and evaluation methods used to study the process and its participants adhere to the same principles. For the past five years, a team of community-based researchers, academics, and PB participants have designed research questions and instruments, implemented data collection, analyzed and shared data with PB participants and practitioners, and issued reports to the wider public. Like PB, the research design is rooted in the communities where PB is operating. The research is not intended to sit on a shelf but is actively used by participants and practitioners to help reflect on the process, improve deliberation in decision-making, and strengthen the process and outcomes of PB. This article will discuss Participatory Action Research principles used by the Community Development Project of the Urban Justice Center,

explore the applicability of these principles to the Participatory Budgeting research context, and explain how these practices have helped to deepen and improve the process and outcomes of PBNYC.

Marquetti, A., Schonerwald da Silva, C. E., & Campbell, A. (2012). Participatory economic democracy in action: Participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre, 1989–2004. *Review of Radical Political Economics, 44*, 62–81

Abstract: This paper is a case study of a particularly important and well known experiment in participatory economic democracy, participatory budgeting (PB) in Porto Alegre under the Workers' Party. Its intention is to draw both positive and negative lessons from this experience. There are three fundamental parts to the paper. The first part sets the frame for understanding this experiment by reviewing several relevant considerations of participatory democracy in general, and then describing the institutional structure of Porto Alegre's PB. The second part is an empirical investigation for this case of three central issues in participatory economic democracy: participation, the nature of choices, and the resulting redistribution. A third part considers a number of limitations of the PB process as it occurred in Porto Alegre from the perspective of economic democracy.

Malinowski, M. (2014). *The mystery in school finances: Discovering answers in community-based budgeting*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Book description: There are critical roles in the budget process for the Superintendent, Finance Officer, and internal and external stakeholders. The superintendent functions similar to a Chief Executive Officer; they are the main go-between for the board of directors and the district. Providing a vision for the school district as a whole is critical, as well as working to ensure community engagement provides a comprehensive 360-degree perspective – which in turn drives the budget process to ensure it reflects the community served. School budgets, regardless of geography, follow state procedures for both development and final approval. These perfunctory tasks include putting a budget on display for viewing – receipt of public comment and a vote. What this book seeks to provide are ideas for incorporating ongoing community discussion and dialogue on the budget process. This book additionally provides insight and information unto the budget process that drives all school decisions.

Malinowski, M. J., & Davis, D. G. (2011). Taking another path: Community-based budgeting. *School Business Affairs, 77*, 10-12.

Abstract: Given the current economic constraints facing the country, school districts in the U.S. have been pushed to develop annual budgets through a new lens and to accept the reality that budget adoption is a complex, political process. Whether a school district is rich or poor, growing or declining in enrollment, serving a specialized population or relying primarily on state or local revenue, there seems to be general public

dissatisfaction with the school district budget process. During the past budget year, the School District of Cheltenham Township ventured down a different path to final budget adoption. Of utmost importance was what Stephen Covey, in his book "The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People," labeled "Habit 2: Begin with the End in Mind." For the School District of Cheltenham Township, the "end" was to develop a budget that supported a school system according to the district motto--Where Excellence Begins with Education--and valued the unique programs in academics, arts, and athletics. The end also needed to be accomplished through community collaboration. In this article, the authors describe how the school district designed the budgeting process.

Maniscalco, C. S. & Maniscalco, P. M. (2000). Budget 101: Introduction to the budget process for non-financial managers. *Emergency Medical Services*, 1-9.

Introduction: Ugh! Not the budget again! How many times have we heard this muttered under ones breath when requested to participate in the development or modification of our organizations budget? But this does not have to be the instinctive response when confronted with budgets. Budgets are not as intimidating as they seem.

Morgan, D. F., Robinson, K. S., Strachota, D., & Hough, James. A. (2015). *Budgeting for local governments and communities*. M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Description: This text is designed to serve as a primary textbook for a course in public budgeting and finance in public administration. The textbook features sections devoted to general concepts of local public budgeting, revenues and budgeting, expenditure formats for decision and control, and executive priorities, budget adoption, and implementation. The authors have paid special attention to integrating theory and practice throughout, covering budgeting as a central political activity and the legal, historical, and moral foundations of budgeting.

Pape, M., & Lerner, J. (2016). Budgeting for equity: How can participatory budgeting advance equity in the United States? *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 12, 1-15.

Participatory budgeting (PB) has expanded dramatically in the United States (US) from a pilot process in Chicago's 49th ward in 2009 to over 50 processes in a dozen cities in 2015. Over this period, scholars, practitioners, and advocates have made two distinct but related claims about its impacts: that it can revitalize democracy and advance equity. In practice, however, achieving the latter has often proven challenging. Based on interviews with PB practitioners from across the US, we argue that an equity-driven model of PB is not simply about improving the quality of deliberation or reducing barriers to participation. While both of these factors are critically important, we identify three additional challenges: 1) Unclear Goals: how to clearly define and operationalize equity, 2) Participant Motivations: how to overcome the agendas of individual budget delegates, and 3) Limiting Structures: how to reconfigure the overarching budgetary and bureaucratic constraints that limit PB's contribution to broader change. We suggest

practical interventions for each of these challenges, including stronger political leadership, extending idea collection beyond the initial brainstorming phase, increasing opportunities for interaction between PB participants and their non-participating neighbors, expanding the scope of PB processes, and building stronger linkages between PB and other forms of political action.

Pape, M., & Lim, C. (2019). Beyond the “usual suspects”? Reimagining democracy with participatory budgeting in Chicago. *Sociological Forum*, 34, 861-882.

This article examines whether democratic innovations in the United States attract citizens who are typically underrepresented within existing political institutions. We focus on participatory budgeting, an intervention where residents decide how to allocate a particular pot of public money. Taking “PB Chicago” as our case study, we use survey and interview data to examine whether organizers realized their stated goal of involving residents other than the “usual suspects.” We find that residents who voted in PB Chicago were more often white, college educated, and from higher-income households relative to both the local population and politically active residents in Chicago. While these residents were not necessarily the most active across other stages of the PB Chicago process, we find little evidence that lower socioeconomic status and minority residents were accessing the civic learning and empowerment gains associated with participatory forms of democracy. Outreach made the process more inclusive but was insufficient to overcome several important structural constraints. Of particular note, the needs and interests of less privileged residents were not met by the narrow capital works focus of PB Chicago. We suggest that when implemented under such conditions, participatory budgeting risks deepening existing political and social inequalities.

Peck, J. & Theodore, N. (2015). *Fast Policy: Experimental Statecraft at the Thresholds of Neoliberalism*. University of Minnesota Press.

Book description: Fast Policy is the first systematic treatment of this phenomenon, one that compares processes of policy development across two rapidly moving fields that emerged in the Global South and have quickly been adopted world wide—conditional cash transfers (a social policy program that conditions payments on behavioral compliance) and participatory budgeting (a form of citizen-centric urban governance). Jamie Peck and Nik Theodore critically analyze the growing transnational connectivity between policymaking arenas and modes of policy development, assessing the implications of these developments for contemporary policymaking. Emphasizing that policy models do not simply travel intact from sites of invention to sites of emulation, they problematize fast policy as a phenomenon that is real and consequential yet prone to misrepresentation.

Petite, W. (2020). The promise and limitations of participatory budgeting. *Canadian Public Administration*, 63, 522-527.

Introductory text: Once heralded a “new terrain” for the assembly of a “participatory public” (Avritzer 2006; Wampler and Avritzer 2004) and a form of “revolutionary civics” (Sangha 2012), participatory budgeting has developed a strong foothold as a public engagement technique used by various levels of government, primarily at the municipal level.

Pinnington, E., Lerner, J., & Schugurensky, D. (2009). Participatory budgeting in North America: The case of Guelph, Canada. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, 21, 454–483.

In 1989, the Brazilian city of Porto Alegre initiated a model of budget participation known internationally as "participatory budgeting." In this process of diagnosis, deliberation and decision-making, city residents directly decide how to allocate part of a public budget, typically at the level of municipal government. During the past two decades, hundreds of cities in Latin America, Europe, Asia, and Africa have adapted this model of participatory democracy to their own contexts. In this article, we explore one of the first Canadian experiments of participatory budgeting. In Guelph, Ontario, a civil society organization called the Neighbourhood Support Coalition uses participatory budgeting to allocate of public and private funds. We discuss the Canadian context for this experiment, as well as the history and evolution of participatory budgeting in Guelph. Based on four years of interviews, ethnographic observation, and primary and secondary literature, we identify several lessons learned through the Guelph process, as well as the conditions that have enabled its development and posed challenges for its success.

Rubin, I. (Ed.). (1988). *New Directions in Budget Theory*. State University of New York Press.

This collection is the first book-length work in many years to provide new theoretical direction to budget theory. Written by several of the most respected people in budgeting, including Allen Schick, Naomi Caiden, and Lance LeLoup, it explores such current topics as the scope of budgeting, the degree and source of variation in budgeting, and changes in budgeting process over time. *New Directions* will help to build a framework that is less confining than incrementalism, and will stimulate and guide future research. Some of the essays deal with the implications of looking at budgeting from a multi-year perspective, and the importance of allocating sources other than money (such as personnel ceilings); others pose questions about what a budget theory should look like, and how many budget theories are needed.

Secondo, D & Lerner, J. (2011). Our money, our decision: Participatory budgeting takes root in New York City. *Social Policy*, 22-25.

Intro text: Participatory Budgeting was launched in October 2011 in New York City (PBNYC)-the largest PB process in the US. A joint initiative of four New York City Council Members and dozens of organizations, it allows New Yorkers across the city to decide directly how to spend millions of taxpayer dollars. By bringing together diverse partners

to design and implement the participatory process, PBNYC has emerged as a model for bottom-up, community-based governance. And by coordinating this work across four council districts, it shows how to scale up local democratic processes, while still maintaining community control.

Shah, A. (Ed.). (2007). *Participatory Budgeting*. The World Bank.

From the editor: This series represents a response to several independent evaluations in recent years that have argued that development practitioners and policy makers dealing with public sector reforms in developing countries and, indeed, anyone with a concern for effective public governance could benefit from a synthesis of newer perspectives on public sector reforms. This series distills current wisdom and presents tools of analysis for improving the efficiency, equity, and efficacy of the public sector. Leading public policy experts and practitioners have contributed to this series.

The first 14 volumes in this series, listed below, are concerned with public sector accountability for prudent fiscal management; efficiency, equity, and integrity in public service provision; safeguards for the protection of the poor, women, minorities, and other disadvantaged groups; ways of strengthening institutional arrangements for voice, choice, and exit; means of ensuring public financial accountability for integrity and results; methods of evaluating public sector programs, fiscal federalism, and local finances; international practices in local governance; and a framework for responsive and accountable governance.

- Fiscal Management
- Public Services Delivery
- Public Expenditure Analysis
- Local Governance in Industrial Countries
- Local Governance in Developing Countries
- Intergovernmental Fiscal Transfers: Principles and Practice
- Participatory Budgeting
- Budgeting and Budgetary Institutions
- Local Budgeting
- Local Public Financial Management
- Performance Accountability and Combating Corruption
- Tools for Public Sector Evaluations
- Macrofederalism and Local Finances
- Citizen-Centered Governance

Shybalkina, I., & Bifulco, R. (2019). Does participatory budgeting change the share of public funding to low income neighborhoods? Participatory budgeting and the distribution of resources. *Public Budgeting & Finance*, 39, 45–66.

Abstract: Using a newly compiled dataset, we measure the effects of participatory budgeting on the allocation of capital funding among areas of different income levels within New York City council districts. A difference-in-differences design compares changes in the allocation of funding in adopting districts before and after the adoption of participatory budgeting to changes over the same period among a control group consisting of later adopters. On average, adopting districts increase funding in the next to the lowest income census tracts more than the control group, but participatory budgeting does not redirect funds to the lowest income census tracts.

Sintomer, Y., Herzberg, C., & Röcke, A. (2008). Participatory budgeting in Europe: Potentials and challenges. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 32, 164-178.

The ‘transfer’ of participatory budgeting from Brazil to Europe has been a highly differentiated process. In Porto Alegre, this innovative methodology enabled democratization and social justice to be articulated. In Europe, participatory budgeting relies on multiple procedures, and it is therefore necessary to give a clear methodological definition of it so that cases can be coherently compared and ideal-types constructed to understand the variety of concrete experiments. The six ideal-types we propose (Porto Alegre adapted for Europe; representation of organized interests; community funds at the local and city level; the public/private negotiating table; consultation on public finances; proximity participation) show striking differences that are highly influenced by existing participatory traditions. It is, above all, with the models Porto Alegre adapted for Europe and community funds that an ‘empowered participatory governance’ can develop and that a fourth power, beyond the three classical ones, is developing — that of the citizenry when it directly (or through delegates) assumes a decision-making power. However, other models have their strengths, too, for example with regard to the reform of public administration which is a critical aspect in the search for ‘another possible world’.

Sobanjo, B. A. (2016). Strengthening participatory democracy through participatory budgeting. *Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies*.

Although participatory budgeting (PB) was introduced in Sub-Saharan Africa in 2005, it has yet to be widely adopted. While PB has great potential to enhance citizen participation in the democratic process, little academic research has focused on the utility of PB as a mechanism for citizen empowerment in the region. The purpose of this case study was to gain further understanding of the role of civil society in educating and empowering the citizens of Ijede LCDA in Lagos State, Nigeria to participate effectively in budgetary decision-making processes. The data were gathered from 15 semi-structured, one-on-one interviews of purposefully selected participants that included adult citizens

of Ijede, government officials, politicians, and representatives of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) connected to the budget process, two follow-up focus groups with participants, and analysis of government budgetary documents. Using Avritzer's theory of participatory institutions as the foundation, the study explored stakeholder perceptions of how citizens can be effectively educated and empowered to participate in the PB process. The data revealed the fragility of PB when local government officials suspended the process because other financial demands were considered more expedient than PB, a situation made possible in the absence of a legal framework institutionalizing the process. Another major theme uncovered is that PB must engage community-based organizations to be effective. Positive social change in the form of enhanced citizen participation in the political process can come about in Nigeria if PB is implemented under an institutionalized legal framework that guarantees sustainability.

Stewart, L. M., Miller, S. A., Hildreth, R. W., & Wright-Phillips, M. V. (2014). Participatory budgeting in the United States: A preliminary analysis of Chicago's 49th ward experiment. *New Political Science*, 36, 193–218.

Abstract: This paper presents a preliminary analysis of the first participatory budgeting experiment in the United States, in Chicago's 49th Ward. There are two avenues of inquiry: First, does participatory budgeting result in different budgetary priorities than standard practices? Second, do projects meet normative social justice outcomes? It is clear that allowing citizens to determine municipal budget projects results in very different outcomes than standard procedures. Importantly, citizens in the 49th Ward consistently choose projects that the research literature classifies as low priority. The results are mixed, however, when it comes to social justice outcomes. While there is no clear pattern in which projects are located only in affluent sections of the ward, there is evidence of geographic clustering. Select areas are awarded projects like community gardens, dog parks, and playgrounds, while others are limited to street resurfacing, sidewalk repairs, bike racks, and bike lanes. Based on our findings, we offer suggestions for future programmatic changes.

Su, C. (2016). Re-engaging the disenfranchised: Participatory budgeting in the United States; Review of democracy reinvented: Participatory budgeting and civic innovation in America, Brookings Institution Press, 2016. *National Civic Review*, 105, 23–28.

Intro text: Corin Mills, a young man from New York City, was not always confident in his ability to complete long-term projects, let alone attend college. He had dropped out of high school and served a brief jail sentence. Then, through an organization called Getting Out Staying Out, Mills became involved in participatory budgeting (PB)—a process in which community members, rather than elected officials, allocate public funds. Mills vetted project ideas pitched by his neighbors, and helped to develop a proposal for a mobile laptop lab to be shared by nine public schools. When his proposal won \$450,000, Mills built upon his new skills and accomplishment to apply to and attend college; he even



launched a successful scholarship crowdfunding campaign that movingly related his struggles.

Su, C. (2017). Beyond inclusion: Critical race theory and participatory budgeting. *New Political Science*, 39, 126-142.

Critical Race Theory (CRT) researchers maintain that mainstream liberal discourses of neutrality and colorblindness inherently reify existing patterns of inequality, and that privileging the voices of people of color and the marginalized is essential to addressing issues of equity and equality. Participatory budgeting (PB) aims, too, to include the voices of the marginalized in substantive policy-making. Through a CRT lens, I examine the ways in which the New York City PB process has thus far worked to simultaneously disrupt and maintain racial hierarchies. I pay particular attention to how social constructions of the “good project” shape the discourses around community priorities and winning projects—especially in the areas of security/policing and education. While the New York PB process has successfully reached out to and effectively enfranchised traditionally marginalized constituents, including communities of color, its current focus on districts and the voting phase, alongside limited work on critical praxis, limits the extent to which these newly enfranchised constituents can problematize larger funding formulas and criteria in public budgets.

Su, C. (2017). From Porto Alegre to New York City: Participatory budgeting and democracy. *New Political Science*, 39, 67-75.

Because of its popularity, there is now a large literature examining how participatory budgeting (PB) deepens participation by the poor and redistributes resources. Closer examinations of recent cases of PB can help us to better understand the political configurations in which these new participatory democratic spaces are embedded, and articulate the conditions that might lead to more meaningful outcomes. Who participates? For whose benefit? The articles in this symposium, on participatory budgeting in New York City (PBNYC), highlight both strengths and challenges of the largest American PB process. They focus less on redistribution, more on the dimensions of the process itself and of PBNYC’s successful social inclusion, new dynamics between participants and local politicians, and the subtleties of institutionalization. The symposium also reminds us, however, that contestations over meaningful participation are on-going, and that of all of PBNYC’s multiple goals, equity has proven to be the most elusive.

Swaner, R. (2017). Trust matters: Enhancing government legitimacy through participatory budgeting. *New Political Science*, 39, 95-108.

Legitimacy is a problem of contemporary governance. Communities lack trust in elected officials—in their effectiveness, fairness, and representation of the public interest. Participatory budgeting (PB)—a set of democratic processes where residents determine

how to spend a public budget—helps bridge that distance by letting the public make spending decisions. Since 2011, some of New York City’s (NYC) council members have been implementing PB with their capital budget—setting aside a million dollars in their districts each budget cycle for PB. Participatory budgeting has the potential to rebuild relationships between government and communities. Using data from over eighty interviews conducted by New York University (NYU) graduate students in 2013 and 2014 with PBNYC participants over two years, this article suggests that in council districts using PB, residents have greater feelings of access to and voice in local government, and better understanding of the complexities of spending public monies, often leading to a more positive view of government officials, and bolstering legitimacy of local government.

Touchton, M. & Wampler, B. (2014) Improving social well-being through new democratic institutions. *Comparative Political Studies*, 47, 1442-1469.

Abstract: We evaluate the role of a new type of democratic institution, participatory budgeting (PB), for improving citizens’ well-being. Participatory institutions are said to enhance governance, citizens’ empowerment, and the quality of democracy, creating a virtuous cycle to improve the poor’s well-being. Drawing from an original database of Brazil’s largest cities over the last 20 years, we assess whether adopting PB programs influences several indicators of well-being inputs, processes, and outcomes. We find PB programs are strongly associated with increases in health care spending, increases in civil society organizations, and decreases in infant mortality rates. This connection strengthens dramatically as PB programs remain in place over longer time frames. Furthermore, PB’s connection to well-being strengthens in the hand of mayors from the nationally powerful, ideologically and electorally motivated Workers’ Party. Our argument directly addresses debates on democracy and well-being and has powerful implications for participation, governance, and economic development.

Wampler, B. (2012). Participatory budgeting: Core principles and key impacts. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 8, 1-13.

This essay is a reflection piece. I identify key principles at the core of how PB functions and to discuss the scope of change we might expect to see generated by these institutions. I move beyond the idea that there is a specific model or set of “best practices” that define PB. Rather, it is most fruitful to conceptualize PB as a set of principles that can generate social change. The weaker the adherence to these principles, the less social change generated. The second purpose of the essay is to reflect on the impacts generated by PB. How do these institutions matter? My assumption is that ordinary citizens are more likely to be supportive of new democratic processes if they are able to clearly identify positive changes created by their participation in the new democratic institutions. Ordinary citizens are unlikely to continue to participate in new political institutions unless they perceive that these institutions produce tangible, positive changes in their lives. In this short reflection piece, I analyze how PB may affect democratic legitimacy, social well-being, and civil society.

Wampler, B. (2000). A guide to participatory budgeting.

Intro text: Participatory Budgeting (PB) programs are innovative policymaking processes. Citizens are directly involved in making policy decisions. Forums are held throughout the year so that citizens have the opportunity to allocate resources, prioritize broad social policies, and monitor public spending. These programs are designed incorporate citizens into the policymaking process, spur administrative reform, and distribute public resources to low-income neighborhoods. Social and political exclusion is challenged as low-income and traditionally excluded political actors are given the opportunity to make policy decisions. Governments and citizens initiate these programs to (i) promote public learning and active citizenship, (ii) achieve social justice through improved policies and resources allocation, and (iii) reform the administrative apparatus.

Wampler, B. (2007). *Participatory budgeting in Brazil: Contestation, cooperation, and accountability*. Pennsylvania State University Press.

From chapter 1: Participatory institutions provide citizens with the opportunity to work directly with government officials and their fellow citizens in formal, state-sanctioned public venues, allowing them to exercise voice and vote in decision-making processes to produce public policy solutions that may resolve intense social problems. Close working relationships among citizens and government officials are frequently forged, allowing for collaborative learning and in-depth negotiations. Citizens use newly won political rights to secure new social rights, thereby improving their communities and lives. Participatory institutions adopted in developing-world countries over the past two decades have often been designed to incorporate low-income and politically marginalized individuals who live in poor and underserved neighborhoods. And yet, as we will see, the direct incorporation of citizens and community may also allow government officials to dominate the new institution as well as the agendas of civil society organizations (csos), which subverts the original intent of many participatory institutions—the expansion of rights, authority, and democratic practices to ordinary citizens.

And later: Although there has been a proliferation of participatory institutions in the developing world over the past twenty years, we continue to lack a systematic and comparative accounting of how citizens use these institutions. We also do not understand the full range of political and policy outcomes that have been produced. In this book I analyze Brazil's, and Latin America's, best-known and most widely disseminated participatory institution, Participatory Budgeting (pb), in eight Brazilian municipalities. My goal is to develop a generalizable theoretical explanation to more fully account for how and if citizens and government officials use this innovative institution to extend accountability and establish citizenship rights.

And later: And yet pb programs can also produce weak outcomes that will not transform basic decision-making processes or allow citizens to be directly involved in policy making.

It is possible that poorly performing pb programs will have a negative impact on citizens and csos, which should temper calls for the widespread adoption of participatory institutions as a magic bullet that will transform the lives of poor citizens in poor and industrializing nations. In addition, citizens who participate in some pb programs may have little authority delegated to them, thereby limiting their ability to hold government officials accountable and to use pb as a means to activate and exercise their own rights.

Wampler, B., McNulty, S., & Touchton, M. (2018). *Participatory Budgeting: Spreading Across the Globe*. (a report)

From the introduction: This report originated in response to questions generated by David Sasaki of the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and Laura Bacon of the Omidyar Network. Its original purpose was to better inform the Hewlett Foundation and Omidyar Network on the current status of Participatory Budgeting (PB) programs, research, and impact. In this report, we sum up the current state of our understanding of PB. We focus on several important aspects of PB and how it has evolved in the past twenty years, with an emphasis on the Global South.

This report focuses on ten separate areas. First, we introduce and review the key trends in research in order to identify the parameters of research questions and issues of interests to academic and policy communities. Second, we then describe the spread of PB across the globe and the conditions for its implementation. The third section builds on the previous one and identifies the key issues that adopting governments often have to address when they adapt PB's rules to meet local needs. This section also focuses on specific issues related to the implementation of public works projects and social service programs that PB participants selected. The fourth section explores the potential impact that PB programs are thought to generate.

The fifth section narrows the analysis to focus explicitly on citizen participation and inclusion. The sixth section focuses on the role of technology in PB. The seventh section illuminates issues related to advocacy organizations, donors, and 'PB Champions.' The eighth section focuses on research, with an emphasis on conflicting findings as well as gaps in our knowledge and research opportunities in the near future.

General State of PB Knowledge: There is a vast literature about PB around the world, and several findings emerge regarding themes such as the adoption of PB, the roots of PB, the purpose of PB, and the role of different actors in PB. As the literature grows and evolves, our understanding about some themes, discussed below, is quite coherent. Other themes demand much more work, a topic that comes up again in the final section of this report.

7 key themes:

Adoption

Variation in quality of PB programs and PB outcomes

PB as “radical democracy”

PG as governing technique

Civil society

Inclusion

PB’s impact

Weber, R., Crum, T., & Salinas, E. (2015). The civics of community development: Participatory budgeting in Chicago. *Community Development*, 46, 261–278.