

# Participatory Budgeting in Public Sphere, Governance, Transparency and Participation

Birsen NACAR<sup>1</sup>, Nihat FALAY<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Doç. Dr., Akdeniz Üniversitesi, İİBF, Maliye Bölümü, nacarbirsen@akdeniz.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-9019-9372

<sup>2</sup> Prof. Dr., İstanbul Üniversitesi, İktisat Fakültesi, Maliye Bölümü (Emekli Öğretim Üyesi), ORCID: 0000-0001-7981-8857

**Abstract:** Today's modern cities have many vital problems. Participatory budgeting (PB) plays an important role in solving these problems by ensuring the effective development of democracy. Participatory budgeting, which incorporates democratic elements such as ensuring citizen participation in budget decision-making, increasing accountability and transparency, attempts to solve the problems of the city by increasing communication between citizens and representatives at the local level and creating an organized society. In this way, it can be used as a tool to promote different types of sustainability in the political, economic and social spheres, from creating an organized society that will enable segments of the city with limited opportunities to become effective in the budget process, to social justice, from environmental problems to providing basic health services, clean water and wastewater systems, schools and kindergartens and living spaces for the poor, from the provision of better quality public services to the efficient use of resources due to accurately identified public services, and from corruption, bribery and nepotism to the solution of administrative failures. This study aims to present the concept, emergence, functioning and outcomes of participatory budgeting.

**Keywords:** Participatory Budgeting, Transparency, Governance, Local Government

**Jel Codes :** H61, H72, H83

## *Kamu Alanında Katılımcı Bütçeleme, Yönetişim, Şeffaflık ve Katılım*

**Öz:** Günümüzün modern kentlerinin pek çok yaşamsal sorunu bulunmaktadır. Katılımcı bütçeleme, demokrasinin etkin bir şekilde gelişmesini sağlayarak bu sorunların çözümünde önemli bir rol oynamaktadır. Bütçe kararlarına vatandaş katılımının sağlanması, hesap verebilirliğin ve şeffaflığın artırılması gibi demokratik unsurları bünyesinde barındıran katılımcı bütçeleme, vatandaşlar ve yerel düzeydeki temsilciler arasındaki iletişimi artırarak ve örgütlü bir toplum yaratarak kentin sorunlarını çözmeye çalışır. Bu sayede kentin kısıtlı imkânlarla sahip kesimlerinin bütçe sürecinde etkin olmasını sağlayacak örgütlü bir toplum yaratılmasından sosyal adalete, çevre sorunlarından temel sağlık hizmetlerinin, temiz su ve atık su sistemlerinin, okul ve kreşlerin ve yoksullar için yaşam alanlarının sağlanmasına, daha kaliteli kamu hizmetlerinin sunulmasından doğru tespit edilmiş kamu hizmetleri sayesinde kaynakların verimli kullanılmasına, yolsuzluk, rüşvet ve kayırmacılıktan idari başarısızlıkların çözümüne kadar siyasi, ekonomik ve sosyal alanda farklı sürdürülebilirlik türlerini teşvik etmek için bir araç olarak kullanılabilir. Bu çalışma, katılımcı bütçeleme kavramını, ortaya çıkışını, işleyişini ve sonuçlarını ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır.

**Atıf:** Nacar B., Falay, N. (2024). Participatory Budgeting in Public Sphere, Governance, Transparency and Participation, *Politik Ekonomik Kuram*, 8(1), 149-159.  
<https://doi.org/10.30586/1431542>

Geliş Tarihi: 04.02.2024  
Kabul Tarihi: 07.03.2024



**Telif Hakkı:** © 2024. (CC BY) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Katılımcı Bütçeleme, Şeffaflık, Yönetişim, Yerel Yönetimler

**Jel Kodları:** H61, H72, H83

### 1. Relationship Between State and Civil Society

Democratization has been discussed as a process of creating a relationship between the state and civil society. In this respect theoretical approaches have been outlining for described in this relationship:

1. "The first approach is related to liberal theory. In this approach "civil society is referred to as a self-regulated sphere, autonomous from the state. The state is viewed as to secure private autonomy" (Diamond, 1994, s.5)" (Novy and Leuboult, 2005, s.2024).

2. "The second approach is associated with the republican tradition. Based on the citizens gather in a public space to discuss common problems and collectively find solutions. Civil society is viewed as constructing the state via the results of collective discussions by its citizens (Arendt, 1998). Therefore, in this approach citizenship is central concept focusing on social innovation in the sense of lessons in democracy" (Novy and Leuboult, 2005, s.2024).

3. "The third approach is the model of public sphere by Habermas. Referring to the bourgeois public sphere which counterbalanced the public sphere controlled by the royal court. It elaborates on the importance of the consensus created through political action within non-state spaces (Habermas, 1990) and in this model, civil society is formed by actors who gain influence in the public sphere" (Novy and Leuboult, 2005, s.2024).

4. "The fourth approach is related to critical state theory in a Gramscian way of looking at the problem. Gramsci was aware that domination is not only based on consensus, but on coercion as well. His concept of society transformation as a power strategy to overcome capitalist domination. For him, the state and civil society together form an expanded state. Civil society is the political realm encompassing the state apparatus, and different interests struggle for their goals and proposes to counter the hegemony of the existing ruling powers (Gramsci, 1971, s.129)" (Novy and Leuboult, 2005, s.2024). In these rivalries and clashes, social movements play a decisive role in these conflicts.

### 2. History of Participatory Budgeting

"Participatory budgeting programs are parts of a larger effort in Brazil to extend existing democracy. Brazil continued to be dominated by traditional patronage practices, social exclusion, and corruption, but numerous governments, NGO's social movements and political parties have turned these ideas and rules associated with participatory budgeting to improve and enrich Brazil's democracy" (Wampler, 2000, s.2). One of the reasons why participatory budgeting is transferable to other local units is that clientelism and social exclusion are everyday realities in many parts of the developing countries.

In fact, in Porto Alegre neighborhood movements emerged in the 1970s. "Residents of poorer districts rebelled against the government's lack of interest in acting for their benefit. Their primary demand was for urban infrastructure and services as well as for the autonomy of habitants" (Novy and Leubolt, 2005, s.2026). They organized their demands using actions such as roadblocks. By these roadblocks, they linked their material demands to the question of civic rights, in this way they embedded their problems in a larger context. These initiatives were mobilized in the course of the protests of the military dictatorship. Demanded democratization called in the distribution priorities of public budgets do favour socially marginalized groups (Abers, 2000).

"Participatory budgeting began in 1989 in the municipality of Porto Alegre. This city has more than 1 million inhabitants and is wealthy by Brazilian standards. In 1988 the Workers' Party won the mayoral election" (Wampler, 2007, ss.23-24). This party's companied was based on "democratic participation" and "the inversion of spending priorities" in which public resources were spent in middle-and upper-class. Participatory budgeting was intended to help poorer citizens and neighborhoods, on the contrary. So, the aim was intended to help these poorer citizens receive larger shares of public spending: During the first years the administration experimented with different

mechanisms to tackle financial constraints and provide citizens with a direct role in the government's activities, and they invert to social spending priorities of previous administrations.

In 1989 and 1990 fewer than one thousand citizens participated in the participatory budgeting process. In 1992 the number of participants had jumped to nearly eight thousand citizens. After the Workers' Party was selected in 1992, with participation increased to more than twenty thousand people a year, then participation grew as citizens realized that participatory budgeting was an important decision-making process (Wampler, 2007, ss.23-24).

"When the Workers' Party assumed to office of the mayor in Porto Alegre in 1989, they encountered a bankrupt municipality and a disorganized bureaucracy. During the first two years of their administration, the government experimented with different mechanisms to tackle the financial constraints, to provide citizens with a direct role in the activities of government and to invert the social spending priorities of previous administration. Participatory budgeting was born through this experimental process" (Wampler, 2007, ss.23-24). After winning the 1992 election the program took on a life of its own with participation increasing per year. Participation grew as citizens realized that participatory budgeting was now an important decision-making venue. There is wide variation in success while other administrations are financially constrained, so they are made to implement new public works.

In Porto Alegre the mayor's office is responsible for initiating participatory budgeting bill, for this reason the municipal government organizes a series of public meetings by local unit. Additional information is distributed to the public in the form of a "quality of life index" which provides measures of basic indicators of well-being. The meetings include broad representation. In these meeting city executives, administrators, representatives of community entities such as youth and health clubs and interested inhabitant of the local units (Fung and Wright, 2001, s.13).

"The first meeting included a discussion of how previous budget was spent and this Meeting was attended by citizen-delegates. A second set of local meetings, citizen-delegates reported their findings from neighborhood meetings. The mayor's office also incorporated the proposals in its proposed budget. Throughout the process the municipal government worked as a partner with the Budgeting Council" (Fung and Wright, 2001, s.13).

Before the implementation of participatory budgeting, Porto Alegre's Union of Neighborhood Association produced a report demanding participation in formulating the budget. That report described eight municipalities in which participatory budgeting had been attempted in the past Workers' Party published discussions of various forms of participatory governance. At least two other political parties on the left implemented very similar participation programs at roughly the same time as the Workers' Party.

"Local governments throughout Latin America began using participatory budgeting thereafter especially after 1996. When the United Nations Habitat II Conference in Istanbul recognized Porto Alegre's participatory budgeting as one of the 42 best practices in urban governance. All the early experiences were implemented by parties which opposed the party in power at the national level. Experiments first occurred in Brazil, because this country gave significant spending responsibilities to municipalities and mayoral elections. The twin waves of decentralization and democratizing in the 1980 and 1990s encouraged similar experimentation in Brazil" (Goldfrank, 2007, s.93).

"In Brazil, the budgeting process is initiated generally by the executive branch. But even at the local level the communication channels between citizens and their representatives are weak (Heimans, 2002). In this process the population has limited opportunities to express themselves about the way public money is used" (Zamboni, 2007, s.7). Essentially only a limited number of organized civil society effectively manage to influence the budgeting process.

"Experiences of public participator in local government decisions, the first participatory budgeting experiences did not have a well conceived and structured model based on a solid theoretical background (Navarro, 2001). It was more likely a learning-by-doing process than the implementation of a solid strategy" (Zamboni, 2007, ss.7-8). "Participatory budgeting has been introduced in several different forms. Consequently, participatory budgeting would be unfounded to give a hard-and-fast definition of the term participatory budgeting, since the sociological essence of a procedure can hardly be unambiguously demarcated and differences between Latin America and Europe are enormous" (Brezovar and Stanimirovic, 2022, s.570).

"Participatory budgeting generally refers to an inclusive, deliberative process of incorporating citizen priorities into local government decision making on public investment. Participatory budgeting has been classified as innovation models in urban areas. Lately some positive examples can be found in rural areas. It encompasses environmental protection economic performance and societal welfare simultaneously" (Brezover and Stanimirovic, 2022, s.570). On the other hand, participatory budgeting practices can therefore be used as a tool promoting different types of sustainability.

"The constitutionally guaranteed in some countries democratic institutions do not operate as intended, because politics and the administration are characterized by corruption and clientelism. Specifically at the municipal level, it is common that leading politicians are dependent on the economy and that they purchase votes with money and follow promises. In the Porto Alegre the living standard is above the average of other Brazilian cities. It has provided for a reversal of priorities: Primary health care was set up in the living areas of the poor, the number of schools and nursery schools was extended and in most of the local citizens have access to water supplies and wastewater systems" (Sintomer, et al., 2008, s.166). International scholars and World Bank have Porto Alegre participatory budgeting as an example of best practice regarding local administration.

"A historical analysis of participatory budgeting results in the identification of three basic stages: The first stage, dating from 1989 to 1997 was worked by experimentation. New forms of managing public resources were invented. This first occurred in Porto Alegre and in other few cities. The second stage corresponds to the period from 1997 to 2000. When more than 130 Brazilian municipalities adopted the model with marked variations. The third stage, from 2000 to the current and nowadays, is a stage of expansion outside Brazil, and diversification; numerous Latin American and European cities have adopted existing models" (Cabannes, 2004, s.29). Today, the practice of participatory budgeting is rapidly expanding and taking different models and forms according to each country's own culture of democracy (Sakinç and Bursalioğlu, 2014, s.1).

The examples considered on cities from all three periods (Cabannes, 2004, s.30):

Brazil- Porto Alegre since 1997, and Recife, Belem, Belo Horizonte, Santo Andre, Campinas, Alvarado, Juiz de Fora, Caxias do Sul, Icapui, Mundo Novo

- Mexico- District of Cuauhtemoc
- Argentino- Buenos Aires, Posario
- Uruguay- Montevideo
- Peru- Villa el Salvador, Ilo
- Ecuador- Cuenca, Cotacachi
- Colombia- Puerto Asis
- Spain- Cordoba
- France- Saint Denis, Bobigny
- Germany- Baden, Wurttemberg

### 3. Administration and Participation in Participatory Budgeting

In the world participatory budgeting is a citizen-oriented administration and it refers to issues and matters as increasing quality of administration, reinforcing accountability mechanisms and ensuring transparency and participation in the provision of public

services quality better. The proving needs to the people for food governance and participation and change of the traditional government style. The demands are for change of management and improvement of the services provision process (Karataş, 2007, s. 84). Citizen participation in government and local budgeting process is a main topic that has received attention. Citizen participation in budgeting is a novel model of governance that brings multiple stakeholders to engage and participate in budgetary decision-making mechanisms (Hong, 2015, s.2).

One reason of participatory budgeting process is the assumption that dialogue between central and local administrators and citizen is a useful mechanism for increasing accountability. Participatory budgeting aligns budgetary decisions with actual citizen priorities and values, and it can feel useful information into budgeting. As a result, citizens in cities with more supportive of local government (Kim and Schachter, 2013, ss.456-457).

As a result, there are many beneficial outcomes of citizen participation in participatory budgeting: 1) Informing decision-making, 2) Educating participants about the budgeting process, 3) Giving support for budget proposals, 4) Influencing decision-making, 5) Enhancing trust and creating a sense of community (Ebdon and Franklin, 2006, s.441; Bilge, 2015, ss.3-4).

#### 4. Key Features of Participatory Budgeting

It is possible to identify the key features of participatory budgeting in two-way planning and two-way design process in requirement questions (Manes-Rossi, et al., 2023, ss.216-17):

First, the introduction of participatory budgeting appears to be partly shining by a political will to increase citizen participation. The second feature is the creation of a separate body to take charge and faster co-production. The third feature is the flow of information, both for soliciting proposals and selecting the ones to be put to a vote. The fourth feature is presented in the organizational arrangements for presentation of proposals. The fifth feature is seen in the deliberation procedure which means all residents of the local citizens take part in the deliberation process. The sixth feature relates to final decisions is in the hands of citizens, thus placing "ideal type of" community funds at local level.

Different experiences of the local units and development of participatory budgeting, three main characteristics of contemporary thinking mobilized (Brun-Martos and Lapsley, 2017, ss.1007-1009):

1. Managerialism versus Democracy: The setting of local units has been at the center of reform of their structures and processes as a part of the worldwide phenomenon of "new public management". Local units are political organizations with elected representatives having responsibility for shaping the policies and direction of these entities while working with city managers to deliver programs for elected members. It has been observed that transparency by a group of scholars advocates greater "participative" democracy rather than "representative" democracy (Young, 1997; Haikio, 2010).

2. Distinguish between programs of Governmentally: Government and technologies of government are how government bodies seek to shape and influence life. In the daily cases, such as city directives education, social care, housing, transport, and infrastructure provide the elements of the local unit. The technologies of government are a disparate set of techniques and practices that are mobilized to deliver on the local governments.

3. Transparency: New public management approach influences can be seen as an antecedent of the present universal preoccupation with transparency in public and local finances. Furthermore, the process of participatory budgeting strikes a chord with a fundamental principle of both democratic accountabilities. Transparency can be used widely via participation in public finance, but without clear meaning and it is hard to assess its impact (Brun-Martos, 2017, s.1009; Zamboni, 2007, s.4-6). The co-management in budgeting and especially based on participatory budgeting is characterized by variability

depending on the relations between the local self-government units and society in every connected country (Filiplak and Dylewski, 2018, s.20).

Participatory budgeting programs were implemented by progressive municipal governments. These governments enjoyed strong bases of support from local inhabitants, social movements, and local unions and NGOs. In this process, a progressive sector of civil society and includes two important demands that emerged from civil society: 1) Transparency and openness through the decentralized and democratization of the state 2) Increased citizen participation in policy-making areas. Participatory budgeting programs are the outgrowth of the 'citizen's demands.

Achieve participation of citizens not only to select new local policies but also to legitimize the government's reform efforts. Higher rates of participation of government and local citizens will help to legitimize a government's policies. On the other hand, participatory budgeting programs have been most successful in municipalities in which their civil society has been organized (Wampler, 2000, s.2). Participatory budgeting programs were initiated by progressive municipal governments via actors, governments, and broader political environment.

In local units available discretionary funding is important a participatory budgeting as it increases the likelihood that citizens can directly select policy outcomes, because governments must have the resources to initiate public works selected by the local participants, while participatory budgeting programs address the overall financial health of the municipality, the basic focus remains discretionary spending. Thus, through appropriate communication models to be established between public administrators and citizens, it will be ensured that local people decide how to use a certain budget size in the distribution of public resources and that the opinions of the public are considered in decision-making processes (Sakınç and Bursalioglu, 2014, s.2; Özen and Dikici, 2016, s.14).

Participatory budgeting programs also focus on taxes and the financial health of local units must be discussed at great length, and the meeting focuses on the types and amounts of taxes collected by the central and local governments. This leads to more generalized discussions of who pays taxes, and this also generated discussion about how central and local governments must work together to develop creative solutions to increase the number of resources. This also emerges are one key objective for governments to implement participatory budgeting fiscal and financial strapped municipalities (Wampler, 2000, ss.6-7). Of course, basically participatory budget is a system that will enable citizens to have a say at least in the cities they live in, at least with the taxes they pay. Contrary to the old understanding of public administration, which has become cumbersome, citizens are no longer excluded from the administration, but are involved in the administration both individually and collectively (Zarph, 2022, s.1070).

## 5. Participants in Participatory Budgeting Process

"Participation" is the key factor and the keyword in the participatory budgeting process. The literature on participation includes citizen participation occurs when citizens and their representative interact to provide feedback to central and especially local governments. At the policy formulation as the implementation stage of governance there are four interrelated arguments that support the rise of the public participation on fiscal decision (Moynihan, 2007, ss.55-58):

The first one is the postmodern argument that includes an understanding of the dynamics of individuals about their government makes it likely that citizens will seek to involves themselves in public incomes and expenditures decisions through discussion (Fox and Miller, 1996). Second, checks the disillusionment with bureaucracy which checks administrative power has spurred interest in participatory process, because the hierarchical-bureaucratic model has been attacked by various riches as lacking responsiveness and this power and organizations have proved unable to create and inclusive relationship with citizens (Zajac and Bruhn, 1999). In place of "representative bureaucracy" it advocates of participation support the development of "strong

democracy" by interested citizen participation (Barber, 1986). The search for democratic ideal thirdly is a more achieved approach that shows greater concern for participation which produces benefits for citizens and offers them to fulfil the "democratic wishes" to influence on the governing process (Morone, 1998). This ideal is closely associated with the fulfilment of citizens rights. Fourthly, in developing countries the need for participation is very real object that participation fosters good governance, promotes governance, increases social justice helps individuals become better citizens (Putnam, 1993).

In focusing on budgeting process, citizen input is generally viewed to reduce the level of citizen distrust in government and to educate people about government activities. Citizens in cities with more participation are less cynical about local government (Berman, 1997). However, participation is made difficult by barriers such as lack of knowledge, public perception that their opinions are unwanted, and citizen apathy and lack of time. Overall scholars have concluded that participation is beneficial when it occurs early in the budgeting process and when it is two-way communication rather than simply one-way information sharing (Frisby and Bowman, 1996).

Different kinds of participatory processes have been used in government budgeting are available. Each method has strengths as well as weaknesses. Research may be representative, and consistent usage over time reveals trends in opinions. Public meetings have been used in a deliberative may provide two-way communication on budgeting problems, but attendance is often low and may not represent the local community, and participants may have insufficient knowledge for effective input (Ebdon, 2003, ss.173-176; Roberts, 1997, ss.124-132). On the other hand, studies have found a "discontinuity" between citizen demand and willingness to pay taxes. In addition, willingness to pay is related to an individual's perception of government performance (Glaser and Hildreth, 1999, s.48-67).

As a result participation efforts to be elective if they include the these characteristics: Participants are representative of the broader community, participation is open to a large number of participants, input on citizen incomes and expenditures are early in the budgeting process, participation includes two-way communication between citizens and officials, citizen output is considered by decision-makers, and input reveals preferences of citizens (Ebdon, 2003; Ebdon and Franklin, 2004, ss.34-36).

## 6. Correlations and Stages of Conducive to Participatory Budgeting

Four factors are a combination of participatory budgeting. These are strong mayors' support, civil society's willing and able to contribute to ongoing local policy debates, a generally supportive political environment, and the financial resources to fund the projects selected by citizens (Wampler, 2007, 24). It means there are several dimensions of participatory budgeting process, like a financial budgetary dimension, considering both contribution of popular and local government, physical or territorial dimension and regulatory that is legal dimension (Cabannes, 2004, ss.33-34).

In a normative and analytical approach to participatory budgeting, most of the scholars agree that political will, sufficient resources, and political decentralization are necessary for successful participatory budgeting. Other conditions cited can be helpful such as political will, sufficient resources, political decentralization, social capital, bureaucratic competence, small size to courage collective action, legal foundation. All these normative and analytical approaches include the following factors: deliberation, accessible rules and information, centralized supervision, focus on immediate versus long-term planning, informal versus formal structure (Goldfrank, 2007, ss.98-99).

The stages of the participatory budgeting procedure are preparation of the financial factors, the "zero stage" development of the procedure rules, the education and information campaign, the development phase, the proposal submission phase, the verification phase which includes expenditures and incomes, the discussion phase, the selection of them, the supervision of implementation phase and evaluation of the process.

Firstly, the next step in "stage zero" was to decide whether the resources of the civic budget should be divided into smaller portions of expenditures and incomes distributed among different areas of local unit. It must be decided to set an upper limit for the projects submitted for implementation or not (Binda and Niedziela, 2021, ss.289-291). According to the procedure, the stages that come after "stage zero" include submission of proposals by residents. The next stage of is the verification of the submitted proposals. The execution of this phase must be similar on all communes. The next stage also, is the selections of projects for funding execution.

The final stage of the procedure is the execution and implementation of the winning projects. The projects must be chosen by vote had to be included in budget resolution for a given year in all examined communities. The list of selected projects transferred to the mayor as a recommendation of implementation in the budget year (Binda and Niedziela, 2021, ss.291-292).

### **7. The Results of Participatory Budgeting and Policy Implications**

The results of participatory budgeting programs vary widely: To examine the significant policy implications, it is necessary to take into consideration the three central tenets of participatory budgeting such as public learning and promoting active citizenship, social justice and administrative reform: Participation appears to rise more quickly when the government commits support and resources to participatory budgeting, because citizens realize that there is a direct connection between the time they dedicate to participatory budgeting and changes in policy outcomes. In classical and traditionally excluded citizens the opportunity of voice their demands in a formal sphere. The legitimation of their demands and rights in participatory budgeting to raise issues in public areas are important steps forward in breaking and down existing / presence of social hierarchies.

The public resources allocated through the participatory budgeting programs tend to be implemented in low-income areas and citizens. It guarantees that poorer regions receive more resources than better-off neighbors via "the quality-of-life index". Participatory budgeting helps distribute wealth to poorer areas of municipalities, and it allows the poorest members of local unit to decide how to spend resources in their community. Another way in which participatory budgeting programs promote social justice is through the development of "thematic decision-making" bodies. Governments that are dedicated to spending more resources in poorer citizens implement participatory budgeting expanded to include projects that would attract the middle class. It means that traditional policy organizers can no longer rely on clientelism but to mobilize and deliberate in new ways and resources. Participatory budgeting programs act as "citizenship school" and citizenship education. Meetings provide governments and well-informed activists the opportunity to discuss matters to the budget, government authority and responsibilities, taxation, expenditure, and social, political, and civil rights. Social justice is also can be achieved using more efficient and community-oriented policies. Less corruption fostered by transparent processes helps ensure that public will be used effectively, and takes process affects poor and low-income citizens. These decisions and votes result in specter change in their communities via the opportunity to make decisions that shape their lives of fellow citizens and empower process for low-income and previously excluded citizens.

In participatory budgeting implementing new decision-making process also requires changes to the bureaucracy that implementation confirms to the new criteria. In successful participatory budgeting officials are personals appointed by the administration of each district. These officials act as intermediaries between local citizens and technical staff. In this approach technical information becomes part of the public discussions. So clear, rational, and systematic rules for the implementation of projects can be established. In establishment of clear rules, provided all interested citizens, government officials, bureaucrats and businesspeople, public forms will be translated into actual works and



expenditure outputs. Governments that are invented in participatory budgeting will also reform their administrative units (Wampler, 2007, ss.49-53).

## 8. Conclusion

The topic of participatory budgeting has its antecedents in South America (Porto Alegre) as part of a political challenge to the establishment (Zamboni, 2007; Goldfrank, 2007). This challenge to established practice which had the intention of enhancing transparency, participation and democratic accountability is spreading internationally with different interpretations and practices shaped by different institutions, social and political consequences (Ebdon. and Franklin, 2004; Binda and Niedziela, 2021; Filiplak and Dylewski, 2018; Brun-Martos and Lapsley, 2017; Patsias, Latendresse and Bherer, 2013; Ahmad and Weiser, 2006; Fölscher, 2007)

In some cases, the official position on participatory budgeting has been rather limited, being restricted to the recommendation of pilot studies. However, there was also evidence of citizen path, but where citizens connected with the idea, these initiatives enhanced both democratic accountability and transparency in public finance. The expectation that citizen would act on the funds, allocated to them was realized in pilot studies via social programs, expenditures, and services in pilot studies. There is evidence of local citizens achieving high level of transparency, not only giving access to budgetary information but also understanding it.

Participatory budgeting has the potential to become a mediating instrument between city managers and the electorate and representatives, by forging a bridge across the worlds of management and democratic accountability. This may also lead to a development, especially in the context of contemporary governance, which produces a "horizontality" in the relations between the central government and local governments/units.

## References

- Abers, R. N. (2000). *Inventing Local Democracy: Grassroots Politics in Brazil*, Lynne Rienner Publication: Colorado.
- Ahmad, R.; Weiser, E. T. (2006). *Fostering Public Participation in Budget Making (Case Studies from Indonesia, the Marshall Islands and Pakistan)*, Philippines Asian Development Bank and The Asian Foundation.
- Arendt, H. (1998). *The Human Condition*, The University of Chicago Press: Chicago and London.
- Barber, B. (1986). *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*, University of California Press: Berkeley.
- Berman, E. M. (1997). Dealing With Cynical Citizens, *Public Administration Review*, 57(2), 105-112.
- Bilge, S. (2015). A New Approach in Public Budgeting: Citizens' Budget, *Journal of International Education and Leadership*, 5(1), 1-17.
- Binda, J.; Niedziela, S. (2021). The Participatory Budgets Implementation on The Example of Selected Municipalities. *Ekonomika Regiona (Economy of Region)*, 17(1), 288-300.
- Brezovar, N.; Stanimirovic, T. (2022). Sustainability Aspects of Participatory Budgeting at Municipal Level in Slovenia, *Public Sector Economics*, Institute of Public Finance, 46(4), 569-589.
- Brun-Martos, M. I.; Lapsley, I. (2017). Democracy, Governmentality, and Transparency: Participatory Budgeting in Action, *Public Management Review*, 19(7), 1000-1021.
- Cabannes, Y. (2004). Participatory budgeting: A Significant Contribution to Participatory Democracy, *Environment and Urbanization*, 16(1), 27-46.
- Diamond, L. (1994). Rethinking Civil Society: Toward Democratic Consolidation, *Journal of Democracy*, 5(3), 4-17.
- Ebdon, C.; Franklin, A. L. (2003). Citizen Participation in The Budget Process: Exit, Voice and Loyalty, *Encyclopaedia of Public Administration and Public Policy*, 173-176.
- Ebdon, C.; Franklin, A. L. (2004). Searching For a Role for Citizens in The Budget Process, *Public Budgeting and Finance*, 32-49.
- Ebdon, C.; Franklin, A. L. (2006). Citizen Participation in Budgeting Theory, *Public Administration Review*, 66(3), 437-447.

- Filiplak, B. Z.; Dylewski, M. (2018). A Real or A Marginal Trend in Participatory Budgets in Local Governments, *Financial Internet Quarterly*, 14(4), 12-21.
- Fox, C. J.; Miller, H. T. (1996). *Postmodern Public Administration: Toward Discourse*, Sage Publications: New York.
- Fölscher, A. (2007). Participatory budgeting in Central and Eastern Europe, *Participatory Budgeting*, in, Ed., Anwar Shah, The World Bank, Washington, D. C., ss. 127-157.
- Frisby M.; Bowman, M. (1996). What We Have Here Is a Failure to Communicate, *Public Management*, 78(2), February.
- Fung, A.; Wright, E. O. (2001). Deepening Democracy: Innovation in Empowered Participatory Governance, *Politics and Society*, 29(1), 5 - 41.
- Glaser M. A.; Hildreth, W. B. (1999). Service Delivery Satisfaction and Willingness to Pay Taxes, Citizen Recognition of Local Government Performance. *Republic Productivity and Management Review*, 23(1), 48-67.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, Ed. H. Quentin, and G. Nowell Smith, London, Lawrence, and Wishart. <https://ia600506.us.archive.org/19/items/AntonioGramsciSelectionsFromThePrisonNotebooks/Antonio-Gramsci-Selections-from-the-Prison-Notebooks.pdf>
- Goldfrank, B. (2007). Lessons from Latin America's Experience with Participatory Budgeting, *Participatory Budgeting*, in, Ed., Anwar Shah, The World Bank, Washington, D. C., ss. 91-126.
- Habermas, J. (1990). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, The MIT Press: Cambridge.
- Haikio, L. (2010). The Diversity of Citizenship and Democracy in Local Public Management Reform, *Public Management Review*, 12(3), 363-364.
- Heimans, J. (2002). Strengthening Participation in Public Expenditure Management: Policy Recommendations for Key Stakeholders, Paris, OECD Development Centre Policy Briefs 22, OECD Publishing.
- Hong, S. (2015). Citizen Participation in Budgeting: A Trade-off Between Knowledge and Inclusiveness? *Public Administration Review*, 75(4), 572-582.
- Karataş, H. (2007). Kamu Yönetiminde Yeni Bir Anlayış, *Bütçe Dünyası*, 24, 83-94.
- Kim, S.; Schachter, H. L. (2013). Citizen Participation in The Budget Process and Local Government Accountability: Case Studies of Organizational Learning from The United States and South Korea, *Public Performance and Management Review*, 36(3), 456-471.
- Manes-Rossi, Brusca, I.; Orelli, R. L.; Lorson, P. C.; Haustein, E. (2023). Features And Drivers of Citizen Participation: Insights from Participatory Budgeting in Three European Cities, *Public Management Review*, 25(2), 201-223.
- Morone, J. A. (1998). *The Democratic Wish*, Yale University Press: New Haven.
- Moynihan, D. P. (2007). Citizen Participation in Budgeting: Prospects for Developing Countries, The world Bank: Washington, D. C. ss. 55-90.
- Navarro, Z. (2001). Decentralization, Participation and Social Control of Public Resources: 'Participatory Budgeting' in Porto Alegre (Brazil), *Development*, 41(3), 68-71.
- Novy A.; Leubolt, B. (2005). Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre: Social Innovation and The Dialectical Relationship of State and Civil Society, *Urban Studies*, 42(11), 2023-2036.
- Özen, A; Dikici, U. (2016). Katılımcı Bütçeleme ve Çeşitli Ülke Uygulamaları, *International Journal of Applied Economic and Finance Studies*, 1(1), 11-31.
- Patsias, C.; Latendresse, A.; Bherer, L. (2013). Participatory Democracy, Decentralization, and Local Governance: The Montreal Participatory Budget in The Light Of 'Empowered Participatory Governance', *International Journal of Urban Regional Research*, 37(6), 2214-30.
- Putnam, R. D.; Leonardi, R.; Nonetti, R. Y. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princeton University Press: Princeton NJ.
- Roberts, N. (1997). Public Deliberation: An Alternative Approach to Crafting Policy and Setting Direction, *Public Administration Review*, 57(2), 124-132.
- Sakınç, S.; Bursalıoğlu, S. A. (2014). Bütçelemede Demokratik Bir Değişim: Katılımcı Bütçeleme, *Electronic Journal of Vocational Colleges*, May/Mayıs, 1-10.
- Sintomer, Y.; Röcke, A.; Herzberg, C. (2008). Participatory Budgeting in Europe: Potentials and Limitations of Participatory Budgeting, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 32(1), 164-178.

---

Wampler, B. (2000). A Guide to Participatory Budgeting, <https://internationalbudget.org/wp-content/uploads/A-Guide-to-Participatory-Budgeting.pdf>, 02.03. 2024.

Wampler, B. (2007). A Guide to Participatory Budgeting, *Participatory Budgeting* in, Ed., Anwar Shah, The World Bank, Washington, D. C., ss. 21-54.

Young, S. C. (1997). Local Agenda 21: The Renewal of Local Democracy, *Political Quarterly*, 68, 138-147.

Zajac, G.; Bruhn, G. (1999). The Moral Context of Participation in Planned Organizational Change and Learning, *Administration and Society*, 30(6), 706-733.

Zamboni, Y. (2007). Participatory Budgeting and Local Governance: An Evidence-Based Evaluation of Participatory Budgeting Experiences in Brazil, *Participatory Budgeting and Local Governance*, Working Papers, May 28.

Zarplı, S. A. (2022). Kamu Bütçelemesinde Yeni Bir Yaklaşım Olarak Katılımcı Bütçeleme: Türkiye’de Belediyelere Yönelik Bir Araştırma, *KMÜ Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 24(43), 1069-1088.

---

**Çıkar Çatışması:** Yoktur.

**Finansal Destek:** Yoktur.

**Etik Onay:** Yoktur.

**Yazar Katkısı:** Birsen NACAR (%50), Nihat FALAY (%50)

**Conflict of Interest:** None.

**Funding:** None.

**Ethical Approval:** None.

**Author Contributions:** Birsen NACAR (50%), Nihat FALAY (50%)

---