



STUDYDADDY

Get Homework Help From Expert Tutor

[Get Help](#)

Synthesis Matrix – Participatory Budgeting

	Definition of PB (types, mechanisms, processes)	Theoretical Discussions (pros/benefits and cons/obstacles)	Methodology
1. Franklin, Ho, & Ebdon (2009) <i>Participatory Budgeting in Midwestern States</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Two-way communication • Gaining Support • Influencing decision making • Community building • Enhancing trust • Macrolevel: surveys, budget simulations, Citizen budget committees, focus groups, special budget meetings • Microlevel: direct citizen interaction, neighborhood/district meetings 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed survey (from 12 states) of nine different participatory mechanisms to describe the use and perceived value of such mechanisms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Surveys ○ Budget simulation ○ Citizen budget committee ○ Focus groups ○ Special budget meetings ○ Regular public hearings ○ Televised public hearings w/ call-in features ○ Neighborhood/district meetings ○ Direct citizen interaction • Identify the relationship between the elected officials' value of different participatory mechanisms and perceptions of the extent to which citizens actually used the mechanisms
2. Rossmann & Shanahan (2012) <i>Defining and Achieving Normative Democratic</i>	<p>Needs structural and mechanical avenues and procedural channels</p> <p>Goal to achieve legitimate democratic process</p>	<p>Openness—access to information, lack of secrecy, and transparency of process</p> <p>Inclusiveness—representation and participation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand how committee members comprehend their democratic mission in the participatory budgeting process, how they assess their accomplishments toward this goal, and what factors contribute

<i>Values in PB</i>			<p>to or inhibit their success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative; empirical analysis • Individual semi-structured interviews with 6 open-ended questions • Open coded interviews into nodes/concepts—20 to 75 minutes long, six years after • Used inductive analyses of the data to detail a conceptual map • 24 current and former members of committee tasked with developing new budgetary process “open to and inclusive of, the entire campus community.”
3. Ebdon & Franklin (2006) <i>Citizen Participation in Budgeting Theory</i>	Mechanisms—public meetings, focus groups, simulations, advisory committees, surveys	Four elements critical to structuring budget participation <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environment—structure, political culture, legal requirements, pop’n size/diversity 2. Process design—timing, type of allocation, participants (selection method), willingness to pay 3. Mechanisms—public meetings, focus groups, simulations, advisory committees, surveys 4. Goals and outcomes—reduce cynicism, education, gain support for proposals, gather input for decision making, change resource allocation, 	Methodology not defined Purpose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is known about citizen participation in budget process? • What are gaps in knowledge? • Future paths for research

		enhance trust, create a sense of community	
4. Ebdon (2000) <i>The Relationship between citizen involvement in the Budget Process and City Structure and Culture</i>		Pros: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less cynical Cons/Obstacles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Getting representativeness • Fear of increasing spending levels • Perception of effectiveness by officials influences the use of PB in the process • Influenced by characteristics of the community (socially, politically) • Cities with at-large mayoral elections or district city council elections have more formal involvement 	Purpose: Investigate the relationship between structural and cultural factors and the use of citizen involvement in the budget process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1996 ICMA survey on roles and relationships of local govt officials • 1,150 cities
5. Cabannes (2004) <i>PB: A significant contribution to participatory democracy</i>	Varying definitions/differences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct democracy (citizens) vs. indirect (delegates or leaders); “community-based representative democracy • final budget decision—varies from active part of citizens and deliberative councils to exec and legislative branches with all power • Who is in charge of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PB built fundamentally on territorial spaces (districts, neighborhoods) and thematic entry points that are specific to each city • How is PB anchored w/in public admin? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Politically—with links to mayor ○ “efficiency”—links to finance dept ○ local office in charge of planning 	25 municipalities in Latin America and Europe—selected based on diversity and innovation, chose with the help of the Municipality of Porto Alegre and the expertise of the NGO Cidade “systematic analysis”

	<p>decision-making?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ COP—central body ○ Many non-Brazilian are social and political frameworks so that structures are enlarged but networks are not modified • Social control and inspection of works—from executive branch to “neighbors” • Demands by citizens <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City-based vs. community-based • Control of resource—amt of \$\$ • Degree of formalization and institutionalism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ socially—specific PB dept ○ some have both, tying both social and political 	
--	---	--	--

<p>6. Herian (2011)</p> <p><i>Local Budgeting and public participation: Contextual Predictors of state laws mandating public input</i></p>	<p>Identifies the stages of PB as previously defined by Berner and Smith (2004):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On file for inspection • Notice of availability • Publish budget or summary • Notice of hearing • Public hearing • Publish final budget 		<p>Purpose: examine the political, economic, and institutional variables associated with the presence of state laws that mandate the use of public input in local budgeting</p> <p>Used dependent data from Berner and Smith (2004), extrapolated to the years 2001-2006 to provide an analysis that spans eight years for each of the 50 states (n=400); pooled times series data set; Poisson regression analysis</p> <p>2 dependent variables: number of public participation laws required of cities and counties in each state, the 6 types of public input laws that each state requires</p> <p>Independent variables: Political—Democratic proportion of state legislatures, party competition Economic—median income and per capita state GDP, per capita state expenditures Institutional—legislative professionalism, gubernatorial institutional power Other—population, turnout rates for state elections</p>

<p>7. Berner & Smith (2004) <i>The state of the states: A review of state requirements for citizen participation in the local government budget process</i></p>	<p>Public participation defined as anything that required contact with or involvement by the public in the budget process in any way.</p> <p>Six categories of public participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placing the proposed budget on file for public inspection • Notifying the public that the proposed budget was available for inspection • Publishing the proposed budget and/or its summary • Providing notice of a public hearing on the proposed budget • Holding a public hearing on the proposed budget before final exam • Publishing the final budget after adoption 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To inform and to involve • Officials should embrace b/c: believe that citizens can provide insight and information, leading to better public policy; interaction • Public engagement—attempts—sometimes voluntarily and sometimes not—to bring citizens into a problem solving process that goes beyond the simple representation of citizen interests and (b) do this in a structured and semi-public manner 	<p>Examination of statutes from all 50 states between summer 1999 & 2000, documenting any requirements for public participation in the local government budget process</p>
<p>8. Ebdon (2002) <i>Beyond the public hearing: Citizen participation in the local government process</i></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation is most beneficial when it occurs early in the process so that it can actually affect decisions, when it is two-way deliberative communication, and when the mechanisms are designed around for the purpose for participation • To help citizens develop a “macro” level view of budget trade-offs is to combine education and participation early in the process, at the budget development stage 	<p>Phone interviews with city budget officers in 4 neighboring Midwest states: Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska—5 questions</p> <p>Explores the factors that might affect the use and effectiveness of participation in the budget process; the type of participation used, when it occurs in the process, and the size of the city</p>

<p>9. King, Feltey & Susel (1998) <i>The Question of participation: Toward authentic public participation in public administration</i></p>	<p>Current frame of PP (4 major):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue or situation • Admin structures, systems, and processes w/in which participation takes place • Administrators • Citizens <p><i>Table of comparison between Unauthentic and Authentic Participation, p.321</i></p>	<p>Conventional participation—administrator controls the ability of the citizen to influence the situation or the process; the administrator has the authority to formulate decisions only after the issue has been defined</p> <p>Issues→Systems/Processes→Administrators→Citizens</p> <p>“Citizen empowerment in the absence of administrative transformation is problematic.”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with SMEs and focus group discussions among citizens and public administrators in northeast Ohio—seven groups in 3 communities • Qualitative techniques—desire for depth in addressing the question of how to make participation efforts more effective for both citizen and administrators • Questions: what does PP mean to you? Barriers? How can effective PP be achieved? What advice

<p>10. Novy & Leubolt (2005)</p> <p><i>PB in Porto Alegre: Social Innovation and the dialectical relationship of state and civil society</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-going social experiment of linking elements of direct and indirect democracy • Develop through conflicts, as a step-by-step institutionalization of popular participation in local politics, combined with on-going participant-oriented evaluation and modification of the process 	<p>Social innovations on 3 levels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic need were met directly—previously ignored districts saw investments • Intro of PB fostered less authoritarian relations between citizens and the local government. Above average especially among poorer, women, and 	<p>Purpose—ID and role of social innovation in urban development, further the understand of the contradictory relationship between state and civil society</p> <p>*Define the history of PB in Porto Alegre</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Description of PB process• Founded legitimacy in strengthening civil society	<p>ethnic minorities— significant social innovation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Participation in the public sphere allowed citizens to overcome their purely individualistic approaches	
--	---	---	--



STUDYDADDY

**Get Homework Help
From Expert Tutor**

Get Help