

HOPE FOR DEMOCRACY

25 YEARS OF PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING WORLDWIDE

THECNICAL FILE

“HOPE FOR DEMOCRACY – 25 YEARS OF PARTICIPATORY
BUDGETING WORLDWIDE”

ORGANISATION
NELSON DIAS

COLLABORATION
SIMONE JÚLIO

TRANSLATION / ARTICLE
CARLOTA CAMBOURNAC (FREEFLOW LDA.)

TEXT REVIEW
PATRICK CANNING

EDITION
IN LOCO ASSOCIATION
AVENIDA DA LIBERDADE, 101
SÃO BRÁS DE ALPORTEL, PORTUGAL
TEL. +351 289 840 860
FAX. +351 289 840 879
E-MAIL: GERAL@IN-LOCO.PT
WWW.IN-LOCO.PT

APRIL 2014

EDITORIAL DESIGN
SIGMASENSE - DESIGN CONSULTANCY

ISBN
978-972-8262-09-9





To In Loco Association, for their 25 years.

IN DE X

PREFACE (ENGLISH VERSION) 6

PREFACE 8

INTRODUCTION 10

GLOBAL DYNAMICS 18

25 years of Participatory Budgets in the world: a new social and political movement? 21 *Nelson Dias*

Transnational Models of Citizen Participation: The Case of Participatory Budgeting 28 *Yves Sintomer, Carsten Herzberg & Anja Röcke*

Paying attention to the participants' perceptions in order to trigger a virtuous circle 47 *Giovanni Allegretti*

Beyond the line: the participatory budget as an instrument 65 *Ernesto Ganuza & Gianpaolo Baiocchi*

REGIONAL DYNAMICS 76

Francophone Africa 78

PB: Overview, Gains and Challenges of a Process for Promoting Citizenship and Building Local Democracy in Africa 79 *Mamadou Bachir Kanoute*

Sub-Saharan Africa 88

The dynamics of the diffusion of the Participatory Budget in Sub-Saharan Africa: from Dakar to Maputo 89 *Osmany Porto de Oliveira*

Africa 100

Participatory Budgeting experience in Cameroon 101 *Jules Dumas Nguebou & Achille Noupeou*

PB and the budget process in the south Kivu Province 107 *Emmy Mbera & Giovanni Allegretti*

The mozambican experiment of Participatory Budgeting 127 *Eduardo Jossias Nguenha*

Latin America 134

Participatory budgets in Argentina: evaluation of a process in expansion 135 *Cristina E. Bloj*

Participatory Budgets in Brazil 153 *Luciano Joel Fedozzi & Kátia Cacilda Pereira Lima*

The emergence of the Participatory Budget and its expansion in Brazil: analysing the potential and limitations 165 *Leonardo Avritzer & Alexander N. Vaz*

Analysis of PB in Chile. A reflection of the national public policy evolution? 177 *Pablo Paño Yáñez*

Democratic participation in Colombia 189 *Carolina Lara*

Mandating Participation: Exploring Peru's National Participatory Budget Law 203 *Stephanie McNulty*

Dominican Republic: 14 years of participatory local management 215 *Francis Jorge García*

Participatory Budgets in Uruguay. A Reflection on the cases of Montevideo and Paysandú **221** *Alicia Veneziano & Iván Sánchez*

North America 240

Building Sustainable Empowerment: Participatory Budgeting in North America **241** *Donata Secondo & Pamela Jennings*

Asia 254

Civic engagement through Participatory Budgeting in China: three different logics at work **255** *Baogang He*

Innovations in PB in China: Chengdu on-going experiment at massive scale. **269** *Yves Cabannes & Ming Zhuang*

Europe 286

Participatory Budgeting in Germany: Citizens as Consultants **287** *Michelle Anna Ruesch & Mandy Wagner*

The Participants' print in the Participatory Budget: overview on the Spanish experiments **301**
Ernesto Ganuza & Francisco Francés

Participatory Budgets in Italy: Reconfiguring a collapsed panorama **313** *Giovanni Allegretti & Stefano Stortone*

A decade of Participatory Budgeting in Portugal: a winding but clarifying path **325** *Nelson Dias*

Participatory Budgeting in Sweden: telling a story in slow-motion **353** *Lena Langlet & Giovanni Allegretti*

Participatory Budgeting Polish-style. What kind of policy practice has travelled to Sopot, Poland? **369**
Wojciech Kęblowski & Mathieu Van Crielingen

Oceania 378

PB in Australia: Different designs for diverse problems and opportunities **379** *Janette Hartz-Karp & Iain Walker*

THEMATIC DYNAMICS 390

Childhood and youth Participatory Budgeting, foundations of participatory democracy and the policy of the polis **393** *César Muñoz*

Electronic Participatory Budgeting: false dilemmas and true complexities **413** *Rafael Cardoso Sampaio & Tiago Peixoto*

Building a democratic pedagogy: Participatory Budgeting as a "school of citizenship" **427** *Pedro Pontual*

Participation as of the gender perspective from the analysis of specific participatory processes **431** *Cristina Sánchez Miret & Joan Bou I Geli*

Psychological *empowerment* in participatory budgeting **443** *Patrícia García-Leiva*

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES **452**

BIBLIOGRAPHY PER ARTICLE **464**



GIOVANNI ALLEGRETTI

PAYING ATTENTION TO THE PARTICIPANTS' PERCEPTIONS IN ORDER TO TRIGGER A VIRTUOUS CIRCLE

One of the most interesting studies on participatory budget published last year is the book “*El círculo virtuoso de la democracia: los presupuestos participativos a debate*” written by Ernesto Ganuza and Francisco Francés. The authors present PB in an incremental approach, as an instrument that reinforces mutual trust between citizens and institutions through gradual processes that are closely related to the “design,” that is, the architecture of the participative process itself. This factor is described – in the different experiences reported – as an engine, or on the contrary, as an inhibitor, whether of virtuous relationships between the different players of the territory or of its own “legitimacy” while a new “institution” acknowledged by inhabitants as a space that places in direct cooperation administrators and administered people, progressively dematerializing the border between them.

This perspective is, undoubtedly, of strategic importance in a planet where we live a deep crisis of legitimacy of traditional democratic institutions, especially the ones within representative politics. In fact, the increasingly visible estrangement of citizens from many of the institutions that they should perceive as their “own representatives and the defenders of their interests” is stressed out by the self-referential behaviours of many elected authorities, which collide with the economic crisis many countries are facing, making it appear that the world of politics is a “caste” (Rizzo and Stella, 2007) that only pursues its own survival and the maintenance of its positions of power. It is obvious that the distrust in the ability of democracy to fulfil its promises can not be solely attributed to the political class, given that (as Pippa Norris stresses out in her book *Democratic Deficit*, of 2011) the distance between the citizens’ expectations and the results that the government institutional systems are able to produce tend to worsen due to competition phenomena (which sometimes can be positive) that enter in short-circuit, determining “vicious circles” of negativity. Just to give an example: part of the perception of the growing distance between citizens and their political representatives is due to the sounding board role of the media, and also the higher dissemination of culture and access to school, that made people more demanding, and have contributed to widen the gap between the expectations the citizens have towards democracy and its actual performance.

This perspective calls our attention for a central factor that each participatory process should take into account: the existence of “social construction of reality” phenomena, in which continuous short circuits are determined between the operation of institutions and the perceptions that the different inhabitants have of them. These per-

Participation in public choices is a manner of improving our democracy. This demands the capability to build a living process, where everyone has room and a voice, adjusting to constant changes. I believe this is the most authentic manner of making politics (Iolanda Romano, Cosa fare come fare. Decidere insieme per praticare davvero la democrazia, 2012)

ceptions are closely related to prejudices, expectations, and the degree of demand and critical capabilities of the latter. Traditionally, if an area is more sensitive and deeply related to the people's yearnings, the latter shall weight a lot in the final perception of the performance. With this in mind, is therefore understandable that representative democracy is seldom considered as satisfactory. In fact, we all feel that in a world where the number of countries formally defined as "democratic" is growing every year (Freedom House, 2012), the *qualitative intensity* of democratic regimens, on the contrary, is constantly lower, especially in many of the countries that already have a consolidated democratic history.

Leonardo Avritzer and Boaventura De Sousa Santos (2003) have been drawing attention to the "dual pathology of liberal democracies" that includes, at the same time, a "representation pathology," that is "the fact that the citizens consider themselves less and less represented by those they have elected," and a "participation pathology," related to an increasingly common idea that "it's not worth to participate," as the citizens "feel too little" (Santos, 2008) to face the big interests and the political and economic dynamics which master society. In fact, the second component is linked to the first one especially in what concerns the processes that Ibarra (2007) has defined as "participation by invitation," opposing to the dynamics of "participation by irruption" that arises when people seek to dialogue with the institution by means of self-mobilization and occupation – temporary or permanent – of physical and virtual spaces. The arenas of "participation by invitation" are the ones created when one or more institutions officially opens social dialogue spaces and "admits" the presence of citizens in moments of public debate and decision-making; most of the times they are merely "concessions" (therefore these are processes initiated with an "up to bottom" direction) confined in micro-spaces of decision whose incidence on the set of public politics is limited or residual. These have an intrinsic vulnerability that may also affect the most interesting and bold cases, such as several participatory budgets that accept to co-decide together with their citizens some non-secondary slices of public resources, and therefore greatly reduce the margin of discretionary decisions of elected representatives. This vulnerability is the result of the nature of this "invitation" itself, coming from institutions that no longer have the complete trust of the territory inhabitants, and so each proposal coming from them (including the ones on open participatory decisions) is surrounded by suspicion and perceived with scepticism.

What can, then, reinforce this proposal that – bravely – try to break up the traditional monopoly of the north-western representative democracy? We believe that the answer is largely related to the architecture of the participatory processes themselves, as well as to information and communication mechanisms created to take root in the society. These two elements, in fact, tend to be assumed by the inhabitants as indicators unveiling the actual intentions of a representative institution toward the participatory process. They are interconnected with a series of central elements to determine an acceptance more (or less) convinced of the proposed participatory path by the population, that is related not only with the volume of resources placed into discussion or the choice of

a co-operative participatory modality (and not only a consulting one), but also with the mode of construction of game rules, with no mutual ambiguity of communication, with the room dedicated to training and empowerment of social players, with the capability of the process of not demonizing conflicting elements, with the time and the debate disposition and the eventual voting of priorities, and the necessary “filters” to narrow down the proposals arising from the society before making a decision on their prioritization.

As such, this article aims to discuss some of these themes that, in several examples of existing participatory budgets, have shown to have an important weight over legitimating and the ability to create territorial roots for the processes themselves. Although we begin by quoting some examples of processes that are not PB, we will then try to focus on our own budgets in order to enlighten the specificities that make these reflections particularly pertinent.

1. Not trivializing the participation

The two macro families of participatory budgets that we have previously quoted, using the definitions by Pedro Ibarra of “participation by invitation” and “participation by irruption” – although the two frequently intersect and overlap – tend to receive a differentiated treatment from institutions and elected in representative democracy. What happens the most is that the participation forms “by irruption” are usually criminalized, while the ones “by invitation” deserve a more differentiated set of reactions, from “convinced support” to the cases in which they are tolerated with little enthusiasm, only hoping that they can bring direct benefits to the elected representatives and the institutes of representative democracy.

Such a treatment differentiation contributes – undoubtedly – for the deepening of the “double pathology” of liberal democracies, as due to this some social subjects do not feel recognized in political life and tend to assume conflicting and merely vindicate radical positions. A participatory process that tries to banish conflict from its horizon, or only “anesthetise it” can be perceived not as a new manner of accepting the difference in politics, but only as a mere extension of the representative processes centred in the one that – in the open line opened by Alexis de Tocqueville – could be seen as a “dictatorship of the majority”.

In the book “Elogio del conflitto” (2010), psychologists Benasayag and del Rey draw attention for the positive aspects, progressive, and social (and not only) individual growing up that the “conflict” includes and – on the contrary – on the adverse effects of conflict removal by the contemporary political scenario, which creates a “dangerous illusion” that ends up any comparison and confrontation and also opens the door to a political use of conflict menace and criminalization of any divergence from the standard rules. Is it therefore imaginable that a participatory process ends up refusing and demonizing conflict, criminalizing internal dissidence and therefore reproducing the pathology of risk of any dispute and a “disciplinary” logic of reading and using power?

It is true that the refusal to face the conflict within a formalized participatory process

¹ See the interpretation of Cluster 2 on the emotional analysis of the text that included interviews with technical personnel of the City Council who work in the Lisbon Participatory Budget and in other processes of social dialogue.

² According to the above mentioned new Encyclopaedia of Law (enriched for the first time with the entries “participatory democracy” and “deliberative democracy”) the word has been used to indicate different scopes of institutionalized involvement from citizens in the political life of their territory (from union agreement to militancy in corporate entities or lobbying) and even to designate forms of dialogue between different institutions or the presence of public entities within the entrepreneurial fabric and agencies providing services to citizens.

is not always a choice from the institutions. This is the case, for example, of the Tuscany Law no. 69/2007, with which Tuscany Region was self-forced to assemble public debate paths on large infra-structure choices, offering the citizens the possibility to activate this mechanism by collecting signatures; but, in spite of the possibility opened by the law, in the first 5 years of life of that Law, this path was never actually activated (Florida, 2012). Probably this was due to a lack of confidence of social movements in the regional institutions but also to the desire of keeping alive the easy (and more mediated) forms of antagonist conflict, instead of facing the hard and demanding work of a negotiation dialogue based on deeply analysing the content as well as the proposals and the joint assessment government/society of different alternative choices. In other cases – such as the famous “Public Debate” activated in 2006 on the transformation of the beltway named “Gronda de Genoa” – it can clearly be stated that the success of the participatory process itself was due to the valorisation of the already existing conflict surrounding an issue of high social impact, that rendered the new participatory institution appealing and helped to anchor it in the local territory and the social debate (Bobbio, 2010, Pomatto, 2011).

As such, we can query if the specificities of a participatory budget justify that they refuse or not the conflict. In fact, introducing a competition for scarce resources between a potentially very high number of citizens, movements and organizations, PB seems to be a path of the kind Michelangelo Caponetto (2002) would define as “conflicted”, that is, inherently permeated by conflict, as a foundational component of its own nature. On the other hand, this definition surpasses the mere definition of “conflict space”, as it includes an objective of overcoming the conflict itself through its open and transparent manifestation. Therefore, more than “anesthetising” the conflict, participatory budgets should promote its gradual overcoming, channelling energy and creativity of participation toward convergences able to abridge around those dates and deadlines or delivering budget documents that exist in every context (by law or internal regulation) and that can become an important “technical” support acting as a catalyser of common ideas or mediation between different positions (Allegretti, 2003). In spite of this potential, there are still many PB processes that try to “tame” the conflict dimension of the participation, or that simply cannot assume it as an important component in the construction of the participatory model. As Falanga has shown relating to the Lisbon PB (2013)¹, this habit is also visible in the speech of institutional players responsible for the organization of the processes, who end up extolling the mythic dimension of the stage of the priority “vote”, and forget the stage of discussion and deliberation on the content, that can be less competitive but that would be more important from the point of view of the conflict between values and visions.

This last reflection reveals that the “trivialization” of a participatory process can include different elements, including the secondary value attributed to the deepening of content (deliberative phase) and an over-valuation of the co-decision phase, reduced to a mere sum of preferences individually expressed by the citizens.

It could be worth underlining that the cases of participatory budgeting that improperly use the term “participatory democracy” are not rare. As properly refereed by Umberto Allegretti, in the new Italian Encyclopaedia of Law (2011), the use of this

term is only justified when the participation experiences are reduced to visions and solid horizons of overcoming the semantic prevalence of representative democracy, while in other cases the PB (as well as other paths of social dialogue) are but “participatory moments” slightly associated to the action of representative institutions. In fact, in the last twenty years, the work “participation” has been frequently used in an abusive manner at the international level, until becoming, many times, almost a buzzword, that is, a good word for every season, that incorporates a so vast amount of senses and concepts that it becomes incapable of really communicating anything.² Undoubtedly, the abuse of the “participation” rhetoric has contributed to determine a high level of expectations, frequently frustrated to the point of becoming partially responsible for the feeling of being an “empty” concept, as well as having little weight in the destinies of democracy tout court. Others, and stronger ones, responsible for this feeling are the set of weak results that many participatory experiences have determined, regarding a wide variety of errors performed within the processes that characterize them and are closely linked to the original “restrictive or minimalists” dispositions of the same.

With no fear of making a mistake, we could state that the efficacy of most participatory processes and the possibility that they produce satisfaction in the citizens are dependent variables, closely linked to the concrete results produced, as well as the times and disclosure techniques used to render them visible.

Participatory processes also belong to a context where the social construction of reality has a lot of weight in the memory that lasts from the processes and the diffuse perception of their success. We could even raise the hypothesis that they are even more subject to the weight of this perceptive dimension than to any other decision or public policies construction path. All this because they involve emotional issues linked to the confidence between citizens and politicians, self-esteem, voluntarism of civic engagement, the sacrifice of free time and desire of the people to see their lives changing for the better, by means of a direct role in democracy practices finally reinvented as a space of recovery of the “people power” which started it. In this perspective, it is not only what happens in participatory processes that matters, but also the manner in which these events are chained and progressively connected, and also as they are described, valued and finally filed and reproduced in the collective memory (Allegretti, 2013).

We should, in fact, ask ourselves if it makes sense to invest energies and resources to assemble innovating spaces of participation (especially as they are not imposed by any law), if afterwards the promoters are not interested in the reactions that the path generates

in participant players, nor to give voice to the concerns of citizens. In fact, many participatory processes downplay the importance of the perception of the different participant players that form the dialogic nature of any participatory process, and that may contribute to create a “vicious circle” in which the more the process is incapable of meeting the expectations and desires of the participants, the weaker the response to the institutions efforts to open new interaction spaces, demoralizing the political representatives and blocking the efforts to advance with innovations that require a lot of energy, investments and – frequently – political loneliness from the elected persons (and many technicians) who bear these trials.

As such, two main hypothesis guide our navigation:

- 1) the first is that the peculiar nature of every participatory process consists in the creation and continuous recreation of social capital, understood as a set of positive energies set to work for intensification of democratic quality;
- 2) the second hypothesis is that the social capital dispersion (that may happen due to errors blocking the investment of civic energies in the construction of the territory and public politics) is an almost irreversible phenomena. That is, when an individual understands that the good will with which he “donated” his free time or knowledge for a process of supposed social transformation was underrated, his contributions were wasted and his trust in the institutions betrayed with no explanations, he tends to return to the private sphere, according to a set of different behaviours that can include depression, escape the fulfilment of civic duties, withdrawal from any political commitment (including vote), up to revenge actions that include violence and vandalism.

2. Continuities and discontinuities in the definition of PB models

As pointed out by several authors³, the participatory budget cannot be read only as a “standard procedure” that is, a “device” marked by clear relationships between simple and recognizable factors. On the contrary, it is far more realistic to describe it as a set of “principles” that can be locally adapted up to the point of originating processes that are very different. According to this second perspective, the participatory budget is imaginable as an “ideoscape” (Appadurai, 1991), that is a political model that travels globally, but only exists through its local appropriation. As such, the same model ends up transforming itself in an incremental manner by the different located implementations. If the travels the participatory budget has performed in the last 15 years, from Brazil to other countries and continents (Sintomer et al, 2013), and the concrete experiences inspired in this model have been so diverse, this also depends on the fact that the PB, from the first Brazilian experiences of the 90’s (including Porto Alegre), has presented an enormous variety of possible goals to be achieved. These differentiated objectives (many times co-present in one single experience) include a large series of different “meanings” that could have been attributed to an experimentation of the PB, according to the different instruments and specific procedures used to mould is organizational architecture. Therefore, in fact, the holistic approach and the conceptual complexity embedded in the idea of participatory budget, imply an attention to the coherence that exists between the declared goals that inspire every PB experience, and the “instruments” and specific “techniques” used in order to reach those goals.

As it is difficult to provide rigid definitions (regulatory or essentialist) in order to recognize and differentiate the PB from other participatory processes typologies, a possible path that some authors have followed was to adopt a definition of the “methodological” type (Sintomer et al, 2008; Sintomer and Allegretti, 2009), choosing to create some “guidance maps” built on Weber “ideal types” that represent different families of participatory budgets. As such, a hexagon was imagined, whose vertices represent different procedural typologies that characterize each specific procedures of PB based on the relationship that is being produced between the specific processes and some predominant models of privileged public management in the specific context in which each experience is included (see Sintomer et al, 2013). An indispensable aspect that these definitions had to include is the fact that participatory budgets are “processes” with evolve (or do not evolve) in time, and that, due to those transformations, can grow in the content quality and attraction capability, or (on the contrary) drain themselves until loosing its original nature and regressing to very traditional forms of politic/society dialogue.

Thus, it is possible to identify a “vital cycle” of each experience of participatory budget, formed by actions that may lead to its progressive evolution or a downgrading (that is, a progressive weakening) that can expose fragilities and even lead to a quick “death” of the experimentation, as shown by a recent article by Alves and Allegretti (2012) on the change in the Portuguese panorama of participatory budgets in the last decade.

In fact, the history of the journey of participatory budgets throughout the planet in the last decade clearly shows that they were – every time – used as opportunities to introduce a visible “discontinuity” in a territory relating to previous tested social dialogues forms or, on the contrary, they were introduced in the “continuity” of pre-existing participatory models, although adding the will to bring new elements of efficacy and creativity. Defining a specific rule – in terms of “it has to be” – on when to adopt one or other strategy would make no sense

at all (besides not being easy), as usually this is related to cyclical and specific choices of each context. But undoubtedly, it is possible to find a “general logic” to which that choice responds to, or at least, it would be wise to respond to: and this is related to the degree of success achieved by previous participatory trials. That is, if those practices did not achieve the aimed goals (in terms of deliberative quality, attraction capability, and diversification of the public, of satisfaction of the players, generated products, etc.), it does not seem to make sense transforming them into a binding and inertial element of a PB path centred in a continuing basis with them. On the contrary, had they shown a huge capability to produce encouraging results, it would make perfect sense rooting the participatory budget in those results, ideating it as an opportunity to introduce new creative elements to evolve, consolidate and perfect the previously existing procedure.

The plurality of definitions existent in the literature to define the PB help to identify the high level of complexity of strictly classifying the experiences of PB, suggesting it would be useless and very little motivating aiming to establish a hierarchy of the cases based on an absolute “value” of each experience, not keeping the reading intimately related to its capability to transform (or not) public policies and civic and political cultures of each specific context.

It would probably be better to adopt the line of reading claimed by Graham Smith (2009), an important author for the study of democratic innovations, who alerts to a frequent “bad practice” in studies on participatory trials, that is, the habit of judging them in relation with the abstract models of participatory coherence and perfection and not according to the positive transformations they introduce in each context. To Smith, the right posture would be to evaluate each experience according to the offer of the institution panorama “before” it appeared and, successively, to evaluate which were the “procedural” transformations that the participatory process underwent with time, progressively moving away from or closer to (with different strength and different degrees of maturing) that perfection probably inaccessible in its entirety.

As shown in literature, there are no absolute valid “star-guides” to express the constant transformation that is in the essence of a participatory budget, avoiding falling into an entropic and progressive impoverishment dynamics. But it is possible to track some “determinant factors” that act in each territory, affecting the success or weaknesses of any PB. Among them, there are four main factors that we should stress : (1) political will; (2) organizational and propositional capability of the social fabric ⁴; (3) the financial autonomy of the institution proposing the PB and the available resources amount for the participatory budget; (4) the process architecture and the rules with which it warrants equal access to all potential participants.

These four factors do not have a weight and a real incidence merely due to the fact that they exist, but they partially affect the result of a participatory process in the proportion of how the citizens “perceive” the consistency of each one of them. This reflection suggests that a PB may become more or less strong concerning the commitment and the attention granted to ensure the centrality of each one of these elements, but also according to the establishment, maintenance and disclosure of the relationships between them. This last feature is linked to some fundamental principles that could guide the relationships among different success factors, generating an asset able to consolidate the participatory path and its sustainability. Therefore, in the following section we will try to

³ See DICO – Critical and interdisciplinary dictionary on participation: <http://www.participation-et-democratie.fr/fr/node/1035>

⁴ The first two usually act in a complementary manner, compensating for each other.

identify three of these “guiding” principles (according to Allegretti, 2013) and present some concrete examples that can reinforce problematic areas that show the need to respect these principles.

3. Three pillars to guide the evolution of PB

Several authors (Ganuza and Francés, 2012; Avritzer, 2009; Wampler 2007; Allegretti, 2005) have shown the fragility of the PB relating to representative institutions and the contribution that can be provided for its rooting in the territory through the existence of some pre-requirements (in terms of transparency, coordination, informational capillarity, language clarity and so forth). The “virtuous circle” between the pre-requirements and the innovating character of each specific architecture of a PB would not be activated only based on actions given that the players’ perceptions are an integral part of the social construction of reality and, therefore, end up being responsible for an amplifying effect that partly contributes to determine the success of the actions that the participatory process implements and also its own sustainability.

The sustainability of a PB should be understood as the ability of reproducing the process in time, keeping or increasing its possibility to attract participants and produce effective transformations over the territory and structuring public politics. It is proportional to the “resilience” of the same participatory process, that is, its capability to change its shape – if necessary – keeping intact the principles and central values, aiming to adjust to the different external conditions (whether political, institutional or financial). We would like to focus on three guiding principles that seem to be crucial to ensure the continuous evolution of a process without mischaracterizing the values and horizons structuring it. These are the following:

- a)* Keeping a firm will to characterize the process as a set of rules and instruments intrinsically evolutionary, that is, able to continuously renovate themselves, in an incremental and attentive manner to all that emerges from past monitoring actions.
- b)* Structuring all the necessary transformations to assure the PB the possibility to mature, becoming more attractive and effective, and increasing its deliberative quality without forgetting the need that the introduced changes do not affect the “centrality” of the citizens in the process. This does not mean that every introduced change has to be negotiated in detail with the participants, but it is certain that all transformations of the decision model and the relations of power between the players should not be changed without previous consent of the citizens when they risk being perceived by the latter as “threats” to their gradual acquisition of power within the decision mechanism. In fact, if in the origin of the PB there is the will to recover trust relationships between inhabitants and institutional representatives in a time of diffuse distrust in the role, the spirit of service and the integrity of the politicians, it is obvious that each change in the power relationships conveyed by the changes in procedural architecture can be faced as a “betrayal” of the founding spirit of the PB and, therefore, a regression towards the “power of politicians,” able to generate some stiffening in the relationships between the players and a waste of the social capital created in the previous process.

c) Finally it will be necessary that each introduced change is gradual and is not excessively “scaring” for the institutional players (whether politicians or members of the technical board). In fact, it is extremely important to be able to explain, defend and show with evidence and appropriate indicators the benefits that the transformation is able to bring to the process as a whole, and its capability of self-probation to citizens.

This last principle is important as the PB are different from other more formalized participatory processes, and are not only a “public policy” (Alves, 2012), therefore unable to survive if it is not constantly supported by political will of those who hold the power of territory management and decisions over public policies. If these players lose confidence in the process, they can threaten the maintenance of the very own “political pact” on which the PB efficacy is based, making it unsustainable in the short term. It is also worth quoting an almost physiological element of political dialect between representative and participatory procedures: that is, the fact that any new elected mayor or city councilman who aims to continue a pre-existent participatory process wants to leave her/his personal imprint, to be able to “take possession” of the creature and caring for her with more passion.

If this legitimate desire is not taken into account by the citizens, and on the contrary is faced as a strange and dangerous threat, there is the risk that the new administrators end up marginalizing the PB, as this is faced merely as an obligation, a heavy heritage of a flagship project (that is, an important “flagship project”) of the previous administration that does not add to the new rulers anything that can be disclosed as their “recognizable logo”. For example, in 2013, in the town of Condeixa-a-Nova (that has passed from an experience dedicated to the young people to a largest trial that opens two separated but interrelated spaces of co-decision for younger citizens and all the others), the Mayor – who was leaving as he could not be elected to a fourth mandate – decided not to include a set of occasional changes discussed during the previous year PB, with the explicit intention of leaving to his successor all the modifications he would consider useful to negotiate with the inhabitants considering an eventual modification of the general or specific goals of the participatory budget.

In this perspective, there is no sense in asking if we should accept or deny this need to introduce novelties in the participatory process, but the real problem seems to be finding the way to defend the PB accumulated achievements, maximizing all positive contributions of the new elements, without losing any of the major gains from the past.

It is worth to underline that in Portugal, in the last few years, there is a growing tendency to build “Letters of Principles” that present in writing the goals and the fundamental values on which the process is built upon, asserting themselves almost as a “constitution” to be respected at all times in the transformation of the operating rules that can occur from time to time. Although in the specific Portuguese case there are not (yet) written self-regulations with the participants (as it already happens in Spain and Brazil)⁵, the methodology presents interesting aspects exactly in the sense of allowing changes in the rules that can perfect the process in time, respecting the horizons and values established from the beginning. In order to assure this “constitutional” operation in the relationship between fundamental principles and pro-

⁵Only in the case of Condeixa-a-Nova some rules were discussed (by the participants’ willingness) during the PB process of 2012, and consequently changed to 2013.

⁶ Cases such as the PDM from São Paulo and Salvador (whose approval was blocked by justice as they did not comply with the minimum obligations required by law relating to the true participation of citizens in the instrument's design) are many times bring forth in those debates.

⁷ Given that the interruption of the PB also is related to the failure of the inhabitants to claim any penalty on its lack of implementation.

⁸ In the case of Porto Alegre, some authors (for example Langellier, 2011) underline some risks of the PB self-regulation. For example, after 2005, when the new coalition that replaced the Partido dos Trabalhadores (Workers Party) was not able (or did not want) to contradistinguish some proposals for rule changes presented by a series of segments of the society interested to "arrogate" the process for their own benefit, some measures were approved that have determined a series of setbacks in the level of social coverage of the PB.

⁹ See: issuu.com/observapoa/docs/observando_v.1_n.1_2009_?mode=window&view-Mode=doublePage

cedural rules, it may be necessary – in the future – to establish an organism for surveillance and monitoring the respect for the "Letter" and eventually improve and detail the principles and fundamental values in time.

In spite of these transformations, we have to acknowledge that to date there have been few examples of participatory budgets in the world that have shown deep attention, not only to the real structuring of the process and the relationships between the players, but also to the centrality of the reactions that each action can determine in its players. Next section, we will try to identify some examples of PB that considered as indispensable to look after the "hypersensitivity" of citizens, which is a normal condition in dialogue processes that touch sensitive aspects relating to emotions, dreams, individual and collective expectations, and that mainly try to value the energies that the individuals participating in the process voluntarily "donate" to the latter, using for that effect the time that could have been spent in activities linked to the private sphere. Namely, we shall centre our discussion on themes linked to financial and organizational architecture of PB processes, trying to show the manner they can affect the mobilization of other determining factors for the success and sustainability of each process.

3. Citizens "in the centre"

If, for many years, most of the Brazilian participatory budgets refused to address the subject of PB process institutionalization through official deliberations, the reason for this refusal was frequently justified by the risk that the processes might become rigid, "frozen" and "bureaucratized", thus becoming linked to the bureaucracy that rules inter-institutional relationships and therefore unable to evolve as quickly as necessary in order to respond to the celerity that often characterizes maturing processes from the players and their relationships within the processes. Beyond these motives, there would be the idea that a PB works and "is worth" when the participants are really passionate by the process as a method of policies elaboration and the deliberative game becomes – in a short period of time – in an institution (Allulli, 2011). That is, something in which the participants, although only temporarily, internalize the rules and principles, therefore legitimizing the process, as they understand it as intrinsically rational and correct, not only as a tool to be used, but also as a public asset to defend. This speech was – undoubtedly – instrumentally used as a comfortable "protective shield" by politicians not willing to formally ratify an important step of transfer of power to citizens, but also to have an instrument of "election blackmail" grounded in the strong link between the PB survival and the permanence of that political force in office. In the beginning of the Millennium – after the sudden death of several PB due to electoral defeats – the debate became more vivid (Allegretti and Alfonsin, 2005), given that citizens have started to claim the need of having a legally binding instrument that, in case of victory of coalitions or political parties that are not interested in promoting PB, would allow them to "charge" the application of new political leaderships, as it happens, for example, with the participatory master plans thanks to the Law of the City Statute⁶

Other countries have acted from the start in a manner that is different from Brazil. In Europe, for example, there are cases of PB (in some areas of Italy and Poland) where politicians – at first – have taken, among the first measures, the decision to formalize the existence of the process, by means of turning it into an acknowledged “right” by the citizens. These trials however, have not been able to assure the process maintenance, as it happened in the Italian County Pieve Emanuele, whose statute includes the PB since 2003, but no one has claimed its implementation since the centre-left coalition lost the municipal elections in 2006. This example – when compared with Brazilian cases in which the change of a political majority did not lead to the PB disappearance (as in Porto Alegre or Caxias do Sul) – tells us that political and also social probation⁷ is one of the key element for the sustainability of a participatory process in time.

As such, we could list the field of a process rules construction as the first and important space for power dispute that can determine the acceptance, the rooting and sustainability of a PB in time. This explains the growing importance that the self-construction has been gaining (to the very own participants) of the rules presiding the participatory budget operation. Such proposal, from the 90’s, claimed the need to replace a “top down” regulation with the public discussion of a “self-regulation”, in whose transformation the inhabitants have an important degree of control.

The central idea of this tendency is the fact that – being the PB per se a participating instrument “by invitation” (therefore creating many times a sort of “concession”, or a “generous opening” in the availability of administrators that legally would have the whole power to execute the choices on their own and in a discretionary manner) – the whole construction of the rules is kept in the hands of institutional representatives and that would not trigger new trust relationships, especially in territories and political situations marked by a substantial distrust in institutions. In fact, the participation rules duly established and disclosed “top down” can reinforce scepticism towards the process and the sense that it may represent only a new “bureaucratic trap”, where only the ones who created the rules can profit from the benefits of the process. It does not matter how much this impression corresponds to the truth; the fact is that this doubt on the honesty of the PB may arise in the citizens minds, and that is enough to have a negative impact in the legitimization of the process and its rooting in the territory. If self-regulation represents an effective measure to face negative perceptions that a top down regulation can trigger, its efficacy is nevertheless related to the methods used for the revision, and the

degree of control and supervision exerted over that moment of the participatory cycle by institutions possible plural in their composition and that, due to that composition, will be recognized as fairer and equidistant from the different players that directly dispute power within the PB.

When, in several cities, the City Councils established PB Monitoring Committees (which include political opposition or even drawn citizens – as in the cities of Capannori and Cascina in Tuscany) this is an acknowledgment of the fact that each space where the rules are built can be (and usually is) perceived as a “space of power” that can benefit the people who have the better knowledge, organizational capability and time to be able to take advantage from it⁸. Therefore it is crucial that this step of the participatory cycle is monitored and regulated, in order to assure that the change of rules only occurs in a manner perceived as “fair” and not privileging only some groups of territorial players. The “observatories” that began to appear in some cities (in Cameroon, France and in Brazil, *Observapoa* of Porto Alegre, that nowadays publish the magazine “*Observando o Orçamento Participativo de Porto Alegre- Observing the Participatory Budget in Porto Alegre*”⁹) are also an interesting manner to act – at the same time – on the monitoring of the operation and of the rules and the production of “information to the citizen”, therefore avoiding that the informational monopoly from the institutional source becomes an obstacle to the trust in the participatory process.

Today, many cities begin with very “light” operating rules, waiting for new rules to be proposed in the following years by the same citizens according to a growing desire of “guardianship” and “protection” of everyone’s right to participate, but also the efficacy and efficiency of the process. Sometimes, these rules “demanded” over time by the citizens are mainly related to the relationships between the participatory process and the administrative routine operation. In fact, the introduction should especially be gradual and consensual on the rules of a “technical” nature, as these can seem as a politicians or the technical body’s attempt to re-appropriate themselves of part of the decisions, simulating that they are the result of technical and regulator obligations that can not be disregarded. In this perspective, the usefulness of self-regulation is highly visible, as it allows that the more difficult to digest rules are gradually appropriated and understood by the citizens, and not only rejected as “enemies”. As such, the qualitative complexity of a PB occurs gradually and progressively, without causing excessive “shocks” between institutions and citizens.

4. *The futile efforts of advisory PB*

All the above mentioned, reinforces the reflection that one of the central elements of the participatory budget debates is related to the issue of the centrality of the participants in the decision assumption. In fact, while in Brazil, from the 90's onwards, it was never questioned that the PB could only be a "decision-making process" (that is, corresponding to a model in which the inhabitants have the right to decide the list of priorities and the institutions respect the priorities order established by the participants, within the maximum scheduled amount), in other countries and continents there has always been the hypothesis to build "advisory" models of participatory budget. In these models, the citizens express their desires and proposals, but in the end the public institutions make the final decision on which proposals should be included in the list of the financed projects. This second model of PB has been defined in many ways in comparative literature, but always with words that point to a "weak, "light," "poor" commitment and a degree of reduced innovations relating to pre-existing experiences of inhabitants participation in the discussion of public policies and projects. In the comparative analysis between 55 European PB, performed between 2005 and 2009 by the Marc Bloc Institute, under the direction of Professor Yves Sintomer, this PB model was also named as "selective listening": particularly, the analysis underlined the need to include a high level of accountability (or feedback) that can provide citizens with evidence of a good political will relating to consider their proposals, but also detailed information on the reasons that led to the refusal of some proposal and the acceptance of others. Only with this safeguard (the presence of a strong commitment to explain the final choices after the "selection of priorities to be financed" is made by the elected authorities) would nowadays be possible to insert some processes self-denominated PB – such as the Swedish case of Orsa or many of the German examples (more similar to models of "consultation on public finances") in the list of participatory budgets. Today, the debate is still vivid regarding this issue. There are even groups of militant consultants (for example, in Portugal or the United States) who refuse to accept consulting contracts with only advisory PB experiences, claiming their poor autonomy comparing to representative politics, and the lesser capability to resist to alterations determined by changes of external factors. Many radical movements (especially from the left political wing) refute the experiences of advisory PB as "non-influential" in the change of the political culture, because they leave the selective power in the hands of the same elected authorities that would have, in the absence of the PB, made all the decisions. For these critics, public authorities that promote advisory PB frequently make an "instrumental" use of the processes, directing the decisions to preconceived choices, trying to legitimize them by means of the words pronounced by the citizens in the process, but without really promoting a true debate on alternatives nor accepting the "surprises" that frequently arise in the public deliberation phase of the participatory processes.

What interests us from this debate is mainly the fact that the reasons defended by the adversaries of the "advisory" PB model are deeply related to the weight of the "perceptions" of the participants in the possibility of being loyal to a participatory process and acknowledge its legitimacy that should mark a real new "institution". The centre of the problem, seen for the citizen's perspective, is in the mechanism the

Englishmen define as cherry picking. Although the stage in which the elected authorities or their technical bodies choose the priorities in a list of desires and proposals expressed by the citizens can be honest and transparent, for the citizens there are always doubts on the criteria used to finalize that choice.

In fact, it is likely that there is no need for a municipal government to use the speech of the inhabitants in order to legitimize preconceived choices so that the public will form a negative opinion on the manner the selection process was driven. This happens because, in fact, many of the exclusions are not motivated by other reasons than the lack of sufficient resources to be able to accept all the presented proposals. Viewing this motivation, it is extremely difficult to make the excluded accept the fact that their proposals deserved to be less financed than the accepted ones. This is because usually there is no clear statement of the criteria that justify the exclusion or the approval of proposals with apparently the same dignity. And also if those criteria were listed, how would it be viable to make comparisons that seem “objective” between very different proposals based only in definitions such as “efficiency”, “realism”, the “feasibility”, the “public utility”, even the “degree of deficiency of the type of equipment proposed” in a given territory?

The PB that use this criteria in the stages of proposal filtering, inserting in their assessment better “targeted” indices or parameters, have always known that these criteria can never be seen as “objective”, “neutral” or “equidistant” towards a decision. This is the reason why cases such as the participatory budgets of Porto Alegre, Seville or Cordoba (in Spain) have given a secondary role to these criteria (visible in the attribution of less “weight” over the set of the decision), making clear that the centre of the decisions was the outcome of the vote from which the citizens were and are the only protagonists.

It seems therefore natural that whichever the criteria used to justify a selection of priorities made by someone different from the participants themselves, are perceived as “arbitrary” and “contestable” in the manner in which they were defined and/or used. In fact, this is a structural weakness of the participatory advisory models, that alone are not able to set aside the “mistrust” that the use of high levels of “discretion” in the final decision on the allocation of resources for investments naturally causes in whoever has offered their free time, competency and passion to contribute for the making of better decisions, which are closer to the needs of the inhabitants. The citizen who has invested in a participatory process, in view of the final choice, will also ask himself: “What are the ‘hidden criteria’ that lead to that choice?” “What was the weight of patronage relationships in the final decision?” Therefore, it does not need to be a choice made with evil intentions. Whatever the final choice proposed by the political players, it would have many possibilities of being perceived as unfair by the citizens.

As such, if no one compels (as in Peru or the Dominican Republic) a local authority to commit in a voluntary participatory process that can hide so many traps and produce negative perception in the public from which it would want to conquer trust in the first place, why risking to launch this adventure without opening a space of decision autonomy for the inhabitants? In the end, we can say that – to obtain a same degree of trust (and legitimacy) from the citizens – a merely advisory PB process implies a

lot more work for the institution than a co-decision PB process, as they have to justify in detail each rejected proposal, with the risk that every explanation can be perceived as negative (such as incomplete, exotic, poorly justified or even performed in bad faith...) by the citizens. In recent years, especially in many European countries (where, in the last half of the previous decade, several trials of advisory PB have been implemented), this reasoning starts to work, as soon as the number of experiences of deliberative nature is growing. A highly visible case is Portugal, where up to 2008 most PB were merely advisory, in the line tried by Palmela municipality, the first participatory budget of the country. In 2012, from the existing 23 trials, only 5 were advisory ones. As shown in the study by Alves and Allegretti (2012), most advisory PB were suddenly interrupted, especially due to the financial and economic crisis that generated a series of cuts in municipal finances, which have determined the blocking of the implementation of some works included in the participatory budget of previous years and a lot of frustration among citizens. Some cases such as Sesimbra municipality (where, in 2010, in its 5th anniversary, the PB went from deliberative to advisory, and then stopped in 2011) show how the disempowerment of the PB and change in the model that can be considered as a “weakening” of the previous trial have acted as an “antechamber of death” for the PB.

In some manner, the advisory PB model has shown to be little “resilient”; that is, unable to face the alteration brought by the change in the framework conditions in which the process was held. It is, therefore, understandable why processes such as the Portuguese municipality of Amadora, in a moment of crisis, have chosen to reinforce the intensity of the PB and transform them in co-decision processes, expecting to reinforce the bonds of trust between the population and the institution that proposed the PB by means of a clear statement of the will to change the dominant model of governance hitherto chosen.

Obviously, also in a PB co-decision model there can exist delicate moments that can contribute to determine the image of a lesser or higher commitment of the administration in changing the political culture, offering a really central role to the citizens. Among them, there is especially one step of the decision path that needs to be stressed out, regarding filtering and splaying of the proposal presented by the citizens, aiming to ensure the quality and the reduction of the number of those proposals that will be submitted to vote of the final priorities on which to invest the resources foreseen in the PB.

This splaying operation is always necessary, since many participatory budget models tend to generate a large range of citizen demands, and therefore also risking the public to be lost in the excessive amount of projects, ending up not reading them all before the start of priorities voting. A classic example is Lisbon municipality, where the participatory budget allowed the proposals to be submitted through the internet, which has generated since 2008, a very high number of applications that have (every year) to be necessarily filtrated and reduced in order to allow a conscious and rational voting by the participants. This is the reason why, since 2009, the large amount of “proposals” has to be analysed by a team of technicians from the municipality, that merges and reworks them in articulated “projects”: the number of which is about $\frac{1}{4}$ or $\frac{1}{5}$ of the initial number.

In many cities, this “filtering” has frequently created dissatisfaction, and many proponents claim not to recognize their own original proposal, although the mergers and aggregations include the identification codes of all original ideas which conform them. In Lisbon, a sign of this dissatisfaction was, back in 2009, a revolt that erupted at the beginning of the poll for the winning projects, forcing the City Council to shut down the votes count and reopening the polls, having asked the technicians to collect all complaints and re-evaluate the initial proposal and its merger.¹⁰ From the following year onwards, this procedure became standard, introducing in the PB regulation of the Portuguese capital (and its duplicate in many other cities) a period devoted to the presentation of complaints, followed by the re-evaluation of the projects object of the criticism. It is therefore not strange that other Portuguese cities that wanted to mimic the example of Lisbon – have afterwards chosen different solutions to reduce the proposals, as well as in an intermediate poll in the very own assemblies’ proposal (Cascais) or in prolonged contacts of the city hall technical teams with the proponents in order to favour corrections and merger of proposals (Guimarães and Condeixa).

As in the case of the adoption of an advisory model of PB, and also relating to this problem it would be possible to ask: “Why should we spend so many efforts to undermine the confidence in the process through a splaying model of the proposals that can offer the perception that is once more the “bureaucracy” that directs the final decisions?” The same “extensive” use of information technologies (that facilitates the redundancy and partially forces the splaying phase) could in this sense be questioned as an instrument generator

of suspicion. Because in fact, if on one hand it can assure the inclusion of new players in the PB, on the other it tends to reduce the negotiations between players and a sum of individual preferences and also does not allow a true control of this aggregation by the citizens, as it happens in a back office level, that is, in the backstage, in a dark room that only produces results without allowing a real monitoring of the accounts and the preferences expressed by the participants¹⁰.

Special consideration should also be given to those cities (very few in Europe but many in other continents) that return the power not only of splaying, but also of decision, for “delegates” or “popular advisors,” without going through the potential vote of all the inhabitants in plenary spaces (virtual or present). In fact, in a time where many people are suspicious of all who present themselves as “representatives” of others, this may contribute for a wrong image of the participatory budget. In fact, the choice to trust in small groups of people (although openly elected in previous stages of the process) for important choices can generate mistrust in many citizens, and it can also “disclaim” most participants from the process, as far as – since the delegates from various districts or theme assemblies are elected – the role of the citizens is very reduced. In such path, there is the risk of creation of new “representative spaces” that do not stimulate the population direct growth (in political and pedagogical terms) nor a higher social dynamism built on new horizontal relationships between individuals and groups in the space of “learning by doing” formed by the participatory budget. Due to these motives, many cities prefer that the citizens, in successive classroom spaces, are the ones that splay investment proposals through debates that lead to a reduced and “realistic” number of proposals over which the entire population of a given territory rules by means of methods of prioritization and extended voting, or even local referendum.

The case of Cascais, in Portugal, is very clear in showing that, whenever the reduction of redundancies of the proposals is the responsibility of the citizens themselves, the acknowledge legitimacy of the process regarding the used methods is around 100%, even from whom was not able to approve any proposal (OPtar Cascais 2012). This data allows us to make a general reflection on the importance that the architecture of a process – and its capability of relating its transformation and instruments to the perceptions of the participants – has to determine the success and the very own probation of a participatory path.

¹⁰ In spite of the energies required (in terms of time and personnel) and the risks implied in terms of dissatisfaction of the inhabitants, such procedure of splaying does not seem to be very effective. As it is obvious from the results of the Optar Project, that nowadays monitors a dozen of participatory budgets in Portugal, it seems that most people do not even read all the proposals (which are over 200) and only vote in those they already know or that someone told them to.

¹¹ This kind of criticism has been very marked in Italy between 2012 and 2013, in the newborn *Movimento 5 Stelle* (5 Stars Movement) vote to choose the candidates for members of parliament and the vote for the unit candidate of the movement for President of the Republic.

5. Looking to the future: some concluding reflections

Today, in the world, there are only three places (two countries, Peru and Dominican Republic, and a province, South Kivu in Congo) where the participatory budgets have become mandatory by law. The existing studies on these areas (Mbera, 2012; Allegretti et al., 2012; Mc Naulty, 2012; World Bank, 2010) present ambiguous and differentiated findings. In fact, many local and regional administrators perceive this obligation as violence, but the local population perceives it as a warranty, and they frequently ask to introduce improvements in old and very rigid laws. At the same time, it seems that the mandatory process generated some positive effects in terms of construction of “prerequisites” for the implementation of good participatory budgets (especially in terms of transparency, efficacy, accountability and construction of redistributive criteria for the resources in the territory), but did not present the capability to “induce” new good practices – which happen only in areas marked by a strong political will. Other methods more centred in the “promotion” of the PB from supra municipal institutions – as it happens in Poland and in Tuscany, or already has been done in Lazio Region or the Province of Malaga (Allegretti, Paño and Garcia, 2011; Allegretti, 2011) have proven more effective, although the possibility of creation of slightly compromised processes and of low democratic intensity represents, in these cases, also a not secondary possibility.

In any way, the above-mentioned situations are a small percentage of the PB that presently exists in the planet. Most other are represented by voluntary processes, that are born from the meeting between different political will of representatives from institutions, social movements, and, more rarely, public servants that work in local administrations. Most of these trials include participatory process with some evolutionary capability in time, that many times are born weakly – that is, with reduced amounts of resources, in limited territories with a marginal role in the net of public policies – and gradually advance through pilot programs and incremental expansions.

In many cases, they have reduced energies to go forward, and therefore privilege action over self-reflection; that is, they move forward intuitively, without monitoring their findings, using only the “intuitions” of the elected administrators and the officers involved in the PB as a guide for the progressive transformation. A smaller number of cases, in the last few years, has been committing to partnerships with universities or non-governmental organizations in order to ensure a more scientific assessment of the participatory processes, and the possibility to study the feedback from the careful listening to the participants and the questioning

of the reasons for its absence offered by the citizens who do not participate. Few are nowadays the examples of cities gifted with PB that are already equipped with the construction of permanent structures (usually called Observatories) devoted to monitor the performance and the impact of participatory budgets, sometimes in the middle of other tasks.

Within the above-mentioned scenario, there seems to exist a limited number of examples of participatory budgets designed as true “trials”, seriously grounded, not only in terms of political will, but also scientifically designed to analyse their results and coherently modify its shapes and the manner to establish pro-active relationships between the players. Other PB are only “trials” that happen, but seldom devote the necessary space for a self-critical reflection that sustains transformations capable of increasing the coherence between the declared goals and the means used to reach them, relating to its own sustainability in time. Particularly reduced, is the number of examples of PB that in each step – and especially in the intervals between annual cycles, when there is space and time to introduce the necessary changes in the process operation – try to analyse the perceptions that the processes raise in the players of the territory.

The aim of this chapter was to offer a reflection precisely on this last issue, searching the relationship between the neglect existing in many locations on the “perceptive” aspects relating to the participatory processes and the success of the PB. We could conclude that we have disclosed as such some “weakness” areas in which the perception of the actor could determine a lack of legitimization of the processes themselves. If attention is not paid to these risks, it is easy to imagine that the PB may even represent – at a certain point in its life – a “political boomerang” for its promoters. This result would not obviously be a mechanical fact, but the consequence of an incapability of the promoters to ensure the sustainability of participatory budgets in time by means of a critical reflexive posture, able to listen and value the hypersensitivities that surround participatory processes. The latter, in fact, are very delicate political and power struggle spaces, especially when they bet on the possibility to valorise collective intelligence, the maturing of social capital and the reconstruction of mutual trust between political players e citizens.

In this article, we started by identifying some success factors that literature has highlighted as “determinant” in the construction of successful experience of PB until today. After, we tried to analyse some of the “critical macro areas” (such as the spaces for rules construction or filtering of proposals, etc.) that are part of the organization architecture of the participatory budgets, in order to

understand a series of frequent risks that can threaten the success of the PB (when the transformation of the process happens without attention) and to understand how the same changes could have been faced and understood by the different territorial players.

The indications we have tried to offer to deal with some of these risks have included some concrete examples, but also the identification of the three general principles that could guide the evolutionary transformations of a PB, positively affecting its sustainability: (1) the need to keep constant the incrementally evolutionary character of each participatory process; (2) the commitment to make each transformation, allowing the citizens to continue to perceive themselves as the “centre” of the participatory process; (3) the necessary attention to care for the perceptions of the political players, from which depends the continuation of the process, that need to be pampered and respected by the effort to keep the PB alive and rich (and many times they end up isolated from the political parties or from the other administrators), and they also need a critical and constructive support to avoid that the participatory budget ends up as a cyclic repetition of democratic rituals already emptied of its original “soul”.

The most important aspect to underline, to conclude, is that – also when it is not possible to have detailed instruments to test and study the citizens’ reactions towards the progressive transformations of the architecture of the participatory budgets and their relationships with the representative institutions, the territory and its population – it is necessary to pay attention and try to imagine what each element that forms a participatory process can determine in the public for which it is directed. Because, in order to activate a “virtuous circle” between the behaviour of the institutions and the benefits brought by participatory innovations, it is not enough that the first ones act honestly and with good intentions, they should take care – at every step – of the impression that their acts are generating in the territory inhabitants.



AUTHOR'S NOTE

The thoughts present in this article are deeply connected to the project “*O Orçamento Participativo como Instrumento Inovador para Reinventar as Autarquias em Portugal e Cabo Verde: uma Análise Crítica da Performance e dos Transfers*” (Participatory Budget as an Innovating Instrument to Reinvent Municipalities in Portugal and Cape Verde: A Critical Analysis on Performance and Transfers), funded by the Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (PTDC/CS-SOC/099134/2008 - FCOMP-01-0124-FEDER-009255). Some of the partial results of this study are presented here. This work also benefited from the interchanges developed within the Project “*Cidade e Alteridade: Convivência Multicultural e Justiça Urbana*” (City and Otherness: Multicultural Coexistence and Urban Justice), co-funded by a partnership FCT/CNPQ (4.4.1.00). The author wishes to thank Kátia Lima for agreeing to disclose and updating some of the reflections proposed in her book “*Orçamento Participativo – Olhares e Perspectivas*” (Participatory Budget – Views and Perspectives), from 2013.

BI
BLIO
GRA
PHY

PER

AR

TI

CLE

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF PARTICIPATORY BUDGETS IN THE WORLD A NEW SOCIAL AND POLITICAL MOVEMENT?

NELSON DIAS

TRANSNATIONAL MODELS OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION: THE CASE OF PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING

YVES SINTOMER

BOBBIO, Norberto (2002) *O Futuro da Democracia*, São Paulo, Paz e Terra.

FRANCO, Augusto de (2007) *Alfabetização Democrática: o que podemos pensar (e ler) para mudar nossa condição de analfabetos democráticos*, FIEP e Rede de Participação Política do Empresariado, Curitiba, Brazil.

PNUD (2004) *A Democracia na América Latina – ruma a uma democracia de cidadãos e cidadãs*, PNUD, Santana do Parnaíba (São Paulo).

TOURAINÉ, Alain (1994) *O que é a Democracia?* Lisbon, Instituto Piaget.

ABERS, R. *Inventing Local Democracy*. Grassroots Politics in Brazil. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers. 2000.

ALLEGRETTI, G. *L'insegnamento di Porto Alegre*. Autoprogettualità come paradigma urbano. Firenze: Alinea. 2003.

AVRITZER, L. *Democracy and the Public Space in Latin America*. Princeton: University Press Princeton. 2002.

AVRITZER, L. *Participatory Institutions in Democratic Brazil*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press. 2009.

AVRITZER, L, WAMPLER, B. *The Expansion of Participatory Budgeting in Brazil* (Report, Belo Horizonte). 2008.

BAIERLE, S. *Urban Struggles in Porto Alegre: between Political Revolution and Transformism*. Porto Alegre: ONG Cidade. 2007.

BAIOCCHI, G. *Militants and Citizens. The Politics of Participatory Democracy in Porto Alegre*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 2005.

Baogang H., "Civic Engagement through Participatory Budgeting in China: Three Different Logics at Work?" *Public Administration and Development*, 31, 122-133. 2011a.

— "Authoritarian Deliberation. The deliberative turn in Chinese political development," *Perspectives on Politics*, v. 9, n. 2 (June), 269-289. 2011b.

CABANNES, Y. (ed.) *Participatory budgeting and Local Finances*. Porto Alegre: Network Urbal N°9 European Community. 2003.

CABANNES, Y. *Answers to 72 Frequently Asked Questions About Participatory Budgeting*. UMP-LAC, UN-HABITAT and UNDP. Quito: 2004. Disponível em: www.unhabitat.org/documents/faqpp.pdf.

CHAUDHURIS, S.; HELLER, P. *The plasticity of participation: evidence from a participatory governance experiment*. 2002. Disponível em: www.siteresources.worldbank.org/INTEMPowerment/Resources/13892_chaudhuri_heller.pdf, acessado em 24 de Novembro de 2009.

FEDOZZI, L. *Orçamento participativo: Reflexões sobre a experiência de Porto Alegre*. Porto Alegre: Tomo. 1999.

FEDOZZI, L. *O Poder da aldeia*. Porto Alegre: Tomo: 2000.

FEDOZZI, L. *Observando o Orçamento participativo de Porto Alegre*. Porto Alegre: Tomo. 2007.

FUNG, A.; WRIGHT, E. O. (eds.) *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. London/New York: Verso. 2003.

GANUZA, E.; Francés F., *El Círculo virtuoso de la democracia: los presupuestos participativos a debate*, Madrid: CIS. 2012.

GENRO, T.; de SOUZA, U. *Orçamento Participativo. A experiência de Porto Alegre*. São Paulo: Editora Fundação Perseu Abramo. 1997.

GRET, M.; SINTOMER, Y. *Porto Alegre. A esperança de uma outra democracia*. Lisboa: Campo das Letras. 2003.

GUEYE, B. *Le budget participatif en pratique*. Dakar: IED-Afrique. 2008.

HERZBERG, C. *Der Bürgerhaushalt von Porto Alegre*. Münster : Lit. 2001.

JAIN, L.C. *Decentralisation and local governance*. New Delhi: Orient Longma. 2005.

KANOUTE, M. B. *Manuel du budget participatif en Afrique Francophone*. Dakar ONU HABITAT and ENDA T. 2007. Disponível em: www.unhabitat.org.

LERNER, J.; WAGNER, E. *Van Participatory Budgeting in Canada: Democratic Innovations in Strategic Spaces*. Amsterdam: TNI. 2006. Disponível em: www.tni.org.

MARQUETTI, A. *Characteristics of Brazilian Cities Experimenting with participatory Budgeting*. Working Paper. Porto Alegre: PUCRS. 2005.

MARQUETTI, A.; DE CAMPOS, G.; PIRES, R. (eds.) **Democracia Participativa e Redistribuição: Análise de Experiências de Orçamento Participativo**. São Paulo: Xamã. 2008.

MATSUBARA, A. Participatory Budgeting in Japan: the case of the City of Ichikawa. 2013. In: SINTOMER et al. 2013c.

MORORÓ R.R. **Participatory Budgets as a Mean of Promoting More Equitable Distribution of Public resources: Potential and Contradictions**, paper presented at the Conference “Beyond Accra: Practical Implications of Ownership and Accountability in national Development Strategies”. London. 2009.

NEUNECKER, N.; MASTUTI, S. S. Indonesia: Engendering Participatory Budgeting to Reach Poor People: Tanah Datar – Indonesia Experience. In: SINTOMER et al. 2013c.

OLOWU, D. **Local Democracy, Taxation and Multi-level Governance in Africa**. The Hague: Institute of Social Studies. 2003.

RAZA, A.; WEISER, E.T. **Fostering Participatory Budgeting**. Manila: Asian Development Bank and The Asia Foundation. 2006.

Röcke, A. **Framing Citizen Participation. Participatory Budgeting in France, Germany and the United Kingdom** (to be published). 2013.

SANTOS, B. de Sousa Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre: Toward a Redistributive Democracy. **Politics & Society**. v. 26, n.4, p. 461-510. 1998.

SHAH, A. (ed.) **Participatory Budgeting**. Washington: World Bank Publications. 2007.

SINTOMER, Y., HERZBERG, C.; RÖCKE, A., ALLEGRETTI G., (2012), “Transnational Models of Citizen Participation: The Case of Participatory Budgeting”, **Journal of Public Deliberation**, v. 8, n.2, Article 9.

SINTOMER, Y., HERZBERG, C.; RÖCKE, A., ALLEGRETTI G., LOPES ALVES M. **Learning from the South: Participatory Budgeting Worldwide – an Invitation to Global Cooperation**. Bonn: Engagement Global. 2013a. Disponível em: www.service-eine-welt.de/

SINTOMER, Y.; HERZBERG, C.; RÖCKE, A. **Participatory Democracy and Public Service Modernisation**. Farnham: Ashgate. 2013b.

SINTOMER, Y., TRAUB-MERZ R., JUNHA Z., HERZBERG C. (eds.) **Participatory Budgeting in Asia and Europe, Key Challenges of Participation**. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan. 2013c.

SMITH G. **Democratic Innovations: Designing Institutions for Citizen Participation** (Theories of Institutional Design). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2009.

SONGMIN, A. Participatory Budgeting in Korea: the case of Dong-Ku, Ulsan. 2013. In: Sintomer et al. 2013c.

TALPIN, J. **Schools of Democracy. How Ordinary Citizens (Sometimes) Become More Competent in Participatory Budgeting Institutions**. Colchester: ECPR Press. 2011.

UCLG (ed.) **Decentralization and Local Democracy in the World: First Global Report**. Barcelona: UCLG. 2008.

UN-HABITAT e MDP (eds.) **Participatory Budgeting in Africa: A Training Companion**. Nairobi/Harare: UN-Habitat/MDP. 2008.

WAMPLER, B. **Participatory Budgeting in Brazil: Contestation, Cooperation, and Accountability**. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press. 2010.

WORLD BANK (ed.) **Brazil Toward a More Inclusive and Effective Participatory Budget in Porto Alegre**. Washington: World Bank. 2008.

ZAMBONI, Y. **Participatory Budgeting and Local Governance: An Evidence-Based Evaluation of Participatory Budgeting Experiences in Brazil**. Working Paper. Brasília: Controladoria Geral da União. 2007. Disponível em: www.bvc.cgu.gov.br.

Abers, R. (2000), *Inventing Local Democracy: Grassroots Politics in Brazil*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder

Allegretti, G. (2005), *Porto Alegre: una biografia territoriale. Ricercando la qualità urbana a partire dal patrimonio sociale*, Firenze University Press, Florence

Allegretti, G.; Alfonsin, B. (2003), “Dalla gestione consensuale alla riprogettazione condivisa del territorio”, in D. della Porta e L. Mosca (org.), *Globalizzazione e movimenti sociali*, Roma, Manifestolibri, pp. 121-153.

Allegretti, G.; Paño, P.; García, P. (2011), *Viajando por los presupuestos participativos: buenas prácticas, obstáculos y aprendizajes.*, CEDMA. Málaga

PAYING ATTENTION TO THE PARTICIPANTS' PERCEPTIONS IN ORDER TO TRIGGER A VIRTUOUS CIRCLE

GIOVANNI ALLEGRETTI

- Allegretti, G. (2011), «Le processus d'économie participative de la région Lazio. Quand l'expérimentation devient le symbole d'une gestion politique», in Sintomer, Y. ; Talpin, G. [orgs.], *La démocratie participative au-delà de la proximité. Le Poitou-Charentes et l'échelle régionale*, Presse Universitaire de Rennes, Rennes
- Allegretti, G. et alii (2012), *Estudio comparativo de los presupuestos participativos en en República Dominicana, España y Uruguay*, CEDMA, Malaga
- Allegretti, G. (2013), “Os orçamentos participativos sabem escutar? Reflexões para reforçar a sustentabilidade dos orçamentos participativos”, in Lima, K., Boson, C.: (2013, eds.), “Orçamento Participativo olhares e perspectivas”, Livraria Paulo Freire Ed.
- Allegretti, U. (2011), entrada “Democrazia partecipativa”, in *Enciclopedia del diritto. Annali IV*, Giuffrè, Milão
- Allulli, M. (2011), “Pratiche partecipative e istituzionalizzazione. Tra ritualità e decision-making”, in *Rivista Italiana di Politiche Pubbliche*, n. 3/2011, pp. 443-475
- Alves, M. (2012), *What happens when concepts travel? Discussing the emergency of participatory processes in inhospitable political contexts.* (working paper, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, dep. of Political Sciences). 5th Seminar on Sociological and Political Research. RCC; CIS; Harvard University, Sept 2012, Cambridge.
- Alves, M, Allegretti, G. (2012) “(In) stability, a key element to understand participatory budgeting: Discussing Portuguese cases.” *Journal of Public Deliberation: Vol. 8: Iss. 2, Article 3.* Descarregavel de: <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss2/art3>
- Appadurai, A. (1991), “Global Ethnoscapes: Notes and Queries for a Transnational Anthropology”, in *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, ed. R. Fox, Santa Fe, N.M.: School of American Research Press, pp. 191-210.
- Avritzer, L. (2012) “Democracy beyond aggregation: the participatory dimension of public deliberation”, *Journal of Public Deliberation: Vol. 8: Iss. 2, Article 10.* Descarregavel de: <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss2/art10>
- Avritzer, L.(2009) *Participatory Institutions in Democratic Brazil*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Washington.
- Baiocchi, G. (2005) *Militants and citizens: the politics of participatory democracy in Porto Alegre*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- Banco Mundial (2010), *Evaluación del Presupuesto Participativo y su relación con el Presupuesto por Resultados*, World Bank Press, Washington/Lima.
- Benasayag, M.; Del Rey, A., (2010), *Elogio del Conflitto*, Feltrinelli, Milano
- Bobbio, L. (2010), “Le specificità del dibattito pubblico sulle grandi infrastrutture. Il caso della variante autostradale di Genova”, in U. Allegretti (a cura di), *Democrazia partecipativa. Esperienze e prospettive in Italia e in Europa*, Firenze, Firenze University Press, pp. 285-297.
- Caponetto, M. (2002), *Scenari di progetto identitario. Il caso di Lucca*, Alinea, Firenze
- Dias, N. (2010), “Orçamentos Participativos em Portugal” in *Vez e Voz* nº 97, June 2010, ANIMAR, Lisbon
- Fedozzi, L. (2000), *O poder da aldeia : gênese e história do orçamento participativo de Porto Alegre*, Tomo Editorial, Porto Alegre
- Freedom House (2012), *Freedom in the World 2012, Report Annuale*, www.freedomhouse.org
- Ganuzo, E. (2008) *Control político y participación en democracia: los presupuestos participativos*, Ed. Fundación Alternativas, Madrid
- Ganuzo, E.; Frances, F. (2012), *El círculo virtuoso de la democracia: los presupuestos participativos a debate*, Cit, Madrid
- Ibarra, P. (2007), “Participación y poder: de la legitimación al conflicto”, em Gurrutxaga, Igor A. e Pedro I. Guell, *Democracia Participativa y Desarrollo Humano*, Madrid, Instituto Internacional de Sociología Jurídica de Oñati, Ed. Dykinson, pp.37-56.
- Langelier, S. (2011), “Que reste-t-il de l'expérience pionnière de Porto Alegre ?”, in *Le Monde Diplomatique*, Ottobre 2011
- Mbera, E. (2012), “Towards budget transparency and improvement in the South Kivu Province”, in Parycek, P.; Edelmann, N.; Sachs, M. (eds), *CeDEM12. Proceedings of the International Conference for E-Democracy and Open Government*, Danube University of Krems, Austria, pp. 47-58
- McNulty, S. (2012) “An Unlikely Success: Peru's Top-Down Participatory Budgeting Experience”, *Journal of Public Deliberation: Vol. 8: Iss. 2, Article 4.* Descarregavel de: <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss2/art4>

- Norris, P. (2011), *Democratic Deficit: Critical Citizens Revisited*, Cambridge University Press, New York/Cambridge
- Pateman, C., 2012, "Participatory Democracy Revisited," APSA Presidential Address, *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 10/No. 1
- Pomatto, G. (2011), *Gioco strategico e deliberazione. Il dibattito pubblico sulla Gronda di Genova*, SPS University Press, Torino
- Rizzo, S.; Stella G. (2007), *La Casta*, Rizzoli, Milano
- Romano, I. (2012), *Cosa fare come fare. Decidere insieme per praticare davvero la democrazia*, Editore Chiarelettere, Torino
- Santos, B. (2008), "Sintese Final," in *Actas do I Encontros dos Orçamentos Participativos Portugueses*, In-Loco, S. Brás de Alportel.
- Santos, B. De Sousa; Avritzer, L. (2003), "Introdução: para ampliar o cânone democrático," in Santos, B. De Sousa (org.). *Democratizar a democracia: os caminhos da democracia participativa*. 2ª Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, p. 39-81
- Santos, B. de Sousa (2003) *Democratizar a democracia. Os caminhos da democracia participativa*, Edições Afrontamento, Porto (introdução geral para a chancela "Para nova emancipações").
- Sintomer, Y.; Allegretti, G. (2009) *I bilanci partecipativi in Europa. Nuove esperienze democratiche nel vecchio continente*, Ediesse, Rome and Allegretti (2009)
- Sintomer, Y.; Allegretti, G. (2013, no prelo), *Os Orçamentos Participativos na Europa. Entre democracia participativa e modernização dos serviços públicos*, Almedina, Coimbra
- Sintomer, Y.; Allegretti, G.; Herzberg, C.; Röcke, A. (2013, versão atualizada da edição 2010), *Learning from the South: Participatory Budgeting Worldwide –an Invitation to Global Cooperation*, InWENT gGmbH, Bonn (edições em Portugues, Ingles, Alemão)
- Sintomer, Y.; et al. (2008), "Participatory Budgeting in Europe: Potentials and Challenges," in *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Volume 32.1 March 2008
- Smith, G. (2009), *Democratic Innovations*, Cambridge University Press
- UN-Habitat (2008), *Participatory Budgeting in Africa – A Training Companion with cases from eastern and southern Africa* (2 volumes), UN-Habitat, Nairobi
- Wampler, B.. (2007), *Participatory Budgeting in Brazil. Contestation, Cooperation, and Accountability*, Penn State Press
- Allegretti, G (2011), "Los presupuestos participativos en África y en Asia" en Falck, A y Paño, P (eds.) (2011), *Democracia participativa y presupuestos participativos*, Málaga: Diputación Málaga y Unión Europea.
- Avritzer, L (2006), "New Public Spheres in Brazil: Local Democracy and Deliberative Politics" in *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30(3): 623-637.
- Bassoli, M (2011), *Participatory budgeting in Italy: as analysis of (almost democratic) participatory governance arrangements in International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2427.2011.01023.x
- Cooke, B, and U Kothari (2001) "The case for Participation as Tyranny" in Cooke, B y Kothari, U (eds.) (2001) *Participation: The New Tyranny*, London: Zed Press (pp 1-15).
- Ganuzza, E y Baiocchi, G (2012), "The Power of ambiguity: How Participatory Budgeting Travels the Globe" in *Journal of Public Deliberation* 8 (2), article 8.
- Ganuzza, E y Francés, F (2012) *El círculo virtuoso de la democracia: los presupuestos participativos a debate*. Madrid: CIS.
- Ganuzza, E; Nez, H y Morales, E (2013) "The struggle for the voice: associations against citizens in participatory budgeting" *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* (forthcoming)
- Goldfrank, B (2012), "The World Bank and the Globalization of Participatory Budgeting" in *Journal of Public Deliberation* 8 (2), article 7
- Goldfrank, B (2007), "Lessons from Latin American Experience in Participatory Budgeting," in **Anwar Shah, ed., Participatory Budgeting**. Washington, DC: World Bank Institute
- He, B (2011), "Civic engagement through participatory budgeting in China: three different logics at work," **Public Administration and Development**, 31 (122-131)
- Lascombes, P and Le Gales, P (2007), "Introduction: Understanding Public Policy Through Its Instruments? From the Nature

BEYOND THE LINE: THE PARTICIPATORY BUDGET AS AN INSTRUMENT

ERNESTO GANUZA
GIANPAOLO BAIOCCHI

**THE DYNAMICS OF THE
DIFFUSION OF THE
PARTICIPATORY BUDGET
IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA:
FROM DAKAR TO MAPUTO**

**OSMANY PORTO DE
OLIVEIRA**

of Instruments to the Sociology of Public Policy Instrumentation” *Governance* 20(1): 1–21.

Leubolt, B; Novy, A y Becker, J (2008) “Changing Patterns of Participation in Porto Alegre” in *International Social Science Journal* 59 n°193 (435–448)

Marquetti, A. (2003): “Participação e redistribuição: o Orçamento participativo em Porto Alegre”. en *Avritzer, L. y Navarro, Z. A inovação democrática no Brasil*. São Paulo: Cortez.

Peck, J and Theodore, N (2010), “Mobilizing Policy: Models, Methods, and Mutations”. *Geoforum* 41(2). Elsevier Ltd: 169–174.

Pont, R (2003) *Democracia, igualdade e qualidade de vida: a experiencia de Porto Alegre*, Porto Alegre: Veraz.

Sintomer, Y; Herzberg, C and Röcke, A (2008), “Participatory Budgeting in Europe: Potentials and Challenges” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32(1): 164–178.

Sintomer, Y; Herzberg, C. y Allegretti, G (2010), *Learning from the South: Participatory Budgeting Worldwide – an Invitation to Global Cooperation*. Bonn: InWEnt gGmbH.

Songmin, A. (2009), “Korean cases: participatory budgeting in Dong-Ku, Ulsan”, **paper presentado en la Conferencia Participatory Budgeting in Asia and Europe: key challenges of participation**, 17–19 August, Hangzhou (China)

Talpin, Julien (2011), *Schools of Democracy: How ordinary citizens (sometimes) become competent in participatory budgeting institutions*, Colchester: ECPR Press.

Utzig, J. “Notas Sobre o Governo do PT em Porto Alegre.” *Novos Estudos Cebrap* 45, n° 6 (1996): 209–22.

Wampler, B. (2007) “A Guide to Participatory Budgeting” in *Participatory Budgeting* edited by Shah, A. Washington: World Bank.

AFRICITÉS (2012) Évaluation du Processus des Africités et Suivi des Recommandations. CGLUA, Rabat.

ALDECOA, Francisco & KEATING, Michael (1999), *Paradiplomacy in Action: The Foreign Relations of Subnational Governments*. Frank Cass: London.

WORLD BANK: <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/AFRICAEXT/MOZAMBIQUEEXTN/0,,menuPK:382138~pagePK:141159~piPK:141110~theSitePK:382131,00.html>

BUNCE, V. Wolchik, S., (2009), “Transnational Networks, Diffusion Dynamics, and Electoral Change in the Postcommunist World”. Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Toronto.

DOLOWIZ D., MARSH D. “Learning from Abroad: The Role of Policy Transfer in Contemporary Policy Making”, *Governance*, Vol. 13, N° 1, 2001, p. 5–24.

GAYE, B, (2008), “Le Budget Participatif en Pratique: Un guide pratique destiné aux acteurs locaux.” IED.

GOOD GOVERNANCE LEARNING NETWORK (2012). Putting participation at the heart of development//Putting development at the heart of participation: A civil society perspective on local governance in South Africa. The State of Local Governance Publication, South Africa.

HASSENTEUFEL P., « De la comparaison internationale à la comparaison transnationale, les déplacements de la construction des objets comparatifs en matière de politiques publiques », *Revue Française de Science Politique*, N°1, Vol. 55, February 2005, pp. 113–132.

NGUENHA, E. (2009). ‘Governação Municipal Democrática em Moçambique: Alguns Aspectos Importantes para o Desenho e Implementação de Modelos do Orçamento Participativo,’ Paper presented at the 2nd IESE Conference on ‘Dynamics of Poverty and Patterns of Economic Accumulation in Mozambique,’ Maputo.

NGUENHA, E. (2009). Orçamento Participativo em Moçambique: Modelos, Práticas e Indicadores de Medição de Desempenho. No data.

PORTO de OLIVEIRA, O. 2010. Le transfert d’un modèle de démocratie participative: Paradiplomatie entre Porto Alegre et Saint-Denis. Collection Chrysallides, IHEAL/CREDA. Paris.

PORTO de OLIVEIRA, O. 2011. “L’implication des réseaux dans la circulation des politiques de gouvernance participative : Le cas du Forum des Autorités Locales”. Papier présenté au XIème Congrès de l’Association Française de Science Politique. Section Thématique – 26

“Agir par réseaux : Les réseaux en science politique : méthodes et objets”. Strasbourg 28 août – 1 Septembre.

PORTO de OLIVEIRA, O.2012. “Embaixadores do Orçamento Participativo: Um prelúdio à circulação internacional de um dispositivo de governança participativa”. Paper prepared for presentation at the 6th Latin American Congress of Political Science (ALACIP) Symposium: Participation, representation, institutionalisation: where are the relations between state and civil society in Latin America heading? Quito 12 – 14 June.

SINTOMER, Y., HERZBERG, C. e ALLEGRETTI, G. (2012). Aprendendo com o Sul: O Orçamento Participativo no mundo – um convite à cooperação global. Engagement Global gGmbH, Bonn.

SMITH, T. (2004). “The potential for participatory budgeting in South Africa: A case study of the “People’s Budget” in eThekweni Municipality”. Centre for Civil Society, University of KwaZulu Natal.

TEIXEIRA, A. C., ALBUQUERQUE, M. do C. (2006). “Orçamentos Participativos: Projetos políticos, partilha de poder e alcance democrático”. IN: DAGNINO, E., OLVERA, O., ALDO, P. (Org.). A disputa pela construção democrática na América Latina. Paz e Terra. Campinas.

WORLD BANK. (2000). Entering the 21st Century: World Development Report 1999/2000. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

WORLD BANK. (2009). Municipal Development in Mozambique: Lessons from the First Decade. Volume I: Synthesis Report, Washington.

Allegretti G. (org., 2011a), **Estudio comparativo de los presupuestos participativos en República Dominicana, España y Uruguay**, CEDMA, Málaga

Allegretti, G. (2011d) “From Skepticism to Mutual Support: Towards a Structural Change in the Relations between Participatory Budgeting and the Information and Communication Technologies?” in **Mindus**, P., Greppi A. et Cuono M. (orgs.), *Legitimacy_2.0. E-Democracy and Public Opinion in the Digital Age*, Goethe University Press, Frankfurt am Main

Allegretti, G.; Paño, P.; Garcia, P. (2011), **Viajando por los presupuestos participativos: buenas prácticas, obstáculos y aprendizajes.**, CEDMA. Málaga

Governo da RDC (2006), Programa do Governo para 2007–2011, Kinshasa

Governo da RDC (2011), Lei n.º 11/011 de 13 de Julho de 2011 relativa às Finanças Públicas, Kinshasa

Frères des hommes (2006), **Les budgets participatifs**, dossier thématique trimestriel, FDH, Paris

Hôgye, M. (2002), “Theoretical approaches to public budgeting”, Budapeste

Huddleston, J.K. (2005), **An introduction to local government budgets: A guide for planners**, Madison, Wisconsin

E (2009). Estudo de viabilidade do Orçamento Participativo na Província do Kivu Sul, Bukavu

Mbera, E. (2012), “Towards budget transparency and improvement in the South Kivu Province” in Parycek, P.; Edelmann, N.; Sachs, M. (eds), *CeDEM12. Proceedings of the International Conference for E-Democracy and Open Government*, Danube University of Krems, Áustria, pág. 47-58

McNeil, M.; Malena, C. [org.] (2010), *Demanding for Good Governance. Lessons from Social Accountability Initiatives in Africa*, Banco Mundial, Washington, D.C.

Shah, A. (2007, ed.), *Participatory Budgeting, Public Sector Governance and Accountability series*, **World Bank Publications**, Washington, D.C.

Sintomer, Y, Herzberg, C., Röcke, A., Allegretti, G. (2012): “Transnational Models of Citizen Participation: The Case of Participatory Budgeting”, **Journal of Public Deliberation**, Vol. 8, Ed. 2, Artigo 9.

Sintomer, Y.; Herzberg, C.; Röcke, A. (2008), « From Porto Alegre to Europe: Potential and Limitations of Participatory Budgeting », **International Journal of Urban and Regional Research**, volume 32/1, Mach, pág. 164–178.

Governo Provincial do Kivu Sul (2012), Decreto Provincial n.º 12/03/GP/SK, de 5 de Outubro de 2012, sobre a Institucionalização do OP nas Entidades Descentralizadas da Província do Kivu Sul, Bukavu

Ugandan Local government budget committee: General Guide to the Local Government Budget Process for District & LLG Councillors, NGOs, CBOs & Civil Society, www.lgfc.go.ug/archives.php, acedido a 14 de Março de 2013

UN-HABITAT (2004), **2 Perguntas Frequentes sobre Orçamento Participativo**, UN-Habitat, Nairobi

PB AND THE BUDGET PROCESS IN THE SOUTH KIVU PROVINCE

EMMY MBERA

GIOVANNI ALLEGRETTI

**THE MOZAMBICAN
EXPERIMENT OF
PARTICIPATORY
BUDGETING**

**EDUARDO JOSSIAS
NGUENHA**

AZEVEDO, N.; GOMES, M. (2008). Um Balanço da Literatura sobre o Orçamento Participativo de Belo Horizonte: Avanços e Desafios. In Democracia Participativa – a experiência de Belo Horizonte, Azevedo, A.; Nabuco A. (organiz.), 2008. Editora Leitura, Belo Horizonte.

CAMBRAIA, Alexandre; NGUENHA, Eduardo (2008). Dissemination paper on Participatory Budgeting Experiments: Approaches to Brazil's Patterns and to African Context. Participatory Democracy Project. The World Bank and Municipal Development Partnership for Eastern and Southern Africa.

FEDOZZI, Luciano (2001). Orçamento Participativo: Reflexões sobre a Experiência de Porto Alegre, 3ª ed. Tomo Editorial e FASE, Porto Alegre, Brasil.

FEDOZZI, Luciano (2000). O Poder da Aldeia: Gênese e História do Orçamento Participativo de Porto Alegre, 1ª ed. Tomo Editorial e FASE, Porto Alegre, Brasil.

GIACOMONI, James (2005). Orçamento Público, 13ª ed. Editora Atlas SA, São Paulo, Brasil.

MUSGRAVE, Richard; MUSGRAVE, Peggy (1989). Public Finance in Theory and Practice, 5a ed. McGraw-Hill, New York.

NGUENHA, Eduardo (2011). Orçamento Participativo em Moçambique: Modelos, Práticas e Indicadores de Medição de Desempenho. Comunicação à Conferência sobre Democracia Participativa promovida pela Universidade São Tomás de Moçambique, Instituto Florence para Desenvolvimento e AWEPA Moçambique. Maputo, Moçambique.

NGUENHA, Eduardo (2008). A Governação Municipal Democrática em Moçambique: Alguns Aspectos Importantes para o Desenho e Implementação de Modelos de Planificação e Orçamento Participativo. IESE, Maputo, Moçambique.

PEREIRA, Paulo Trigo; AFONSO, António; ARCANJO, Manuela; SANTOS, José Carlos G. (2005). Economia e Finanças Públicas. Escolar Editora, Lisboa. Portugal.

YVES, Cabannes (2004). 72 Perguntas Frequentes sobre o Orçamento Participativo. UN-HABITAT.

SANTOS, B.; AVRITZER, L. (2002). Democratizar a Democracia: os caminhos da democracia participativa. Civilização Brasileira, Rio de Janeiro.

YVES, Cabannes (2004). 72 Perguntas Frequentes sobre o Orçamento Participativo. UN-HABITAT.

SAMUELSON, Paul; NORDHAUS, William D. (1993). Economia, 14ª ed. McGraw-Hill.

SANTOS, B.; AVRITZER, L. (2002). Democratizar a Democracia: os caminhos da democracia participativa. Civilização Brasileira, Rio de Janeiro.

TENGLER, H. (2007). Relatório de Levantamento de Materiais de Formação sobre a Planificação Participativa no Âmbito Municipal e Distrital e Análise de Boas Práticas. Projecto de Governação Autárquica Democrática / USAID. Maputo.

WAMPLER, Brian (2007). Participatory Budgeting in Brazil: Contestation, Cooperation, and Accountability. The Pennsylvania State University Press, USA.

WORLD BANK (2008). Brazil Toward a More Inclusive and Effective Participatory Budget in Porto Alegre. Vol. I: main Report. The World Bank, Washington.

**PARTICIPATORY BUDGETS
IN BRAZIL**

**LUCIANO JOEL FEDOZZI
KÁTIA CACILDA PEREIRA
LIMA**

AFONSO, José R. (2012). Desafios do Federalismo Brasileiro: A Dimensão Econômica-Fiscal. Senado/Interlegis, Brasília, 19/10/2012.

ALLEGRETTI, G.; HERZBERG, C. El retorno de las carabelas. Los presupuestos participativos de América Latina en el contexto europeo. Amsterdam/Madri: TNI Working Paper/FMI, 2004.

AVRITZER, L. Instituições participativas e desenho institucional: algumas considerações sobre a variação da participação no Brasil democrático. Opinião Pública, Campinas, vol. 14, nº1, Junho 2008.

BANCO INTERNACIONAL DE RECONSTRUÇÃO E DESENVOLVIMENTO (BIRD). Rumo a um Orçamento Participativo mais inclusivo e efetivo em Porto Alegre. Relatório. 2008. (www.wds.worldbank.org).

BOURDIEU, P. Le capital social: notes provisoires, Actes Rech. Sci. Soc., 31, 1980, pp. 2-3.

DAGNINO, Evelina. Os movimentos sociais e a emergência de uma nova noção de cidadania. In: DAGNINO, Evelina (org) Anos 90 Política e Sociedade no Brasil. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1994.

FAORO, R. Os donos do poder. Porto Alegre: Globo, 1958.

- FEDOZZI, L.; MARTINS, A.L.B. Novas instituições participativas, processos de elitização e o Orçamento Participativo de Porto Alegre. 35º Encontro Anual da ANPOCS. Águas de Lindóia: 21 a 25 de outubro de 2012.
- FEDOZZI, Luciano. Os Orçamentos Participativos e a discussão sobre as questões práticas envolvidas na construção dessa instituição da democracia participativa. (<http://www.ufrgs.br/democraciaparticipativa>). In: ZICCARDI, A. (coord.) CIUDADES DEL 2010. Entre la sociedade del conocimiento y la desigualdade social. México:UNAM, 2012, p. 1065-1105.
- FEDOZZI, Luciano. O poder da aldeia. Gênese e história do Orçamento Participativo de Porto Alegre. Porto Alegre:Tomo Editorial, 2000.
- FEDOZZI, Luciano. Orçamento Participativo. Reflexões sobre a experiência de Porto Alegre. Porto Alegre: Tomo Editorial; Rio de Janeiro: FASE-IPPUR (UFRJ), 1997.
- FERNANDES, Florestan. A Revolução Burguesa no Brasil. Ensaio de interpretação sociológica. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1976.
- GURZA LAVALLE, A. (Org.) O horizonte da política. Questões emergentes e agendas de pesquisa. São Paulo:Unesp e Cebrap, 2011.
- HARVEY, D. Social Justice and the City. London:Edward Arnold Ltd, 1973
- HOLANDA, S. B. Raízes do Brasil. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 1993.
- INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA - IBGE. Censo Demográfico (1970, 1980, 1991, 2000, 2010). Rio de Janeiro.
- ____.Conselhos Municipais estão presentes no país. Censo Demográfico 2000. Rio de Janeiro, 2000.
- KOWARICK, Lúcio. A espoliação urbana. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1979.
- LEFEBVRE, H. O Direito à Cidade. São Paulo: Ed. Documentos, 1969.
- MENEGUELLO, Raquel. PT: a formação do partido. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1989.
- MULTI CIDADES. Finanças dos Municípios do Brasil. Anuário Estatístico. Ano 8. Frente Nacional de Prefeitos, 2012. <http://www.fnp.org.br/Documentos/DocumentoTipo107.pdf>.
- PIRES, R. R. C.; VAZ, A. C. N. Participação faz diferença? Uma avaliação das características e efeitos da institucionalização da participação nos municípios brasileiros. In: AVRITZER, L. (Org.). A dinâmica da participação local no Brasil. São Paulo: Cortez, 2010. p. 253-304.
- PÓLIS, Instituto. Levantamento das cidades brasileiras que realizaram o orçamento participativo (1989-2004). 2006. Disponível em: <<http://www.polis.org.br/download/239.pdf>> Acesso em: 10 ago. 2012.
- REDE BRASILEIRA DE ORÇAMENTOS PARTICIPATIVOS (RBOP). Guarulhos: RELATÓRIO TÉCNICO, 2012
- REVISTA LUA NOVA. Após a participação. São Paulo, 84: 353-364, 2011.
- RIBEIRO, A. C., GRAZIA, G. (2003). Experiências de Orçamentos Participativos no Brasil. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- RIBEIRO, L. C. Q. (Org.); SANTOS JUNIOR, Orlando Alves dos (Org.) . As Metrôpoles e a Questão Social Brasileira. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Revan; FASE, 2007.
- RIBEIRO, L. C. Q. e SANTOS JUNIOR, O. A. (orgs). Globalização, fragmentação e reforma urbana: o futuro das cidades brasileiras na crise. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1994.
- SADER, Eder. Quando novos personagens entram em cena: experiências e lutas dos trabalhadores da grande São Paulo. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1988.
- SANTOS JUNIOR, Orlando Alves dos (Org.) ; MONTANDON, D. T. (Org.) . Os Planos Diretores Municipais Pós-Estatuto das Cidades: balanço crítico e perspectivas. 1. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Letra Capital, 2011.
- SCHUMPETER, J. A. Capitalismo socialismo e democracia. Rio de Janeiro: Fundo de cultura, 1961.
- SINGER, André. Os sentidos do lulismo. Reforma gradual e pacto conservador. São Paulo: Cia das Letras, 2012.
- SINTOMER, Y., HERZBERG, C., RÖCKE, A. (2008). Participatory Budgeting in Europe: Potentials and Challenges. Berlin: International Journal of Urban Regional Research. (32), 1, p. 164-178.
- SINTOMER, Y.; HERZBERG, C.; ALLEGRETTI, G.; Aprendendo com o Sul: O Orçamento Participativo no Mundo - um convite à cooperação global. Diálogo Global Nº 25. Alemanha: Engagement Global GmbH, 2012

THE EMERGENCE OF THE PARTICIPATORY BUDGET AND ITS EXPANSION IN BRAZIL: ANALYSING THE POTENTIAL AND LIMITATIONS

LEONARDO AVRITZER

TEIXEIRA (2003) E ROVER (2003). AVRITZER, L. e NAVARRO, Z. A inovação democrática no Brasil. São Paulo:Cortez, 2003.

TELLES, Vera da Silva. Sociedade civil e a construção de espaços públicos. In: DAGNINO, Evelina (Org.). Anos 90 Política e Sociedade no Brasil. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1994. p.91-102.

TRIBUNAL SUPERIOR ELEITORAL, 2012 <http://www.tse.jus.br/partidos/partidos-politicos> acesso em 20/12/2012

VAINER, Carlos B. Pátria, empresa e mercadoria. Notas sobre a estratégia discursiva do Planejamento Estratégico Urbano. In: ARANTES, O; VAINER, C. ; MARICATO, E. A cidade do pensamento único. Petrópolis:Vozes, 2000, p. 75-104.

WEBER, M. O socialismo. GERTZ R. E. (org.) Max Weber & Karl Marx. São Paulo: Hucitec, 1994, p. 252-77.

AVRITZER, L. .(2002a). **Sociedad civil**, espacio publico y poder local:un analisis del presupuesto participativo. In: Evelina Dagnino. (Org.). **Sociedad civil**, esfera publica y democratizacion en America Latina. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Economica, 2002.

AVRITZER, L. .(2002b). **Democracy and the public space in Latin America**. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

AVRITZER, L. (2006). **Models of democratic deliberation: participatory budgeting in Brazil**. In: Boaventura de Sousa Santos. (Org.). **Democratizing democracy: beyond the liberal democratic canon**. 1 ed. New York: Verso, 2006.

AVRITZER, L. (2009). **Participatory Institutions in Democratic Brazil**. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009.

BAIOCCHI, Gianpaolo. (2005). **Militants and citizens: the politics of participation in Porto Alegre**. Stanford: University Press, 2005.

DAGNINO ET AL, 2006. **La disputa por la construccion democrática em América Latina**. Mexico. Fondo de Cultura.

MARQUETTI, A. A.(2003). **Participação e Redistribuição: o Orçamento Participativo em Porto Alegre**. In: Avritzer, Leonardo; Navarro, Zander. (Org.). A inovação democrática no Brasil. 1 ed. São Paulo: Cortez Editora, v. 1, p. 129-156.

SANTOS, Boaventura de Souza. **Orçamento Participativo em Porto Alegre: para uma democracia redistributiva**. IN: Democratizar a democracia: os caminhos da democracia participativa. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2002.

SILVA, Marcelo Kunrath. (2002). **Cidadania e exclusão: os movimentos sociais urbanos e a experiência de participação na gestão municipal em Porto Alegre**. Porto Alegre: Editora da UFRGS.

SINTOMER, Y. e BACQUÉ, M.-H. (orgs.). **Gestion de proximité et démocratie participative: une perspective comparative**. Paris: La découverte, 2005.

TORRES RIBEIRO, Ana Clara; GRAZIA de Grazia. (2003). **Experiência de Orçamento Participativo no Brasil: Período de 1997 a 2000**. São Paulo: Editora Vozes.

WAMPLER, Brian. (2003) **Orçamento Participativo: uma explicação para as amplas variações nos resultados**. In A inovação democrática no brasil. Edited by Leonardo Avritzer and Zander Navarro. (São Paulo: Editora Cortez). (Title in English: "Participatory Budgeting: An explanation of the broad variations in outcomes").

WAMPLER, Brian; AVRITZER, L. (2005). **The Spread of Participatory Budgeting in Brazil: From Radical Democracy to Participatory Good Government**. Journal Of Latin American Urban Studies, New York, v. 7, Fall, p. 37-52

WAMPLER, Brian. (2008). **Participatory Budgeting in Brazil: contestation, cooperation, and accountability**. Pennsylvania State University Press

ANALYSIS OF PB IN CHILE. A REFLECTION OF THE NATIONAL PUBLIC POLICY EVOLUTION?

PABLO PAÑO YÁÑEZ

AA.VV (2012). **Construyendo democracias y metodologías participativas desde el Sur**. Ed. LOM. Santiago de Chile, Chile.

Allegretti, G., García, P. y Paño P. (2011). **Viajando por los Presupuestos Participativos: buenas prácticas, obstáculos y aprendizajes**. Proyecto Parlocal. CEDMA. Málaga, España.

Allegretti, G., Barragán, V., Chavez, D., García-Leiva, P., Gutiérrez, V., Navascués, J., Paño, P., (2011). **Estudio comparativo de los presupuestos participativos en República Dominicana, España y Uruguay**. Proyecto Parlocal. CEDMA. Málaga, España.

Baierle, S. (2010). **Porto Alegre neoliberal: la decapitación social-capitalista de líderes comunitarios y los límites del Nuevo Gerencialismo Público inclusivo en Diálogos entre Militantes**. Participación, territorio y ambiente. Ed. Casa Bertolt Brecht. Montevideo, Uruguay.

Falck, A. y Paño, P. (eds.) (2011). **Democracia Participativa y Presupuestos participativos: acercamiento y profundización sobre el debate actual**. Manual Escuela Políticas de Participación Local. Proyecto Parlocal. CEDMA. Málaga, España.

Ganuzza E. y Francés F. (2012). **El círculo virtuoso de la democracia**: los presupuestos participativos a debate. Centro de Investigación Sociológicas, CIS. Madrid, España.

Ganuzza, E., Olivari L. y Paño P. (2011). **La democracia en acción: participación de la ciudadanía en la acción pública**. Metodologías participativas y Presupuestos Participativos en Falck, A. y Paño, P. (eds.) (2011). **Democracia Participativa y Presupuestos participativos**: acercamiento y profundización sobre el debate actual. Manual Escuela Políticas de Participación Local. Proyecto Parlocal. CEDMA. Málaga, España.

Guerra, C. (1997). **Nueva estrategia neoliberal**: la participación ciudadana en Chile. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Centro Regional de Investigaciones Multidisciplinarias. México.

Klein, N. (2008). **La doctrina del shock**. El auge del capitalismo del desastre. Ed. Paidós, 1ra ed. Argentina.

Mayol, A. (2012). **El derrumbe del modelo**. La crisis de la economía de mercado en el Chile contemporáneo. Ed. LOM. Santiago de Chile, Chile.

Montecinos, E. (2011). **El presupuesto participativo en Chile**: Diseño institucional y condiciones para su desarrollo. ¿Complemento o subordinación a las instituciones representativas locales? en Mascareño, C. y Montecinos, E. (coords). **Democracia participativa vs Representación**. Tensiones en América Latina. Universidad de Los Lagos (Chile) y CENDES (Universidad Central de Venezuela). Caracas, Venezuela.

Morales Labbé, M. (2009). **Presupuestos Participativos en Chile**. Percepción de la comunidad respecto de la participación social que este mecanismo participativo genera. El caso de la comuna de Peñalolén. Memoria para optar al título de Master en Participación y políticas Locales. Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona. Mimeo.

Municipalidad de La Serena (2012). Ciudadanos transformando ciudades. El presupuesto participativo en La Serena. Participación Ciudadano Activa en los Espacios Locales. La Serena, Chile.

Ochsensus, C. y Delamaza, G., (2010). “Redes de participación institucional y gobernanza democrática local. El caso de los Presupuestos Participativos en Chile”. **Revista del CLAD Reforma y Democracia**; n°46.

Paño Yáñez, P (2013). **Sobre malas prácticas en la realización de Presupuestos Participativos**. Una reflexión para su mejora tras más de 20 años de implementación en AA.VV (2012) Construyendo democracias y metodologías participativas desde el Sur. Ed. LOM. Santiago de Chile, Chile.

Ramos, J. y Fontalba, I. (2006). **Presupuestos Participativos en el sector Salud**. Una experiencia innovadora en el servicio de Salud Talcahuano: Chile. en Fernández. M. (compiladora) (2006). Innovaciones en la gestión participativa de la salud. Lecciones y Aprendizajes 2006. Universidad de Los Lagos – Unidad de Participación Social. Subsecretaría de Redes Asistenciales. Ministerio de Salud. Santiago de Chile, Chile.

Sousa Santos B. (2005): **Reinventar la democracia**. Reinventar el Estado. CLACSO Libros. Colección Biblioteca de Ciencias Sociales. Argentina.

Sousa Santos, B. (2004). **Democracia y participación**: El ejemplo del presupuesto participativo de Porto Alegre. Ed. Viejo Topo. España.

Arroyo, Juan, and M. Irigoyen,. 2005. **Desafíos de la democracia participativa local en la descentralización**. CARE Perú. Lima, Peru.

Defensoría del Pueblo. 2003. **Descentralización y buen gobierno**: Compendio de normas. Lima: Defensoría del Pueblo.

Conaghan, Catherine. 2005. **Fujimori's Peru: Deception in the Public Sphere**. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Grupo Propuesta Ciudadana. 2011. “Hacia un Presupuesto Participativo basado en Resultados.” XVI Ciclo de Formación Módulo 1. (<http://www.propuestaciudadana.org.pe/node/846113>, Acedido em 19 de Fevereiro de 2013).

2009. “Presupuesto participativo: Boletín de vigilancia #2.” Lima: Peru.

(<http://www.descentralizacion.org.pe/vigilaperu-gobiernosregionales.shtml>, Acedido em 1 de Novembro de 2010).

Kenney, Charles. 2004. **Fujimori's Coup and the Breakdown of Democracy in Latin America**. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

McClintock, Cynthia. 1993. “Peru's Fujimori: A Caudillo Derails Democracy.” *Current History* (Março): 112-119.

McNulty, Stephanie. 2012. “An Unlikely Success: Peru's Top-Down Participatory Budgeting Experience.” **Journal of Public Deliberation** 8(2). Artigo 4.º.

**MANDATING
PARTICIPATION:
EXPLORING PERU'S
NATIONAL PARTICIPATORY
BUDGET LAW**

STEPHANIE MCNULTY

- 2011. **Voice and Vote:** Decentralization and Participation in Post-Fujimori Peru. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Mesa de Concertación para la Lucha Contra la Pobreza (MCLCP). 2011. Presupuesto participativo 2008-2009. Lima, Peru.
- 2007. **I Informe nacional de monitoreo:** Resultados del proceso participativo. Lima, Peru.
(<http://www.mesadeconcertacion.org.pe/contenido.php?pid=87>, Acedido em 12 de Dezembro de 2009).
- Ministerio de Economía y Finanzas (MEF). Sem data “Qué es el Presupuesto por Resultados?” (http://www.mef.gob.pe/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=2122&Itemid=101162&lang=es, Acedido em 7 de Março de 2012).
- 2009. **Líneas de base de los programas estratégicos 2008-2009.** Lima, Peru.
- 2004. “Una breve reseña de los avances del presupuesto participativo en el Perú 2003-2004.” Lima: MEF.
- ProDescentralización (PRODES). 2012. Proceso de descentralización: Balance y agenda a Julio de 2012. Lima, Peru.
- 2011. **Proceso de descentralización:** Balance y agenda a Julio de 2011. Lima, Peru.
- 2010a. “Guía del Presupuesto Participativo Basado en Resultados.” Lima, Peru. (http://www.mef.gob.pe/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1940&Itemid=100288, Acedido em 19 de Fevereiro de 2013).
- 2010b. “**Participación y descentralización:** Percepciones y expectativas ciudadanas.” Evaluación Rápida de Campo. Lima, Peru.
- Ramírez Huaroto, Beatriz. 2009. “**El reto de formalizarse:** Enseñanzas recogidas de los procesos de formalización de organizaciones sociales de base promovidas por el CMP Flora Tristan.” Centro de la Mujer Peruana Flora Tristán. Lima, Peru.
- Remy, María Isabel. 2011. **Participación ciudadana y gobiernos descentralizados.** Cuadernos Descentralistas 28. Grupo Propuesta Ciudadana, Lima, Peru.
- 2005. **Los múltiples campos de la participación ciudadana en el Perú.** Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Secretaría de la Descentralización. 2012. Propuesta de Plan Nacional de Descentralización y Regionalización (2012-2016). Lima, Peru. (<http://descentralizacion.gob.pe/images/stories/pdf/PNDR.pdf>, Acedido em 21 de Fevereiro de 2013).
- Shack, Nelson. 2006. **Presupuestar en Perú.** Santiago: Naciones Unidas.
- Banco Mundial. 2010. “**Peru: Evaluación del presupuesto participativo y su relación con el presupuesto por resultados.**” Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- 2008. “**Brazil: Toward a More Inclusive and Effective Participatory Budget in Porto Alegre.**” Report 40144-BR. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- Zas Friz Burga, Johnny. 2004. **La insistencia de la voluntad:** El actual proceso Peruano de descentralización política y sus antecedentes inmediatos (1980-2004). Lima: Defensoría Del Pueblo.

**PARTICIPATORY
BUDGETS IN URUGUAY
A REFLECTION ON THE
CASES OF MONTEVIDEO
AND PAYSANDÚ**

ALICIA VENEZIANO
IVÁN SÁNCHEZ

- ALLEGRETTI, G.: “**Estudios comparativos de Presupuestos Participativos en República Dominicana, España y Uruguay**” en ALLEGRETTI, Giovanni (Comp.). PROYECTO PARLOCAL (FEDOMU-DM-IDP-UE). Edit. CEDMA. Málaga.
- BARRAGÁN, V.; ROMERO, R; SANZ, J (2011) “**Fundamentos políticos y tipología de los presupuestos participativos**”. En FALCK, Andres y PAÑO, Pablo (Edits) Democracia Participativa y Presupuestos Participativos: acercamiento y profundización sobre el debate actual. Proyecto PARLOCAL (FEDOMU-DM-IDP-UE). Edit. CEDMA. Málaga.
- BOU, Joan (2011). “**Funcionamiento Operativo de los Presupuestos Participativo**”. FEDOMU (Federación Dominicana de Municipios). En FALCK, Andres y PAÑO, Pablo (Edits) Democracia Participativa y Presupuestos Participativos: acercamiento y profundización sobre el debate actual. Proyecto PARLOCAL (FEDOMU-DM-IDP-UE). Edit. CEDMA. Málaga.
- BURJEL, Fernando (2006). “**Una mirada sobre la izquierda en el gobierno de Paysandú: con el cambio en la frente**”. Cuadernos del CEP N°1., Centro de Estudios Paysandú. Paysandú- Uruguay.
- CHÁVEZ, Daniel (2011): “**Origen y funcionamiento de los Presupuestos Participativos**”. En ALLEGRETTI, Giovanni (comp.): Estudios comparativos de Presupuestos Participativos en República Dominicana, España y Uruguay. Proyecto PARLOCAL (FEDOMU-DM-IDP-UE). Edit. CEDMA. Málaga.
- CONGRESO DE INTENDENTES (2007): “**Experiencias de Presupuesto Participativo en Uruguay**”, Programa de Fortalecimiento Institucional del Congreso de Intendentes y los Gobiernos Departamentales, OPP, AECID y PNUD, Montevideo.
- EP-FA (2005): “**Cambia Paysandú. Por un municipio honesto, transparente, humano, justo y participativo. Ejes**

programáticos”. Programa electoral de EP-FA. Paysandú-Uruguay.

FERLA, Paula; MARZUCA, A; VENEZIANO, A (2012).: **Democracia y descentralización**; rol de los Concejos Vecinales y su aporte sobre la cuestión metropolitana. Defensoría del Vecino, UCUDAL, UDELAR, Plan Cuenca Arroyo Carrasco, Center for research on Direct Democracy y Fundación ANIMA, Universidad de Zürich. Edit. Defensor del Vecino. Montevideo.

HEINZEN, Helena (2006). **Presupuesto Participativo en Paysandú**: el desafío de construir ciudadanía. Cuadernos del CEP N°1. Centro de Estudios Paysandú. Paysandú.

INTENDENCIA DEPARTAMENTAL DE PAYSANDÚ (2010) **“Presupuesto Participativo en Paysandú “mas ciudadanía...más democracia”**. MARTÍNEZ GUERRA, Viviana (Edit). Programa de Desarrollo Local del Centro Latinoamericano de Economía Humana (CLAEH) . Paysandú

PARLAMENTO DE LA REPÚBLICA ORIENTAL DEL URUGUAY (2009): **“Ley de Descentralización y Participación Ciudadana 18.567”**, del 13 de setiembre del 2009, Montevideo.

- (2010) **“Ley modificatoria 18.644”**, del 12 de febrero del 2010. Montevideo

SÁNCHEZ, Iván (2012). **“Políticas de participación en el país: lecciones del Presupuesto Participativo”**. En Municipios: una política en el tintero. Andreoli, Alejandra et.al (coords.) Universidad de la Republica-Comisión Sectorial de Investigación Científica. Ediciones Art 2. Paysandú.

- (2010) **“Lógicas y actores en la descentralización político-territorial en el Uruguay. Un abordaje desde las dimensiones cultural y política”**. En A 100 años de la Ley de creación de la figura del intendente. Oficina de Planeamiento y Presupuesto – Programa Uruguay Integra (UE).

VENEZIANO, Alicia (2012): **“Relaciones Intergubernamentales, Intragubernamentales y Socio- gubernamentales en la ley de descentralización y participación ciudadana y en los decretos de Montevideo”**. Ponencia presentada al IV Congreso Uruguayo de Ciencia Política AUCIP. Montevideo.

- (2008): **“La participación ciudadana en la Descentralización de Montevideo: Aprendizajes y reflexiones desde los noventa”**, Revista Uruguaya de Ciencia Política. Instituto de Ciência Política. Volume 17, Número 1. Janeiro – Dezembro, Montevideo.

- (2005) Evaluación y reflexiones para Iberoamérica de la implementación de una reforma del estado orientada al ciudadano: la `descentralización participativa` del gobierno de Montevideo (1990-2002)”. Premio Internacional “Andres Bello”; INAP (Instituto Nacional de Administração Pública) do MAP (Ministério das Administrações Públicas) de Espanha. Edit. INAP, Madrid.

- (1999): **“Escenarios e incertidumbres de lo local en Uruguay: los posibles impactos de la Reforma Constitucional en la descentralización”**, en Sociedad em Debate N° 4, Universidade Católica de Pelotas, Pelotas.

Baiocchi, Gianpaolo, and Josh Lerner. “Could Participatory Budgeting Work in the United States?” **The Good Society**. Vol. 16, N.º 1 (2007), pág. 8-13

Barr, Andy. “2008 Turnout Shatters All Records.” **Político**. 5 de Novembro de 2008.

<http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1108/15306.html>

Community Development Project at the Urban Justice Center, “A People’s Budget: A Research and Evaluation Report on the Pilot Year of Participatory Budgeting in New York City,” Setembro de 2012.

Pinnington, Elizabeth, Josh Lerner and Daniel Schugurensky. “Participatory Budgeting in North America: The Case of Guelph, Canada. ” **Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management**, 21 (3), 455-484, Outono de 2009.

Ang YY. 2009. **Centralising treasury management in China: the rationale of the central reformers**. Public Administration and Development 29: 263-273.

Bates R H. 1991. **The economics of transitions to democracy**. PS Political Science and Politics 24: 24-27.

Baiocchi G. 2005. **Militants and Citizens: The Politics of Participatory Democracy in Porto Alegre**. Stanford University Press: Stanford.

Cai B, Yuan S. 2005. **Tuijin cunwu gongkai he minzhu guanli de xin qidian: dui mishan shi guanche luoshi zhongban shiqi hao wenjian de diaocha yu sikao (Promoting the openness of village affairs and a new starting point of democratic management: Investigation and reflection on Mishan city’s implementation of document, No.17), Zhongguo minzheng (China Civil Affairs) 1: 35-37.**

**BUILDING SUSTAINABLE
EMPOWERMENT:
PARTICIPATORY
BUDGETING IN NORTH
AMERICA**

DONATA SECONDO
PAMELA JENNINGS

**CIVIC ENGAGEMENT
THROUGH PARTICIPATORY
BUDGETING IN CHINA:
THREE DIFFERENT
LOGICS AT WORK**

BAOGANG HE

- Cai Y. 2008. **Power structure and regime resilience: contentious politics in China**, *British Journal of Political Science* 38(3): 411-432.
- Chen J. 2007. **Canyu shi yusuan de lilun yu shijian (Theory and Practice of Participatory Budgeting)**. *Jingji shehui tizhi bijiao (Comparative Economic and Social Systems)* 130 (20):52-57.
- Chen J, Chen Y. 2007. Difang zhili zhongde Canyu shi yusuan: guanyu zhejiang wenling shi xinhe zhen gaige de anli yanjiu (Participatory Budgeting in Local Governance: A Case Study of Reform from Xinhe Town, Zhejiang Province). **Gonggong guanli xuebao (Journal of Public Management)** 4 (3): 76-83.
- Chen Y. 2008. **Canyu shi yusuan de Wenling moshi (The Wenling Model of Participatory Budgeting)** *Jinri zhongguo luntan (China Today Forum)* 5: 95-98.
- Chu S. 2008. Dangqian nongcun gonggong changpin gongji jizhi chuanguan de yige shijiao: canyu shi yusuan (A new perspective of innovation mechanism of rural public goods supply: Participatory Budgeting) **Guangdong caijing zhiye xueyuan xuebao (Journal of Guangdong College of Finance and Economics)** 7 (4):18-21.
- Collins P, Chan. HS. 2009. **State capacity building in China: an introduction**. *Public Administration and Development*, 29:1-8.
- Cooke B, Kothari U (eds). 2001. **Participation: the new tyranny?** Zed Books: Londres.
- Feng Y. 2007. **Guanyu cunwu gongkai he minzhu guanli zhidu jianshe de sikao (Reflection on the openness of village account and the construction of democratic management system)**. *Dangzheng ganbu luntan (Cadres Tribune)* 10: 238-239.
- Fishkin J, He B, Luskin RC, Siu A. 2010. **Deliberative Democracy in an Unlikely Place: Deliberative Polling in China**. *British Journal of Political Science*, 40(2):435-448.
- He B. 2006. **Participatory and deliberative institutions in China**. In *The Search for Deliberative Democracy in China*, Leib E and He B (eds). Palgrave: Nova Iorque; 176-196.
- He, B. 2007. **Rural Democracy in China**. Palgrave/Macmillan: Nova Iorque.
- He, B. 2008. **Deliberative Democracy: Theory, Method and Practice**. China's Social Science Publishers: Pequim.
- He, B. Wang CG. 2007. **Deliberative democracy in rural China: a case study of Bianyu experiment**. *Sociological Studies*. 3: 56-73
- He, B, Warren, M. 2011. **Authoritarian deliberation: The deliberative turn in Chinese political development**, *Perspective on Politics*, próxima Edição de Junho.
- Hess S. 2009. Deliberative institutions as mechanisms for managing social unrest: the case of the 2008 Chongqing taxi strike, China: **An International Journal** 7(2): 336-352.
- Hickey S, Mohan G (eds). 2004. **Participation, from tyranny to transformation? exploring new approaches to participation in development**. Zed Books: Londres.
- Huang H. 2008. Shenzhen gongmin de gonggong yusuan zhilu (Shenzhen citizens' journey of Participatory Budgeting) *Nanfang zhoubao (Nanfang Weekend)*, 6 de Novembro: 13-14.
- Leib E, He B (eds). 2006. cap. 12. **The Search for Deliberative Democracy in China**. Palgrave: Nova Iorque.
- Li F. 2008. **Zhongguo jiceng gonggong zhengce canyu de xin fazhang (New Development of China's Grassroots Participation in Public Policy)**. *Minzhu yu Kexue (Democracy & Science)* 5.
- Li W, Lu Y, She Y. 2008. **Lun yusan minzhu yu canyu shi yusuan (On Budgetary democracy and Participatory Budgeting)** *Dangdai Jingji (Contemporary Economics)* 3: 142-3.
- Lin L, Hu G. 2008. **Guanzhu zhengfu qiandai zi zhuanli baodao: Yusuan gaige zhi zeguo shiyan (A Special Feature on Taking Charge of Government's pocketbook: The Budgetary Reform in Zeguo)** *Minzhu yu fazhi (Democracy and Legal System)* 10.
- Ma J. 2005. **China's Public Budgeting Reform**. Central Translation and Compilation Publisher: Pequim.
- Ma J. 2007. The politics of Chinese budget reform. *Journal of Sun Yat-sen University (Chinese)* 3: 23-34.
- Ma J, Niu ML. 2007. Chonggou Zhongguo Gonggong Yusuanjizhi (Reconstruction of the Chinese Public Budget System). **Zhongguo Fazhan GuanCha (China Development Observation)** 2:13-.
- Ma J. 2009. If you can't budget, how can you govern? *Public Administration and Development*, 29, 9-20.
- Nylen WR. 2003. **Participatory Democracy versus Elitist Democracy: Lesson from Brazil**. NY: Macmillan.
- O'Brien KJ, Li L. 2006. **Rightful Resistance in Rural China**. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

- Rodan, G, Jayasuriya K. 2007. **Beyond hybrid regimes: more participation, less contestation in Southeast Asia.** *Democratization* 14(5):773-794.
- Santos B. 1998. **Participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre:** toward a redistributive democracy, *Politics and Society* 26(4): 461-510.
- Su Z. 2007. **Canyu shi yusuan de gonggong touzi xiaoyi** (The Efficiency of public Investment of participatory budgeting). *Gonggong guanli xuebao (Journal of Public Management)* 4 (3): 84-89.
- Wang H. 2007. **Shiyan canyu shi yusuan, jianshe yangguangxing caizheng** (Experimenting participatory Budgeting and building transparent budget) *Jiangnan Luntan (Jiangnan Forum)* 2: 31.
- Weaver RK. 1986. **The politics of blame avoidance.** *Journal of Public Policy.* 6: 371-398.
- Yang D. 2004. **Remarking the Chinese Leviathan.** *Stanford University Press: Stanford.* 235-248.
- Yang Z. 2007. **Canyu shi yusuan tuidong defang zhengfu zhili gexin: fang shijie yu zhongguo yanjiu suo suozhang Li fan** (Participatory Budgeting promotes innovation of local governance: an interview with Li Fang, the head of the World and China Institute). *Zhongguo gaige (China Reform)* 6: 22-29.
- Yang Z. 2009. **Gongmin shehui tuidong canyu shi yusuan gaige** (Civil society pushes the reform of participatory budgeting). *Zhongguo Gaige (China Reform).* 310 (7):55-57.
- Zhang N. 2007a. **Canyu shi yusuan gaige shiyan** (The Experiment of participatory budgeting reform) *Jue Ce (Decision-Making)* 7:36-37.
- Zhang N. 2007b. **Canyu shi yusuan gaige shiyan: jinsheng leguan** (Reform and experiment of participatory budgeting: caution and optimism) *Zhongguo fazhan Guancha (China Development Observation)* 2: 21-22.
- Zhang S, Zhang L. 2007. **Woguo jiceng minzhu jianshe zhong de canyu shi yusuan** (Participatory Budget in the building of grassroots democracy in China). *Hua Shang (Chinese Businessman)* 24: 67-68.
- Zhang X. 2008. **Shenhua gonggong yusuan gaige, zengqiang yusuan jiandu xiaoguo: guanyu Zhejiang Wenlin shi canyu shi yusuan de shijian yu sikao** (Deepening the reform of the public budget and enhancing the effect of budget monitoring: the practice and thinking of participatory budgeting in Wenlin city, Zhejiang Province) *Renda yanjiu (People's Congress Study)* 11.
- Zhongguo fazhan yanjiu jijin hui (China Development Research Foundation). 2006. **Zhongguo fazhan yanjiu jijin hui fu ba xi canyu shi yusuan kaochao baogao (Draft) (the Report of China development research foundation on participatory budgeting in Brazil).**
- Zhu S. 2007a. **Canyu shi yusuan yu zhengzhi shengtai huanjing de chonggou: Xinhe gonggong yusuan gaige de guocheng he luoji** (Participatory budgeting and reconstruction of political ecological environment: the process and Logic of Xinhe's public budgetary reform) *Gonggong guanli xuebao (Journal of Public Management)* 4 (3):90-95.
- Zhu S. 2007b. **Cong yuansheng dao luansheng: jiceng minzhu zhengzhi jianshe- Wenlin minzhu kentan he canyu shi yusuan zhi bijiao yanjiu** (From the origin birth to twins: present continuous building of grassroots democratic politics: a comparative study of Wenlin's democratic heart-to-heart forum and participatory budgeting) *Gansu xingzhen xueyuan xuebao (The Journal of Gansu Administration Institute)* 3: 13-20.
- Zhu S. 2008. **Wenling canyu shi yusuan de yanjin yu shenhua: jiyu yusuan minzhu kentan shiyan shangjing de jiedu** (The Evolution and deepening of Wenling participatory budgeting: An explanation of the talkfest of "experiment scene") *Hunan rongye daxue xuebao (The Journal of Hunan Agricultural University)* 9 (3): 1-9.
- Cabannes, Y. (2010) **Versão chinesa de 72 Perguntas Frequentes** (FAQ) sobre Orçamento Participativo, Programa Habitat dos Estados Unidos, China Social Press, Pequim.
- Cabannes, Y. (2013), **Contribution of Participatory Budgeting to the provision and management of basic services at municipal level**, IIED Research report for Global Observatory on Local Democracy 33 pág. + imagem anexa,
- He, Baogang (2011). **Civic Engagement through participatory budgeting in China: three different logics at work.** John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- He Baogang (2012), **Participatory Budgeting through Deliberative Polling: A Case Study of Zeguo Town, Zhejiang, China,** não publicado.
- Naisbitt, J (2011), **Innovation in China:** Chengdu Triangle. Beijing, Zhong Hua Gong Shang Lian He Chu Ban she.

INNOVATIONS IN PB IN CHINA: CHENGDU ON-GOING EXPERIMENT AT MASSIVE SCALE.

CABANNES YVES
MING ZHUANG

**PARTICIPATORY
BUDGETING IN
GERMANY: CITIZENS AS
CONSULTANTS**

MICHELLE ANNA RUESCH
MANDY WAGNER

Shuwen Zhou (2012), **A way to achieve social justice**. A case study of an ongoing participatory experiment in Chengdu, Tese de Mestrado, Unidade de Planeamento do Desenvolvimento, Londres, 2012.

Wu Yan and Wen Wang (2012), **Does PB improve the legitimacy of the local government?** A comparative case study of two cities in China, *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 2012 Vol. 71, n.º 2, pág.122-135.

Ahlke, Joseph (2008). **Bürgerhaushalte in Deutschland – Anfänge und Ansatzpunkte**. Recuperado em 15 de Março de 2013 de <http://www.buergerhaushalt.org/article/b%C3%BCrgerhaushalte-deutschland-anf%C3%A4nge-und-ansatzpunkte>

Amrhein, Uwe (2012). **Der große Bluff: In Deutschland ist der Bürgerhaushalt real schon gescheitert**. *Engagementmagazin Enter*. Recuperado em 12 de Março de 2012 de <http://www.entermagazin.de/2012/09/debatte/titel-der-groese-bluff/>

Bertelsmann-Stiftung (n.d.). Carl Bertelsmann-Preis 1993: **Kommunalverwaltung**. Recuperado em 15 de Março de 2013 de http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/cps/rde/xchg/SID-FDE4D94A-CFC3149C/bst/hs.xsl/5703_5713.htm

Franzke, Jochen & Kleger, Heinz (2010). **Bürgerhaushalte: Chancen und Grenzen**. In **Modernisierung des öffentlichen Sektors**, 36, Edition Sigma.

Günther, Albert (2007). **Der Bürgerhaushalt: Bestandsaufnahme – Erkenntnisse – Bewertung**. Richard Boorberg Verlag.

Herzberg, Carsten & Cuny, Cécile (2007). **Herausforderungen der technischen Demokratie: Bürgerhaushalt und die Mobilisierung von Bürgerwissen. Eine Untersuchung von Beispielen in der Region „Berlin-Brandenburg“**. PICRI/Centre, Marc Bloch/Hans-Böckler-Stiftung: Berlim.

Herzberg, Carsten (2005). **Bürgerhaushalt in Großstädten: Arbeitsmaterialien für die Umsetzung**. Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung: Bona.

Herzberg, Carsten (2010). 10 Jahre Bürgerhaushalt in Deutschland – eine Bilanz. In H. Glasauer, C. Hannemann, V. Kirchberg, J. Pohlen & A. Pott (Eds.). **Jahrbuch Stadtregion 2009/10**. Kreativität und städtische Kultur (pág. 107-119). Barbara Budrich: Leverkusen-Opladen.

Herzberg, Carsten, Sintomer, Yves, Allegretti, Giovanni & Röcke, Anja (2010). **Learning from the South: Participatory Budgeting Worldwide – an Invitation to Global Cooperation**. *Dialog Global N.º 25*. InWent/Serviceestelle Kommunen in der Einen Welt: Bona.

Herzberg, Carsten, Röcke, Anja & Sintomer, Yves (2009). **Der Bürgerhaushalt in Europa – eine realistische Utopie? Zwischen partizipativer Demokratie, Verwaltungsmodernisierung und sozialer Gerechtigkeit**. VS-Verlag: Frankfurt.

Holtkamp, Lars & Fuhrmann, Tobias (2013). Stellungnahme zur Anhörung der Enquete-Kommission 16/2 „**Aktive Bürgerbeteiligung für eine starke Demokratie**“, 1 de Março de 2013. Tema: „Bürgerhaushalte und offene Haushalte“.

Klages, Helmut (2010). **Qualitätskriterien für die Gestaltung von Bürgerhaushalten**. Recuperado em 14 de Março de 2013 de <http://www.buergerhaushalt.org/article/qualit%C3%A4tskriterien-f%C3%BCr-die-gestaltung-von-b%C3%BCrgerhaushalten>.

Märker, Oliver & Wehner, Joseph (2011). **Bürgerbeteiligte Haushaltskonsolidierung, der gemeindehaushalt**, 112, pág. 3 – 6.

Märker, Oliver & Nitschke, Ulrich (2008). **Bürger als Ideengeber für die Haushaltsplanung**. *Der städtetag* (4), pág. 17 – 21.

Märker, Oliver & Rieck, Sophia (2008). **Bürgerhaushalte in Deutschland Statusbericht – 3 de Dezembro de 2008**. Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, InWent/Serviceestelle Kommunen in der Einen Welt.

Märker, Oliver & Rieck, Sophia (2009). **Bürgerhaushalte in Deutschland ein Überblick – Statusbericht** Versão de 01.07.2009. Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, InWent/Serviceestelle Kommunen in der Einen Welt: Bona.

Märker, Oliver & Rieck, Sophia (2010). **Bürgerhaushalte in Deutschland – Statusbericht** Versão de 01.03.2010. Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, InWent/Serviceestelle Kommunen in der Einen Welt: Bona.

Märker, Oliver (2011). **Bürgerhaushalte in Deutschland – Statusbericht** Versão de 12.04.2011. Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, InWent/Serviceestelle Kommunen in der Einen Welt: Bona.

Märker, Oliver (2012). 5. **Statusbericht Buergerhaushalt.org**. Março de 2012. Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, Engagement Global/Serviceestelle Kommunen in der Einen Welt: Bona.

Rüttgers, Martin (2008). **Bürgerhaushalt: Information, Partizipation, Rechenschaftslegung**. Arbeitskreis

Bürgergesellschaft und Aktivierender Staat der Friedrich Ebert-Stiftung: Bona.

Ruesch, Michelle (2012). **Erfolg oder Misserfolg? (Wie) ist eine Evaluation von Bürgerhaushalten möglich?** Bericht zum Workshop der Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung und der Engagement Global/Serviceestelle Kommunen in der Einen Welt, 22 de Novembro de 2012, Frankfurt am Main. Engagement Global: Bona.

Schröter, Nina (2013). 6. **Statusbericht Buergerhaushalt.org** Janeiro de 2013. Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, Engagement Global/Serviceestelle Kommunen in der Einen Welt: Bona.

Schruoffeneger, Oliver & Herzberg, Carsten (2008). **Diskussionspapier: Ist ein grüner Bürgerhaushalt möglich?** Vorschläge und Überlegungen zur Gestaltung von Bürgerhaushaltsverfahren in Berliner Bezirken. Fraktion Bündnis'90/Die Grünen im Abgeordnetenhaus von Berlin.

Serviceestelle Kommunen in der Einen Welt (2012). **Achtes bundesweites Netzwerktreffen Bürgerhaushalt**, 22 e 23 de Maio de 2012. Documentação. Material N.º 56. Engagement Global/Serviceestelle Kommunen in der Einen Welt: Bona.

Sintomer, Yves, Herzberg, Carsten, & Röcke, Anja (2012). **Transnationale Modelle der Bürgerbeteiligung: Bürgerhaushalt als Beispiel**. In C. Herzberg, H. Kleger & Y. Sintomer (Eds.). Hoffnung auf eine neue Demokratie: Bürgerhaushalte in Lateinamerika und Europa (pág. 27 – 60). Campus Verlag: Frankfurt am Main.

The Participatory Budgeting Project (n.d.). **What is PB?** Recuperado em 18 de Março de 2013 de <http://www.participatorybudgeting.org/about-participatory-budgeting/what-is-pb/>

Wehner, Josef & Oliver Märker (2013). **E-Partizipation – Politische Beteiligung als statistisches Ereignis**. In J.-H. Passoth & J. Wehner (Eds.). Quoten, Kurven und Profile – Zur Vermessung der sozialen Welt. Springer VS: Wiesbaden.

Wehner, Joseph & Märker, Oliver (2011). Online-Bürgerhaushalte. Elektronische Partizipation in der kommunalen Haushaltsplanung. Panerin, 4, pág. 21 – 23.

Alves, M. y Allegretti, G. (2012) **“(In) stability, a key element to understand participatory budgeting: Discussing Portuguese cases.”** Journal of Public Deliberation Vol. 8: Iss. 2 (1-19)

Avritzer, L. (2006), **‘New public spheres in Brazil: local democracy and deliberative democracy’**, International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 30(3): 623-639.

Baiocchi, G. (1999), **‘Participation, activism and politics: the Porto Alegre experiment and deliberative democratic theory’**. Working Paper University of Wisconsin – Madison. Retrieved 11 October 2004 from <http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/Baiocchi.PDF>

Baiocchi, G. (2003), **‘Emerging public spheres: talking politics in participatory governance’**, American Sociological Review 68(1): 52-74.

Fedozzi, L. (2005), **Perfil Social e Associativo dos Participantes do OP de Porto Alegre**, POA: UFRGS Editoria.

Ganuza, E. y Francés, F. (2012a) **El círculo virtuoso de la democracia: los presupuestos participativos a debate**, Madrid: CIS

Ganuza, E. y Francés, F. (2012b) **“The deliberative turn in participation: the problem of inclusion and deliberative opportunities in participatory budgeting”**, European Political Science Review (2012), 4:2, 283-302

Ganuza, E. y Baiocchi, G (2012), **“The power of ambiguity: how participatory budgeting travels the globe”** Journal of Public Deliberation 8 (2), 1-19.

Ganuza, E. Nez, H y Morales, E (2013), **“The struggle for a voice: tensions between associations and citizens”** International Journal of Urban and Regional Research (forthcoming 2013)

Ganuza, E. (2010) **“Les origines des budgets participatifs”** en La démocratie participative inachevée en Bacqué, M-H and Sintomer, Y (eds), Paris : Adels/Yves Michel (pp23-43).

Sintomer, Y y Gret, M. (2003): **Porto Alegre, la esperanza de otra democracia**, Barcelona: Debate.

Sintomer, Y., Herzberg, C. and Röcke, A. (2008) **Budgets participatifs dans Europe**, Paris: Découverte.

Sintomer, Y y Ganuza, E (2011), **Democracia Participativa y Modernización de los Servicios Públicos: los presupuestos participativos en Europa**, Ámsterdam: La Decouvere-TNI.

Verba, S, Scholzman, K.L, Brady, H.E (1995): **Voice and equality. Civic voluntarism in American politics**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**THE PARTICIPANTS’
PRINT IN THE
PARTICIPATORY BUDGET:
OVERVIEW ON THE
SPANISH EXPERIMENTS**

**ERNESTO GANUZA
FRANCISCO FRANCÉS**

**PARTICIPATORY BUDGETS IN
ITALY: RECONFIGURING A
COLLAPSED PANORAMA**

**GIOVANNI ALLEGRETTI
STEFANO STORTONE**

Allegretti, G. (2010), “Os Orçamentos Participativos na Itália: inovações dentro de um quadro em rápida transformação” in Schettini Martins Cunha, E. e Moreira da Silva E. (org), (org.), *Experiencias Internacionais de Participação*. S. Paulo: CORTEZ/UFMG, pp. 67-110.

Allegretti, G. (2011a), «Le processus d'économie participative de la région Lazio. Quand l'expérimentation devient le symbole d'une gestion politique», in Sintomer, Y. ; Talpin, G. [orgs.], *La démocratie participative au-delà de la proximité. Le Poitou-Charentes et l'échelle régionale*, Presse Universitaire de Rennes, Rennes

Allegretti, G. (2011b), “Descentralización infra-municipal y participación en Italia y Portugal. Una lectura “en movimiento” entre el conflicto y la cooperación”, *Revista “Voces”*, nº 5-2011, January, Santo Domingo, p. 42-63.

Allegretti, G. (2012) “From Skepticism to Mutual Support: Towards a Structural Change in the Relations between Participatory Budgeting and the Information and Communication Technologies?”, in Mindus, P., Greppi A. et Cuono M. (orgs.), *Legitimacy_2.0. E-Democracy and Public Opinion in the Digital Age*, Goethe University Press, Frankfurt am Main

Allegretti, G.; Paño, P.; Garcia, P. (2011), *Viajando por los presupuestos participativos: buenas prácticas, obstáculos y aprendizajes.*, CEDMA. Málaga

Allegretti, G.; Rispoli, F. (2007), “Toscana: verso la costruzione partecipata di una legge sulla partecipazione”, in *URBANISTICA*, 134, 92-96.

Allulli, M. (2011), “Pratiche partecipative e istituzionalizzazione. Tra ritualità e decision-making”, in *Rivista Italiana di Politiche Pubbliche*, n. 3/2011, pp. 443-475

Allulli, M.; Allegretti, G. (2007), “Os Orçamentos Participativos em Itália”, in *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, 77, 101-130

Alves, M.; Allegretti, G. (2012) “(In) stability, a key element to understand participatory budgeting: Discussing Portuguese cases.”, *Journal of Public Deliberation*: Vol. 8: Iss. 2, Article 3. Available at: : <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss2/art3>

Amura, S.; Stortone, S. (2010), *Il manuale del buon amministratore locale. Buone prassi da imitare per sindaci, assessori, cittadini attivi*, Altraeconomia, Roma

Avritzer, L. (2012), “The different designs of public participation in Brazil: deliberation, power sharing and public ratification”, in *Critical Policy Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 113-127

Bagnasco, A. (1984), *Tre Italie. La problematica territoriale dello sviluppo italiano*, Il Mulino, Bologna

Bobbio, L. (2013, no prelo), *La qualità della Deliberazione*, Carocci, Roma

Caltabiano, C. (2006), *Gli anticorpi della società civile. Nono rapporto sull'associazionismo sociale*, Roma: IREF/ACLI

Diamanti, I. (2008), “I media e le mappe. Due diversi modi per leggere il voto del 2006”, in M. Bertoincín-A. Pase (org.), *Territorialità. Necessità di regole condivise e nuovi vissuti territoriali*, Franco Angeli, Milano

Elia, L. (2002), “Le prospettive dell'assetto costituzionale”, in *Rassegna parlamentare*, n.1/2002.

Floridia, A. (2008), “Democrazia deliberativa e processi decisionali: il caso della legge regionale toscana sulla partecipazione”, in *Stato e Mercato*, n. 1

Floridia, A. (2012), *La democrazia deliberativa: teorie, processi e sistemi*, Carocci, Roma

Ganuza, E.; Frances, F. (2012), *El círculo virtuoso de la democracia: los presupuestos participativos a debate*, Cit, Madrid

Pateman, C., 2012, “Participatory Democracy Revisited”, *APSA Presidential Address, Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 10/No. 1

Peixoto T. (2008), *E-Participatory Budgeting: e-Democracy from theory to success?*, E-Democracy Centre/Zentrum für Demokratie Aarau, e-Working Paper.

Picchi, M.(2012), “Il «sostegno» ai progetti di bilancio partecipativo attraverso la l. r. Toscana n. 69/2007”, in Bortolotti, F.; Corsi, C. (2012), *La partecipazione politica e sociale tra crisi e innovazione. Il caso della Toscana*, Ediesse, Rome

Putini, A. (2010), *Esperimenti di democrazia. I bilanci partecipativi in Italia*, Aracne, Roma

Putnam, R. (1996), *Comunidade e democracia. A experiência da Itália moderna*, Rio de Janeiro, Fundação Getúlio Vargas, tradução de Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy (1993)

Santos, B. de Sousa (coord.) (2003) *Democratizar a democracia: os caminhos da democracia participativa*. Rio de Janeiro:

Civilização Brasileira, 2002; Também publicado em Portugal, Porto: Edições Afrontamento

Sintomer Y.; Allegretti, G.; Herzberg, C.; Röcke, A. (2010), **Learning from the South: Participatory Budgeting worldwide – An invitation to Global Cooperation**, numero especial de “Dialog Global”, n° 25, GIZ/Bonn

Sintomer, Y. (2010), “Saberes dos cidadãos e saber político”, in **Revista Critica de Ciencias Sociais**, n° 91, pp. 135 – 153

Sintomer, Y. (2011), **O Poder ao Povo**, Editora UFMG, Belo Horizonte

Sintomer, Y. ; Talpin, G. [orgs] (2012), **La démocratie participative au-delà de la proximité**. Le Poitou-Charentes et l'échelle régionale, Presse Universitaire de Rennes, Rennes

Sintomer, Y.; Herzberg, C.; Röcke, A.; Allegretti, G. (2012) “Transnational Models of Citizen Participation: The Case of Participatory Budgeting”, **Journal of Public Deliberation**: Vol. 8: Iss. 2, Article 9. B- Available at: : <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss2/art9>

Sintomer, Y; Allegretti, G. (2009), **I Bilanci Partecipativi in Europa**. Nuove esperienze democratiche nel vecchio continente, Roma, Ediesse.

Spada, P. (2010); “The Effects of Participatory Democracy on Political Competition: the Case of Brazilian Participatory Budgeting”, **paper presented at the APSA Conference 2010**, Washington, D.C., USA.

Stortone, S. (2010), “Participatory Budgeting: towards a “civil” democracy?;” in **M. Freise, M: Pyykkönen e E. Vaidelyte (eds.) A Panacea for all Seasons? Civil Society and Governance in Europe**, Baden-Baden, Germany, Nomos.

UCLG (2008), **The 2nd Global Report on Decentralization and Local Democracy**, UCLG, Barcelona

Wainwright, H. (2007), **Reclaim the State: Experiments in Popular Democracy**, London, Verso.

Wampler, B.; Hartz-karp, J. (2012) “Participatory Budgeting: Diffusion and Outcomes across the World”, **Journal of Public Deliberation**: Vol. 8: Iss. 2, Article 13. Available at: : <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss2/art13>

Allegretti, Giovanni, 2007, “Teorie ed esperienze di riprogettazione territoriale partecipata con gli abitanti: dal consenso alla condivisione”, in **M. Bertoncin; A. Pase (org.)**, Territorialità. Necessità di regole condivise e nuovi vissuti territoriali, Franco Angeli, Milão.

Dias, Nelson, 2006, **O Orçamento Participativo como Novo Experimentalismo Democrático – o caso do Município de Guaraciaba/SC (Brasil)**, Master Thesis, Lisbon, ISCTE.

Dias, Nelson e Allegretti, Giovanni, 2009, “The Variable Geometry of Participatory Budgeting: Which Lessons from the new Portuguese Explosion?” pp. 623-637, in **DALY, Katherine et all, Learning Democracy by Doing: Alternative Practices in Citizenship Education and Participatory Democracy**, Transformative Learning Centre, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Toronto.

Dias, Nelson e Allegretti, Giovanni, 2009a, “Orçamentos Participativos em Portugal Em busca de uma democracia de maior proximidade ou de uma racionalidade funcional?” in **Revista Cidade – Comunidades e Território** n° 18, Junho, Centro de Estudos Territoriais/ISCTE, Lisboa, pp.59-78.

Fedozzi, Luciano, 2001, **Orçamento Participativo – reflexões sobre a experiência de Porto Alegre**. Porto Alegre: Tomo Editorial.

Pinto, Teresa Costa et al (Coord.), 2010, **A Tona de Água I – Necessidades em Portugal, Tradição e Tendências Emergentes**, Tinta-da-china, Lisboa.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa, 2008, “Síntese Final”, in **Actas do I Encontro Nacional sobre Orçamento Participativo**, Lisbon, Associação In Loco e Câmara Municipal de São Brás de Alportel

Touraine, Alain, 1994, **O que é a democracia?** Lisbon, Instituto Piaget.

Adolfsson, P.; Solli, R. (2009), **Offentlig sektor och komplexitet : om hantering av mål, strategier och professioner**. Lund, Studentlitteratur.

Adolfsson, P.; Wikström. E. (2007), “After quantification: Quality Dialogue and Performance in a Swedish municipality”, in **Financial & Accountability Management** 23(1): 73-89.

Allegretti, G. (2003); **Autoprogettualità come paradigma urbano**, Florence: Alinea

Allegretti, G. (2011), “Which role for the participation of citizens in the management of water services? The spread-

**A DECADE OF
PARTICIPATORY
BUDGETING IN
PORTUGAL: A WINDING
BUT CLARIFYING PATH**

NELSON DIAS

**PARTICIPATORY
BUDGETING IN SWEDEN:
TELLING A STORY IN SLOW-
MOTION**

LENA LANGLET
GIOVANNI ALLEGRETTI

- all-around dialogue strategy of VA SYD in Malmö, Sweden” in **Alberto Ford, Cintia Pinillos, Gisela Signorelli, Mariana Berdondini (org.)**, “Profundizando la democracia como forma de vida. Desafíos de la democracia participativa y los aprendizajes ciudadanos en el Siglo XXI”, Rosario: Universidad de Rosario, 560–570.
- Alves, M.; Allegretti, G. (2011), “The longevity of the new democratic participatory instruments: discussing the stability of participatory budgeting. In **Challenging Citizenship** – International Conference – June 3–5, 2011 – Universidade de Coimbra
- Brorström, B.; Solli, R.; Malmer, S. et al. (2005), **Förvaltningsekonomi** : en bok med fokus på organisation, styrning och redovisning i kommuner och landsting. Lund, Studentlitteratur.
- Brunsson, N.; Sten A. Jönsson (1979), **Beslut och handling** : om politikens inflytande på politiken. Estocolmo, LiberFörlag.
- Cabannes, Y. (2004), Participatory Budgeting and Local finances, **BaseDocument for the network URBAL N° 9**, Porto Alegre: PGU-ALC/Comissão Europeia/Prefeitura de Porto Alegre (versão actualizada, 2005)
- Cohen, S. A. (1993), “Defining and Measuring Effectiveness in Public Management”, in **Public Productivity & Management Review**, 17(1): 45–57.
- Cornwall, A.; Gaventa, J. (2001), PLA Notes 40: deliberative democracy and citizen empowerment. Londres: **International Institute for Environment and Development**.
- Demediuk, P. (2010), The form and function of local government community engagement initiatives – **Swedish case studies**. Universidade Victoria, Melbourne.
- Lindberg, K.; Blomgren, M. (2009), **Mellan offentligt och privat : om styrning, praktik och intressen i hälso- och sjukvården**. Estocolmo, Santérus Academic Press.
- Lindberg, S.; Svensson R. (2012), Rösträtt till salu. **World Values Survey-undersökningen i Sverige 2011**, Premiss förlag
- Luhmann, N. (1979), **Trust and power : two works**. J. Wiley, Chichester
- Muñoz, C. (2004), **Pedagogia da vida cotidiana e participação cidadã**, Cortez: Instituto Paulo Freire, São Paulo
- Rossini, N. (1998), **De l’aventure à l’expérience**. Des conseils municipaux d’enfants et de jeunes forment-ils de nouveaux acteurs ?, Institut National de la Jeunesse et l’Education Populaire (Marly-le-Roi) – Document de l’Injep, n°36
- Sintomer, Y.; Allegretti, G.; Herzberg, C.; Röcke, A. (2010), “Learning from the South. Participatory Budgeting Worldwide – an invitation to global cooperation”, **Global Dialog**, n° 25/2010, Bona: InWent/GIZ (versão em Inglês e Alemão) – versão actualizada, 2013
- SKL (2008), **Local Government Financial Equalisation**, SKL, Estocolmo
- SKL (2010), **Levels of Local Democracy in Sweden**, SKL, Estocolmo
- SKL (2011), **Medborgarbudget i Sverige, Europa, och Världen**. Sveriges Kommuner och Landsting, Estocolmo, Suécia, pág. 83–96.
- Solli, R.; Demediuk, P.; Adolfsson, P. (2011), “Young People, Big Ideas: Participatory Budgeting Fixes a River”, **The international journal of environmental, cultural, economic and social sustainability**.
- Solli, R.; Demediuk, P.; Adolfsson, P. (2011); “Varför medborgarbudget nu?” In: **SKL (2011)**, Medborgarbudget i Sverige, Europa, och Världen. Sveriges Kommuner och Landsting, Estocolmo, pág. 83–96
- Solli, R.; Demediuk, P.; Adolfsson, P. (2012); “People Plan their Park: Voice and Choice through Participatory Budgeting”, **International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences**, Vol. 6, n° 5, pág. 185–198
- Solli, R.; Demediuk, P.; Burgess, S. (2011), “We Can Get Something More Complete: Participatory Budgeting to Enhance Sustainability”, **The International Journal of Environmental, Cultural, Economic and Social Sustainability**, Vol. 7, n° 1, pág. 179–192
- Sverige Studien. The Swedish National Values Assessment Study 2012 (2012), Preera, Skandia and Volvo IT, disponível em: http://www.sverigestudien.se/images/sverigestudien2012_eng.pdf
- Tonucci. F. (2003), *Se i bambini dicono: adesso basta!*, Laterza, Torino

Baiocchi, G. (2003) Participation, activism and politics: The Porto Alegre experiment. In Fung, A. & Wright, E. O. (Eds.), *Deepening Democracy*. London, New York: Verso, 45–76.

Cabannes, Y. (2004) Participatory budgeting: a significant contribution to participatory democracy. *Environment & Urbanization*, 16, 1, 27–46.

Czajkowska (2011) Seminarium: Budżet partycypacyjny w dużym mieście – Budżet obywatelski w Sopocie cz.1. YouTube video of a seminar. Available at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=21THC9J1q3s>.

Ganuza, E. & Baiocchi, G. (2012) The power of ambiguity: How participatory budgeting travels the globe. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 8, 2, 1–12.

Gerwin, M. (2011) Sopot ma budżet obywatelski. *Krytyka Polityczna*. Available at: <http://www.krytykapolityczna.pl/Serwissamorzadowy/GerwinSopotmabudzetobywatelski/menuid-403.html>.

Gerwin, M. (2013) 8 kryteriów budżetu obywatelskiego Available at: <http://www.sopockainicjatywa.org/2013/01/31/8-kryteriow-budzetu-obywatelskiego/>

Gerwin, M. & Grabkowska, M. (2012) Budżet obywatelski. In *Partycypacja. Przewodnik Krytyki Politycznej*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Krytyki Politycznej, 100–111.

Gonzalez, S. (2010) Bilbao and Barcelona ‘in motion’. How urban regeneration ‘models’ travel and mutate in global flows of policy tourism. *Urban Studies*, 48, 1397–1419.

Górski, R. (2007) *Bez państwa. Demokracja uczestnicząca w działaniu*. Kraków: Korporacja ha!art.

Harvey, D. (1989) From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler Series B, Human Geography* 71, 1, 3–17.

Harvey, D. & Potter, C. (2009) The right to the Just City. In Connolly, J., Novy, J., Marcuse, P., Olivo, I., Potter, C. & Steil, S. (Eds.), *Searching for the Just City. Debates in Urban Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, 40–51.

Harvey, D. (2012) *Rebel Cities*. London, New York: Verso.

Kębłowski, W. (2013) Budżet partycypacyjny. Krótka instrukcja obsługi. Warsaw: Instytut Obywatelski. Available at: http://www.instytutobywatelski.pl/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/budzet_partycypacyjny.pdf

Kębłowski, W. & Van Criekingen, M. (forthcoming) How ‘alternative’ alternative urban policies really are? Looking at participatory budgeting through the lenses of the right to the city. *Métropoles*. Issue topic: Alternative Urban Development Policies. Soon available at: <http://metropoles.revues.org/4623>

Kębłowski, W. (forthcoming) Budżet partycypacyjny w Polsce. [Participatory budgeting in Poland]. Warsaw: Instytut Obywatelski.

Małowski, D. (2012) Co nam zostało z kongresów kultury. In *Partycypacja. Przewodnik Krytyki Politycznej*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Krytyki Politycznej, 246–253.

Marcuse, P. (2012) Whose right(s) to the city? In Brenner, N., Marcuse, P. & Mayer, M. (Eds.), *Cities for people, not for profit*. London: Routledge, 24–41.

Mayer, M. (2012) The ‘right to the city’ in urban social movements. In N. Brenner, P. Marcuse & M. Mayer (Eds.), *Cities for People, not for Profit*. London: Routledge, 63–85.

Mergler, L. (2014) Ruchy miejskie do rad! *ResPublica*. Available at: <http://publica.pl/teksty/ruchy-miejskie-do-rad>.

Nasze Miasto (2013, March 25) Budżet obywatelski w Sopocie to wzór do naśladowania dla innych miast? Available at: <http://sopot.naszemiasto.pl/artykul/budzet-obywatelski-w-sopocie-to-wzor-do-nasladowania-dla,1786548,t,id.html>.

Pearce, J. (2010) Introduction. In J. Pearce (ed.), *Participation and Democracy in the Twenty-First Century City*. Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 1–33.

Płaszczyc, E. (2005) Poland. Case study: Płock. In: Sintomer, Y., Herzberg, C. & Röcke, A. (Eds.), *Participatory Budgets in a European Comparative Approach. Perspectives and Chances for the Cooperative State at the Municipal Level in Germany and Europe*. Volume II (documents). Available at: <http://construisons-democratie-participative.com/documents/budgetparticipatifeneurope.pdf>

**PARTICIPATORY
BUDGETING POLISH-
STYLE. WHAT KIND OF
POLICY PRACTICE HAS
TRAVELLED TO SOPOT,
POLAND?**

WOJCIECH KEBŁOWSKI
& MATHIEU VAN
CRIEKINGEN

Pretty, J. N. (1995) Participatory learning for sustainable agriculture. *World Development*, 23, 8, 1247-63.

Purcell, M. (2013) Possible worlds: Henri Lefebvre and the right to the city. *Journal of Urban Affairs*. Online version of record published before inclusion in an issue.

Shah, A. (Ed.) (2007) *Participatory Budgeting*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Silver, H., Scott, A. & Kazepov, Y. (2010) Participation in urban contention and deliberation. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 34, 3, 453-477.

Wampler, B. & Hartz-Karp, J. (Eds.) (2012) The spread of participatory budgeting across the globe: adoption, adaptation, and impacts. Special issue of the *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 8, 2.

Ward, K. (2006) 'Policies in motion' urban management and state restructuring: the trans-local expansion of business improvement districts. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30, 54-75.

Ward, K. (2011) Policies in motion and in place. The case of business improvement districts. In McCann, E. & Ward, K., *Mobile Urbanism*, Minnesota/London: University of Minnesota Press, 71-95.

White, S. C. (1996) Depoliticising development: the uses and abuses of participation. *Development in Practice*, 6, 1, 6-15(10).

**CHILDHOOD AND
YOUTH PARTICIPATORY
BUDGETING,
FOUNDATIONS OF
PARTICIPATORY
DEMOCRACY AND THE
POLICY OF THE POLIS**

CÉSAR MUÑOZ

Benedetti, M.: **El amor, las mujeres y la vida**. Alfaguara. 2001.

Bettelheim, Bruno: **Con el amor no basta**. Fondo Cultura Económico. 1973.

Brook, Peter: **Espacio vacío**. 2002.

Carieri, Francesco: **El andar como práctica estética**. Ed. Gustavo Gili. 2002.

Ceballos, Paloma: **Un método para la investigación-acción participativa**. Ed. Popular.

Cristiane Rochefort: **Primero los niños**. Ed. Anagrama. 1977.

Deligny, F. : **Los vagabundos eficaces**. Ed. Estela. 1971.

Doltó, Françoise: **La causa de los niños**. Paidós. 1990.

Freire, Paulo: **Concientización**. Ed. Zero.

Freire, Paulo: **Educación como práctica de la libertad**. Ed. América Latina. 1965.

Freire, Paulo: **Educación liberadora**. Ed. Zero.

Freire, Paulo: **Educación y cambio**. Ed. Búsqueda. 1976.

Freire, Paulo: **Pedagogía y acción liberadora**. Ed. Zero.

Freire, Roberto y Brito, Fausto: **Utopía y Pasión**. Tupac Ediciones. 1990.

Guerau, Faustino: **La vida pedagógica**. Roselló Impresions. 1985.

Klein, Naomi: **No logo**. Paidos. 2002.

Korczak, Janusz: **Cómo amar a un niño**. Ed. Trillas, 1986.

Korczak, Janusz: **Si yo volviera a ser niño**. Ed La Pleyade.

Kundera, M.: **La insoportable levedad del ser**. Ed. Tusquets. 1987.

Lefebvre, H.: **LA vida cotidiana en el mundo moderno**. Alianza Ed.

Lispector, Clarice: **Aprendizaje o el libro de los placeres**. Ed. Siruela.

Makarenko, A. S.: **El poema pedagógico**. Ed. Paidós. 1979.

Marcuse, Herbert: **Eros y Civilización**. Ed. Planeta Agostini.

Marina, J.M.: **El rompecabezas de la sexualidad**. Ed. Anagrama. 2002.

Muñoz, César y otros: **El niño en Europa**. La participación en la vida cotidiana y su relación con la prevención de la violencia .Programa Daphne. Comisión Europea. 2000.

Muñoz, César: **Vivir, Educar: desde la seducción, el amor y la pasión**. Centro de Investigaciones Pedagógicas de la Infancia,

la Adolescencia y la Juventud. Programa Daphne. Comisión Europea. 2003.

Muñoz, César: **Pedagogía da Vida Cotidiana e Participação Cidadá**. Ed. Cortez. Sao Paulo. 2004.

Nadolny, Sten: **El descubrimiento de la lentitud**. Ed. Edhasa.

Offe, Claus: **Partidos políticos y nuevos movimientos sociales**. Ed. Sistema. 1988.

Pániker, Salvador: **Primer testamento**. Ed. Seix Barral.

Pániker, Salvador: **Segunda memoria**. Ed. Seix Barral. 1988.

Pániker, Salvador: **Variaciones 95**. Ed. Areté. 2002.

Proust, Marcel: **La fugitiva** El Pais. 2002.

Redl, F. y Wineman, D.: **Niños que odian**. Ed. Paidós. 1970.

Sánchez, Félix: **Orçamento Participativo, teoria e prática**. Cortez Editora. 2002.

Séller, A.: **Sociología de la vida cotidiana**. Ed. Península. 1977.

Senté, Richard: **Carne y piedra: el cuerpo y la ciudad en la civilización occidental**. Alianza Editorial. 2002.

Sorman, Guy: **Los verdaderos pensadores de nuestro tiempo**. Seix Barral.

Thoreau, Henry D.: **Desobediencia civil y otros escritos**. Ed. Tecnos. Clásicos del Pensamiento. 2001.

Vaneigem, Raoul: **Aviso a escolares y estudiantes**. Ed. Debate. 2002.

Vaneigem, Raoul: **Tratado de saber vivir para uso de la jóvenes generaciones**. Ed. Anagrama. 2002.

Varios Autores: **Malaguzzi y la educación infantil en Reggio Emilia**. Barcelona. A.M. Rosa Sensat. Col. Temas d'Infància. 1996

Varios Autores: **Discurso sobre la vida posible**. Quemar los puentes. El comienzo de una nueva época. Sediciones nº 11

Winterson, Janette: **La pasión**. Ed. Edhasa. 1990.

Yourcenar, Margarita: **Memorias de Adriano**. Ed. Edhasa.

ALLEGRETTI, Giovanni, "From Skepticism to Mutual Support: Towards a Structural Change in the Relations between Participatory Budgeting and the Information and Communication Technologies?" **in MINDUS**, P.; GREPPI, A.; CUONO, M. (orgs.), *Legitimacy_2.0. e-democracy and public opinion in the digital age*. Frankfurt am Main: Goethe-University Press, 2012, p. 145-181.

ARTERTON, Christopher F. **Teledemocracy: can technology protect democracy?** London, Sage Publications 1987.

ÅSTRÖM, Joachim; GRÖNLUND, Åke. In: COLEMAN, S.; SHANE, P.M. (Orgs.). **Connecting Democracy: Online Consultation and the Flow of Political Communication**. Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 2012, p. 75-96.

BAEK, Y. M; WOJCIESZAK, M. E.; CARPINI, M. X. D. **Online Versus Face-to-Face Deliberation: Who? Why? What? With What Effects?** *New Media & Society*, v. 13, n. 7, p. 135-162, 2011.

BANDEIRA, P.S. **Atitudes em Relação a Participação no Rio Grande do Sul**. Fundação de Economia e Estatística do Rio Grande do Sul. Disponível em:

<http://www.fee.tche.br/sitefee/download/jornadas/2/e12-04.pdf>

CADDY, Joanne; PEIXOTO, Tiago; MCNEIL, Mary. Beyond public scrutiny: stocktaking of social accountability in OECD countries. **Relatório OECD**. Disponível em:

<http://www.sasnet.org/documents/Curriculum/Strategic%20Communication/J%20Caddy.pdf>

CASTELLS, Manuel. **A Galáxia Internet: reflexões sobre a Internet, negócios e a sociedade**. São Paulo: Jorge Zahar Editor Ltda, 2003.

COLEMAN, Stephen; BRUMLER, Jay G. **The internet and democratic citizenship: theory, practice and policy**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

COLEMAN, Stephen; SAMPAIO, Rafael Cardoso. **Institutionalising a democratic innovation: A study of three e-participatory budgets in Belo Horizonte**. Em avaliação para *New Media & Society*.

DALE, Allison; STRAUSS, Aaron. Don't forget to vote: Text message reminders as a mobilization tool. **American Journal of**

**ELECTRONIC
PARTICIPATORY
BUDGETING: FALSE
DILEMMAS AND TRUE
COMPLEXITIES**

RAFAEL CARDOSO
SAMPAIO
TIAGO PEIXOTO

Political Science, 2009, 53.4: 787-804.

DAVIS, Richard. **Politics Online: Blogs, Chatrooms and Discussion Groups in American Democracy**, Routledge, London and New York, 2005.

DAVIES, Todd; CHANDLER, Reid. Online deliberation design: choices, criteria, and evidence. In: NABATCHI, T.; GASTIL, J.; WEIKSNER, G. M.; LEIGHNINGER, M. (orgs.). *Democracy in Motion: evaluating the practice and impact of deliberative civic engagement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, p. 103-131.

DOWNS, Anthony. **An economic theory of democracy**. New York: Harper and Row publishers, 1957.

FARIA, Antonio e PRADO, Otávio. "Orçamento Participativo Interativo". In: LOTTA, Gabriela S. BARBOZA, Hélio B. PINTO, Marco Antonio C. T. e VENERA. *20 experiências de Gestão Pública e Cidadania*. São Paulo: Programa Gestão Pública e Cidadania, 2003. Disponível em: <http://www.eaesp.fgvsp.br/subportais/ceapg/Acervo%20Virtual/Cadernos/Experi%C3%AAncias/2002/8%20-%20orcamento%20participativo%20interativo.pdf>.

FERREIRA, D. E. S. Inclusão, participação, associativismo e qualidade da deliberação pública no Orçamento Participativo Digital de Belo Horizonte. **Paper apresentado no 34º encontro anual da Anpocs, 2012**. Disponível em: http://www.anpocs.org/portal/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=1322&Itemid=350.

GOMES, Wilson. Participação Política Online: Questões e hipóteses de trabalho. In: MAIA, R. C. M.; GOMES, W.; MARQUES, F. P. J. A. *Internet e Participação política no Brasil*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2011, p. 19-45.

GOODIN, Robert E. *Innovating democracy: democratic theory and practice after the deliberative turn*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

GOODSPEED, Robert. The Dilemma of Online Participation: Comprehensive Planning in Austin, Texas. **Working paper**. Disponível em: http://web.mit.edu/rgoodspe/www/papers/RGoodspeed-Austin_Online_Participation_9-19-10.pdf.

GRAHAM, Todd. Beyond "Political" Communicative Spaces: Talking Politics on the Wife Swap Discussion Forum. **Journal of Information Technology & Politics**, 9:31-45, 2012

GRÖNLUND, Åke. Emerging Electronic Infrastructures: Exploring Democratic Components. **Social Science Computer Review**, vol. 21, n. 1, p. 55-72, 2003.

Gronke, P., Galanes-Rosenbaum, E., Miller, P. A., & Toffey, D. (2008). **Convenience voting**. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*, 11, 437-455.

LAUDON, Kenneth C. **Communications technology and democratic participation**. New York: Praeger, 1977.

LÉVY, Pierre. **Cibercultura**. São Paulo: Editora 34, 1997.

MACINTOSH, A.; WHYTE, A. **Towards an evaluation framework for eParticipation**. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, Vol. 2, N. 1, p. 16-30, 2008.

MANSBRIDGE, J.; BOHMAN, J.; CHAMBERS, S.; CHRISTIANO, T.; FUNG, A.; PARKINSON, J.; THOMPSON, D.F.; WARREN, M.E.. A systemic approach to deliberative democracy. In: PARKINSON, John; MANSBRIDGE, Jane (Orgs.). *Deliberative Systems: Deliberative Democracy at the Large Scale*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012, p. 1-26.

MALHOTRA, Neil, et al. Text messages as mobilization tools: the conditional effect of habitual voting and election salience. **American Politics Research**, 2011, 39.4: 664-681.

MARQUES, F. P. J. A. **Government and e participation programs: A study of the challenges faced by institutional projects**. *First Monday*, v. 15, p. 1-25, 2010.

Miori, V and Russo, D. (2011). "Integrating Online and Traditional Involvement in Participatory Budgeting" **Electronic Journal of e-Government**, V. 9, N. 1, p. 41 -57.

NABUCO, Ana Luíza. MACEDO, Ana Lúcia. FERREIRA, Rodrigo Nunes. **A Experiência do OPDigital em Belo Horizonte: O Uso das Novas Tecnologias no Fortalecimento da Democracia Participativa**. *IP - Informática Pública*, Ano 11, n. 1, Jun/2009, p. 139-155.

OLSON, Mancur. *The logic of collective action: public goods and the theory of groups*. Harvard University Press, 1965.

PEIXOTO, Tiago. (2009). Beyond Theory: e-Participatory Budgeting and its Promises for eParticipation. **European Journal of ePractice**. Disponível em: <http://www.epractice.eu/files/7.5.pdf>

PRATCHETT, Lawrence; WINGFIELD, Melvin; POLAT, Rabia Karakaya. Local democracy online: an analysis of local government web sites in England and Wales. **International Journal of Electronic Government Research (IJEGR)**, 2006, 2.3: 75-92.

RYFE, David M.; STALSBURG, Brittany. The participation and recruitment challenge. In: NABATCHI, T.; GASTIL, J.; WEIKSNER, G. M.; LEIGHNINGER, M. (orgs.). *Democracy in Motion: evaluating the practice and impact of deliberative civic engagement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, p. 43-58.

ROSE, Jeremy; RIOS, Jesus; LIPPA, Barbara. **Technology support for participatory budgeting**. *Int. J. Electronic Governance*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2010.

SALTER, Lee. **Structure and Forms of Use**. A contribution to understanding the ‘effects’ of the Internet on deliberative democracy. *Information, Communication & Society*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 185-206, 2004.

SAMPAIO, R.C.; MAIA, R. C. M.; MARQUES, F. P. J. A. Participation and Deliberation on the Internet: A case study on Digital Participatory Budgeting in Belo Horizonte. *JOCI - The Journal of Community Informatics*, v. 7, p. 1-22, 2011.

SINTOMER, Yves; HERZBERG, Carsten; RÖCKE, Anja; and ALLEGRETTI, Giovanni (2012) “Transnational Models of Citizen Participation: The Case of Participatory Budgeting” *Journal of Public Deliberation: Vol. 8, N. 2, Article 9*. Disponível em: <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss2/art9>.

SÆBØ, Øystein; ROSE, Jeremy; FLAK, Leif Skiftenes. **The shape of eParticipation: Characterizing an emerging research area**. *Government Information Quarterly*, v. 25, n.3, p. 400-428, 2008.

TRECHSEL, Alexander H. **E-voting and electoral participation**. *Dynamics of Referendum Campaigns—An International Perspective*. Palgrave, London, 2007, 159-183.

VAZ, J. C. **Using the Internet for collaborative local governance: the digital participatory budget in Brazil**. In: PAULICS, V. (Org.). *The Challenges of democratic management in Brazil*. São Paulo: Brasil, 2009, p. 127-148.

VEDEL, Thierry. **The idea of electronic democracy: origins, visions and questions**. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 2006, 59.2: 226-235.

WILHELM, Anthony. **A democracia dividida**. In: EISENBERG, J. e CEPIK, M. (orgs.) *Internet e Política. Teoria e pratica da democracia eletrônica*, Humanitas, 2001.

WOLTON, Dominique. **E depois da Internet?: para uma teoria crítica dos novos mídias**. Lisboa: Difel, 2000.

WRIGHT, Scott. (2012). **Politics as usual? Revolution, normalization and a new agenda for online deliberation**. *New Media Society*, 14(2) 244-261.

WRIGHT, Scott; STREET, John. **Democracy, deliberation and design: the case of online discussion forums**. *New Media Society, Londres*, vol. 9, p. 849-869, 2007.

FREIRE, Paulo in **FÓRUM DE PARTICIPAÇÃO POPULAR NAS ADMINISTRAÇÕES MUNICIPAIS**. 1995. Poder local, participação popular e construção da cidadania. s/l.

PONTUAL, Pedro de Carvalho. 1995. Construindo uma Pedagogia Democrática do Poder. **La Piragua: Revista Latino Americana de Educación y Política**. Santiago, Chile: CEAAL, nº 11, pp. 25-35.

PONTUAL, Pedro de Carvalho 2000. O Processo Educativo no Orçamento Participativo: aprendizados dos atores da Sociedade Civil e do Estado. **Tese de Doutorado PUC-SP**.

PONTUAL, Pedro de Carvalho. 2003. Pedagogia de la gestión democrática. **Documento apresentado ao Encontro sobre municipalismo na América do Sul**. Barcelona Espanha.

ASTELARRA, Judith (comp.): **Participación política de las mujeres**. Madrid, CIS, 1990.

BARRAGÁN, V., ROMERO, R. y SANZ J. M. (2012). **Análisis de los Presupuestos Participativos a través de las propuestas expresadas por la ciudadanía en ALLEGRETTI (comp.)**. Estudio comparado de los presupuestos participativos en República Dominicana, España y Uruguay. Parlocal. Málaga: CEDMA.

BOU, J. (2004-2009): **Publicación de las propuestas del Consejo de Ciudadanía en la web virtual de los**: Pressupost Participatiu. www.santacristina.net.

BOU, J. (2011). La experiencia de presupuesto participativo de Santa Cristina d’Aro, en BOU, J. (Coord.). **Refundar la democracia**. Atrapasueños Editorial (2011).

BOU, J.; GARCÍA-LEIVA, P.; PAÑO, P (2012). **La pobreza, la igualdad de género y el medioambiente**. Análisis de tres Objetivos de Desarrollo del Milenio a través de procesos de presupuestos participativos en República Dominicana, España y Uruguay. Parlocal. Málaga: CEDMA,

**BUILDING A
DEMOCRATIC PEDAGOGY:
PARTICIPATORY
BUDGETING AS A “SCHOOL
OF CITIZENSHIP”**

PEDRO PONTUAL

**PARTICIPATION AS OF THE
GENDER PERSPECTIVE
FROM THE ANALYSIS OF
SPECIFIC PARTICIPATORY
PROCESSES**

**CRISTINA SÁNCHEZ
MIRET
JOAN BOU I GELI**

Butlletins del Pressupost Participatiu (2009) de l'Ajuntament de Santa Cristina d'Aro: propostes prioritzades pel Consell de Ciutadania per al pressupost participatiu 2009.

FREIXENET, M. (2011) Dones joves i política; una tensió no resolta. Programa Ciutats i Persones. Col.lecció CiP, **Articles Feministes**, n.11.

GUTIÉRREZ- BARBARRUSA, V. (2012). Análisis sobre la participación en los Presupuestos Participativos en ALLEGRETTI (comp.). Estudio comparado de los presupuestos participativos en República Dominicana, España y Uruguay. Parlocal. Málaga: CEDMA.

LAGARDE, M. (1999) Claves feministas para liderazgos entrañables. **Memoria del Taller, Managua, 6.8 de octubre**, edición a cargo de Sofia Montenegro

SÁNCHEZ, C. (2008) La participación como instrumento de transformación social, **comunicación presentada en el Congreso de Innovación Democrática**, Santa Cristina d'Aro.

SÁNCHEZ, C. (2011) Análisis social de la Participación en el municipio de Santa Cristina d'Aro en BOU, J (Coord.): **Refundar la democracia**. Atrapasueños Editorial, 2011.

SÁNCHEZ, C. (2011) Metodología de análisis de los presupuestos participativos. El Análisis de la Participación; grupos sociales presentes, grupos sociales ausentes y transformación social en BOU, J (Coord.): **Refundar la democracia**. Atrapasueños Editorial, 2011.

SÁNCHEZ, C.(2009) El procés participatiu de Santa Cristina d'Aro des de la perspectiva del gènere, en M. DE LA FUENTE, M. FREIXANET (Coords.) Ciutats i persones- Polítiques de gènere i participació ciutadana al món local. Col.lecció Grana, n. 26, ICPS. Barcelona.

SÁNCHEZ, C.; VALL_LLOSERA, L (2008): Gènere i conciliació de la vida personal, familiar i laboral. A Condicions de vida i desigualtats a Catalunya. Polítiques n.65 Editorial Mediterrània i Fundació Jaume Bofill.

**PSYCHOLOGICAL
EMPOWERMENT
IN PARTICIPATORY
BUDGETING**

PATRICIA GARCÍA-LEIVA

Allegretti, G. (comp.) (2012). **Estudio comparativo de los presupuestos participativos en República Dominicana**, España y Uruguay (pp. 259-321). Málaga: Cedma. Diputación de Málaga. Proyecto Parlocal. ISBN: 978-84-694-7156-2

Bellamy, C. D. & Mowbray, C. T. (1998). Supported education as an empowerment intervention for people with mental illness. **Journal of Community Psychology**, 26 (5) 401 - 414.

Brown, L. D. (1993). Social Change through collective reflection with Asian nongovernmental development organizations. **Human Relations**, 46, 249-273

Chesler, M.A. (1991). Participatory action research with self-help groups: an alternative paradigm for inquiry an action. **American Journal of Community Psychology**, 19, 757-768.

Cornell Empowerment Group (1989). Empowerment and family support. **Networking Bulletin**, 1(2), 1-23

Cronbach, L. J. y Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological test. **Psychological bulletin**, 52, 281-302.

Elden, M. & Chisolm, R.F. (Eds) (1993). Emerging varieties of action research: Introduction to the special issue. **Human Relations**, 46, 121-142.

Ganuzo, E. (2007). Tipología y modelos de presupuestos participativos en España. Córdoba: **IESA Workingpaper series**. Nº 1307. IESA-CSIC.

García-Leiva, P., Domínguez-Fuentes, J. M., Hombrados-Mendieta, M^a. I.; Morales-Marente, E. y Palacios-Gálvez, M^a. S. (2009). Los presupuestos participativos y el fortalecimiento comunitario. **Presentado en el Congreso Nacional de Psicología Social**, celebrado desde el 1 hasta el 3 de octubre en Tarragona.

García-Leiva, P., Domínguez-Fuentes, J.M., Hombrados, M. I., Palacios, M. S, Marente, E. & Gutierrez, V. (2011). Evaluación de los presupuestos participativos en la provincia de Málaga. In M.A. Morillas, M. Fernández y V. Gutierrez. **Democracias participativas y desarrollo local** (pp 145-196). Málaga: Atrapasueños.

García-Leiva, P. y Paño, P. (2012). Construcción de ciudadanía desde la percepción de los actores de los presupuestos participativos En G. Allegretti (comp.) **Estudio comparativo de los presupuestos participativos en República Dominicana, España y Uruguay** (pp. 259-321). Málaga: Cedma. Diputación de Málaga. Proyecto Parlocal. ISBN: 978-84-694-7156-2

Hall, R.H: (Ed.) (1992). Participatory research, **Part I. American Sociologist**, 23 (Whole issue)

Hombrados, M.I., & Gómez-Jacinto, L (2001): Potenciación en la intervención comunitaria. **Intervención psicosocial**, 10, (1), 55-69

Instituto de Estadística y Cartografía de Andalucía (2010). Andalucía pueblo a pueblo. Extraído a 8 de Janeiro de 2010 do endereço <http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/institutodeestadisticaycartografia/sima/>.

Instituto Nacional de Estadística, INE (2010). Demografía y población. Extraído a 8 de Janeiro de 2010 do endereço <http://www.ine.es>.

Montero, M. (2003). Teoría y práctica de la Psicología Comunitaria. La tensión entre sociedad y comunidad. Buenos Aires: Paidós Tramas Sociales.

Montero, M. (2004). El fortalecimiento de la comunidad, sus dificultades y alcances. *Intervención Psicosocial*, 13, 1, 5 – 19.

Montero, M. (2010). Fortalecimiento de la ciudadanía y transformación social: área de encuentro entre la psicología política y la psicología comunitaria. *Psykhé*, 19, 51-63.

Rappaport, J. (1987). Terms of empowerment/exemplars of prevention: Toward a theory for community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 15, 121-148.

Rappaport, J. (1990). Research methods and the empowerment social agenda. In P. Tolan, C. Keys, F. Chertok & L. Jason (Eds.) *Researching community psychology: integrating theories and methodologies* (pp. 51-63). Washington, DC: **American Psychological Association**.

Rich, R. C., Edelstein, M., Hallman, W. K., & Wandersman, A. H. (1995). Citizen Participation and Empowerment: The Case of Local Environmental Hazards. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23, (5), 657-676.

Talpin, J. (2011). *Schools of Democracy: How ordinary citizens (sometimes) become competent in participatory budgeting institutions*. Colchester: **ECPRpress**

Whyte, W. F. (1991). *Participatory action research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Yeich, S. & Levine, R. (1992). Participatory research's contribution to a conceptualization of empowerment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22, 1894-1908.

Zimmerman, M. A. (1990) Taking aim on empowerment research: on the distinction between individual and psychological conception. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 18, 169-177.

Zimmerman, M. A. (1995). Psychological Empowerment: Issues and Illustrations. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23, (5), 581-599.

Zimmerman, M. A. (2000). Empowerment theory: psychological, organizacional, and community level of analysis. En J. Rappaport y E. Seidman (Eds.) *Handbook of Community Psychology* (pp. 43 – 63). Nova Iorque: Kluwer Academic.

Zimmerman, M. A. & Rappaport, J. (1988). Citizen Participation, perceived control, and psychological empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 16, 725-750.

Zimmerman, M.A & Warschausky, S. (1998). Empowerment Theory for Rehabilitation Research: Conceptual and Methodological Issues. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 43 (1), 3-16.