©Tiina Viirelaid www.tartu.ee

Anni Korts-Laur

Deliberative dimensions in participatory democracy: the case of the participatory budgeting process in Tartu, Estonia

· U C ·

UNIVERSIDADE DE COIMBRA

Anni Korts-Laur

Deliberative dimensions in participatory democracy: the case of the participatory budgeting process in Tartu, Estonia

Dissertation of the Master Roads to Democracy(ies) presented to the Faculty of Economics of the University of Coimbra to obtain the Master degree

Dr. Silvia Ferreira

Coimbra, 2016

Abstract

Since the late 1980s when participatory budgeting was invented in Porto Alegre, the number of local governments that have adopted the procedure is still growing today. In parallel there has been a progressive emergence of deliberative democracy that has conceptual and normative tensions with the model of participatory democracy, in which the participatory budgeting is a successful tool today. It is important to adapt the deliberative quality of participatory processes to revitalise the participatory budgeting initiative. In this light, the aim of this master dissertation is to identify what deliberative democracy elements are evident in the model of participatory budgeting in Tartu.

This master dissertation will begin with describing the concepts of participatory and deliberative democracy. Following with introducing the emergence of participatory budgeting and providing an overview on the typologies apparent in Europe. Moving on with the analytical and methodological approach of this study and finally before analyzing the empirical data I will create the context and introduce the participatory budgeting case in Tartu.

The case study was conducted with the example of the participatory budgeting process in the City of Tartu, Estonia in the year 2015. The empirical part of this study was conducted in July 2016. The study included documental analysis and interviews with voters, authors or proposers of an idea to the participatory budget and the project manager of the initiative from the Tartu City administration.

This study implies that as participatory budgeting is a tool of participatory democracy in some instances it is still evident that it holds elements from deliberative democracy, such

as: first, the element of discussion as the PB process urged some of the voters into discussions both in formal and informal ways; secondly, the educative power was apparent not only through participation but through discussions; thirdly, the existence of procedures for formal discussion through facilitation of a moderator; fourth, the feeling of empowerment that people could have a say or perform their power, or even in that the participation inspired the person to be more active as a citizen. The results provide some support that the model of PB in Tartu enforces community and citizen empowerment due to the practice of idea authors doing the outreach for their project and the voters through familiarising themselves with the projects that can teach them about the issues in their neighbourhood and in the City in general.

Resumo

Desde o final dos anos 80, quando o orçamento participativo foi inventado em Porto Alegre, o número de governos locais que adotaram o procedimento continua em crescimento. Paralelamente tem-se verificado uma afirmação progressiva da democracia deliberativa, a qual possui tensões conceptuais e normativas com o modelo da democracia participativa, da qual o orçamento participativo é um instrumento de sucesso. É importante adaptar a qualidade deliberativa dos processos participativos com vista a revitalizar potencial democrático do orçamento participativo. Nesta perspetiva, o objetivo desta dissertação de mestrado é identificar que elementos da democracia deliberativa estão presentes no modelo de orçamento participativo em Tartu, na Estónia.

Esta dissertação começará por descrever os conceitos de democracia participativa e deliberativa, prosseguindo com uma descrição sobre o surgimento do orçamento participativo e fornecendo uma visão geral das tipologias existentes na Europa. Avança-se, depois, para a abordagem analítica e metodológica deste estudo e, finalmente, antes de analisar os dados empíricos, é apresentado o contexto da democracia na Estónia e o caso do orçamento participativo em Tartu.

O estudo de caso centrou-se no processo de orçamento participativo na Cidade de Tartu, Estónia, no ano de 2015. A recolha de dados empíricos no terreno verificou-se em julho de 2016. O estudo incluiu análise documental e entrevistas a eleitores, autores ou proponentes de uma ideia para o orçamento participativo e ao gestor de projeto esta iniciativa da autarquia da Cidade de Tartu.

Este estudo mostra que o orçamento participativo é um instrumento da democracia participativa e que, além disso, que detém elementos de democracia deliberativa, tais como: o debate, dado que o processo de orçamento participativo instou alguns dos eleitores a debater as propostas tanto em espaços formais como informais; o poder educativo foi evidenciado não só através da participação, mas também dos próprios debates; a existência de procedimentos para o debate formal através da facilitação de um moderador; o sentimento de empoderamento resultante da perceção de que as pessoas podem ter uma palavra a dizer, usarem o seu poder, e mesmo a ideia de que a participação inspira as pessoas a serem mais ativas como cidadãs.

Os resultados apoiam, até certo ponto, a tese de que o modelo de orçamento participativo em Tartu reforça a capacitação da comunidade e dos cidadãos. Tal acontece quer em virtude da prática dos autores de ideias de divulgação dos seus projetos, quer em virtude da familiarização dos eleitores com os projetos, os quais podem instruí-los relativamente às questões no seu bairro e na cidade em geral.

Palavras-chave: democracia deliberativa; democracia participativa; orçamento participativo; estudo de caso; Estónia

Table of Contents

List of tables

Introduction

Democracy was already imagined by Aristotle in between 335–323 BC in a book called *Politics*. It had segments of democracy, freedom, equality and citizenship. In Ancient Greece, democracy was built out from economic crises and also of the experience of having oligarchies based on violence. According to Aristotle, democracy meant having citizens directly involved in governing in relatively small units, small city states.

In the eighteenth century, the same definition was carried on by the political thinkers, such as Rousseau for example, believing democracy could be feasible, but in a form of small community (Stromberg, 1996). Also according to Markoff (1999) democracy was often used to denote an ancient political system as a point of reference, as in the observation of a late seventeenth-century dictionary that "democracy only flourished in the republics of Rome and Athens".

In the late eighteenth century such idea was still there but the definition's core was written down as following: Democracy is a form of government, with sovereignty given to the people as a body. Consequently, there was the debate on whether the same body of people could be given the right of being a "political animal". The fear of mediocrity was spread through the whole eighteenth century. Namely, that democracy leads to despotism, enshrines mediocrity, and causes people to be rootles, godless, and materialistic. (Stromberg, 1996)

In my view, the best reflection towards the execution of democracy is argued by Barber (2004: 165-166), according to whom "democracy grows slowly and requires indigenous struggle, the cultivation of local civic institutions, and a carefully nurtured spirit of

citizenship that depends heavily on education". The core idea outlines the conditions for democracy in a very succinct way, namely, the democracy that acquires indigenous struggle; civil consciousness and sense of responsibility that results from local civic institutions; and finally the nurture of citizenship that should include both education and accessibility to participation.

The previously remarked is, in my opinion, a vital cornerstone in defining the nature of participatory and deliberative democracy.

In this master dissertation I will explore the model of deliberative democracy in order to find its elements in participatory budgeting in the case of Participatory Budgeting in Tartu 2015. Also it is important to understand the normative and practical notions of participatory democracy, in which the participatory budgeting is a successful tool today.

One of the reasons why this topic is relevant is the widespread discontent with democracy and the need to revitalize democracy. Sintomer, Röcke and Helzberg (2016: 2) open up the context: "As the European project seems paralysed, torn between varying conceptions and threatened by national or even nationalistic sentiments. Parallel to the new engagement of citizens, in almost all countries, political systems face voter disillusionment or crisis of legitimacy." Boaventura de Sousa Santos and João Arriscado Nunes describe the current situation by a predominance of forms of 'thin' democracy or low-intensity democracy, with democratic life reduced to steadily less mobilizing periodical elections to choose those who will exercise power on behalf of citizens (Santos and Nunes, 2004). Could be argued, that representative democracy has made citizenry passive and has alienated them from being politically active.

Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg add that "Everywhere, abstention is on the rise; citizens' faith in political institutions and politicians is declining; party membership is decreasing, in term of both quantity and intensity of identification, and this affects strongly the traditional parties. In parallel more institutional participatory procedures have multiplied since the beginning of the 90s and citizen participation is on the political agenda. (Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg, 2016: 2)" Likewise, in Estonia, in Tartu, the Participatory Budget was put in place to tackle these same issues of discontent with democracy. Estonia, as 25-year old democracy has been going through times of political dissatisfaction, political distrust, and low citizen participation, seen also as citizens' apathy. The discontent was also connected with events in the year 2012 such as the scandal about Reform Party's secret funding. The latter received a rapid response in the form of Charter 12, which is an Estonian citizens' initiative, signed by seventeen prominent public figures (mostly academics and thinkers), calling for greater democratic accountability on the part of the authorities. That followed with The People's Assembly *Rahvakogu,* a platform to crowd-source ideas and proposals for improving elections, public participation, as well as political parties and their funding. The proposals and ideas were then discussed at 'Deliberation Day' and a result, 15 proposals were selected to be send to the Estonian parliament, the *Riigikogu*, for legislative amendments. From which three proposals became laws in a year. This was the first time a mechanism from deliberative democracy was used in Estonia and proved that, when the right conditions are created, citizens are willing and capable of participating in the policy making process.

During the turbulence in the Estonian democracy participatory budgeting (henceforth PB) was first introduced to local governance decision-makers during autumn 2011 in the framework of the project "Participatory budgeting in local governments" implemented by

an Estonian non-governmental organisation - e-Governance Academy Foundation (eGA) (Krenjova and Reinsalu, 2015). The first pilot of participatory budget took place in Tartu, in 2013. Today, as more local governments are being introduced to the participatory budget, the quality of the practice stays relevant.

Herewith, one of the aims of the dissertation is to explore one of the tools of participatory democracy, the participatory budget, especially the typologies found in Europe. Moreover, the research intended to characterise which type of participatory budget is found in the case on Tartu.

As stated above, the rapid spread and the political reactions it has produced makes PB distinct from other new participatory instruments (Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg, 2016: 3). They elaborate, "the procedure – which involves non-elected citizens in making decisions on public finances – was invented in Porto Alegre and very rapidly spread through the rest of Brazil and Latin America". Ever after that "by 2005 it had been adopted by 55 European towns. Five years later there were more than 250 participatory budgets and at the end of 2012, between 474-1317. (ibid: 9)"

As stated above, one of the aims of this master dissertation is to look into the PB case in Tartu and find elements of deliberative democracy in the model; namely, the quality of participation and deliberation, the educative power, empowerment of citizens, the legitimacy and accountability.

This introduction is followed by a theoretical Chapter 1 on describing participatory and deliberative democracy, focusing on theoretical approaches and concepts within the field of research on democracy studies. Chapter 2 will introduce PB in more detail and will give an overview of the six typologies of PB in Europe. After the theoretical chapters I

will follow the descriptions of the methodology of this work - a single-case study (see Chapter 3). Chapter 4 will introduce the democracy in Estonia, mapping the PB and most importantly, introducing the case under study – the PB process in Tartu, year 2015. In the final Chapter 5 will analyse the material from the fieldwork and present which of the elements of deliberative democracy were evident in the case of PB in Tartu.

This dissertation is based on some fundamental literature concerning participatory and deliberative democracy models and the PB tool. The authors such as James S. Fishkin, David Held, Yves Sintomer, Anja Röcke, Carsten Herzberg, Julien Talpin, Edward C. Weeks, Stephen Elstub, Peter McLaverty, Boaventura de Sousa Santos, Leonardo Arvitzer, Seyla Benhabib, Jürgen Habermas, Kasper N. Hansen, Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson contributed with important ideas to this study. The Estonia authors to whose works I refer to are Kristina Reinsalu, Jelizaveta Krenjova and Ringa Raudla. Their studies are about the applicability of PB in the new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE).

Material for the analysis is composed of theoretical works by above mentioned authors, reports by e-governance Academy and of 11 semi-structured interviews which were conducted in Estonia, Tartu.

1. The concepts of deliberative and participatory democracy

1.1. Participatory democracy

I will pursue with defining participatory democracy, but to understand its theoretical basis better I will firstly elaborate on the classical roots of democracy and in particular participatory democracy.

Held (2006:13) argues that "the development of democracy in Athens has been a central source of inspiration for modern political thought. Its political ideals – equality among citizens, liberty, respect for the law and justice – have influenced political thinking in the West." Hence the importance in defining the antique model of democracy. On a notion of Zittel and Fuchs (2007) it is perceived as a model in a double meaning of the word. First, in the sense that it is a descriptive model that gives a simplified account of the complex reality of Athenian democracy in antiquity and which is restricted to identifying essential characteristics. Second, in the sense of a normative model, since for many modern theoreticians and practitioners, this antique democracy has been a natural example to be emulated.

On the first meaning of Athenian democracy in antiquity Hornblower (1992 apud Held, 2006: 12) describes, it appears that during the mid-sixth century the first 'democratic' polity emerged in Chios, though others, all with their own particularities and idiosyncrasies, soon formed. While Athens stands out as the pinnacle of this development, the new political culture became fairly widespread throughout Greek civilization, enfranchising the whole of the free citizenry.

In order to grasp the model of classical Athens, Held (2006) describes that the citizenry as a whole formed the key body of Athens: The Assembly. The Assembly met over forty times a year and had a quorum of 6000 citizens and all the major issues came before the assembled citizens for deliberation and decision. Issues were such as the legal framework for the maintenance of public order, finance and direct taxation, ostracism and foreign affairs. In other words, the Assembly decided the political commitments of the Athenian state.

About voting at the Assembly, Held (2006: 17) notes, that

> While unanimity (*homonoia*) was always sought in the belief that problems could only be resolved correctly if the common interest was clearly recognized. The Assembly allowed intractable issues to go to a formal vote with majority rule (Larsen, 1948). Voting was both a way of making explicit differences of judgement and a procedural mechanism to legitimate a solution to pressing matters.

Therefore, as Held elaborates, "the Greeks probably invented the use of formal voting procedures to legitimate decision in the face of conflicting positions. But the ideal remained consensus, and it is not clear that even majority of issues was put to the vote (Mansbridge, 1983: 13-15 *apud* Held 2006: 17)."

Another characteristic of democracy in classical Athens was the scrutiny of accountability of the political administrators' and the state system, with constant rotation of positions to diffuse the power. Held describes

> As the Assembly was a large body to operate, it needed help to prepare its own agenda, to draft legislation and to be a focal point for the reception of new political initiatives and proposals. A council of 500 took responsibility for organizing and proposing public decision; it was aided, in turn, by a more streamlined Committee of

50 (which served for one month) with a president at its head (who could only hold office for one day).

Having that many citizens politically involved, as the assembly had a quorum of 6,000 citizens Held (2006) also notes that in the centre of the Athenian city-state political culture, there was celebrated the notion of an active, involved citizenry in a process of self-government, the governors were to be the governed. All citizens met to debate, decide and enact the law. The principle of government was the principle of a form of life.

The citizenry of Athens, depending on the period, ranged from 30,000 to 60,000 and were adult male citizens. And the Pnyx, the hill where the Assembly met, could only hold between 6,000 and 8,000 (Fishkin, 2009).

According to Pericles, formally, citizens faced no obstacles to involvement in public affairs based on rank or wealth. The demos held sovereign power, that is, supreme authority, to engage in legislative and judicial functions. Athenian democracy concept of 'citizenship' entailed taking a share in these functions, participating directly in the affairs of the state. As Pericles said: 'we do not say that a man who takes no interest in politics is a man who minds his own business; we say that he has no business here at all.' (Held, 2006)

The process of government itself was based on what Pericles, the influential Greek statesman and orator, refers to as 'proper discussions', i.e. free and unrestricted discourse, guaranteed by *isegoria*, an equal right to speak in the sovereign assembly (Finley, 1973b: 18-19 *apud* Held, 2006: 15). Moreover, "to express and transform their understanding of the good through political interaction (Farrar, 1992: 38F *apud* Held, 2006: 15)". Decisions and laws rested, it was claimed, on conviction – the force of the better argument – and not mere custom, habit or brute force. Subsequently, the

importance of public deliberation was not emphasized again in political theory for a long time.

When talking about the roots of classical democracy one cannot ignore the exclusivity of ancient democracy. Held (2006: 19) notes "The classical polis was marked by unity, solidarity, participation, public deliberation and highly restricted citizenship. The state reached deeply into the lives of its citizens, but embraced only a small proportion of the population." Only Athenian men over the age of 20 were eligible for active citizenship.

Despite the exclusivity, the ideas from ancient democracy gave inspiration for future thinkers. As the institutions described in Aristotle's further clarify the truly radical nature of ancient democracy. It is hardly surprising that Marx and Engels took it as a source of inspiration; their own model of a properly democratic order, the Paris Commune of 1871, which had a remarkable number of common features with Athens (Held, 2006). Communists, left-wing socialists, anarchists, and others have seen the Commune as a model for, a "liberated" society, with a political system based on participatory democracy from the grass roots up.

> All aspects of 'government' would then, according to Marx, be fully accountable to the majority: 'the general will' of the people would prevail. The smallest communities would administer their own affairs and elect delegates to larger administrative units (districts, towns) which would, in turn, elect candidates to still larger areas of administration (the national delegation). This arrangement is known as the 'pyramid' structure of direct (or delegative) democracy. All delegates are revocable, bound by the instructions of their constituency and organized into a 'pyramid' of directly elected committees. (Held, 2006: 115)

Moving on from the ancient democracy, the major difference of participatory democracy from concepts of liberal and representative democracy is obviously the advocacy of greater participation of the citizens in the political process (Pállinger, et al., 2007).

To grasp the ideal of participatory democracy a good start would be the argument of Pateman in 1970. Drawing upon central notions of Rousseau and Mill, the author argues that participatory democracy fosters human development, enhances a sense of political efficacy, reduces a sense of estrangement from power centres, nurtures a concern for collective problems and contributes to the formation of an active and knowledgeable citizenry capable of taking a more acute interest in government affairs (Held, 2006).

Therefore, participatory democracy is a structure emphasizing on decision-making and it requires citizens to exchange their views and enables debate for their supporting reasons concerning public political question.

Initiatives of participatory democracy hence aim more for the public and civic dimension of politics. It means that what matters is the self-development of citizens that would create the sense of political efficacy and a concern for collective problems. It tackles the problems of the old habits of representative or liberal democracy which has set the social responsibility of different sectors very low and considers that democratic experimentation is not feasible.

Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2005) explains such tendencies with the conception of hegemonic democracy in which the most visible symptoms of the twin crises of representation and participation hold a deficit of credibility and legitimacy. Liberal democracy has become less and less credible not only in the "new frontier" countries but also in the countries where it has its deepest roots.

Santos and Arvitzer (2005) identify the hegemonic conceptions within democratic theory that came to prevail in the second half of the twentieth century, marked by the confrontation between two conceptions of the world and their relation with the process of western modernization: on the one hand, the conception of liberal democracy and, on the other, a Marxist conception of democracy that took self-determination in the world of labour as the centre of the process of the exercise of sovereignty on the part of citizens understood as individual producers. The authors continue, that from this confrontation stemmed the hegemonic conceptions within democratic theory that came to prevail in the second half of twentieth century: "These conceptions are related to the answer given to three questions: that of the relation between procedure and form; that of the role of bureaucracy in democratic life; and that of the inevitability of representation in large-scale democracies (Boaventura de Sousa Santos, 2005: xxxvii)."

When talking about counter-hegemonic theories of democracy, Jürgen Habermas was the author who opened the discussion on proceduralism as a societal practice and not as a method of constituting governments. Social emancipation needed to be reinvented. Accordingly, Habermas reintroduces societal and participatory proceduralism into the discussion on democracy and introduces a new element on the route. Proceduralism has its origins in the plurality of the ways of life in contemporary societies. Politics, in order to be plural, must count the assent of the actors in rational process of discussion and deliberation. (Santos 2005)

David Held (2006: 212) argues that

> if people know opportunities exist for effective participation in decision-making, they are likely to believe participation is worthwhile, likely to participate actively and likely, in addition, to hold that collective decisions should be binding. On the other hand, if

people are systematically marginalized and/or poorly represented, they are likely to believe that only rarely will their views and preferences be taken seriously, weighted equally with those of others or assessed in a process that is fair or just. Thus, they are likely to find few good reasons for participating in, and regarding as authoritative, the decision-making processes which affect their lives.

Participatory democracy therefore not only needs mechanism for broadened citizen's involvement and contribution but also a strong political support to the mechanism from up-down. Such mechanisms can be for example referendums and participatory budgeting. Of the latter, I will focus on, in the upcoming chapter. Participatory democracy however, does not require that all decisions be made directly by the people. From the standpoint of participatory democracy, direct consultation is not merely about the choice of policy elites but also the choice of policies. (Fishkin, 2009)

Moreover, participatory democracy can also serve an 'educative function'. Fishkin (2009: 77-78) states

> that much of the revival of interest in participatory democracy was spurred by the argument that is serves an "educative function". Those who participate learn how to be citizens by doing. They get a greater sense of efficacy and become more informed about public issues. Most importantly, they acquire a sense of "public spirit". As they discuss public problems together they appreciate different points of view and learn to weigh and to value interests broader than their own.

When talking about the educative effect of participation it is important to consider the scale of the society. Fishkin notes, in large-scale nation-state the same educative function as envisioned in small-scale democracy is normally small. Fishkin (2009: 79) argues that "In the small-scale context, the deliberative argument for participation is really valuing something like deliberation. And even the modest educative effects of larger-scale

participation in referenda are surely linked to the fact that they stimulate a vast public discussion."

Hence, there is scepticism on participatory democracy model that if one wants an educative effect then something like deliberation seems required (Fishkin, 2009). As also Held claims, increased participation alone does not address the problem of the quality of participation. Participatory democrats fail to focus on specifically deliberative deficits (ibid: 236).

1.2. Deliberative democracy

A more engaging and consensus seeking model of democracy is deliberative democracy, as a term used for the first time by Joseph Bessette (1980, 1994). But already earlier "it was argued that public deliberation was an essential element of democracy (Elstub and McLaverty, 2014: 4)" and suggested by many that the cure for the ills of democracy is to more fully engage citizens in the deliberative process of community decision making. Whether called "strong democracy" (Barber, 1984), "unitary democracy" (Mansbridge, 1980), "discursive democracy" (Dryzek, 1990), "civic discovery" (Reich 1988), or "deliberative democracy" (Gutmann and Thompson, 1996) "the proposed cures share an emphasis on eliciting broad public participation in a process which provides citizens an opportunity to consider the issues, weigh alternatives, and express a judgement about which policy or which candidate is preferred" (Weeks, 2008: 296).

Defining deliberative democracy as the "informed participation by citizens in the deliberative process of community decision making" establishes the minimum condition to be met by any reform claiming that label. That is,

deliberative democracy requires, that public participation be 1) broad; 2) informed, and 3) deliberative. An additional fourth condition is credibility: if the results of the public process are to be accepted by the general public, by interest groups, and by policy makers, they must be highly credible. (Weeks, 2008: 297)

Debates on deliberative democracy distinguish a political approach focused on improving the quality of democracy (Held, 2006) or in enhancing the nature and form of political participation, not just increasing it for its own sake (Cohen, 1989). This means more connected politics with the wider processes and problems of political debate; more public argumentation and reasoning among equal citizens. Citizens share a commitment to the resolution of problems of collective choice through public reasoning. In addition, the 'mutual justifiability' of political decisions is the legitimate basis for seeking solutions to collective problems.

Hence, the free and reasoned assent of citizens to the terms and conditions of political order needs good civic education. This is what deliberative democracy tackles. Deliberative politics requires both the nurturing of a civic education program and discursive public fora to help 'upgrade the quality of citizenship' (Offe and Preuss, 1991). Civic education needs to be part of every child's learning process, from early school through higher education and beyond.

Therefore, it can be claimed that one of the conditions for deliberative democracy is a strong civic education program that is reproductive. Bohman (1998) validates that with his contribution regarding how deliberative democracy educates the citizenry. He gives an interesting and inclusive explanation arguing that deliberative democracy has established a rationality of "the forum" rather than "the market". Rather than a simple compromise or bargaining equilibrium, the goal of deliberation is consensus, the agreement of all those

affected by a decision. In addition, in the early formulations of the deliberative ideal in the 1980s, deliberation was always opposed to aggregation and to the strategic behaviour encouraged by voting and bargaining (Bohman, 1998: 400).

The idea is that the public can be manipulated by "the market" politics and the result is that increasingly politically aware and active citizens are challenging the wall of immunity of the political elite to return to the sense and feeling of self-government. This was already present in the model of Renaissance republicanism where the highest political ideal was the civic freedom of an independent, self-governing republic. In my opinion the key matter is the prevention of the cult of elected officials and passive citizenry which I find being in interdependence and can also be diagnosed in the lack of democratic competence of the people, growing disengagement, lack of participation in elections and public issues, media saturated politics, cult of personality, alienated elites and the invasion of the political process by marketing tools for opinion formation.

Shortly how deliberative poll works – a representative sample of population is brought together in one place for a few days in order to deliberate on a pressing matter of public concern; deliberation then involves two elements: exposure to, and questioning of, a range of experts on the issue at stake; and a debate among the participants. Next step is another poll and the result of pre- and post- deliberative polls are compared. (Held, 2006)

As for the result and impact, Held (2006: 247) asserts: "Apart from the immediate impact of a deliberative poll on its participation, it is hoped that, if the results are well publicized (perhaps on a radio and television), the general public would be stimulated to consider their own views more carefully." It is also important to bring out that deliberative polls

were not designed to replace the political institutions of liberal democracy, but to support and complement and even renewing them.

Hereby, Chappell (2012) believes that the theory of deliberative democracy responds to the problems that currently exist in democratic practice, which of some mentioned above. These include apathetic, badly informed voters, low turnout, elections fought with sound-bite rhetoric and political exclusion. Newer democracies also experience more severe problems of corruption and a relative lack of transparency in political decision making.

So how to measure the quality of deliberative democracy in order to avoid such problems and what are the basic characteristics? Authors such as Fishkin, Gutmann and Thompson give some relief to that question. Fishkin (2009: 33-34) offers five conditions in which the process of deliberation can achieve its quality:

1. Information: The extent to which participants are given access to reasonably accurate information that they believe to be relevant to the issue.
2. Substantive balance: The extent to which arguments offered by one side or from one perspective are answered by considerations offered by those who hold other perspectives.
3. Diversity: The extent to which the major position in the public are represented by participants in the discussion.
4. Conscientiousness: The extent to which participants sincerely weigh the merits of the arguments.
5. Equal consideration: The extent to which arguments offered by all participants are considered on the merits regardless of which participants offer them.

Those five conditions again require specific condition that Gutmann and Thompson (2004) describe as characteristics of *reason-giving* requirement, the *access* to that process

and that the decisions made in that process are *dynamic* and *binding* for some period of time. Finally,

> Combining these four characteristics, we can define deliberative democracy as a form of government in which free and equal citizens (and their representatives), justify decisions in a process in which they give one another reason that are mutually acceptable and generally accessible, with the aim of researching conclusions that are binding in the present on all citizens but open to challenge in the future (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004: 7).

Chappell (2012) adds a couple of values not to be disregarded within this debate; the reciprocity and other-regarding interests. Firstly, the reciprocal quality of deliberation is grounded in the requirement to give reason and justifications for our beliefs in the political forum (ibid).

> This presupposes respect for other citizens that is manifested by providing them with reasons for our beliefs and preferences and by listening to the reasons they in turn provide. The underlying assumption is that in the public political forum citizens and politicians need to justify their stand on issues in a way that other will understand, if no necessarily accept (ibid: 7)

Secondly,

> Deliberative democracy is also aimed at making citizens more other-regarding, more concerned about the interests of others and less selfish. This captures the intuition that in politics citizens should take the needs and interests of others into account when they form their preferences and contribute to making decisions. According to the theory, during deliberation citizens will learn about the perspectives, beliefs and interests of others to a much greater extent than they would be able to under more adversarial forms of democracy. (ibid: 7)

Hence, reciprocity and other-regarding values facilitate learning, helping the citizens acquire new information and correct false beliefs.

Another condition for deliberative democracy is the existence of a public culture and institutions supporting the development of deliberative structures of democracy. In order to turn democratic politics from the passive registration of interest, the know-all certainty of armchair critics and the inclination of the moment, to a more refined and reflective process (Held, 2006). Increasing there is a deliberative element in modern democracies existing in practice in some institutions today, such as deliberative polls, deliberative days, peoples' assemblies etc.; expanding voter feedback mechanisms and citizen communication; civic education and public funding of deliberative bodies.

Hereby, it is necessary to add two dimensions for practical forms of deliberation – micro and macro deliberation.

Chappell (2012) argues that micro deliberation is expressed in face to face deliberation, in equality in speech as in equal chance and time of speech. Micro deliberative events often employ moderators in order to make sure that these normative principles are upheld in practice. The role of moderators is to facilitate the debate, to ensure equality and inclusion and to give guidance that encourages reasoned debate without determining the direction the discussion will take. This may be especially helpful in ensuring that the discussion is reasoned and other-regarding.

On the other hand, macro deliberation is the ongoing, disaggregated process of discussion in the public sphere.

> It takes place over a long period of time, not necessarily continuously. It encompasses many of the things we regard as necessary for the healthy democratic culture and civil society: free media, public debate, statement by politicians and the voice of civil society activists. All members of a polity can participate in macro deliberation should they wish

to do so, although the extent of the opportunities they have for participation will vary considerably. (Ibid: 12)

If all members of a nation state can participate in macro deliberation, how is the equality in mass political participation guaranteed and fostered, and how will it be reasoned and regarding of all the quality characteristics valued in deliberative democracy? Fishkin offers some answers with his discussion on mass participation, political equality and deliberation. The author (Fishkin, 2009: 45) elaborates:

> By political participation we mean behaviour on the part of members of the mass public directed at influencing, directly or indirectly, the formulation, adoption, or implementation of governmental or policy choices. Voting has become by far the most widely shared form of political participation, but contributing money, time, or effort to political causes, demonstrating, writing letters or emails to governmental officials, signing petitions are all activities that involve large numbers of people.

The latter means citizens engaging in mass political participation:

> Mass participation signals a form of mass consent. When the people participate and they approve certain results (whether in an election or referendum) there is a mandate for whatever policy outcomes result. The idea is that those who are subject to living with decisions should have an actual share in the decision processes. (ibid: 46)

The latter idea of equal share in decision processes should lay on those who are the subject to living with these decisions.

The three principles – deliberation, political equality, and mass participation – pose a predictable pattern of conflict (ibid: 46): attempts to realize any of the two will undermine the achievement of the third. The outcomes are set out in the Table 1 by Fishkin (2009: 46).

Table 1 Options in the trilemma

	Political equality	Participation	Deliberation
Opinion one: Mass democracy	+	+	-
Opinion two: Mobilized deliberation	-	+	+
Opinion three: Microcosmic deliberation	+	-	+

So how to achieve the best possible version keeping the three principles? I would argue that the technological developments offer new forums for discussion and makes it easier to participate and reason collectively. Hence, in the end, the main conflict lays in the design of institutions and their political will, how to weight/deliberate between those three values.

On a normative conception of deliberative democracy that emphasizes public reasoning, bringing in the relationship between the normative presuppositions of democratic deliberation and the idealized content of practical rationality. Benhabib explains

the discourse model of ethics formulates the most general principles and moral institutions behind the validity of a deliberative model of democracy. The basic idea behind this model is that only those norms (i.e., general rules of action and institutional arrangements) can be said to be valid (i.e., morally binding), which would be agreed to by all those affected by their consequences, if such agreement were reached as a consequence of a process of deliberation that had the following features: 1) participation in such deliberation is governed by the norms of equality and symmetry; all have the same chances to initiate speech acts, to question, to interrogate, and to open debate; 2) all have the right to question the assigned topics of conversation; and 3) all have the right to initiate reflexive arguments about the very rules of the discourse procedure and the way in which they are applied or carried out. (Benhabib, 1996: 70)

Deliberative model of democracy in a proceduralist concept emphasizes first and foremost certain institutional procedures and practices for attaining decisions on matters that would be binding to all (Benhabib, 1996: 73). Proceduralism is a rational answer to persisting value conflicts at the substantive level. Deliberative democracy proceeds not only from a conflict of values but also from a conflict of interests in social life. Proceduralist models of democracy allows the articulation of conflicts under conditions of social cooperation to be mutually acceptable to all. (Benhabib, 1996: 73)

The deliberative quality of a participatory process can now be considered according to three main principles (Blondiaux, 2005: 126-27 *apud* Fishkin, 2009): A principle of discussion; a principle of inclusion; a principle of publicity. Which are from the same notion to Weeks conditions mentioned previously.

To define the meaning of the word 'deliberation', which has been set center to the deliberative democracy, Sintomer, Röcke and Helrzberg (2016: 214) present their interpretation that is also prevalent in their latest book.

> In English as in the accepted meaning given it by contemporary political philosophy the word 'deliberation' refers to a careful consideration or discussion about all the dimensions of an issue. This may resemble ideal scientific discussion, with communication based on strenght of the best argument, or as a process aimed at convincing people, including arguments but also testomonies and other types of expression that involve an emotional dimension. (…) In Old French and other Neo-Latin languages, this word is synonymous with decision-making, and thi meaning is still partly present today.

For deliberative theorists, the process of deliberation is regarded as essential to democracy. According to Ackerman and Fishkin (2003: 25 *apud* Held, 2006: 25)

The deliberative democrats hope that new forms of deliberative engagement will stimulate reflection not only on the part of those immediately involved, but also on the part of those who come into contact with 'deliberative activists' – family members, friends and workmates. They hope that re-engaging some citizens in politics will stimulate widespread networking which could eventually trigger a culture of far-reaching civic participation.

Having in mind that the new forms of deliberative engagements have a wider space of influence, it is also important that logical analysis and rational reflection are essential aspects of deliberative competence. Rosenberg (*apud* Elstub and McLaverty, 2014: 99-100) elaborates

that citizen deliberation is a collective activity, not simply a personal cognitive one. As such, it requires the ability to use talk to work collaboratively with people who have differing points of view to come to a common understanding of a problem and how to address it. This requires a certain communicative competence. Participants must understand the value of talk as a mean both for enhancing one's personal understanding of a problem and for co-operating with others in coming to mutually satisfying decisions. Only then they will be willing to suspend action in favour of deliberation.

It is the communicative situation itself which has the capacity to change people. As Talpin (2011: 192) says: "Only when discussions become collective, when people listen to other's arguments and answer each other, can people be affected. This kind of discussion – defined as deliberation – can only emerge when disagreement is voiced. But disagreement is scarce, because it is risky."

When talking about legitimacy in context of deliberative democracy Bernard Manin (*apud* Held, 2006: 232) defends: "the source of legitimacy is not the predetermined will of individuals, but rather the process of its formation, that is, deliberation itself." On the

other hand, on the proceduralist point of view arguing that, "the principles of deliberative democracy, should not prescribe the content of laws, but only the procedures (such as equal suffrage) by which laws are made and the conditions (such as free political speech) necessary for the procedures to work fairly (Gutmann & Thompson, 2002).

The mentioned importance of deliberation process in a way evolves a moral point of view and is based on the 'principle of reciprocity'. According to Gutmann and Thompson (2002: 156)

> Reciprocity is widely recognized as a core principle of democracy in its many moral variations – liberal, constitutional, procedural, and deliberative – but most theories do not give it the central role that deliberative democracy does. Reciprocity holds that citizens owe one another justifications for the mutually binding laws and public policies they collect to enact. The aim of a theory that takes reciprocity seriously is to help people seek political agreement on the basis of principles that can be justified to others who share the aim of reaching such agreement.

However, as reciprocity claims to find agreement in giving one another justifications for their actions and decisions, it is essential that these arguments are based on well informed opinions. That however depends on the complexity of the topics under deliberation and "complexity makes us all depend on experts of one kind of another (Elstub and McLaverty, 2014: 9)."

Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson (1996: 15 *apud* Elstub and McLaverty, 2014: 53) say a little about expertise but they occasionally note that lay deliberation needs to be informed by appropriate empirical evidence. Indeed, they conceive empirical claims as an important componenet of the key deliberative virtue of reciprocity:

> Reciprocity asks that our empirical claims in political argument be consistent with reliable methods of inquiry, as these methods are available to us here and now, not for

all times and places. Neither relativity at our collecitve dispoal. By using the most reliable methods of inquiry, we demonstate our mutual commitment to reach deliberative agreement in the empirical realms that are relevant to moral argument. (ibid)

For authors like Habermas, Bohman and other like-minded thinkers, "expert authority supports deliberative democracy when it is embedded within an institutionalized culture of public scrutiny (Brown, 2014: 51)."

2. Participatory budgeting

2.1. Emergence of participatory budgeting

Participatory budgeting merged in Brazil Porto Alegre at the end of 1980s as a result of political and social marginalization of the popular classes, or their integration by means of populism and clientelism; restriction of the public space and its privatization by the patrimonialist elites; "artificiality" of the democratic game and liberal ideology resulting in a huge discrepancy between the "legal country" and the "real country" (Santos, 2005).

Brazil as a society with a long tradition of authoritarian politics has been going through a democratic transition since the adoption of the new constitution in 1988, which was progressive and open to citizen participation. However, the political system remained characterized by corruption and clientelism.

1988 Constitution in Brazil was the result of debates about rights of citizenship, political decentralization, and strengthening of local power (Santos, 2005). Furthermore (ibid: 309)

> this new political context created the conditions for political forces on the left to set up innovative experiments in popular participation in municipal government. This political opportunity was facilitated by the fact that the political forces in question were closely related to the popular movements that in the 1960s and 1970s had struggled locally, both in the countryside – and in a doubly hostile context of techno-bureaucratic military dictatorship and clientelistic patrimonialism – for the establishment and recognition of collective subjects among the subaltern classes.

One of the first observers of the PB in Porto Alegre, Rebeca Abers in 2000, explains that the form of PB emerged due to a window of opportunity, which opened in the aftermath of the electoral victory of the Labour Party (*Partidos dos Trabalhadores,* PT), in 1988 (Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg, 2008). As the PT took over the administration of Porto

Alegre, a new modality of municipal government was installed, known as "popular administration" (Santos, 2005). Santos describes

> It was based on an institutional innovation aimed at guaranteeing popular participation in preparing and carrying out the municipal budget, hence, in the distribution of resources and the definition of investment priorities. This new measure, which became known as "participatory budget", is the key to the success of the PT municipal government.

In other words, The Porto Alegre process, participatory budgeting, is an institutional invention. The idea of PB is to allow participation of non-elected citizens in the allocation of public finances. PB is a structure and a process of community participation based on three major principles on a set of institutions that function as mechanisms or channels of sustained popular participation in the decision-making process of the municipal government (Santos, 2005). Three principals are

> 1) all citizens are entitled to participate, community organizations having no special status or prerogative in this regard;

> 2) participation is governed by a combination of direct and representative democracy rules, and takes place through regularly functioning institutions whose internal rules are decided upon by the participants; and

> 3) public investment resources are allocated according to an objective method based on a combination of "general criteria" – substantive criteria established by the participatory institutions to define priorities – and "technical criteria" – criteria of technical or economic viability as defined by the executive and federal, state or city legal norms, which it is up to the executive to implement.

Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg (2016: 20) in studying European experiments add five additional criteria that need to be taking into consideration:

> 1) Participatory budgeting deals with financial and/or budgetary issues.

2) The city level, or a (decentralized) district with an elected body and some power over administration, must be elected.

3) It must be a repeated process (if it is from the outset planned as a unique event, it is not a PB process).

4) It must include some form of public deliberation within the framework of specific meetings/forum (the inclusion of ordinary citizens into the institutions of "classic" representative democracy represents no PB process).

5) There needs to be some accountability on the output.

Looking back to see, what were the stages of PB "invasion" since the first initiative in Porto Alegre in 1989. Cabannes (2004: 29) identifies three major stages

> The first, dating from 1989 to 1997, was marked by experimentation. New forms of managing public resources were "invented". This first occurred in Porto Alegre and in other cities such as Santo André (Brazil), and Montevideo (Urugay). The second stage, which we call the Brazilian spread, corresponds to the period from 1997 to the period from 1997 to 2000, when more than 130 Brazilian municipalities adopted the model, with marked variations. The third stage, from 2000 to the current day, is a stage of expansion (outside Brazil) and diversification; numerous Latin and, more recently, European cities have adopted existing models, generally with significant adaption.

Allegretti uses a definition of Appadurai (1991, *apud* Allegretti, 2014: 14) that we could consider PB as an "ideoscape", signifying a political model which travels globally but exists through local appropriation. Allegretti continues that, PB today could be considered a mainly urban "device" and a reason to explain such prevalence could be that

> the original conception of PB was aimed at bridging social gaps and reducing the distance between citizens and elected institutions. This usually constitutes a deeper problem in large and dense urban areas whose size and scale of problems reinforce social polarization and the separation between inhabitants and their political representatives.

However, on the benefits of PB process to the local communities, as Allegretti (2014: 35) claims that "even if articulated mechanisms of participation often prove useful to enlarge technical skills, awareness and knowledge levels of participants, they do not automatically grant a fostering of complex cultural changes".

Before moving on to the typology of PB models in Europe, Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg (2008) outline three basic principles that have been particularly important in the setting-up and functioning of PB procedure. They draw the conclusion from the following international scholars - Abers, 2000; Herzberg, 2001; Avritzer, 2002; Allegretti, 2003; Baiocchi, 2005; Gret and Sintomer, 2005.

1.) The first principle is grass root democracy, carried into effect via citizens' assemblies in the 16 districts of the city. The aim of these assemblies is to determine priorities and to elect delegates and representatives who follow up on the development of suggestions put forward. In addition to investments, political guidelines for the design of municipal policies on such issues as education, health, culture, etc. are discussed. Priorities are selected on the basis of the principle of 'one man one vote', so that every citizen has the same number of votes at his or her disposal.

2.) Social justice, the second principle, is realized via an allocation formula. The funds which are at the disposal of each of the investment areas are distributed among the districts, taking into consideration the number of residents and the quality of the infrastructure available, as well as the local list of priorities. These three criteria ensure, for example, that districts with a deficient infrastructure receives more funds than areas with high quality of life.

3.) Citizen control, the third principle, is realized by means of boards, such as the Council of the Participatory Budget, which convenes once a week for two hours. Its members are elected during the basic assemblies of the districts. It is their duty to ensure that the priorities of the districts are taken up in the budget to the largest extent possible.

2.1. Typology of participatory models in Europe

Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg (2016) offer a typology of PB procedures in differentiated six models:

- Participatory democracy

- Proximity democracy

- Participatory modernization

- Multi-stakeholder participation

- Neo-corporatism

- Community development

The authors have based their work on six series of criteria to define this typology (ibid: 45-47):

1) Context. The analysis of the national cases has shown how context influences the concrete dynamics of participatory budgeting. The same procedure and the same political determination will produce very different effects, depending on the socio-political context in which they are implemented.

2) Normative frames. The authors aimed to clarify the declared goals of citizen participation: such as, administrative aims (modernisation pf public action, proximity management and so on) or social goals (social justice, social inclusion, solidarity, gender equality and so on). Finally, over and above the declared objectives or goals, it is important to understand the normative fames of action (for instance, participatory democracy of community empowerment).

3) Procedures. Procedures alone are not enough to build an overall typology but it is also needed to consider how the process actually works. Processes may have decision-making abilities or be based on selective listening (cherry-picking). In some cases, the

rules are transparent, in others not. Procedures my (or may not) confer participants with real decision-making capacities as well as great deal of autonomy, and it may or may not lead to the beginnings of a new kind of institutional power, a fourth power that reaches beyond the traditional division of power.

4) Dynamics of collective action. The meaning of participatory instruments depends essentially whether a broad social mobilisation does or does not exist. Also participatory instruments vary considerably depending on the type of actors that participate, and their dynamics depend on whether they are rooted in a social movement or whether, on the contrary, they have been initiated top-down.

5) The relationship between conventional politics and participatory instruments. They may be non-existent and in no way interwoven, or be so only to a small extent, particularly when participation is being used only as a managerial technique with no political impact.

6) Strengths, weaknesses, challenges. The strengths, weaknesses and challenge of the six participatory models are the first evaluated in terms of a logic that is internal to each of the models, although they also draw on the comparison between different ones.

Next I will describe these six models of participation drawn from the European practises more in depth.

The first PB model is called 'participatory democracy', which has also been called as 'Adaption of Porto Alegre". According to the authors (ibid) in this model you can observe the greatest potential repercussion in terms of social justice or political effects. Being based on the participation of the working class it creates an emerging plebeian public sphere. "On the old Continent as outside Europe, it first represented an attempt to promote an alternative to neoliberalism (ibid: 48)". The authors therefore expect to find that it is generally implemented by 'progressive' town halls, particularly in places where alter-globalist currents bring pressure to bear on institutional left-wing forces. This

concerns primarily Latin America and in Europe it has had its greatest influence in Spain and Italy.

For the authors (Sintomer et al., 2012: 19) 'participatory democracy' means "that traditional mechanisms of representative government are linked to direct or semi-direct democratic procedures – in other words: non-elected inhabitants have de facto decision-making powers, although de jure the final political decision remains in the hands of elected representatives." This model "enables good quality decision-making, combines participation with social justice and, in this way, contributes to making the idea of citizen participation more credible (Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg 2016: 48)".

Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg explain (ibid: 48-49):

> In the context of participatory budgeting, this model is linked to processes where projects are ranked by criteria of distributive justice and where they have formal rules. The meeting at the neighbourhood level are open for every interested citizen or organised group; delegates are elected for the city level. In contrast to proximity democracy, the discussions go beyond the micro-local level and include projects of city-wide importance.

However, authors elaborate (ibid: 49) that this model can work only under specific circumstances, and that other models are therefore more appropriate in certain context. The strength of participatory democracy type, for instance, "is that it combines a strong, autonomous, influential civil society with a transformation of political institutions that aims to reinforce their legitimacy (ibid: 49)." And the weakness is that it requires many favourable factors such as particularly a strong political determination and independent civil society that is prepared to cooperate with the local authorities.

The above mentioned 'proximity democracy' however "is grounded in informal rules and leaves civil society with only marginal autonomy (ibid: 49)". Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg elaborate: "In proximity democracy, the state is powerful at local level, but civil services are not necessarily involved in a strong process of administrative modernisation, and the participatory processes take place essentially at neighbourhood level".

In the context of participatory budgeting, this model is related to procedures that include the mere consultation of citizens, or a discussion and decision about small neighbourhood funds, with no link to the city-wide level. From where we can see the weakness in the arbitrary way policymakers' 'selectively listen' to cherry-pick people's proposal (ibid: 50).

This model is influential in France and Portugal and is also undoubtedly the most widespread model in Europe.

The third model defined by the authors (ibid: 50) is 'participatory modernisation' "the participatory process is top-down, is not political and has only consultative value. Civil society has only limited independence and there is no space for either fourth power or for a countervailing power." Moreover "the quality of decision-making and of deliberation is relatively limited, because these projects are generally based on techniques that are similar to opinion polls and limited to aggregating opinions rather than stimulating discussions (ibid: 50)."

This model relating to participatory budgeting is most common in Germany. Municipal authorities of very different political affiliations have introduced participatory budgeting procedures that are linked to 'participatory modernisation' model to a greater or lesser extent. "In the last years, participatory budgeting has also been liked to austerity policies: people are invited to make proposals for saving or have to discuss saving proposals made

by the government (ibid: 52)." Other than Germany approaches close to the ideal type of participatory modernisation have thus developed particularly in Northern Europe (e.g. Finland Hämeenlinna).

The fourth model's main characteristic according to Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg is that the citizens who take part just constitute one of the many different actors, together with private enterprise and local government. Also local politics appear to have only limited room to manoeuvre, compared with economic forces. Therefore, called the 'multi-stakeholder participation' where the civil society is weak and has little autonomy, even if the rules for the decision-making process are clearly defined. "It is essentially middle class individuals who take part, and the projects are aimed at active citizens or NGOs, who are supposed to be the spokesmen of local residents (ibid: 52)."

This model in participatory budgeting exists only in Eastern Europe. Sintomer and other authors (ibid: 52) describe the processes that are "set up by partnerships involving for instance local governments, international organisations and private enterprises. Meetings are not open to the public, but only those the donor(s) selected; they also provide the funding." The models strength is that it is well adapted to the contexts with a strong market, and it directs private funding to projects of general interests. The mentioned strength, however comes with in the cost of private enterprises having the upper hand. And the other weakness is that there is no structural connection between participation and modernisation. Hence, the challenges facing this model according to the authors (ibid: 52) are

> how to link participatory instruments with the core business of municipal politics: that is, to stabilise the financial flows on which they depend; to balance the weight of the various stakeholders involved in the process, and to open up to topics that are

relevant to them; and the pressure to transform NGOs and associations into para-governmental organisations or semi-commercial entities.

The fifth, 'neo-corporatism model' "distinctive characteristic is that local government plays a strong role by surrounding itself with organised groups (NGOs, trade unions and employers' associations), social groups (the elderly, immigrant groups and so on) and various local institutions (ibid: 53)". Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg further explain, that in this model, government aims to establish a broad consultation and tries to achieve social consensus through the mediation of social consensus through mediation of interests, values and demands for recognition by the various factions in society. "The participatory rules may be formalised, while the quality of deliberation is variable (ibid: 53)".

In terms of participatory budgeting procedures, the neo-corporatist model is not widespread in Europe today according to the research of the authors. It has only a certain influence in Spain in forms of associative democracy.

Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg note that the neo-corporatist models "strengths are the linkage between the main organised structures of society, which facilitates social consensus around certain aspects of public policies. (ibid: 53)" On the other hand, "the main challenges are linking participation and modernisation, avoiding co-optation of associations or NGOs to public management, or going beyond a simple cherry-picking approach and successfully discussing the most controversial matters (ibid: 53)".

The final, sixth model is 'community development' which dominant characteristic by the authors (ibid: 54) "is that participation is aimed fundamentally at the phase of project implementation, in a context that dissociates municipal politics and a strong participatory process driven as much by a bottom-up dynamic as a top-down one". In such model there

are fairly clear procedural rules and relatively high quality of deliberation. "The most active participants are those involved in running the community organisations (ibid: 53)." Hence "this participatory model has clear advantages in a context in which local government is weak and where, conversely civil society has genuine independence and a real tradition of organising that enables the community sector to manage local projects themselves."

As it is seen above there is a lot of diversity when trying to explain the emergence of participatory budgeting in Europe. The authors add that "this mosaic adds another dimension to the puzzle of the institutional variations and highly contrasting socio-economics contexts in Europe (ibid: 55)."

The impact of participatory budgeting however should be treated cautiously, as Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg state. "The impact of the European participatory budgets on the modernisation of civil services appears to vary widely (ibid: 173)". The authors bring out six major trends that can be identified: improved services, better responsiveness, problem-solving, devolution, 'joint-up-thinking' and transparency. Also it should be kept in mind that the PB typologies presented can change in time and should not be understood within strict boarders.

3. Analytical and methodological approach

3.1. Analytical model

As Elstub and McLaverty note that today deliberative democracy has 'come of age' and is now in its third generation;

> The recent history of deliberative democracy has been particularly auspicious, to the extent that it not only dominates theoretical discussions of democracy but is starting to receive broad coverage in practical discussions of democracy. Not only does this suggest that deliberative democracy has 'come of age' (Bohman, 1998), and takes an 'empirical turn' (Dryzek, 2008), but that deliberative democracy is now in its third generations (2014: 1).

The first-generation deliberative democrats were Habermas (1996) and Rawls (1993) who, debated the normative justifications of deliberative democracy, interpretations, and necessary components of the theory but failed to take account of the sheer complexity of contemporary societies (*apud* Elstub and McLaverty, 2014: 1). "First-generation deliberative democrats thought reason exchange to be the only applicable form of communication, which would result in uniform preference exchange, ending in consensus (ibid: 5)".

The second generation deliberative democrats, however, shifted away from the notion of consensus for more realistic conception that must acknowledge cultural pluralism and its challenge to common goods and unitary public reason; social inequalities would mean the exclusion of permanent minorities from public deliberation; that large-scale public organizations are inevitable; and finally, owing to community bias, there is a restriction on the problems that will be acknowledged and solutions that are considered feasible (ibid:

5). "In the second generational view reasons are public and successful if citizens are willing to accept the resulting majority decisions, or that these decisions are at least sufficiently acceptable that citizens continue to participate in deliberation (ibid)".

Second-generational deliberative democrats Bohman (1996) and Gutmann and Thompson (1996) took complexity seriously and reformed the theory of deliberative democracy in the process (ibid)." They offered insight in terms of how the type of institutions required to ensure deliberative democracy could be actualized in complex societies (ibid).

The second generation paved way for the third one to emerge and to establish the nature of the institutions in practice. "Within this third generation, deliberative democracy is perhaps at its most pluralistic when it comes to the question of institutional design (Elstub and McLaverty, 2014: 7)".

In previous researches, there are some conceptual tensions between the two models of democracy, participatory and deliberative:

> Some convinced supporters of participatory democracy tend to overlook deliberative democracy, which they suspect may be too technocratic. Likewise, many partisans of deliberative democracy who mainly advocate for mini-publics are fairly reserved about participatory democracy, which they suspect of hindering the creation of enlightened opinion. (Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg, 2016: 199)

However, there has yet to be more exhaustive attempt to seek deliberative elements apparent in existing participatory budgeting models and how to develop hybrid models.

The purpose of this master dissertation is not to synthesize the two models of democracy, but to simply observe in what way are deliberative elements evident and what is their influence on the participants. That, in the end, would help developing the participatory budgeting model to be more deliberation driven, hence having better quality of deliberation.

The main research question of this thesis is: **In what way are deliberative elements evident in the model of participatory budgeting in Tartu and what is their influence on the participants?**

The concepts that I am using in the thesis come from participatory and deliberative democracy. Both models stand for the need to improve the quality of democracy and to enhance the nature and form of participation: Informed debate, public use of reason and impartial pursuit of truth and a commitment to politics as an open-ended and continuous learning process.

The main concept from which derived dimensions to analyse and compare with the data received from the fieldwork comes from deliberative democracy (Table 2). The dimensions are drawn by authors such as Fishkin 2009; Cohen 1996; Held 2004; Hansen, 2004; Weeks 2008.

All the authors address the element of deliberation quite thoroughly. Held summons the more practical indicators that also Fishkin describes in detail, such as conducting deliberative polls and deliberative days with the help of technology and online public fora for discussions. Barber brings in the concept of 'democratic talk' (and its nine functions) that he finds as the process of decision making, that the transformative power of strong democracy needs to use.

The educative power is overlapping with the concept of deliberation in a way that the learning comes through deliberation. The element of learning power is brought out in more detail for better distinction of evidence found in the fieldwork by the authors. It leads to becoming more competent as a citizen, more other-regarding and analytical.

Also, it is important to inquire how the knowledge is being attained by the participants in participatory budgeting.

Table 2 Operationalisation of the concepts of deliberative democracy

Deliberative democracy	
DIMENSIONS	**INDICATORS**
Deliberation: Decision-making; Collective public reasoning.	Discussion among peers ("democratic talk" by Barber, nine functions[1]) Conducting deliberative polls, deliberative days; E-government initiatives from full on-line reporting to direct access to representatives; E-democracy programmes including online public fora; Group analysis and generation of public fora; Being more involved in the political issues.
Educative power	Learning, e.g. new skills being citizens; Other skill such as increased organization skills.
Participation	The quality of participation: Procedures in place - moderators, set of principles to ensure equality in speech, meaning equal time or chance to talk; Inclusion of different interest groups, individuals and organizations. Inclusion that is equal and accessible. Access to information.
Legitimacy	Reciprocity - Promotion of mutual justification; Openness and transparency.
Accountability	Feedback system; Deliberation between politicians and citizens; Deliberative process must be methodologically sound.
Empowerment	Deliberation by encourage more deliberation; Increased sense of being capable of engaging and participating in politics.

Drawn from authors: Fishkin 2009; Held 2004, Gutmann and Thompson, 2004; Elstub and McLaverty, 2014; Hansen, 2004; Weeks 2008.

---

[1] 1. Articulation of interests; 2. Persuasion; 3. Agenda-setting; 4. exploring mutuality; 5. Affiliation and affection; 6. Maintaining autonomy; 7. Witness and self-expression; 8. Reformulation and reconceptualization; 9. Community-building as the creation of public interests, common goods, and active citizens.

The dimension participation is also brought out for better distinction of evidence found on the field. Moreover, I am focusing on the quality of participation, meaning participation in deliberation, whatever kind it might be, formal or informal. The quality of participation can be ensured with clear procedures and a set of principles that facilitate equality in speech. Also, access to participation needs to be inclusive and equal for the sake of quality deliberation. Additionally, Weeks brings out as one of the conditions for public deliberation informed public participation. Therefore, in this research I describe the main channels of information for the participants in participatory budgeting in Tartu and see how the respondents' perceived them.

Moving on to the dimension of legitimacy, that is, what offers justification for deliberative democracy, I picked the concept of 'reciprocity' by Gutmann and Thompson, which hold that citizens owe one another justification for the mutually binding policies they collectively enact. In addition, I have added other dimensions, that of openness and transparency.

A dimension that is also connected with legitimacy is accountability. I have drawn from the participatory budget process design elements in Table 3 by Krenjova and Raudla (2013). I dealt with it as a separate dimension since I find it needs more attention. Accountability in deliberative democracy by Elstub and McLaverty (2014) is understood in terms of reason-giving, between the citizens and officials. Both need to justify their decisions. One way to do it is having in place mechanism of feedback.

On empowerment Hansen (2004) gives a good insight, that I add as one of the dimensions. Namely he states that deliberation encourages more deliberation and makes

citizens experience an increased sense of being capable of engaging and participating in politics.

In addition to the concept by Hansen, I brought in element from Krenjova and Raudla about what is the role of civil society in the process of participatory budgeting.

Table 3 Participatory Budgeting: Process design elements

PB decision-making body	Who sets up the rules of the game?
Participation	How are the participants being selected? What types of participation mechanisms are used? (public meetings, focus groups, simulation, advisory committees, surveys etc.) How do citizens participate (direct vs indirect participation)? How are the meetings organised (territorial or thematic logic, city, district or neighbourhood level)?
Deliberation	What is being deliberated? (investments or service delivery, projects or general areas? How do participants communicate and make decisions?
Empowerment	What role does the civil society play? Are the participants' decisions binding for the authorities?
Control and monitoring	Who controls the implementation of the budget?

Source: Krenjova and Raudla, 2013 drawing on Cabannes (2004), Sintomer et al. (2010a), Fung (2006), Ebdon and Franklin (2006) and Talpin (2007).

3.2. Research objectives

The main objective of the research was **to find elements of deliberative democracy participatory budgeting in Tartu**.

Secondary objectives of the thesis are the following;

- To describe the history of Estonian democracy and the experience of deliberative democracy in Estonia, with emphasis to the important historical events that have shaped the political landscape in Estonia and how the modernization of democracy found its beginning.

- To map the participatory budgeting in Estonia and describe how Tartu PB was first introduced, what scenario went into practice and how it has progressed.

- To characterise which type of participatory budget is found in the case on Tartu in light of the typology suggested by Sintomer, Röcke and Helzberg.

- To focus on the year 2015 of participatory budgeting in Tartu and find elements of deliberative democracy.

For that I have conducted interviews with 11 participants (project manager, idea authors and voters) who took part of the process under. The questions are formed based on the operationalization of the concepts of deliberative democracy.

3.3. Methodology

In this master dissertation, the research is within the qualitative tradition, aiming at the understanding of deliberative democracy. The best methodology found to be the appropriate one to address the research question was a case study. One of the applications of case study is "to describe an intervention and the real-life context in which it occurred". (Yin, 2003: 15). Case study allows data collection involving multiple sources of information and research techniques – interviews, documents and reports.

The design for the method was a single case study. One of the rationales for the single case study design, according to Yin, is that when the single case represents the critical case in testing a well-formulated theory. "To confirm, challenge, or extend the theory, a single case may meet all of the conditions for testing theory (Yin, 2003: 40)." The case of this master dissertation, however, is that the theory is the practice of PB in Tartu in year 2015 which is under the model of participatory democracy.

3.3.1. Sample and case

The unit of analysis is the year 2015 of participatory budgeting process in Tartu. The beginning of the process is when the project manager team starts the new year with analysing the past year participatory budget. The ending point is, when the winning ideas are being announced and the conclusion being made about the 2015-year participatory budgets' progress.

First, it was vital to hear from the project manager, Lilian Lukka, about the real practise on the field, whether the regulations are binding and how the participatory budgeting process is being ran. The project manager, in this case, is the privileged informant having a first-hand experience and information in all the processes during the participatory budgeting in year 2015.

Other important informants were the key people and/or authors who proposed an idea to the PB process in the year 2015. Their experience is in the communication with the project manager and with the citizens, experiencing the deliberation to take place. I interviewed three idea authors.

Third, Tartu citizens voting for the ideas. Their knowledge is more from a point of view of an outsiders and a bystander of the process. What I was interested in was how the participatory budget process influenced them, how they gathered the information about the process. Also, if their participation held the elements from the deliberative democracy. I interviewed seven voters.

The attempt was to gather insider or expert knowledge that goes beyond the private experiences, beliefs, and knowledge-base of the individual you are talking to. What this individual believes 'others' think, or how 'others' behave.

3.3.2. Data collection techniques and analysis

To provide evidence for the PB case in Tartu, I used the source collected from the fieldwork and additional documentation, such as administrative documents by the city government and the formal evaluation of the same 'site' under study.

The documents under analysis were the three reports by the e-Governance Academy Foundation, which is one of the partners to Tartu City in developing the Participatory Budgeting initiative. These reports were important to get an overview of the past years of participatory budgeting practises in Tartu City and to see what kind of recommendations were given and which were accepted by the City administration. Other important source is the administrative document, the regulation nr.74 accepted by the City Council "Budget preparation, execution, and financial management procedures of the City of

Tartu.[2]" The regulation of procedures gives the legal framework for the participatory budgeting process.

Going through with the documentation analysis was also helpful to find out the target-group for the interviews. To have flexibility in collecting data in the field, the best method was found to be semi-structured and open-ended interviews. This data collection technique was considered suitable since "semi-structured interviews are used when the researcher knows enough about the topic or phenomenon to identify the domain (i.e., knows the limits of the topic and what is and is not pertinent to the research question) but does not know and cannot anticipate all the questions (Gubrium et al., 2012: 197)." Semi-structured interviews help to draw out rich descriptions of lived experience and "make better use of the knowledge-producing potentials of dialogues by allowing much more leeway for following up on whatever angles are deemed important by the interviewer (Brinkmann, 2013: 21)". Importantly, semi-structured interviews give the researcher a greater chance of becoming visible as a knowledge-producing participant in the process itself, rather than hiding behind a pre-set interview guide (ibid). The advantages of the method are something that I took exercised when conducting the interviews.

Based on the theoretical concepts and the documentation analysis, the following key-categories were extracted: deliberation, educative power, participation, legitimacy, accountability and empowerment. As follows, knowing the categories in which I needed to find evidence on the field, I was able to write out the questions for the interviews (see the Annex I). There are sub-categories were created based on the data collected from the field that are as follows: under participation, 'having information' and 'the quality of

---

[2] Translation by the author. Original: „*Tartu linna eelarve koostamise, täitmise ja finantsjuhtimise kord.*"

participation', and under legitimacy 'openness and transparency'. Table 4 gives an overview of the chosen material of analysis and the labels of each analytical unit.

To analyse my data, I used qualitative content analysis. As already stated, a first model of possible key-categories was based on different theoretical approaches about deliberative democracy and also supported with the information from the documents. The sub-categories represent a unit of information composed by the instances found from the field, based on the interviews. A detailed chart with all categories, key-categories, definitions and examples can be found in the Annex II.

Label	Title	Date
Interviews with Tartu citizens who voted in year 2015		
P1		04.07.2016
P2		06.07.2016
P3		06.07.2016
P4		11.07.2016
P5		11.07.2016
P6		12.07.2016
P7		
Interview with the project manager		
Project manager		04.07.2016
Interviews with the author or/and a proposer of an idea		
A1 (one of the winning ideas)		05.07.2016
A2		06.07.2016
A3		
Documentation		
	Tartu City Council 11th of October regulation nr.74 amendments "Budget preparation, execution, and financial management procedures of the City of Tartu.[3]"	16.04.2015

---

[3] Translation by the authors. Original: „*Tartu Linnavolikogu 11. oktoobri 2012. Aasta määruse nr 74 "Tartu linna eelarve koostamise, täitmise ja finantsjuhtimise kord" muutmine.*"

Table 4 Analytical units

Analytical papers		
	Case study of Preparing Participatory Budgeting in the City of Tartu	2013
	Report. Participatory Budgeting in Tartu 2014. Second year: changes, experiences and suggestions.[4]	2014
	Participatory Budgeting in Tartu 2015, experiences of 3 years.[5]	2015

3.3.3. Research process

In seeking for the interviewees, the challenge was to find the 'common' voter in different backgrounds and ages for the sake of a diverse sample. I reached out in total around 546 people through Facebook, also Facebook groups and through the networks on Tartu citizens with the help of acquaintances from Tartu. As there are 93,687 (2016) people in Tartu and in year 2015 there were 3772 voters, the chances to find eligible interviewees turned out to be time consuming. The contact with the voter respondents was mainly made through social media. I contacted 46 people with a personal message through Facebook. These contacts I collected from the acquaintances I had in Tartu. Also through different Facebook groups where I had a chance to send my notice reached around 500 people. Responses to my personal messages were either that the person did not participate or was not a resident of Tartu. The best method in finding voter respondents turned out to be via personal messages and contacts of my acquaintances in Tartu. However, the Facebook groups had much wider audience, I had only one person replying. Other than social media, I did not find better channel to reach the sample.

---

[4] Translation by the authors. Original: „Aruanne. Kaasav eelarve Tartu linnas 2014. Teine aasta: muudatused, kogemused, ettepanekud.“
[5] Translation by the authors. Original: „Kaasava eelarve Tartu linnas 2015 3. aasta kogemused.“

As noted above, to reach the idea authors was easier due to the fact that their names were public in the online platform VOLIS. Having the names, I used internet to find the e-mail of other cases through Facebook. To organise the meeting with the project manager, I sent an e-mail to her work contacts. The response was quick and the meeting took place at her work space.

The interviews were carried out in the beginning of July in Tartu. Eight of the interviews were face-to-face conversation and 3 of them via Skype due to the location of the respondents.

For the interviews I tried to create a comfortable environment asking for the interviewees their preference for the venue of the conversation. Usually they were quiet corners of a coffee shop in Tartu City centre, and some cases in the public park. Before starting the interviews, I asked permission to voice-record the conversation, noting that they would remain anonymous. Also, I ensured that the recording is solely for the purpose of my thesis. None of the respondents had a problem with me recording the conversations and it did not seem to bother them during the conversation. The project manager, Lilian Lukka, gave a permission to use her name in the study.

The interviews with the project manager and idea authors lasted longer, about 40-60 minutes. With the voters the interviews took between 15-35 minutes.

4. Estonian road to democracy

Estonia, a small country of 1.3 million people on the Baltic coast in north eastern Europe has a remarkably long history under the rule of German, Danish, Swedish, Russian, and other sovereigns, which contrasts with its current success.

In Estonia, the abolishment of serfdom was achieved in 1816–19, bringing along new land laws from the 1840s to the 1860s. Hereafter peasants were allowed to move freely, buy property, govern their own affairs in local councils, and pay rent rather than obligatory labour to their landlords. Even though it was a great effort, Laar (2005: 23) elaborates, yet, „becoming the master of one's farm marked the first step on the way of becoming the master of one's own country."

More freedom fostered the industrialization and the growth of the towns. After the reopening of the University of Tartu the education could develop all over the country, schoolmasters becoming the leaders of the spreading national movement. (Laar, 2005: 23-25)

The Estonian national movement, which followed, led to a development of Estonian language and culture and the history before the German conquests. The Estonian first legal political parties were formed during the revolution in 1905, initiating strikes and demonstrations for the purpose to attain any forms of autonomy. But yet, in the World War I the Russian monarchy was shattered and its Provisional Government supported the democracy, allowing Estonia to form local governance and autonomy so that in May 1917 to the Estonian national unit *Maapäev* (Diet) the national parties were elected in majority.

On 24 February 1918 Estonians declared their independence, 'taking advantage of' the power vacuum, one day between the two foreign armed forces, the ones of the Bolshevik's and the German's in Tallinn Hiden (2008: 79) pointed out: "Declaring independence is one thing; securing it quite another." In June 1920, a democratic Constitution was adopted, declaring all citizens equal before the law. In the Republic of Estonia with parliamentary government not only the electoral rights were granted but also the citizen's initiative (Zetterberg, 2009).

A rapid building-up work followed, occasionally disturbed by Soviet Russia, which proved that "independence was not to be taken for granted and that it could be lost very easily (Laar, 2005: 48-49)." In the early 1930s, the Great Depression reached Estonia and brought along a political crisis, causing several changes of government (Raun, 2002), which ended up with establishing an authoritarian government. The following years 1934-1940 are called the "era of silence".

Zetterberg (2009) describes that in August 1939, the Nonaggression Pact divided the Eastern Europe between German and Soviet influence, and during the war, which followed, Estonia and the other Baltic States among others were occupied. A puppet government was installed, and in August 1940 Estonia was formally incorporated into the Soviet Union. The sovietisation started and the National elite was destructed. During the wartime Estonia lost nearly a quarter of its population. The Communist Party became the only legal political party and there were foreigners from Russia in all top positions. The Estonian language was marginalized. But after Stalin's death in 1953 and since 1960s, the Estonian cultural elite started to rise and among other things, in 1980 with the Letter of 40 intellectuals a protest was expressed in order to point out the weakened positions of Estonian culture and language.

By the 1980s Mikhail Gorbachev initiated glasnost (openness) and perestroika (restructuring). 'Perestroika is an objective necessity', the second president of Estonia from 1992 to 2001 Lennart Meri quoted him, and the presumption of any reforms are the democratization of the society and the triumph of the public voice (Meri, 1996).

So the Estonians „took advantage of the weakening of the Soviet power, first cautiously and later more and more actively controlling the limits of their freedom (Laar, 2005: 61)." In 1986, the Estonian Heritage Movement; on August 23, 1987, the Estonian Disclosure Group of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact (MRP-AEG); in 1988, the Plenum of Creative Unions in Tallinn and the Heritage Protection Days in Tartu, the Popular Front *Rahvarinne*, the mass demonstrations of the „Singing Revolution"; in 1989, the movement of citizens' committees and the Estonian Congress; on August 23, 1989, the Baltic Chain, in 1990, the victory of the forces supporting independence at the local elections – simultaneously spreading the „Estonian virus" in all the Soviet Union – and on August 20, 1991, the independence of Estonia is re-established in a non-violent way (Laar, 2005).

To illustrate the development of local governance during the Soviet regime Gabór Soós (2006: 168) describes

> A cornerstone of Estonian local governance – the municipality – was abolished by the Soviet regime. Local life was organized around production units: collective farms in rural areas, enterprises in urban areas. This took a heavy toll on local communities. The formation of a new system began at the end of 1989, with the adoption of the Local Government Act (LGA). This reform destroyed the Soviet politico-administrative hierarchy. It was targeted to the fast devolution of tasks and resources from central authorities to democratically elected local authorities, which were elected as early as 1989. First, the municipal level of a local government was restored. The division of competence between regional and municipal governments was defined, and the devolution of resources to autonomous budgets of the municipalities began. It

involved a rather collaborative process between the tiers of government. After the presentation of the development plan, local communities would receive a mandate for government from a special commission of the Supreme Council of Estonia. The devolution of tasks was quite effectively linked with an evaluation of the actual capacity of the local communities. Thus, the foundations for an Estonian local government system were established and legitimized far before formal state independence.

Implementation of reforms in the political system and ratification of a new constitution followed and the first free and fair elections were held in September 1992.

Estonia is a parliamentary democracy with a unicameral parliament. The parties range from social democratic to conservative on the political spectrum. Estonia has quickly enacted political changes and transformed itself into a democratic state. The governments of the 1990s succeeded in instituting lasting economic reforms, including wholesale privatization of state enterprises, reestablishment of private property and title rights, and a quick transformation of the legal and tax structures to conform to European Union (EU) standards. These reforms allowed Estonia to gain EU membership in 2004.

4.1. The People's Assembly in Estonia

Unity and patriotism booming from the Estonian re-independence did not give vacuum, for example, to corruption at first, but to dysfunctional relations between the political system and the economic system and, also, power has gambled down the political ethics.

When talking about political ethics Max Weber holds that it's most important principle is taking responsibility for the consequences of your actions. The deficiency of the latter can lead to a hijack of democracy by the leaders who depend upon the cartelisation of political parties. The reluctance to take responsibility showed yet again the lacking

political ethics. That is namely the results we see today, the steadily boiling Estonian patience triggered by the political scandal that erupted last spring 2012 over questionable donations from members of the ruling party. That unfolds a series of bottlenecks in Estonian political system that impelled for wide citizens' movement that resulted in Estonian Peoples Assembly that is described next.

Despite that the triumph of Estonian re-independence more than 20 years ago was the widespread civic movement, today, we see the political power vertically as in a pyramid with the bottom being held by citizens and in the upper level the prime minister and president. The dangerous tendency of "immortality" of the political elite and the suppression of civic activity can be a cause for something bigger than just the lack of trust towards the state institutions. Especially in Estonia, the question of vertical power has become severely outdated, in need to be replaced by horizontal politics, which could allow a new dimension of extent, cohesion and comprehension. Moreover, the cause for such fragility is the lack of trust in political culture, which acts in low levels of political participation beyond voting, and low level of public confidence in institutions. As for the result we can see a large number of disconnected voters. The same results reflect in The Economist Intelligence Unit's Democracy Index 2015 according to which Estonia scored 7,85 points in a scale of 0-10 being placed on 34th position. That, however, is better than in the previous years. But Estonia scored the highest in electoral process and pluralism and the lowest in political participation and political culture.

Democracy cannot be forced upon or planted in by no other than the people who have to live with the consequences of political choices. And that is what Iceland was doing and Estonia is following up in engaging a radically new democratic venture, The People's

Assembly. The preface of such form of citizens' initiative was a petition, Charter 12, signed by the panel of seventeen respected public figures calling for greater democratic accountability on the part of the authorities. The Charter 12[6] asked for the support of citizens for the five principals brought out below; asking for opening up the system and giving civil society an actual voice in politics;

- the public must have a clear overview of political organizations' sources of financing – both of the usage of public money and the origins of their other revenues;

- the establishment, financing and operation of political parties must be transparent, and political parties must represent the public – not group interests;

- the system of governance must clearly reflect the will of the voter – e.g. a representative must be obliged to report back on a regular basis to the voters;

- political parties in the Parliament may not monopolize the path to power – the establishment of political parties the entry of non-party blocs into the Parliament must be simplified;

- Citizens must have broader opportunities for expressing their political will than regular elections – an instrument for citizens' legislative initiative must be created.

The petition followed a meeting in November 2012 by a working group of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and representatives from political parties. The meeting was held by the President´s office. Five weeks later a website (www.rahvakogu.ee) was opened where everyone could propose ideas for improving elections, public participation, as well as political parties and their funding. Many different individuals and groups helped organize this event: The Estonian Cooperation Assembly, the Praxis Centre for Policy Studies, the Network of Estonian Non-profit Organizations, the e-Governance Academy, the Open

---

[6] Source: http://www.harta12.ee/eng/

Estonia Foundation, as well as political parties, IT and communications professionals, and others. Core funding for the project came from the Estonian Cooperation Assembly, a state sponsored nonpartisan think tank, while the organizational costs of the 'Deliberation Day' event were primarily covered by a grant from the Open Estonia Foundation. However, most of the work on the project was done by volunteers.

The online platform (www.rahvakogu.ee) is a platform for crowd-sourcing ideas and proposals to amend Estonia's electoral laws, political party law, and other issues related to the future of democracy in Estonia. It combines modern communication tools with traditional face-to-face discussions and focused specifically on five questions: the electoral system, political parties, competition between the political parties and their internal democracy, financing of the political parties, strengthening the role of civic society in politics between the elections, and stopping the politicization of public offices.

The agenda of The People's Assembly was the following[7]:

- January 2013: Proposals and comments were submitted, commented, supported or criticized online.

- February 2013: Analysts grouped the proposals and comments into bundles of different possible scenarios and provide them with impact analysis.

- March 2013: organising the "deliberation day" for selecting the most preferred scenarios at public meetings, which then were presented to the parliament, *Riigikogu*, by the President of the Republic.

Held (2006) notes, that in a participatory society, an equal right to liberty and self-development can become achievable. It is a society which fosters a sense of political

---

[7] Source: http://www.rahvakogu.ee/

efficacy, nurtures a concern for collective problems and contributes to the formation of a knowledge citizenry capable of taking a sustained interest in the governing process.

The Assembly's example has shifted the question from "Who makes the decisions?" to rather asking "How the decisions are being made?" This means the participatory democracy is having its up-rise and the successful representatives in a democracy are the ones who are convinced to keep the citizens engaged and also giving possibility for them on doing so.

A condition of participatory democracy, direct participation of citizens in the regulation of the key institutions of society, including the workplace and local community, is something that has been given as a proposal in the Assembly. More precisely the idea of participatory budgeting on the municipal level. As also Alexis de Tocqueville has insighted in stating that "Liberty is municipal!", therefore emphasizing the importance of local participatory levels that would activate the citizens into decision making.

Secondly, an interesting proposal called for making the political parties more accountable by being given a right for the citizens to endow a small amount from their income tax return. That mechanism could discipline the parties also during the time between elections. And the voters could get a hold on influencing the parties in this period and on the other hand parties will find themselves in need of explaining their strategies and looking for support to the latter.

The People's Assembly pointed out to the relevance of elements from deliberative democracy in the public sphere with, for example, proposals suggesting that the educational programmes need more study elements of civil rights, ethics and open society. It presupposed that an educated and informed citizenry improves participation in

the political scene. In other words, prepare people for qualitative citizenship and to replace fixed preferences with open-ended and continuous learning process – for the people to have a reasonable political judgement.

One other key feature of deliberative democracy model is also E-democracy programmes including on-line public fora and also E-government initiatives from full on-line reporting to direct access to representatives.

The previous notion is also present in the proposals. Beginning with an online platform for impact analyses of laws under amendment and a web application which would help citizens to understand how their taxes are being used. Secondly, creating an online citizens' forum to discuss over People's Assembly's proposals and creating a separate institution to advance the deliberative democracy model. In addition, The People's Assembly organized a day of deliberation that was using the deliberative poll method. Approximately three thousand people participated in the process of the People's Assembly that lasted 14 weeks. The budget of the People's Assembly was ca 100,000 euros, the majority of which was spent on the organisation of the Deliberation Day.

The outcome and recommendations of the Deliberation Day phase of the projects were formally presented to the Parliament by the president of Estonia. Three of the 15 proposals sent to Parliament have become laws, and another four have been partly implemented or included in the government programme.

Couple of years before the topic of participatory budgeting was introduced to Estonian local governance decision-makers during autumn 2011 in the framework of the project "Participatory budgeting in local governments" implemented by an Estonian non-

governmental organisation - e-Governance Academy Foundation[8] (eGA). Krenjova and Reinsalu (2015) describe that the local authorities of the city of Tartu, Estonia's second largest city, perceived the idea with enthusiasm and the workshop continued with workgroup discussions on the feasibility of PB. The political culture was ready for the initiative, as Raudla and Krenjova, (2013: 29) describe,

> the political culture can influence the readiness of local authorities to empower citizens, which in turn influences which type of PB decision-making processes (consultation, co-governance or transferring de-facto decision-making power) are feasible in a country. In addition, how active citizens are can shape the scope of participation (the groups of citizens that can be involved), their mode of communication and participation mechanism to be used in PB.

4.2. Participatory budgeting in Estonia. The case of Tartu City

Tartu was the first city in Estonia to try participatory budgeting with a pilot project in autumn 2013. By spring 2016 many other local governments in Estonia have implemented PB initiative. The cases of participatory budgeting in Estonia have been fast emerging after the pilot year of 2013 in Tartu. By autumn 2014 four local governments in Estonia implemented participatory budget initiative. "Except Tartu, which has the population of 9 5596 inhabitants, other municipalities are rather small: Viljandi counting 17602 residents, Kuressaare – 14070 and Elva - 5807 inhabitants". (Krenjova and Reinsalu, 2015: 7)

According the research of Krenjova and Reinsalu (ibid)

---

[8] The e-Governance Academy (eGA) is a non-profit information society think tank and consultancy establishment as a foundation in 2002 based on a Memorandum of Understanding signed by the Government of the Republic of Estonia, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Open Society Institute (OSI). The mission of eGA is to: Support the sustainable development of information societies through training, research and networking; Act as a global ICT think tank and competence centre

all four cases have minor differences but the same overall structure involving the stage of gathering citizens' input that is followed by the selection of proposals by the experts; the process is finalized by citizens' voting. All local governments have the obligation to fulfil the idea that gathered most votes.

It is important to bring out that other local governments developed their participatory budgeting models in Tartu's example, hence all models in Estonia follow the same structure with some differences.

As previously stated PB was first introduced to Estonian local government decision-makers during autumn 2011 by an Estonian non-governmental organisation e-Governance Academy Foundation. Until today eGA is advising on the planning and performance of PB in the City of Tartu. "The primary objective was to continue, in cooperation with Tartu City Government and City Council, development of the most suitable model and a detailed process description for the PB process of the City of Tartu and to advise, throughout the process, on process activities and their communication to the public." (Official Tartu City homepage).

One of the main objectives of PB implementation in Tartu, 2013 was the improvement of understanding of city budget as well as the decision-making within the city government. Also, cooperation between communities, increase in civic participation and the learning factor are stressed. Planning and executing projects has to teach those involved to carefully consider problematic areas as well as to try to find possible solutions[9].

As a result of numerous discussions, arguments and exchange of ideas during preparatory stage of PB (Krenjova, Reinsalu, 2015: 10), the PB design in Tartu was agreed to consist of the following stages

---

[9] Official website of participatory budgeting in Tartu http://www.tartu.ee/kaasaveelarve, 28.05.2016

Firstly, from late August to early September, the presentation of ideas took place (both via offline and online tools). Everyone was eligible to present his or her idea that had to qualify as an investment and the cost of which should not have exceeded 140 000 EUR (which constituted approximately 1% of the municipal investment budget). In total 158 ideas were submitted, 1 of them on paper while all others were submitted electronically. After this the experts analysed and consolidated similar ideas, assessed and commented on their estimated cost until October 2013. As a result of this stage, 74 ideas were selected for the public vote. The event of presenting ideas took place in mid-November. It was broadcasted online as well as ideas were available on the city webpage. Every Tartu resident that reached 16 years of age was eligible to vote. In total, 2645 votes were casted, 2370 of them electronically and 275 - on paper, which constitutes approximately 3,3% of all eligible voters in the city of Tartu. Most active voters were aged 30-36 (36% of all voters). The idea that got the biggest number of votes (773) was named "Investment in presentation technology for Culture Block". Tartu City Council confirmed the decision by accepting the budget on the 19th of December 2013.

After the pilot project, the local government of Tartu decided to continue with the implementation of PB, but with an amended structure. Krenjova and Reinsalu (2015: 10) note "the idea was to provide the citizens with more opportunities to present and discuss their proposals both with other citizens as well as with the experts in the field." Aside from that many other suggestions were made based on a thorough analysis conducted by e-Governance Academy Foundation to bring out suggestions for the next year. The suggestions were made about communications and the process itself.

About the communication one of the conclusions was that the citizens were not informed enough about the process. Solutions for that were seen to use more innovative ways to use the public space for broader information sharing; to make better use other good

examples of web-communications[10]; last to consider whether the term "*kaasav eelarve*" (participatory budgeting) is clear and attractive enough. Second, one conclusion drawn from the pilot year was that the process did not help the public to better understand about how the city budget forms, about its alternatives, choices and costs of different objects. As a solution the authors suggested practices and forms to attractively present it. Third conclusion was that the participatory budgeting initiative has not reached the youth. The youth between age 16-91 were only 3% from total number of votes. As a solution the authors argued for a better co-operation with youth-organisations and youth targeted communication. Fourth issue was the lack of public functions. The positive side, however, was that the citizens were for the idea or participatory budgeting in general; the simplicity in proposing their ideas and personal communications between the authors of an idea and the public relations office of Tartu. Fifth concern was about the openness of the experts' work. The process of preparations and argumentation over different ideas should be more transparent for the public to see and follow. The last conclusion drawn from the pilot year addresses the lack of time and human resources to which one of the solution was seen in re-organizing the staff in a public communications department.

The conclusions and suggestion about the participatory budgeting process in Tartu were about the chosen scenario of participatory budgeting; the events; and technical environment. The observations were about whether there should be ideas presented in fields that should be by default the duties of local government; better chances for smaller ideas; more access for voting; and better connection between the local government and civil society. Secondly, about the events, its format and timing. There was a suggestion on taking up discussion rounds after submitting the ideas between the experts and

---

[10] e.g http://www.participatorybudgeting.org/stories/

participants. Third, there were suggestions on how to make the online voting environment VOLIS more user-friendly.

There is no official source for the statistics of the voter turnout. The information was requested via e-mail because there was no official document giving the overview. The project manager has the information first hand from VOLIS.

Table 5 Voter turnout in PT in Tartu

2013	2645 voters (275 voting tickets, 2370 online).
	3,3% of all Eligible residents of Tartu.
	16-19 age group: 66 voters (3%)
	20-29 age group: 584 (22%)
	30-39 age group: 958 (36%)
	40-49 age group: 540 (20%)
	50-59 age group: 284 (11%)
	60-69 age group: 113 (4%)
	70-79 age group: 77 (3%)
	80 years and older: 23 (1%)
	The oldest voter was 92 years old, who gave his/hers vote electronically.
	The average age of the voter was 38.
	1106 were men and 1530 women
2014	1938 voters.
	2,4% of all Eligible residents of Tartu.
	4029 votes casted (from 2014 each voter could give up to 3 votes)
	There were no significant changes in the distribution of the votes between age groups. There were voters from ages 16 to 93.
	The turnout was better among youth in the age group of 16-19 and 20-29.
	But still the youth votes are modest.
2015	3772 voters.
	4,7% of all Eligible residents of Tartu.
	6929 votes casted.

Source: Lukka, L. (2016) Voter turnout in PT in Tartu. [e-mail]

From the data in Table 5 it is possible to see that people above age 30 were the most active group in participating in voting. The problem of the low number of youth voting has been stated also in the analysed documents of the e-Governance Academy Foundation (2013, 2014, 2015). However, as seen in the data provided by the project manager, Lilian Lukka, in 2015, there were no significant changes in the distribution of the votes between age groups. The turnout was better among youth in the age group of 16-19 and 20-29, but the change is not substantial.

As in the previous years the main objectives of participative budgeting are to improve understanding of the city budget and its shaping process, cooperation between communities, find solutions to problems in the city and/or realize a new idea. The complete sum for participative budgeting was 140 000€. For an investment object the maximum cost is 70 000€ and at least two ideas were to be put into practice.

Below is presented the procedural layout of 2015 year of Tartu's participatory budgeting (Official home page of Tartu City 01.10.2015):

Information day - April
- Introduction of the principles of shaping the city budget
- Introduction of the process of participative budgeting and its goals
- Recommendations on how to turn a mundane idea into a stirring one

Gathering ideas - April - May
- Ideas may be submitted by everyone - both individuals and organizations
- Ideas can be submitted on the official homepage of the city of Tartu www.tartu.ee, via e-mail press@raad.tartu.ee or postal mail to Tartu City Government.
- Names of those who submit ideas are public
- Ideas can be investment objects

Technical preparation - May

- At the stage of technical preparation,
- ideas will be divided into groups by theme
- feasibility of the ideas will be considered from financial, temporal and technical aspects.
- Infeasible ideas will be cast aside, all such decisions will be accounted for on the homepage www.tartu.ee.

Discussions - June

- The goal for the discussions is to achieve substantial discussion over ideas and their effect, merging and amending ideas, selecting ideas for public voting (~20-25)
- All ideas deemed feasible as a result of the previous stage will be up on the city's homepage for commenting.
- If necessary, the authors will be given suggestions on how to ameliorate their submitted ideas or it will be recommended to merge several similar ideas.
- For each field, an expert group will be assembled, to which belong the authors of ideas (one representative per idea in each group), experts of the corresponding field from the Tartu city government and specialists of the given field from elsewhere.
- Each theme group will discuss their ideas and judge them based on criteria previously agreed upon.
- Each theme group must determine, which ideas from that group will be put up for vote.

Introducing ideas – July- September

- The proposers will seek support for their ideas.
- The city government will introduce all chosen ideas on equal terms on the city's homepage, in public city space, via social media, etc.
- A public function will be held so that the proposers might introduce their ideas.

Public vote – October 5th -11th

- Every person at least 16 years of age, who is according to the Estonian Population Register a resident of Tartu as of the date of announcing the public vote, can participate in the voting.

- Each person participating in the voting can vote for up to three ideas. That differs from the project in 2013, when only one vote could be cast.

- Votes are cast electronically in VOLIS[11].

- Votes can be cast personally, when using an identification card or mobile-ID, or in the Tartu city information centre, with assistance from an employee. When using the city information centre, the voter will be asked to present identification.

- The voting lasts for one week.

- Local governments' councils' information system VOLIS will be used for the vote.

Implementing ideas - 2016

- At least two ideas that were given the most votes will be put into practice. If the cost for the two most popular ideas is under 80 000€, the next best idea that can be achieved with remaining funds will also be implemented.

- The investment object that was chosen by public vote will be realized by the city government.

- The ideas for participative budgeting must be realized in the year 2016

Following the year 2015 PB model, Kristina Reinsalu (2015) from the e-Governance Academy Foundation wrote down their analysis of the year and suggestions for the following one. The suggestions are divided under the aims of the participatory budgeting in Tartu:

1. Improve understanding of the city budget and its shaping process

- Re-evaluate the opening events format and content

- To separate the ideas between the practical ideas (e.g. pavements, crossroads etc), as thing that 'the city should do anyhow' with novel, clever and innovative ideas

---

[11] VOLIS is a system for local democracy procedures. Source: www.volis.ee

- To increase the allocated amount. The participatory budgeting in Tartu has started off quite successfully and citizens have gone along with the voting and trust the initiative.

2. Cooperation between communities

- The next years' discussion on scenario should be wider, so that there would be already written in the emphasis on novel city scape objects. Would be good to involve the activists, the idea authors from previous years should be invited to the discussions earlier.

- Taking example of the Icelandic model, to gather ideas based on a district. It would develop the cooperation between districts and would activate each community to fight for their ideas.

- With gathering the ideas and with voting to go closer to each community.

- To consider changing the scenario of gathering ideas based on a topic or a subject.

3. Find solutions to problems in the city and/or realize a new idea

- To communicate even more through different channels and through the whole process, about the plans of the City and projects in planning. That would decrease the ideas which are dealing with things that City is already undertaking.

- One of the possibilities would be to change the comments and evaluations of experts to the online platform VOLIS, where the ideas are introduced and voting takes place.

- To send a clear message that even if the idea will not win but gets a considerable number of votes, it is a clear sign for the administration, that the idea/object is important. Each of the vote is important and all the 3 votes should be used.

- To continue communicating about the winning project of the last years, but also the other ideas that the city administration has picked up to realise, and to recognize the peoples' initiative and also to remind about the on-going process of participatory budgeting.

- It could be forcefully emphasised the requirement of creativity and originality of the ideas. Aside to the inspirational public opening event there could be trainings (like in the second year the marketing training) for the idea authors.

- For the future projects to carry the youth spirit of Tartu, it should be considered how to engage them more, both in proposing ideas and voting. For example, giving

a voting right to all the Tartu University students who live here at least for 5 years during their studies. Namely, they do not have to be the citizens of Tartu.

4. Recommendations for the general communication

- The voting process has been promoted, but there should be more attention paid to publicising the process from the beginning and explaining the initiative, what exactly and when will happen.

- The stages of the participatory budget could be introduced in a visually more attractive way, why not adding humour to the equation.

- All the decisions need to be transparent, for example it should be considered to make the experts comments public. Each idea getting pass to the final voting needs to abide to the following criteria: Provides a public good; Is in the public use; Not to cause unreasonable expenses for future budget. If the fulfilment of these criteria is questionable, they must find an answer in the public, or the idea will not pass to the voting.

These yearly recommendations, by the e-governance Academy have been received as opportunity to learn within the process. It will be interesting to see how the process will be adopted in the year 2016 participatory budgeting process.

4.3. Typology of PB in the case of Tartu

Looking at the characteristic of Tartu PB model, it is a challenging task to determine under which typology suggested by Sintomer, Röcke and Helzberg can be seen in the case of Tartu. Until now, there has not been an exhaustive analysis by the Estonian authors, however, Krenjova and Reinsalu (2015: 11) gives an insight that

It can be argued, that in terms of citizen empowerment, the Tartu PB design (even within the limited 1% of the investments budget) is closer to the Porto Alegre model, where citizens are engaged in the co-production of the budget, than to the "selective

listening" experiences worldwide. According to experts, the process has gone very smoothly so far.

Based on the other characters of Porto Alegre model, the discussion in Tartu goes beyond the micro-local level and includes projects of city-wide importance. However, as the model claims to need a strong, autonomous, influential civil society the central role is still at the hands of city administration to set the rules of the process and appointment of experts to judge the feasibility of the proposal before they go into discussions. However, it depends how one defines a civil society. For example, if the meaning would be a sphere that is "based on the association and mobilisation of citizens in the public sphere (Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg, 2016: 212)", then in the case of Tartu, it can be seen in how the process empowers the communities.

The key characteristics of the second model 'proximity democracy' describes proximity in the double sense of geographical closeness and increased communication between citizens, civil services and local authorities, while leaving the main decision-making powers to the hand of latter (Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg, 2016). The geographical closeness can be seen in the case of Tartu, as Krenjova and Raudla (2013) brining in the comparison of the new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe "the Czech Republic and Hungary, having LGs of a very small size, could opt for proximity participation. The same is applicable to Estonia and Romania with slightly bigger municipalities that, however, are still small enough for setting up multi-level structures of the PB process." I would like to add that the case of Tartu is also similar in the second sense of proximity, the increased communication between citizens, civil services and local authorities, however, as it is modestly evident. Moreover, the main decision-making power as in voting is in the hands of citizens.

To compare the Tartu case with 'participatory modernisation' that is common with the German approach to PB, the main difference lays in the nature of decision-making process. In 'participatory modernisation' deliberation is relatively limited and PG process has consultative value where formally citizens have an advisory role. As in the case of Tartu citizens are invited to engage in discussions to make an informed decision via voting. What can be recognised both in the model and Tartu case is that they both bring the city administration closer to the citizens, either it is via consultation or voting. Moreover, the discussions in both are about secondary issues and not on overall budgetary policy, however, it is introduced.

The main characteristic of the fourth model 'multi-stakeholder participation' is that within the relationship between state, market and the third sector, the marked holds the hegemony. The meetings are not open, only to those who the donor(s) selected. Hence the similarities with the Tartu case are small, however the participants in 'multi-stakeholder participation' have decision-making powers, as in the Tartu case, the citizens involved are mostly organised ones and in association with companies.

In the 'neo-corporatist' model, in its self-explanatory definition, the state selects areas for which it delegates responsibility to the social partners who represent specific interests, meaning organised groups and social groups. In this model "government aims to establish a broad consultation and tries to achieve social consensus through the mediation of interests, values and demands for recognition by the various factions in society (Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg, 2016: 53)". That is one of the main contrast from the Tartu model where the interests are set by the citizens through their proposals, the city administration does not limit them and keeps the aims of the PB broad.

The 'community development' model by its normative frames is close to the model of Tartu as the better communication between communities is one of the aims of the PB in Tartu. However, it is a goal and not a premise for the model, as in the 'community development' model. Similarly, the citizens have decision-making power. In contrast, Tartu's model has a context in which local government is strong and the city administration has a central role in setting up the procedures in PB. The strength in 'community development' of having a strong procedural independence of civil society is the weakness in Tartu's case.

As seen above, the Tartu PB model has characteristics from most of the typologies offered by Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg. To place Tartu case in the spectrum, it would be somewhere between the models of 'adaption of Porto Alegre' and 'proximity democracy'.

5. Deliberative dimensions of the PB in Tartu

In the following chapter I have analysed the data from the 11 interviews with the participants in PB process in Tartu – the project manager, idea authors or proposers and voters. The interviews (see Annex 1) are based on the operationalisation of the theoretical concepts of deliberative democracy (see Table 2) with the following key-categories: deliberation, educative power, participation, legitimacy, accountability and empowerment and sub-categories under participation, 'having information' and 'the quality of participation', and under legitimacy 'openness and transparency'.

5.1. The Educative power of PB in Tartu

One of the dimensions of deliberative democracy is the power to educate the citizens through deliberation. In the case of Tartu, deliberation does not solely mean that the knowledge comes from discussions through public reasoning, but that it holds a personal level of learning. According to Julian Talpin (2011: 171), based on his research "the learning of four types of skills and competences can be observed in PB institutions: practical know-how, technical skills, political competence, and local knowledge".

Asking from the respondents what they have learned from the process of participatory budgeting in Tartu, either participating via voting or being the activist submitting an idea in year 2015, the knowledge obtained is both of a practical nature and also overlapping with other feelings such as a sense of community (P1, P2, P6,) and empowerment, and how they are interdependent. Shawn W. Rosenberg (2014: 98) elaborates on that notion that "By participating in deliberations, citizens with different cultural backgrounds better understand one another and, therefore, are more able to work together to mitigate

conflict between them. They will also recognise their interdependence and thus develop a sense of community."

In a way, individuals become more aware in general about their urban environment and about what being a citizen means. In the research of Julien Talpin (2011) about how ordinary citizens (sometimes) become competent in participatory budgeting institutions, he states that PB engagement allows citizens to discover the territory of the City and gain local knowledge. Or just talking with other participants, actors increase their knowledge of the territory. Talpin describes such learning in local knowledge, when activists and lay citizens discover the local territory through participation in PB.

In the same way, the experiences in participation in Tartu PB has similar tendencies, through participating actors can identify the role of a citizen better and they get a sense of empowerment. For example, they have learned that their voice can have power:

> Maybe about voicing your opinion. I am not the person to do that so much, when talking about my City. It has taught me that my voice can have power. In politics you are not so sure whether your vote/voice will reach anywhere. With participatory budgeting it is more realistic, maybe due to my vote some project got to be realized. (P5)

Also, how the City Council has taken advantage of the opportunity seeing there is a need to involve the citizens more:

> What I have learned is that the involvement of common citizens is getting more attractive because people want to have their say and City Council has used this opportunity in a very clever way, they are giving us the voice, which is good. (P5)

More specifically, a learning element, perhaps a more practical one, is also found in reading about and familiarizing oneself with the problems that other individuals (the one

proposing the ideas) have found evident in the city. For example, through familiarizing oneself with the ideas they learn more about the issues that the idea deals with:

> (...) when I read about those ideas, each of them solved some problem and then reading more about it I learned more about the problem. (P1)

In addition,

> Particular skills I cannot bring out. One of the things is that you need to familiarize yourself with these ideas if you want to vote. It broadens your horizon a little, someone did propose these ideas. What kind of problems did others see? And then you also look around town with a different glance, you notice things you didn't before, there was no need for it, as if. You see the whole picture better. (P3)

About more practical skills learned through participating in the process, it is interesting that the ones proposing ideas are not bringing out skills that one could imagine they gained, such as public speaking, marketing, teamwork and so on. The skills you would assume they gained, since they all went through these processes or presenting their ideas at public events, finding supporters for the ideas and, mostly, working in a team. However, their answers show more self-reflective and retrospective thoughts. Such as finding out about your competences and resourcefulness during the outreach on your idea (A1). In a different case, more retrospective, learning about the need to advertise the idea to gain more votes and what the process of outreach and advertisement should be about (A2). Also, in self-reflection seeing the mistakes done and learning from it, that being a more personal lesson (A3).

With participatory budgeting, the city of Tartu wishes to improve the citizens understanding of the city budget and its shaping process, cooperation between communities, find solutions to problems in the city and/or realize a new idea (e.g. the Tartu City homepage). As for one of the aims of Tartu City's Council, participatory

budgeting is to educate people about the budget formation of Tartu. It is also stated by the project manager:

> Surely those who go out with their ideas - I'm talking generally, not about one particular year - have certainly learned quite a number of aspects. One of the goals of participatory budgeting has been to show how the process and seriousness of formation of the budget is, that it is not as simple and there are a lot of considerations to be made, and you cannot have everything with the money that you have. And about the decision making part, I believe that those who have been closely involved in the project, those who have submitted their ideas and been along the process, they better understand the gravity of the decision-making. And certainly, they have learned how things work in the city government, that simply having a good idea, as a premise for executing it, is not enough, but they will be planned for a long time. And you must make public procurements. That it is not so easily doable. For example, how much specific things cost, why are they not just asphalting the roads. But when we show them that from the money that was allocated, you could only asphalt 100 meters of road. Then they will immediately become smarter, get to realize that things are expensive.

When asked about what mechanisms supported the learning processes, the project manager stresses the personal experience each participant had. Also, she adds, that she communicated especially with the idea authors all the time, explaining why their idea was feasible or not. She says that all this educates - the communication, giving feedback and the information she shares.

What the project manager has expressed as a learning experience, can be also seen in one of the interviewees' answers. However, that knowledge does not come naturally, by just participating, but requires extra time and interest by the participants (P1, P2). One of the respondents, for instance, did not find they learned from the process, as a voter, since

the participation was so small. However, still being appreciative for the opportunity given to the citizens (P7).

Generally, it can be said that participatory budgeting in Tartu serves an educative function. This is a function that according to participatory democracy theorists is achieved by participation. Citizens get a greater sense of efficacy and become more informed about public issues in general (Fishkin, 2009). However, the individuals whose participation was via voting, were not all involved in democratic debate that should enable exchange of reasoning that deliberative theorists claim to be in one of the main principles, the principle of discussion (Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg, 2016). That will be explored in the following paragraphs when looking into respondents' experience in participating in discussions about the submitted ideas with friends, family etc. It was mediocre in acknowledging a discussion to be an educative power.

5.2. Deliberation in PB in Tartu

One of the sub-categories under deliberation is discussions, in other words, deliberation. Discussions between different actors, as in face-to-face and/or online (social media) interaction. One of the aims of the interviews was to examine the different interactions through discussions and what kind of influence it had on the people. Some of the interviewees brought out in what way they were in discussion with others over the ideas of the participatory budgeting in Tartu, year 2015. It is important to distinguish the type of the interaction. In some cases, it was a lively discussion, a debate, and a reasoning over what ideas one found better than others, and what were their and others' arguments for them (P2, P5, P7). Such interactions took place at work and in the home environment,

with friends, family and colleagues. To answer the follow-up question about what kind of effect these discussions had on the interviewees, one of them describes it to be mind-broadening and positive (P5) and at other case simply interesting to voice your opinion and hear others (P7). However, none of the voters took part of the public discussions organized by the city.

Even though the public communication department has been trying to raise the participation with, for example, changing the location and format of these events, the participation by citizens has stayed modest. In 2015, the participation in the public thematic discussions was around 100 (Reinsalu, 2015) people in total for all the 4 meetings. These 100 people mostly being the participants proposing an idea, the experts and few members from the city government and few of the common citizens out of personal interest.

Therefore, the idea authors had a different experience with discussions. Two of them took part on the thematic discussions (A1, A3) organized by the project manager, where the deliberation was moderated and attended by experts as well. But how they describe their participation at the thematic discussions, is modest. They bring out the procedural elements of the discussion: the presence of a moderator, that they could hear other authors' ideas and present theirs. Also, that there was a good atmosphere which helped to voice their opinions. About the procedural elements of discussion, I will elaborate under the paragraph about the quality of participation.

One of the idea authors had discussions preparing the project in small thematic work-groups and commissions such as the history commission of the University of Tartu (A3).

The author found it to be a better way in holding discussions in smaller groups than for example, public meetings (A3).

At one instance, one idea author (A2) got a proposal from another author to merge the projects. That proposal came based on the discussions at the thematic meetings as this was also one of the possibilities of the thematic discussion to offer to the idea authors, to bind similar ideas, making them stronger.

In this master dissertation, I did not go in depth, about whether deliberation has produced the 'other regarding' element to interaction and if it helped for individuals to be more open-minded to issues as they were learning about them.

Moreover, the self-change process of the actors cannot be measured or elaborated on since the knowledge of the participation is based on the actor's self-reflection not by the direct observation of the researcher that would allow more understanding of the participation process of the actors. Such research would need different methodological approach for example an ethnographic method.

In addition, according to Elstub and McLaverty, (2014: 192)

> the development of deliberative democracy is likely, at best, to be slow. It is unlikely that people will gain deliberative capacities simply through their involvement in deliberative events unless there is systematic effort by facilitators to imbue participants with appropriate psychological facilities.

That being said, psychological investigations into deliberative democracy are increasing.

In conclusion, the discussions were present within the family, workplace environment and among friends, them being a lively discussion, a debate or a reasoning over what ideas one found better than the others and what were the general arguments for and against them.

The influence of the discussions was described as positive and mind-broadening. However, this was the informal way in which the voters engaged in discussions. It cannot be looked deeper in terms of the quality of the deliberation. In the case of the idea authors, who participated in the facilitated discussions, they described the deliberation as being equal in that time and attention were spent equally on all participants.

5.3. Having information from the PB process

Firstly, I will tackle the condition of being informed in public participation. Weeks (2008) explains that "becoming informed about a policy problem requires a knowledge of the basic elements of the problem, about the relationships among those elements, and the consequences and trade-offs associated with alternative policies". Likewise, Fishkin (2008: 160) brings out information as one of the criteria of quality deliberation. Namely, "the extent to which participants are given access to reasonably accurate information that they believe to be relevant to the issue."

In the participatory budgeting initiative, it is important that the voting is based on informed opinion, so, I will look into the different channels of information and which channels the voters and participants used to gather information about the ideas and participatory budgeting in general. Also, it is important to differentiate the two channels of information; one coming from the side of the city and the other from the idea authors.

On behalf of the city, the main channels for information about the participatory budgeting initiative in 2015 were social media (City of Tartu Facebook page and homepage); local newspapers, *Tartu Postimees* and *Tartu Ekspress*; exposition on the *Kaarsild* (Arch bridge) (Project manager). The opening event was the Information day where the city's

representative introduced the principles of shaping the city budget and the process of participative budgeting and its goals. Next events were the 4 thematic discussions where the idea authors and experts came together to deliberate and evaluate the ideas with the result of picking the best ideas out for the final voting. The last event in the participatory budgeting process in 2015 was the public function to introduce the final 25 ideas. All the events were open for all citizens.

When asking the voters how and where they got the information about the Tartu PB 2015 and about the different ideas, all the above-mentioned channels are brought out except for the public events.

Asking where they got their information from, they refer to the social media, but not only the Tartu City's Facebook page, but their friends' newsfeed on Facebook. Either one of the idea authors is their friend, acquaintance (P6) etc., or they see other people's newsfeeds, sharing the projects they will vote for (P1). Also, one of the voters said that an important source for information was mouth-to-mouth and from acquaintances (P7). Most thorough information about the ideas of 2015 and about the participatory budgeting in general comes from the City's homepage, that many interviewees refer to, though with different importance, as the main source for information (P2, P3, P6).

Other important source was media: online media and social media. Many voters claimed to first hearing about the participatory budgeting and about the ideas in 2015 via media, either online or on paper from sources like *Postimees*, *Tartu Postimees* and *Tartu Ekspress* (P1, P2, P3, P5, P6, P7). As most of the voters are also Facebook users, they got information through Facebook friends or Tartu city Facebook page.

Interestingly, two participants, one a voter (P2) and the other an idea author (A3), have subscribed to Tartu city newsletter, in paper and e-mail, where they get thorough information about the daily news of Tartu.

Some of the participants also connect the will of receiving information with how participatory budgeting process includes public, interest groups etc. If the individual is not open to receive information it does not matter what the means of information is (P2). Hence, receiving information is connected with the interest of the citizen and their will to have the information in the first place.

> As much as I have followed the information flow, for example what comes through press notice. If you are interested, then you are always invited to the city- and information days, that there is such a project happening, come and see. I dare to believe that you are being offered the possibility, but you need to be interested yourself, it won't be handed to you on a platter at your home. (P2)

The second source for information was created by the project managers/authors of the ideas. The question for them was how they saw the channels to be good or not and what they did to advertise their idea. One of the most important things to publicise the idea was through the authors themselves. It is very important and also as one of the goals of the participatory budget to build community cooperation.

One of the things that idea authors anticipated was a bigger publicity by the city (A1, A2). However, they were aware, to some extent, that the bigger responsibility to do the publicity and find supporters for their idea laid on the idea authors. Also they all saw that the publicity by the city's side was treating all the ideas equally. In the end, like all the idea authors (A1, A2, A3) noted, the amount of work they put into communicating their ideas was the premise for getting higher number of votes. One of them (A3) also recognize the

fact, that a strong network, community or an institution (e.g. NGO) supporting the idea is an important advantage, rather than, for example, an idea that comes from an individual. Another argument was that if the idea has a strong community behind it, then it has better chances for winning. That is also evident in many of the voters' preferences for ideas; idea that address their district (P2, P4, P6, P7).

The project manager adds that the increased numbers of the voters comes from the work that idea authors do. Namely, "(…) We tried to do better advertising, but mostly the work that the idea authors do with outreach is what brought the increase of votes."

Two of the respondents, however, brought out a reason why they did not find participating on those events necessary (information day and public function to present the final ideas). They said the participation not to be necessary because they already had the information that they needed and claimed there to be nothing new for them. (P1, A3).

In conclusion, the channels that the city used for publicity mostly were the main sources for the voters, next to second important channel, that is the information gained from the circle of acquaintances. However, the public events attendance by citizens' other than the idea authors, was low. The latter has been stated also in many of the analysis paper looking back to each year practicing participatory budgeting in Tartu (Reinsalu, 2015). It has been also suggested by the author (e-Governance Academy, 2014), that the public communications department should think of ways to make these events more attractive to the citizens to bring up the number of participants. Last but not least, something that can be gathered by what was said by the voters, the project manager, and the idea authors, is that having a community, network or an institution as a support group behind the idea, will give it better publicity and premise for higher number of votes.

5.4. The quality of participation in PB process

Under the quality of participation, I will elaborate on the procedures of the discussions and the equality of speech. Meaning, whether participants had equal time or chance to talk and how they were included. Also, how were the procedures in place before and during the discussions and whether the deliberation was moderated. It is important to determine how the environment is for participating in deliberation, and if in the end the quality of deliberation was ensured.

Here is important to note that most of the planning on participatory budgeting in Tartu does the project manager, who is also the communications manager in the Department of Public Relations in Tartu City. She is the person who keeps in contact with the idea authors, finds the experts to the thematic discussions, manages the publicity etc.

As none of the voter respondents participated in any of the discussions or events organised by the city administration, there are no experiences to reflect on. All of the idea authors, however, participated in one or more public discussions. About thematic discussion procedures there is no exhaustive description by the ideas authors. However, more from the project manager, who is better informed than other participants. The project manager gives an overview of the process of the thematic discussions:

> Then the idea authors and experts came together. Every author had to present their idea, however they wanted to do it, we didn't set up the rules of the presentation form. Some just talked, others had a presentation. When the idea was presented, for each idea we gave 5 minutes, the experts got a chance to ask questions, also the other authors could ask questions. So, then the discussion happened over open and unclear questions. If there was an author of an idea missing, we read their idea out loud to everyone. After that, the voting happened in participation of the authors and experts. They evaluated each idea based on five criteria. As a result, we had the final ideas for

the last round of public voting. All ideas can't make it to the last round because the people cannot read all the ideas, there has to be a selection before. That is something we learned at the pilot year, as we got feedback about that.

Based on the responses, however, it seems the procedural elements and the meeting principals were not as clear to all or needed to be clarified beforehand. Idea author A1, for example, with his team, needed information about the format for the presentation and if they could use extra material to support their presentation. But they knew about the time limit beforehand. The idea author A3 claimed to have had the information on the spot, except the time limit, which she also knew beforehand. However, the missing part of practicalities caused some discontent:

> I knew before about how much time we had for talking, but that you could make a PowerPoint presentation I didn't know. I felt a little bad because of it, but in the end it didn't matter. Most of the procedural things were told on spot, about what will happen and what is supposed to be the result for this meeting. (A3)

Hence, it is important how the information about the format and the procedures of the thematic discussions are being communicated to the participants.

On the other hand, the informal feel of the meeting had a good influence on the general environment, an idea author describes: "It was such a nice informal event, there was this one young guy leading the thing. He conducted the process, of course you could have a word if you needed, they offered you the word also. Some of the people there spoke a lot. The informal feel favoured that." (A3)

The idea author A2 did not participate at the thematic discussion, the idea co-author participated on behalf of their idea.

Moving on to the already mentioned moderation of the discussion. When asking from the project manager about how the project team ensured the quality of deliberation, she brought out having a strong moderator who they have been happy with since the pilot year. She described the moderator at the thematic discussions as follows:

> We had a very strong moderator who we have used since the beginning, and we will try also in future. He follows the time attentively, and when the time is running up he has a pleasant way to let the speaker know about it so it doesn't have any abrupt and offensive effect. So he follows that carefully and leads the discussion forward. In that way we have followed the quality of discussion from the beginning and we have discussed with the moderator what we could do better so the group discussion would be efficient. But luckily he has been like it since the beginning (…).

The attentiveness and efficiency has also been mentioned by two of the participants (A1 and A3), quoting one of the idea authors (A3) "It was necessary to have him to keep things going too broad or too long and not focused, a moderator can restrain this whole group of people."

Both of idea presenters in the thematic discussions (A1, A3) felt they had the possibility to have a say.

A moderator was also used at the public function when presenting the final ideas (Project manager) for the purpose to keep the discussion objective, not to let it diffuse around or to get stuck with one idea because, according to the project manager, all the ideas need to get equal attention. She elaborates: "We would not bring any of the ideas out on its own, because we need to handle all them equally and by the same principles, so we try to follow that."

Other important participants in the participatory budgeting process were the experts. As mentioned above the experts were selected by the project manager for the first round of evaluations and the second round at thematic discussions. The project manager explains the process:

> The thematic discussions were after we did the first selection of ideas. On the first selection, the experts get together and evaluate whether in their opinion the idea is good or bad, they assess whether the idea would fit in the budget, if it is technically possible. For example, if someone wants to build a fountain somewhere, but the on land where he/she wants it, for example, there's something else that's planned there for the next year by someone else. People do not know these things. So then the experts need to evaluate whether the ideas are doable and in this way many ideas got to be eliminated at the first round. The ones that get through, we divide into thematic groups. (…)

It is important to stress that as the idea authors and experts were evaluating ideas in the different criteria in 10-point scale, the idea authors could not grade their own idea.

The project manager also notes that they tried to keep balance with how many experts were from the city administration and how many were from the outside circle. When asking the voters about how much they know about the rules of participatory budgeting in Tartu City none of them brings out the role of experts. On the side of the idea authors however they do seem to know about who is evaluating the ideas on the first round because they all received an e-mail from the project manager with the notice. Since it was more than a year ago when it happened to the idea authors weren't able to recall having an explanation with it or minutes from the experts' evaluation meeting. The second round was different since the evaluation happened on spot and the results were made public at the end of the discussions.

One of the idea authors (A1) comments: "Interestingly, there was the discussion and right after the evaluation, it was a very decisive deliberation." By the same participant was also a question raised about the fairness of the evaluating system at thematic discussions: "Participants could grade the opponents' ideas, I am not so sure how objective that is."

Indeed, it was a decisive meeting and needed objectivity which knowledge could bring, so it means that it is even more important for all the participants to have the needed knowledge beforehand to the thematic discussions.

The awareness of the principals of the first evaluation and of the process during the thematic discussions are also connected with the deliberative democracy dimension of legitimacy that will be covered in the following paragraphs. Also, according to Weeks (2008), deliberative democracy requires broad public participation which means, it is important for the participant to have all the information necessary for quality deliberation.

Another thing to consider is the role of the experts. As mentioned above, the project manager justifies the need for expertise to evaluate the feasibility of the ideas, which the idea authors would not be able to evaluate themselves, since they do not hold the information that the experts do. For example, some of the experts were from the city administration, departments like Architecture and Building, Urban Planning etc., and have knowledge of the city planning and policies. On that note, it is true, as Elstub and McLaverty (2014: 9) claim, that "complexity makes us all depend on experts of one kind or another." However, authors continue: "supporters of deliberation between members of the public argue that public deliberation will produce better decisions." For authors like Jürgen Habermas, James Bohman and like-minded thinkers, expert authority supports deliberative democracy when it is embedded within an institutionalised culture of public

scrutiny (ibid: 51). That is a part to view under the paragraphs of legitimacy and accountability.

In conclusion it can be said that the procedures of the discussions and the equality of speech was supported, for example, by the facilitation of the moderator. The latter was helping to ensure the equality in speech at the deliberation. The procedure principle need to be introduced beforehand to the participants, in order to ensure a good environment for discussions. Unfortunately, the quality of deliberation cannot be explored in depth based on the data received from the research. But through the quality of participation one can evaluate the premise for good deliberation.

5.5. Openness and transparency in PB in Tartu

Under legitimacy I was interested in finding out what the interviewees thought about the openness and transparency of the participatory budgeting process in Tartu. Whether it involved enough of the citizens and interest groups. By openness and transparency, I mean how the rules about the processes of participatory budgeting were made, who was included to the making of these rules, how were the rules articulated by the organisers to the participants. For example, the body of experts, what was the procedure for appointing them and how were the results made by them communicated, if there were minutes of the meeting available to the public.

On openness and transparency one of the voters brings out an aspect, claiming that the way the participatory budgeting is allocating the money is a more open way to ask for consultation from the citizens. To illustrate:

And now when the council decides to do this kind of consultation round about a part of budget, then usually there would be around 20 people participating, but now there is around 3000 people and many institutions, so I think the legitimacy only raises by it. That is not perfect immediately, when looking at the participatory budget, then still it's not the same how it (the funds) was allocated before. Before it happened, it took place at the City Council and that's all. It was much more invisible and hidden before, for example, if the music school Eller got funding for repairs, it would be harder to know how much and how. (P1)

Fairly, it can be claimed that the mechanism of participatory budget does open up parts of the budget formation to the public and makes the process transparent. However, the allocated fund is small, being only 1% of the investment budget. And secondly, the knowledge of the participants about the City budget has not bettered with the initiative, as I will show in the following paragraph.

The process is mostly seen as open and transparent (P1, P2, P5, A1, A3) and the respondents did not share any concerns. Firstly, the reason for the overall content is perhaps connected with the amount of information they were able to collect, as was also apparent under the previous category of having information. Second reason for the contentment could also be the lack of understanding over what openness and transparency should entail in the participatory budget process. The fault may lay in the way the question was posed, since often the answers drifted away from the topic of openness and transparency, instead some of the respondents brought out some issues that could be done better. Such as having more different institutions and NGO-s submitting the ideas. Also, the fact that you need to have a bigger group of people behind your ideas, because the support of the institution will make the idea doable and will bring more voters to the participatory budgeting initiative.

Some of the responders say that they do not remember and that they had no extra interest in it.

As stated in the previous category the experts for the evaluation are selected by the project manager. It is important to bring out the principal that when assembling the experts, they try to keep a balance between how many are from the city administration and how many are independent outsiders. She elaborates:

> The previous group of experts, in there are more city administration people from the departments and we also have included people from the City Councils different parties. But during the thematic discussions we have tried to keep the balance, half from the city administration and other half independent outsiders, so the people would be more represented and their voice more present. In these two groups some of the experts overlap. People from the civil society are not presented there, only specialists. We don't assess the importance of the ideas there, only the technical side, that if the idea fits to the budget if it's doable within the given time limit. The idea has to be realised within the next year after being announced as winner. They look at the criteria and don't give evaluation on the content.

The assembling of the expert panels depends much on the turned out ideas, if there is a lot on street renovation or bicycle track idea etc., the project manager tries to find for experts from these fields.

To conclude, the process of participatory budget is seen as open and transparent by the respondents. The openness and transparency is very much connected with having the necessary amount of information about the processes. Also, the panel of experts divided between specialists from the city administration and independent outsiders was regarded balanced.

5.6. Accountability of PB process

As in the electoral process, Hansen (2004) describes, the citizens provide their delegates with a mandate to govern on their behalf, and the same time, the citizens judge the incumbents for their prior actions. Accountability mainly refers to the retrospective part of this process plus the mechanism to hold the local authorities accountable. In deliberation "accountability means that the deliberators are accountable for their arguments to other deliberators (Hansen, 2014: 276)." In other words, "the participants in deliberation should be willing to justify their reason to others (ibid)". On the other side, Hansen states: "Many deliberative democrats explicitly argue that politicians in contemporary representative democracy cannot only rely on the formal mandate given to them in election; they also need to take the time and effort to justify their decisions to the citizens through deliberation. In this way, deliberative accountability is twofold."

Gutmann and Thompson (1996: 128, *apud* Elstub and McLaverty, 2014: 153) understand accountability in deliberative democracy in term of reason-giving. They define the idea of accountability in the following terms: 'Citizens and officials try to justify their decisions to all those who are bound by them and some of those who are affected by them.'

I was not able to go into such depth in analysing the deliberative accountability on the side of the citizen deliberators. Even more, knowing, that most of the respondents did not participate in the face-to-face deliberation. Hence, I focused on the organisational side of accountability of the participatory budgeting process, for example how through feedback the participants can influence the processes and if there was a feedback mechanism in place. Also how the politicians were present in the deliberation with citizens. Another condition placed by Weeks (2008) is that the deliberative process must

be methodologically sound. On the latter the paragraph on the quality of participation can bring some evidence.

I asked for the respondents to describe how and where they could give feedback about the Tartu participatory budget 2015 procedures and about other matters they found necessary. And if they found the feedback was binding. Most of the respondents (P1, P2, P3, P5, P6, P7, A1, A2) told that if they would have wanted to give feedback they would have probably found the right place, for example, the homepage of Tartu City (P2), some contact from the City Government (A2, P6) or the public relations department (A1). Since only one of them recalls to have given feedback it will not be possible to reflect on whether the feedback was binding to the city administration.

On the side of the project manager she told to have many ways of receiving feedback, by phone, via e-mail making sure her contacts were available. There is positive feedback in the answers of the idea authors, saying the communications with the project manager was good and open. The project manager states, however, that they did not specially call people out to collect feedback since the people were already doing it. About taking account of the feedback she calls it to be based on the nature of the suggestions. For example:

> Last year we had many letters about the voting end time, this we will definitely discuss but I don't know what the decision will be. Maybe we will prolong the voting time this year (2016), because we got feedback on that, maybe we will add couple of days, perhaps we'll get more people to vote. In this respect, we definitely listen and read the feedback, and then make a decision.

In addition, the suggestions that the project manager has to consider is the yearly feedback from the e-Governance Academy Foundation.

On whether city's authorities or politicians were present at the discussions, two of the idea authors (A1, A3) recalled them being at the thematic discussions and also at the public function presenting the ideas. But they did not comment on their role or their activity there.

Another inquiry connected to the authorities and accountability is about whether the participants saw the voters' decisions to be binding for the authorities. To begin with, the project manager clearly describes the legality about how the peoples' decision are binding for the City Council. When in October the voting ended, the two winning ideas have been revealed, these projects will be added to their own budget line that will be confirmed by the end of the year. The process is on schedule.

The question is, how do the participants perceive that? One thing is clear the two idea authors, who have participated at the thematic discussions are informed about the process. That they have legitimate expectation (A1) for the decisions to be binding for the authorities and know that there is a special budget line (A3) for the winning ideas. Still, one of the idea authors (A3) and voter (P2) brought out that there could be more information about how the funds are being used the next year, and about the progress realising the winning ideas.

About the rest of the interviewees, there is a pattern that their awareness is a matter of communication from the city administration or the project manager team. Some of the voters have noticed (P3, P2) for example 'the Participatory Budget in Tartu' logo's that signifies the projects that were funded by that initiative. They are usually tagged on the physical projects. Lastly, others are not so sure and can't answer (P1, P5, A2) or some (P6, P7) simply haven't paid attention to it in that way.

As a conclusion, it can be said that in the eyes of the interviewees the participatory budgeting process is accountable in the sense that they feel they know where they can turn their feedback and that the voters' decisions are binding. However, there is not possible to see if the feedback is accounted to see if the participants can influence the process via feedback. About how are the politicians present in the deliberation with citizens, it is seldom possible for the politicians and the participants to engage in a mutual exchange of arguments.

5.7. Citizen's empowerment by the Tartu PB process

Hansen (2004: 283) notes that "the claimed potentials of deliberative democracy are that deliberation may encourage empowerment in the sense that participants may experience an increased sense of being capable of engaging and participating in politics, and a willingness to involve themselves in political discussions and an increased sense of having influence on government decisions." In addition, "participating in deliberation in one arena may also potentially spread to other levels of political life. As such, deliberation may encourage more deliberation and participation. (ibid)"

I asked the participants to describe how their interest was changed towards the politics of Tartu's local governance, having participated in the Tartu PB in year 2015. Before elaborating on the answers, Hansen (2004: 283) brings out a relevant point that "relating to the idea that political participation leads to more political participation, deliberation may also affect the general interest in politics. That is, deliberation with fellow citizens may open the door to aspects of politics which used to be closed for the participants, and may increase their general interest in politics."

Most of the voters and idea authors told to have more interest (P1, P5, A1, A2) and increased attention in general (P3) or as a citizen (P2) to the city environment. One of the idea authors told to have increased interest into topics such as new constructions in the city, but stated not to have had increased interest or knowledge about the formation of city budget (A1). Two of the voters told to not have increased interest in the city governance (P6) as one of the reasons being to have moved to another city (P7). Respondent A3, the idea author, claimed to have always been interested in the city politics and did not recall an increase in that respect.

However, in their positive responses there is a need to stress, that the increase of interest is there due to the element of participation, because they mostly had not a deliberation with fellow citizens as was stated in the paragraph under 'discussions'. In other words, they didn't have an act of deliberation, meaning engagement in face-to-face exchange of arguments, except voters P2, P5 and P7, who claimed to have engaged in deliberation. Hence, the increase of general interest in politics of Tartu is not due to the deliberative democracy element but the participatory democracy. Nonetheless, deliberative elements will be, also in few examples, evident when speaking about the increased sense of power.

Concerning empowerment, I asked the respondents what kind of influence the participation in the process had on them. Again, mostly it was described to be positive (P1, P2, P3, P5). They explain to have possibility to perform power through participatory budgeting (P2) and having a possibility to have a say (P3). One of them (P5) describes that it was encouraging to see the ideas being realised and seeing how active the citizenry has become through the process. What was also interesting to hear was that the participation

had inspired to become more active, like for instance the respondent P6 claimed to have. To better illustrate:

The voting passed and I didn't have such a big interest in it. But still, it is a good possibility to change something in your hometown, like the district communities do. People have become so active, there are district days (festivals), that shows that people care more. And there will be more people who might be interested in voting. Last week I joined some *Tähtvere* (district in Tartu) community Facebook page, seems like quite many people are active and get together and do stuff. I could communicate more with my neighbours, create a sense of community, because good association with community creates a sense of security. It is anyhow a quiet place. I don't remember what ideas we had there, but active people will always find activities what to do or better. (P6)

As it is seen, the participant claims to be only voting, and not having big interest in it. But it is clear, also from the other answers that seeing other people active in their community inspired them. The same can be seen by the project manager reference on how the influence on the participants can be indirect and positive. However, to answer my question if they can measure the rise of the interest somehow, then she is not sure about how to measure it. One of the indicators can maybe be the increase number of voters.

For ones stating, already being active and interested, the participatory budgeting does not give extra feeling of power. (A3) At one instance, there is a strong sign of empowerment through deliberation. One of the idea author (A1) has claimed to have become more interested and more active politically. Moreover, he expresses the need to join a group of like-minded people, in that case, an electoral alliance in Tartu. To illustrate:

Yes, right after the campaign euphoria, couple of days later I contacted *Vabakund* (electoral alliance in Tartu). I felt like when you are active then it's possible to achieve something. So that I should channel that someplace, where you have like-minded

people. Instantly there was activation that unfortunately faded a little, because they didn't see the opportunity and didn't engage me immediately. To stick to the questions then yes, I don't know how it was with others who got less votes. (A1)

The reason for the activation was the communications and outreach work on the streets engaging with voters. To illustrate: „Before anything else it was the work I did on the field (engaging with voters and doing outreach). (A1)"

A positive thing that was not apparent in any of the answers was that none of them expressed having experience that would have negative impact on empowerment and decrease of interest.

About the role of the civil society in implementing to the participatory budget procedures, based on the data has been small and not systematic.

In conclusion, most of the voters and idea authors had increased interest in the city environment and government. However, one needs to be careful when looking into what caused that interest, whether it was via simple participation or it was the face-to-face interaction with fellow citizens. Therefore, it should be kept in mind that the increase of general interest in politics of Tartu is not due to the deliberative democracy element but to the participatory democracy elements. To ask the question, what influence the participation in participatory budgeting had on the voters and idea authors, they mostly described it to be positive and it was evident that the experience was empowering, either through the feeling that people could have say, of perform their power, or because participation inspired the person to be more active as a citizen. The potential of citizen empowerment in participatory budgeting should be further explored to see in which ways the process could be made more deliberative in that sense.

6. Conclusion and findings

In this master dissertation, the research was carried out within a qualitative methodological approach by using the case study method. The main purpose was to find out in what way are deliberative dimensions evident in the model of participatory budgeting in Tartu and what is their influence on the participants.

To contextualize the case, I described the history of Estonian democracy and the experience of deliberative democracy through giving an overview of important historical events that shaped the political landscape of Estonia and the progress of modernizing democracy. Secondly, I have mapped the participatory budgeting in Estonia and characterised the type of participatory budget that is found in the case on Tartu in the light of international typologies. For that I presented a typology of participatory budget models in Europe based on the research of Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg.

I described the PB process in Tartu in the year of 2015 and looked for elements of deliberative democracy in this participatory democracy instrument. For that I conducted interviews with 11 participants (project manager, idea authors and voters) who took part in the process of PB in the year under research. The questions were formed and based on the operationalization of the concept of deliberative democracy and the PB Process design elements.

The research is focused on one year of 2015 in order to obtain the recent knowledge and experiences of the respondents. However, the long-term influence and perspective of self-change and learning of civic should not be disregarded. There are signs of learning and adaption on behalf of the PB management team, guided by the project manager, throughout the years.

It was concluded that from the typologies of PB models in Europe the Tartu City case can be placed between the models of 'adaption of Porto Alegre' and 'proximity democracy'. Main differences from the former are that in Tartu case the civil society does not have as much procedural independence and the civil society is less autonomous. Similarities are found in the procedures, as in Tartu the citizens also have a decision-making power, but via voting and they have the freedom in proposing their own topics/ideas to discussions. The latter model 'proximity democracy' is similar with Tartu case within its two senses of proximity: geographical closeness and increased communication between citizens. Yet leaving the decision-making powers to the city administration, which is the critical difference from the Tartu case.

As seen in the models of PB, participatory democracy can be complementary to the traditional representative democracy. Similarly, deliberative democracy is seen as such by different deliberative theorists through the waves of deliberative democracy. The third generation of deliberative theorists tries to overcome criticism directed to the model; the culturally bias conception that tends to silence or devalue some people and groups, and the deliberation taking place in small closed groups. They offer an approach focusing more on the power of argument, the 'new spirit of public action' (Blondiaux, 2008) and opting for a process and long-term perspective on self-change (Talpin, 2011).

6.1. Deliberative dimensions in Tartu PB

I chose to look closer to the deliberative dimension to see its benefits in participatory budgeting and justify the deliberative procedures and institutions. The main deliberative elements evident in the Tartu PB were, firstly, and most importantly, the element of

discussion as the PB process urged some of the voters into discussions with other voters, that being a more informal and casual form of talk. The formal discussion, within facilitated space, was more apparent for the idea authors. Second, the educative power emerges both with participation and deliberation. Third, procedures for formal discussion through facilitation of a moderator were present. Fourth, the feeling of empowerment was evident in a couple of instances, when it was due to deliberation and not simply participation in voting.

To elaborate on the results of this research, the main findings are as follows:

First, participatory budgeting in Tartu serves an educative function both through participating in the process of PB, being an element of participatory democracy; and due to, as in some instances, the engagement in discussions. The learning was expressed, for example, in discovering that the participants were part of a broader community and learning about the problems within the community. The finding can be supported with the research of Talpin (2011) where he notes that PB engagement allows citizens to discover the territory of the city and gain local knowledge.

Second, the element of discussion was present within the family, workplace environment and among friends, being as a lively discussion, a debate and a reasoning over what ideas one found better than others and what were others' arguments for them. The influence of the discussions on the interviewees was positive and mind-broadening. The idea authors who took part in more formal discussions, that were facilitated by the city administration, described the deliberation as being equal in giving word. The informal type on discussion that I described was aimed at taking decisions and is more in accordance with the strict meaning of deliberation by Talpin (2011) and Manin (1987) as a reasoned

exchange of arguments aimed at taking a collective decision. The informal discussions described above do not end with collective decision but still undergo to reasoned or casual conversations described by Talpin (2011) under types of discursive models. Chappell (2012) describes the above mentioned informal and formal discussion in micro deliberation that is expressed face to face, in equality of speech as in equal chance and time to speech, often employing moderators. Therefore, the research at hand supports the Fishkins (2009) reasoning that deliberation in mass participation is hard to achieve and rather argues for deliberation in small groups.

Third, success of an idea depends on the support from a community, network or an institution, meaning that having information and doing outreach is connected with creating a sense of community among the voters, also making the public participation more informed. The finding supports the argument of Tartu PB having similarities with the model of proximity democracy, explained by Sintomer, Röcke and Herzberg, where the proximity is in the double sense of geographical closeness and increased communication between citizens.

Fourth, the quality of participation, meaning the existence of procedures of the discussion and facilitation by a moderator, was found to be a premise for good deliberation – e.g. equality in speech and enhancing environment. That notion is supported by Talpin (2011), who describes procedure to be one of the conditions for the emergence of deliberation. "If the deliberation is scarce in PBs, it can, nevertheless, emerge under certain specific social, political and institutional conditions (ibid: 150)". He argues that the main conditions for the emergence of deliberation in non-experimental political settings are: procedure, disagreement, leaders and stakes.

Fifth, the process of participatory budget is seen as open and transparent by the interviewees, that is connected with having the necessary amount of information about the processes. However, I am modest in this turnout since the reason for the contentment could also be the lack of understanding on what openness and transparency should entail in the participatory budget process. Also, the participants' knowledge about the city budget formation was not improved with the process of PB.

Sixth, there is a feel of accountability by the interviewees in the sense that they think they know where to turn their feedback and that the voters' decisions are binding. However, it is not possible to see if the feedback is accounted and see if the participants can influence the process via feedback, since most of the interviewees did not feel the need to give feedback. Hereby, I need to emphasize that the meaning for accountability referred to retrospectivity in participation and the mechanisms in place to hold local authorities accountable.

Seventh, most of the voters and idea authors had increased interest towards the city environment and government and increased general interest in the politics of Tartu. This, however, was due to participation, not the discussions, as not many respondents were engaged in them. About the influence of PB on the interviewees, they mostly described it to be positive and it was evident that the experience was empowering, either in creating the feeling that people could have a say, or perform their power, or even that the participation inspired the individual to be more active as a citizen. The feeling of empowerment was still evident in a couple of cases, when it was due to deliberation not simply participation through voting. Therefore, the deliberative element such as discussion in PB can have potential in empowering citizens.

Finally, it was evident that in some instances the participants, mostly the voters, simply were not interested in obtaining more information, or going into deeper discussions or to the public events. They needed a further interest or another step to reach for more information. As Taplin (2011: 102) expresses that "participatory democracy is on all the lips but, somewhat surprisingly, few people are actually interested in getting involved in local democratic institutions." That is something to be considered when thinking about how to engage passive and disconnected citizens. Another concern with low participation is the question of legitimacy as such a small fraction of the population can take binding decisions that will affect all. Therefore, as seen in the results above, the deliberative elements can engage more citizens, however moderately, and the potential can be found in the repeated participation in deliberative decision-making in forming a competent citizen.

6.2. Recommendations for the Tartu PB process

As it can be seen in the findings, PB proves to be beneficial to the people that are involved in the process, however, the participation in the public discussions and the general voting turnout is still modest. Therefore, I would like to bring out couple of recommendations derived from the findings of this study to overcome the challenges and further develop the deliberative dimensions in Tartu City PB model.

For the sake of broad information, there should be more publicity on how the winning ideas become alive and to keep the public informed about the progress to be open and transparent throughout the whole PB year.

Second, however it is difficult to get the citizens to participate in the public events it should not be taken lightly that the informal discussion takes place in home, work or other environments. The best publicity, as was seen based on the research, is face-to-face and within community and requires discussions on matters that concern the individuals directly or indirectly.

Third, it is important to learn how to include all individuals who entered participation of deliberation. For example, reducing the technical gaps between experts and citizens (Talpin 2011). Or focusing more on the learning experience of the idea authors whose projects are evaluated not feasible and the ones who get eliminated after the discussion rounds. If most PB participants exit these institutions rapidly and become cynical, then these actors might exit the institution and never come back. Moreover, as Talpin (2011) expresses that, participatory democracy, failing to do politics differently, falls back in citizens' view into the traditional traps of representative government. Therefore, it needs to be re-evaluated how the feedback is given to them in order to make it more of a learning experience.

Fourth, as the other local governments develop their participatory budgeting models taking Tartu's practise as an example, it is important that the Tartu (and other PB practise cities in Estonia) PB team are open for changes and for learning from each other. Moreover, the local governments practicing PB and Tartu PB initiatives project team and Tartu local government would benefit from entering the international network of participatory politics and governance to share the experiences and get an injection of ideas to improve and enliven the PB practise in Tartu.

6.3. Conclusion

It is important to emphasize that these findings are based on a small sample, hence I would like to refer to the transferability of the research model of the current thesis. It would be interesting to apply the same framework and analysis to other cases to confirm if this is evident in other PB practises. Furthermore, it would be interesting to look into the experiences of participants in deliberation more in depth and to see the long-term consequences of participation in PB. As Talpin (2011) has suggested, to evaluate the impact of participation on individuals, it could be achieved through survey research, assessing before and after the participatory experiences whether participants had changed their minds.

In conclusion, it can be said that the model of PB in Tartu enforces the community and citizen empowerment due to the practice on idea authors doing the outreach for their project and the voters through familiarising themselves with the projects that can teach them about the issues in their neighbourhood and in the City in general. As one of the main ways to acquire information, aside for the communication by the City, it comes from friends and acquaintances which enhances the sense of community for the citizens. In the end, the participatory budgeting model should be developed to be more deliberation derived, being a convergence of participatory and deliberative democracy. Hence having better quality of argument resulting in higher civic competence.

Bibliography

Allegretti, G., 2014. Participatory democracies: a slow march toward new paradigms from Brazil to Europe? Paris: Les Éditions Infolio.

Aristotle, 1995. Politics, Oxford: Clarendon

Barber, B., 1984. Strong Democracy, Participatory Politics for a New Age, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Benhabib, S., 1996. Toward a Deliberative Model of Democratic Legitimacy. In: Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 67-95.

Bohman, J., 1998. Survey Article: The Coming of Age Deliberative Democracy. The Journal of Political Philosophy, pp. 400-425.

Brinkmann, S., 2013. Qualitative Interviewing. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brown, M. B., 2014. Expertise and deliberative democracy. In: S. Elstub & P. McLaverty, eds. Deliberative Democracy: Issues and Cases. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cabannes, Y., 2004. Participatory budgeting: a significant contribution to participatory democracy. Environment and Urbanization, 16(1), pp. 27-46.

Chappell, Z., 2012. Deliberative Democracy. A Critical Introduction. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cohen, J., 1989. Deliberation and democratic legitimacy. In: The Good Polity. Normative Analysis of the State. Oxford: Blackwell.

Elstub & P. McLaverty, eds. Deliberative Democracy: Issues and Cases. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Fishkin, J. S., 2009. When the People Speak. Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultation. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Gubrium, J. F., Holstein, J. A., Marvasti, A. B. & McKinney, K. D., 2012. The SAGE Handbook of Interview Research. The Complexity of the Craft. London: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Gutmann, A. & Thompson, D., 2002. Deliberative Democracy Beyond Process. Journal of Political Philosophy, 10(2), pp. 153-174.

Gutmann, A. & Thompson, D., 2004. Why Deliberative Democracy? Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hansen, K. M., 2004. Deliberative Democracy and opinion formation. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark.

Held, D., 2006. Models of Democracy. 3rd ed. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Hiden, J., 2008. Estonia – Winning Recognition 1918–1921. Tallinn

Krenjova, J. & Reinsalu, K., 2015. Participatory Budgeting at the Local Level: The Case Study of Tartu, Estonia. In IRSPM conference "Shaping the future, Re-inventing or Revolution?". Birmingham.

Krenjova, J. & Raudla, R., 2013. Participatory Budgeting at the Local Level: Challenges and Opportunities for New Democracies. Halduskultuur – Administrative Culture, 14(1), pp. 18-46.

Laar, M., 2005. Bird's-eye view of Estonian History. Tallinn: Grenader Grupp OÜ.

McLaverty, P. & Elstub, S., 2014. Introduction: issues and cases in deliberative democracy. In: P. McLaverty & S. Elstub, eds. Deliberative Democracy: Issues and Cases. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Meri, L., 1996. Presidendikõned. Tartu: Ilmamaa.

Offe, C. & Preuss, U., 1991. Democratic institutions and moral resources. In: Political Theory Today. Cambridge: Polity.

Official website of participatory budgeting in Tartu http://www.tartu.ee/kaasaveelarve, 28.05.2016

Pállinger, Z. T., Kaufmann, B., Marxer, W. & Schiller, T., 2007. Direct Democracy in Europe: Developments and Prospects. Springer Science & Business Media.

Raun, T. U., 2001. Estonia and the Estonians. 2 ed. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press.

Reinsalu, K., 2015. Kaasava eelarve Tartu linnas 2015: 3. aasta kogemused, Tallinn: Estonian e-Governance Academy.

Rosenberg, S. W., 2014. Citizen competence and the psychology of deliberation. In: Elstub & P. McLaverty, eds. Deliberative Democracy: Issues and Cases. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press.

Santos, B. d. S. & Avritzer, L., 2005. Introduction: Opening Up the Canon of Democracy. In: B. d. S. Santos, ed. Democratizing Democracy: Beyond the Liberal Democratic Canon. London: Verso.

Santos, B. d. S. & Nunes, J. A., 2004. Introduction: Democracy, Participation and Grassroots Movements in Contemporary Portugal. South European Society and Politics.

Sintomer, Y., Herzberg, C. & Röcke, A., 2008. Participatory Budgeting in Europe: International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, Volume 32.1, pp. 164-178.

Sintomer, Y., Herzberg, C., Röcke, A. & Allegretti, G., 2012. Transnational Models of Citizen Participation: The Case of Participatory Budgeting. Journal of Public Deliberation, 8(2).

Sintomer, Y., Röcke, A. & Herzberg, C., 2016. Participatory Budgeting in Europe. Democracy and Public Governance. New York: Routledge.

Soós, G., 2006. The State of Local Democracy in Central Europe: Reports from Bulgaria, Estonia, and Slovakia. Nádor: Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative, Open Society Institute.

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

The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2015. Democracy Index 2015: Democracy in an age of anxiety, London: The Economist Intelligence Unit Limited.

Zetterberg, S., 2009. Eesti Ajalugu. Tallinn: Tänapäev.

Zittel, T. & Fuchs, D., 2007. Participatory Democracy and Political Participation: Can Participatory Engineering Bring Citizens Back In? New York: Routledge.

Weeks, E. C., 2008. The Practice of Deliberative Democracy Results from Four Large Scale Trials. In: N. C. Roberts, ed. The Age of Direct Citizen Participation. New York: Sharpe, M. E.

Yin, R. K., 2003. Case study research: design and methods. 3rd ed. London: Sage Publications.

Annexes

Annex I Interview questionnaires

1. Questions to the project manager of PB in The City Council of Tartu

What was your role at the Tartu PB 2015? Describe the tasks.

Who participated in setting up the rules for different PB procedures?

How transparent was the setting up of these procedures?

1.1. Educative power

What do you think people learned from participating in the process? The ones who submitted ideas and the citizens who voted.

Which where the best instruments for these learnings?

1.2. Deliberation

How are the meetings organised (territorial or thematic logic, city, district or neighbourhood level)?

Can you elaborate on whether there were any intentions or discussions in the Tartu PB 2015 project team about the quality of deliberation and how to ensure it?

1.3. Participation

How were the proposals and the information about PB publicised to the citizens? If not well, please elaborate how could it have been done better? How could the Tartu PB 2015 have reached more locals participating and voting?

How is the access secured for all citizens to participate with ideas and for the information and voting?

What types of participation mechanisms are used? (information day, thematic discussions and at introduction of ideas).

How was the information about PB communicated to the citizens?

Are the meetings moderated? (meaning are there set of rules to ensure equal speech)

1.4. Legitimacy

How are the people selected to the technical team who give the first judgement to the ideas/project, whether they are feasible or not?

1.5. Accountability

How is the progress of the realisation of the winning ideas being communicated?

How is the implementation of the budget made transparent for the public?

1.6. Empowerment

What role did the civil society play along the process? Which organisations were contributing to the process and what role did they play?

How are the voters/participants' decisions binding for the authorities?

Has there been a perception that citizens are now more interested in politics and/or public issues? Please describe.

2. Questions to a proposer or an author of an idea

How did you participate in the Tartu PB?

What were the rules in giving in the proposal and the following processes? Were the rules actually respected? Were the rules clear?

Was there a chance to contribute to the setting up or changing the rules? If yes, please describe.

Please tell the story how you came up with the idea and why you decided to submit it? Who was involved with the project?

What was like the process of submission? Please describe.

What was like the process of evaluation? Please describe.

2.1. Educative power

Can you tell me about what you learned (what skills) during the Tartu PB 2015 process? And as a citizen?

What helped (e.g. instruments) you to gain that knowledge?

2.2. Deliberation

Please describe your participation in the meetings (information day, discussion, within the theme groups, something else)?

What were the procedural rules for the meetings (also theme groups), for example, to facilitate the equal time or chance to talk, inclusion?

Were the principles set prior to the meetings (also theme groups) and how were they communicated out in advance and on spot?

Did you feel that you had a chance to vocalize your opinions? If yes, can you describe what helped you to do that? If not, what would have helped you to vocalize your opinion better?

Were there moderators? If yes, what would you say was their role? How do you think their presence was necessary?

How and where did you get the information about the Tartu PB? How did you involve you friends or acquaintances to the proposal or discussions?

2.3. Participation

How were the proposals and the information about PB publicised to Tartu citizens? If not well, please elaborate how could it have been done better? How could the Tartu PB 2015 have reached more locals participating and voting?

Did the proposals have an equal chance for publicity at the public function and at the city's homepage? If yes, describe how? If not, what could have been done better?

During the public function and other meetings how were the ones participating given the chance for equal speech?

In your opinion, were there access to equal participation throughout the Tartu PB 2015? If not, how could it have been ensured better?

If yes, please describe how was the access secured for all citizens to participate with ideas and the access to the information and voting? Describe, if and how was the diversity of participants ensured?

2.4. Legitimacy

In your opinion, did the Tartu PB process involve enough citizens and interest groups? Was the whole process open and transparent? What do you think of the voter turnout? Please describe.

If you see there was lack of legitimacy throughout the Tartu PB process, what could have been done to better it?

2.5. Accountability

Describe how and where could you give feedback about the Tartu PB 2015 procedures and about other matters you found necessary? How was the feedback binding?

Were the city's authorities or politicians present at the discussions? What was their role?

2.6. Empowerment

Can you tell me if you are more interested of the politics of the Tartu's local governance and budgetary policies having participated in the Tartu PB 2015 initiative? Please describe.

What kind of influence had the Tartu PB 2015 process on you? Was is empowering? If yes, please explain how. If not, please explain why?

How would you say, it is true that the voters' decisions are binding for the authorities?

3. Questions to the Tartu citizen who voted at year 2015

How did you participate in the Tartu PB? Please describe.

What were the rules for participation and where these rules respected? Were the rules clear?

Was there a chance to contribute to the setting up or changing the rules? If yes, please describe.

3.1. Educative power

Can you tell me about what you learned (what skills) during the Tartu PB 2015 process? And as a citizen?

What helped (e.g. instruments) you to gain that knowledge?

3.2. Deliberation

Please describe your participation in the meetings (information day, discussion, something else?

How did you make up your mind about for which ideas to vote for? Where did you get information about it?

If you participated in the discussions:

What were the procedural rules for the meetings, for example, to facilitate the equal time or chance to talk, inclusion?

Were the principles set prior to the meetings and how were they communicated out in advance and on spot?

Did you feel that you had a chance to vocalize your opinions? If yes, can you describe what helped you to do that? If not, what would have helped you to vocalize your opinion better?

Were there moderators? If yes, what was their role? How do you think they role was important/necessary?

How and where did you get the information about the Tartu PB 2015 and about the different proposals? How did you involve you friends or acquaintances to the discussions about the proposals?

3.3. Participation

How did you hear about the Tartu PB 2015?

How and where were the proposals and the information about PB publicised to Tartu citizens? If not well, please elaborate how could it have been done better? How could the Tartu PB 2015 have reached more locals participating and voting?

Do you feel all the proposals had an equal chance for publicity at the public function and at the city's homepage? If not, please elaborate how could it have been done better?

During the public function and other meetings how were the ones participating given the chance for equal speech?

In your opinion, were there access to equal participation throughout the Tartu PB 2015? If not, how could it be done better?

If yes, please describe how was the access secured for all citizens to participate with ideas and the access to the information and voting?

3.4. Legitimacy

In your opinion, did the Tartu PB process involve enough citizens and interest groups? Was the whole process open and transparent? What do you think of the voter turnout? Please describe.

If you see there was lack of legitimacy throughout the Tartu PB process, what could have been done to better it?

3.5. Accountability

Describe how and where could you give feedback about the Tartu PB 2015 procedures and about other matters you found necessary? How was the feedback binding?

Were the city's authorities or politicians present at the discussions? What was their role?

3.6. Empowerment

Can you tell me if you are more interested of the politics of the Tartu's local governance having participated in the Tartu PB 2015 initiative? Please describe.

What kind of influence had the Tartu PB 2015 process on you? Was is empowering? If yes, please explain how. If not, please explain why?

How would you say, it is true that the participants' decisions are binding for the authorities?

Annex II Content analysis table

Key-category	Sub-Category	Definition	Excerpt
Deliberation	Educative power	How new skills are learned.	„When reading the ideas, how people have made an effort to get attention to their project, how they have explained their ideas and how they have planned it. Then I get an understanding. You must be prepared like with quick starters, you need to have good visuals and good 'sales text'. And then also people will see if you really want something you must work for it. It doesn't work like this that you have an idea and you just propose it. There is a assumption that you need to do your research and make an effort, and then it will be a kind of a quality filter, who does not do it will not get a big support. In a way it is a beautiful logic." (P1) „...when I read those ideas, each of them solved some problem and then reading more about it I learned more about the problem." (P1) „In itself, when there are organisations, that are more connected to the City environment, are participating in the PB then already their explanations open up a lot about who is doing what and where and how the organisations are connected….It gives a good overview of things in the city."(P1) „If you would explore these ideas, I personally didn't so much, but I am saying if you would, to the ones that interest you more, you will get more knowledge. "(P1) „One thing is clear, as a result of this process people maybe sense how little money we have, as a City of Tartu, even as it is a very small amount of the budget. (the amount allocated with Tartu PB). In a way it pushes people to think: "Okay, here is our common tax money, we won't be able to realise all good ideas with it". So, next time I will know, having participated in this process and having been in front of these choices, that the city council faces the same issues. Probably that happened. But more specifically about the process I didn't learn about. It must be some sort of extra interest or information I would need to have to read about how the city budget is being formed." (P1) „It is so nice to get to know my hometown better through this process. I have lived here since I was born in Karlova district. This is how I see it „oh, look in that district they are doing this and in the other one they have that, but they want to develop it". I get to know so much about my City and that is for me the best thing. "(P2) „As a citizen there is to be learned a lot more. But I would say I only learned in personal level about what was happening in Tartu. As a citizen I could learn about this budget business, to understand it better. This side stayed modest." (P2) „Particularly skills I cannot bring out. One of the this is already that you need to familiarize yourself with these ideas if you want to vote. It broadens your horizon a little, someone did propose these ideas. What kind of problems others saw? And then you also look around town with a different glance, you notice thing you didn't before, there was no need for it, as if. You see the whole picture wider." (P3) "What I have learned is that the involvement of common citizens is getting more attractive because people want to have their say and city council has used this opportunity in a very clever way, they are giving us the say, which is good". (P5)

				„Maybe about voicing your opinion. I am not the person to do that so much, when talking about my City. It has taught me that my voice can have power. In politics you are not so sure whether your vote/voice will reach anywhere. With participatory budgeting it is more realistic, maybe due to my vote some project got to be realized." (P5)
				„Gives you knowledge and your wishes will be considered. When the votes find an idea that is reasonable and supports their objectives, and you have enough people coming together, the idea will be realized." (P6)
				„I don't think I learned anything. I gave my vote and that was all. It's very good that Tartu citizens are involved, there is such an opportunity, but I don't think I learned anything specific or that I got anything from it, the participation was so small." (P7)
				„As an individual I learned that you cannot give up until you have not tried everything, used all the tools, because later you would regret that you didn't, and I didn't want to be the one to regret." (A1)
				"About lessons learned, one thing is that never think you have lost before the end. Later seeing the results, I saw it was pretty tight win." (A1) "We learned that having an idea itself is not enough, you must also market it." A2)
				"I saw that we have a lot of active citizens, who are very interested in the work of the city council and governance and also they give a lot of themselves to better the life of the city. I was surprised by novelty of the ideas, or the things people found could be bettered, there were many good ideas and it's sad you can't realise them all. In that way it is great that we have so many active citizens who are trying to better the city's environment." (A2)
				"I learned that things won't move by themselves, I should have known that better. I put too much hope in others. I should have done the things that I could myself. You have to proactive yourself, things won't move by themselves. This is my personal lesson." (A3)
				„Surely those who go out with their ideas are - I'm talking generally, not one particular year - has certainly learned quite a number of aspects. One of the goals of participatory budgeting has been to show how the process and seriousness of formation of the budget, that it is not as simple and there are a lot of considerations to be made, and you cannot have everything with the money that you have for use. And about the decision making part, I believe that those who have been closely involved in the project, those who have submitted their ideas and been along the process, they have seen more of the gravity of the decision-making. And certainly, they have learned how things work in the city government, that simply having a good idea as a premise for execute is not enough that go, but they will be planned for a long time. And you must make public procurements. That it is not so easily doable. For example, how much specific things cost, why are they not just asphalting the roads. But when we show them that from the money allocated you could only asphalt 100 meters of road. Then they will immediately become smarter, get realize that things are expensive. " (Project manager)
				What mechanisms supported the learning processes? „Through the personal experience, because we communicate with them all the time, who submitted their idea, we give them feedback, if their idea got forward and if it didn't, we say why. Very often it didn't simply fit into the budget, and then we explain, that with this amount of money it can't be done, that it's not realistic. And then when the idea passed, very often it needs to be changed, to specify that, with this money we can do this much, not the whole idea. All that teaches, the communication and giving feedback and the information." (Project manager)

Deliberation	Discussions/deliberations	Discussions and deliberations between different actors, as in face-to-face and/or online (social media) interaction.	„We have discussed with my husband. We have voted almost always for different things. Let's say there has been a little debate. In work environment unfortunately we haven't, only in year 2014 when we tried to do the Raad district things, then we had discussions at work." (P2) „Before the voting I did not discuss, but after the vote in year 2014 it came up as a topic when we saw on the streets the graffiti. I voted for that idea and many of my friends also. So then we had a little discussion about that." (P3) „Among my family we talked briefly about if there were any interesting ideas and who will vote. Also with brother, partner and friends who are more active and with then in more depth. Even a lively discussion began about why one of the idea is more interesting than others." (P5) Follow-up question: What effect that discussion had? „In a positive way. When you look at the projects then you do it through your own perspective. Maybe you will not understand all the aspects or the background. It broadens your mind, and it's good to hear other people's opinions, maybe they can persuade you." (P5) „I didn't discuss it with anyone, I was not so active that I would have had even spoken with my friends about it. Perhaps I mentioned it to my partner passingly. From my friends Facebook newsfeed and I researched a little more from Tartu homepage." (P6) "I think we had a strong discussion also at work, who reasoned what, what was closest to their heart, either that at work, with friends or with family." (P7) Follow-up question: What effect did the discussions with friends, colleagues and family have? „Like every other day and dependent on a day's news, it's always nice to have a discussion, but next day you already have other topics. It's nice to share ideas and discuss." (P7) Over what did you discuss with your friends? "About the ideas, what arguments for what ideas who had. In Karlova district I have a lot of friends and acquaintances, I got information from them." (P7) „Then with my co-author we met with a competing ideas author that was very similar to ours, connected with building solar power stations in Tartu. He contacted us himself, we met and discussed the topic. Since me and my co-author, we didn't have such an interest to market that idea, then we didn't get to a deal. We had a more modest plan." (A2) ((about meeting the other person who wanted to merge the ideas)) „On the group discussion where everybody met and then 2 or 3 weeks after he contacted us himself with proposal to unite the forces and lead the projects together as one. At that point we didn't have bigger interest, both of us had a lot to do with our own things. Our marketing side stayed modest, in conclusion, to look at all the ideas, then the right project won. We are not sad at all that we didn't win." (A2) My grandfather is very active on questions like city's management and politics. He is a man of discussions. Every year he speaks about the participatory budgeting, not on the sense of the ideas but the initiative. (A2) "I participated at the thematic discussions. My colleague, who was also a co-author, participated at the last discussion (the public event introducing the final ideas). Where I was, was the introduction round where 25 projects went to for voting. It took place at a very good environment, each project leader presented their idea in 2-5 minutes, some showed pictures, some not. And then there was the discussion that opened a bit the ideas behind the projects more. Then in the end there was the evaluation, where we chose the finalists." (A3)

				„Because all the participants who got to the next phase got to participate in a bigger discussions circle where you could hear others ideas and present your own. This was a discussion mostly necessary for the ones proposing ideas. There were not so many people from outside. You could get to know what kind of projects were submitted, last year there were many great projects." (A3) „The discussions were held only among our museum when we discussed our project and when we prepared it. We have a little workgroup where we discuss the matters of Toomemäe and also the history commission of the university where it was addressed. In these small workgroups. Then we made the good thoughts statute. All this happened in small groups not gathering a public meeting at Toomemäe for example. I don't know if that would have been important, but there were a lot of small workgroups, some of them I already mentioned to you but maybe there were some more." (A3) „We had a workgroup that was led by the e-Governance Academy, Kristina Reinsalu. There were also representatives from different political parties, heads of the city and councillors. E-Governance Academy made a thorough preliminary work, they offered different scenarios how to conduct a participatory budgeting. So they were discussed in the workgroup ((mentioned above)) and found a suitable scenario for Tartu. That was a big group of people which we have not gathered after again, meaning with the politicians, rather in smaller groups. But every year still we get together with the heads of the city to reflect on the last year, how we did and what we should change." (Project manager) „At the discussions, where the authors of the ideas participated, I noticed that quite a few came with a distrustful attitude or when they answered via email that "well okay, I will come a talk and let's see". But when the discussion was over, quite many came to tell me that it was a great event and that they gained so much information. Last time there were two discussions in a row and one of the authors of an idea asked if she could participate in the next discussion since it was so interesting." (Project manager)
Participation	Having information	The ways in obtaining information about the PB process and the ideas in order to have informed opinion.		"It was a diversified process from many channels, hard to even say where it started. Anyhow from Facebook for sure, from people who were involved somehow with it. Tartu's youth council and people connected to it. Media also. But now in years in different ways, for example in some events the city officials introduce the idea of participatory budgeting. Or in third sector events they have also talked a lot about it. (…) But the concrete idea for which I voted, in year 2015 I think, the initiator of the idea was my friend/acquaintance and via him/her I saw it. Usually there are couple of people I know participating in. In general, the idea seemed reasonable, I familiarized the idea in Facebook and so in the end I voted. Maybe I wouldn't have had voted if I didn't see the reasoning and a call for vote in Facebook." (P1) „I did not participate, it wasn't needed. I heard from someone who participated there that no one was there and everybody was telling everything to each other ((meaning the authors of the ideas)). Other ways, it seems pointless keeping in mind that many who have thought their idea through well has also described it in detail and the ones who have not given it much thought will not have good description of their idea. In that ways I am not sure what is the value of these events, perhaps to some yes." (P1) „In a word, the ideas do not seem so visible to me as in first time. They realised then that people will publicise themselves and they worked hard to be visible, so first year the whole thing was pretty big. In my opinion, in the next years it wasn't so big ((the publicity)), it seems to me that it depends. Maybe the city can't do so much, they don't have so many channels that would reach the target groups. And that the idea authors have the channels, or they actually don't. It seems to me that the project that won was connected with an institution that a lot of people is connected to." (P1)

| | | | | „Information comes from the homepage and the voting is done electronically. I made the decision and as did our family and husband according to our district Karlova. Before definitely according to Raad (Tartu Town Hall) and ERM (Estonian National Museum). But 2015 definitely according to our district. Thing that ended up in the final round from our region. (P2)

When did you hear first time about participatory budgeting in Tartu?
„I assume 2016 is the fifth time, so I have participated three times. Therefore, the first two times I missed it somehow. It was probably because I have ordered now the newsletter of the city. When it already comes to your mailbox then you will notice more than if it would be only in newspaper, where you may not notice everything." (P2)

„Let's say it like this, that when a citizen has ordered this information to her/his mailbox and does not rely on watching the city homepage, then the information will not be unnoticed. Let it be the information day or the participatory budgeting voting. It's a matter of a choice that the citizen makes, and how he/she has decided to let the information to get to him/her. It's up to the citizen, everyone does not have newspaper coming home. In the newspaper the information has always been in, but you can not only rely on that anymore." (P2)

In your opinion, did the Tartu PB process involve enough citizens and interest groups? Was the whole process open and transparent? What do you think of the vote turnouts? Please describe.
„As much as I have followed the information flow, for example what comes through press notice. If you are interested, then you are always invited to the city- and information days, that there is such a project happening, come and see. I dare to believe that you are being offered the possibility, but you need to be interested yourself, it won't be handed to you on a platter to your home." (P2)

„Homepage, in the voting online page (volis.ee), where all the ideas where explained" (P3)
How did you hear about the Tartu participatory budget?
„I think it was two years ago via Facebook page of the city" (P3)

„The most information I got from the Arch bridge, they had poster presentation there. These were the most informative, and had the easiest access. It was also in internet but at the bridge it was brought to your hand. It attracted attention and I even read them." (P4)

„Via media (Postimees, Tartu Postimees). If you follow the Facebook page of the City of Tartu, then from there. In television they didn't have it. Since I was connected to a political party, so I got a lot of information from there, it is being discussed in the parties. But mostly media and social media. Facebook friends and groups." (P5)

„In Postimees the online article. Then in Facebook it was shared a lot. Some acquaintances were connected with some project and then once I read about the projects from the homepage of the city." (P6)

„I don't follow the print media, probably some articles were available online. There are more of my acquaintances who follow and share it in Facebook. I don't live in the centre and don't go out too much so I guess that's also why I do not have so much information" (P6)

„If I wouldn't have had the acquaintances, who were connected to the projects, then it would have just passed me by." (P6)

„In Facebook there were the most information also in Postimees. In there also, definitely. But mainly from Facebook." (P7) |

| | | | | „I also like the Karlova recreation park idea. It was because of my acquaintances, who told me about it. "(P7)

„I do not remember publicity in the cityscape, it was more like mouth-to-mouth, maybe from the news, can't remember more. There was not separate e-mail, but I'd say the cover and the outreach was enough." (P7)

How did you involve your friends or acquaintances to the proposal or discussions?
„Outreach and activating your people, that they would be up to date. Million kroon's do not grow on a tree; you have to work for it. Informing the citizens, that there is this competition, and here is information about us." (A1)

„The presentation on the Arch bridge for example. I remember I had an emotion that Tartu does not have a strong information channel like television. If you don't have television, then 50+ age group is out from the game. So you will hear about the project that somehow get to you, most likely from social media. One thing is the Arch bridge, but not all the districts go pass there and yes the flayers, but these you get from the town hall." (A1)

„As a citizen, I'd say that the city could have been more active.(…) On the other side I understand that the city created the instrument, they did all the paperwork and allocated that 0,1% or how much it was from the investments budget. So now is the grass root levels time and up to activists to do the publicity and outreach. Maybe that's how it was planned and it is nice if it works like this. But it comes with a premise that all the idea authors do the publicity, not just only to their project but also for the participatory budget instrument. So, it is important how to get the neutral attention at first place to talk about the instrument and about the possibility to be involved like sort of the Swiss model." (A1)

„We hoped that the idea would publicise for itself, but it is clear that we were wrong, so it's the hindsight we gained, that we could have worked with the other ideas author. At that time, we didn't have the time and the interest". (A2)

„Friends did enquire about how we are and what was that process exactly about. Essentially we are both (with co-author) honest people, we both told to our friends that our idea is good, but also check out the other ideas, and if you see something better, then we won't mind" (A2)
„We anticipated a bigger campaign for the idea, but in the end what mattered was that the people (authors) will do half as much more publicity than the city. City did the exposition to the Arch bridge, then also the newspaper Postimees. In the city's homepage definitely also. I thought it would have been bigger. The perception was other about how the ideas were going to be brought to the citizens so that all would know what ideas were presented." (A2)
Kas seda ei antud teada, et osalejad peaks ise rohkem kampaaniat tegema ja tutvustanud linnapoolseid kanaleid?
Didn't they tell you that the idea authors had to do more campaigning themselves and did they tell what the channels from the city would be?
„That part we don't know. She (the co-author) said we need to do publicity ourselves. We agreed still that we will do it calmly until the moment we were notified we should do it bigger." (A2)

„It was communicated well, it got to me via several channels." (A3)

„At the first information day I didn't go to. Because I had heard about it anyhow, then I didn't consider it necessary. It was nothing new to me, probably it is the reason why I didn't go there." (A3)

How did you involve your friends or acquaintances to the proposal or discussions? |

				„I didn't really have time for it. I did the things that was asked from the city side. Then we send out a call for voting to different mailing lists, newsletters and networks in the university. Then also to the museum lists. It was an online based information sharing, but it wasn't active enough." (A3) „I don't know how regular people get the information but to me it gets through several ways. One side it's the city's newsletter and almost daily the press notices. If there in something important then I read it. From there this information came several times in different forms. The posters were in the cityscape; it is important that there is a visual poster about the participatory budgeting. I don't know if that has been in the last year, but it catches your eye. Then on the homepage of the city and the Arch bridge exposition. As years pass people know better what participatory budget is. But at the same time looking how low it the voting turnout, I see we have a lot of room for improvements. For me the information come directly. Oh, yes, and then the newspaper Tartu Postimees that more of the elderly read. Youth have the social media; there the publicity is strong. In Tartu Postimees they had over two pages' big introduction of the ideas, that was very useful because it is read a lot, through that people will know what it (participatory budgeting) is." (A3) „In many ways, the media is a big help, we did agreements the newspapers here in Tartu, Postimees and Tartu Ekspress, they printed out all the ideas. They do not have a direct responsibility to do that, we didn't pay in commercials, they are just interested. Some TV channels covered I, then we had a big exposition on the Arch bridge, because people are used to see different expositions and displays there. That was in 2015 and also sooner. We used social media, it was up on out homepage, also we posted from out Facebook page and once about all the idea separately. And then also exposition at City Town Hall information centre. We tried to use all the channelled we had. And then there were the information day seminar or discussion that also served the purpose to introduce the ideas." (Project manager) „One of the most important things how to publicise your idea was through the authors themselves. It is very important and also as one of the goals of the participatory budget that we have articulated, to build community cooperation. And how in last year 2015 the authors of the ideas publicised their ideas, though not all of them. How they found supporters for their idea and what they did for it, it was really impressive and positive, up until to the day of voting when they were out on the streets handing out their flyers and calling people up for voting." (Project manager) How do you think, were the idea authors activity in proportion to how many votes they got? „The increase of voter also comes by itself, because people see it more, and it catches the eye more, that there is this kind of voting in Tartu. We tried to do better advertising, but mostly the work that the idea authors with outreach is what brought the increase of votes." (Project manages) Did the proposals have an equal chance for publicity at the public function and at the city's homepage? If yes, describe how? If not, what could have been done better? „I don't know. The city does not so much, in principal they would treat all the ideas equally (the Arch bridge and homepage). A lot changes how the project leaders communicate their idea and how the media makes some of the ideas bigger than others. The network behind some interest groups was clearly seen. The strength is hidden in how much each one publicises their idea. The support groups network is what makes one project stronger than others." (A3) Did the proposals have an equal chance for publicity at the public function and at the city's homepage? If yes, describe how? If not, what could have been done better? "Yes I believe so, and it is a right strategy from the side of the city, they communicated all the ideas on the same basis, but if you want to enter this as a winner you need to put work into is. On the side of the city it was very honestly made, no one favoured anyone." (A2)

| Participation | Quality of participation | | The quality of participation in the equality in speech, procedures and the set of principles in place. | What was like the process of submission? Please describe.
„There were two rounds. There was a big number of projects submitted, that were then divided into different theme groups. We were under construction and infrastructures thematic group and then the defence for the ideas took place. We were there 3 of us. One of us made the presentation, 3-4 minutes, we also showed illustrative material. The city had formed a panel of experts. After all the presentations the evaluation happened there on spot. In addition to the experts also the idea authors could evaluate others ideas. On spot the result came in, we knew who is in the final round and the action begun in August or in the beginning of September. Interestingly, there was the discussion and right after the evaluation, it was a very decisive deliberation." (A1)

Were the principles set prior to the meetings (also theme groups) and how were they communicated out in advance and on spot?
„Maybe I am getting the discussions mixed up. For the first meeting (thematic group discussion) we asked for a format for the presentation, if we could show the slides, what was the time limit. The time limit we knew before but about the format of the presentation and about using help material we had to ask in advance. I may owe you some answers because I don't remember much." (A1)

Do you know how the experts were assembled?
„No. Maybe it depended on my position, I was not included in that phase. How much did I needed to know anyhow? But when I was invited to go to thematic discussion and I was notified that I need to defend the idea in the Autumn." (A1)

What was like the process of evaluation? Please describe.
„I do not remember, only the evaluation form. I remember an emotion when we got pass and I was sad about one of the ideas didn't get pass. These are emotional memory pictures it's all a game. I don't remember sensing any violation of rules." (A1)
"Participants could in principal grade the opponents' ideas, I am not so sure how objective that is." (A1)

Were there moderators? If yes, what would you say was their role? How do you think their presence was necessary?
„A manager from the public relations, or was there a man from the City administration. It was moderated nicely; I don't have any complaint on that:" (A1)
„I knew before about how much time we had for talking, but that you could make a PowerPoint presentation I didn't know. I felt a little bad because of it, but in the end it didn't matter. Most of the procedural things were told on spot, about what will happen and what is supposed to be the result for this meeting. (A3)

Did you feel that you had a chance to vocalize your opinions? If yes, can you describe what helped you to do that? If not, what would have helped you to vocalize your opinion better?
„Yes, definitely, it was such a nice informal event, there was this one young guy leading the thing. He conducted the process, of course you could have a word if you needed, they offered you the word also. Some of the people there spoke a lot. The informal feel favoured that." (A3)

What was like the process of evaluation? Please describe.
„I don't remember if I was sent the list of the names, but what I do remember is that I was sent a notice that I was selected to the next round, I don't remember any criteria. There was no explanation. Since it was long time ago I don't remember in such detail. They are not so strict about it when making the choices but kindly. They take out the ideas that are unrealistic, utopic or jokes." (A3)
Kas tead, mis kriteeriumide alusel neid ideid hinnati?
Do you know based on which criteria the ideas were evaluated on?
„They didn't say that as far as I can remember. (A3) |

| | | | | ((I name the criteria))
„Oh yes, these general ones I know. They were at the application form, probably they graded based on that." (A3)

Were there moderators? If yes, what would you say was their role? How do you think their presence was necessary?
„Yes there was. It was long time ago. Of course it was good, if he wouldn't have been there then someone else should have had to take the role, no good would have come of it. The moderator was necessary to keep the whole thing together, either he is from the city administration or somewhere else, I do no remember from where he was. It was necessary to have him to keep thing going too broad or too long and not focused, moderator can restrain this whole group of people." (A3)

„The thematic discussions were after we did the first selection of ideas. On the first selection the experts get together and evaluate whether in their opinion the idea is good or bad, they assess either the idea would fit in the budget, if it is technically possible. For example, someone wants to make a fountain somewhere, but the on land where he/she wants it, for example, has already something else planned on by the next year by someone else. People do not know these things. So then the experts need to evaluate whether the ideas are doable and in this way many ideas got to be eliminated at the first round. The ones that get through, we divide into thematic groups. (…)" (Project manager)

„We always try to see how is the best way to divide the ideas under themes, so that they would be logically connected. We cannot plan that ahead; the ideas are very different every year. Then we agree on thematic discussion meeting times gather all the idea authors and to each theme I tried to find the experts who are strong in this field." (Project manager)

„Then the idea authors and experts came together. Every author had to present their idea, however they wanted to do it, we didn't set up the rules of the presentation form. Some just talked, others had a presentation. When the idea was presented, for which we gave 5 minutes, the experts got a chance to ask questions, also the other authors could ask questions. So then the discussion happened over open and unclear questions. If there was an author of an idea missing, we read their idea out loud to everyone. After that, the voting happened in participation of the authors and experts. They evaluated each idea based on five criteria. As a result, we had the final ideas for the last round of public voting. All ideas can't make it to the last round because the people cannot read all the ideas, there has to be a selection before. That is something we learned at the pilot year, we got feedback about that." (Project manager)

Who were scoring?
„The idea authors and experts. The author could not give points to his/her own idea. It seemed this system worked so far so we did it this time, the third time, again. "(Project manager)

Can you elaborate on whether there were any intentions or discussions in the Tartu PB 2015 project team about the quality of deliberation and how to ensure it?
„We had a very strong moderator who we have used since the beginning, and we will try also in future. He follows the time attentively, and when the time is running up he has a pleasant way to let the speaker know about it so it doesn't have any abrupt and offensive effect. So he follows that carefully and leads the discussion forward. In that way we have followed the quality of discussion from the beginning and we have discussed with the moderator what we could do better so the group discussion would be efficient. But luckily he has been like it since the beginning, people talk about their ideas in an interesting way and carefully follow the others ideas and join in when they have something to say." (Project manager)
How is the public venue for presenting the final ideas built up? What is its goal? |

				„When the final list of ideas for voting is turned out, then I will continue to talk with the authors individually. And tell them also about this even that is in October, you can also call it a discussion, because it has the same principle as in the thematic discussions where the authors present their project shortly and all the people in the crowd can ask questions. Evaluation and choices won't be made there, it's reason is to introduce the ideas etc. So the person that came to the event can go into the ideas better. (Project manager) „Was there also a discussion moderator? „We have used a moderator. We have tried to keep the discussion objective, not to let it diffuse around or to get stuck with one idea. All the ideas get equal attention. We would not bring none of the ideas out on its own, because we need to handle all them equally and by the same principles, so we try to follow that." (Project manager)
Legitimacy	Openness and transparency		How the rules about the processes of participatory budgeting were made, who were included to the making of these rules, how were the rules articulated by the organisers to the participants.	In your opinion, did the Tartu PB process involve enough citizens and interest groups? Was the whole process open and transparent? What do you think of the vote turnouts? Please describe. „Clearly it would be great if the turnout would be higher, for example 50% of the citizens. But it seems now to be in proportion. Since they allocated under 1% then it is a surprise that 3% voted. In the end it depends on what kind of ideas are on the table and who leads them. When you have bigger institutions out with ideas that connects more people then there will be more people voting. Also the amount of allocated money would be bigger. But I think 3000 people is a good result for Tartu. To a certain extent, the identity authentication on voting is annoying, but you can't do it without it. It's good if there are really ideas that would develop Tartu, then its good if the ones who really think about the ideas are mainly voting. But to get a lot of votes when people are not really thinking about them, I am not sure how much it will help along with the results quality or the peoples contentment with the end result. In some sense it's good that we go step-by-step and in small quantity. It is controversial, when in the end random people are being included, who are not thinking through their choices, it's two-headed. But the idea of participatory budgeting in principal is not, especially as the amount is so small, to have very big number of citizens voting." (A1) „It's hard for me to answer about transparency and openness since I am not neutral in this. I have done many project in co-operation in the recent 6-7 years. In my opinion Tartu City has always been very open and transparent. Mostly, when there are some participation activities, they have worked hard and provided funding for it. Mostly, it seems the city is open for ideas, but the people are not willing to have their further say. Or it does not accost them or they are not interested. With third sector organizations (NGO-s) it has always been that the city is open for them but it is hard to get the NGO-s together. In a word it seems to me that the city administration is open, but then again I have never submitted any ideas there (to participatory budgeting) or I have not had interest to see how the finances flows afterwards. To me, as much as I have seen, all seems okay, and I have no reason to doubt that. It's being run reasonably." (P1) „Eventually the city budget is being formed by the City Government and the approval/ratification by the City Council through voting. Everyone can participate there, it is being communicated out enough, everyone knows when it happens. And now when the council decides to do this kind of consultation round about a part of budget then usually there would be around 20 people participating, but now there is 3000 people and many institutions, so I think the legitimacy only raises by it. That it is not perfect immediately, when looking at the participatory budget, then still it's not the same how it was allocated before. Before it happened it took place at the Council and that's all. It was much more invisible and hidden before, for example, if the music school Eller got funding for repairs, it would be harder to know how much and how." (P1) „As much as I have followed the information flow, for example what comes through press notice. If you are interested, then you are always invited to the city- and information days, that there is such a project happening, come and see. I dare to believe that you are being offered the possibility, but you need to be interested yourself, it won't be handed to you on a platter to your home." (P2)

				„I don't remember there to have been a thorough discussion, they just announced the result. The end result was easy, people voted and the ideas with most votes won." (P3)

„I don't remember there to have been a thorough discussion, they just announced the result. The end result was easy, people voted and the ideas with most votes won." (P3)

„Open and transparent I think yes, the information I always had. Also about the process, what days what happens and by what time I have to cast my votes. From my side the information was sufficient. There could have been more voters and the financial percentage could of also been bigger. Maybe you could get more people if you would highlight more the importance of the cause (participatory budget imitative). I don't know from what angle but they could see what group had the highest turn up. They probably have that data; they could analyse it. To weigh on the group who is not turning up to vote, then how to get closer to them and how to get to that group most effectively." (P5)

„I didn't ask for extra information about anything, I didn't in principle look who got how many votes, but I checked out what got the funding. All this just passed by me, I wasn't interested." (P6)

„Yes I think so. It was a hot topic."
What do you think about the voter turnout?
„I don't remember, can't say"
 ((I answer 3771 voters))
„Yes, of course, the number seems small" (A7)

"I believe so, because we didn't have anything to complain about. Later for our internal analysis we asked for the number of votes by the day and form (votes casted personally and electronically)" (A1)

„In the beginning of the voting I got an e-mail saying there will be a public function to introduce the ideas to the citizens, all interested be there, none of us (him and the co-author) went there. I imagine it was nice if the people were interested, and if they were aware of that event, and about the possibility to hear about the idea, and to ask questions. Nice of the city to do it and the people who were there I am sure it was interesting and useful." (A2)

„I think it is pretty good by now. People are more familiar with it, it definitely helps. About the rules I don't know if, for example, some interest group wishes officially to change the rules and they address it accordingly via letter, I do not know if it will be proceeded and if the changes will be made, I don't know about that. In my opinion the rules are being made by the City Government, the rules have been changed about the possibility to submit ideas that are in event format. Things are not so rigid but how much it is wished/wanted that the citizens involve in it, I think they rather don't want it so much. And I don't believe the citizens themselves want to be involved in it so directly." (A3)

„What could be is having more activity in submitting ideas. And that this side would be extended, so the idea submitters would not always be the same and that there would be different groups who do it. Mostly they are some NGO-s and institutions, who can as well realise the ideas. An action/performance must be behind an idea, having just a good idea is not enough. Inevitably there needs to be some institution, at least for the bigger ideas and there could also be more discussion when we have all these good ideas. We need to discuss about them. What kind of urban space we want? It is wider question about the urban space, be it the transport, roads, monuments or attractions, it's our shared space. So the idea itself is very positive and thankworthy, that its being dealt with. And also that there are results, it's not only talk and written in some development plan. The goal is at least to realise the two things (winning ideas)." (A3)

Other thoughts?

			„It is like with referendums, if the City Government suggest that let's make a public vote and people will participate, which is by the way personal not impersonal. That is the process that makes it legitimate." (P3) How are the people selected to the technical team who give the first judgement to the ideas/project, whether they are feasible or not? „The previous group of experts, in there are more city administration people from the departments and we also have included people from the City Councils different parties. But during the thematic discussions we have tried to keep the balance, half from the city administration and other half independent outsiders, so the people would be more represented and their voice more present. In these two groups some of the experts overlap. People from the civil society are not presented there, only specialists. We don't assess the importance of the ideas there, only the technical side, that if the idea fits to the budget if it's doable within the given time limit. The idea has to be realised within the next year after being announced as winner. They look at the criteria and don't give evaluation on the content." (Project manager) Are they appointed every year again and who's task is it? „On principle, I assemble them and it depends much on the turned out ideas, if there is a lot on street renovation or bicycle road idea, I look for experts from that field." (Project manager)
Accountability			Reretrospectivity in how the participants and how they see the city administration accountable. If there were mechanism in place to assure accountability, such as feedback systems.	„I think at the first year I did want to let them know that the voting was a little uncomfortable, but I didn't have the motivation to let someone know about it, also because I heard that everyone was saying the same. I saw that this feedback was visible and clear so I didn't feel the need to do it myself. If I should have had to give it, I don't know where I would have given it. Probably to the person who deals with it. But if there was some kind of feedback mechanism, then I don't know about it." (P1) „At Tartu City's' homepage. I am sure there would have been the offer to give feedback, even more so since it's the participatory budgeting thing, I am sure there is such a place where they collect feedback. It's all built on it." (P2) „I don't remember, maybe there was a place to give feedback. If I would have wanted to give it, I think I am sure I would have found it." (P3) „I don't know if they offered this possibility but I think if I would have looked for it, I would have found it. It wasn't necessary so I dint pay my attention to it" (P5) „I would have written someone from the City Government. There were surely some contacts in the end, the officials name. To the general mail you can always write and call. In Tartu they answer e-mails, I haven't seen any problems there." (P6) „Surely, I would have found it if I wanted to. This kind of information would have been easily findable, right now, from the top of my head I can't say, but I am sure this possibility existed." (P7) „I'd say to the public relations department, that's the first guess. My co-author had e-mail exchange, so we could ask questions directly." (A1) "Yes, I would have surely found it, usually at the end of the articles people can give feedback, or straight turn to City Government. If I would have had the interest I would I found it." (A2)

| | | | | | „I think to Lilian, the Project manager. Maybe I even wrote to her. I have myself thought of it (the participatory budgeting) a lot, someone even wrote an article about it. I think it's possible to write, but how many do it, I don't know. But after how it goes, with using the funds, about that could be more information, could be more outreach on that." (A3)

Where the city's authorities or politicians present at the discussions? What was their role?
 "They were not at the thematic discussions. At the last event the higher staff was there. At the first one (thematic discussion) not, I might be wrong. At the last event all citizens could ask questions. I for example, had one question. At the thematic discussion there were few citizens, but less. It was quite a niche thing, there were people from concrete groups." (A1)

"There thematic discussion was more on their own, between the people there and the City Government members. Yes, also the vice-mayor. The listened, didn't take a word. There were not so many regular people there, it still is a public event." (A3)

„Feedback can be given in many ways, call or write, my contacts are everywhere. We have not specially called people out to collect feedback. People are so active; they are doing it anyways. Taking account of the suggestions, it depends on the suggestion. Last year we had many letters about the vote end time, this we will definitely discuss but I don't know what the decision will be. Maybe we will prolong the voting time this year (2016), because we got feedback on that, maybe we will add couple of days, perhaps we'll get more people to vote. In this respect we definitely listen and read the feedback, and then make a decision." (Project manager)

What mechanisms supported the learning processes?
„Through the personal experience, because we communicate with them all the time, who submitted their idea, we give them feedback, if their idea got forward and if it didn't, we say why. Very often it didn't simply fit into the budget, and then we explain, that with this amount of money it can't be done, that it's not realistic. And then when the idea passed, very often it needs to be changed, to specify that, with this money we can do this much, not the whole idea. All that teaches, the communication and giving feedback and the information." (Project manager)

How would you say it is true that the voters' decisions are binding for the authorities?
„I assume, it is not exactly obligatory and that the Council can overrule the decision, if they really don't like it. There is probably some mechanism for it. I assume it has not been done before (the overruling). I assume everyone tries to do the right thing with this money and what was promised. But if it won't work out in the end, it wouldn't be so surprising to me." (P1)

 „I think, for me it more like this, that I walk on the street and see these actions, if we stumble on them (The projects carry a sign of participatory budgeting in Tartu logo). It hasn't come to my mailbox, saying that this thing is done, haven't noticed. There could be a press notice when some project is finalized." (P2)

„Over the previous year project I know about, they are seen on the streets, and they also have the sign/logo, it can be seen that the projects are done." (P3)

„I do not know exactly, maybe yes maybe no." (P5)

"Haven't followed it at all." (P6) |

			„Ausalt öeldes ei ole niimoodi silma peal hoidnud. Ei ole kuskilt nagu märganud, et mis edasi sai." (P7) "Honestly, I haven't keep my eye on like this. Like I haven't noticed, what happened next." (P7) Good question, so far it has been binding. Purely legally, maybe you know better. I have a legitimate expectation that it is binding." (A1) „Actually I don't know, (talking about the last year winner 'Arena sketch') since they got the money to develop the idea not to construct it, haven't heard more about it. A little overview would be good, to know who got the funds, how far is the project and if they actually got the money. Good question, I haven't looked into it and I don't remember to have seen it written somewhere." (A2) "I think the things have been done, meaning they are binding. With some things I know that they have been done, but about the last things I don't know. But of course are the decisions binding, City Government has a budget line specially for that, it will be spent, as targeted." (A3) „The Council has decided that the ideas that have the most votes will go to the budget. Legally it is being confirmed, that when in October the voting has ended, the 2 ideas have been revealed, then they will be added to the next year's budget on their own line. The budget it confirmed at the end of the year. In that sense we run a schedule. No-one is trying to game it out, the previous Council decision is binding, people decides." (Project manager)
Empowerment		The influence on the participants in participating in PB process. How they can articulate it.	Can you tell me if you are more interested of the politics of the Tartu's local governance having participated in the Tartu PB 2015 initiative? Please describe. "Yes, but not remarkably. But I cannot say that I haven't. Inevitably, it has been going on couple years now and in many years I have been forced to think about the city governance and the budget. Again, a question is wouldn't have I not otherwise? But a little for sure, can't say that not at all." (P1) „I think yes. I definitely participate with my husband and thanks to that, the participatory budgeting, I see the city differently. See here is the pavement edge that was made lower to make the crossing easier, and there is the participatory budgeting logo. My eyes are wider open, maybe if I haven't participated I wouldn't have noticed it and passed it right by. I pay more attention as a citizen." (P2) „Actually, I used to live some time in Tallinn, and I participated meanwhile I was living in Tallinn, but now I am back in Tartu. In this year I haven't paid a lot of attention to it." But did you interest rise? „Yes, that definitely." (P3) „I am more interested in formation of the city budget, because I know how hard it is and how much it is politically affected. I see so many organisations and fields that are deeply underfunded and the money goes to what gets more media attention or populism. That is however not connected to the interview." (P5) „No, if there were not my acquaintances who participated with a project, this would have just passed by me." (P6) "I can follow it, but there are other things in life. I moved away from there, and I don't delve into it, I will definitely though vote in the future. I don't know whether I keep my eye more on the city governments actions. As much as there are thing going through the news, I would see that." (P7)

„Personally yes, I feel how I pay more attention to the city related news, what concerns constructions, for example. On the other hand, the City and the political mechanisms can be a very contradictory unity, if it is connected with a lot of money. I have mixed feelings. On one side they give us the funds, we work on the field, and at the same time some big decisions are being made over our heads. Socially active people are always interested and busy. The formation of a budget, to follow it in detail, I don't have that kind of time. On that part I don't pay more attention. And the understanding about it has also not bettered. I knew what were the funds we were working with, I acknowledged that the amount allocated is actually tiny from all the investment budget." (A1)

"In that sense surely a little. Since I had to move away during the voting, then after that I wasn't that interested. And now I live in a new crazy city with a lot to do. If I would have stayed in Tartu I would be more interested for sure." (A2)

"I am always interested. I can't say that it changed my interest." (A3)

What kind of influence had the Tartu PB 2015 process on you? Was is empowering? If yes, please explain how. If not, please explain why?

It didn't empower me, I can't say. This whole process, however, has been positive to me, I see how in public sector things can be done, quite fast. And that is possible to have a public sector activity that is reasonable and also the people perceive as reasonable. Well, most reasonable people sense it as reasonable. I have doubted that could any public sector be received in a positive way or not. And if any good idea can be done. These two things it proved, in principle, it is possible to do in a way that people don't directly hate it and maybe some even like it. Maybe it's about the thing when money is being allocated because then it is always good, maybe because of that, even so." (P1)

„About power I can't say. I think I am glad to be involved, and that the citizens can pitch ideas. So, let's call it a power. We can perform our power through that. It is our small power through the participatory budgeting." (P2)

„Its more about the possibility for people have a say, about this town, that for sure. The City Government came closer to the citizens." (P3)

„I had no emotions. I helped a person I know. I did the process and didn't really think of it." (P4)

„As much as it has had influence on me, it has been positive. I'm personally not influenced by the participation part but more about the diversity of ideas. It has always interested me on what kind of projects people will come up with. The voting goes along with it, and out of responsibility I do it. Personally, reading about the idea, that afterwards, indeed, I will forget. But still at that moment it is interesting to see." (P5)

„I can't say, it could be a feeling that I have a power and my vote counts. When you vote and your ideas gets the funding, then it would be even better feeling." (P6)

„Great initiative and possibility for citizens to voice their ideas and find funding for them. I don't know if it influenced me personally." (P7)

„Yes, right after the campaign euphoria, couple of days later I contacted Vabakund (electoral alliance). I felt like when you are active then it's possible to achieve something. So that I should channel that someplace, where you can have like-minded people. Where the common sense prevails not the covetousness. Instantly there was activation that unfortunately faded a little, because they didn't see the opportunity and didn't engage me immediately. To stick to the questions then yes, I don't know how it was with others who got less votes." (A1)

				What made you feel like this?

What made you feel like this?

„Before anything else it was the work I did on the field (engaging with voters and doing outreach). I have followed the news since the beginning of this century when I was 18-19 years old, since then I have been interested and now for the first time I could actively be part of something. And also what I have followed previously I felt I need to join some group. The whole thing, the result and the process, effected some of my previous thoughts that maybe I should crystallize them." (A1)

„I saw that we had so many active citizens in the city who are interested in the city's work and governance and who give so much of them to make the life here better. I was surprised in the freshness of the ideas, what things people found to be needing fixing, that the ideas were actually good and it is sad we can't realise all of the ideas. In that sense it's great that we have so many citizens who try to make the city environment better." (A2)

„Yes, in that sense definitely. I like their idea to engage people in such competitive way. I remember last year won this very interesting idea about making the pavement edges lower. It won because it was such a simple and genius idea. Came from an honest citizen, who saw a problem, and what can a tiny nut do in a big machine work. It better the lives of many people in Tartu. It was a great initiative and I hope it will carry on. But yes, the one with most friends will win, that is questionable. Maybe there should be the evaluation of the experts/judges there, but that's going into too detail. If it was up to me; I don't like the campaign part so much, don't like to promote myself or my ideas like this." (A2)

„It had good influence on me. It wasn't something I had to work too hard and I wanted to do this project anyhow, it is not up to the university administration to decide if they will pick this idea up. Still rather positive, it wasn't too special to me though also. I anyhow write some applications all the time." (A3)

Something to add to your thoughts?
„I think Tartu was the first one to pick up the participatory budgeting (in Estonia). It's a quite good feeling." (P2)

„What I have learned and what I see in my acquaintanceship, maybe in general in the commission, I see that participation is in a growing trend. And the best thing not so much what project wind but that there are so many interesting ideas that can later get funding separately from somewhere else. It is an interesting and important point. Maybe the participatory budget in initiative to someone to develop the idea and later the idea will be realised. Maybe in the beginning it won get the funding, but later some private investor or the city will pick it up. This is the interesting part in my opinion." (P5)

"I do not remember when it started, but probably years no and it has gotten positive feedback, that the projects have come to life and that is encouraging. The topic is always present here, in Tartu, and in media." (P5)

„The voting passed and I didn't have such a big interest in it. But still, it is a good possibility to change something in your hometown, like the district communities do. People have become so active, there are district days (festivals), that shows that people care more. And there will be more people who might be interested in voting. Last week I joined some Tähtvere (district in Tartu) community Facebook page, seems like quite many people are active and get together and do stuff. I could communicate more with my neighbours, create a sense of community, because good association with community creates a sense of security. It is anyhow a quiet place. I don't remember what ideas we had there, but active people will always find activities what to do or better." (P6)

What role did the civil society play along the process? Which organisations were contributing to the process and what role did they play?

				"Only the e-Government Academy, but they were included as experts. In this way I can't answer this. We led the project and didn't get support directly. It was rather a moral support, pat on the shoulder saying, well done, good that you are doing this, or they help or offer some possibilities. For example, in city libraries we have been able to put our bookmarks between the books in the library with the information about the ideas and call out for voting. Two years we have done it, they offered it themselves. Don't know how much it has risen the number of voters, maybe it will reach more people. But I don't know how else to answer this question." (Project manager)

"At the first year 2013, there were no civil societies representatives, we went through with the pilot year and after that we had many discussions and then we did listen to what the opinions of the civil society were and we did the changes. (Project manager)

Has there been a perception that citizens are now more interested in politics and/or public issues?
„I don't know, it can be very indirect, there has been no research on it. But the voters number already speaks for it, that people have found out about it, and maybe some other thoughts will spring up from this process. I have noticed that people are more aware. But has it risen the interest in general, I don't know. For some people it might be a first contact with making a decision concerning the City. I am sure that is has a very positive influence, but I don't know how to measure it." (Project manager)