Supplementary Material

SM .1 Coding of Open-Ended Responses

This section describes the process used to code responses to an open-ended question that asked: "If you were given $1 million to improve public spaces in your community (such as streets and sidewalks, street lighting, parks), what would you spend it on?" Responses ranged in length from 0 words (11 cases in our sample), to 131 words, with a median of 6 words (average = 9.7 words).

The coding scheme was created inductively. We began with one coder drafting an initial coding scheme based on a review of 50 randomly selected responses. Two additional coders reviewed an additional 100 responses each. The team of three coders consulted with one another to discuss the coding scheme and make minor refinements (e.g., a general "infrastructure" category was added to capture respondents who either referred to unspecified "infrastructure" improvements or who referred to specific, but infrequently mentioned infrastructure—most often improvements to sewers/flooding mitigation, public transportation improvements, or expansion of parking options). A "miscellaneous" category was also added to capture references to hospitals, poverty alleviation efforts, and a variety of rarely-mentioned projects.

Note that, although some respondents offered simple responses such as "streets," many mentioned more than one project. For example, one respondent listed "schools library and parks." We coded this response as referring to two codes: education and parks/recreation. In short, a respondent could be flagged as mentioning multiple categories.

Having settled on the coding scheme, each coder was assigned a random selection of 250 responses to code. After a final round of discussion to confirm that no additional changes to the coding scheme were needed, the remaining responses were each coded by one coder. The final coding scheme included fifteen substantive categories, as well as a category for unusable responses that were nonsensical, referred to allocating the money to personal expenses (e.g., "buy a new house") or too vague to be meaningful (e.g., "help the community"). We list the fill set of 15 substantive categories below, providing examples of responses flagged with each code in parentheses (note that some responses we use as examples here were flagged for multiple categories):

1. Sidewalks: references to sidewalk repair / improvements ("clean up parks and fix any cracks in the sidewalks"; "sidewalks and streets")

2. Streets: references to street repair/improvements ("fixing the streets, some holes on the streets can really damage a car tire"; "fix up streets "; "fixing up streets and alleys and better lighting")

3. Alleys: references to alley repair/improvements ("paving alleyways"; "fixing up streets and alleys and better lighting")

4. Traffic safety: references to changes to traffic lights, addition of stop signs, safer crosswalks ("improve the traffic lights"; "more police presence for speeding")

5. Lighting: references to improved street lighting; if a specific location other than streets was mentioned—e.g., lighting in parks—that category was flagged as well ("street lighting so people can see at night"; "park making it safe for kids and more lights")

6. Parks / Recreation: references to splash pads, playgrounds, exercise equipment ("roads parks and schools"; "parks for the kids, and families to spend time outdoors in their community")

7. Beautification: improvement of vacant lots, planting trees and gardens ("I would enhance the landscapes"; "community fresh gardens")

8. Clean-up: general mentions of need to clean up litter, animal waste, dealing with rats ("the cleaning of trash on roadways"; "litter cleanup"; "more green spaces, more cleanup efforts around the train stops")

9. Housing: references to the need for improved access to housing; often referencing homelessness ("streets, parks, housing"; "new houses in my hood"; "house homeless")

10. Public safety: policing, crime abatement, installation of cameras ("freeing the neighborhood of drugs and guns"; police protection"; "more surveillance cameras in the streets")

11. Education / Youth: references to school improvements, after-school programs, libraries, youth centers ("I would spend it in fixing streets and providing more money to schools"; "I would spend it on building school")

12. Arts: specific mention of art projects ("parks and public art"; "encouragement of live theater")

13. Business: references to the need to stimulate business investment / aid for local businesses ("more retail space"; "getting businesses to occupy the vacant buildings in town"; "I would revitalize the downtown main area and the community center.")

14. Infrastructure: references to infrastructure improvement not captured by above categories including sewage/drainage, bike lanes and other transit ("streets and sewerage"; "improve bridges"; "bike lanes")

15. Miscellaneous: references to hospitals, poverty alleviation efforts, other rarely-mentioned projects ("I give charity to the poor"; "social services"; "senior services"; "more mental health institutions"; "I help people with disabilities")

Once all responses had been formally coded by one coder, each coder was assigned to independently code a random selection of approximately half of the responses that had been coded by each of the other two coders. Thus, all responses were independently coded by two coders.

Inter-coder reliability was high, ranging from 91.7 to 99.8 percent across the sixteen possible coding flags. In instances where there was a discrepancy, the third coder—who had not yet coded the response in question—served as the arbiter to reconcile the coding difference.[20] In cases where the coder assigned to resolve a discrepancy was unsure, they flagged the response and the three coders discussed how to best code the response.

As a final step, we collapsed a number of the initial coding categories. We combined streets (flagged in 34.5 percent of responses) with two lower frequency categories that also pertained to

---

[20]In some cases, resolving these discrepancies was straightforward—e.g., one coder had simply missed a mention of sidewalk repair in a lengthy response. In others, the discrepancy was tied to ambiguities regarding the lines between similar categories. For example, although coders agreed that "refurbishing shopping centers and building centers of commerce" should be flagged as "business," there was disagreement regarding whether it also referred to "beautification." Similarly, some responses were ambiguous, e.g., it is not clear whether "safety of the streets" refers to fixing dangerous potholes or improving public safety.

traffic-related issues: alleys (flagged for only 1.5 percent of responses) and traffic safety (3.8 percent of responses). We also combined four coding categories that referred to efforts to revitalize the community via art projects (0.5 percent of responses), cleanup efforts (5.1 percent), beautification (5.9 percent), or stimulating business investment (2.3 percent).

SM .2 Question Wording

Participatory Budgeting Questions

The following text prefaced the questions measuring interest in participatory budgeting (bold in original):

> **Participatory Budgeting** is a four-step process that invites residentsrather than government officialsto decide how to use public money to improve public spaces in their communities (e.g., street and sidewalk repair, additional street lighting, park improvements).

> Step 1: residents **submit ideas** for projects they believe would benefit their community.

> Step 2: residents can **join planning committees** that meet every week or two to determine which ideas could work, how much they would cost, and other details. During this process, residents may work with the local elected officials office, participatory budgeting representatives, or city officials.

> Step 3: residents present the proposals from each committee to a **town hall meeting** for further debate.

> Step 4: residents **vote on which projects to fund**.

Respondents rated their level of interest in participating in each stage of the process on a four point scale: not at all (1), a little (2), somewhat (3), very (4). Labels for each stage were: Submitting project ideas; Participating on a planning committee; Attending a town hall meeting; Voting on which projects to fund.

SM .2.1 Other Questions

Response options listed in parentheses in order.

- *Gender.* Finally, for statistical purposes, we would like to ask you some demographic questions. First, what is your gender? (Woman; Man; Trans woman/Trans female; Trans man/Trans male; Gender nonbinary; Something not listed [please specify])

- *Age.* In what year were you born? (pull-down ranging from 1919 to 2004)

- *Education.* What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Less than a high school diploma; High school diploma or equivalent (GED); Some college with no degree; Associate degree; Bachelor's degree; Graduate or professional degree)

- *Income.* Thinking back over the last year, what was your family's annual income? (Less than $10,000; $10,000 - $19,999; $20,000 -$29,999; $30,000 - $39,999; $40,000 - $49,999; $50,000 - $59,999; $60,000 - $69,999; $70,000 - $79,999; $80,000 - $99,999; $100,000 - $119,999; $120,000 - $149,999; $150,000 - $199,999; $200,000 - $249,999; $250,000 - $349,999; $350,000 - $499,999; $500,000 or more; Prefer not to say)

- *Ethnicity/Race.* What is your race or ethnicity? Please select all that apply. (Hispanic/Latino/Latina/Latinx/Latine; Black or African American; American Indian or Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; Asian; Middle Eastern or North African; White; Something not listed [please specify])

- *Rating of Neighborhood.* How would you rate the quality of each of the following parts of your neighborhood? (Poor; Fair; Good; Very good; Excellent): Streets, alleys, and sidewalks; Green spaces (for example parks, trees, gardens, parkways); Overall cleanliness.

- *Trust in Neighbors.* Please answer the following questions about your neighbors. A) How much do you trust them? B) How much can you rely on them for support? (not at all; a little; somewhat; a lot)

- *Inclination to Vote for Candidate Who Promises PB.* Would you be more or less likely to vote for a candidate for local office if they supported providing the public with opportunities to engage in participatory budgeting? (Much less likely; Somewhat less likely; Would not affect my vote choice; Somewhat more likely; Much more likely)

SM .3   Additional Analysis

- Table SM.1 reports descriptive statistics for respondents in our sample.

- Table SM.2 reports models analogous to those reported in Table 2, specifying indicators for reported participation in other political acts as outcomes.

- Table SM.3 reports regressions analogous to those reported in Table 3, specifying responses to a question that asked "Would you be more or less likely to vote for a candidate for local office if they supported providing the public with opportunities to engage in participatory budgeting?" as the outcome. That outcome was measured on a five point scale ranging from "much less likely" to "much more likely."

- Table SM.4 reports patterns tied to open-ended responses (analogous to those reported in Table 5, broken down by whether the respondent indicated they had heard of participatory budgeting prior to the survey.

Table SM.1: Summary Statistics

	(1) Full Sample
Educational attainment (1-6)	3.99
Family Income (1-16; prefer not to say = mean)	7.27
Income refusal	0.046
Age in Years	46.6
Man (1=yes)	0.41
Other Gender (1=yes)	0.013
Eth/Race: Black	0.22
Eth/Race: Latine	0.16
Eth/Race: Asian	0.053
Eth/Race: Other	0.014
Eth/Race: More than One	0.059
Trust in Neighbors (1-4)	2.80
Voted (1=yes)	0.87
participated in protest march rally demonstration	0.22
signed petition	0.35
posted on social media	0.32
contacted local official	0.25
heard of pb	0.26
Submit Idea	2.58
Committee	2.43
Town Hall	2.60
Vote	3.05
Chicago (1=yes)	0.54
Neighborhood Cleanliness (1-5)	3.30
Neighborhood Streets (1-5)	3.30
Neighborhood Green Space (1-5)	3.07
Observations	1446

Cell entries are means.

Table SM.2: Predicting Non-PB Reported Participation

	(1) Voted	(2) Protested	(3) Signed Pet.	(4) Social Media	(5) Contact	(6) Meeting
Educational attainment (1-6)	0.007	-0.005	0.023*	0.011	0.006	0.006
	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.008)
Family Income (1-16; prefer	0.011**	0.027**	0.015**	0.020**	0.022**	0.029**
not to say = mean)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)
Income refusal	0.003	-0.121**	-0.091	-0.050	-0.022	-0.091*
	(0.037)	(0.034)	(0.054)	(0.053)	(0.054)	(0.043)
Eth/Race: Latine	0.044	0.214**	0.238**	0.097*	0.066	0.149**
	(0.029)	(0.035)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.037)	(0.036)
Eth/Race: Black	0.037	0.068*	0.142**	0.070*	0.032	0.074*
	(0.026)	(0.028)	(0.036)	(0.033)	(0.032)	(0.031)
Eth/Race: Asian	0.001	-0.100**	-0.061	-0.084	-0.113*	-0.068
	(0.045)	(0.037)	(0.054)	(0.051)	(0.045)	(0.049)
Eth/Race: Other	0.131	0.048	0.098	0.071	0.166	0.108
	(0.074)	(0.098)	(0.110)	(0.111)	(0.107)	(0.115)
Eth/Race: More than One	0.027	-0.038	0.101	0.106	0.054	-0.025
	(0.042)	(0.039)	(0.055)	(0.057)	(0.052)	(0.047)
Age in Years	0.005**	-0.006**	-0.004**	-0.008**	-0.001	-0.006**
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Man (1=yes)	0.021	0.050*	0.040	0.045	0.024	0.023
	(0.018)	(0.020)	(0.025)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.022)
Other Gender (1=yes)	-0.064	0.374**	0.399**	0.144	0.254*	0.105
	(0.117)	(0.118)	(0.100)	(0.123)	(0.117)	(0.106)
Chicago (1=yes)	0.053**	0.124**	0.095**	0.062*	0.116**	0.089**
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.023)
Constant	0.483**	0.200**	0.197**	0.417**	0.031	0.214**
	(0.051)	(0.048)	(0.060)	(0.059)	(0.057)	(0.054)
Observations	1370	1446	1446	1446	1446	1446

Cell entries are unstandardized OLS coefficients; robust standard errors in parentheses; $*p < .05; **p < .01$.

Voted = In talking to people about elections, we often find that a lot of people were not able to vote because they weren't registered, they were sick, or they just didn't have time. Thinking back specifically to the last local election where you live (e.g., election for mayor or city council), which of the following statements best describes you? (I am not eligible to vote = 0; I did not vote = 0; I thought about voting this time, but didn't =0; I usually vote, but didn't this time = 0; I am sure I voted = 1).

Other outcome variables (no = 0; yes = 1): During the past 12 months, have you... joined in a protest march, rally, or demonstration about a local political issue; signed a petition on the Internet or on paper about a local political issue; posted information on social media about a local political issue; contacted or tried to contact a local political official; attended a public meeting on town or school affairs.

Table SM.3: Inclination to Vote for Candidate Who Promises PB

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Educational attainment (1-6)	0.020	0.013	0.013	0.006	0.016	0.006
	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.018)
Family Income (1-16; prefer	0.040**	0.034**	0.034**	0.036**	0.032**	0.031**
not to say = mean)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Income refusal	-0.373**	-0.362**	-0.364**	-0.343*	-0.351**	-0.326*
	(0.132)	(0.133)	(0.133)	(0.133)	(0.133)	(0.133)
Eth/Race: Latine	0.240**	0.219**	0.219**	0.019	0.221**	0.014
	(0.070)	(0.070)	(0.070)	(0.082)	(0.069)	(0.080)
Eth/Race: Black	0.200**	0.221**	0.233**	0.137	0.237**	0.154*
	(0.067)	(0.068)	(0.072)	(0.072)	(0.068)	(0.077)
Eth/Race: Asian	-0.166	-0.138	-0.138	-0.370**	-0.138	-0.356**
	(0.102)	(0.101)	(0.100)	(0.115)	(0.099)	(0.113)
Eth/Race: Other	-0.128	-0.126	-0.120		-0.120	
	(0.287)	(0.288)	(0.290)		(0.291)	
Eth/Race: More than One	0.048	0.068	0.071		0.072	
	(0.109)	(0.110)	(0.110)		(0.111)	
Age in Years	-0.007**	-0.007**	-0.007**	-0.008**	-0.008**	-0.008**
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)
Man (1=yes)	0.057	0.053	0.054	0.023	0.045	0.012
	(0.049)	(0.049)	(0.049)	(0.049)	(0.048)	(0.049)
Other Gender (1=yes)	0.280	0.285	0.285	0.205	0.295	0.209
	(0.188)	(0.182)	(0.183)	(0.214)	(0.184)	(0.213)
Chicago (1=yes)	0.129**	0.148**	0.158**	0.171**	0.137**	0.160**
	(0.049)	(0.049)	(0.054)	(0.050)	(0.048)	(0.055)
Rating of Neighborhood (1-5)		0.077**	0.075**	0.074**		0.033
		(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.027)		(0.030)
Poverty Rate (ZCTA)			-0.002			0.001
			(0.004)			(0.004)
Percent of ZIP code Coethnic				-0.004**		-0.004**
				(0.001)		(0.001)
Trust in Neighbors (1-4)					0.113**	0.111**
					(0.030)	(0.033)
Constant	3.914**	3.726**	3.752**	4.071**	3.684**	3.923**
	(0.123)	(0.138)	(0.153)	(0.169)	(0.132)	(0.185)
Observations	1446	1446	1446	1340	1446	1340

Cell entries are unstandardized OLS coefficients; robust standard errors in parentheses; $*p < .05; **p < .01$.

Table SM.4: Relationships between Prior Awareness of Participatory Budgeting and Open-Ended Responses

	Streets and Traffic	Parks / Recreation	Lighting	Sidewalks	Revitalization
Had not heard of PB	44.1%	29.5%	22.1%	20.4%	13.8%
Had heard of PB	23.2%	20.3%	15.0%	16.0%	10.5%
P-value from T-test	¡ .001	¡ .001	0.002	0.054	0.090

	Public Safety	Education / Youth Programs	Housing	Infrastructure	Miscellaneous
Had not heard of PB	9.2%	5.3%	4.2%	11.7%	6.5%
Had heard of PB	3.8%	3.8%	3.3%	6.2%	9.3%
P-value from T-test	¡ .001	0.230	0.430	0.002	0.064

Cell entries indicate the percentage of responses offered by people who reported having heard or not heard of participatory budgeting. P-values are from t-test comparing the equality of percentages across groups. Note: percentage differences appear to be partially explained by a tendency for those who reported having heard of participatory budgeting to entered significantly fewer overall words in their open-ended responses (average = 7.8 v. 10.5; $p < .001$) and, on average, were flagged as mentioning fewer types of expenditures (average = 1.45 v. 1.73; $p < .001$).