INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PUBLIC FINANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

NAWALA

Volume 1, Number 2, 2022

Advancing Public Accountability Through Fiscal Transparency and Open Budgeting

Hasna Maheswari[1*]

[1] Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

Article history:
Received: July 23, 2022
Revised: August 26, 2022
Accepted: October 02, 2022
Published: December 30, 2022

Keywords:
Accountability, Fiscal Transparency, Governance, Open Budgeting.

Identifier:
Nawala
Page: 76-88
https://nawala.io/index.php/ijpfa

This study examines how fiscal transparency and open budgeting contribute to advancing public accountability and improving governance outcomes. The central question addresses the extent to which making fiscal data accessible and fostering citizen participation can enhance trust, efficiency, and responsiveness in public financial management. Using a systematic literature review of peer-reviewed studies and institutional reports, the analysis synthesizes evidence on both the benefits and limitations of these reforms. The results indicate that transparency mechanisms promote greater civic engagement, better allocation of resources, and reduced opportunities for corruption, while open budgeting processes align fiscal priorities with societal needs. The discussion highlights that these outcomes depend heavily on institutional capacity, political will, and legal frameworks. The findings underscore that fiscal transparency and open budgeting, when effectively implemented, form a virtuous cycle of participation and trust, making them indispensable for sustainable governance reforms.

*Corresponding author:
(Hasna Maheswari)

1. Introduction

Advancing public accountability through fiscal transparency and open budgeting has become a focal point of governance reforms in both developed and developing contexts. Fiscal transparency, defined as the comprehensive, timely, and reliable public disclosure of budgetary information enables citizens, civil society, and oversight bodies to assess government performance and hold decision-makers accountable (de Renzio & Wehner, 2017). Open budgeting complements this by embedding participatory mechanisms into the budget cycle, allowing stakeholders to influence priorities and monitor outcomes. Together, these approaches aim to bridge the gap between citizens and state institutions, fostering trust and improving the efficiency and equity of public spending (Harrison & Sayogo, 2014).

Empirical evidence suggests that fiscal openness can lead to tangible improvements in governance quality and service delivery. Cross-country analyses indicate that higher levels of fiscal transparency are associated with stronger budget credibility, better fiscal discipline, and more prudent macroeconomic management (Montes & da Cunha Lima, 2018; ElBerry & Goeminne, 2021). At the subnational level, transparency initiatives such as publishing detailed budget reports and using open data platforms have been linked to enhanced legislative oversight and improved allocation of resources (Stanić, 2018). However, transparency by itself is not a guarantee of accountability. Comparative and experimental studies reveal that the availability of fiscal data does not automatically translate into greater public trust or increased citizen engagement unless accompanied by mechanisms that ensure accessibility, comprehensibility, and actionable feedback (Waddington et al., 2019).

Participation-focused reforms, especially participatory budgeting, have been widely studied as pathways for turning fiscal transparency into meaningful accountability. Research from Brazil, Russia, and multiple other contexts demonstrates that participatory budgeting can reorient public spending toward social priorities and, in some cases, improve health and welfare outcomes. These benefits, however, are contingent on enabling conditions such as political commitment, administrative capacity, and the integration of citizen input into formal decision-making processes (Beuermann & Amelina, 2018). Without these, participatory mechanisms risk becoming tokenistic exercises rather than tools for genuine empowerment.

The literature also emphasizes the importance of the quality and usability of fiscal information. As open government data studies have shown, information must be timely, machine-readable, and standardized to be effectively utilized by civil society and oversight bodies (Attard et al., 2015). Weaknesses in data presentation, absence of disaggregated figures, or delays in publication can diminish the potential impact of fiscal transparency initiatives, even in otherwise reform-minded contexts. Furthermore, variations in institutional arrangements, political incentives, and capacity levels across countries and regions create differing trajectories of reform adoption and effectiveness (de Renzio & Wehner, 2017).

This review synthesizes peer-reviewed empirical research published between 2013-2021 to assess the extent to which fiscal transparency and open budgeting have advanced public accountability. By systematically analyzing findings from multiple governance contexts, it identifies the institutional, political, and technical factors that mediate reform outcomes. The aim is to move beyond normative assumptions about the benefits of openness, providing an evidence-based understanding of when and how fiscal transparency and participatory budgeting deliver measurable accountability gains. Such a synthesis can inform policymakers and practitioners seeking to design more effective transparency and participation strategies that are adapted to their specific governance environments.

2. Literature Review

The academic discourse on fiscal transparency underscores its role as a cornerstone of modern public financial management. Early empirical work established a positive association between transparency and fiscal discipline, showing that greater disclosure reduces the scope for fiscal misreporting and off-budget activities (Alt et al., 2014). Building on this, de Renzio and Wehner (2017) synthesized cross-country evidence demonstrating that fiscal openness contributes to improved budget credibility, more efficient resource allocation, and enhanced oversight. However, they also cautioned that reforms are often unevenly implemented, with political incentives and institutional capacity influencing their depth and sustainability.

At the subnational level, research has revealed significant variations in transparency practices, even within countries with strong national frameworks. Stanić (2018) reviewed determinants of local budget transparency, highlighting the roles of administrative capacity, political competition, and external auditing institutions. These findings suggest that the design and enforcement of transparency measures must account for contextual factors to be effective. Studies examining the macroeconomic implications of transparency, such as Montes and da Cunha Lima (2018), further indicate that openness can stabilize inflation expectations and reduce fiscal volatility, illustrating broader economic benefits beyond governance outcomes.

Open budgeting initiatives expand the transparency agenda by incorporating participatory mechanisms into budget processes. Participatory budgeting (PB) has received extensive scholarly attention, with case studies and quantitative analyses from Brazil, Russia, and other contexts documenting improvements in public service delivery, shifts toward pro-poor spending, and gains in social outcomes (Gonçalves, 2014; Beuermann & Amelina, 2018; Wampler et al., 2021). Nonetheless, evidence also points to limitations: PB outcomes are contingent on political will, sustained funding, and the integration of citizen priorities into formal budget decisions. Without these enabling factors, PB risks functioning as a symbolic rather than substantive exercise (Beuermann & Amelina, 2018).

The literature also points to the critical role of data quality and usability. Attard et al. (2015) identified persistent shortcomings in open budget data, including delays, lack of machine-readability, and absence of standardized formats. These barriers can undermine the capacity of civil society actors, journalists, and oversight institutions to effectively analyze and use fiscal information. Furthermore, experimental studies such as Grimmelikhuijsen et al. (2013) reveal that transparency alone may not enhance public trust unless coupled with meaningful engagement opportunities and credible follow-up actions.

Overall, peer-reviewed research published between 2013-2021 paints a nuanced picture: fiscal transparency and open budgeting have demonstrated potential to strengthen accountability, but their impact is highly dependent on contextual variables, institutional quality, and the design of participatory and oversight mechanisms. This review situates the subsequent analysis within these established empirical patterns, highlighting both achievements and persistent gaps in the global transparency landscape.

3. Methods

This study employs a systematic literature review (SLR) to synthesize empirical research on fiscal transparency, open budgeting, and public accountability. The review followed recognized SLR protocols, ensuring a transparent and replicable process. Peer-reviewed journal articles published between 2013-2021 were identified through searches in Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. Search terms combined keywords such as "fiscal transparency", "open budgeting", "public accountability", "participatory budgeting", and "open government data".

Studies were included if they (1) were published in peer-reviewed journals, (2) provided empirical evidence—quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods—on fiscal transparency and/or open budgeting, and (3) examined implications for accountability, governance quality, or socio-economic outcomes. Excluded materials included conceptual papers, non-peer-reviewed reports, and studies lacking clear empirical data. Reference lists of selected papers were also screened for additional sources through backward citation searches.

Data from eligible studies were extracted on publication year, geographic scope, research design, analytical approach, and key findings. Thematic synthesis was used to group evidence into recurring categories, including institutional determinants of transparency, participatory mechanisms, macroeconomic effects, and data quality issues. Given the heterogeneity of research designs, no meta-analysis was conducted; instead, qualitative synthesis allowed for identifying patterns, contextual influences, and gaps. This approach ensures a focused, evidence-based assessment of how fiscal transparency and open budgeting contribute to public accountability.

4. Results and Discussion

The literature consistently demonstrates that fiscal transparency and open budgeting enhance public accountability by reducing opportunities for corruption and promoting informed citizen engagement. According to Grimmelikhuijsen et al. (2013), transparent fiscal practices strengthen trust in government institutions by providing clear and accessible information, which is crucial for democratic legitimacy. This accessibility not only helps citizens understand government performance but also enables civil society actors, the media, and opposition parties to scrutinize decisions more effectively. Harrison and Sayogo (2014) emphasize that open government frameworks combining transparency, participation, and accountability are more likely to generate sustainable governance outcomes, as they enable both top-down and bottom-up oversight mechanisms. In practice, this means that governments must not only disclose fiscal information but also create institutional spaces where citizens can contribute to and influence budget priorities.

The relationship between transparency and governance outcomes is also shaped by institutional capacity and political incentives. Alt et al. (2014) notes that even in advanced economies, weak oversight and political pressures can lead to fiscal gimmickry despite formal transparency mechanisms. This underscores that institutional design alone is insufficient without complementary accountability systems, such as independent audit bodies, legislative scrutiny, and robust media freedom. Montes and da Cunha Lima (2018) provide empirical evidence that fiscal openness reduces inflation and stabilizes inflation expectations, linking transparency directly to macroeconomic performance. By fostering predictability and credibility in fiscal policy, transparent budgeting can reassure markets and citizens alike, reducing uncertainty that can destabilize economic planning.

Participatory budgeting emerges as a key tool for operationalizing fiscal transparency. Gonçalves (2014) finds that it can significantly improve social outcomes, including reductions in infant mortality, by aligning spending priorities with citizen's needs. This alignment occurs because communities often have first-hand knowledge of service delivery gaps, allowing for more effective allocation of limited resources. Touchton and Wampler (2014) similarly argue that participatory institutions enhance social well-being, particularly when they are institutionalized and adequately resourced, which ensures continuity beyond political cycles. Beuermann and Amelina (2018) further show that such mechanisms can improve decentralized service delivery by strengthening local accountability and creating feedback loops between communities and government agencies. Over time, these feedback loops can help institutionalize trust between citizens and the state, which is critical for sustaining engagement.

At the global level, de Renzio and Wehner (2017) highlight that fiscal openness not only improves governance quality but also enhances resource allocation efficiency. This efficiency is achieved by ensuring that funds are directed toward priority sectors where they can have the greatest developmental impact. Stanić (2018) supports this view by reviewing empirical evidence that subnational fiscal transparency is influenced by both political competition and administrative capacity, indicating that local context plays a decisive role in shaping outcomes. For instance, municipalities with competitive elections and strong bureaucracies are more likely to embrace open budgeting practices. Attard et al. (2015) reinforce the importance of open data initiatives, noting that they improve both the timeliness and the accessibility of fiscal information, which in turn facilitates independent monitoring and media scrutiny. The speed at which accurate fiscal data becomes available can be decisive in preventing misuse of funds during budget execution.

However, achieving the full potential of fiscal transparency requires addressing barriers such as limited public awareness, data usability challenges, and political resistance. Montes and da Cunha Lima (2018) stress that transparency must be coupled with public communication strategies to ensure citizens can interpret and act upon fiscal information. Without such strategies, even technically sound budget documents may remain inaccessible to non-expert audiences. Likewise, Grimmelikhuijsen et al. (2013) caution that without active citizen engagement, transparency measures risk becoming symbolic rather than transformative.

Governments must therefore invest in building civic literacy around public finance, enabling citizens to meaningfully use fiscal data.

Overall, the evidence suggests that fiscal transparency and open budgeting have measurable impacts on governance quality, macroeconomic stability, and social well-being. Yet, these outcomes are contingent on institutional capacity, political will, and the degree of citizen participation. Strengthening both the supply side (government disclosure) and the demand side (citizen oversight) of transparency is therefore essential for maximizing accountability gains. Future reforms should integrate legal mandates for disclosure with practical tools for citizen engagement, such as budget portals, participatory councils, and mobile feedback systems. When transparency measures are embedded within a broader framework of accountability and civic participation, they are more likely to translate into meaningful democratic control and improved policy outcomes, fostering both trust in public institutions and resilience in governance systems.

5. Conclusion

This review highlights that fiscal transparency and open budgeting are powerful tools for enhancing public accountability and improving governance outcomes. Evidence from diverse contexts shows that these practices can strengthen citizen engagement, promote more efficient allocation of resources, and curb opportunities for corruption. By making fiscal information accessible and understandable, governments foster trust, enable informed public debate, and encourage more responsive policy-making. Participatory mechanisms, such as open budget consultations, further ensure that budgetary priorities reflect community needs, ultimately leading to improved service delivery and social outcomes.

However, the success of these reforms depends on more than just the availability of data. Institutional capacity, political commitment, and an enabling legal framework are critical to translating transparency into tangible improvements. In many cases, gaps in accessibility, limited technical literacy among citizens, and insufficient enforcement of transparency regulations reduce the potential benefits. Addressing these challenges requires an integrated approach, combining robust legal mandates, user-friendly information platforms, and active capacity-building initiatives for both government officials and the public.

Overall, fiscal transparency and open budgeting are not ends in themselves but essential means to achieving accountable governance and sustainable development. When supported by strong institutions, they create a virtuous cycle of trust, participation, and effective public financial management. Continued efforts to deepen openness, close implementation gaps, and ensure meaningful citizen participation will be key to realizing the full promise of these governance innovations.

References

Alt, J. E., Lassen, D. D., & Wehner, J. (2014). It isn't just about Greece: Domestic politics, transparency and fiscal gimmickry in Europe. British Journal of Political Science, 44(4), 707–716.

Attard, J., Orlandi, F., Scerri, S., & Auer, S. (2015). A systematic review of open government data initiatives. Government Information Quarterly, 32(4), 399–418.

Beuermann, D. W., & Amelina, M. (2018). Does participatory budgeting improve decentralized public service delivery? Experimental evidence from rural Russia. Economics of Governance, 19(4), 339–379.

de Renzio, P., & Wehner, J. (2017). The impacts of fiscal openness. The World Bank Research Observer, 32(2), 185–210.

ElBerry, N. A., & Goeminne, S. (2021). Fiscal transparency, fiscal forecasting and budget credibility in developing countries. Journal of forecasting, 40(1), 144-161.

Gonçalves, S. (2014). The effects of participatory budgeting on municipal expenditures and infant mortality in Brazil. World Development, 53, 94–110.

Grimmelikhuijsen, S. G., Porumbescu, G., Hong, B., & Im, T. (2013). The effect of transparency on trust in government: A cross-national comparative experiment. Public Administration Review, 73(4), 575–586.

Harrison, T. M., & Sayogo, D. S. (2014). Transparency, participation, and accountability practices in open government: A comparative study. Government Information Quarterly, 31(4), 513–525.

Montes, G. C., & da Cunha Lima, L. L. (2018). Effects of fiscal transparency on inflation and inflation expectations: Empirical evidence from developed and developing countries. The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance, 70, 26–37.

Stanić, B. (2018). Determinants of subnational budget/fiscal transparency: A review of empirical evidence. Public Sector Economics, 42(4), 449–486.

Touchton, M., & Wampler, B. (2014). Improving social well-being through new democratic institutions. Comparative Political Studies, 47(10), 1442–1469.

Waddington, H., Sonnenfeld, A., Finetti, J., Gaarder, M., John, D., & Stevenson, J. (2019). Citizen engagement in public services in low-and middle-income countries: A mixed-methods systematic review of participation, inclusion, transparency and accountability (PITA) initiatives. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 15(1-2), e1025.

Wampler, B., McNulty, S., McNulty, S. L., & Touchton, M. (2021). Participatory budgeting in global perspective. Oxford University Press.