THE CONTRIBUTION ASSOCIATIONS MAKE TO CITIZENSHIP

COMPARATIVE EVIDENCE FROM SÃO PAULO AND MEXICO CITY

Peter P. Houtzager, Fellow
Institute of Development Studies (IDS), University of Sussex
p.houtzager@ids.ac.uk

Arnab K. Acharya, Senior Lecturer
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM)
arnab.acharya@lshtm.ac.uk

23 April 2008

This paper is based on survey research conducted by the IDS-CEBRAP-LSE project "Rights, Representation, and the Poor: Comparing Large New Democracies – Brazil, Mexico, and Delhi." We appreciate the thoughtful comments of our collaborators on the project, Adrián Gurza Lavalle and John Harriss, and the research assistance of Graziela Castello and Georgina Blanco-Mancilla. We also wish to thank Andres Mejia Acosta, Anuradha Joshi, David K. Leonard, Eduardo Marques, Mick Moore, Sanjay Reddy, Nardia Simpson, Judith Tendler and Katie Young for comments that substantially improved this paper. Versions of this paper were presented at the Urban Institute in Washington DC, the University of São Paulo in Brazil, the 30th Annual Meeting of the *Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação e Pesquisa em Ciências Sociais* (ANPOCS) 2006, Brazil, the "Workshop on Poverty and Democracy" held at Duke University 2006, and at the workshop "Rights, Representation and the Poor" Rockefeller Foundation Bellagio Center, Italy (2005). We thank the participants of these events for their comments.

Abstract

The contribution associations, as local public spheres, make to active citizenship is widely assumed in the literatures on political participation and civic engagement but its empirical demonstration is surprisingly rare. The studies that do explore this contribution have primarily been conducted in affluent industrial democracies. This paper seeks to identify whether associations increases active citizenship in the different context of newer middle-income democracies. It uses new primary data from a survey conducted in the large urban centers of São Paulo and Mexico City. In many middle-income democracies, the legacies of authoritarian rule, political clientelism, and inequality continue to exercise a powerful influence on citizens' relations to government: even where elections are fair and competitive, large classes of people do not enjoy the type of direct citizenship relations to government consonant with the democratic ideal, and through which one can petition for access to basic public goods and services that are legal entitlements, appeal administrative decisions, and obtain public information. Many individuals instead have to rely on brokered, contentious, or in the extreme of state failure, detached relations to government (involving collective self-provisioning). This paper therefore examines whether associations increase the likelihood that individuals become active citizens and whether it enhances direct citizenship relations consonant with the democratic ideal. We find that, similar to what occurs in affluent industrial democracies, individuals with associational participation in both cities are considerably more likely to be active citizens. Associational participation does not, however, increase the likelihood that individuals have direct citizenship relations to government. There is no evidence that associations, as local public spheres, improve the quality of citizenship relations to government. We interpret this result as suggesting that associations help individuals overcome some obstacles to influencing government, but not what appear to be obstacles of a different type and/or magnitude involved in shifting from, for example, detached relations to direct citizenship relations.

Associations contribute to democratic citizenship, the literature suggests, in one of two basic ways. One, as collective actors, associations are believed to contribute at the political level to the construction of the legal status and substantive content of citizenship, and to the transformation of citizenship rights into effective public policy. Two, as a local public sphere, associations are said to transform individuals into *active citizens*, by helping them acquire civic skills and develop shared interests and/or identities. While there is considerable research on the historical contribution associations have made to the substantive content and legal status of citizenship, there is surprisingly little research on whether (and how) associations enhance the active citizenship of ordinary people. Most studies of active citizenship are part of the political participation or civic engagement literatures, and tend to assume rather than demonstrate the impact of associational participation on active citizens. These studies, mostly survey based, have overwhelmingly been conducted in affluent industrial democracies.

This paper seeks to identify what impact associations have on active citizenship in the very different context of newer middle-income democracies. It uses new primary data from a Citizen Survey conducted in the large urban centers of two important new democracies, São Paulo in Brazil and Mexico City (Federal District) in Mexico. The two countries are similar to many other new democracies in that the legacies of authoritarian rule, political clientelism, and gross social inequality continue to exercise a powerful influence on citizens relation's to government. Because of the substantial variation in sub-national political regimes in both countries, we selected the large urban centers of São Paulo and Mexico City as our analytic units: these cities have the characteristics believed to contribute to high-quality citizenship, including a vigorous associational spheres, relatively effective government, and competitive electoral politics. The comparison across the cities is enriched by the fact that (a) the cities have distinct political trajectories and, related, (b) the nature or quality of the citizens relations to government vary. The paper does not seek to explain the different patterns of citizenship relations in the two cities, but instead uses this variation in the dependent variable to show that, irrespective of the pattern of civil relations that prevails, the impact of associational life is broadly similar.

In the literatures on political participation and/or civic engagement active citizenship is defined as activity protected by political and civil rights that seeks to influence government behavior. Operational definitions in survey research, however, are often narrower, focusing particularly on

electoral participation, or broader and encompass any form of public or civic engagement. Our conception of active citizenship also focuses on citizens' relations to government, but along a different dimension of citizenship than electoral participation. In countries such as Brazil and Mexico, because voter turn-out is high, electoral participation is not a significant public issue and there is little variation to explain. In contrast, large classes of people in the two countries lack access to the public goods and services to which they are entitled by virtue of their citizenship, are denied the right to information and to review of administrative decisions by public officials, and on occasion face ill treatment, intimidation, or violence from these public officials (Méndez, O'Donnell, and Pinheiro 1999, O'Donnell 2005, Diamond and Morlino 2005). Hence our focus is the 'civil' dimension of active citizenship –citizens' relationship to the public bureaucracy that has a duty to ensure equal access to public goods and services, and must do so in ways consistent with the democratic rule of law. Active citizenship in this civil dimension consists of activities that seek to hold government accountable for meeting its 'duty to act,' by petitioning these in person, rather than by greater activism at the political level.

The paper examines two distinct components of this 'civil dimension' of individual's citizenship relation to government. One is whether individuals who participate in associational life are more likely to be active citizens, mobilizing to obtain access to public goods and services. The second dimension is the quality of the relations to government created by this activity. Longstanding political exclusion of particular populations, authoritarian political and social practices, and clientelist networks can combine in diverse ways in new democracies to produce a number of qualitatively distinct relations to government: (i) brokered relations through powerful third parties, (ii) contentious relations involving collective action such as public protest, or in the extreme, (iii) detached relations as citizens' collectively self-provision public goods and services they understand government ought to provide but has failed to or has done so poorly. The citizenship ideal, in contrast, is (iv) a direct relation in which individual citizens can, at little cost, approach government through institutionalized channels, to seek information or redress, to petition for access to or improvements in basic public goods and services. This paper therefore explores to what degree citizens who participate in associational life are more likely to have the democratic ideal of direct relations to government, rather than brokered, contentious, or detached relations. We also examine whether the associational impact on these components of active citizenship is greater for the bottom social strata, defined by class and gender.

Participation in associational life is believed to contribute to active citizenship because the consequent face-to-face interaction with others teaches individuals basic democratic values and skills, provides access to important information, and fosters collective interests or identities. Survey research nonetheless often uses 'formal membership' to measure the presence of this delicate relationship. This sacrifices information about the causal factors believed to operate. We therefore understand 'participation' to mean regular or ongoing involvement in associations' activities. This definition captures both the key causal relation involved and provides a contextually sensitivity understanding: in Brazil, Mexico, and in many other new democracies, much or even most relations between individuals and associations does not involve formal membership. This is particularly true in the case of neighborhood and community associations, religious associations or groups, but can also hold for ethnic, leisure, or issue-based organizations.

Our analysis of the descriptive statistics and the multivariate models shows that associational participation increases active citizenship in both cities. And while this finding holds true across the different class and gender positions, it is those with lower class positions that experience the largest relative increases – that is, individuals with less years of education and, in São Paulo those outside of the labor force. Associational participation does *not*, however, alter the quality of individual's citizenship relation to government. People who participate in associational life are no more likely than the general population to have *direct* citizenship relations, and no less likely to have detached, contentious, or brokered relations. These two outcomes are found in both São Paulo and Mexico City, despite the cities different patterns of citizenship relations and the some differences in composition of associational life.

We interpret this result as suggesting that associations help individuals overcome some of the obstacles to influencing government, such as lack of information or knowledge, but not what appear to be obstacles of a different type and/or magnitude involved in shifting from, for example, detached relations to direct citizenship relations. The latter obstacles, we conjecture along the lines suggested by the comparative democratization literature, cannot be overcome by individual citizens in their relations to government, but rather requires action at the political level by actors who represent and aggregate large classes of people. It is action at this level that has historically produced substantial change in political institutions.

There are significant methodological challenges involved in exploring the impact of associations on active citizenship. Related work from the US shows that inferential models to identify associational effects are vulnerable to dual causality and that individuals who participate in associations may also have a greater proclivity to engage in public affairs independent of any associational participation. Our results are made to withstand these possibilities. The specifications are tested for endogeneity through the use of instrumental variables and for selection biases through the use of a more recent technique called propensity score matching.

The next section sets out the conceptual basis of the paper and its relation to the literatures on political participation and civic engagement and that on comparative democratization. In the following section we define key concepts and identify the indicators used to measure them. Appendix 1 provides a full list of the concepts, variables, and survey questions used to produce the variables. A short methods section then highlights the advantages of the comparative and sub-national research design and introduces the São Paulo – Mexico City comparison. This is followed by a descriptive portrait of the relationship between associational participation and active citizenship, and how this relationship varies across class and gender. The multivariate models that follow identify the causal importance of associational participation for active citizenship. In Appendix 2 we validate the models. We conclude by examining some of the implications of our findings for positive democratic theory.

I. Associations and the Citizenship Relations

The first hypothesis that this paper explores – that individuals with associational participation are more likely to be active citizens – is virtually an assumption in the literatures on political participation and civic engagement. Key studies argue that associations help overcome narrow individualism or apathy by socializing individuals into core civic values – i.e. deliberation, tolerance, trust, reciprocity, and working collectively towards common goals – and to provide the civic skills and resources necessary to pursue these values in the public sphere (Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995: 15-16, 528-9; Putnam 2000: 338-9; Rosenstone and Hansen 1993: 12-16). One of the valuable contributions of this body of work is the suggestion that individuals with lower socio-economic status – generally defined in terms of class (income/education and labor market insertion) and gender – face obstacles to the

exercise of citizenship that are socio-economic in nature. And in fact, one of the most consistent empirical regularities in survey research conducted in affluent democracies is that individuals who have less education and income, have more precarious labor market insertion, and/or are women, are less likely to be active citizens.

Empirically grounded research in this area, however, has generally treated membership in association as one of several forms of political participation or civic engagement, and therefore as something to be explained (Rosenstone and Hansen 1993, Putnam 2000, Dalton 2006). Remarkably few studies have sought to verify empirically the impact of associations on active citizenship. This is true in the case of the few studies that include newer democracies (Verba, Nie, and Kim 1978; Bratton 2006).

The important exception is the notable study conducted by Verba, Schlozman and Brady (1995). The sophisticated civic engagement model the authors' develop links the impact of associational participation to active citizenship through their role in surmounting behavioral and resource obstacles to citizenship activity. The model suggests that such activity requires the possession of a combination of time, money, and civic skills. These are acquired through family and school, the workplace, as well as in churches or in voluntary association. For individuals whose family, school, and/or workplace experiences were unfavorable to the acquisition of these resources, participation in churches or voluntary associations acts as an alternative path to acquiring civic skills. Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995) provide convincing evidence that associational participation helps individuals caught at the bottom end of the class and gender stratification 'catch-up' with their more privileged counterparts in the factors that support active citizenship.

The first goal of this paper, therefore, is to explore whether the causal relation between associational participation and active citizenship holds in newer, and less affluent, democracies as well. There is no reason to assume that the positive associational effect observed in affluent industrial democracies such as the U.S. will be present in these contexts. Substantial agreement exists in the comparative democratization literature that the political institutions in newer democracies Latin America, Africa, Asia, and the former Communist block differ in important ways from those in older affluent industrial democracies, as well as

amongst each other.[1] Scholars of comparative democratization, Collier and Levitsky (1997: 430) observe, have coined an ample array of adjectives to signal these differences even as they, or perhaps because they, converge on a procedural minimum definition of democracy that has three attributes: contested elections, full suffrage, and guarantees of civil liberties such as freedom of association, assembly, and speech.[2] Among the qualifiers of democracy in middle or low-income countries that Collier and Levitsky (1997) identify are terms such as "neopatrimonial," "low-intensity" or "delegative," "illiberal," "protected" or "tutelary," "oligarchic" or "elitist-pluralist."

The quality of citizenship relations to government becomes a matter of significant concern when political institutions are understood to seriously constrain the exercise of citizenship. The literatures on political participation and civic engagement have not entered the debate on the quality of citizenship, in part because most work focuses on affluent democracies where such constraints are less openly visible and in part because they are grounded in a view of democracy in which individuals are believed to be effective legal equals and to have unconstrained access to the polity.[3] In these literatures it is assumed that government will responds to interests, once voiced, in a relatively unproblematic manner. This in turn assumes a professional public bureaucracy (a state apparatus) that, through effective organizational hierarchies, is accountable and responsive to elected officials, and treats citizens respectfully and in an equal manner and in accordance to law. Irrespective of the extent to which these presuppositions hold in affluent democracies, there is good evidence to suggest they do so evenly in many newer and less affluent democracies.

In contrast to the literature on political participation or civic engagement, the recent round of scholarship on comparative democratization has focused on the quality of citizenship. This work emphasizes the problematic nature of one particular dimension of democracy: the rule of

[1] This large literature includes broad comparative historical studies of democratization (Tilly 2004, 2007), democratic transitions (Schmitter, O'Donnell, and Whitehead 1986, Karl 1999), democratic consolidation (Linz and Stepan 1996; Mainwaring and Scully 1995), measuring democracy (Munck and Verkuilen 2002; Bowman, Lehoucq, and Mahoney 2005), democratic citizenship (Yashar 1999; Dagnino 2007; Avritzer 2003, 2004; Tulchin and Ruthenberg 2007; Friedman and Hochstetler 2002), and the quality of democracy (Diamond and Morlino 2005; O'Donnell 1993 and 2005).

[2] Cf. O'Donnell and Schmitter 1986, Huntington 1991, and Przewoski 1999.

[3] On newer and less affluent democracies, see for example Durand Ponte (2004) on Mexico, Bratton (2006) on Africa, and Booth and Seligson (2006) on Latin America.

law. This work suggests that the component of citizenship that is most problematic or weakest is not the exercise of political rights (through electoral activity), but the exercise of civil rights when citizens establish relations with government to obtain access to public goods and services necessary to the enjoyment of many (non-political) rights constitutive of contemporary citizenship (Méndez, O'Donnell, and Pinheiro 1999, O'Donnell 2005, Diamond and Morlino 2005). As Guillermo O'Donnell (2005) and others observe, even in contexts where elections are fair and competitive, the accountability of public bureaucracies is often weak, access to public goods and services highly unequal, and state failure is not uncommon for particular classes of citizens. Public officials in many newer democracies regularly fail to treat citizens in a manner consistent with their legal status as rights carriers. The importance of individual's relations to officials in the public bureaucracy for the quality of citizenship is hard to overstate. As Lipsky (1980: 4) reminds us, the decisions and actions of these officials, or street-level bureaucrats, "…determine the eligibility [i.e. access] of citizens for government benefits and sanctions…[and] oversee the treatment (the service) citizens receive in those programs."

In Latin America, a number of qualitative studies have focused on violations of the rule of law by police, and on violence, corruption, and impunity from justice when citizens seek redress or take action to remedy these violations (Mendéz, O'Donnell, Pinheiro 1999, Davis 2006). Our focus is broader, in that active citizenship involves accessing public officials in government bureaucracy to appeal or seek public explanation of decisions, to obtain information, contest ill-treatment, or petition for access to or improvement in public services for which there is already exists a legal mandate and duty to act. [4]

Recent work on democratization by Tilly (2000, 2004, 2007), O'Donnell (1993, 2004, 2005), and O'Donnell and Schmitter (1986) provide a basis for linking the quality of citizenship

[4] The tremendous expansion of government, with the rise of the administrative state (or its bewilderingly complex incarnations such as the welfare or developmental state), has been accompanied by the creation of a wide array social, cultural, environmental and other rights, and many more lesser entitlements that represent new government obligations or 'duties to act.' These duties range from broad social rights that obligate government to provision healthcare or education, to lesser legal entitlements such as basic urban infrastructure: roads, sewerage and urban services such as garbage collection. There has been a proliferation of civil relations as the public bureaucracy charged with the duty to ensure these rights and entitlements has grown in size and in its impact on people's lives. There has been an accompanying expansion in civil and participatory rights that

relations to the democratic rule of law. O'Donnell and Schmitter (1986: 7) suggest that democratic citizenship involves "… the obligation of those implementing such choices to be equally accountable and accessible to all members of the polity." O'Donnell (2005) observes that this definition of the rule of law is closer to the continental notion of the *Rechtsstaat* and the *Le'Etat de Droit*, which entails a broader answerability of all legally constituted actors, than to the Anglo-Saxon notion of the rule of law, which emphasizes equality before the law and the guarantees of political rights or civil liberties to curtail arbitrary or abusive government action. O'Donnell (2005) has stressed that government under the democratic rule of law submits to electoral accountability and to governmental accountability, exercised by the judiciary and legislature. In contemporary democracies, we should add, it also submits to forms of societal accountability exercised by individual citizens or civil society actors through an array of new participatory governance institutions (Schedler, Diamond, and Plattner 1999, Smulovitz and Peruzzotti 2002; Mainwaring and Welna 2003).[5]

These newer forms of accountability are not only, or even primarily, to control the lawfulness of government's actions in regards to civil liberties, but particularly the lawfulness of 'unequal action' or inaction in meeting the duty to provide legal entitlements or the conditions or goods that allow citizens to fulfill the array of social or other rights (Smulovitz and Peruzzotti 2002, Isunza 2006, Mainwaring and Welna 2003). These rights include respecting individual's right of review of administrative decisions (Stewart 1975, Soares 1997), the right to information (Ansell and Gingrich 2003, Goetz and Jenkins 2005), as well as participatory rights of citizens and organizations representing groups affected by public policy (Chaudhuri and Heller 2002; Avritzer 2003; Santos 1998; Baiocchi 2005).

Quality of citizenship relations can therefore be defined in terms of the degree of access to government and equality citizens enjoy vis-à-vis public officials. We define four ideal typical citizenship relations for which meaningful empirical referents exist: *direct*, *brokered*, *contentious,* and *detached*. These and the other variables used in the paper's analysis are defined in the next section.

---

sanctions new forms of societal accountability of public bureaucracy (Stewart 1975, Cain, Dalton and Scarrow 2003, Ansell and Gingrich 2003, Govender 2003).

From Concepts to Variables

The move from abstract concepts such as citizenship relations to the empirical measures survey's produce involves a series of difficult analytic choices. Capturing such concepts empirically often involves a two-step process. The first is to identify particular dimensions or types of the concept, and then specific questions that can produce the information necessary to capture these dimensions or types. Here we make the case for the more important choices we have made. The full list of variables and survey questions is presented in Appendix 1.

In the case of the three central concepts – active citizenship, citizenship relations, and participation in associational life – we used a five year recall period. That is, a person who has signed a petition to, for example, demand police posts four years prior to the survey, is counted as an active citizen. There is an unsettled debate about the sources of measurement error in survey research, but some agreement that the reliability of interviewee's answers can vary according to the length of the recall period, the retrieval strategy (episodic enumeration versus estimation), and the nature of the information solicited (Bound, Brown, and Mathiowetz 2001: 3743-45; Mathiowetz 2000). For information that is particularly difficult to recall, for example frequently recurring and/or non-descript activities, a year recall period is often adopted. For information on activities that are less recurrent and more exceptional for the respondent, and therefore easier to remember, such as joining a protest against the lack of police presence in the neighborhood or organizing the community to establish a neighborhood watch, longer recall periods are justified.

Active citizenship

Our variable *active citizenship* is defined as any activity undertaken in the last five years to access or improve publicly provided goods or services to which individuals are legally entitled. Such activities include any attempt to hold public bureaucracy directly accountable for meeting legal obligations to provision public goods and services, but it also includes efforts to collectively self-provision such goods without any government involvement. It does *not* include private solutions, such as individual market-based or self-provisioning solutions.

[5] Legislatures across regions of the world have delegated authority to new institutional sites, situated alongside legislative bodies and the courts, for citizen exercise of societal accountability. In Brazil such councils are constitutionally mandated and include representatives of government, users, and providers.

Hence, attempting to increase one's personal security by purchasing a gun is not included, while participating in a neighborhood watch is included.[6]

Specifically, the Citizen Survey first asked respondents about their problem salience in a number of issue areas and whether they believed government had primary responsibility for addressing problems in these issue areas. It the asked respondents whether they had engaged in six different types of acts to solve problems in these or related areas. The acts were: (i) approaching government; (ii) bringing court cases; (iii) seeking the assistance of political parties; (iv) seeking the assistance of an influential person; (v) participating in a demonstration or other public act; (vi) organizing with others to self-provision a solution. A final, open, question (vii) asked respondents if there was any other activity which they had undertaken. This final question captured 'signing a petition' as a common act.[7]

Citizenship Relations

Different activities that citizens engage in when seeking access to public goods reflect distinct types of citizenship relations to government. The activities identified in the Citizen Survey serve as indicators for four basic categories of citizenship relations.

Direct relations are closest to the democratic ideal of citizenship. They suggest individuals enjoy both access to government through institutionalized channels and a degree of equality with public officials that ensures treatment consist with that under the democratic rule of law. The two indicators for *direct relations* are people who entered into contact government officials in person and those who used the court system to force some form of government action. Empirically, citizens overwhelmingly seek review of decisions made by public bureaucracies by approaching these in person, whether by visiting the relevant offices, making telephone calls, or sending correspondence. The number of instances in which judicial institutions were used is very small.

[6] In the latter case, the individual has entered the public realm to address a concern over public order, a constitutive component of citizenship and a precondition for the fulfillment of other rights.

[7] We do not claim that the citizens in both cities are reporting having acted to address the same problems, but rather the same *type* of problems in domains such as these. The overwhelming majority of activity in the two cities sought to address issues related to housing, primary urban services (such as drainage, garbage collection, or electricity), secondary urban services (such as public parks and leisure areas), public order, and to a lesser extent payment/collections of utility bills.

Brokered relations involve the intervention of a more powerful third-party to obtain access to public officials or obtain some form of government response. It represents an effort to overcome asymmetries in power, based in control over information or specialized knowledge, monopoly access of brokers (such as party cadre or local political bosses), or in other sources of economic or political power. Such relations may involve forms of clientelism by a variety of powerful third parties or constituency services by elected officials that are not necessarily clientelist in nature. The variable *Brokered relation* has two indicators: seeking out political parties and seeking out other influential persons to intercede on one's behalf. Individuals can also seek out leaders of associations, in which they may or may not participate. Empirically we find few cases of association leaders being sought out as brokers. Instances where individuals seek out associations for their role as direct providers of particular goods, rather for their role as brokers, qualify as forms of collective self-provisioning and hence detached relations.

Contentious relations exist when citizens organize and engage in collective action outside of normal institutional channels, such as engaging in public demonstrations or petition drives, to apply public pressure on government. Contention can be to influence public policy or to hold government accountability for its duty to act. This paper is concerned with the latter. Contention may reflect a lack of access to government and/or high inequality in relations to public officials, but critically it entails that individuals are aware of their entitlements as citizens. It requires, furthermore, a number of favorable conditions: a social or organizational network to coordinate activity, and a political environment in which political repression is not pervasive.[8] The types of activities that make up *contentious relations* are often more costly or risky to individuals than those related to *direct relations*, because they tend to require larger numbers of people, creating coordination costs, and often lack the legal protections of that formal and institutionalized channels offer. This non-legality of many contentious forms of activity suffers the risk of repression by public authorities or private groups.

Individuals with little access to government and in profoundly unequal relations with public officials can *detach* from government and rely on social networks to collectively self-

[8] There is a voluminous literature on the conditions and processes likely to lead to contentious collective action, such as protest activity and social movements, but see Tilly 2006, McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly 2001; Tarrow 1998, Melucci 1996, McAdam 1999.

provision public goods. They organize with friends, family or community members in local publics to collectively self-provision basic goods, such as sewerage, housing, or security. *Detached relations* from government therefore centrally involve collective self-provisioning. Self-provisioning does not represent a form of civic engagement as defined in the North American literature, but rather a form of active citizenship to acquire access to public goods and services that for which government is understood to be legally responsible. In somewhat different language, detached relations are a response to a form of state failure in provisioning basic public goods and services.

Finally, in cases where individuals have undertaken more than one type of act and hence combine citizenship relations that are qualitatively different, we use the variable *Mixed relations*. Combining distinct types of relations suggests that no single type of relation is effective for seeking access to government and, in the extreme, a lack of institutionalization of citizens' access to government.

In the multivariate analysis that follows an additional, final, variable is used. We are unable to specify a model for *direct relations* in Mexico City because of low frequency of that type of relations. *Detached relations* are numerous in Mexico City but, for reasons discussed below, we were also unable to specify a good model for this type of citizenship relation. For the multivariate analysis (only) we therefore create a variable called *Not detached*. This variable includes individuals who sought to access government in any way, whether through activities which compose *direct*, *brokered* or *contentious relations*. People with *not detached* relations are those who make demands on government for the provision of public goods and services.

Associational participation

The convention in survey research conducted in affluent democracies and transported to other contexts has been to use formal membership as a proxy for associational participation.[9] Our

[9] The World Values Survey (2005), for example, ask respondents if they are 'active members,' 'inactive members,' or 'not members,' and Verba, Schlozman and Brady (1995:542-549) use 'member of….' The Latino Barometer (2005) differs in that it ask about membership but also about active participation. In Brazil the 2000 Demographic Census (IBGE 2001) and São Paulo state's Well-Being study (SEADE 1998) use formal membership. Mexico's Federal Electoral Institute's (IFI) "Encuesta Nacional de Cultura Política 2003" uses a definition similar to ours, "participation in …," but unfortunate the question does not specify a time period.

variable Associational Participation is defined somewhat differently, in order to make sure we capture the form of 'participation' in which the hypothesized associational effects on citizenship occurs – that is, the face-to-face interaction that makes possible the acquisition of Tocquevillian "knowledge of how to combine" and other civic skills, as well as develop collective interests or identities (Putnam 2000: 58; Skocpol 1999: 498-504). Depending on the type of association and the research context, formal membership may or may not coincide with this form of face-to-face interaction that is of central analytic concern. Because the form of organization and type of relation to their respective publics are very different, we use analytic equivalents to capture this interaction in two basic types of association: 'community' and 'workplace.'[10] In the case of the former we use participation, in the latter membership.[11]

A wide array of associations in São Paulo and Mexico City define the relationship with their publics in terms of 'the community', and do not have strictly formal membership (Houtzager, Gurza Lavalle, and Acharya 2005: 954).[12] This is the case for most neighborhood associations, community organizations, some types of public interest organizations, and church groups. For these associations the analytically correct focus is 'participation' rather than formal membership. By "participation" we mean ongoing involvement in the association and its activities. We use a simple set of dichotomous variables for measuring participation in these different types of associations, rather than membership. The variable *Community association* is defined as any participation in cultural, neighborhood, and ethnic or issue-based associations over the five years prior to the survey. While we use a dichotomous variable, we do report the average number of 'acts of participation' a month that respondents had in the different types of associations.

The relation individuals have with workplace associations is very different from that with community associations and this leads us to use an analytic equivalent to 'participation.' In unions, professional associations, and even in associations that represent workers in informal employment (see definition p. 16-17), formal membership is the norm and the type of interaction

[10] Analytic equivalents are distinct empirical phenomena which nonetheless fulfil the same analytic function in a model. For classic statements on conceptual equivalence, see Przeworski and Teune 1966, Verba, Nie, and Kim 1978, and Locke and Thelen 1995.

[11] Studies of associational life make a variety of other distinctions between associations that do not serve our analytic goals in this paper. These include distinctions between internally democratic and autocratic associations (Putnam 1993; Cohen and Rogers 1995), purposefully political and non-political (Skocpol 1999; Diamond 1999), and formalized forms of bonding or bridging social capital (Putnam 2000; Hill and Matsubayashi 2005). For an overview, see Fung 2003.

members enjoy occurs both at the workplace and at specific association activities. Under Brazilian and Mexican labor legislation all workers in a unionized workplace automatically become union members. Because of this, the causal face-to-face interaction between association members that we are looking for takes place both during specific association meetings, events, and activities, and in an ongoing and continual manner in the workplace itself. *Workplace association* includes trade unions, informal sector associations, and professional associations. The response rate for cooperatives is very low, but it is include in workplace associations in order not to lose any observations.

Religious organizations in Brazil and Mexico, two overwhelmingly Catholic countries, are also not organized around the idea of formal membership. But in this case the analysis faces a distinct challenge. The share of the population that attends church regularly is high, over 65% in the two cities. The variable therefore lacks sufficient the variation to be useful in the subsequent multivariate analysis.[13] Descriptive statistics suggest that there is no significant variation in active citizenship between Catholics and not-Catholics, however.[14] For these reasons our analysis focuses on secular associational activity.

Our variable *Associational participation* is defined as participation in the last five years in any association for (i) cultural/sporting activities, (ii) neighborhood or community affairs, (iii) cooperatives, or (iv) other less common types of non-religious association, such as ethnic, issue

[12] For a similar finding in India, see Harriss 2005.

[13] Membership in religious groups is largely restricted to Protestant Churches in some of the wealthier democracies. In Catholicism, Hinduism, Islam and many other religions, the faithful 'attend' church, temple or mosque but do not define this relationship as one of membership. In Brazil this holds for the younger evangelical protestant churches as well. In the case of religious groups therefore, 'participation' in the activities of religious groups, or attending religious activities, are analytic equivalents to membership. 'Belonging' to a church fails the test, because many people who belong to a certain denomination in Latin America do not in fact participate in religious or church related activities.

[14] The expectation that religious activity is related to active citizenship comes in large part from the U.S. experience. The lack of effect of religious participation in the cities may also reflect, to some degree, differences between Latin American Catholicism and U.S. Protestantism. The 'Catholic Puzzle' – high Church involvement, teachings that emphasize participation in community life, but low levels of civic activity – appears related to structural features of their respective churches (Bane 2005). Verba, Schlozman and Brady (1995: 245, 381) argue that, in the United States, the large size of Catholic parishes, limited opportunities for lay participation in liturgical activities, and hierarchical organization mean that Catholic church-goers have fewer opportunities to acquire public skills than their Protestant counterparts. The structure of the Catholic Church in Latin America is of course similar, or more hierarchical, and in major urban centers such as São Paulo and Mexico City parishes tend to have particularly large congregations.

specific or minority organizations, or membership in (iv) trade union/professional representation. By associational participation we mean secular associational participation.[15]

Because our definition of associational participation casts a wider net than formal membership, the share of people we report as participating in associations tends to lie at the higher end of that reported in other studies of São Paulo and Mexico City, and of Brazil and Mexico more generally.

Socio-economic status

We know from previous work conducted in São Paulo and Mexico City that active citizens and associational participation are both stratified by class and gender similar to what occurs in affluent industrial democracies. In general, across affluent and middle-income democracies, it is men, the better educated and more affluent, and individuals with better positions in the labor market who are most active, and who participate most in associational life. The gaps in active citizenship and associational participation between class and gender strata raises an important concern: is it possible that the impact of associations on active citizenship is greater for lower strata, and associations can consequently contribute to reducing an important source of inequality in citizenship? We look for such differential impact across class and gender.

While the gender variable is self-explanatory, as we use what amounts to a dichotomous variable – woman/man – the class variables are more complex. Virtually all definitions of class start with some combination of education and income levels. To capture class we primarily use educational attainment, rather than income, because reliable income data is difficult to collect, particularly at the household level (Deaton 1997), and household income and education are, as expected, statistically correlated in the cities, and particularly in São Paulo. Studies also consistently show that political engagement, of diverse forms, and in both affluent Western democracies and middle or low-income democracies, is particularly sensitive to education (Krishna 2003, Chaudhry and Heller 2002, Rosenstone and Hansen 1993, Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995).

[15] We use a five-year time window because an individual who has had ongoing participation in associational life in this period prior to the interview, (s)he is likely to still possess many, if not all, of the benefits that are believed to accrue from participation – information, knowledge, skills, social networks, and so forth.

We use dichotomous, rather than continuous, education variables because the years of educational attainment is strongly clustered around final year of primary, secondary, and higher education. These markers provide convenient definitions of the education component of class. Therefore we use variables for each of the three education categories. Because the share of the population with no years of formal schooling is below 4%, we include this stratum in the category *Primary education or less*. For pragmatic reasons our definitions of these variables are slightly different in the two cities. In São Paulo we distinguish between people with *Primary education or Less*, *Secondary*, and *Higher education*. In Mexico City there is no statistically significant variation across primary and secondary education for active citizenship. We therefore simplify the model for Mexico City by using the variable *Higher education* and *Not higher education*.

Labor market status is also a common component of definitions of class. The distinctions in labor market status we emphasize are two: between people inside and outside of the labor market, and between workers with formal and informal work relations. Scholars of the region emphasize that outsourcing and/or the informalization of labor relations have led to a decline in union size and power, and to a more general fall of political engagement or rise of new populisms (Roberts 2002, O'Donnell 1994). We define variables for people who are *In the labor market* as either working or unemployed but looking for work, and those who are *Outside of the labor market* as people who not working and not looking for work, such as full-time homemakers, students, and retirees.

Definitions of formal and informal workers vary substantially and we avoid the concept 'informal economy' in recognition that formal and informal labor relations can co-exist in the same workplace and particularly in the same economic sector. We use a juridical definition of labor relations: *Formal work relations* (in the private sector) involve legal employment contracts*, Informal work relations* exist in the absence of such contracts, and *Public sector work relations* are those in which the contractor is government. People who work for remuneration are 'informal' if: (i) they are employees and do not have a formal employment contract; (ii) are independents (*autonomo*) who work without employment relations and do not contribute to national social insurance (hence are not liberal professionals); or (iii) have micro-enterprises with five or less employees, do not contribute to national social insurance, and do not have

formal contracts with any of their employees. This definition is similar to that used by CEPAL and the ILO (Comin 2003).

Finally, we use a small number of variables that other studies have shown may influence either active citizenship or associational participation in our two research contexts. Some studies point to *race* a factor in Brazil. Racial categories in Brazil are extremely complex, varied, and contested. We use the simplest possible distinctions – white, black, and mixed – and leave out many other distinctions.

Religion is another factor that is widely examined. In Mexico City the overwhelming majority of the population is Catholic and this variable was only used in São Paulo. We used Catholic, Protestant, and Other. Protestant includes both traditional churches such as Lutheran and Presbyterian, and newer evangelical churches such as the Assembly of God and the Universal Church.

Finally, we use a *territorial* variable to control for possible neighborhood effects. In São Paulo the dummy variable is defined in terms of the city's 96 administrative districts. In Mexico City we used the city's 17 administrative *delegaciones*.

II. The Survey and Logic of Comparison

Our findings come from a Citizen Survey of the general population conducted in the metropolises of São Paulo (municipality; N=1,292) and Mexico City (Federal District; N=1,285) during 2002/2003. The Survey explores the types of relations individuals have to associations, to government, and to political parties. The questionnaire and sampling method used in cities was the same, with relatively minor adjustments to account for contextual specificities, such as the terms used to for political brokers. The household survey was conducted in person and included batteries of questions about problem-salience and problem-solving strategies, political participation and knowledge, associational participation, work history and labor market insertion, and demographic and household. The survey has a representative random sample of

the adult population (18 years of age or older) within municipal boundaries of São Paulo (10.7 million population) and the Federal District of Mexico City (8.5 million population).[16]

São Paulo and Mexico City, notwithstanding important differences between them, are most likely cases – that is, if the generalizations based on the experience of affluent democracies do not hold in these cases they will be powerfully undermined (George and Bennett 2005: 120-121). The cities are located in middle-income countries that differ substantially from the affluent industrial democracies in which most existing research has been conducted. The two countries both experienced democratic transitions in the last 25 years, share the legacies of authoritarian rule, pervasive political clientelism, and high levels of social inequality, and have up until recently had associational spheres dominated by corporatist associations under high levels of state control. Over the past two and-a-half decades, they have seen the emergence of competitive democratic institutions and vigorous and pluralist associational spheres.

We selected sub-national rather than national regimes in Brazil and Mexico because large new democracies such as these characteristically have sharp regional variation in government presence and political institutions. Whereas the sub-national regimes represented by São Paulo and Mexico City today have the kind of substantial government presence and competitive electoral arena that is considered a virtual prerequisite for the possibility of high quality

[16] The stratified random sample is composed of four strata that were over-sampled, defined by factors that are believed to influence levels and forms of collective action – level of a region's development (or government presence), support for left-wing parties, and occupational mix – and a fifth strata that represented the rest of the city. Our analysis in this paper is based on the full sample, in which respondents from the four strata are weighted appropriately, in order to make generalizations at the level of the city possible. Selection of respondents took place in three stages: selection of census sectors, of households therein, and finally of individual respondent. Selection was random at each of the three stages: census sectors were selected using 2000 Census data, a recount of households in the selected sectors was undertaken before randomizing household selection, and at the household level we used a kish selection procedure. The population of the cities' larger metropolitan area is over 20 million, but our survey was restricted to the São Paulo municipal area and the Mexico City Federal District. The survey in São Paulo was coordinated by the Centro Brasileiro de Análise e Planejamento (CEBRAP) and conducted by the survey firm Projetiva. In Mexico City it was conductd by the Unidad de Estudios Sobre la Opinión (UDESO), at the Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (IIS-UNAM). Three call-backs were made before considering a household closed. The São Paulo sample is 1,641 interviews with a 79% response rate (distribution of not completed interviews: 221 closed or not located households, 81 refusals, and 45 for other reasons). The Mexico City sample is 1,577 interviews with a response rate of 81.5% (distribution of not completed interviews: 142 refusals, 81 closed or not located households, and 69 for other reasons). The survey questionnaire can be obtained by contacting p.houtzager@ids.ac.uk.

citizenship, this is not true of many regions of the country and of rural areas in particular.[17] In the context of such regional variation national-level data can mask important causal relations because these can average out high variations in the values of important explanatory variables. This is a particularly significant concern in countries where enclaves of the authoritarian clientelism associated with 'low intensity democracy' coexists with regions where government does far better at enforcing civil or political rights and producing public goods for their realization (O'Donnell 1993; Fox 1994,Foweraker and Landman1997). Sub-national units such as large urban centers constitute a universe with a higher degree of internal homogeneity than national units and reduce this heterogeneity problem (Snyder 2001).

São Paulo and Mexico City do differ significantly in many ways. Some of this variation provides the analysis that follows additional analytic leverage. Most importantly, the cities vary on the dependent variable – the type and degree of institutionalization of citizenship relations. In São Paulo 37% of the population are active citizens, and most of these have *direct* citizenship relations to government, or *mixed* relations that include *direct* as one of the types of relations. It is significant, however, that within the lower strata of the city's population, people which have primary education or less or who are outside of the labor market, very few have any form of relations to government. This stratum is made up entirely of inactive citizens, who in fact appear closer to denizens than citizens (Houtzager, Acharya, and Gurza Lavalle 2007: 25, 27).

In Mexico City 59% of the population are active citizens, and no such layer of denizens exists. Rather than *direct* citizenship relations, however, quarter of active citizens have *detached* citizenship relations to government, and almost half have *mixed* relations that include *detached* as one of the types of relations (Houtzager, Acharya, and Gurza Lavalle 2007: 25, 28).[18] The large share of active citizens who have *mixed* relations in Mexico City suggests that, in order to gain access to public goods and services, they have to undertake multiple types of activities,

[17] On these prerequisites, cf. Linz and Stepan (1996), 37, O'Donnell 1993, and Diamond 1999. The two cities, for example, coverage of municipal water supply and sanitation is close to 98 percent of households.
[18] The share of the population with *brokered relations* is similar in the two cities and surprisingly low given the characterization of politics found in most of the literature on Latin America. Only a part of the discrepancies between our findings and accounts in the literature can be explained by our choice of cases – two largest urban centers rather than national political systems – and by some under-reporting that may result from local political culture.

indicating that the civil dimension of citizenship is poorly institutionalized when compared to São Paulo.

These different patterns of citizenship relations are striking because the cities' populations have broadly similar problem salience across the investigated issue areas and overwhelmingly attribute primary responsibility for addressing problems in different issue areas to government.[19]

Variation on the independent variable, participation in secular association, is less pronounced. In both cities a little over a third of the population participated in secular associations in the five years prior to the survey.[20] In São Paulo the level of participation in community and workplace organizations is similar, at 18 percent of the population. In Mexico City 25% of the population has participation in community associations but only 9% in workplace organizations (Houtzager, Acharya, and Gurza Lavalle 2007).[21] The distribution of the third of the population that participates in associational life is therefore different, and particularly marked in workplace organizations.

The differences identified above reflect in large measure distinct settlement patterns and political trajectories. São Paulo is a young city of immigrants, which grew to be Brazil's financial and manufacturing center in the first half of the 20th century. It has become, furthermore, an important autonomous political pole within a highly decentralized federal system. Electoral politics in the city is highly competitive and three different parties, spanning the ideological spectrum, have alternated power over the past 25 years. It has dynamic, well-organized, and influential civil society (Gurza Lavalle, Houtzager, and Castello 2005). The trajectory of the city's democratic institutions is tied to the national democratic transition that, relative to Mexico's transition, led to a profound political reorganization, including the substantial erosion of powerful corporatist labor institutions and renewal of the labor movement, a significant expansion of the political role played by civil society organizations, and the creation of an array of participatory governance institutions (Kinzo and Dunkerley 2003, Tavares de Almeida 1996,

[19] In São Paulo a fifth of active citizens have *contentious* relations (Houtzager, Acharya, Gurza Lavalle 2007).
[20] *Current participation* was 22% and 21% in São Paulo and Mexico City, respectively.
[21] The *intensity* of participation in community associations is similar in the two cities, and ranges from participating on average 3 times a month in the activities of neighborhood associations – such as meetings, campaigns, and events – to twice a week in those of cultural or leisure associations. The participation in workplace organizations is far less intense: members participate only 0.5 and 1.5 times a month, in São Paulo and Mexico City respectively.

Dagnino 1994 and 2002, Avritzer and Navarro 2004, Kingstone and Powers 1999). The military's exit from power began in 1979, with the reorganization of the party system, formal handover of power in 1985 (after 21 years of rule) and was completed with the writing of a new constitution in 1988 and first direct presidential election in 1989. At the time of the survey, in 2002, the Workers' Party held by the mayoral office in São Paulo and the country's Presidency.

In contrast to São Paulo, Mexico City has been an important urban center since the pre-Columbian period and since independence has retained its role as a national capital in a highly centralized (if formally federal) political system (Davis 1994). It is also the heart of the most fully developed system of corporatist institutions in Latin America, built through the state-party *Partido Revolucionario Institutional* (Revolutionary Institutional Party, PRI).[22] In Mexico democratic reforms accelerated as Brazil completed its transition cycle, and took a very different form: during the 1990s the one-party dominant regime under the PRI shifted to a multiparty regime in which the PRI remains a powerful actor, labor market reforms led to a decline but not a substantial renewal of the labor movement, and political reform focused primarily on the electoral system rather than at the constitutional level (Camp 2006, Levy and Bruhn 2006).[23] In 1997 the left opposition party, the *Partido de la Revolución Democrática* (Party of the Democratic Revolution, PRD), won the first mayoral election in Mexico City. In 2000 the right opposition party, *Partido Acción Nacional* (National Action Party, PAN), won the first elections for president. At the time of the survey the PRD continued in mayoral office and the PAN in the Presidency.

III. Portrait of the Relationship between Associations and Active Citizens

For a first view of the relationship between associational participation and active citizenship we provide a descriptive portrait. In order to provide a simple and clear description we do not address here the issue of co-variation and multivariate effects, examined in the next section of the paper.

[22] The best comparative analysis of corporatism in Mexico and Brazil is Collier and Collier (1991).
[23] Mexico City, the national government's seat of power and (still) an important manufacturing center, lost its autonomy to the federal government shortly after the Mexican Revolution early in the 20th century, and within the context of a highly centralized state, only began to regain this autonomy in 1994. The city's elected *Asamblea de Representantes* only acquired legislative functions in that year, and it only elected its first mayor (*jefe de gobierno*) three years later, in 1997.

The share of the population in the two cities that participate in associations *and* are active citizens is 17 % in São Paulo and 24.4% in Mexico City. The higher percentage in Mexico City reflects the larger share of the population that is active in that city – 59% in the Mexico City and 37% in São Paulo. Table 1 shows that, in both cities, individuals who participate in associations have substantially higher levels of active citizenship than their counterparts without such participation. In São Paulo, twice as many of those who participate in associations are active citizens compare to people without such associational participation. In Mexico City the difference is smaller, but still substantial at 65% greater. The correlation between associational participation and civil relations is therefore particularly strong in São Paulo and still substantial in Mexico City.

Table 1 Active Citizens by Social Strata and Associational Participation
(Percent and frequency[a])

Associational Participation		**São Paulo**		**Mexico City**	
		With	Without	With	Without
Entire sample		56 (404)	27 (888)	79 (420)	48 (864)
Education	Low	68 (19)	19 (126)	81 (32)	56 (58)
	High	68 (91)	34 (67)	93 (94)	59 (149)
Labor Market	Out	47 (83)	19 (381)	81 (154)	45 (449)
	In	58 (321)	33 (507)	77 (266)	50 (415)
Gender	Women	57 (197)	29 (540)	82 (202)	46 (537)
	Men	55 (207)	26 (348)	76 (218)	51 (327)

[a] The absolute numbers in (parentheses) represent the frequency in our sample of a given characteristic together with associational status. The value (126) thus represents number of people with low education that have no associational participation in São Paulo.

Participation in associations, Table 1 shows, is associated with higher levels of active citizenship across social strata, but the lower positions appear to obtain greater gains in active citizenship with participation. In São Paulo, the share of those with low education who become active

citizens increases 258%, whereas those with higher education see an increase of 100%. The difference between those outside of the labor market in São Paulo with and without associational participation is 147%, whereas it is 76% for those in the labor market. In Mexico City we see a larger difference for women than men when they participate in associations.

Thus, associational participation appears to not only increase overall levels of active citizenship, but also to substantially narrow the gap in active citizenship between classes and gender. The significance of this potentially associational impact must be qualified, however. The stratification of associational participation itself is severe and limits the extent to which these positive effects reach strata with lower levels of active citizenship. Stratification of associational participation is in fact higher than that of active citizenship, and in both cities occurs along education, gender, and labor market hierarchies. For example, women are far less likely than men to participate in the activities of associations: 41% of men but only 24% of women participate in São Paulo, and 39% of men and 25% of women in Mexico City.[24]

Table 1 also provides initial evidence that associations increase the exercise of citizenship because they help overcome obstacles that are socio-economic in nature. The far larger increase in active citizenship for those lower on the socio-economic hierarchies suggests that associations help overcome these types of obstacles to active citizenship. It shows that low levels of education or being outside of the labor market are particularly likely to pose significant obstacles to active citizenship. The gap in active citizenship associated with education and labor market insertion is especially severe in São Paulo but it is significant in Mexico City as well. In the former city, those with higher education or who are in the labor market have almost twice the rate of active citizenship.[25]

[24] The share of individuals who have higher education and who participate in associations in São Paulo is three and-a-quarter times greater than that of individuals with only primary education or less, a gap largely driven by inequalities in the participation in workplace-based organizations. The education-gap in Mexico City is less extreme than in São Paulo, but it is nonetheless evident.

[25] Gender, in contrast, appears to have no relationship to active citizenship (São Paulo) or a weak one (Mexico City). Because the labor market is strongly gendered in Mexico City, there is considerable overlap between those *Outside of labor market* and *Women*. This overlap is small in São Paulo.

Associations and the Quality of Citizenship

The portrait above does not offer any evidence that associational participation may improve the quality of citizenship relations to government, and in particular that it is related to direct citizenship relations. Tables 2 and 3 below suggest that people with and without associational participation have similar types of citizenship relations. People in lower strata – by education, gender, or labor market insertion – have similar types of citizenship relations whether they participate in associations or not. In fact, they have similar relations as people in higher strata (see Tables 2 and 3).

In the case of São Paulo, we see that associational participation has a strong correlation with *direct* and *mixed* relations, which are the most common in the general population, and no apparent relation with *detached* relations, which is quite rare in the general population (Table 2). As is the case for the population as a whole, there is also a correlation with contentious relations (not shown here).[26] Active citizens with associational participants are no more likely than non-participants to establish *direct* relations with government. In Mexico City there is a small negative correlation with *direct* relations, and a relatively strong positive correlation with *detached* and especially with *mixed* relations (Table 3). Thus, in both cities, association participation appears to reinforce the existing patterns of citizenship relations and, for the sample as a whole, does not improve or otherwise alter citizenship relations to government.

[26] Numerically, using the epidemiological concept of risk ratio, the likelihood of being engaged in being an active citizens is more than twice than twice as high for those with participation in associational life in comparison to those without such participation in São Paulo; this value is slightly lower in the case of direct citizenship relations. Thus we can suggest associational relation does not favor direct relations over any other type of relations.

Table 2 Citizenship Relations by Social Strata and Associational Participation– São Paulo
(Percent and frequency)

Civil Relations		**Direct**		**Detached**		**Mixed**		*Frequency*	
Associational Participation		With	Without	With	Without	With	Without	*w*	*w/out*
Entire sample		19	10	4.6	4	25	10	*404*	*888*
Education	Low	41	6.5	9	3	18	9	*19*	*126*
	High	20	17	3	2	39	11	*91*	*67*
Labor Market	Out of	16	6.2	6.7	3.2	20	5.5	*83*	*381*
	In	20	13	4	4.4	26	13	*321*	*507*
Gender	Women	23	11	4.5	4.4	25	9.2	*197*	*540*
	Men	16	8.8	4.6	3.2	25	11	*207*	*348*

Table 3 Citizenship Relations by Social Strata and Associational Participation – Mexico City
(Percent and frequency in sample)

Civil Relations		**Direct**		**Detached**		**Mixed**		*Frequency*	
Associational Participation		With	Without	With	Without	With	Without	*W*	*W/out*
Entire sample		11	12	15	13	48	22	*420*	*864*
Education	Low	4.6	16	15	11	48	27	*32*	*58*
	High	9.6	16	18	14	64	32	*94*	*149*
Labor Market	Out of	12	11	20	12	44	22	*154*	*449*
	In	10	13	12	15	51	21	*266*	*415*
Gender	Women	12	10	16	14	49	20	*202*	*537*
	Men	10	15	15	11	47	25	*218*	*327*

IV. Associational Effects on Citizenship: Multivariate Analysis

The descriptive portrait above shows that participation in associations is likely to have a positive relation to *active citizenship* in both São Paulo and Mexico City. It does not appear, however, that associational participation has any relation to the type of citizenship relations that individuals have to government. In particular, associational participation does not appear to increase *direct* relations that approximate the democratic ideal. The multivariate analysis in this section, through the use of probit models,[27] allows us to verify the strength of these statistical

[27] The residuals of the estimates are roughly normal.

links by controlling for the effects of explanatory factors other than associations. It also enables us to identify whether the impact of associational participation on active citizenship is differentiated across class and/or gender, and in particular whether people of lower class status or women experience greater increases in active citizenship than others when participating in associational life.

We find models for *active citizens*, *direct* citizenship relations in São Paulo, and *not-detached* relations. *Direct* relations in Mexico City are so few that it is not possible to find a model for that type of citizenship relation. In the case of *detached* relations, it is not possible to define models in either city, but for distinct reasons. In São Paulo their frequency is low. In Mexico City *detached* relations are numerous but we are unable to specify a model because they are distributed widely across the variables in our models: class, gender, and associational participation. The inability to specify a model in Mexico City is therefore an important finding in its own right: it confirms that *detached* relations are pervasive across socio-economic categories, rather than concentrated among lower classes or among women. They also appear to be no less common among individuals with associational participation.

The lack of models for *direct* and *detached* in Mexico City does, however, impose some limitations on the analysis that follows and an asymmetry in the presentation of the models. We therefore define models for *not-detached*, a variable that combines all efforts to access government, which allows us to assess whether associational participation make it more likely that individuals attempt to pressure government to obtain access to basic public goods and services.

The models we present are parsimonious and yet are the ones with highest explanatory power. They reflect the relation we observed with individual bivariate relations described above and test hypotheses prominent in the literature. The reported variables consistently remained significant in different specifications of the models. Some of the variables reported below, such as education in the case of Mexico City, represent more aggregated categories that we created after having run regressions using categories with finer distinctions but that were consistently not significant.

The models could suffer from endogeneity or selection biases. Endogeneity – the problem of bi-directional causation – would be present due to the possibility that associational participation arises primarily for the purpose of citizenship activities. Selection biases would be present due to the possibility that some common factor(s) could affect both associational participation and active citizenship; this common factor would be absent among the non-participants. The coefficients arising from estimations that correct these problems are difficult to interpret. Furthermore, we can rule out these problems in our specifications. We therefore interpret the simple probit models and use a relatively new technique called propensity score matching, one of several tools to detect impact of a singular factor such as being exposed to media campaigns or a new educational methods, among other things, when programs are not implemented through a random assignments. . The problems of endogeneity and selection biases are discussed in Appendix 2.

Explaining Active Citizens and Citizenship Relations: Basic Models

The probit models reveal that three explanatory factors are consistently highly significant for *active citizens*, *direct* relations in São Paulo, and *not-detached* relations (Tables 4 and 5). These factors are associational participation, education, and some aspects of labor market status. A few other variables, which do not add much explanatory power are included in the models because they are widely believed to influence citizenship activity. The religion variables, for example, are only weakly significant for *active citizens* in São Paulo, yet they test the hypothesis that particular religious groups contribute to making their participants active citizens. Given the predominance of religious activities in both cities, it is unsurprising that religious participation cannot explain variability in active citizenship.

The multivariate analysis confirms that there is high probability that the relationship between associational participation and *active citizens* in the two urban centers is strong and, as validated in Appendix 2, suggests that the causal link flows from associations to active citizenship. It also confirms that associations enhance the level of different types of citizenship relations in the two cities. Associational participation is an important explanatory factor for *direct* citizenship relations and, not surprisingly then, for *not-detached* relations in the case of São Paulo (Table 4) Associational participation is much weaker in explaining *direct* citizenship. It is also an

important explanatory factor in Mexico City, for both *active citizens* and for *not-detached* relations (Table 5).

The models for São Paulo are generally stronger than the ones for Mexico City and allow us to make stronger claims for the former city. The model for *direct* relations in São Paulo is weaker than the other models for that city, because the substantial share of active citizens in São Paulo with direct relations (33%) are nonetheless a small share of the overall population at 12% and relatively few in absolute numbers. In Mexico City associational participation appears to contribute to both not-detached relations (which includes direct relations), as shown in Table 5, but also to detached relations, as suggested by the inability to define a meaningful multivariate model to explain their prevalence and by the descriptive statistics in Table 3.

Educational achievement is also highly significant in the models and contributes to being an *active citizen*. The results in the two cities are similar; but the positive relationship is much more striking in São Paulo than it is in Mexico City.[28] Similar to what various studies have found in affluent industrial democracies, individuals with higher levels of education are considerable more likely to be active citizens than those with less. In São Paulo those with lower education virtually do not have *direct* relations. Higher education does not seem to be a factor in determining *direct* relations; this is likely due to fact that the number of people with higher education when broken down across different categories of citizenship relations is small.

In the case of labor market status, different aspects are significant in the two cities. In São Paulo, whether a person is *inside the labor market* is an important explanatory factor. In Mexico City it is the type of labor relation that matters: *formal employment* has a negative influence and *owning a business* has a positive one.

The gender variable is not significant in the models and women and men in both cities have the same proclivity to be active. There is a correlation between being a woman and *being outside of the labor market* in Mexico City. However, being *outside of the labor market* is not significant in our models for Mexico City, and therefore the labor status variables do not appear to disguise

[28] Inclusion of income categories alters the results only when these are reduced to two categories – low and high – which makes the low income group weakly significant. There is, however, some correlation between income and educational categories.

a gender effect on active citizenship.[29] We therefore conclude there is no significant gender gap in active citizenship or in types of relations in the two cities.

We should note here that informal employment, which is often believed to have a negative impact on individuals' relation to government, and to political life more generally, is not a significant factor in explaining active citizenship. The impact of labor market status is in some sense surprisingly limited: in São Paulo to being inside the labor market or not, and in Mexico to having formal employment relations or owning one's own business.

Table 4 Probit Models for Active Citizens and Citizenship Relations – São Paulo

Variable		**Active Citizens**		**Direct Relations**		**Not-Detached Relations**	
		Coef.	Sign.	Coef.	Sign.	Coef.	Sign.
Associational Participation		0.64	0.000	0.28	0.007	0.64	0.000
Education	Primary	-0.33	0.002	-0.61	0.003	-0.52	0.000
	Higher	0.19	0.034	0.13	0.340	0.24	0.028
	Secondary	Control		Control		Control	
Labor market – Outside		-0.37	0.000	-0.34	0.004	-0.42	0.000
Gender - Women						0.11	0.150
Religion	Evangelical	-0.22		Control			
	Catholic	-0.18	0.41	0.007			
	All others	Control		Control			
Race	Black	0.41	0.007				
	White and all others	Control					
Territorial Dummies – Grajau		-0.81	0.005	-0.69	0.125	-0.88	0.005
Income (hh) - Low Only				-0.24	0.040		
Constant		-0.25	0.000	-1.09	0.000	-0.57	0.000

No. observations = 1292; Model 1 Chi2 : 152.40; Model 2 Chi2 61.47; Model 3 Chi2 : 162.42

[29] Regional variables and being black in São Paulo were occasionally significant. In Mexico City variables describing family structures, age, and some regional variables play a weak role.

Table 5 Probit Models for Active Citizens and Citizenship Relations – Mexico City

Variables		Active Citizens		Not-Detached	
		Coef.	Sign.	Coef.	Sign.
Associational participation		0.89	0.000	0.74	0.000
Education	Higher	0.51	0.000	0.36	0.000
	Secondary and Below	Control		Control	
Labor market	Formal Employee	-0.24	0.017	-0.17	0.082
	Own Business	0.45	0.004	0.34	0.017
	Public, non in labor force and Informal	Control			
Territorial Dummies	1, district	-0.34	0.077	-0.17	0.077
	Others	Control		Control	
Age	18-30 yrs old	0.2	0.010	0.23	0.003
	Above 30				
Household Structure	Extended	0.11	0.188	0.1	0.246
	Nuclear	0.21	0.035	0.21	0.035
	All Other	Control		Control	
Constant		-0.31	0.000	-0.62	0.000

No. observations = 1266; Model 1 Chi2 : 173.88; Model 2 Chi2 : 130.21.

Associations Contribution to Active Citizenship across Class

We noted that that in addition to associational participation, class positions are very likely to influence *active citizens*, as well as *direct* and *not-detached* citizenship relations to government. Similar to what occurs in the United States and in other affluent industrial democracies, individuals with higher class status – that is, with higher educational attainment and more favorable positions in the labor market – are more likely to be active citizens. This section examines to what extent associations' contribution to active citizenship is differentiated across class, and whether, as Verba, Schlotzman, and Brady (1995) found in the United States, people at the bottom end of the class structure experience greater contributions than others. It explores the question: can associations counter the downward impact of low socio-economic status on becoming an active citizen?

To examine this issue we carry out some simulations using our two data sets and the results of the regressions already reported. We examine the proclivity of engaging in active relations given particular characteristics of a person. That is, given the coefficients reported in Table 4 and 5, what would be the likelihood of an individual being an active citizen, given a particular

set of characteristics; that is, for each person in our data we can calculate the probability of that person being an active citizen using the coefficients.

Education has a powerful impact on whether individuals become active citizens. In São Paulo, 20 percent of the population has primary education or less but very few of these people will be active. How much greater is their proclivity to be active citizens when they participate in associations, and does it increase more than that of the well educated? The average propensity of individuals in this population to be active is 51 percent when they participate in associations, whereas it is only 20 percent for the average person with low education. This large increase in the propensity to be active contrasts to the far smaller increase the population with higher education experiences. Among the highly educated, the propensity to be active is 59 percent for those with associational participation and 54 percent for those in general with higher education.. Part of the small increase in this case is explained by overall high levels of active citizens in the population with high levels of education. Nonetheless, the effect of associational participation on active citizenship for people with little education is far greater than that for people with higher education. This result, however, does not lead optimism. Less than 15 percent of those with lower levels of education participate in associations and hence only a small segment of this population acquires the increase in active citizenship.[30] Nonetheless, the small share of this population who are active citizens, are so because of their participation in associations.

In Mexico City, education has a smaller but still substantial impact on active citizenship.[31] Within the population with secondary education or less – there is no significant variation in active citizenship between those with secondary and those with primary education – those who participate in associations are more likely to be active citizens: the propensity to be active is 75 percent, versus 53 percent for this population on average. Among those with higher education, the effect of associational participation is smaller: the corresponding numbers are 83 percent and 72 percent.. The difference in the associational effect on active citizenship across education levels is smaller than in São Paulo, but so is the stratification of associational participation. Hence more people in Mexico City will acquire this positive effect.

[30] In contrast, 50% of the population with higher education engage in associational participation.
[31] The differences in the definition of the independent variables are not the primary source of this difference between the cities.

The pattern for labor market insertion is slightly less dramatic in the cities but broadly similar. In São Paulo the share of those outside the labor with associational participation is 46 percent, versus 23 percent for the average counterparts with such participation. In Mexico City, we find that people with certain types of employment are active to different degrees. Individuals with their *own businesses* are more active than people with formal or informal employment relations.

Although associations can substantially increase active citizenship among people in lower class positions, the severe stratification of associational participation itself significantly limits this impact in the general population. In both cities, and in São Paulo in particular, improving educational levels would substantially increase the share of the population that are active citizens, as a result of both direct educational effects on active citizenship and through the effect education has on increased associational participation.

V. Some Concluding Thoughts for Democratic Theory

The preceding analysis leaves little doubt that participation in associational life enhances active citizenship in the two cities we surveyed. The analysis therefore extends to a new and very different set democratic contexts, the proposition originally formulated and tested in affluent industrial democracies that associations, as local public spheres, play an important role in producing active citizen. The paper presents a significant extension of this proposition, as it is in no way obvious that associations would, or could, play such a role in democracies marked by longstanding authoritarian and clientelist political traditions and by sharp inequality. Within the universe of newer middle-income democracies, São Paulo and Mexico City are the most likely cases, because of the strong government presence of competitive political system, and well developed associational spheres. Hence the full range of democratic contexts for which the argument is valid will only become evident when similar research is conducted in less favorable cases.

Our analysis also identifies an important limit to the contribution associations make to democratic citizenship. Associations do not contribute to improving the *quality* of citizenship relations to government. The type of relations individuals have with government is not influenced by associational participation, in either of the two cities, and in particular it does

not make more likely that the type of *direct* relations to government approximates the democratic ideal of citizenship under the democratic rule of law. For some of the reasons discussed below, there is no immediate reason to believe that the lack of associational impact on the quality of citizenship should not hold in less favorable cases than São Paulo and Mexico City, or indeed in regions of more favorable cases such as the affluent industrial democracies.

The two finding have important implications for positive democratic theory. The fact that active citizenship and the type of citizenship relations individuals have with government are strongly independent suggests that these are two distinct dimensions of citizenship. We need to investigate and explain each of these two dimensions separately, on their own terms, and avoid conflating them. Further, we need to adjust our expectations of the contribution associations, as local public spheres, can make to improving the quality of citizenship relations.

A directly related implication is the circumscription of the theory that explains the positive associational effect on levels of active citizenship found in the literatures on political participation and civic engagement. Made most carefully and eloquently by Verba, Schlozman and Brady (1995), the theory suggests that associations contribute to the accumulation of the civic skills, values, and other resources, that facilitate individual's engagement in the political arena and with government. Associations in particular make up for the deficits in factors experienced by people with lower class positions: people with better class positions accumulate these factors of civic engagement throughout their lives through family, school, and the workplace. Associations, therefore, level the playing field for those who have had less favorable life trajectories.

The lack of a relation between quality of citizenship relations and participation in association strongly suggests that the quality of democratic citizenship does not appear to be the aggregate outcome of individuals' micro-level citizenship activity. The increases in citizenship activity that individuals experience because of their participation in associations does not appear to empower them to improve the type of relation they have with government,

and in particular to establish citizenship relations that conform more closely to the democratic ideal.

Perhaps associations as collective actors, and at the political level, have a significant impact on the quality of citizenship relations. The institutionalists in the comparative democratization literature have shown that they have played a central role in the construction of the legal status and substantive content of citizenship. If there is no obvious link between the micro-level action of individual citizens and macro-political outcomes, could the reverse link exist: macro-level political change that improves the citizenship experience of individuals? The idea that political institutions have a causal effect all of their own, which cannot be reduced to class or other socio-economic factors, is now widespread. An institutionalist explanation of our findings would emphasize that democratic ideal of *direct relations* are more likely emerge as a result from the collective action of large associations, such as labor unions or social movements, that aim to transform political institutions.

The focus of the comparative democratization literature, however, has been primarily on regime-level political institutions. It has not sought to trace down to the level of the individual the consequences for citizenship of different regime structures. Deducing micro-level consequences from macro-level institutional change is of course no less perilous than the inverse path. From the commanding heights of regime-level analysis one cannot see what quality of citizenship differently positioned citizens in fact enjoy.

This poses a challenge to students of democracy that is not new, but certainly has not been met. In what ways can we link macro- or regime-level dynamics to micro-level consequences for citizenship as it is actually experienced and exercised in different contexts? Whatever the responses might be, our understanding of democratic citizenship will certainly improve by efforts that seek to link theoretically and empirically the dynamics at these two levels.

Appendix 1 Table 1.1 List of Variables

Concepts	Variables	Survey Questions
Active Citizens	Active citizens	1. In the last five years have you approached the government to try to address problems like those on the cards? 2. In the last five years, have you, alone or with other people, brought any legal case in order to try to solve any problems like those on the card? 3. In the last five years have you approached a political party to solve any problems like those on the card 4. Sometimes people approach a big man [um pistolão/ una palanca] to help solve or fix a problem. In the last five years have you approached such a big man [um pistolão/ una palanca] to solve any problems like those on the card? 5. In the last five years have you taken part in any kind of demonstration or other public protest to try to solve any kind of problem like those on the card? 6. Sometimes people join together to solve problems on their own. For example, by organizing a rotating credit fund or helping in home construction. Have you taken part in any kinds of activities like these? 7. In the last five years HAVE YOU DONE ANYTHING ELSE, apart from the things that have already been mentioned, to try to solve problems like those on the card? For example, have you signed a petition or done anything else? Card handed to respondents: Problems in areas such as air pollution, basic needs such as food and clothing, violence and crime, public services such as electricity, gas, water, …, and medical care.
Citizenship Relations	Direct	No.s 1 & 2
	Detached	No.s 6
	Brokered	No.s 3 & 4
	Contentious	No.s 5 & 7 (respondents who answered 'signed petitions')
	Mixed	Any combination of Direct, Detached, Brokered, or Contentious
	Not detached	Any relation that is not Detached
Associational Participation	Secular	1. Have you ever in your life participated in a neighborhood association? Do you currently participate in any? In the last five years have you participated in any neighborhood association? 2. Have you ever in your life participated in any women's group or [ethnic, regional, minority] group or association? For example, an association of black people or of Italian or Japanese origin? 3. Have you ever in your life participated in any cultural association, music or dance group, or sports club? Do you participate in one now? In the last five years have you participated in any cultural association, music or dance group, or sports club? 4. Have you ever in your life belonged to any union, guild or professional association? In the last five years have you belonged

	Religious	to a union, guild or professional association? Do you currently belong to one? 5. Have you ever in your life belonged to any type of cooperative? Do you currently belong to one? In the last five years have you belonged to any cooperative? 6. Have you ever in your life participated in any religious group, church, or mosque? And do you participate in one now? And have you participated in one during the last five years? Distributed to Secular or Religious depending on response: 7. In the last five years, have you participated in any group, movement or association that we have not yet mentioned?
	Community Workplace Other	No.s 1, 2, 3 No.s 4, 5 No.7 if not codes for 1-5
Gender	Men Women	Interviewer coding
Education	Primary or less Secondary Higher	What was the last year of school you completed?
Labor market status	In labor market Out of labor market	In the last week have you carried out any paid activity, or worked in any family business, for at least five hours? Follow-ups: Do you usually carry out at least five hours of paid work a week, or work in a family business, but did not work last week? Are you looking for work at the moment?
	Formal employment – public sector Formal employment – private sector Own business Informal employment	Which of the following work situations is closest to yours? Are you a 'registered employee (entitled to social insurance), an 'unregistered' worker, a public sector employee, or do you have own business? Follow-up for 'own business:' Which of the following work situations most resembles yours? Do you have your own business, work without any employment ties, or work as a contractor? Follow-up: Normally how many people can you count on to help you with your business? Do you pay ESI for all the people who help you in your business, only some, or none of them?
Race	São Paulo only: White, Black, Mixed	Interviewer coded: 1 Black, 2 Pardo (mixed white& black), 3 Asian 4 White
Religion	São Paulo only: Catholic, Protestant, Other	What is your religion? Coded: Evangelical, Catholic, Other religion or philosophy, Believe i God but do not have a religion , Doesn't have a religion, is an atheist or skeptic
Region of city	São Paulo: districts Mexico City: d*elegaciones*	Coded from survey 'control data.'

Appendix 2

We justify the models reported in Tables 4 and 5 by examining: (i) fixed effect due to unobserved regional heterogeneity (ii) simultaneous causality or endogeneity (iii) selection biases. As we believe the results in Tables 1 and 2 are intuitive, we are interested in verifying whether we can use these results to draw conclusions about tendencies of individuals' to actively exercise their citizenship in various ways.

Fixed Effect Model: The data set from each city can be thought of as a set of information for a panel of individuals from different regions: districts in the case of São Paulo and electoral zones in case of Mexico. These districts could impose unobserved effects in a homogenous way on individual behavior within a particular region. We tested this by running a fixed effect model for the regions of the cities. The results indicated that spatial fixed effects do not have an effect on active citizenship. As no particular regional variables were used in the regressions, random effect models were not considered.

Endogeneity: We use instrumental variables that can explain associational participation and also are independent of proclivity to be an active citizen. We do not rely on theoretical justification for the chosen instrumental variables. Table 2.1 reports the test to justify the models in this regard for São Paulo.

The standard probit entries in Table 2.1 (columns 1 and 2) differ from each other because the second specification has an additional variable for labor market insertion. The corresponding IV estimates are compared (column 1 with 4 and column 2 with 5) through a *seemingly unrelated* estimation technique available in STATA-9. This technique is similar to a Hausman specification test, with a variance for the difference in the estimators related to null and the alternative hypotheses that is more often well defined (STATA-9 manual-suest command). In both specifications we note that the null hypothesis of non-endogeneity cannot be rejected. That is, endogeneity is not likely to have a significant effect. We note, however, the result is not entirely robust. For some specifications we reject the null hypotheses. Thus endogeneity cannot be completely ruled out in the case of São Paulo.

The results for Mexico City are less ambiguous. Table 2.2 shows the results of our endogeneity tests where one compares column (1) with column (2) to rule out endogeneity.

Table 2.1 Testing for Endogeneity for mobilizing government, São Paulo

Dependent Relation (not weighted) **Variable**	(1) Standard Probit Coeff	Sign	(2) Standard Probit Coeff	Sign	(3) Secular Association Coeff	Sign	(4) IV-Result 1 Coeff	Sign	(5) IV-Result 2 Coeff	Sign
Labor Market-Outside			-0.323	.00	-0.433	0.000			-0.385	.00
Primary Education	-0.322	.006	-.280	.019			-0.384	.002	-0.36	.00
Higher	0.355	.00	0.313	.006			0.430	.001	0.45	.00
Gender-Women	0.148	.04	0.232	.004			0.151	.067	0.22	.009
Secular Associational Activity	0.65[1]	.00	0.60[2]	.00			0.70[1]	.016	0.185[2]	.523
Reg Dummy- Grajau	-0.46	.00	0.606	.00			-0.795	.00	-0.82	.00
Reg Dummy					-0.919	0.000				
Low Income					-0.911	0.000				
Mid-level Income					-0.66	0.000				
High-level Income					-0.49	0.005				
Public Sector					0.791	0.002				
Formal					0.310	0.004				
Race-Others					0.823	0.813				
Constant	-0.745	.00			0.238	0.133	-0.719	.00		
Chi-SQ	134		148		105.8					

[1]Similairty in coefficient values cannot be rejected; p-value 0.860 [2]Similarity in coefficient cannot be rejected; p-value 0.138

Table 2.2: Testing for endogeneity for active citizenship in Mexico City

Dependent Relation (not weighted) **Variable**		(1) Standard Probit Coeff	Sign	(2) Secular Association Coeff	Sign	(3) IV-Result Coeff	Sign
Labor market	Formal Employee	-0189	.849	.194	.00	-.023	.817
	Own Business	.353	.011			.355	.010
	Public Sector			.70	.00		
Education-Higher		.423	..00			.416	. 00
Secular Associational Activity		.704[1]	.00			.648[1]	.088
District 1 Dummy		-.272	.026			-216	.068
Age 30-49 years old		.239	.002			.237	.010
Household Structure	Extended	.0506	.63			.016	.876
	Nuclear	-.272	.096			.122	.130
Gender				-.287	.00		
Unemployment				.111	.5		
Constant		-.285	.00	-.39	.00		
Chi – Square		134.21		58.01			

[1]Similairty in coefficient values cannot be rejected; p-value 0.880

Selection Bias: To detect selection biases stemming from associational participation we use a recent and intuitive method known as propensity score matching. First, we identify the group with associational participation as the treated group and the group that is without associational relation as the control group. Suppose that associational participation does not contribute to active citizenship but other characteristics do contribute. Suppose further that these other characteristics, even if unobservable, are highly correlated with some observable characteristics relevant to associational participation. In that case, associational participation is irrelevant to active citizenship. Then, on average, a member from the treated group should engage in citizenship activity in the same way as a member from the control group when both have these other observable characteristics.

To see this more clearly, one can construct two sub-groups of individuals from, respectively, the treated and control group by selecting individuals for each of the two groups that have the same characteristics in regards to a set of variables. If the two groups, distinct only in regards to associational participation, have similar rates of citizen activity then associational participation does not contribute to active citizenship. Two groups are deemed similar in this context if they

have the same proclivity to participate in associational activities no matter if they actually had or had not participated in associations in our sample. The proclivity is based on a probit using certain characteristics following findings by Rosenbaum and Rubin (1985). We then use standard methods to pair control and treated group by this proclivity (or score) described in (Dehejia and Wahba 2002) to obtain two sets of sample – a group that actually had associational participation and one that did not. Both have similar observed characteristics; one can conjecture that non-observed factors are similar. We can show that the small samples contain statistically similar groups.

If the matched control and treated groups are *equally* active then the associational effect on being active is essentially very small or negligible. We next show that the propensities to be active for the treated and control groups are in fact different, despite the fact that they have similar characteristics. The difference in being active widens when comparing the matched groups.

In Table 2.3, the columns under the heading *Unmatched* report the proportions that are active citizens or that mobilize government. The difference in proportions that make up active citizens for those with associational participation and those without is significant. This difference remains consistent throughout the two matching techniques we used. In each case the groups act differently. Thus we can confirm that there are no selection biases in associational participation influencing citizen activities. Similar results hold for Mexico City, but in Table 2.3 we only present the results for *mobilizing government*. We note again that the model to explain associational participation is rather weak for Mexico City.

Table 2.3 Propensity to be active for those with and without associational participation after groups have been matched, São Paulo and Mexico City

Outcome Variable	**Unmatched**		**One to one: nearest neighbor**		**Three nearest neighbor**	
Associational Participation	With	Without	With	Without	With	Without
São Paulo						
Active Citizens	.5597	.2777	.559	.258	.5601	.2732
Mobilizing Government	.5	.2425			.5	.2309
Mexico City						
Mobilizing Government	.5683	.3604			.5683	.3908

No alternative models: What is result of the various tests we have run to substantiate the models reported in Tables 4 and 5 in the text? Can we assert that associational participation results in increased active citizenship of various forms? We believe the results for the endogeneity test show that the probit models are applicable even if for some specifications endogeneity cannot be ruled out. Our tests show that we can rule out selection bias, with the reservation that we do not have strong explanation for associational participation in the case of Mexico City.

References

Álvarez, L. (Ed.) (2002). *La Sociedad civil ante la transición democrática*. (México, DF: Plaza y Valdés Editores)

Álvarez Enríquez, L. (2004). *La Sociedad civil en la ciudad de México: Atores sociales, oportunidades políticas y esfera publica*. (México DF: Plaza y Valdés Editores)

Ansell, C. & Gingrich, J. (2003). Reforming the Administrative State. (In B. E. Cain, R. J. Dalton & S. E. Scarrow (Eds.), *Democracy Transformed? Expanding Political Opportunities in Advanced Industrial Countries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Avritzer, L. (2003). *Democracy and the Public Space in Latin America*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press)

Avritzer, L. (2004). O Associativismo na cidade de São Paulo. (In L. Avritzer (Ed.), *O Associativismo em São Paulo*. São Paulo: UNESP)

Avritzer, L. & Navarro, Z. (Eds.) (2004) *A Inovação democrática no Brasil*. (São Paulo: Cortez editora)

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

Bane, M. J. (2005). The Catholic Puzzle: Parishes and Civic Life. (In M. J. Bane, B. Coffin, and R. Higgins (Eds.), *Taking Faith Seriously*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

Bratton, M. (2006, Feb 17-18). Poor People and Democratic Citizenship in Africa. (Paper presented at the Duke Workshop on Poverty and Democracy, Durham)

Booth, J. A. & Mitchell, A. S. (2006, February 17-18). Inequality and Democracy in Latin America: Individual and Contextual Effects of Wealth on Political Participation. (Paper presented at the Duke Workshop on Poverty and Democracy, Durham)

Bound, J., Brown, C. & Mathiowetz, N. (2001). Measurement Error in Survey Data. (In J.J. Heckman & E. Leamer (Eds.), *Handbook of Econometrics. Volume 5*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science)

Bowman, K., Lehoucq, F. & Mahoney, J. (2005). Measuring Political Democracy: Case Expertise, Data Adequacy, and Central America." *Comparative Political Studies* 38 (8), 939-970.

Cain, B. E., Dalton, R. J. and Scarrow, S. E. (Eds.) (2003). *Democracy Transformed? Expanding Political Opportunities in Advanced Industrial Countries*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Camp, R. A. (2006). *Politics in Mexico: The Democratic Consolidation*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Centro de Estudios Sociológicos. (1997). México en el umbral del milenio. (México, DF: El Colegio de México)

Chaudhuri, S. & Heller, P. (2002). The Plasticity of Participation: Evidence from a Participatory Governance Experiment. (Mimeo, Department of Economics, Columbia University)

Cohen, J. & Rogers, J. (1995). *Associations and Democracy*. (London: Verso)

Collier, R. B. & Collier, D. (2001). *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement and Regime Dynamics in Latin America*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press)

Collier, D. & Levitsky, S. (1997). Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research. *World Politics*, 49 (3), 430-451.

Comin, A. A. (2003). Mudanças na estrutura ocupacional do mercado de trabalho em São Paulo. Doctoral dissertation, University of São Paulo.

Dagnino, E. (2007). Dimensions of Citizenship in Contemporary Brazil. *Fordham Law Review*, 75 (5), 2469-2482.

Dagnino, E. (Ed.) (1994) *Anos 90: Política e sociedade no Brasil*. (São Paulo: editora brasiliense)

Dagnino, E. (Ed.) (2002) *Sociedade civil e espaços públicos no Brasil*. (São Paulo: Paz e Terra)

Davis, D. E. (1994). *Urban Leviathan: Mexico City in the Twentieth Century*. (Temple: Temple University Press)

Diamond, L. (1999). *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press)

Dalton, R. J. (2006). *Citizen Politics: Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. (Washington: CQ Press)

Dalton, R. J., Scarrow, S. E. & Cain, B. E. (2003). New Forms of Democracy? Reform and Transformation of Democratic Institutions. (In B. E. Cain, R. J. Dalton, & S. E. Scarrow (Eds.), *Democracy Transformed? Expanding Political Opportunities in Advanced Industrial Countries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Davis, D. E. (2006). Undermining the Rule of Law: Democratization and the Dark Side of Police Reform in Mexico. *Latin American Politics & Society*, 48 (1), 55-86.

Deaton, A. S. (1997). *The Analysis of Household Surveys: A Microeconometric Approach to Development Policy*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press)

Dehejia, R. & Wahba, S. (2002). Propensity Score-Matching Methods for Non-experimental Causal Studies. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 84 (1), 151-161.

Diamond, L. (1999). *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation*. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press)

Diamond, L. & Morlino, L. (Eds.) (2005). *Assessing the Quality of Democracy.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press)

Durand Ponte, V. M. (2004). *Ciudadanía y cultura política: México 1993-2001*. (Mexico DF: Siglo veintiuno)

Fox, J. (1994). The Difficult Transition from Clientelism to Citizenship. *World Politics*, 46, 151-184.

Friedman, J. & Hochstetler, K. (2002). Assessing the Third Transition in Latin American Democratization: Representational Regimes and Civil Society in Argentina and Brazil. *Comparative Politics* 35 (1), 21-42.

Fung, A. (2003). Associations and Democracy: Between Theories, Hopes, and Realities. *American Review of Sociology*, 29, 515-39.

George, A L. & Bennett, A. (2005). *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences.* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press)

Goetz, A.M. & Jenkins, R. (2005). *Reinventing Accountability: Making Democracy Work for Human Development.* (Palgrave Macmillan)

Govender, K. (2003). Assessment of Section 4 of the Promotion of Administrative Justice Act 2000 as a Means of Advancing Participatory democracy in South Africa. S*APR/PL*, 18, 1-27.

Gurza Lavalle, A, Houtzager, P. P. & Acharya, A. K. (2005). Beyond Comparative Anecdotalism: How Civil and Political Organizations Shape Participation in São Paulo, Brazil. *World Development* 33 (6), 951-961.

Gurza-Lavalle, A., Houtzager, P. P. & Castello, G. (2005). The Political Construction of Civil Organizations: A comparative Analysis of São Paulo and Mexico City. (Paper presented at the workshop "Rights, Representation and the Poor: Comparing Large Developing Democracies – Brazil, India, and Mexico," Bellagio Center, Italy)

Harriss, J. (2005, March 12). Political Participation, Representation and the Urban-Poor: Findings from Research in Delhi. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 1041-1054.

Heckman, J. (1990). Varieties of Selection Bias. *American Economic Review* 80, 313-318.

Hill, K. Q. & Matsubayashi, T. (2005). Civic Engagement and Mass-Elite Agenda Agreement in American Communities. *American Political Science Review*, 99 (2), 215-224.

Houtzager, P. P. (2003). Introduction: From Polycentrism to the Polity. (In P. P. Houtzager & M. Moore (Eds.), *Changing Paths: The New Politics of Inclusion in International Development.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press)

Houtzager, P. P., Gurza-Lavalle, A. & Castello, G. (2005). Citizens and States in the Post-Reform Period: Direct, Contentious, and Detached Relations in São Paulo and Mexico City. (Paper presented at the workshop Rights, Representation and the Poor Rockefeller Bellagio Center, Italy)

Houtzager, P. P., Acharya, A. K. & Gurza-Lavalle, A. (2007). Associations and the Exercise of Citizenship in New Democracies: Empirical Evidence from São Paulo and Mexico City. *IDS Working Paper 285*. (Institute of Development Studies, United Kingdom)

Huntington, S. P. (1991). The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century. (Norman: Oklahoma Press)

Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (IBGE). (1996). *Pesquisa mensal de emprego: abril de 1996. Associativismo, representação de interesses e participação política*. (Rio de Janeiro: IBGE)

Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (IBGE). (2001). *Censo Demográfico 2000: Características da população e dos domicílios: Resultados do universo*. (Rio de Janeiro: IBGE)

Isunza Vera, E. (2006, 28-29 April). Interfaces socio-estatales y procesos de democratización: Una tipología para analizar experiencias de participación ciudadana, transparencia y rendición de Cuentas. (Paper presented at the 2nd Annual Europe-Latin America Encounter on Participatory Democracy and the Quality of Public Services, Poitiers, France)

Karl, T. L. (1990). Dilemmas of Democratization in Latin America. *Comparative Politics,* 23 (1), 1-19.

Kinzo, M. D. A. & Dunkerley, J. (Eds.) (2003). *Brazil since 1985: Economy, Polity and Society*. (London: Institute of Latin American Studies)

Kingstone, P. R. & Power, T. J. (Eds.) (1999). *Democratic Brazil: Actors, Institutions, and Processes*. (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press)

Krishna, A. (2003). Poor People's Participation in Democracy at the Local Level: Information and Education Matter more than Wealth and Social Status. (Terry Sanford Institute Working Paper SAN03-04, Duke, North Carolina)

Levy, D. C. & Bruhn, K. (2006). *Mexico: The Struggle for Democratic Development*. (Berkeley: University of California Press; 2 edition)

Linz, J. J. & Stepan, A. 1996. *Problems of Democratic Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press)

Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-Level Bureaucracy: The Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Service.* (New York: Russell Sage)

Locke, R. & Thelen, K. (1995). Apples and Oranges Revisited: Contextualized Comparisons and the Study of Labor Politics. *Politics and Society*, 23 (3), 337-67.

Mainwaring, S. & Welna, C. (Eds.) (2003). *Democratic Accountability in Latin America.* (New York: Oxford University Press)

Mainwaring, S. & Scully, T. R. (Eds.) (1995). *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America.* (Stanford: Stanford University Press)

Mathiowetz, N. A. (2000). The Effect of Length of Recall on the Quality of Survey Data. (Paper presented at the Fourth Conference on Methodological Issues in Official Statistics, Stockholm, Sweden)

McAdam, D. (1999). *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*. (2nd edition. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press)

McAdam, D., Tarrow, S. & Tilly, C. (2001). *Dynamics of Contention*. (Cambridge University Press)

Méndes, J. E., O'Donnell, G., & Pinheiro, P. S. (Eds.) (1999). *The (Un)Rule of Law and the Underprivileged in Latin America.* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press)

Munck, G. & J. Verkuilen. (2002). Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices. *Comparative Political Studies* 35 (1), 5-34.

O'Donnell, G. (1993). On the State, Democratization, and Some Conceptual Problems: A Latin American View with Glances at Some Postcommunist Countries. *World Development*, 21, 1355-69.

O'Donnell, G. (1994). Delegative Democracy. *Journal of Democracy*, 5 (1), 55-69.

O'Donnell, G. (2005). Why the Rule of Law Matters. (In L. Diamond & L. Morlino (Eds.), *Assessing the Quality of Democracy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press)

O'Donnell, G & Schmitter, P.C. (1986). *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press)

Putnam, R. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press)

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. (New York: Simon & Schuster)

Przeworski, A. (1999). Minimalist Conception of Democracy: A Defense. (In I. Shapiro & C. Hacker-Cordón (Eds.), *Democracy's Value*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Przeworski, A. & Teune, H. (1966). Equivalence in Cross-National Research. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 30 (4), 551-568

Roberts, K. (2002). Party-Society Linkages and Democratic Representation in Latin America. *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, 27 (53), 9-34.

Rosenbaum, P. & D. Rubin. (1985). Constructing a Control Group Using Multivariate Matched Sampling Methods that Incorporate the Propensity. *American Statistician*, 75 (371), 591-93.

Rosenstone, S. J. & Hansen, J. M. (1993). *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. (New York: Longman)

Rueschemeyer, D., Stephens, E. H. & Stephens, J. D. (1992). *Capitalist Development and Democracy*. (Cambridge: Polity Press, and Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

Santos, B. de S. (1998). Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre: Toward a Redistributive Democracy. *Politics & Society*, 26 (4), 461-510.

Schedler, A., Diamond, L. & and Plattner, M. F. (Eds.) (1999). *The Self-Restraining State: Power and Accountability in New Democracies.* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Riener)

Schmitter, P. (1974). Still the Century of Corporatism? *The Review of Politics*, 36, 85–105.

Schmitter, P., O'Donnell, G. & Whitehead, L. (1986). *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press)

SEADE, Fundação Sistema Estadual de Análise de Dados. (1998). *Pesquisa de condições de vida.* (São Paulo: Fundaçao SEADE)

Skocpol, T. (1992). *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States*. (Cambridge: Belknap Press/Harvard University Press)

Skocpol, T. (1999). Advocates without Members: The Recent Transformation of American Civic Life. (In T. Skocpol & M.P. Fiorina (Eds.), *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution)

Smulovitz, C. & Peruzzotti, E. (2002). Social Accountability in Latin America. *Journal of Democracy*, 11 (October), 147-158.

Snyder, R. (2001). Scaling Down: The Subnational Comparative Method. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 36 (1), 93-110.

STATA-9. (2005). *Reference*. (College Station, Texas: StataCore LP)

Stewart, R. (1975). The Reformation of American Administrative Law. *Harvard Law Review*, 88 (8), 1669-1813.

Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Tavares de Almeida, M. H. (1996). *Crise econômica & interesses organizados*. (São Paulo: Edusp)

Tilly, C. (2000). Processes and Mechanisms of Democratization. *Sociological Theory*, 18, 1-16.

Tilly, C. (2004). *Contention and Democracy in Europe, 1650-2000*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Tilly, C. (2007). *Democracy*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Tulchin, J. S. & Ruthenberg, M. (Eds.) (2007). *Citizenship in Latin America.* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner)

Verba, S, Nie, N. H. & Kim, J. O. (1978). *Participation and Political Equality: A Seven-Nation Comparison*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L. & Brady, H. (1995). *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press)

Whitehead, L. & Gray-Molina, G. (2003). Political Capabilities over the Long Run. (In P. P. Houtzager & M. Moore (Eds.), *Changing Paths: The New Politics of Inclusion in International Development.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press)

Yashar, D. (1999). Democracy, Indigenous Movements, and the Postliberal Challenge in Latin America. *World Politics*, 52 (1), 76-104.