CITIZEN PARTICIPATION MODELS, IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Introduction.

Public participation as public policy, has gained currency in political science and public administration in recent years, due in large part to the development of a new model of government called governance << particularly within local governance >> reference to the patterns and structures that emerge in a democratic system between social, political and administrative actors (Kooiman, 1993). This is a new style of government (other than the traditional hierarchical transition to government-governance), which is characterized by increased interaction between state and non-state actors in joint decision-making networks between public and private (Natera, 2004:6).

This new model pretends to enhance public participation in the closest to the citizen, that is to say, the local level, through a strategy of subsidiarity. Citizen participation is part of the "participatory democracy" and has also been present in the discourse of political elites in countries with liberal representative democracy in recent decades, as a strategy to revitalize traditional democracy. Participatory democracy as Parés (2009:17) said, does not have a homogeneous and universal definition, due to the heterogeneity of the social, political, economic and cultural, it almost impossible to find a useful definition for all the diversity of practices participatory.

Theoretical Framework/Conceptualization

However, the concept of "citizen participation" has found itself some points of agreement in the literature, including the International Observatory for Participatory Democracy, defining citizen participation as political practices through which citizens intended to influence some dimension of what is public (OIDP, 2007). And verba & Nie, gives the following definition: "Political participation Refers to activities of Citizens that are more or less directly aimed at influencing the choice of the people they govern and / or actions taken" (Verba & Nie, 1972:2). Meanwhile Brady, tells us that refers to "Ordinary citizen action aimed at influencing some political outcomes (Brady, 1999:737)."

However, it is important to clarify that under the term "citizen participation" can be involved a number of forms of participation (voting in elections, protests, demonstrations etc.), therefore, the criterion for determining what kind of participation we are talking in this work, will be the claim of the citizen to be part of, be, feel part of and take part (Alguacil, 2005) of the res publica, that is to say, in matters of public policy.

In this sense, speaking of citizen participation must be understood in terms of consultation, deliberation or decision, as can be: advisory councils, participatory processes, public
hearings, participatory budgeting, etc. The model of participatory democracy complements the forms of representative liberal democracy prevailing to date, such as forms: voting in elections, membership in political parties, participation in rallies and campaigns, etc. (Parés, 2009: 18).

Early models of representative versus participatory democracy, derived from the theoretical and policy approaches to democratic regulation: the liberal, neo republican and autonomous approach. Citizen participation it is derived from neo republican focus, on so-called forms of participatory democracy (deliberative and direct), in response to the failures of representative democracy (Guitián: 2001, 2003); under this "participatory" model citizens are constantly called to participate in the formulation, planning and / or management of certain policies.

**Typology of political participation.**

Once defined political participation and having specified acts encompassing, now we will refer to their type, in order to frame the citizen participation within the different modes of participation. Since 1972 Verba and Nie, made a criterion of theoretical classification distinguished four types of participation: voting, campaign activities, cooperative activities (working with other people or organizations to solve local problems) and contacts initiated by citizens. More recently authors like Teorell, Torcal and Montero (2003) propose the following typology:

- **Electoral vs non-electoral**
- **Conventional vs unconventional.**
- **Exit voice and loyalty.**

**Electoral vs non electoral**

Voter turnout is the form of political participation which is more exerted and lower costs than other forms of participation and occurs within a highly mobilizing political context (voting, participating in meetings, assist in the development of the campaign, etc.) And non-electoral refers to other forms of participation that develop outside the electoral context (e.g., when citizens contact with elected representatives, or work in a political action group, etc.).

**Conventional and unconventional participation.**

Distinctive forms of political participation based on whether or not to conform to social norms and dominant values of a society (Barnes and Kaase, 1979). Conventional political participation is legal and legitimate, and in many cases such as voting, is promoted by institutions and elites. Russel J. Dalton (1988:47) tells us that some examples of conventional participation are voting (voting in elections) campaign activity (convince others how to vote, attend rallies, demonstrations, working for a party or candidate); communal activity (work in groups to solve common / contact with political problems). Unconventional participation does not use channels institutionalized participation (voting,
campaigning, etc.) and sometimes is extralegal, it develops from the boycotts, conscientious objection and insubordination, occupations of buildings, traffic crashes, petition signatures, etc. Some authors prefer to call political protest rather unconventional participation and given as examples: sabotage, guerrilla, put explosive bombs, kidnapping, etc.

*Exit voice and loyalty.*

This distinction is due to Hirschman (1977), which makes the distinction between voice and exit (exit voice and loyalty). The output refers to the ability to exert pressure by threatening to leave: for example, stop voting in elections, leaving a political party, in which the project is no longer believed, and so on. Voice refers to the ability to communicate dissatisfaction towards the system, the party or organization, through public protest, contacts with public office or work as an activist within an organization.

**Background and context of European participation in Spain.**

In promoting actions aimed at increasing citizen participation at the local level involved supranational institutions like the European Union and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), this due to the lack of interest in politics and the difficulties of interest citizens at public through the traditional mechanisms of participation (Pastor, E. 2010).

The role of the European Union at the local level has until recently been on analyzing the regulations approved in citizen participation by the European Parliament and the Commission can conclude that the Union's participation is only one phase in the process of approval of white papers, through periods of public information on-line and a number of incentive programs to twinning between different European cities (Sanchez, Z. 2010), however, as discussed below, there an effort by the Committee, the Parliament and the Council of Europe to encourage citizen participation, among which are the following:

a) *Recommendation No. R (81) 18, of the Committee of Ministers to Member States concerning participation at the municipal level.*

b) *The European Charter of Local Autonomy.*

c) *The Melis report on participation and representation of regions in European integration.*

d) *European governance and civic participation.*

e) *The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European citizens.*

**Considerations of the Council of Europe on participation.**

Highlights include the recommendations made by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, and the intergovernmental sector as part of the Parliamentary Assembly and the Congress (called "conference" until 1994) Local and Regional Authorities of Europe (CPLRE) as representative of the camera local and regional authorities.
The development of local democracy, is the order of the day in all European countries, however, the state of local democracy in the countries of the Council of Europe is different, according to the Report of the Steering Committee on Local and Regional Democracy (CDLR) the major issues raised in the responses of 25 countries (which are not shared by all countries, nor do they have the same effects on the countries in question) are:

**Global trends affecting participation.**

The experience of citizen participation in various forms varies from country to country. There is, however, a number of general trends, manifested in varying degrees in all Member States of the Council of Europe. These trends show that it is important for all countries to monitor the quality of citizen participation in local life preparing programs to meet the needs as they take a matter of urgency. The general trends that participation in all countries are as follows:

*a) The impact of new information and communication.*

These techniques provide citizens with the means to exchange information and knowledge quickly. They also offer new opportunities to decide by vote or, more broadly, to intervene in government decisions. The technology does not determine the policy, but has new expectations and possibilities.

*b) The impact of globalization on the local political structure.*

If there is some time a network of global interconnections, it is also true that there has been an intensification of both the internationalization of the internal affairs of States as the scale of decision making at the international level. Economic and environmental and international issues are, for example, two fields in which national and international dimensions are more related than previously. The internationalization of decision making, which appears in the laws, rules and conventions locally, are manifested in many sectors.

The globalization process has implications for the politics of nation-states as well as reduces the space left to local politics and ultimately questions the value of citizen participation in local life. If "true" decisions and influences are elsewhere, what good local politics? Or to turn the argument, if the legitimate government rests on the consent of those it affects a decision, how is it possible that in a world marked by globalization and the multiple interconnections, this agreement may be allowed to be expressed within the bounds of traditional political structures? The geographical horizon of political life has been extended. It may be that people are able to "think globally and act locally", but the emergence of a global society requires at least a redefinition of the purpose and style of local politics.

*c) The impact of changing patterns of employment and economic growth.*

Modern economies require better educated labor force, stronger participation of women in professional life and for many, a more intense work. While some are forced to become more integrated into the economy, others are suffering the experience of economic and social exclusion. These changes affect in various ways to the propensity to take part in political life. Those are generally better prepared citizens who have a certain degree of
instruction. The obstacles to sex-linked political commitment tend to be based on the most important changes that affect society.

However, the intensity of the professional requirements limits the time they can devote to many political and interest can bring, as the most important "achievements" and political "success" that highlight the providence of State may interest to the extent, that they can find better way in the private sector is lost. As for those who suffer from social and economic exclusion, disappointment, apathy and a sense of powerlessness can keep them away from public life (INAP, 2001: 17-22).

Citizen participation issues in Spain.

In the Spanish case, we found insufficient powers exerted at the local level and the institutional role of local authorities; representative associations of local authorities, and the main political parties are in agreement that local governments are the ones who have to play a more important role than they have taken so far. We must broaden the scope of their responsibilities, ensure financial self-sufficiency and strengthen its institutional position.

All political forces have been involved in negotiations for an agreement on the measures that have: the development of the means of action of local governments to increase their skills and strengthen its presence in various organs; strengthening legal protection of local autonomy from the possible interference by the state or regions, so that public facilities can now go directly to the Constitutional Court against laws that went against local autonomy; improving the mechanisms that influence the way of governing (strengthening the management responsibilities of the executive body and the role of the control of the Council).

Associations representing the interests of citizens complain that in practice local authorities see participation as a concession on their part rather than as a right of citizens: its regulations in this area are more likely to control participation initiatives that develop them; participation is reduced to mere information and this information would be often incomplete or inadequate (INAP, 2001: 80).

In contemporary liberal democracies one of the main problems we encounter is the democratic citizen disaffection, implying low levels of participation in everything related with public policy. So questions arise: Why the citizen participates in democracy? What are the factors that affect their participation?

From a review of the literature we find several explanatory variables on why the city is involved in politics and why participates; found mainly explanatory variables individually and as civic and political culture of the individual (Almond, 2003; Almond & Sydney, 1970, 1989), their socio-economic status (SES) (et al, 1995 and Pattie et al, 2004), the age and gender (Ferrer, M, Medina, L. and Torcal, M. 2006), and so on. But we propose to find another variable that affects citizen participation.
Research Objective

• General objective.

Propose a new explanatory model relating to citizen participation, which will help us to implement participatory public policies in the local government scheme, comparing models of citizen participation derivatives of structural variables and choice theories.

• Specific objectives.

1. Determine the explanatory variables on citizen participation in local government municipalities of Spain.

2. Find the most parsimonious that fits better explain citizen participation, in the local government scheme, derived from the choice and structural theories.

Justification of Research

• Academic or theoretical: measuring levels of citizen participation variables in the theory, so far, are not inferential but descriptive (statistical, range, mean, measures of central tendency, standard error etc.) For example the work of Charles Pattie, Patrick and Paul Whiteley Seyed in Citizenship in Britain (2004). Or Citizens, associations and participation in Spain edited by José Ramón Montero, Joan Font, and Mariano Torcal, 2006.

• Social: currently, citizen participation and public policy is increasingly integrated into the agenda of Western countries with advanced industrial democracy. To the citizen skepticism with everything that has to do with politicians, political parties and institutions (Putnam, 2000) have developed mechanisms of participation that are intended to include more citizens in public decision-making and thus gain legitimacy and democratic support. Example: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Spain, Denmark, Finland, France, Great Britain, Holland, Japan, Norway, New Zealand, and Switzerland, so on.

Hypothesis

According to the research, we will test the next hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1 (Voluntarism Model): Citizens with resources, psychological engagement, mobilized, partisanship and efficacy, report higher levels of citizen participation.

Hypothesis 2 (Equity-fairness model): Citizens with economic deprivation, and low perception of outcomes & expectation, report higher levels of citizen participation.

Hypothesis 3 (Social Capital Model): Citizens that are membership of informal network, exposure to TV (-), membership of associations, with local community attachment, trust in institutions and trust in people, report higher levels of citizen participation.
Hypothesis 4 (Cognitive Engagement Model): Citizens with education, political dissatisfaction, political Knowledge, Interest in politics and media exposure (+), report higher levels of citizen participation.

Hypothesis 5 (General Incentives Model): Citizens with efficacy (influence in government and politics), and incentives like expressive benefits (pride to being Spanish, French, etc.), report higher levels of citizen participation.

Citizen Participation Models.

As we have said previously, the objective of this research is to propose and evaluate an explanatory model relating to citizen participation, which will help us to implement successful participatory public policies in the local government.

In this regard there are several theories that attempt to explain these variables; these theories can be grouped into two broad categories: the choice theories of citizenship and the structural theories of citizenship.

The first theories attempt to explain the individual factors why the citizen participates and further classified into: a) Cognitive engagement theory, and b) The general incentives theory; and the second theories attempt to explain the influence of structural factors affecting citizen participation and are classified as: a) The civic voluntarism theory, b) The social capital theory), and c) The equity fairness theory (Pattie, C., Seyd, P. and Whiteley, P. 2004).

The choice theories of citizenship.

The pure version of these theories has been used by economists; in this perspective the people are viewed as operators in a world where value for money is the transcendent. Under this view, people tend to maximize their usefulness, to make huge profits at minimal cost. According to this theory the participation of citizens in politics depends on three elements: the cost of participation, the benefit that can be obtained and the ability to influence the achievement of results through their own participation (Anduiza, E. and Bosch, A. 2004).

The cost of participation. Participation involves some costs for the individual: an effort is necessary to obtain information, analyze it, process it and decide what to do and how to act. In some cases, such as strikes, to participate may result in loss of wages or even other reprisals. In others, such as voting, the cost of participation is lower. In any case according to the theory, the greater rational choice will be the lower utility costs to participate and therefore lower participation.

Benefits. Participation is exerted in order to achieve a goal: to win our favorite political party, etc. The theory of rational choice does not obtain what purposes that are pursued or reasons to do so, but assumes that individuals have preferences (some parties over others, policies on others, some situations over others). The greater the benefit gained from the achievement of its objectives will be greater involvement and participation. The benefits
are achieved through successful participation (to win the preferred party, the decree was withdrawn or war will not start), unlike costs, are collective, i.e. affecting all citizens have participated or not.

Ability to influence. At about whether to participate valuation, citizens also take into account their ability to influence the final outcome. If citizen action has a high weight at the time of impact on the outcome because it is "one in million" citizens find less utility in participation. If, conversely, that obtained or not depends on the participation target then participate utility increases. Why voter turnout is usually higher when forecasts do not give a clear winner, i.e. when the outcome depends on a few votes.

**The choice theories are classified as:** a) **Cognitive engagement theory**, and b) **The general incentive theory**.

**a) The cognitive engagement theory.**

The main idea of this theory is that participation depends on citizens having access to information about politics and government, and their desire to use that information to engage in a reasoned way. The increase in the levels of education that helps citizens to acquire and process large amounts of information, it is considered that education provides skills in the area of technology while at the same time increases the individual's ability to analyze it further cheaper in cost to acquire information (TV, electronic media, etc.), contribute to produce a process of citizen mobilization. From this point of view, this theory recalls the Greek concept of being an informed citizen and as a member of the polis, actively involved in politics and understand the whole process of government. From this perspective the informed citizen is a "critical citizen". Citizen dissatisfaction with the state makes manifest in forms of unconventional participation, such as protest.

The main variables that explain this theory are: education, use of media, interest in politics and political knowledge, and satisfaction / dissatisfaction policy. Education is measured in levels from low to high; use of media, if referred through these information is acquired about politics; political interest in terms of motivation to continue government operations and policy-making, political knowledge is whether citizens understand how the political system works; and satisfaction / dissatisfaction policy refers to public attitudes about the performance of the system to deliver benefits to the citizens.

Critics to this theory said that this theory does not explain why once individuals have acquired all the information, they would be motivated to use it to act in an informed manner. That is, citizens are able to acquire and process information, but in the absence of incentives is not clear why they would be motivated to participate. Nowadays, it is easy to imagine a city with high levels of education, interested in politics, which follow the media and to know the functioning of the political system, but not voluntarily participate in political events. So, acquire and process information is incomplete to explain participation in the absence of a theory of incentive mechanism.
The hypothetical model of Cognitive Engagement theory is showed below:

**Hypothesis 1 (Cognitive Engagement Model):** Citizens with education, political dissatisfaction, political knowledge, interest in politics and media exposure (+), report higher levels of citizen participation:

Hypothetical Model 1. Related to hypothesis “Cognitive engagement theory”.

*b) The general incentive theory.*

This theory was specifically introduced to explain the different types of participation of activists in a political party, the main idea of this theory is that the individual participates and has positive civic values if they have several types of incentives to do: collective, selective, group, social and expressive. The emphasis on incentives to act, make it identify this theory with rational choice, since the decision of citizens to participate depends on the perceived costs thereof.

Collectives Incentives: refer to the accumulated citizens get involved whether or not benefits, these benefits are defined by economists as public benefits, such as health, education etc. Collective incentives refer to the outputs of the government in relation to the individual safety of citizens and the economy, which are usually the most significant issues for citizens. If citizens think that policies in this area are effective, they will be encouraged to participate, however if they consider that the policies are failing in these areas, citizens will not be motivated to participate. This can also cause an imbalance between the individual sense of rights and obligations. For the personal perceptions of the effectiveness of participation in this theory plays an important role: if the citizen believes the system works well (or not) and at the same time believes that their participation has little or nothing in the outcomes of the political system, not be encouraged to participate. Contrary if you think that the system can provide better outcomes with your participation will be reasonable for you to participate.

Selective incentives: relate to the benefits that people can get for the exercise of participation itself, and who do not participate do not receive these benefits. Such incentives give us the guidelines to understanding why there are citizen activists while others are not. There are usually two types: process and outcome. The process refers to the incentives arising from the process itself, that is to say, the satisfaction it gives citizens actually participating, for example, fun, cathartic, meet interesting and like-minded people, and this can motivate enough to participate; and, incentives result refer to the interest in
achieving certain objectives in the political process, but goals such as personal rather than collective type, for example, citizens who are interested in being elected mayors, deputies, or get public recognition, others occupy their time (retirees people).

Incentives group, refer to the individual perception of that group benefits are a good reason to participate and support civic values. When people consider collective action solves social problems, they might think of the group benefit more than the individual benefit. A cost-benefit calculation of participation at the group level rather than individual level. If this idea is applied to explain the question of what motivates people to be good citizens, one reason may be that some people participate because they believe that they can obtain group benefits that they care about.

Social incentives, derived from social norms or the public perception that other individuals supporting civic attitudes and participation. If individuals are surrounded by citizens demanding their rights but do not meet their obligations, or citizens who expect someone else to do the duties of citizens, this may inhibit participation. Current social networks do influence the behavior of others on his own, from the perspective of this theory.

Finally, expressive incentives, which refer to emotional or affective feelings of individuals towards society. These reasons are outside incentives for cost-effective, are located more in the tradition of social psychological research. They fall within the studies of Campbell et al, (1960), Frank (1988), which refer to models in which the citizen is an emotional predisposition to participate (Commitment model). This means that some people will be motivated to be good citizens when they feel certain affective feelings for their country, it is because of pride in belonging to a particular country, such as would be proud to be Spanish, French, English, and so on.

Clearly, this theory does not put aside the incentives as does cognitive theory, but also you can criticize that overemphasized the importance of rational behavior, leaving aside the socialization process, which plays a very important in explaining why some people are good citizens and not others. For example, there is evidence that citizens engage in voluntary activities, sympathize with certain party or are patriotic because their families. Or individuals with strong family ties in a community tend to be better citizens than those who do not. Thus, the individualistic emphasis of these theories, denying the strong influence played by structural factors in determining good / bad citizen leads to the following theories where these structural factors are discussed.
The hypothetical model of general incentive theory is showed below:

**Hypothesis 2 (General Incentives Model):** Citizens with efficacy (influence in government and politics), and incentives like expressive benefits (pride to being Spanish, French, etc.), report higher levels of citizen participation.

Hypothetical Model 2. Related to hypothesis “general incentives theory”.

**The structural theories of citizenship.**

Such structural theories differ from choice theories in that the first suggest that public participation is the result of forces of macro social level, rather than individual choice, for these theories of social and political structures matter. Within the structural theories of citizenship are: the civic voluntarism theory, the equity-the fairness theory and the social capital theory.

**a) The civic voluntarism theory.**

The origins of this theory go back to the pioneering research of Sidney Verba and Norman Nie, at the United States (Verba and Nie, 1972) on participation. Subsequently, it has been applied by other authors to explain participation in a number of countries (Verba, S., Norman N. 1995, Parry, G. Moysyer, G. and Day, N.1992, Barnes, S. and Kaase, M. 1979, Verba, S. Norman, N. and Jae-On-K 1978). This theory is summarized in three main ideas citizens do not participate because they cannot, because they do not because they have not been asked to do it (Can, Like and asked of CLEAR Inform made by the Council of Europe).

The first aspect (can) is defined in terms of time, money and civic skills; the second (like) in terms of the perception of citizens about the effectiveness of the political system; and the third (asked), refers to the request to participate in co-workers, church or organization, and so on. According to this theory, people with more resources participate more; these resources are the product of social or inherited structures of family and education. According to this model the socioeconomic status (SES) of people (work, education, and income) determines the level of citizen participation.
Verba and colleagues (Verba and Nie, 1972: 118-119), developed the first empirical typology of different modes of participating citizens and classified into six different categories based on the type of participatory activity performed, according to this classification we have: inactive people, as its name indicates little or no participation within these categories dominated by women, the elderly, and people with low socioeconomic status, however within the active citizens often have a greater presence of men middle age, with high levels of education and married and an active social life and work income; specialists voters, who vote regularly but do not participate in anything else; parish participants, who contact with politicians only to specific problems but do not participate more; community people, who are intermittently mixed up in political events and issues of social interest but not permanently intrude; reformers, who are heavily mixed up in all campaigns and participate in conventional forms and some legal forms of protest; and finally, completely activists involved in all kinds of activities, all forms used both conventional and unconventional or even illegal.

Critics: the first problem is that this theory believes that socioeconomic status predicts civic participation. There are cases where people with high socioeconomic resources are not interested in participate, that is to say, the main failure of this theory is that not explains why a large number of people with higher socioeconomic status are not involved in politics. For example, in advanced industrial societies, where there is an increase in wealth and education levels, there is no correlation between this increase in status and participation of citizens, unlike participation in countries like the U.S.A., Japan, etc., is in decline (Miller, W. and Merrill, Shanks 1999).

A second problem is attributed to this theory is the weakness of its theoretical basis, for failure to provide a coherent relationship between socioeconomic explanatory variables and participation, that is to say, no specific mechanisms linking social status with participation. It is hard to imagine that wealthy people with too much time using their money and free time on political activities rather than vacationing, watching TV and so on. While the theories of general incentives refused structural factors in the latter the incentives for citizens to participate forget. This theory can help to explain citizen participation, but by itself does not explain what makes a good citizen.

The hypothetical model of civic voluntarism theory is showed below:

**Hypothesis 3 (Civic voluntarism model): Citizens with resources, psychological engagement, mobilized, partisanship and efficacy, report higher levels of citizen participation**
Hypothetical Model 3. Related to hypothesis “civic voluntarism theory”.

b) The equity-fairness theory.

These theory focuses on the traditional sociological analysis, which considers that society is divided into competing groups who vie with each other for resources. The main idea of this theory is that individuals compare themselves with other groups in the same category and if this comparison is unfavorable outcomes in their life expectations, frustration or political aggression occurs, which causes the individual to mobilize to demand better social conditions. Clearly the application of this comparison, it can occur between private groups or marginalized in some way, as would be the ethnic minorities and people with low income; e.g. between colleagues in the same category, when one would increase the salary and other does not, the latter will be frustrated by this and is very likely to manifest in different ways. This model has been used to explain the forms of "unconventional" participation as political protests, blocking traffic, or even using illegal forms of protest.

There is evidence that this theory explains certain types of participation as above mentioned forms, but there are serious doubts about the relevance of this theory to explain forms of orthodox or conventional participation, such as voting or why citizens join to parties. It might indeed citizens who are frustrated by their situation, vote against the party deemed guilty, but it can happen otherwise, that is to say, that given the public disappointment in politics, they decide not to participate. As you can appreciate this theory is contrary to the theory presented above civic voluntarism, because while it proclaims that people with more resources tend to participate in this it is said that the lack of resources in persons is what motivates them to participate.
The hypothetical model of equity-fairness incentive theory is showed below:

*Hypothesis 4 (Equity-fairness model): Citizens with economic deprivation, and low perception of outcomes & expectation, report higher levels of citizen participation.*

Hypothetical Model 4. Related to hypothesis “the equity-fairness theory”.

c) *The social capital theory.*

The origins of this theory can be placed in the book "Democracy in America" by Tocqueville in 1832, in which the author analyzes the structure of society in the United States and concluded that the interaction between persons within various associations generates interpersonal trust and social capital. More recent authors (Fukuyama 1995, Putnam, 1993, 2000, Brehm and Rahn, 1997; Van Deth et al, 1999) have extensively developed this theory. The main idea in this theory is that trust between people determines which citizens work together to find solutions to common problems. According to Putnam, social capital is defined as "the organizational social traits such as trust, norms and social networks that provide efficiency to society by facilitating coordinated actions" Trust is the main indicator and generator of social capital according to this theory, because it allows individuals to participate in activities in their community together, with other citizens even without meet each other. In Making Democracy Work (1993), Putnam concludes that communities characterized by high levels of social capital and extensive social networks of citizen involvement have better services in health, education and less crime rates, and high levels of participation.

This theoretical model has received wide attention by contemporary authors from call school social capital, however, is currently being questioned by many other authors, mainly criticizes postulating that participation in non-political volunteer activities, no contribute to better citizens, more aware of public affairs, and generate social and political capital that facilitates cooperation and benefits the functioning of democracy, yet the associations simple social interaction is not sufficient to promote certain democratic attitudes and behaviors.
Another criticism that has received this model is that it denies the influence of incentives for participation, as the problem of explaining why, if a society is characterized by higher levels of social capital that make cooperation between individuals is high, persists few citizens participate while others do not.

The hypothetical model of social capital theory is showed below:

_Hypothesis 5 (Social Capital Model): Citizens that are membership of informal network, exposure to TV(-), membership of associations, with local community attachment, trust in institutions and trust in people, report higher levels of citizen participation._

It is represented in the next scheme:

Hypothetical Model 5. Related to hypothesis “social capital theory”.

**Research Design and empirical strategy.**

**Method**

**Sample and Data collection procedures**

This study used an open, cross-sectional design. We use 2450/Citizenship, Participation and Democracy Survey (Sociological Research Center) of Spain.
Sampling procedure was multistage, stratified cluster sectioning municipalities and then sections in a proportional way. Finally ultimate units (individuals) were established by random routes as gender and age quotas.

- Designed: 4,287 interviews. Distributed as follows:
  - Cataluña: 1,140 interviews
  - Madrid: 505 interviews
  - País Vasco: 1,000 interviews
  - Rest: 1,642 interviews

- Applied: 4,252 interviews. Distributed as follows:
  - Cataluña: 1,135 entrevistas
  - Madrid: 479 entrevistas
  - País Vasco: 1,000 entrevistas
  - Rest: 1,638 entrevista

**Participants:** Spanish population of both sexes, 18 years and over.

**Structural equations**

Regression equations are less restrictive assumptions that allow measurement errors in both variables independent as dependent variables. They are mathematically complex. The great advantage of this type of models is that they allow proposing the kind of relationships we expect to find between the different variables, before moving on to estimate the parameters that are specified by the proposed relations. Therefore confirmatory models are also referred to as the fundamental interest is "confirmed" by analyzing the sample (or samples) proposed theoretical level relationships. As discussed below, the theoretical model specification allows us to propose causal structures among the variables, so that some variables cause an effect on other variables, in turn, may translate these effects to other variables.

The reliability was estimated for each of the scales included in the study using the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. Structural equation models (SEM) were conducted using the AMOS program. These models permit the inclusion of variables that are inter-correlated and can be used to predict individual or multiple variables.

The parameter estimates for the following terms were tested for statistical significance ($\alpha=.05$, two-tailed): factor loadings, path coefficients for direct, indirect and total associations and residual error variance terms for criterion variables. The following criteria were used as indices of an acceptable model fit: (a) Goodness of Fit (GFI) >.90; (b) Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) >.90; (c) Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) <.05; (d) Comparative Fit Index (CFI) >.90; (e) $X^2/gl < 3^{(38)}$; (f) Normed Fit Index (NFI) >.90; (g) Tucker-Lewis coefficient (TLI) >.90$^{(39)}$; and (h) Incremental Fit Index (IFI) >.90$^{(40)}$. 
**Results.**

The reliability was estimated for each of the scales included in the study using the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. Structural equation models (SEM) were conducted using the AMOS program. These models permit the inclusion of variables that are inter-correlated and can be used to predict individual or multiple variables.

After being tested each hypothetical model using the same method, we have the results below:

**Choice theories.**

1. **Cognitive engagement model.**

As show bellow, this model is predictive of citizen participation in 52%, the most higher result comparing with structural theories which the most higher result was of equity-fairness model with 33%.

In this case the variables political knowledge and politics dissatisfaction are correlated in 44%, but political dissatisfaction is correlated with interest in politics with 31% and with media exposure with 11%, that is to say, the independent variables not explain alone the dependent variable, its necessary correlated between them.

So, the impact the most impact on citizen participation are interest in politics and politics dissatisfaction with 63 and 37 % respectively, which confirm the previously studies that said when people is in disappointment with their government and has a lot of information and interest in politics, report higher levels of citizen participation.

For example, in Spain the 15-M movement or called “indignant movement”, this was a symptom of civil society dissatisfaction with the economic outcomes of Spanish government.

In general, the hypothetical model explains 52% the citizen participation, and it has a higher level of fit: adjusted Goodness of Fit Index of .903 and Normed Fit Index of .900, which is statistical significant.
2.- General Incentives Model.

According to the preliminary results, the variable expressive benefit impact 27% on citizen participation, but is due the correlation between efficacy and expressive benefits. So, as said previously by literature when people feel proud about being Mexican, spanish, French etc. It’s probably that they participate, contrary to people that not feel proud or love for their country. For example in empirical research in City Hall Alcobendas, which is spanish city, you can see in front of the built of City Hall, placard like “I love you Alcobendas”, “I want prices for Alcobendas” etc. And this city report higher level of citizen participation. We don’t say that this variable is unique and determinant for the citizen participation, but we found an impact on dependent variable.

In general term, the hypothetical model explains 14% the citizen participation and most of the indices of fit are above 80%.
Structural theories.

1. Voluntarism model.

In this case, the variable efficacy correlated with mobilization impact each other whit 40%, and the most significant variable that impact on citizen participation is mobilization with 30%, and the less significant variable is resources. Whit this result we confirm the theoretical framework working by authors like the Spanish Morales L. who in her book “Instituciones, movilización y participación política: el asociacionismo político en las democracias occidentales” said that a society mobilized report higher levels of citizen participation.

So in the hypothetical model tested, result the variable mobilization the most important, which is easy to think that when the people is asked to participate by political parties, associations, friends etc. is probably that people participate, and when nobody asked to people to participate probably the people not participate.

The preliminary results are important for example, when the politics wants higher levels of participation of people, they have to consider that someone has to asked people to
participate, and to make chances for that, for example into direct democracy forms like plebiscite, referendum, or another mechanism for asking people to participate.

All of the variables taken considered by this model and showed in scheme, explain the citizen participation in 24%, that is to say, a lower level of significance, but we have to consider the higher model fit: adjusted Goodness of Fit Index of .921 and Normed Fit Index of .944, which is statistical significant.

2.- Equity-fairness model.

Like the preliminary results showed below, the most important variable in this case is the perception of outcomes & expectatives, with 45% of significance, but correlated with economic deprivation explain 27% the impact on citizen participation. So the variable perception of outcomes & expectatives, explain with a higher level the citizen participation, that is to say, when people perceive a good results of their government like in education, security, public health, they probably being enrolled in public policy, and participate giving their opinion and pushing to politics to continue doing a good job.

Contrary, when people are disappointment or dissatisfied whit the outcomes of government, they don’t be enthusiastic to participate together with politics, and so on.

For example in countries with higher levels of participation like United State of America or England, usually the outcomes of government in education, or good public services motivate to people to continue participating and paying taxes, because they thought that government is using well their money.

According to the preliminary result the hypothetical model explain the citizen participation in 33%, but it has a higher levels of fit: adjusted Goodness of Fit Index of .949 and Normed Fit Index of .905, which is statistical significant.
3.- Social Capital Model.

According with the preliminary result in this hypothetical model, the variable trust in people correlated with trust in institutions is significance in 65% and 13% on citizen participation, but trust in people alone is not significance and not represent impact on citizen participation.

And membership of association impact on dependent variable in 15%, which is according previously results, that said people mobilized by association reports higher levels of participation.

But the Putnam and the capital social theory, appearing not to be determinant in the results showed below, because if people doesn’t trust in people it don’t care for participation, but if people trust in institutions is more probably that they participate.

All the variables of this model, explain the citizen participation in 18%, and most of fit indices are acceptable above 80%.
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Conclusion.

According to the preliminary analysis and results of data, using structural equation models (SEM) were conducted using the AMOS program. We have that the cognitive engagement model explain the citizen participation in 52%, and the variables of political dissatisfaction and interest in politics are the most significance, which mean when people are dissatisfied with the outcomes of government, it’s probably that they will protest(e.g. 15-M movement in Spain). And the general incentive model, just explain 14% the citizen participation, but the variable expressive benefits (related with proud of being Mexican, Spanish etc.) was significance with 27%, which is important to say that the people with proud for their country, report higher levels of citizen participation.
In the case of structural theories we have that the civic voluntarism model and equity-fairness model, are the most significant models for explain citizen participation with 24 and 33%, respectively. And in the case of civic voluntarism model the variable of mobilization and efficacy, were the most important to explain the participation, which mean that a society mobilized by parties or associations are probably participate more, contrary when nobody asked the participation. In the case of equity-fairness model, the variable of perception of outcomes and expectative is the most significant with 45%, which mean that when people are frustrated they participate, for trying to change their life.

Finally, the social capital model is not very significance, because just explain 18% of citizen participation, and the variable of trust in people is not determinant, because is necessary the correlation between trust in people and trust in institution, for impact to dependent variable. So, the previously studies by Putnam and colleges, are not confirmed in this research, and confirm the studies of Morales L. who said, that when people participate in free activities like hunting club, is not probably that they participate in politics.
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