



centro de estudos da metrópole

**INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR ON  
METROPOLIS AND INEQUALITIES**

**Civil Society Organizations in two Latin American  
Metropolises**

Adrian Gurza Lavalle<sup>\*</sup>  
Natália Salgado Bueno<sup>\*\*</sup>

March, 25th & 26th, 2010

---

<sup>\*</sup> Professor at the Department of Political Science of the University of São Paulo (USP) and research fellow at the Center for Metropolitan Studies of the Brazilian Center for Analysis and Planning (CEM/CEBRAP). E-mail: layda@usp.br

<sup>\*\*</sup> Master's student at the Department of Political Science of the University of São Paulo (USP) and research fellow at the Center for Metropolitan Studies of the Brazilian Center for Analysis and Planning (CEM/CEBRAP). E-mail: nataliasbueno@gmail.com

## I. Introduction

After three decades of intense international debate on civil society among scholars, in institutions oriented towards international development and cooperation, and among activists themselves, it is possible to acknowledge three reasonably broad consensuses on what had been variously characterized throughout the world as the "emergence", "resurgence", "rediscovery", "redemption", or "resurrection" of new or vibrant civil societies - the preferred adjective used in the literature. Firstly, the more influential interpretations of civil society drew on normative stylizations of a virtuous civil society that would be the producer of democratizing effects on the political, cultural, and at times economic domains. Secondly, civil society is immeasurably more heterogeneous than theoretical formulations elaborated at the moment of "euphoria" would lead one to suppose; therefore, instead of being unified by common commitments and values, it is pervaded by divergences and conflicts, presents characteristics that could cause either positive or negative effects, and is composed of organizational ecologies that are extremely complex and diversified. Thirdly, civil society or, more precisely, a set of new actors capable of qualifying as part of it in each context have taken on institutionally acknowledged functions - in national and sub national governments as well as in multilateral institutions - in the design, oversight, and execution of public policies and relief programs, as well as in the representation of various audiences and diffuse interests<sup>1</sup>.

These three consensuses are an improvement in relation to the main features of literature during the 1990s: The first of them synthesizes criticisms in reviews of prior literature; the second and third ones, in addition to pointing out deficiencies in this literature, highlight the research and analytical challenges to be faced. As for the second consensus, we still know very little about how the heterogeneous composition of civil society is organized: How are different organizational ecologies composed of civil organizations and what are the consequences of such composition? What are the different positions and functions of

---

<sup>1</sup> On the first and second consensuses, see the works of Alexander (1998); Encarnación (2003; 2006), Olvera (2003), Dagnino, Olvera and Panfichi (2006), Isunza (2001); Gurza Lavalle (2003a), Warren (2004); for the third consensus, see the works of Chlamers, Martin and Piester (1997), Fox (2006), Fung and Wright (2003), Fung (2004), Heller (2002), Santos and Avritzer (2002), Isunza and Gurza Lavalle (forthcoming), Gurza Lavalle and Castello (2008), Gurza Lavalle, Houtzager and Castello (2006a; 2006b).

the different types of civil organizations, as well as their strategies when associating with other organizations? How has the organizational ecology of civil society transformed itself in terms of its composition and of the roles played by new and traditional actors? Concerning the third consensus, there is also very unsatisfactory knowledge of the scope and implications of the new roles played by civil organizations: To what extent do civil organizations direct their actions at political institutions? What is the role of different political institutions in the repertoire of actions by different types of civil organizations? What is the variation of functions taken on by organizations and what is their effectiveness? What are the effects of civil organization's institutional involvement on civil organizations themselves and on State's administrative apparatus? What are the sources of legitimacy and the accountability devices connected to these roles?

The more recent academic writing has focused more and more on these two sets of issues. This working paper is part of this movement in the more recent literature and presents partial results of an ongoing research that aims at contributing to the production of knowledge on these two sets of issues as well as on the interconnection between organizational ecology and political institutions. In these pages, we specifically look at the composition, *modus operandi*, and changes in the organizational ecology that composes civil society. We empirically examine, through network analysis, two constellations of civil organizations in two different national and metropolitan contexts: Mexico City and São Paulo. The data sources as well as the methods applied to their analysis will be briefly presented in section IV.

It is important to underline that the general implications for theoretical debate of our own findings as well as understanding their meaning for the roles and changes in civil society in Latin America is an ongoing work that still requires a considerable amount of effort and synthesis. Even so, our current analytical reflection and empirical results are sufficiently robust to contribute to the debate on civil society.

In the 1990s, the celebration of a new civil society committed to the democratization of political regimes and to a change in the values of their own societies – social modernization and social differentiation in the theoretical jargon – was preceded by not less optimistic diagnoses in the 1970s and 1980s. Those diagnoses pointed out the emergence of other new

subjects of social transformation that were not subordinated to the script prescribed by class struggle theories. In effect, the new social movements have also caused great expectations and were theoretically framed as agents of social transformation, either in the modality of urban actors of popular extraction or as actors committed to the expression of post-material identities and issues. Thus, in half a century's time, two waves of different actors had a similar status in the literature, and they also changed the scenario of organized collective action in Latin America. Meanwhile, in this region, less theoretical attention and empirical research was dedicated to traditional actors that have been performing relatively stable functions within the universe of civil organizations for a long time - especially service non-profits, neighborhood associations, and community associations. However, existing civil society in each context is not constituted of only one of these three sets of actors – whatever their internal composition might be – and, plausibly, the function they perform depends on their insertion in a complex organizational ecology that encompasses them all: Those who have been long present or are traditional; those who emerged between the 1970s and the 1980s in connection with popular mobilization, and the more recent ones who were not rarely grouped under the rubric of new civil society.

The following pages examine the composition of the organizational ecologies empirically found in the two metropolises and the centrality patterns of the different types of actors present in them as well as their relational strategies. In doing so, we assume that the structural positions occupied by the different types of actors in these ecologies, as well as their relational strategies, allow us to understand the functions they perform in civil society. It is also assumed that although the relational data examined portray a single moment in time, the sociological characterization of actors based on local literature allows the identification of how new they are in terms of the emerging functions they have come to perform in each context. This means that a recently created philanthropic institution may be characterized as traditional – provided that its functions are properly philanthropic – while an association for the defense of human rights founded in the context of Latin American dictatorships would be more adequately classed as new although it was created in the 1980s. In other words, when a temporal dimension is incorporated into the analysis and equated with the belonging of civil organizations to the three groups of actors defined by the roles they play in civil society, the results sheds light on the transformations that

occurred in civil society after the 1960s. Thus, it becomes possible to question both the structural composition and position of the different types of actors in their respective civil organization networks and their relational strategies from the perspective of what they say about the transformation of civil society.

Roughly speaking, the three main findings show that there have been significant transformations in the realm of organized collective action with similar general tendencies in both cities, although with varied intensities and discrepancies regarding some specific types of civil organizations. Firstly, from a relational standpoint the most relevant actors as well as those who are evidently unimportant coincide in both cities. More central actors who have, therefore, more relational capacity for action and choice are "the same," and belong to the two last waves of emerging actors: NGOs, popular organizations, and coordinating bodies. In turn, there is also a coincidence concerning more peripheral actors, those who concentrate relational disadvantages. All of those belong to the traditional civil society. In this case, neighborhood associations and community associations have been found to occupy marginal positions in the network and in the relational strategies of other actors. Service non-profits with a long trajectory in the world of civil associations are in an intermediate position, not in the prominent position of central actors, but in structural conditions of action that are clearly superior to those of peripheral actors.

Secondly, among more central actors, those of the so-called new civil society – especially advocacy NGOs – have become central in the organizational ecologies of both metropolises to such an extent that they not only occupy structurally advantageous positions in their respective networks, but are also the main target of the relational strategies of the majority of other actors. And there is more: Differently from other types of civil organizations, NGOs present an astounding *organizational isomorphism* in both contexts. This plausibly evidences the effects of supranational factors such as international funding and its conditionalities - as is usually pointed out in the literature. Thus, the transformation of collective action is connected to global factors, but in a manner that is different from the one usually pointed out by the literature. The once new actors of popular mobilization, in turn, keep their privileged positions in both cities, but their relevance is peculiar: They have *restricted centrality*, that is, an important position in the general structure of the network

that has no direct correspondence in the relational strategies of other types of actors. In other words, popular organizations are not among the preferred type of actors for the relational strategies of other types of actors, not even for the strategies of those connected to urban popular demands, such as neighborhood associations. The picture becomes clearer when it is noted that another type of highly centralized civil organization, coordinating bodies, is *relationally coupled* to NGOs in both contexts. In Brazil, coordinating bodies are directly associated with the expansion of NGOs, but in Mexico they have emerged as a phenomenon that is emblematic of the force of popular mobilization in the 1970s and 1980s, and were founded to coordinate the action of popular organizations created during that period. The relational coupling with NGOs is, therefore, particularly significant in the latter context.

Thirdly, on the level of the general structure of networks in both cities, the findings show that, as a whole, the actors are in resilient networks of civil organizations with remarkable stability. Moreover, there is also marked concentration of relational power in networks in both contexts, which tends to leverage the protagonism of structurally well-positioned organizations. Traditional and new actors of civil society are, in both cases, in hierarchically structured and stable organizational ecologies with actors who concentrate relational advantages systematically while other peripheral actors accumulate disadvantages. Alternately to normative understandings of horizontality as something that is inherent in networks, this concentration of structural advantages - associated with the concentration of ties and capacity of mediation in few actors - is closely related to the capacity to influence decision-making in political institutions and public policies.

Finally, there are noteworthy differences between the organizational ecologies examined in Mexico City and São Paulo: The constellation of new actors is more varied and more pervasive in the South American metropolis. A transversal perspective of interpretation through the different types of civil organizations reveals two noteworthy configurations that establish differences between the universes of civil organizations in both metropolises: the repertoire of intentional relations of central civil organizations in the Mexican capital – that is, its relational strategy – is more selective or restricted and, in the case of São Paulo, it is more diversified and there are more frequent relations between different types of civil organizations. As a result of the previous characteristics, central organizations in the South

American metropolises are connected with peripheral organizations, while the lack of connection between hierarchically structured sets of organizations is more common in Mexico. Moreover, there are crucial differences between traditional and new actors – equally central or peripheral – in both contexts. It is possible to be central or peripheral for different reasons and performing different functions; that is, the specific *modus operandi* of these actors is not related to their general position in the network – how central or peripheral they are –, but to their relative differences in relation to other types of civil organizations in structurally similar positions. This working paper will pay special attention to the general interpretation of these differences in view of their implications to understand transformations in civil society as well as contextual variations.

The comparison between the two cities proved to be more complex than expected. This was due less to divergences between the organizational ecologies of both Latin American metropolises than to the different meanings of the same types of associations found in the contexts studied. This demanded a strong investment in the characterization of the different types of civil organizations in both metropolises and, for this reason, and also due to the length of this working paper, it was not possible to incorporate the full range of types of actors and political institutions into the analysis as stated in the official program of the International Seminar Metropolis and Inequalities. However, the findings on the relations between the organizational ecologies examined and the political institutions in each context will be incorporated into the exposition. Moreover, examining the results of network analysis for each type of civil organization found in both cities would exceed the space available to this paper. A choice has been made to present a detailed examination only of the types of civil organization that are more relevant either from the structural or relational point of view, or from the perspective of the argument presented here. All results can be found in the tables attached at the end of this paper, and a detailed examination of less relevant types of civil organizations is available upon request.

The argument presented here is developed as follows: The following section presents the organizational ecology found in the sampling of the two cities. The more central types of actors revealed by network analysis are then characterized based on the local literature. The fourth section introduces brief references to the nature of relational data as well as to the strategy of analysis that were used. It also briefly explains what sort of systematization was

used to present the results. The fifth section focuses on the examination and interpretation of results. Finally, the paper is concluded by making the next steps of the analysis explicit.

## **II. Organizational Ecologies: Composition of the Sample**

The database used in this research are the results of two surveys conducted in 2002 and 2003 in the city of São Paulo (municipality), Brazil, and in Mexico City (Federal District), Mexico, when the project "*Rights, Representation and the Poor: Comparing Large Developing Country Democracies: Brazil, India, and Mexico*" was conducted<sup>2</sup>. Both surveys used the same methodological procedures to define the sample, which was snowball generated with the purpose of identifying the more active civil organizations working with underprivileged sectors of the population. The snowball is a modality of sampling that is particularly adequate to conduct network analyses when the universe of actors is unknown or inaccessible (Scott 1992; Atkinson and Flint 2003; Goodman 1961; Sudman and Kalton 1986), as is the case with civil organizations, for which there are no universal lists or registers.<sup>3</sup> A total of 229 civil organizations in São Paulo and 198 in Mexico City were interviewed. In this analysis, respectively 202 and 169 civil organizations were taken into consideration. This generated a relational sample of 827 civil entities in São Paulo, with 1,368 ties among them, and 601 Mexican civil entities, with 1,031 ties among them.

In addition to identifying the actors who make up the organizational ecology of the two metropolises empirically, it is necessary to classify them and make them comparable. As the labels generally used by civil organizations are usually the object of a symbolic dispute to assign meaning to their action, they were not classified based on their self-definitions, but according to objective criteria of two orders: the relation with their beneficiaries and the profile of activities they typically carried out. By applying these criteria, a classification was outlined, whose types of civil organizations are intuitively clear: NGOs, coordinating

---

<sup>2</sup> Information on the project and references to the main works published are available at: <http://www.ids.ac.uk/go/idsproject/rights-representation-and-the-poor> or <http://cebrap.org.br>

<sup>3</sup> More detailed information on the selection criteria of the points of entry of the snowball, as well as of the administration of the flow of interviews, may be consulted in Houtzager, Gurza Lavalle, Acharya (2002).

bodies, popular organizations, service non-profits, community associations, neighborhood associations, neighborhood committees, pastoral organizations, fora, and other organizations as residual category. The characterization of the more central types of civil organizations in the local literature will be presented in the following section, but detailed analyses of the consistence of the typology, of the criteria used for allowing comparisons, and of the types' characterizations in Brazilian literature may be found elsewhere (Gurza Lavallo, Castello and Bichir 2007; 2008; Gurza Lavallo and Castello 2008).

The compositions of the universes of civil organizations in both cities converge to a great extent, but there is no perfect correspondence and there are actors who appear in only one of the contexts (neighborhood committees, in the case of the Mexican metropolis, and fora and pastoral organizations, in the case of São Paulo). In Mexico City, as will be exposed, neighborhood committees are the product of local politics, while fora and pastoral organizations appear significantly only in São Paulo. It is important to stress that the absence of these types of organizations in one of the contexts is because of different reasons: Fora and pastoral organizations are not sufficiently expressive in the Mexican capital to be collected in a snowball sampling in a number that is minimally sufficient to classify them as a type – although both kinds of organizations did exist in the the Mexican civil society. Neighborhood committees, in turn, are for the time being institutions with a strong conjunctural profile; thus, we decided not to merge them into a single type of micro territorial association together with neighborhood associations - an operation that would actually lead to the mistake of diagnosing organizational similarities with neighborhood associations in São Paulo. In fact, the presence of civil organizations without equivalents in both contexts points out significant differences in the historical and political dynamics of the construction of civil actors in both cities, but we will not explore this in this paper (see Gurza Lavallo and Bueno, 2010).

Table 1 presents the distribution of the typology in the samples collected. In general terms, the compositions have similar proportions. Associations of territorial basis are the prevailing types in the two contexts: neighborhood associations in São Paulo and, aggregately, neighborhood committees and neighborhood associations in Mexico City. NGOs follow them closely and they are also distinguishable as a prominent type. Coordinating bodies and service non-profits are

less present, having at least 10 percentage points below the first ones. The main difference between the common types lies in the greater presence of popular organizations in Mexico City (it ranks fifth as the most frequent type<sup>4</sup>) in comparison to São Paulo (which ranks seventh). Finally, it is important to stress that the context-specific types are relevant in both cities and make up over 10% in São Paulo and about 17% in Mexico City.

As stated in the introduction, only central civil organizations will be analyzed here. It should also be noted that we are unable to analyze all measures for popular organization in Mexico City. The snowball sampling procedure only led us to interview two entities that were later classified as popular organizations, although several of them were captured through chain referrals. This means that we cannot analyze measures that demand greater variability of interwoven organizations, even though we are able to analyze measures that rely on other organizations citing popular organizations – which, on their turn, were not interviewed but are part of the network of civil organizations. It should be noted that the fact that we did not find a large number of popular organizations using the same methodological and sampling procedures applied in São Paulo is meaningful and converges with our interpretation on the changes affecting popular organizations

---

<sup>4</sup> Taking into consideration that service non-profits and fora rank fourth together.

**Table 1 – Distribution of Types of Civil Organizations – Mexico City and São Paulo**

Common Types	Mexico City		São Paulo		Examples	
	%	Age (years)	%	Age (years)	Mexico City	São Paulo
<i>NGOs</i>	27.1	12.4	22.5	12.7	Amnistia Internacional; Católicas por el Derecho de Decidir; Ama la Vida AC	Instituto Pólis; Ação Educativa; Grupo Corsa
<i>Coordinating bodies</i>	13.8	9.4	12.5	17.4	Coalición Internacional Hábitat América Latina; Red Democracia y Sexualidad; Convergencia de organismos civiles por la democracia	Ass. Brasileira de ONGs (Abong); Fundação Abrinq; Rebraf
<i>Popular organizations</i>	6.3	33.0	2.4	10.0	Madres Antinucleares Veracruzanas; Central Independiente de Obreros Agrícolas y Campesinos (COAC); Barzón movimiento jurídico	MST; Movimento de Moradia do Centro; Unificação de Lutas de Cortiços
<i>Service non-profits</i>	8.7	24.0	9.2	17.5	Voluntariado de Vicentinas San Vicente de Paul; Fundación pro niños de la calle; Vida y familia AC	Lar Altair Martins; Centro Social Leão XIII; Serviço Social Perseverança
<i>Community associations</i>	2.7	5.6	8.9	20.3	Alcohólicos anónimos; Mujeres Artesanas de Tláhuac; Desarrollo Integral de Tlalpan A.C.	Clube de Mães Coração do Amor; Espaço Cultural São Mates; Ass. Deficientes Físicos de Sapopemba
<i>Neighborhood associations</i>	9.7	8.1	24.5	20.5	Unión de colonos de San Miguel Teotongo; Comunidad de la Delegación Tlalpan; Asociación de vecinos del barrio de la soledad	Soc. Amigos de Vila Sabrina; Soc. Amigos de Vila Alpinas; União do Moradores do Parque Bristol
<i>Other</i>	14.5	20.4	8.2	22.7	---	---
<b>Contexti-Specific types</b>						
<i>Neighborhood committees</i>	17.3	4.3	---	---	Comité Vecinal Estrella; Comité Vecinal San Francisco Xocotitla; Comité Vecinal Santa Maria de la Rivera	---
<i>Pastorals</i>	---	---	2.5	18.6	---	Pastoral da Criança, Pastoral Carcerária da Arquidiocese de SP; Pastoral da Moradia
<i>Fora</i>	---	---	9.2	9.6	---	Fórum Municipal de Saúde, Fórum DCA, Fórum Lixo e Cidadania da Cidade de SP
<b>Total</b>	601	229	827	198		

Source: Project Rights, Representation, and the Poor: Comparing Large Developing Democracies – Brazil, India, and Mexico. CEBRAP/IDS

### III. Literature and Local Characterization of Actors

#### *Rights and Policy Influence*

The denomination "non-governmental organization" – or NGO, according to the acronym it is known by worldwide – has its origin in international cooperation agencies and has been widely used as a generic term for any civil organization in the international literature. However, in Brazil and in Mexico it refers to a subset of organizations delimited by its form of action and by its historical novelty – although the second aspect is more clearly emphasized in the Brazilian literature. In both contexts, when NGOs or a part of them are taken into consideration as a constellation of new actors, the novelty is contrasted to both the type of social actors that prevailed in the scene of collective action during the 1970s and 1980s and the traditional forms of civil organizations – especially popular movements and service non-profits, respectively. The literature usually attributes to social movements an identity between members and beneficiaries, as well as closeness to underprivileged sectors of the population, while it regards that service non-profits limit their repertoire to service delivery to populations defined by some vulnerability. Specific national and metropolitan factors are mentioned in the literature as stimuli to the emergence of these new actors; however, the literature has also pointed out the massive presence of international funding from foundations, multilateral and cooperation agencies is a common favorable conditioning element (Olvera 2003b; Álvarez 2005; Landim 2002).

In Brazil, NGOs correspond in *strictu sensu* to civil organizations known in the Anglo-Saxon literature as advocacy NGOs – dedicated to publicly vocalizing or claiming the demands and needs of third parties or of issues considered to be of general interest. In their origin, in the years of democratic transition and still without publicly being known by this name, they were conceived as advisory and support organizations to social movements, but there is broad consensus in the national literature regarding the fact that NGOs have gotten rid of this initial mission and gained autonomy of action aimed at influencing public policies and public opinion, becoming the most prominent actors in the scenario of collective action in the 1990s.<sup>5</sup> There is also consensus regarding the main characteristics of

---

<sup>5</sup> E.g.: "(...) NGOs have become much more important in the 1990s than social movements themselves (Gohn 2003: 22; see also Paz 2005: 8-11).

NGOs': Discourse elaborated within a semantics of rights and of substantial extension of democracy; issue-oriented work; action aimed at publicizing problems of public relevance; and coordination with other actors by working in networks (Gurza Lavalle, 2003). In other words, NGOs present "(...) a strong vocation to act in the field of politics, investment in the mobilization of public opinion, in lobbying, in the defense of diffuse interests in the public sphere (...) this type of action presupposes that NGOs should develop a capacity to establish interactions, partnerships, forms of communication and cooperation (...) [in order to perform] their traditional role of social multimediators" (Landim 1996: xiv).<sup>6</sup> Thus, the literature in Brazil traces a clear dividing line between NGOs and service non-profits, and tends to associate the first to a democratizing vocation, and the latter to a service delivery vocation.<sup>7</sup> (Carvalho 1998; Paoli 2003).

In Mexico, alternately, the literature uses the distinction between social and civil organizations in a diffuse way<sup>8</sup>. This signals the difference between popular actors whose members are also the beneficiaries of their action, and actors who work for third parties defined in terms of target public (Pliego 2001). However, the differentiation between NGOs and other traditional service delivery organizations, such as service non-profits, is less emphatic in Mexico; it is not rare that they are both variations of the same category within the typologies offered by the literature. In effect, the universe of civil organizations admits diverging diagnoses regarding their composition in the literature: social associations and movements aimed at the defense of citizen rights and cultural plurality - in this sense, they are different from popular movements with material demands -; organizations aimed at promoting and developing services; private assistance associations; environment preservation organizations; philanthropic organizations; professional, commercial, and mutual help organizations (Olvera 2003a; Sánchez Mejorada y Álvarez 2003; Pliego 2001; Álvarez & Ziccardi 2000). This set of organizations is sometimes indistinctly grouped under the rubric of NGOs; sometimes the rubric encompasses only one subset, the natural

---

<sup>6</sup> The following reinforces this argument: As characterized by Maria do Carmo Carvalho (1998: 87-88), NGOs are ruled by the principle of solidarity, by multiple advocacy and empowerment actions, and strongly influence the public agenda. The importance of networks or the characterization of NGOs' style of work based on the notion of networks is constant in the literature (Fernandes 1994: 128-131; Fernandes 2002: 76; Scherer-Warren 1996).

<sup>7</sup> Although this is rare in the Brazilian literature, it is still possible to find specifications concerning the beneficiaries of the work of NGOs in a register similar to that of assistance, characteristic of beneficent institutions (see Coelho 2000: 60), or in terms that seem more appropriate for the 1970s and 1980s (Casanovas and García 1999: 63-67)

<sup>8</sup> Including among the social actors popular urban movement and social movements (Bolos 1999).

candidates of which are promotion and development organizations. However, it should be noted that within civil organizations there is a subset of more recent organizations which, instead of aiming at providing services, tend to politicize demands, to publicize the causes of minorities, and to defend rights (Coulomb and Sánchez Mejorada 1997; CESCO 2007; Phronesis 1995; Álvarez 2005) — NGOs in the terms of Brazilian debate. Thus, those organizations appear as well in the literature as novel actors making up democratic social movements and democratic civil society — different from popular, corporatist, labor based and other traditional forms of organized collective action (Isunza 2001: 257-270, 377-397; Durand 1994a). This subgroup of organizations gained visibility in the 1980s and was widely acknowledged in the following decade, in a trajectory that is similar to that of its Brazilian peers: “gradual substitution of the original concept of support to popular movements as a justification for (...) [their] existence (...) growing autonomization of their action (...) Professionalization and an orientation towards the definition of alternative social policies” (Olvera 2003b: 56-57, see Álvarez 2005: 180). However, there are authors who still differentiate radical and developmentalist NGOs, which are aimed either at the sociopolitical organization of the “people as a fundamental subject”, in the case of the former, or at the work with target audiences, not rarely in alliance with the state, in the case of the latter NGOs (Coulomb and Sánchez Mejorada 1997). In fact, the separation between NGOs and popular movements, although constant, is also less emphatic in Mexican literature.

In Brazil, organizations of advisory and support to popular movements created in the 1970s ended up taking on the identity of NGOs mostly because they were afraid that actors which did not support the democratization, could take control the “NGO label”, usually associated with an emerging domain of action which, as time went by, gained the capacity to influence the definition of the public agenda and policies.<sup>9</sup> In Mexico, NGOs’ novelty seemed to have been associated with a more general process of regime democratization, but its relative indistinction within the world of civil organizations —as opposed to social actors— suggests

---

<sup>9</sup> See the work of Landim (2002) for a remarkable reconstruction of the genesis of NGOs as advocacy and support institutions in the 1970s, as well as their thematic diversification and organizational strengthening in the form of sub networks. This would have led these institutions – in a tortuous process – to take on the identity of NGOs and get progressively rid of their enmeshment (and lack of differentiation) with popular actors. However, the same author affirms that the contact with popular groups is still relevant for NGOs (Landim 1998). For a comparative analysis of the capacity of civil organizations in the countries of the Southern Cone influencing public policies, see Albuquerque, 2008).

that its expansion was not strong enough to shape their own field vis-a-vis other civil organizations.<sup>10</sup> In this sense, Olvera's diagnosis (2003e) seem emblematic as he points out NGOs' inability to articulate with other social actors, the fact that they did not create new alternative projects for public policies, and the fragile connection between them and popular organizations (see also Coulomb, Herraste and Sánchez Mejorada 1997).

### ***Mobilization, mass protests, and organizational articulation***

Popular organizations are actors whose protagonism gained visibility decades ago, and they are not part of the last wave of civil organizations. More precisely, although they are not properly traditional civil society organizations – at least not with the meaning assigned to “traditional,” as a qualification for service non-profits and micro territorial organizations – they represent today a past wave of emergence of new actors with repertoires of action centered on mobilization and protest. Thirty years ago, popular organizations classified as popular movements were welcomed enthusiastically as innovative and autonomous expressions of collective action both for their capacity of challenging the state and for their relative distance regarding the so-called macro structural determinisms as well as for their capacity to express interests excluded from institutional politics (Sader 1988; Alonso: 1988); however, as may be inferred from the literature, they have not only given way to new types organizations, but have also lost breath and capacity of action within the set of civil society actors. Although this past wave new actors has called the attention for similar reasons in both countries, there are various causes invoked to explain their decline, as well as their degree of “disappearance” in the literature.

As the definition of popular organizations and their relation with the concept of social movements is not obvious, some distinctions must be made. More precisely, and as defined here, popular organizations correspond partly to those actors who, since the 1970s and especially in the 1980s, were thought through the theoretical lens of the concept of “social movements” – especially when this concept was used to understand the logic of action of specific actors aimed at collective mobilization resulting from popular demands and, therefore, sometimes also denominated as “popular movements”. The definition of the

---

<sup>10</sup> Olvera (2003a; 2003e) formulates a similar diagnosis, but concerning civil society as a whole.

concept of social movement is ambiguous, leaving aside the question about the the most influential theoretical orientations on social movements in Latin America<sup>11</sup>. This makes it difficult to use the concept in empirical research using an organizational approach, as is the case of this one. The concept of social movements has been used both in the definition of specific actors, with their own organizational structure, usually with a capacity to challenge the state — Movimento dos Sem Terra (MST), Movimento dos Atingidos por Barragens (MAB), Antorcha Popular, Madres Antinucleares Veracruzanos —, and in unifying symbolically dispersed sets of individual and collective initiatives because of affinities and shared meaning concerning specific subjects – the black movement, the housing movement, the feminist movement, the urban popular movement. The concept of popular movement is avoided here because while its first meaning concerns organizations, its second, from a standpoint of a relational approach, poses the very existence of a movement and its frontiers are a research problem and may not be assumed as a given. Thus, the universe of actors defined here as popular organizations corresponds only to the first meaning of the concept: as organizations and *not movements*. The crucial difference between popular organizations and the type of organizations defined here as coordinating bodies lies in the fact that the former, differently from the latter, mobilize segments of the population directly and present themselves as an expression of these segments, although it may mobilize some organizations as well.

In Brazil, except for few exceptions<sup>12</sup>, social movements mysteriously disappeared from the literature in the beginning of the 1990s, in part thanks to the end of the political transition cycle and to the consequent stabilization and institutionalization of politics and social protest, but also due to changes in the analytical categories used by scholars - now converted into the heuristic perspective of civil society and/or NGOs (Gurza Lavallo, Castello and Bichir 2004a; Sobottka 2002). The wave of disenchanting critical reviews in the end of the 1980s, which highlighted the demobilization and cooptation of actors, as well

---

<sup>11</sup> At the time there were three great currents in the international literature on social movements: structuralist approaches that privileged the popular urban movement (Castells 1988; Borja 1981); post-structuralist approaches centered on processes of construction of identities in the so-called new social movements (Evers et al 1984; Melucci 1989; Touraine 1983); and the strategic approaches of the Anglo-Saxon debate which focused on the ability to fund raise and the dilemmas associated with it (Klandermans and Tarrow 1988). The two first approaches prevailed in Latin America.

<sup>12</sup> See, e.g., the works of Mendonça (2002), and Marteleto et al (2002).

as the naivety and optimism of authors, seems to have anticipated that the concept would be somehow abandoned.<sup>13</sup> According to Gohn (2003: 13-32), for example, there were no mass mobilization processes in the 1990s. There was only punctual mobilization within the logic of citizen participation, and not of collective popular activism. In fact – and taking into consideration warnings against the cognitively deleterious effects of the “cyclothymic” relation between academic thought and collective action, which every now and then elevates actors normatively and then accuses them of being co-opted and abandoning the causes of social transformation (Götz 1995) -, it is not rare to find even today diagnoses which reaffirm the faintness of movements and the generalized depoliticization of collective action, now supposedly focused merely on demands for material survival or punctual demands. A similar prospect is also ascribed to the corrosive effects of structural adjustment (e.g. Casanovas and García 1999: 63-67; Rucht 2002).

In the Mexican capital, the emergence of popular sectors occurred in the 1970s under the sign of rupture with the corporate mechanisms of political organization, with disputes for labor union independence and the creation of mass organizations of residents of irregular settlements and low income neighborhoods (“*colonos*”) (Durand 1994b: 103-164; 2001 Ramírez 1988; Duhau 1989; Sánchez Mejorada and Álvarez 2003; Olvera 2003a). We are interested in the second group which, during the 1970s, gave way to the construction of popular fronts and popular coordinating bodies with a remarkable capacity for mobilization (Ramírez 1988: 65-81; Isunza 2001: 201-205). This set of actors was seen, thought of, and examined in its capacity for transformation through the concept of the popular urban movement (MUP standing for *Movimiento Urbano Popular*) — which has the same meaning of the second definition of social movement pointed out above. Although MUP organizations reached high levels of coordination in the 1980s and experienced a new drive after the earthquake in 1985 and the work with the “*damnificados*,” the literature points out, similarly to the Brazilian literature<sup>14</sup>, the “apparent collapse of social movements in the

---

<sup>13</sup> See, e.g., the critical reviews developed by Ruth Corrêa Leite Cardoso (1994: 81-90), Flávio S. Cunha, (1993: 134-135), and Edison Nunes (1987: 92-94).

<sup>14</sup> As in Brazil, the literature seems to have overestimated the penetration of these actors in popular sectors: “(...) los resultados de la encuesta parecen conducir a revisar cierta sobre-valoración que de dicho movimiento había hecho la investigación urbana. Mejor dicho, la investigación plantea la necesidad de diferenciar el protagonismo sectorial logrado por el MUO [...] de su impacto territorial”. (Coulomb, Herraste and Sánchez-Mejorada 1997: 170).

1980s" (Olvera 2003b: 53). Supposedly, this is due to factors of two orders: the effects of structural adjustment and of the reduction of the role of the state, as well as of democratic transition (Coulomb, Herraste and Sánchez Mejorada 1997; Jiménez 2007). Regarding transition, the literature does not point out the "collapse" as a possible reflux arising from the normalization of politics and institutionalization of popular organizations, as argued by the Brazilian literature. But the "apparent collapse" would be caused, on one hand, by the public visibility of post-electoral conflicts and the centrality gained by a citizen agenda of universalist character – which obliterate collective and particularistic actors and demands from MUP -, and, on the other hand, by the decision of MUP actors to embrace Cárdenas' presidential campaign (1988) and the subsequent affiliation of some of his organizations to the Democratic Revolution Party (PRD) — choices which caused internal divisions in MUP organizations (Bolos 1999; Olvera 2003b: 53; Sánchez Mejorada and Álvarez 2003: 225; Álvarez 2005). However, the distinction between (popular) social actors and civil actors is still constant in the literature.

In Brazil and Mexico, the new popular actors of the 1970s and 1980s brought on expectations of social transformation and were given considerable attention by scholars for what had been consensually considered as promising features. In both cases, it has been affirmed that these popular organizations have seen their protagonism fade away. However, and beyond these common elements, there are incongruous factors which seem to have caused different effects. While in Brazil the reflux is associated with the normalization of politics, the institutionalization of channels for processing demands, and the emergence of NGOs as specialized actors capable of influencing certain policies, in Mexico popular organizations seem to have been obscured by the centrality gained by electoral politics, at first, and then absorbed by the arena of political parties and by the party which became the head of left-wing sectors disputing the transition. And there is more: If the protagonism of NGOs in relation to popular organizations is consensual in Brazilian literature, in Mexican literature the comparison between them oscillates between celebrating the autonomy of the first for not depending on material benefits from the state and regretting their lack of popular embeddedness.

Coordinating bodies have been surprisingly innovative for three consecutive decades in relation to popular organizations, partly thanks to the growth of the latter but, differently from them, coordinating bodies were renewed in recent years and dedicated themselves to working for emerging actors. The literature on civil society and social movements makes many references to "networks" or innovative forms of coordination which are more horizontal, dexterous, and capable of aggregating the will of various sets of actors and individuals (Chalmers et al. 1997; Alvarez, Dagnino, Escobar 1992; Jordan 2006). The very notion of social movement frequently refers to a set of actors who share the dilemmas of collective action and a common identity (McAdam, McCarthy and Zald 1996). Against this background, coordinating bodies have been able to innovate thanks to the fact that they are funded by other organizations with the purpose of coordinating and articulating their actions, building common agendas, and leveraging their capacity for aggregating interests aimed at gaining representation before the public power and other social actors.<sup>15</sup> More specifically, these are third-order civil organizations, that is, they have been created and dedicated to working for civil organizations and not for the population. In this sense, they are different both from those whose beneficiaries and founders, managers, or workers of the associations are the same— first-order civil organizations such as neighborhood associations or community associations — and from those established for the benefit of third parties defined as people or segments of the population — that is why they are second-order organizations such as service non-profits and NGOs. Taking into consideration the costs and difficulties of creating and maintaining organizations such as coordinating bodies, their proliferation may be considered an index of the greater density and capacity for action of the sets of the civil society organizations which have created them (Gurza Lavallo, Castello and Bichir 2007; 2008). Despite a certain scarcity of specific literature on coordinating bodies — or at least of literature presenting clear analytical distinctions between these organizations, NGOs, and popular organizations —, entities with this functional profile are identified and their relevance is stressed in different historical conjunctures and under various labels. The differences between the two national and metropolitan contexts in

---

<sup>15</sup> Coordinating bodies are similar to organizations named peak associations in the Anglo-Saxon literature (see Skocpol, 1992).

question sheds light to the transformations in the organizational ecology of the respective civil societies.

In Brazil, coordinating bodies are not rarely labeled as NGOs, characterized as having a distinctive logic of action based on networking and on the creation spaces aimed at coordinating collective action (e.g. Casanovas and García 1999: 69-74; Scherer-Warrem 1996). The fact that NGOs set the tone for the description of coordinating bodies in the literature is not accidental: Firstly, they have been created recently and their organizational profile has no obvious antecedents – although the creation of fronts may be taken as a precedent –; and secondly, not only are NGOs frequently important actors in their foundation, but there are influential coordinating bodies with high visibility which work exclusively for NGOs. In other words, coordinating bodies express the increase in density and importance of NGOs. For instance, the Brazilian Association of Non-Governmental Organizations (ABONG), whose main tasks are oriented towards supporting, guiding and articulating other organizations, is a remarkable evidence of a successful strategy of institutional construction which reflects the increase in density and functional differentiation in the universe of civil organizations and epitomizes the meaning of coordinating bodies in Brazil.

In Mexico, coordinating bodies emerged as a novelty in the scenario of collective action when the MUP and popular organizations were championing social transformation. These coordinating bodies express the strength of MUP actors on the national and metropolitan levels. In fact, coordinating bodies and fronts emerged during the 1970s and 1980s as means of confluence and coordination of popular organizations; thus, they articulated organizations aimed at protest and mobilization (Ramírez 1988), whose actions and discourses shared a “clear definition of the adversary” (Bolos 1999: 160). Some popular coordinating bodies and popular fronts excelled in the MUP thanks to their high capacity for summoning people and fostering unified action as, for example, the Coordinadora Nacional del Movimiento Urbano Popular (CONAMUP) or the Frente Nacional en Defensa del Salario, contra la Austeridad y la Carestía (FNDSCAC), (Ramírez 1988; Bolos 1999; Isunza 2001: 179-284; Álvarez 2005: 158). As was the case with popular organizations in the context of democratization, popular coordinating bodies and fronts declined at the end

of the 1980s and beginning of the 1990s (Bolos 1999: 166). However, this does not mean that civil organizations with coordinating functions have completely disappeared; there are a few recent mentions of "networks" in the literature, new types of coordinating bodies have been created due to challenge of achieving and keeping democratic elections — such as Alianza Cívica (Olvera 2003d) —, and there is evidence, even if unsuccessful, of attempts at creating bodies to coordinate NGOs (Ramírez, 1988; Olvera, 2003e).

Coordinating bodies increased their presence in Brazil and in Mexico at different moments. This reflects the density and capacity of action of the civil organizations which created them, NGOs and popular organizations, respectively. This also seems to suggest that the popular mobilizations in the 1970s and 1980s were particularly intense in Mexico, but similarly to the pattern that has been found for NGOs in Mexico, it suggests that new civil organizations did not have enough strength to foster a new meaning to the organizational ecology of civil society by reshaping the role of coordinating bodies. In Brazil, alternately, popular organizations did not generate anything equivalent to the wave of fronts and coordinating bodies of its Mexican counterparts, but coordinating bodies of NGOs became significant as part of an ensemble of new organizations that became remarkable actors along the two last decades.

#### **IV. Analytical Strategy and Characteristics of the Data**

The comparative analysis between civil organizations in Mexico City and São Paulo has employed four steps to explore relational data. Each step sheds light on a specific aspect of the data, but, only by articulating and interpreting all four steps, we can outline the greater patterns of the *modus operandi* of civil organizations in both metropolises. Firstly, the structural characteristics of the networks will be briefly examined without paying attention to the relative position of the different types of actors. The second step explores the average positions of each type of civil organization. The third step analyses the relations between each pair of organizations, — NGOs with community associations, NGOs with coordinating bodies, and so on — so as to make visible the strategies of interactions among them. In the

last step, each type will be analyzed individually, especially in relation to their capacity of articulation of their own networks.

The interviewed organizations – leaders or members of the board of directors – were requested to cite no more than five organizations to which they were related and which were considered to be the most important ones for their work. The question was asked repeatedly for a range of societal and political actors – only the first will be examined here – always investigating the most valuable ties for the work of the interviewed organization. Since the organizations were asked to inform only the *main* formal or informal relations with other organizations, it may be inferred that: 1) these relations are significant and relevant for the organizations and 2) the ties indicate organizations with which interviewees effectively work or try to associate, that is to say, the existence of relations in the sample is connected with the practical relevance of the tie and with the prestige of the organization in question.

To systematize the diversity and wealth of information that was produced through network analysis is a difficult job that demands parsimony. For this reason, we decided to organize results so as to assemble them in a single table per analytical step. The results referring to the first step could be found in the next section; and although their calculation involves a certain mastery of the technicalities of network analysis, their reading is very intuitive. The purpose of the second step is to measure the importance of each type in the universe of civil organizations and, in order to do so, centrality and cohesion measures are used. Scores are presented in relation to the average of all types, for each measure<sup>16</sup>. Positive values indicate that the score of the measure for the specified type is greater than the average, and negative values indicate that the score of the measure is smaller than the average.

The third step concerns the relational strategy of actors and makes use of two measures. The first measure, an integration measure, takes into consideration the number of actors isolated in a sub network of two types of civil organizations (NGOs and coordinating bodies, for example). Thus it is possible to compare the number of actors isolated in the internal network of each type (NGOs with NGOs, for example). The second measure, in

---

<sup>16</sup> The category "other" was included in the networks to generate measures and calculate averages. However, as this category presents no analytical interest, it was excluded from tables and analyses.

turn, shows the percentage of ties directed at each type of actor in the respective organizational ecology from the total amount of ties sent to the type of actor examined. The fourth and last approach concerns the internal relations of each type of civil organization.

## **V. Networks of Civil Organizations in Both Metropolises**

This section will examine the core structural positions (unintentional) within the networks and the intentional relational patterns (strategies) of civil organizations in both metropolises. The patterns found present a fruitful image of the *modus operandi* of civil society in each context and allow us to identify the relevance and the roles played by traditional and new actors in the respective organizational ecologies. The similarities and differences found make sense in the light of the literature, but also provide fresh insight to the literature based on new information and make it possible to establish critical dialogue with it. Thus, this section offers both a more general interpretation and a more descriptive examination of empirical findings. It is necessary to highlight that the findings are not an artifact of the methodology, meaning that not only the typology avoided self-classification and chose common external criteria, but the methodology applied in both contexts was the same. Therefore, it is plausible to assume that the similarities and differences found by comparing the same type in the two cities studied are significant.

### ***Structure of networks***

The universes of civil organizations in Mexico City and in São Paulo present the same *relational substratum with known properties*, which allow us to systematically compare these two civil society networks. Both networks are not only remarkable stable and with high connectivity, which makes one think that they will remain active in the mid-term scenario, but they also have a concentration of ties that reveals structural availability of relational power and, thus, conditions for fostering the action of actors as intermediaries between civil society and the public power or other actors.

The relational pictures of civil organizations networks in both cities show us that these networks are very similar among themselves: They are large<sup>17</sup>, dispersed, stable and

---

<sup>17</sup> The number of nodes is significantly greater than the average number of ties ( $n \gg k$ ).

resilient networks with considerable connectivity. In fact, they present the general pattern of connectivity that is characteristic of a wide range of resilient networks of various natures (Table 8). Both networks have configurations that are characteristic of networks of the type called "small world". Small-world networks present high connectivity in spite of their size, as well as considerable stability or resilience in face of possible alterations such as loss of actors and/or ties. In a more precise, although more technical vocabulary, both universes of civil organizations simultaneously present a high coefficient of clustering<sup>18</sup> and low average geodesic distance<sup>19</sup>. The coincidence of these two characteristics indicates that the configuration of the two networks coincides with the typical pattern found by Watts (1999).

**Table 2: Structural Characteristics of Civil Organizations Networks in Mexico City and São Paulo**

Measures	Mexico City	São Paulo
Number of actors	601	827
Isolated actors (%)	1.83	5.92
Density (%)	0.55	0.43
Clustering Coefficient	0.23	0.17
Average Geodesic Distance	5.20	4.62
Average Degree	3.27	3.32
Concentration Degree (%)	3.70	5.34
Betweenness Concentration (%)	11.74	17.08

Source: Project Rights, Representation, and the Poor: Comparing Large Developing Democracies – Brazil, India, and Mexico

On the other hand, the distribution of ties in civil organizations networks is concentrated, that is, few actors (called hubs) have many ties and most of them have few ties. This form is similar to the scale-free model found by Barábasi (2000)<sup>20</sup>. The implications of this concentration of ties undoubtedly differ according to the kind nodes and networks analyzed. For actors such as civil organizations, it does not seem absurd to expect such a concentration to be associated with the structural availability of relational power and, therefore, to the enhanced capacity of action of certain actors. The similarity between the

<sup>18</sup> If compared to a random network of the same extension and average degree.

<sup>19</sup> If compared to a caveman network of the same extension and average degree.

<sup>20</sup> Since not all actors were interviewed, it is not possible to confirm that the distribution of ties follows the same power law found by Barábasi (2000). Even so, the distributions present very similar curves.

distribution of ties in Mexico City and São Paulo's networks with the scale-free model is one more indication that both cases share an equivalent structural substratum.

There are a few variations. The most visible one refers to structural measures of concentration – of ties and mediation. The universe of civil organizations in São Paulo appears to be more concentrated than in the Mexican case, both in terms of degree (ties) and of betweenness (mediation).

### ***Central civil organizations: civil society after the 1960s***

In both contexts, the set of more central civil organizations is composed of actors who populated the scenario of collective action after the 1960s and became the center of attention because of their unprecedented character: NGOs, coordinating bodies, and popular organizations. As has been discussed previously with the literatures on Mexico and Brazil, while the protagonism of the first is more recent – from the 1990s and 2000s - the latter emerged in the two previous decades. Coordinating bodies developed more strongly contingent on the greater or lesser expansion of popular organizations and NGOs in each context. Although the more central organizations coincide in both cities, this does not mean that relational patterns in each type of organization are the same in both contexts; in other words, it is possible to be central for different reasons, and these variation may be either explained from the literature or conjectured against literature based on the examined evidence.

NGOs have similar patterns concerning their general position in the network, their relational strategies, the configuration of their internal network, and the structuring of this network in thematic niches to an extent that makes it possible to speak of *organizational isomorphism*.<sup>21</sup> This isomorphism refers precisely to the most important actor in the relational strategies of *all* types of organizations in the metropolises in question. In other words, NGOs not only have become the most relevant actors for the organizational ecologies of civil society in both cities – when considered from the perspective of the

---

<sup>21</sup> Organizational isomorphism is understood here in relational terms, that is, it does not refer to the internal management of the NGOs, but to their relational similarities in terms of their general position within the universe of civil organizations, of their relational strategies, and of the structure of their internal networks. Relational similarities allow to infer similarities in the functional profile of NGOs, but this is a plausible interpretation informed by the literature.

relational strategies of actors - but present similarities to such a great extent that they allow to think of the effects of common supranational factors already pointed out by the literature, such as international funding and its consequences regarding the functional profile of NGOs - the need for professionalization; thematic specialization; and the adoption of the project as a basic unit for organizing work, funding, and account rendering. Although the findings of relational analysis corroborate the diagnoses found in the literature and raise them to a higher level of generalization, they refute the common perception in these diagnoses that these NGOs are detached from other actors of civil society, especially with those actors with strong connections with popular sectors. In fact, if on the one hand NGOs excel because they favour relations among themselves (homophily) and with other highly central actors, on the other hand, they are also the only actor who establishes ties with all types of actors — in addition to being the one most preferred by other organizations. And there is more: In São Paulo, NGOs prioritize the construction of relations with neighborhood associations, and this “embeddedness” may be found in other Brazilian metropolises (Koslinski and Reis, 2009).

Popular organizations also cause surprise, but for other reasons. Firstly, because of the fact that they are, in the best case scenario, only modestly relevant for other actors in spite of their importance in the 1970s and 1980s. The diagnoses in the literature concerning the progressive weakening of urban popular mobilization are confirmed by relational analysis. In effect, despite their centrality, these organizations are *not* an actor favored by any type of actor of the organizational ecologies examined, with the only exceptions being pastorals in São Paulo — which were actually created at the same historical moment. Thus, popular organizations are central, but they express a *restricted centrality*, understood here as a relational prominence caused by their structural position in the network, which has no proportional correspondence in the relational strategies of the other types of civil organizations. Secondly, some differences between this type of institution in the two metropolises should be noted. The withdrawal of their role seems to be considerably greater in Mexico City, precisely in the city where their presence was more expressive. Their small number in the sample, which makes it impossible to examine centrality and cohesion measures that require a large variability of interviewed organizations, is a good index of

their rarefaction.<sup>22</sup> Moreover, Mexican popular organizations receive fewer ties from other types of civil organizations than their peers in São Paulo.

Coordinating bodies, alternately, present a mixed panorama in which similarities are associated with their role in relation to NGOs; differences are associated with their relations with other actors. In Brazil, the profile of coordinating bodies as third-order entities at the service of their founding organizations, the NGOs, seems to be confirmed by relational results; however, differently from what the literature would lead one to think, Mexican coordinating bodies have also been renewed beyond their original ties with popular organizations, in Mexico City. In effect, not only are NGOs the main actor in the relational strategy of coordinating bodies and the coordinating bodies are also the main actor in the relational strategy of the NGOs – in both cities-, but also in the case of Mexican coordinating bodies, the subnetwork composed of NGOs/coordinating bodies is the most integrated one among the over forty sub networks of all possible combinations between two types of civil organizations. The *relational coupling* between NGOs and coordinating bodies, understood as a mutual strategy of maximum priority, becomes more evident when it is noted that popular organizations are secondary or insignificant in the relational strategy of coordinating bodies. It is worthy to remember that in their origin, coordinating bodies were organically tied to popular organizations in Mexico City. In other words, a true overturn seems to have occurred in the scenario of organized collective action over the last decades, in which the organizational isomorphism of NGOs seems to be associated with the role of other types of civil organizations.

Some differences between coordinating bodies in both cities deserve to be mentioned. In the Mexican capital, service non-profits – of intermediate centrality – are more important in the relational strategies of coordinating bodies and, in São Paulo, neighborhood associations – of peripheral condition – are more relevant in the strategies of coordinating bodies. In fact, in the Mexican case, the network of coordinating bodies is organized in two poles, that is to say, one is associated with human rights, democratization, and the defense of minorities – which belongs to the profile of NGOs – while the other focuses on support to vulnerable groups and the defense of traditional values - which belongs to the profile of

---

<sup>22</sup> It should be noted again that the methodological procedures used for identifying the sample were the same in both cities.

religious based service non-profits. Finally, coordinating bodies in São Paulo have more cohesive and integrated networks and are important for the relational strategy of a greater number of actors.

### NGOs in Mexico City

NGOs have a markedly prominent position in civil organizations networks in Mexico City. In the universes of civil organizations, they are the most active type of organization in terms of sending ties, as well as the most favoured type of actor in receiving ties (see Table 2). The privileged position of NGOs may be observed in how easily they access the network as a whole, for they have shortest average geodesic paths (they rank first), they have the greater number of geodesic paths (they also rank first), in addition to reaching a substantial number of actors in the networks (they rank second in reachability). Possibly because of their highly central position and to their easy and rapid access to the rest of the network, NGOs also present a high capacity for mediation (they rank second) in the universe of organizations as a whole. Simultaneous to the protagonism of NGOs among civil organizations, a lesser capacity for generating dependence is noted (they rank fourth). As will be seen below, NGOs are more heavily connected to each other and to coordinating bodies, which are also a well-positioned and central in the set of civil organizations. Thus, their capacity for generating dependence is reduced because of their relations with other central organizations.

It is interesting to note the homophilic pattern of the ties established by NGOs: about 42% of their ties are with themselves (see Table 4). As has already been mentioned, coordinating bodies are the type with which they have the most intense relations, which is not surprising in view of the affinity between both types. Coordinating bodies, as third-level organizations, have been created by NGOs, among other actors, in order to represent them before the state and other organizations of civil society, and also to coordinate their strategies of action and define common priorities. The protagonism of NGOs is also reflected in their relational pattern, for only NGOs and coordinating bodies establish ties with all other types of organizations in civil societies networks. And there is more: In terms of receiving ties, NGOs are preferred by all actors, except for neighborhood associations, whose relational profile is markedly selective and exclusive. It should be noted that NGOs

not only had ties with all actors, but are also the main recipients for ties from coordinating bodies, service non-profits, community associations and, to a lesser degree, popular organizations.

The homophily between NGOs is also expressed in their cohesion and in the articulation of their internal network (Table 6). They are the most cohesive type of civil organization (with the smaller number of isolated cases), and approximately 70% of their nodes are in the main component (of the 5 components found in the internal network of NGOs). The low degree of fragmentation of the network naturally leads to the ease of access among its actors. In terms of distribution of ties, it may be inferred that there are no great asymmetries in concentration of ties. However, some actors are in a privileged position in terms of their capacity for mediation, which is indicated by the concentration in betweenness within the network.

Its main component encompasses the greater part of non-isolated actors – for other components are dyads and triads –, and the visual inspection of the sociogram allows to identify thematic niches within it. There are groups working in favor of issues such as human rights, reproductive rights, health and gender, AIDS, youth and childhood, and, less prominently, housing and urban issues. In the main component there are also bridge actors connecting thematic niches. Interestingly, the organization with higher capacity for mediation in the network is *Católicas por el Derecho de Decidir* – the same as in São Paulo, but with greater centrality in Mexico. It operates as a bridge actor between gender groups related to women's health and rights, and also between groups more broadly oriented to human rights issues. Not only *Católicas por el Derecho de Decidir* intermediates between these groups, but the thematic niches it connects also have actors with capacity for mediation - as has actually been suggested by internal measures in the network regarding the absence of concentration and betweenness (table 6).

### *NGOs in São Paulo*

NGOs in the city of São Paulo are organizations with clearly active centrality with a clear strategy of sending ties and establishing connections. In fact, they are the type of organization with the highest level of active centrality (Table 3). In terms of the reception

of ties, as well as of other indicators of centrality in the network, NGOs have an intermediary position in almost all measures – which differ from the figures from other relational analyses in which they appear as clearly central actors<sup>23</sup>. In this sense, NGOs in São Paulo are partially different from NGOs in Mexico City. The only measure in which NGOs in São Paulo excel is in their capacity to generate dependence and in having a large number of geodesic paths; they are again partially different from the Mexican case regarding the first measure. As will be noted, NGOs relational strategy prefer neighborhood associations (they rank third), among others already mentioned (NGOs themselves and coordinating bodies). This possibly leads to an increase in their capacity to generate dependence thanks to the peripheral position occupied by neighborhood associations.

In terms of the patterns and relational strategies of NGOs in São Paulo with other types of organizations, they also present a homophilic pattern in which they favor themselves in their ties (Table 5). As in Mexico City, they are the second type of institution with the higher degree of homophily, and they are the main destination of their relations in both contexts. Another similarity with Mexico City is that they also favor coordinating bodies in their relational strategy as the second most favored type of institution. And there is more: As in Mexico City, NGOs are crucial for the relational strategies of civil society organizations, as is made evident by the fact that they are favored in the ties of organizations with heterophilic relational strategies: coordinating bodies, service non-profits, and community associations – and popular organizations and fora in the case of São Paulo. This coincidence indicates that even if they are not as central as Mexican NGOs due to their general position in the network, they are crucial in the relational strategies of civil organizations in the Southern American metropolis. As has already been mentioned, and differently from their Mexican peers, NGOs in São Paulo have significant relations with neighborhood associations.

The homophily of NGOs is reflected in their internal organization (Table 7). NGOs are the most cohesive type of organization, present the lesser number of isolated cases, and approximately half of their actors is found in their main component (they have the greater

---

<sup>23</sup> Findings examined elsewhere (Gurza Lavallo, Castello and Bichir, 2007) reveal that NGOs in São Paulo are among the most central organizations in civil organizations' networks in São Paulo. This discrepancy is to a great extent due to the introduction of pastorals into this analysis, as their relational pattern is very particular and causes the relative position of the measures of centrality of NGOs to move downward.

proportion, as do popular organizations). Moreover, a high proportion of NGOs is internally connected to other NGOs. Similarly to what occurs in Mexico City, they have low asymmetry in terms of the distribution of ties among them – degree concentration– in addition to concentrated capacity for mediation (betweenness) – which indicates the existence of NGOs in a privileged position within the network. In general terms, the visual inspection of the sociogram confirms the issue-based connections between NGOs, in which thematic niches can be found in the main component– education, race, gender, housing – and exclusive thematic components, which form niches with only organizations that work for the same issue – violence, children, and disabled people. Differently from Mexico City, the thematic organization did not lead to the constitution of bridge actors and the thematic niches have relatively decentered connectivity in the main component. Moreover, there are exclusive thematic components. In São Paulo, *Católicas pelo Direito de Decidir*, *Ação da Cidadania*, *SOF*, and *Coletiva Feminista* are the highlights of the NGO network because of their capacity for mediation within the network.

#### *Popular Organizations in Mexico City*

Popular organizations are also central actors. Although their number in the sample does not allow to investigate measures such as active centrality, betweenness, number of geodesic paths and reachability, which require a larger number of interviewed organizations, they have high passive centrality – they receive many ties – in comparison with the other two types of more central civil organizations in Mexico City (Table 3). However, they excel mainly for their capacity for mediation and for generating dependence due to the disparity in the relational repertoires among them and the actors with which they are connected. In fact, our results make it evident that popular organizations occupy strategic positions in the network, which makes their access to other organizations relatively trouble free (low average distances). They have highly selective relational patterns (as will be seen below), which suggests that their position in the network probably leads to the formation of niches.

As has already been mentioned, popular organizations in Mexico City have a very selective relational pattern. They establish predominantly homophilic relations and also, secondarily, with neighborhood committees and NGOs - in this order (Table 5). Interestingly, popular organizations are only modest receivers of ties sent, respectively, by neighborhood

committees, NGOs, and coordinating bodies, which reinforces the indication that this type of organizations present a restricted centrality, which do not depend on the relational strategies of other actors interested in contacting popular organizations. It should be noted that between service non-profits, neighborhood and community associations, on the one hand, and popular organizations, on the other hand, there is a mutual perception of irrelevance or reciprocal indifference, for those organizations do not even establish a single tie with popular organizations and vice-versa.

Nor is it possible to investigate the network of popular organizations internally and its sociogram because of the small n of interviewed organizations.

### Popular Organizations in São Paulo

Popular organizations are clearly central actors in the universe of civil organizations in São Paulo. Although they have a significant passive centrality in establishing ties, their main characteristic – inversely to the more active pattern found in Mexico – is that other actors send many ties to them (passive centrality) (Table 3). Their position in the network as well as in the Mexican capital also leads to a high capacity for mediation and generation of dependence. They are positioned in the network so as to have broad access to other actors, through paths with relatively small average distances, that is, relatively trouble free.

The relational pattern of popular organizations in São Paulo is less selective than in Mexico City. Popular organizations favor relations with NGOs, although homophilic relations are also remarkably important, as well as relations with coordinating bodies (Table 5). Moreover, popular organizations gain more integration when associated with NGOs. The relational strategy of popular organizations in São Paulo is more diversified than that of their Mexican peers, for the first have ties with peripheral and intermediary organizations such as community associations, service non-profits, and neighborhood associations – although these connections are not favored. As receivers, popular organizations are not favored as a destination by any actors except for pastorals, although they are connected to all types of organizations. This restates more markedly something that was observed in Mexico, that is, popular organizations have *restricted centrality*, because they appear within the relational repertoire of the strategies of various actors – especially in São Paulo – but, at

any rate, they are not among the first priorities of their relational strategies. In both contexts, there is greater proximity and integration of popular organizations with NGOs.

Popular organizations in São Paulo are internally cohesive and articulated: 50% are isolated in their internal network, the second smaller value after NGOs, and the main component encompasses almost all popular organizations which are not isolated (Table 7). There is also a concentration of ties (degree) and of mediation (betweenness) in a few entities. In line with the great concentration of ties in a few actors, the network is very articulated in its main component. On the other hand, popular organizations which are not part of the main component are not articulated among themselves. The visual inspection of the sociogram clearly shows the centrality and privileged position of the Movimento dos Trabalhadores Sem Terra (MST) and, ranking second, of the Movimento dos Sem-Teto. The MST is favored for its capacity for articulation and mediation in the network, as well as for possessing many ties. And there is more: The MST is the main bridge in the network, for it connects national movements, such as the Movimento Nacional da Luta pela Moradia, the Movimento dos Pequenos Agricultores, and the Movimento dos Atingidos por Barragens, as well as local urban movements also associated with the Movimento dos Sem-Teto, such as the Movimento de Moradia do Centro (MMC).

### *Coordinating Bodies in Mexico City*

Within the universe of civil organizations and their networks, coordinating bodies are both creators and receivers of ties, but their passive centrality is a little more marked – they are actually the second type of organization with greater passive centrality after NGOs (Table 3). They present high capacity for mediation, but this does not translate in a proportional capacity to generate dependence, possibly because their relational strategy favors central and intermediary organizations (especially NGOs, service non-profits, and coordinating bodies themselves). They are inserted in very dense and clustered networks, which reduces the distance in their geodesic paths (second best position). The privileged position of coordinating bodies in the network as a whole is also manifested in the fact that they are among the organizations which can reach the greater number of actors within the network (third best result).

The centrality of coordinating bodies, as would be expected in view of their character of third-order institutions – organizations working for other organizations and not for specific segments of the population –, it is associated with their connectivity with other types of central organizations that are not coordinating bodies (Table 5). However, the fact that they are the type of organization with fewer relations among themselves is surprising: They present a clearly heterophilic pattern, and clearly favor NGOs – service non-profits rank second – in terms of preferred target in their relational strategy. And there is more: Coordinating bodies are not only the type of actor that favors NGOs more in their relational strategies; the affinity between them defines the most integrated network – or the one having a smaller percentage of isolated actors. On the other hand, entities such as popular organizations, neighborhood committees, and community associations have proved to be marginal in the relational strategies of coordinating bodies. Coordinating bodies are, in turn, favored by NGOs, but they are completely irrelevant for popular organizations, neighborhood committees, and neighborhood associations in spite of their centrality. They are not even connected with them.

When their internal network is examined, it becomes evident that in addition to the secondary importance of coordinating bodies in their own relational strategies, their internal networks do not have specific actors capable of concentrating many ties or of serving as intermediaries (Table 6). In fact, only 15% of the actors are present in the main component of the six components articulating their relations. Concerning the cohesion of internal networks, it is necessary to add that more than half of the coordinating bodies are not related at all with other coordinating bodies (53% of isolated entities). A visual inspection of the sociogram reveals mixed relational affinities due to other criteria apart from thematic specialization - especially general ideological orientations and different goals concerning the purposes of collective action. Thus, although there are smaller components with thematic profiles (sub networks working with drug addictions and therapeutic communities), the two main components combine entities with different functional vocations and themes, but with a certain ideological affinity as well as common general action profiles. On the one hand, the main or greater component is integrated by coordinating bodies which coordinate the work of organizations committed, among the most noteworthy, to the causes of sexual free choice and reproductive rights, of civil and

human rights, and of democratization; on the other hand, the second greatest component has a more service delivery profile and is composed mostly of organizations that articulate the work of entities aimed at the defense of family and Christian values, as well as at the support to groups in vulnerable conditions, such as children and adolescents.

### *Coordinating Bodies in São Paulo*

Their centrality is simultaneously active and passive, that is, they are noteworthy for sending ties, but they also occupy an important position as receivers of ties – coordinating bodies rank second in both cases (Table 3). In turn, they have a high capacity for mediation and, differently from their Mexican counterparts, they are responsible for generating greater dependence in the network of civil organizations, possibly for favoring a type of peripheral actor such as neighborhood associations in their relational strategies. Coordinating bodies are not actors which are especially close to those with which they are related and they do not have an average distance as short as those of their Mexican peers. Although their capacity for reaching actors is not among the worst, they have relatively limited capacity if contrasted with their position in the network.

Coordinating bodies in São Paulo are also the type of actor that favors NGOs the most in their relational strategies – excluding NGOs own internal network – and the network between both types of civil organizations is also the most integrated one in the South American metropolis, that is to say, they have the least percentage of isolated actors – although on a level that is inferior to that of found in the Mexican capital (Table 5). However, coordinating bodies in São Paulo are favored in their own strategies for creating ties. Neighborhood associations rank third. Together with NGOs and differently from Mexico City, coordinating bodies in São Paulo are the only types of civil organizations that are relevant for the relational strategies of all other actors – they represent over 10% in the repertoire of ties sent by each actor.

There is a certain concentration of ties in a reduced number of actors with a capacity for mediation in the internal network of coordinating bodies (Table 7). The concentration of ties and capacity for mediation in few actors allows to understand why coordinating bodies present the second higher measure as generators of dependence, differently from their

Mexican counterparts. In comparison with the internal networks of coordinating bodies from Mexico City, they have a more integrated network, for approximately one third of coordinating bodies is part of the main component – twice as much as in the Mexican network, although with 10% more isolated actors. In addition to more integration, the sociogram reveals relevant contrasts between both contexts: The relational strategies of coordinating bodies in São Paulo focus more clearly on issue affinities (niche of organizations focused on the gender issue) and functional affinities (niche of coordinating bodies of neighborhood associations). They also favor ideological affinities, although they have a more programmatic profile than the one found in the Mexican capital. We can find the sub networks of popular movements, funding agencies from the third sector and religious coordinating bodies connecting different actors, which encompass a broad range of meanings of collective action – respectively, protest and mobilization, co-responsibility, and joint action with the public sector, and service delivery. The simultaneous combination of greater integration, on higher specialization and clearer affinities – either of theme, function, or ideology –, is made possible by the mediation of key actors such as the Associação Brasileira de ONGs (ABONG), the Central de Movimentos Populares (CPM), and the União Brasileira de Mulheres (UBM).

## **VI. Final Remarks**

Although not presented in this paper, the results for all actors found in the organizational ecologies of both metropolises have also been analysed. In general terms, the findings confirm the general trends that have already been presented in these pages, but they make them more profitable concerning the specificities of each national and urban contexts. This is particularly visible for the effects of political institutions and their strategies of incorporating social interests through other channels that are not electoral ones.

The next step will be to incorporate political institutions into the analysis of networks and to shed light on their connections with organizational ecologies. The relational data available is limited to the references made by the interviewed civil organizations concerning the political institutions with which they had relevant contact for the performance of their work, but the latter were not interviewed. Thus, all political

institutions in the network are pending nodes and their incorporation into the analysis of indirect patterns of centrality would not change the results for the civil organizations networks considerably. However, it will be firstly possible to take the relational strategy of civil organizations into consideration by focusing on institutions within the total repertoire of relations established by the former. Secondly, by means of a factor analysis it will be possible to investigate whether the centrality of a specific type of actor is significantly associated with this actor's ties with different types of political institutions.

## VII. References<sup>24</sup>:

Albuquerque, Maria do Carmo. 2008. "A participação da sociedade civil na redefinição de políticas de direitos: Os direitos da infância e o direito à moradia em países do cone sul na virada para o século XX. Tesis de doctorado en Integración de América Latina, Brasil: Universidade de São Paulo.

Alexander, ALEXANDER, Jeffrey. 1998. *Real Civil Societies: Dilemmas of Institutionalization*. London: Thousand Oaks/Sage.

Alonso, José A. 1988. "La Iglesia y los movimientos urbanos populares. Un Estudio de Caso en Ciudad Nezahualcóyotl". *Los movimientos sociales en el Valle de México v.II*. Compilado por Jorge Alonso. México: Ediciones de la Casa Chata, pp. 263-299

Álvarez, Lucía, y Alicia Ziccardi. 2000. "Organizaciones Sociales". *La Ciudad de México en el fin del segundo milenio*. Compilado por Gustavo Garza. Distrito Federal: El Colegio de México y Gobierno del Distrito Federal, pp.684-689.

Álvarez, Lucía Enríquez. 2005. Distrito Federal: *Sociedad, Economía, Política Y Cultura*. México: CIICH/UNAM.

Alvarez, Sonia, Evelina Dagnino, y Arturo Escobar. 1992. "Introduction: Theory and Protest in Latin America Today". *The Making of Social Movements in Latin America: Identity, Strategy, and Democracy*. Compilado por Sonia Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino, y Arturo Escobar. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1-19.

---

<sup>24</sup> All references are formatted according to the style of *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*.

Barábasi, Albert-László, y Réka Albert. 2000. "Emergence of Scaling in Random Networks". *Science*, 286(15): 509-512.

Bolos, Silvia. 1999. *Constitución de Actores Sociales y la Política*. México: Universidad Iberoamericana/Plaza y Valdez Editores.

Borja, Jordi. 1981. "Movimientos urbanos y cambio político". *Antología de Sociología Urbana*. Compilado por Mario Bassols, Roberto Donoso, et. al.. México: UNAM, pp. 801-829.

Cardoso, Ruth Corrêa Leite. 1994. "A trajetória dos movimentos sociais". *Anos 90: política e sociedade no Brasil*. Compilado por Evelina Dagnino. São Paulo: Brasiliense, pp. 81-90.

Carvalho, Maria do Carmo Brant. 1998. "Sociedade civil, Estado e terceiro setor". *São Paulo em Perspectiva*, 12 (4): 83-91.

Casanovas, Roberto Sainz y Oscar Garcia Chacón. 2000. *Las ONGs Latinoamericanas y los desafíos del desarrollo organizacional*. Bolivia, ICCO/ PROACTIVA/ IDEPRO.

Castells, Manuel. 1988 [1979]. "Los movimientos sociales urbanos en la vía democrática al socialismo". *Antología de Sociología Urbana*. Compilado por Mario Bassols, Roberto Donoso, et. al.. México: UNAM, pp. 777-783.

Chalmers, Douglas A., Scott B. Martin, y Kerianne Piester. 1997. "Associative Networks: New Structures of Representation for the Popular Sector?". *The New Politics of Inequality in America. Rethinking Participation and Representation*. Compilado por Carlos M. Villa et all. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 543-582.

Coelho, Simone de Castro Tavares. 2000. *Terceiro setor: um estudo comparado entre Brasil e Estados Unidos*. São Paulo: Senac.

Comité de las Entidades de la Sociedad Civil Organizada (CESCO). 2007. *El Gobierno de las Entidades de la Sociedad Civil Organizada*. Distrito Federal: Centro de Excelencia en Gobierno Corporativo, A.C.

Coulomb, René, y Cristina Sánchez Mejorada. 1997. "El protagonismo emergente de las ONGs de desarrollo sobre la escena de la conflictiva social en la ZMCM. Una aproximación". *Dinámica urbana y procesos socio-políticos, v.II*. Compilado por René Coloumb y Emilio Duhau. México: Ocim, CENVI, UAM, pp.175-201.

Coulomb, René y Ma. Emilia Aguirre Herraste, Cristina Sánchez Mejorada. 1997. "Los sectores populares frente a la crisis. ¿Estrategias domésticas o respuestas socio organizativas?". *Dinámica urbana y procesos socio-políticos, v.II*. Compilado por René Coloumb y Emilio Duhau. México: Ocim, CENVI, UAM, pp.139-173.

Cunha, Flávio S. 1993. "Movimentos sociais urbanos e a redemocratização: a experiência do movimento favelado de Belo Horizonte". *Novos Estudos*, 35(março): 134-142.

Dagnino, Evelina, Alberto J. Olvera, y Aldo Panfichi. 2006. "Para uma outra leitura da disputa pela construção democrática no Brasil: Limites e Possibilidades". A disputa pela construção democrática na América Latina. Compilado por Evelina Dagnino, Alberto J. Olvera y Aldo Panfichi. São Paulo: Paz e Terra/Unicamp.

Duhau, Emilio. 1989. "Los Movimientos Urbanos Y la Urbanización de la Política". Políticas Urbanas y Urbanización de la Política. Compilado por René Coloumb y Emilio Duhau. México: UNAM, pp.199-212.

Duhau, Emilio. 1998. Habitat popular y política urbana. México: Porrúa, UAM

Durand, Victor Manuel Ponte. 1994a. La construcción de la democracia em México. Movimientos sociales y ciudadanía. México: Siglo XXI.

Durand, Victor Manuel Ponte. 1994b. "El movimiento obrero, el sindicalismo y la transición política en México". La construcción de la democracia em México. Movimientos sociales y ciudadanía. Compilado por Victor Manuel Durand Ponte, México: Siglo XXI, pp. 103-164.

Encarnación, Omar G. 2003. The Myth of Civil Society: Social Capital and Democratic Consolidation in Spain and Brazil. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Encarnación, Omar G. 2006. "Civil Society Reconsidered". Comparative Politics, 38( 3): 357-376.

Evers, Tilmam. 1984. "Identidade: A face oculta dos movimentos sociais". Novos Estudos, n.4 (abril): 11-23.

Fernandes, Rubem César. 1994. Privado, Porém Público - O Terceiro Setor Na América Latina. Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumará.

Fernandes, Rubem César. 2002. Privado, porém público: o terceiro setor na América Latina. Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumará/Civicus.

Fox, Jonhatan. 2006. "Sociedad Civil y políticas de rendición de cuentas". Perfiles Latinoamericanos, 27:36-67.

Fung, Archon, y Erik Olin Wright. 2003. "Thinking About Empowered Participatory Governance". Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovation in Empowered Participatory Governance. Compilado por Archon Fung y Erik Olin Wright. London: Verso, pp.3-44.

Fung, Archon. 2004. Empowered Participation: Reinventing Urban Democracy. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gohn, Maria da Glória, comp. 2003. Movimentos Sociais no início do século XXI. Petrópolis/RJ: Vozes.

Gohn, Maria da Glória 1997. Teorias dos movimentos sociais — Paradigmas clássicos e contemporâneos. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.

Götz, Ottmann, 1995. "Movimentos sociais urbanos e democracia no Brasil — Uma abordagem cognitiva". *Novos Estudos*, 41 (março): 186-207.

Gurza Lavallo, Adrián. 2003. "Sem pena nem glória: o debate da sociedade civil nos anos 1990". *Novos Estudos*, 66 (julho): 91-110.

Gurza Lavallo, Adrián, Castello, Graziela, y Bichir, Renata. 2004. "Quando novos atores saem de cena: continuidades e mudanças de centralidades dos movimentos sociais". *Política & Sociedade*, 3(5):35-54.

Gurza Lavallo, Adrian, Peter P. Houtzager, y Graziela Castello. 2006a. "Democracia, Pluralização da representação e sociedade civil". *Lua Nova*, 67: 49-103.

Gurza Lavallo, Adrian, Peter P. Houtzager, y Graziela Castello. 2006b. "Representação Política e Organizações Cívicas: Novas Instâncias de Mediação e os Desafios da Legitimidade". *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, 21(60): 43-66.

Gurza Lavallo, Adrián, Castello, Graziela, y Bichir, Renata . 2007. "Protagonistas na Sociedade Civil - Redes e Centralidades de Organizações Cívicas em São Paulo". *Dados*, 50: 465 – 497

Gurza Lavallo, Adrián, Castello, Graziela, y Bichir, Renata. 2008. "Atores periféricos na sociedade civil: redes e centralidades de organizações em São Paulo". *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, 23:73 – 96.

Gurza Lavallo, Adrian, y Graziela Castello. 2008. "Sociedade civil, representação e a dupla face da accountability: Cidade do México e São Paulo". *Caderno CRH (UFBA)*, 21:67-86.

Heller, Patrick. 2002. "O perfil político e institucional da democracia participativa: lições de Kerala, Índia". *Democratizar a Democracia: os caminhos da democracia participativa*. Compilado por Boaventura de Souza Santos y Leonardo Avritzer. Rio de Janeiro: *Civilização Brasileira*, pp.599-648.

Houtzager, Peter, Adrian Gurza Lavallo, y Arnab Acharya. 2003. "Who participates? Civil society and the new democratic politics in São Paulo, Brazil". *IDS Working Paper 210*, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

Isunza, Ernesto, y Adrian Gurza Lavallo, comps.. En prensa. *La innovación democrática en América Latina: Tramas y Nudos de la Participación, la Representación y el control social*. Ciudad de México, DF: Ediciones de la Casa Chata. /CIESAS

Isunza, Ernesto. 2001. *Las tramas del alba. Una Visión de las luchas por el reconocimiento en el México contemporáneo (1968-1993)*. México: Porrúa/CIESAS.

Jiménez, Carlos Solares. 2007. "Reflexiones en torno a los sujetos, los actores, los movimientos sociales y la acción colectiva". Sociedad Civil: Capital social y gestión local. Compilado por Clara Inés Charry y Alejandra Massolo. México: Plaza y Valdes Editores/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, pp.45-62.

Jordan, Lisa, y Peter van Tuijl, comps. 2006. NGO accountability : politics, principles, and innovations. London ; Sterling, VA : Earthscan.

Klandermans, Bert, y Sidney Tarrow. 1988. "Mobilization in to Social Movements: Synthesizing European and American Approaches". International Social Movements Research, pp. 1-38.

Koslinski, Mariane Campelo, y Elisa Reis. 2009. "Transnational and Domestic Relations of NGOs in Brazil". World Development, 37(3): 714-725.

Landim, Leilah. 1996. "Notas para um perfil das ONGs". ONGs: um Perfil. Compilado por Leilah Landim y Leticia Cotrim. São Paulo: ABONG/ ISER, pp. IX-XX.

Landim, Leilah. 1998. "'Experiência militante': histórias das assim chamadas ONGs". Ações em sociedade: militâncias, caridade, assistência, etc. Compilado por Leilah Landim. Rio de Janeiro: Iser/NAU, pp. 23-87.

Landim, Leilah. 2002. "Múltiplas identidades das ONG's". ONGs e universidades: desafios para cooperação na América Latina. Enjeux Contemporains dans les Espaces Lusophones, Paris, v. 2002, n. 1er. sem., p. 215-239, 2002.

Marteleteo, Regina Maria, Leila Beatriz Ribeiro, y Cátia Guimarães. 2002. "Informação em Movimento. Produção e organização do conhecimento nos espaços sociais". Civitas, 2(1): 69-80.

Mendonça, Daniel. 2002. "Para além da lei. Agonismo como princípio de ação dos movimento sociais." *Civitas*, 2(1): 55-68

Melucci, Alberto. 1989. "Um objetivo para os movimentos sociais?". Lua Nova, 17(junho): 49-66.

Nunes, Edison. 1987. "Movimentos populares na transição inconclusa". Lua Nova, 13: 92-94.

Olvera, Alberto. 2003a. "Introducción". Sociedad Civil, esfera pública y democratización en América Latina: México. Compilado por Alberto Olvera. México: FCE y UV, pp13-41.

Olvera, Alberto. 2003b. "Las tendencias genarales de desarrollo de la sociedad civil en México". Sociedad Civil, esfera pública y democratización en América Latina: México. Compilado por Alberto Olvera. México: FCE y UV, pp.42-70.

Sánchez Mejorada, Cristina y Lucía Enríquez Álvarez. 2003. "Gobierno democrático, Sociedad civil y participación ciudadana en la Ciudad de México, 1997-200". Sociedad Civil, esfera pública y democratización en América Latina: México. Compilado por Alberto Olvera. México: FCE y UV, pp 205-283.

Olvera, Alberto. 2003d. "Movimientos sociales prodemocráticos, democratización y esfera pública en México: el caso de Alianza Cívica". Sociedad Civil, esfera pública y democratización en América Latina: México. Compilado por Alberto Olvera. México: FCE y UV, pp. 351-409.

Olvera, Alberto. 2003e. "Conclusiones y propuestas". Sociedad Civil, esfera pública y democratización en América Latina: México. Compilado por Alberto Olvera. México: FCE e UV, pp. 410-438.

Paoli, Maria Célia. 2003. "Empresas e Responsabilidade Social: os enredamentos da cidadania". Democratizar a democracia: os caminhos da democracia participativa. Compilado por Boaventura Santos. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.

Paz, Rosângela. 2005. "Organizações não-governamentais: um debate sobre a identidade política das associadas à Abong". *Cadernos Abong*, 33(junho): pp 5-33

Phronesis: Revista interdisciplinaria de las áreas de Ciencias Sociales y Teología del Centro Antonio de Montesinos AC. 1995. Sociedad Civil. Distrito Federal: Centro de estudios sociales y culturales Antonio de Montesinos.

Pliego, Fernando Carrasco. 2001. "Panorama de las Organizaciones No Gubernamentales en la Ciudad de México: encuesta 1997". *Cuadernos de Investigación*, 28, IIS.

Ramírez, Juan Manuel Saíz. 1988, "Trabajador y/o colono, ¿una dicotomía en las luchas sociales? (La articulación entre el movimiento urbano popular y el sindicalismo independiente)". Los movimientos sociales en el Valle de México v.II. Compilado por Jorge Alonso. México: Ediciones de la Casa Chata, pp. 21-99.

Rucht, Dieter. 2002. "Sociedade como projeto – projetos na sociedade. Sobre o papel dos movimentos sociais". *Civitas*, 2(1): 13-28.

Sader, Emir. 1988. Quando novos personagens entraram em cena: experiências, falas e lutas dos trabalhadores da Grande São Paulo (1970-80). Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Sánchez Mejorada, Cristina. 2001. "Las instancias de participación vecinal y los mecanismos de gestión y control en el Distrito Federal. Un recuento histórico 1940-2000". Espacios Metropolitanos. Compilado por Emilio Duhau. México: UAM, RNIU, 2001, pp. 199-244.

Sánchez Mejorada, Cristina, y Lucía Enríquez Álvarez. 2002. "La política gubernamental en materia de participación ciudadana en el Gobierno del Distrito Federal". ¿Una ciudad para todos? La Ciudad de México, la experiencia del primer gobierno electo. Compilado

por Lucía Enríquez Álvarez, María Concepción Huarte Trujillo, Cristina Sánchez Mejorada Cristina, y San Juan Carlos Victoria San Juan Carlos. México: UAM, CONACULTA, INAH, 2002, pp. 531-567.

Sánchez Mejorada, Cristina F.. 2004. "Gobierno Democrático, política social y participación ciudadana en la ciudad: alcances y desafíos". Pobreza, Desigualdad y Marginalización en la Ciudad de México Compilado por Secretaria de Desarrollo Social del Distrito Federal. Distrito Federal, México: Dirección General de Equidad y Desarrollo Social, pp.157-170.

Santos, Boaventura de Souza, y Leonardo Avritzer. 2002. "Para ampliar o cânone democrático". Democratizar a Democracia: os caminhos da democracia participativa. Compilado por Boaventura de Souza Santos y Leonardo Avritzer. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.

Scherrer-Warren, Ilse.1996. Redes de movimentos sociais. São Paulo: Ed. Loyola.

Skocpol, Theda. 1992. Protecting Soldiers and Mothers. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sobottka, Emil A. 2002. "Apresentação: Organizações e movimentos sociais". Civitas,2(1): 81-95

Touraine, Alain.1989. "Os novos conflitos sociais - para evitar mal-entendidos". Lua Nova 17(junho): 5-18.

Warren, Mark. 2004. "What kind of civil society is Best for democracy?". Portuguese Journal of Social Science, 3(1): 37-47.

Watts, Duncan J. 1999. "Networks, Dynamics, and the Small-World Phenomenon". American Journal of Sociology, 105 (2): 493-527.

**Table 3: Centrality and Cohesion According to Types of Civil Organizations – Mexico City\***

Types	Centrality					Cohesion		
	Direct		Indirect			Average Distance <sup>c</sup>	Number of geodesic paths <sup>a2</sup>	Reachability <sup>a</sup>
	Active <sup>a</sup>	Passive <sup>b</sup>	Betweenness <sup>a</sup>	Dependence (Bonacich) <sup>a</sup>	Influence (Bonacich) <sup>a</sup>			
NGOs	0,32	0,24	0,35	-0,31	-0,82	0,11	0,32	0,23
Coordinating Bodies	0,06	0,20	0,35	-0,07	0,16	0,10	0,01	0,03
Popular Organizations	--	-0,08	--	0,52	0,24	0,10	--	--
Service non-profit	-0,17	-0,14	-0,48	-0,38	-0,91	0,08	0,13	0,25
Community Organizations	-0,57	-0,31	-0,84	0,25	-0,42	-0,23	-0,49	-0,41
Neighborhood Associations	-0,21	-0,39	-0,97	-1,00	1,82	-0,34	-0,59	-0,67
Neighborhood Committees	-0,36	-0,09	-0,50	-0,35	-0,55	-0,23	-0,33	-0,31

Source: Project Rights, Representation, and the Poor: Comparing Large Developing Democracies – Brazil, India, and Mexico.

\*All measures have been calculated with the directed network except for dependence (Bonacich), indirect influence (Bonacich), and average distance.

The general average for each measure was used as a reference category.

a) Presents values only for the interviewed civil organizations (n=169).

a) Presents values for the civil organizations of the sample (n=601).

a) Presents values for all civil organizations of the main component (n=578).

**Table 4: Centrality and Cohesion According to Types of Civil Organizations – São Paulo\***

Types	Centrality					Cohesion		
	Direct		Indirect			Average Distance <sup>c</sup>	Number of geodesic paths <sup>a3</sup>	Reachability <sup>a</sup>
	Active <sup>a</sup>	Passive <sup>b</sup>	Betweenness <sup>a</sup>	Dependence (Bonacich) <sup>a</sup>	Influence (Bonacich) <sup>a</sup>			
NGOs	0,22	-0,11	-0,23	0,10	-0,06	0,00	0,11	0,05
Coordinating Bodies	0,19	0,09	0,36	0,38	-0,22	0,02	-0,04	0,01
Popular Organizations	0,09	1,45	0,86	0,34	-0,004	0,10	-0,03	0,07
Service non-profit	-0,11	-0,35	-0,51	-0,19	-0,83	-0,04	0,21	-0,02
Community Organizations	-0,14	-0,47	-0,60	-0,27	1,46	-0,09	-0,17	-0,21
Neighborhood Associations	-0,14	-0,39	-0,06	-0,17	-0,54	-0,06	0,17	0,08
Pastorals	-0,10	0,07	0,49	-0,29	0,74	0,10	0,03	0,21
Fora	-0,07	0,01	-0,35	0,07	-0,44	0,01	-0,25	-0,16

Source: Project Rights, Representation, and the Poor: Comparing Large Developing Democracies – Brazil, India, and Mexico.

\*All measures have been calculated with the directed network except for dependence (Bonacich), indirect influence (Bonacich), and average distance.

The general average for each measure was used as a reference category.

a) Presents values only for the interviewed civil organizations (n=202).

a) Presents values for the civil organizations of the sample (n=827).

a) Presents values for all civil organizations of the main component (n=775).

**Table 5: Relational Strategies and Integration between Types of Civil Organizations – Mexico City\***

		(%)						
Types		NGOs	Coordinating Bodies	Popular Organizations	Service Non-Profit	Community Organizations	Neighborhood Associations	Neighborhood Committees
NGOs	Sent Ties	42,83	21,02	5,89	4,91	1,77	5,70	5,50
	Integration	22,70	10,57	24,38	19,07	22,35	26,24	16,8
Coordinating Bodies	Sent Ties	35,29	13,24	4,41	14,71	2,94	7,35	4,41
	Integration	10,57	53,01	54,55	40,74	55,56	64,54	40,64
Popular Organizations**	Sent Ties	12,50	0,00	37,50	0,00	0,00	0,00	18,75
	Integration	24,38	54,55	--	60,00	79,63	83,33	37,32
Service Non-profit	Sent Ties	29,46	16,07	0,00	23,21	1,79	2,68	0,89
	Integration	19,07	40,74	60,00	46,15	48,53	64,55	33,97
Community Organizations	Sent Ties	23,08	7,69	0,00	7,69	15,38	15,38	15,38
	Integration	22,35	55,56	79,63	48,53	81,25	82,43	36,67
Neighborhood Associations	Sent Ties	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	10,34	17,24	72,41
	Integration	26,24	64,54	83,33	64,55	82,43	86,21	38,89
Neighborhood Committes	Sent Ties	2,21	0,00	5,15	2,21	0,74	10,29	76,47
	Integration	16,85	40,64	37,32	33,97	36,67	38,89	30,77

Source: Project Rights, Representation, and the Poor: Comparing Large Developing Democracies – Brazil, India, and Mexico.

\* The values in the line "sent ties" do not total 100% because the category "others" is not represented.

All measures have been calculated with the non-symmetrized and complete network of civil organizations (n=601).

\*\* In spite of the low number of popular organizations interviewed (n=2), the possible number of relations between both popular organizations and other types of organizations is seventy.

**Table 6: Relational Strategies and Integration between Types of Civil Organizations – São Paulo\***

		(%)							
Types		NGOs	Coordinating Bodies	Popular Organizations	Service Non-profit	Community Organizations	Neighborhood Associations	Pastorals	Fora
NGOs	Sent Ties	33,18	19,45	6,86	4,35	4,81	11,90	3,20	9,84
	Integration	36,56	30,45	34,47	32,82	38,08	38,56	35,75	36,26
Coordinating Bodies	Sent Ties	29,59	21,43	5,10	5,10	1,53	17,86	4,59	9,18
	Integration	30,45	62,14	56,91	49,16	62,15	52,29	56,45	59,78
Popular Organizations	Sent Ties	25,00	12,50	23,44	4,69	1,56	4,69	6,25	14,06
	Integration	34,47	56,91	50,00	52,08	65,96	62,33	48,78	64,58
Service Non-profit	Sent Ties	20,00	11,67	3,89	13,89	4,44	20,00	1,11	15,00
	Integration	32,82	49,16	52,08	60,53	58,00	51,61	60,82	57,89
Community Organizations	Sent Ties	23,08	11,54	7,69	6,41	15,38	17,95	3,85	7,69
	Integration	38,08	62,15	65,96	58,00	75,68	62,45	66,32	68,67
Neighborhood Associations	Sent Ties	7,69	12,31	5,13	9,23	5,64	40,00	1,54	13,85
	Integration	38,56	52,29	62,33	51,61	62,45	66,01	64,73	61,29
Pastorals	Sent Ties	8,57	14,29	17,14	0,00	11,43	2,86	17,14	8,57
	Integration	35,75	56,45	48,78	60,82	66,32	64,73	61,90	77,32
Fora	Sent Ties	27,85	20,25	6,33	3,80	11,39	13,92	0,00	12,66
	Integration	36,26	59,78	64,58	57,89	68,67	61,29	77,32	82,89

Source: Project Rights, Representation, and the Poor: Comparing Large Developing Democracies – Brazil, India, and Mexico.

\* The values in the line "sent" do not total 100% because the category "others" is not represented.

All measures have been calculated with the non-symmetrized and complete network of civil organizations (n=827).

**Table 7: Concentration, Centrality and Cohesion of the Internal Networks of Each Type of Civil Organization – Mexico City\***

Types	Concentration		Centrality			Cohesion		
	Degree	Betweenness	Average Degree	Betweenness	Influence (Bonacich)	Reachability	Isolated Actors (%)	Actors in the main component (%)
NGOs	-0,11	4,45	0,33	4,75	1,11	5,96	22,70	70,55
Coordinating Bodies	-0,37	-0,56	-0,08	-0,51	0,11	-0,65	53,01	15,66
Popular Organizations	--	-	--	--	--	--	--	--
Service Non-Profit	0,26	-0,44	0,68	-0,53	-0,07	-0,77	46,15	19,23
Community Organizations	0,63	-0,68	0,48	-0,69	-0,43	-0,97	81,25	18,75
Neighborhood Associations	-0,37	-0,94	-0,73	-0,98	-0,35	-0,98	86,21	6,90
Neighborhood Committees	-0,24	0,39	0,50	0,60	0,49	0,24	30,77	33,65

Source: Project Rights, Representation, and the Poor: Comparing Large Developing Democracies – Brazil, India, and Mexico.

\* All measures have been calculated with symmetrized networks.

The general average for each measure was used as a reference category.

Averages have been calculated based on the sub network of each type. The n corresponding to each sub network is on table 1.

**Table 8: Concentration, Centrality and Cohesion of the Internal Networks of Each Type of Civil Organization – São Paulo\***

Types	Concentration		Centrality			Cohesion		
	Degree	Betweenness	Average Degree	Betweenness	Influence (Bonacich)	Reachability	Isolated Actors (%)	Actors in the main component (%)
NGOs	-0,53	1,77	-0,49	1,21	0,96	4,58	36,56	50,54
Coordinating Bodies	-0,29	0,41	-0,50	0,35	0,26	0,21	62,14	32,04
Popular Organizations	2,78	2,28	3,57	3,19	-0,12	-0,47	50,00	50,00
Service Non-Profit	-0,48	-0,91	-0,44	-0,91	-0,24	-0,83	60,53	9,21
Community Organizations	-0,09	-0,86	-0,70	-0,97	-0,23	-0,91	75,68	9,46
Neighborhood Associations	-0,64	-0,38	-0,77	-0,68	0,29	0,19	66,01	21,67
Pastorals	0,52	-0,37	0,91	-0,21	-0,33	-0,85	61,90	23,81
Fora	-0,57	-0,97	-0,79	-0,99	-0,14	-0,95	82,89	5,26

Source: Project Rights, Representation, and the Poor: Comparing Large Developing Democracies – Brazil, India, and Mexico.

\* All measures have been calculated with symmetrized networks.

The general average for each measure was used as a reference category.

Averages have been calculated based on the sub network of each type. The n corresponding to each sub network is on table 1.

