

## Chapter 6

### Civil organizations and political representation in Brazil's participatory institutions

Graziela Castello, Adrián Gurza Lavalle, and Peter P. Houtzager

#### Introduction<sup>1</sup>

There is considerable evidence that civil organizations such as advocacy NGOs, membership organizations, and community associations have become *de facto* and *de jure* representatives of particular segments of the population and interests in the design, implementation, and monitoring of public policy. Governments are, for a variety of reasons, inviting this set of collective actors into institutionalised spaces for policy making, either in a consultative or deliberative role. Conversely, many civil organizations are themselves pressuring governments to create such spaces, in order to gain access to policy making centres. The institutions that have been created over the past twenty years to link these actors and policy makers, such as the systems of deliberative development councils in Guatemala and of policy councils in Brazil, are often part of larger democratic decentralisation reforms that, at least formally, seek to redistribute power within the state and between state and society (Heller 2001; Grindle 1999).

Students of the new participatory institutions and the role civil organizations play in them have not identified the issue of political representation as an important one,

because this issue is masked by the emphasis put on 'citizen participation,' which is seen as the foundation of contemporary democratisation. Institutions such as the councils in Brazil are often referred to as spaces for 'citizen participation,' even though more often than not they bring collective actors (rather than individual citizens) into contact with public officials (Gurza Lavallo et al. 2005). We are not simply witnessing an increase in opportunity for citizen participation, but a broader process of *reconfiguration of political representation* in which civil organizations play a central role.

The contribution of this reconfiguration to greater political inclusion and democratisation hinges in part on how the dilemmas of civil organizations' *representativeness* are resolved. We believe, on the one hand, that as networks of advocacy NGOs, membership organizations, and community associations acquire a new role in political representation, the current processes of the reconfiguration of representation around the executive may converge to produce more inclusive democracy. Similar to the emergence of mass political parties, which contributed to the expansion of institutions of political representation and of democracy itself in the early decades of the twentieth century, the contemporary shifts in forms of political representation involve changes in the workings of the traditional institutions of representative government and an expansion of the locus and the functions of political representation.

On the other hand, the consequences of this reconfiguration for political inclusion and democratisation depend in some measure on the answer to two questions. Who do civil organizations represent when they act as representatives in the polity, and in what terms is this representation constructed? The large majority of organizations that engage in political representation do not have electoral mechanisms through which

they can establish their representativeness – that is, build a mandate and ensure accountability – and most are not membership-based. Furthermore, there are no well-established or widely accepted models of how civil organizations could establish their representativeness beyond these two classic mechanisms. Civil organizations therefore face a significant challenge when it comes to establishing their representativeness.

This chapter explores some of the efforts to meet this challenge using the findings of a survey of 229 civil organizations – that is, neighbourhood or community associations, membership organizations, NGOs, and co-ordinators of networks of these organizations – in the city of São Paulo (population 10 million, within municipal boundaries). The survey was undertaken in 2002 and used sampling criteria that favoured organizations that were actively working with (or on the behalf of) the urban lower-middle-class, working-class, and poor.<sup>ii</sup> Because this universe of organizations works with or for social groups who are said to be marginalised in classic representative institutions and from centres of political power, their role as representatives is especially relevant to the debates on the direction of contemporary democracy and whether greater political inclusion is in the offing.

São Paulo is a 'forerunner case' that may reflect what lies on democracy's horizon. The city is the largest and politically most diverse in Brazil, a country that has since its democratic transition in 1985 become a democratic laboratory of enormous dimensions. It has a tradition of councils linked to left wing actors, has experimented with participatory budgeting and other participatory institutions, and has a longstanding presence of societal actors linked to popular sectors, such as the housing and health movements. Civil organizations in São Paulo and elsewhere in Brazil have, furthermore, achieved notable influence in various areas of public policy since the end

of the military dictatorship in 1985, and particularly since the 1988 Constitution. As the research agenda on the democratisation of democracy suggests with its empirical focus on Brazil and other middle and low income countries, perhaps for the first time democracy and the cutting edge of democratising reforms are being imagined and constructed in the southern hemisphere.

### **Civil organizations, representation and democracy**

The processes of state reform that have unfolded in recent years, and in particular the wave of institutional innovations that have created new opportunities for citizen participation in policy processes, have intensified the political protagonism of civil organizations. In the case of São Paulo, almost two-thirds of our sample of organizations that work with or for the urban poor participate in at least one of the new participatory institutional arrangements, namely the participatory budget or the policy councils (Houtzager et al. 2004). Furthermore, the actors have a broad representative commitment in São Paulo – almost three quarters explicitly assert that they represent the social groups who take part in or benefit from their activities. And, when we take into account the different forms of political representation that lie within reach of these actors, we find that claims of engaging in political representation are associated with actual political practices during which representation is likely to occur. The inverse relationship is as consistent: civil organizations that carry out few or no practices of representation tend *not* to define themselves as representatives of their publics.

This ability of particular types of civil organizations to enter and potentially represent interests of poorer sectors in different policy arenas and in the polity more generally, where these interests are often absent, is also an important reason to pay careful attention to the nexus of societal and political spheres, and their institutional

sedimentation. Whether a civil organization claims that it is a representative of its public is, in São Paulo, closely linked to its relationship with traditional political structures. More precisely, whether an actor supports political candidates is by far the best predictor of assumed representation, followed at some distance by two characteristics – registration as a public interest organizations (*utilidade publica*) or mobilisation and demand making on public authorities.

There is no a priori guarantee that the potential political representation provided by civil organizations will in fact be representative, simply because this form of representation is constructed within a 'societal,' rather than political, sphere. If they function as effective new channels of mediation between the population and electoral processes or, as occurs in Brazil, between the population and public administration in the design and implementation of policies, civil organizations can only contribute to the democratisation of democracy if they themselves are representative, or if they are able to maintain the core tension in the relationship between representatives and the represented. Clientelism and patrimonialism of various kinds, for example, also tend to occur at this level of 'societal' organizational activity.

Paradoxically, the crucial dilemma of the representativeness of civil organizations' representation – who do they represent exactly, and through what mechanisms is the relationship between representatives and those represented established? – has not been taken up in the literatures on the reconfiguration of representation or on democratising democracy. Neither has explored this novel form of representation empirically in any kind of systematic manner, nor in terms of its implications for democracy or democratic theory. The former works with the legitimate model of political representation that exists – i.e. representative mandate through elections – which was historically inspired by a set of actors, and for carrying out particular roles, that do not

The latter literatures do not address the issue of representation, in any form.

Studies of the democratisation of democracy have focused their attention on institutional innovations that embrace various forms of participation in institutional structures for the design and implementation of public policies.<sup>iii</sup> Yet this broad field of study – that composed by work on deepening democracy, social accountability, empowered participation, deliberative democracy, and civil society – does not recognise the issue of political representation by civil organization, because it is (in these studies) masked by the emphasis put on ‘citizen participation’ and ‘civil society,’ which are seen as the foundations of the contemporary democratisation. In this literature there obviously are different emphases, focuses, and analytical categories. Nonetheless, most share two traits that have the effect of blocking the ability to conceive of a role civil organizations might play in political representation. First, to a greater or lesser extent they rely on stylised conceptions of civil organizations, often grouped under the heading of civil society and assumed to have a particular unifying logic. This conceptual, and normative, step eliminates relevant internal differences between societal actors as well as the interactions present at the interface of political institutions and civil organizations. Civil society is said to rationalise public action and democratise political decisions because ‘it’ is guided by dialogue and has capacities and convictions that are previously defined because they have emanated from genuine and ‘pre-political’ roots in the life world. Thus there is an assumed continuity or natural connection between a group of societal actors and society, or some segments of it – i.e. between civil society and society – undermining the investigations into the processes of representation that link the two together. It is worth remembering Pitkin’s (1967: 60-91) observation that representation by

definition presumes difference and not identity between the representative and those that are represented.

Second, research agendas and policy interventions concerned with the democratising of democracy are strongly attached to the idea of participation, be that the direct presence of those eventually affected or benefited by public decisions or face-to-face deliberation. The debate about political representation is incompatible with radical criticisms of representative democracy that denounce the inevitable distorting, dividing effects between those represented and representatives and that in different ways advocate direct democracy. In fact, as long as direct democracy operates by means of self-presentation, the problematic of representation is eliminated entirely (for instance see Tenzer 1992; Keane 1992). The direct participation of those sectors of society considered under- or badly represented in classic representative institutions is understood as a critical means to improve the quality of democratic institutions, by making these more inclusive. If at times the very idea of participation appears burdened by the expectations of its ultimately positive effects on the quality of democracy, however, the idea also appears cognitively impoverished when we consider that in places like Brazil, innovative participatory institutions – independently of whether or not they have stimulated direct citizen involvement – have produced the intense ‘participation’ of civil organizations.

Studies that explore the reconfiguration of political representation, in turn, offer interpretations of a transformation in progress at the level of the party system, where the relationship between elected representative and represented citizen is believed to be in flux (Manin 1997; Novaro 2000; Miguel 2003a and 2003b; Roberts 2002; Hagopian 1998). In these studies, representation fundamentally resides in the electoral process, and for this reason there is no need even to explore whether civil

organizations are acquiring any role in political representation in contemporary democracies. Asserting that civil organizations lack representativeness, either because they have no identifiable mechanism to establish a mandate or authorise their representation – i.e. elections – or because they do not have any accountability mechanisms, voids rather than illuminates the problematique that is explored in this chapter. The possible role of civil organizations in a reconfiguration of representation is defined *a priori* as irrelevant (see Przeworski 2002; Chandhoke 2003).

There are good reasons for some scepticism about the representativeness of civil organizations. In addition to the absence of clear and obligatory accountability mechanisms between the actors and the social sectors they represent (Przeworski 2002), the line between the public and private roles of these organizations is ambiguously defined. As a result, various authors point to the functional role these organizations play in the logic of privatisation and of redistribution of responsibilities between society, the state and the market (Houtzager et al. 2002; Cunill 1997; Dagnino 2002). There are other relevant reservations as well, including the possible proliferation of claims based on substantive representation, such as race and gender, which are alien to the formal and universal logic of modern political representation, or the weakening of civil organizations' capacity to act as agents of social protest and to dispute the political agenda as their involvement in state programmes or participatory institutions increases, or even the public's lack of recognition and expectations of civil organizations (Chandhoke 2003 and 2004).

We believe, however, that it is wise to defer any conclusion based on such reservations, because most take a traditional configuration of political representation or representative mandate as their point of departure. Civil organizations do not, and

cannot, hold a representative mandate on these terms – that is, as public officials elected through universal franchise. Judging them according to this standard may not be a productive exercise. In fact, the boundaries, achievements, and constraints of existing notions of representation within the universe of civil organizations are the subject of great political dispute today. Setting aside the reservations mentioned above allows us to continue to reflect on the analytical challenge that exists. The actors themselves are not waiting for theorists to discover or come to terms with their new political role. Amongst civil organizations today one finds a diversity of partially constructed notions of representation that are used to publicly defend their representativeness. The content of some of these notions is compatible with the expansion of democracy, while that of others clearly is not.

### **Assumed representation by civil organizations**

In the absence of historical or theoretical models for examining political representation by civil organizations, we argue for an analytic strategy that is inductive but guided by the constitutive duality of the concept of representation, on the one hand, and the importance of representatives' genuine (subjective) commitment to the interests of the represented (Burke 1774), on the other. The strategy consists of shifting the question of representativeness from the actual to the symbolic level, centring attention on the representative's commitment to representation, on their identification with those represented and, in sociological terms, on their own perception of their representativeness. It entails taking seriously civil organizations' self-definition as representative: actors' public acceptance or rejection of the idea of being representatives, together with the justifications or congruency arguments used by them to publicly defend the genuineness of their commitment to represent.

The constitutive duality of political representation is the autonomy of the representative and mandate given by the represented (Pitkin 1967). The existence of representation does not guarantee representativeness – its correspondence to the will of those being represented – and the strength of representativeness cannot be accomplished by removing the autonomy of the representative. As Sartori (1962) and Pitkin (1967) have meticulously demonstrated, maintaining analytically only one of the two poles in this duality is the quickest way to empty out political representation of its meaning – it either loses its substantive meaning of acting in the interests or on behalf of those represented, or it loses its political nature as institutional crystallisation for governing society.

Publicly assumed representation is not equivalent to effective representation, but commitment to the interests of the represented is a vital component of representation. Ultimately, Burke (1774) argues, the best measure to guarantee authentic representation – that is, its representativeness – is the existence of a genuine representative commitment. Given the contingent nature of this subjective factor, formal institutional mechanisms are both necessary and desirable to ensure this representative commitment is not displaced or lost. Although the subjective dimension of representation has become systematically devalued amongst theories of democracy, institutional rules and designs are powerless when representatives are not stimulated or moved by a 'feeling of representation.' More precisely, if representation cannot be reduced to merely assumed representation, representativeness cannot do away with the commitment of representing, and this is found in abundance in civil organizations.

## **Six notions of representation**

The idea of 'assumed representation' allows us to avoid the question of whether actual representation is taking place, and thus of an actor's representativeness. It introduces distinctions that help explore the problematique of civil organizations' representativeness in a different form – as justification attached to assumed representation. Justifications are an inherent part of assumed representation. The range of arguments an actor can invoke to defend a claim to represent a public makes explicit the basis of the authenticity of that self-definition, from the perspective of that actor, of course. The typology of congruency arguments condenses this broad range and categorises their key elements. What is considered here are the motives and reasons actually furnished by civil organizations to address the thorny question of their representativeness, once they have assumed the position as representatives of their public. Therefore the typology is a result of the research. It disregards normative conceptual elements and does not say anything about the way in which civil organizations *should* construe their roles of political representation, or about the appropriate mechanisms of accountability or responsiveness that would connect these organizations to those they ultimately represent.

Six congruency arguments prevail among civil organizations (Table 6.1). They are classical-electoral, proximity, services, mediation, membership and identity. Each argument is made up of the same components, although these are related to each other in different ways. Broadly speaking, representation combines three components: *those represented*, always people whose will is bound together in a way that is to a greater or lesser degree direct and concrete (vote, demand, petition) or in a way necessarily indirect and abstract (nation, tradition, common good); *the representative*, mediator and guardian of interests of those represented, whose role lies in diverse levels of

institutionalisation, authorisation, and duty to those represented; and *the locus*, which is simultaneously the jurisdiction where representation is exercised and the interlocutors to whom it is addressed. In this case, where the figures of traditional political representation prove to be inadequate, those represented tend to coincide with the publics of the organizations, usually outlined in quite broad terms such as 'the excluded', 'the poor', 'the community', and 'citizens'. The representative corresponds to the civil organization that is authorised as such by self-definition, and the locus, only implicitly specified in the majority of cases, as a rule centres on the public authority and less frequently on other social institutions and before other societal interlocutors.

Although the three components appear in all of the congruency arguments, in each argument the components relate to each other in a particular manner, the distinguishing mark of which lies in the emphasis placed by the actor on the part and content of those relationships which are used by them as proof of the authenticity of their assumed representation.

**Table 6.1: Typology of congruency arguments**

| <i>Congruency Arguments</i> | Frequency |      | Emphasis of Relationship                                       | Dimensions of the Argument                                | Examples   |
|-----------------------------|-----------|------|--|---|--|
|                             | No.       | %    |  |   |  |
| <b>Classical electoral</b>  | 8         | 4.2  | <i>Vertical</i> : From represented to representative           | Electoral process   | 'Because we are elected to respond politically for this population '   |
| <b>Membership</b>           | 13        | 6.8  | <i>Internal</i> : From the representative to the represented   | Membership  | 'Because we are part of the movement as affiliated members'  |
| <b>Identity</b>             | 9         | 4.7  | <i>Internal</i> : From represented to the representative       | Identity/<br>substantive                                  | 'We are an integral part, we talk because we are '.  |
| <b>Mediation</b>            | 60        | 31.1 | <i>Vertical</i> : From the representative to the locus         | (a) Advocacy;<br>(b) Mediation                            | (a) 'Because we fight for children's rights...'; (b) 'Because we have been their voice before the public authorities '                 |
| <b>Proximity</b>            | 52        | 27.1 | <i>Horizontal</i> : From the representative to the represented | (a) Emancipation;<br>(b) Participation;<br>(c) commitment | (a) '...because we provide the conditions for this group to develop a political conscience...';<br>(b) 'Because we work in partnership |

|                 |     |      |  |                    |  |
|-----------------|-----|------|--|--------------------|--|
|                 |     |      |  |                    | with these people...';<br>(c) 'Because the aims of the organization are centred on this group, supporting their development' |
| <b>Services</b> | 45  | 23.4 | <i>Vertical</i> : From the representative to the represented | Service non-profit | 'Because we try to provide some structure to the families, distribution of milk, basic supplies'                             |
| <b>Others</b>   | 5   | 2.6  |  |                    |  |
| <b>TOTAL</b>    | 192 | 100  |  |                    |  |

The findings reveal that the congruency arguments civil organizations make to support their representativeness appear to be crystalising around a small number of notions of representation. Of the six arguments made by civil organizations, those that have received the most attention in scholarly works – the identity, electoral, and membership arguments – are surprisingly rare. They account for only sixteen percent of the actors who assume representation of their publics. In contrast, mediation, proximity, and services are by far the most common arguments (ranging from 31 to 23 percent of actors).

Who uses these congruency arguments and how do these arguments relate to the potential exercise of representation? The fact that actors overwhelmingly use a single argument suggests that they are consciously and purposefully constructing justifications of their assumed representation. Only one percent make use of three arguments to justify their representativeness, thirteen percent use two arguments and 86 percent use only one. Of the six arguments, those most used are mediation (31 percent) and proximity (27 percent), followed by the service argument. In contrast, membership, identity and classical-electoral mechanisms are only invoked infrequently.

There is an elective affinity between particular congruency arguments and specific types of organizations, reflecting the logic of the arguments themselves (Table 6.2).

Service non-profit organizations do not cite the classical-electoral, membership or identity arguments even once, while they used the service argument with notable frequency. Local associations use the proximity argument the most, and they do not use the membership argument. Together with the coordinating bodies, local association are the only actors to use the classical-electoral argument. The coordinating bodies in turn account for almost all the membership cases cited and centre the reasons for their representativeness on the mediation argument. Advocacy NGOs also make the mediation argument more frequently, followed closely by the proximity argument, although differently from the coordinating bodies, they totally dismiss the classical-electoral argument.

**Table 6.2: Arguments for assumed representation by civil organizations (%)**

| <i>Congruency arguments</i> | Advocacy NGOs | Local Associations | Service non-profits | Coordinating Bodies | Others |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------|
| Classical electoral         | 0.0           | 8.3                | 0.0                 | 8.5                 | 0.0    |
| Membership                  | 6.7           | 0.0                | 0.0                 | 23.4                | 0.0    |
| Identity                    | 6.7           | 6.3                | 0.0                 | 4.3                 | 0.0    |
| Mediation                   | 33.3          | 27.1               | 25.9                | 36.2                | 42.9   |
| Proximity                   | 30.0          | 29.2               | 14.8                | 19.1                | 21.4   |
| Services                    | 16.7          | 27.1               | 55.6                | 6.4                 | 35.7   |
| Others                      | 6.7           | 2.1                | 3.7                 | 2.1                 | 0.0    |
| Total                       | 100           | 100                | 100                 | 100                 | 100    |

Is there a relationship between practices of political representation – (i) new forms of representation within the executive; (ii) direct mediation of demands vis-à-vis specific public agencies; (iii) political advocacy by means of aggregation of interests through traditional electoral channels; and (iv) political advocacy – and the different congruency arguments? Table 6.3 shows that the classical-electoral and membership arguments, which conform to representation structures accepted in mass democracies,

are used by organizations that in fact score more highly in their number of the above four activities ultimately linked to political representation. The identity argument in turn performs similarly, albeit scoring slightly lower. The large majority of organizations that cite these arguments carry out at least three of the activities considered in the analysis. On the other hand, the mediation and proximity arguments are cited by only a small group of organizations which do not carry out at least one of the activities linked to political representation. The congruency argument based on service delivery has the weakest relationship to activities of representation – it is used by actors that in their majority (70 percent) only carry out up to two activities.

**Table 6.3: Representational activities according to congruency arguments (%)**

| Arguments of Representation | Activities of Representation |      |      |      |      |       |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------|------|------|------|-------|
|                             | 0                            | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | Total |
| Classical electoral         | 0.0                          | 0.0  | 12.5 | 62.5 | 25.0 | 100.0 |
| Membership                  | 0.0                          | 7.7  | 30.8 | 61.5 | 0.0  | 100.0 |
| Identity                    | 0.0                          | 0.0  | 44.4 | 44.4 | 11.1 | 100.0 |
| Mediation                   | 5.0                          | 15.0 | 25.0 | 41.7 | 13.3 | 100.0 |
| Proximity                   | 9.6                          | 7.7  | 25.0 | 44.2 | 13.5 | 100.0 |
| Services                    | 13.3                         | 26.7 | 20.0 | 33.3 | 6.7  | 100.0 |
| Others                      | 40.0                         | 20.0 | 40.0 | 0.0  | 0.0  | 100.0 |

These findings from São Paulo suggest a surprising affinity between notions and actions of representation and they interrogate in authoritative and multiple ways some of the assumptions central to the research agendas on reconfiguration of representation and on the democratisation of democracy. For example, 73 percent of organizations assumed representation, and for these organizations the relationship with political institutions is of central importance to their claiming the status of

representatives. By far the best predictor of their propensity to assume their representation of the publics for which or with whom they work is whether the organization has supported political candidates in elections. Furthermore, those who assume representation are far more likely to engage in actual representational activities than those who state they are not representatives. Contrary to the assumptions of the two research agendas, this suggests not only that a majority of civil organizations working with or for lower income groups self-consciously engage in political representation, but also that the dynamics of this political representation are closely related to those of traditional political channels of representation. They are *not* parallel to or separate from traditional channels.

Among the congruency arguments reconcilable with democratic principles, the *mediation* argument appears the most promising. The argument is made by roughly a third of the actors - principally NGOs, community associations and co-ordinators. It suggests that the representation exercised by civil organizations is not an alternative to that of traditional institutions of political representation, but rather an additional form of mediation that connects segments of the population otherwise poorly or under-represented in the State and in electoral politics. Actors who make the mediation argument overwhelmingly engage in political activities in which actual representation is likely to occur.

Recent innovative experiments in institutional participation and state reform in Brazil are reflected within this mediation argument for assumed representation. These political-institutional changes have altered the dynamics of representation amongst civil organizations over the past two decades, and in particular they have led this representation to acquire explicit political dimensions. Civil organizations who make the mediation argument affirm their commitment to a mediating role that connects

poorly or under-represented segments of the population, on the one hand, to the State and electoral politics on the other. What is being discussed therefore is an argument that situates civil organizations as a new form of mediation between representatives and those represented.

## **Conclusion**

Innovative institutional spaces that bring civil organizations into the process of designing and supervising public policy are expanding the boundaries of political representation beyond their original locus and functions, towards the executive. In São Paulo ordinary citizens are not, by and large, the principal protagonists in these new participatory spaces, but rather civil organizations legally invested as representatives of the social sectors envisaged by these policies have assumed this protagonism. Furthermore, it is the civil organizations that actively cultivate political support and build alliances with traditional political actors in order to carry out their objectives that take on the assumed representation of their public.

Confirming that civil organizations are playing a substantial role in the reconfiguration of representation in São Paulo does not say anything about the positive or negative consequences for political inclusion and the quality of democracy. These consequences depend, among other things, on the nature of the representativeness of civil organizations, and the extent to which notions of political representation among these actors meet democratic requirements.

The evidence examined here indicates that one should avoid constructing a single stylised model of representation by civil organizations, as diverse models of representativeness are used in the public justifications of the authenticity of their assumed representation. Undoubtedly, a substantial number of organizations conceive

the legitimacy of their representation in terms that have perverse consequences if they are projected into the political arena. Nevertheless, congruency arguments reconcilable with democratic requirements do exist and these are made by a majority of actors. Amongst these, the notion of representation we call *mediation* is explicitly political and compatible with the contemporary processes of the reconfiguration of representation.

## References

- Atkinson, R. and J. Flint (2003) 'Accessing hidden and hard-to-reach populations: Snowball research strategies', *Social Research Update* 33, [www.soc.surrey.ac.uk/sru/SRU33.html](http://www.soc.surrey.ac.uk/sru/SRU33.html).
- Avritzer, L. (1994) 'Modelos de sociedade civil: uma análise específica do Caso Brasileiro', in L. Avritzer (ed.) *Sociedade civil e democratização*, Belo Horizonte: Del Rey.
- Avritzer, L. (1997) 'Um desenho institucional para o novo associativismo', *Lua Nova*, CEDEC, nº 39, 1997.
- Avritzer, L. (2003) *Democracy and the Public Space in Latin America*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Boham, J. and W. Rehg (2002) *Deliberative democracy*, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Burke, E. (1774) 'Carta a los electores de Bristol', in E. Burke *Textos políticos*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1942.
- Chandhoke, N. (2003) 'Governance and the pluralisation of the state: Implications for democratic practices in Asia' mimeo, Delhi .**
- Chandhoke, N. (2004) 'Revisiting the crisis of representation thesis: The Indian context', mimeo, Delhi.**
- Cohen, J. and A. Arato (1992) *Civil Society and Political Theory*, Massachusetts: MIT.
- Costa, S. (2002) *As cores de Ercília: Esfera Pública, democracia, configurações pós-nacionais*, Belo Horizonte: UFMG.
- Cunil, G. N. (1997) *Pensando lo público a través de la sociedad: nuevas formas de gestión pública e representación social*, Caracas: Nueva Sociedad/ CLAD.
- Dagnino, E. (2002) 'Sociedade civil, espaços públicos e a construção democrática no Brasil: Limites e possibilidades', in E. Dagnino, *Sociedade Civil e Espaços Públicos no Brasil*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.
- Elster, J. (ed.) (1998) *Deliberative Democracy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fung, A. (2004) *Empowered Participation: Reinventing Urban Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fung, A. and E. O. Wright (2003) 'Thinking about empowered participatory governance', in A. Fung and E. O. Wright (eds), *Deepening Democracy:*

- Institutional Innovation in Empowered Participatory Governance*, London: Verso.
- Goodman, L. (1961) 'Snowball sampling', *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 32, nº1.
- Grindle, M. S. (1999) *Audacious Reforms: Institutional Reform and Democracy in Latin América*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gurza Lavalle, A., P. P. Houtzager, and G. Castello (2005) 'In whose name? Representation and civil organisations in Brazil,' IDS Working Paper 249, June.
- Habermas, J. (1993) 'La soberanía popular como procedimiento: Un concepto normativo de lo público', in M. Herrera (ed.) *Jürgen Habermas — Moralidad, Ética y Política: Propuestas y Críticas*, México: Alianza Editorial.
- Habermas, J. (1995) 'Três modelos normativos de democracia', *Lua Nova*, CEDEC, nº 36, 1.
- Habermas, J. (1998) *Facticidad y Validez: Sobre el Derecho y el Estado Democrático de Derecho en Términos de Teoría del Discurso*, Madri: Trotta.
- Hagiopian, F. (1998) 'Democracy and political representation in Latin America in the 1990s: Pause, reorganization, or decline?', in F. Agüero and J. Stark (eds) *Fault Lines of Democracy in Post-Transition Latin America*, Miami: North-South Center Press, University of Miami.
- Heller, P. (2001) 'Moving the state: The politics of democratic decentralization in Kerala, South Africa, and Porto Alegre', *Politics & Society* 29, No. 1.
- Houtzager, P., J. Harris, R. Collie, and A. Gurza Lavalle (2002) 'Rights, representation and the poor: comparisons across Latin America and India'. *LSE Working Paper Series n° 02-3*: London School of Economics.
- Houtzager, P., A. Gurza Lavalle and A. Acharya (2003) 'Who participates? Civil society and the new democratic politics in São Paulo, Brazil', IDS Working Paper 210, Sussex: Institute of Development Studies.
- Houtzager, P., Gurza Lavalle, A. and Acharya, A. (2004) 'Atores da sociedade civil e atores políticos - participação nas novas políticas democráticas em São Paulo', in L. Avritzer (ed.) *Participação política em São Paulo*, São Paulo: UNESP.
- Keane, J. (1988) *Democracia y sociedad civil*, México: Alianza Editorial.
- Keane, J. (1992) *La vida pública y el capitalismo tardío — Hacia una teoría socialista de la democracia*, México: Alianza.
- Manin, B. (1997) *The Principles of representative government*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miguel, L. F. (2003a) 'Representação política em 3-D: elementos para uma teoria ampliada da representação política', *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, nº 51, ano 18, fevereiro.
- Miguel, L. F. (2003b) 'Impasses da accountability: dilemas e alternativas da representação política', Paper apresentado no XXVII Congresso Anual da ANPOCS, Caxambu, outubro.
- Novaro, M. (2000) *Representación y Liderazgo en las Democracias Contemporáneas*, Rosario: Homo Sapiens Ediciones.
- Panfichi, A. (2003) *Sociedad civil, esfera pública y democratización en América Latina: Andes y Cono Sur*, Fondo de Cultura Económica, Universidad Veracruzana.
- Peruzzotti, E. and C. Smulovitz (2002) 'Accountability social: la otra cara del control', in E. Peruzzotti e C. Smulovitz, (eds), *Controlando la política —*

Castello, Gurza Lavalle & Houtzager. "Civil organizations and political representation in Brazil's participatory institutions". In Andrea Cornwall and Vera Schattan P. Coelho (eds.). *Spaces for Change: The Politics of Participation in New Democratic Arenas*. Chapter 6. Final Draft January 2006

*Ciudadanos y medios den las nuevas democracias latinoamericanas*,  
Buenos Aires: Temas.

Pitkin, F. H. (1967) *The concept of representation*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Przeworski, A. (2002) 'Accountability social en América Latina y más allá', in E. Peruzzotti e C. Smulovitz, (eds), *Controlando la política — Ciudadanos y medios den las nuevas democracias latinoamericanas*, Buenos Aires: Temas.

Roberts, K. M. (2002) 'Party-society linkages and democratic representation in Latin America', *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 53.

Santos, B. de Sousa (2002) *Democracia e Participação: O Caso do Orçamento Participativo de Porto Alegre*, Porto: Edições Afrontamento.

Sartori, G. (1962) 'A teoria da representação no Estado Representativo moderno', Minas Gerais, *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Políticos*.

Tenzer, N. (1992) *La Sociedad Despolitizada. Ensayo sobre los fundamentos de la política*, Barcelona: Ediciones Paidós.

<sup>i</sup> This chapter draws heavily on Gurza Lavalle et al. 2005. More systematic empirical support for the claims we make in this chapter can be found in this and in Houtzager et al. (2003)

available for download at: <http://www.ids.ac.uk/gdr/cfs/research/Collective%20Actors-pubs.html>

<sup>ii</sup> The sample was constructed using a snowball technique, particularly useful for accessing 'hidden' populations (Atkinson and Flint 2003). For further details see Houtzager et al. (2003).

<sup>iii</sup> For literature on deepening democracy see the work by Fung (2004), Fung and Wright (2003), Santos Boaventura (2002); for social accountability approaches see Peruzotti and Smulovitz (2002); for a focus on empowered participation see Fung and Wright (2003); for a perspective on deliberative democracy see Habermas (1993; 1995; 1998) and the work of Bohman and Rehg (2002) and in Elster (1998); on civil society see Keane (1988), but especially Cohen and Arato (1992), Costa (2002), Avritzer (1994; 1997, 2003), and Panfichi (2003).