



Political Culture and Citizen Participation: Transiting From Political Space

Judith Josefina Hernández García de Velazco ¹

Edgar Córdova Jaimes ²

Ana Cecilia Chumaceiro Hernández ³

ABSTRACT

Societies build their interpretation and representation on the different phenomena in their social, historical, and political processes, so also the political culture contains a set of beliefs, ideas, myths, norms, which give it identity, values, and ends. Consequently, from the democratic culture, the citizen is encouraged to move in the public space, determined by actions and practices. As a result of these relationships, participation mechanisms are institutionalized for the emancipation or defense of citizens against the role of the State that is domination. Characterizing the aspects that involve political culture, participation, and citizen action in the democratic political space is the central object of this dissertation. The systematic review, bibliographic, documentary, and critical analysis facilitate the method and results' achievement. It is concluded that its authentic representation and participation characterize democracy as a government system. This implied a global interaction with the negotiation of the scheme of interests between rulers and ruled.

Keywords: Democratic Culture; Democracy; Citizen Participation; Political Space.

¹ Postdoctoral degree in State, Public Policies and Social Peace. Phd in Social Sciences, mention Management. Department of Law and Political Science Universidad de la Costa, Barranquilla, Colombia. Orcid - 0000-0002-5621-9496. jhernand86@cuc.edu.co

² Postdoctoral degree in State, Public Policies and Social Peace. Phd in Political Science. Teacher-Researcher Program of Law Universidad del Sinú, Elías Bechara Zainum . Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela. Orcid - 0000-0003-2450-6156. edgar_cordova38@gmail.com

³ Postdoctoral degree in State, Public Policies and Social Peace. Phd in Political Science. Universidad de la Costa, Barranquilla, Colombia. Orcid - 0000-0002-8539-2853 achumace@cuc.edu.co

Political culture and its manifestations; as a set of symbols, norms, values, beliefs, ideas, customs, myths, rituals, relationships that together give identity to the members that make up that society, broadly is what constitutes for the ancient Greeks the *polis*, it is not a formal legal structure but a social agglomerate with values as an amalgam within an isonomy as a central value. In specific terms, the culture condenses; inheritances shared images and collective experiences that give people a sense of belonging (Paz 2013), This would explain a priori the singularities between conglomerates or political communities, nations or regions of larger size, and the mutations observed over time.

The political culture manifests the societal praxis in political processes, ideological, partisan and citizens in general, which determine any human group in its explicit context, and from which political practices such as participation, par excellence a core aspect of the quality of democracy, while the citizens create a symbolic union more or less that point to the sustainability or weakening of the democratic model.

The theme of the democratic quality as a niche for the study of political science (mainly the quantitative approach) has been a theoretical-epistemological challenge in the political culture. In contrast, the political culture in the broad sense is a complex phenomenon. The political culture comprises the values, beliefs, and patterns of conduct relevant to the political process that prevails among individuals and groups in society. The growing interest in his study coincides with the recent history of the expansion of democracy.

A defined set of cultural orientations appears to be essential for the system's stability, depth, and quality, both as economic and social issues, the elites' decisions, or the international context. We must not imagine the political culture as an immobile or a cause to determine a country's political life. It is a variable that maintains complex relationships of interaction with the economy, social structure, and the politico-institutional sphere, although within that system of influences can discern causal directions dominant (Jorge 2016).

In democratic regimes founded in the modern State of Law to guarantee the articulation of the citizen spaces of socialization, various means of socio-political interrelation are fostered, Mechanisms of linkage between the State and citizens are promoted, and their political experiences, which gives an account of the quality of the model.

Social requirements promote spaces for more significant citizens' expression, for the definition of policies, practices, and decision-making on matters that directly and indirectly affect their human development. These participation forms will have a more significant effect if the political

culture established is characterized by fundamental principles such as; inclusion, plurality, alternation, and solidarity. The linking of the citizen in public spaces from the public management in the different instances of local, regional, national cohabitation are established through participatory mechanisms that derive from the constitutional rule and the socio-political experience.

It is as well as the modern State contemporary, above all that emerged from the wave of new constitutions in Latin America in the 1990s 80 and 90 placed the citizen participation (participatory democracy), as the subject of the constitutional status. What we value from this work as a leap forward in the formal constitutional democracies (Social State of Law) as a reaction to the political culture, to change the model of representative democracy to one of a model of participatory democracy typical of the great democracies based on the modern parties of the XX century, as in the cases of Colombia and Venezuela.

Just as formally the State born of this constitutional reform wave, formally established the mechanisms and conditions that favor conditions for conducting political citizen participation (Morlino 2009, 2014; Reales 2016). In such a way that we could say that depending on the possibilities that politically have citizen participation, subjectively would provide data to classify the model of democracy and its quality from a complex perspective, beyond formal institutions, Now this is related to the idea and the valuation that organized citizenry or not, have about participation as a mechanism of political action.

The present work's objective is to characterize the political culture that gives legitimacy to the democratic political regime's models from an ontological configuration. This allows this reflection to approach political models beyond concepts of democratic quality built from political science and law, address the issue from a complex epistemology, and a critical analysis, linking as an element that expresses the democratic quality (equality, justice).

THE POLITICAL CULTURE FOR DEMOCRACY

The classical authors of political culture, Almond and Verba (1965), define the democratic political culture as the set of cognitive and affective elements that the evaluative citizen has on the political system, considering the political culture of a nation as the particular distribution of the patterns of orientations toward the political objects, between members of a nation.⁴

⁴ The genesis of the approach of the political culture in contemporary social science data from 1963, with the publication of the Civic Culture of Almond and Verba B. This study become classic, based on surveys conducted in five countries, attracted, as the same idea of political culture, apologists and detractors. On the sidelines of the controversy that has raised, its influence has been decisive. The study was based on data from surveys conducted in the United States, Britain, Germany,

To the definition made by the authors mentioned above, Eckstein (1988) adds four characteristics of the political culture:

- 1) Represents a form of expression on what they think and what is done.
- 2) The manifest as beliefs, customs, practices, in a collective, it becomes part of the social life itself.
- 3) It is the differentiating factor between society and another.
- 4) It is a moderator of the social conduct, to cohere the thought.

Almond and Verba (1990) goal was to determine the type of political culture in which the democratic form is based. To define culture as the psychological orientations toward the social objects, the authors excluded many elements included in the conceptions more holistic of culture, from the Anthropology: customs, laws, institutions, art, material objects, and similar.

Although a comprehensive vision of culture may be appropriate in specific research contexts, it is necessary to circumscribe it because its same comprehensive character will diminish the explanatory power. However, to restrict it to the psychological guidance or attitudinal dimension, Almond and Verba also dispensed with the behavior, something that, according to critics and we share from in this work, considered a limiting factor on the understanding that the citizens might be able to contribute to the debacle of the political system, by actions or inactions.

Let us take a look specifically cases such as that of Venezuela, that in the face of disappointment or in front of the redistributive system of populist democracy that lasted forty years (1958- 1998), favored the coming to power of a rejuvenated militaristic authoritarian populism that resulted in 19 years in a break with the entire democratic system.

The research work on political culture since the 1970s, according to (Jorge 2016) entered into theoretical crisis since traditionally the assumed or ongoing approaches emphasized the equilibrium aspect and showed difficulties in addressing political and social change, in contrast to disciplines such as critical sociology and rational choice theory (rational choice), among others.

Italy, and Mexico. In Germany and Italy, democracy had succumbed in the immediate past to nazism and fascism. Almond and Verba concluded that their political cultures - as well as that of Mexico, governed by a hegemonic party- had traits that were hindering democracy. With this seemed to exalt implicitly the Anglo-Saxon culture, something which also earned them a large number of criticisms.

Due to the mechanism that postulated the primary source of change of political culture - the transmission of attitudes from generation to generation through the political socialization-. It seemed that these cultural patterns could only vary very slowly. At the height of new trends in socio-cultural and political upheavals of the time, the perspective lost its appeal and was relegated to the sidelines, generally in a block with the theory of modernization.

However, toward the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s, the situation had changed. The interest in the political culture woke up again with the democratization processes in southern Europe and Latin America, where scholars and observers highlighted the influence of cultural factors in the turbulent history of democracy in those regions. In the academic world, the debate continued. They were still in the spotlight the definition of the concept and its causal relationship with structural and institutional factors. What was the political culture an independent, dependent, intermediate variable, or maintained with an interactive relationship with the social structure and institutions? (Rodríguez 2017).

From our conception, the democratic political culture holds on values, principles, and practices, which have a cohesive society around the political manifestations (conceptual frameworks) that have characterized it historically. The democratic political culture is a fundamental pillar of a stable democratic system, as long as they build a cultural pattern identified with democratic principles and that these are maintained, to materialize, to put it another way, that the idea of freedom, justice, solidarity, to achieve subjectively, that move from being a constitutional utopia (the rule of law and the constitutional rule of law).

ABOUT THE COMPONENTS OF THE DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL CULTURE

The term political culture has resulted in the development of efforts to understand the phenomenon of formed societies, which had been nourished by disciplines that have shaped their ontology. The concept ends up being a political order with three roots; political science, psychology, and anthropology.

In a reference already more directly with the theme of democracy as construction or political space, Bobbio (1993; 1994) offers us his opinion about specific characteristics present in the dynamics of democratic politics: tolerance, non-violence, legality, and representative institutions balanced. Of this assertion arise a few principles that characterize a democratic society and citizen participation through direct or representative mechanisms.

The following principles characterize democratic political culture:

- Confidence in institutions.

- Positive valuation of public criticism.
- Willingness to participate.
- Rejection of State violence and private.
- Tolerance.
- Moderation.
- Acceptance of freedom.
- Citizens as subjects with inalienable rights.
- Distrust of any redeeming social or political proposal.

For its part, Peschard (2001) presents a conformation of elements that make up a democratic political culture, as it would be a democracy (political regime), citizenship, civic efficacy, legality, participation, plurality. In general terms, these components and other democratic political cultures: citizenship, participation, and plurality, influence the effectiveness of participatory and representative democracy and gives the democratic models of guidelines for possible typologies from each of these and other elements that make up this political culture.

The ideas of pluralism and tolerance lead to democratic political culture, it is based on the conviction that everyone has the same right to exercise all individual and collective freedoms (of belief, expression, grouping, environment), so that she only has a place for the attitude of tolerance of different beliefs and even contradictory, and a conviction that these can coexist in the same political space. “Talk about a culture of plurality is to refer to a pattern of values and orientations that have as their starting point the existence of diversity in its projection on the political world and power relations” (Paz 2013: 70).

The exercise of democracy implies the acceptance of difference, plurality ideological, ethnic, social status, sexual orientation, gender, implies recognizing that the exercise of power is demarcated by the boundaries between consensus and dissent of social groups, sets from a social perspective a specific role of the State in both merely bureaucratic apparatus, which can only be practiced in the field of institutions that respond to these principles, here is a conceptualization that would encompass such the definition of democracy for minorities.

Finally, we mention an aspect that, according to the days we attend, constitutes a central aspect of what would be a critical review of the political culture issue, and it is precisely what the subject contains today regarding the power relations that are framed from what has been known since the eighties of the last century as globalization.

It is precisely the power relations imposed on politics and, therefore, the definition of national democratic models since the 1980s from the combined effect of emerging globalization (Inclusion - exclusion), which draws a society of information that fundamentally values democracy considering two elements (economy- knowledge, and information), making this in symbolic goods essential for (re) distribution of the model of democracy. Therefore, a value that integrates to the conformation of the political culture and establishing a new millennium law, consumption, and generation of information, pictures, icons (Hopenhayn 2005).

DEMOCRACY FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE QUALITY

Through citizen participation, the quality of democracy determines the relationship model State-Society. As noted at the beginning of the paper, methodologically, we have linked the variable political culture with participatory democracy beyond its classical formal structure, division of powers, elections, and other institutions of modern democracies. The issue of democracy has been vigorously associated in the reform efforts of the State in the countries of Latin America, being found in the discourse of decentralization as one of the objectives to be achieved in conjunction with efficiency; this relationship is presented as two closely related, common and subsidiary objectives.

From those approaches, the (re)democratization of the State from the processes of economic adjustment means that citizens execute politics and control activities as an expression of participatory democracy. This meant that through the transfer of administrative powers to the regions (Regions Departments), it would create spaces for citizens to reduce public management conflict.

From our perspective, it is not a matter of greater political autonomy on the part of the citizenship for the elaboration of public policy according to their interests. It would be a prerequisite of real participatory democracy and less representative, but rather to a strategy to introduce efficiency in the public management model.

It is vital to the generation and strengthening of regional and local leadership alternatives to those proposed by the national parties and central power. There is sufficient empirical evidence to point out that, even though the proposal for political-administrative decentralization raised it, there are not many cases where the national parties' political autonomy was achieved. Moreover, if a weakening of the same, but creation of strong leadership that has served from the right and even from the authoritarian socialism of the 21st-century proposal, in the creation of messiahs and personalistic leaderships, and the mere creation of electoral parties.

The political culture could explain the phenomena of populism, the caciquismo, caudillismo, authoritarianism that our society in an atavistic way brings from colonial times” (Mansilla 2009), and that was evident in the introduction to modernism in the 1950s, and of course, his renewed factors emerged from the reforms of first and second-generation carried out in the 1980s and 1990s (Mansilla 2009).

From the definition of political models, the dynamics that settles the power in those models of democracy. Institutional arrangements that are derived from the same, such is the case of the public administration (of the bureaucratic apparatus) and its distance between those who are running the distribution material (Governments) and those pushing for it (civil society), with the result that each model of public administration applicable a model of links with society (Córdova 2009).

From the literature and more consensus that emphasizes the in the procedural nature, institutional and regulatory framework, we could point out that democratic institutions manifest themselves within a political-administrative order through the division of functions, in such a way that prevents the concentration of power in a single of them formally speaking. Therefore, its structure would rest in the representation and popular participation, separation of powers, legality, and the hierarchy of norms.

One of the vital functions of democratic institutions as a factor of cohesion in a democratic regime, it would be guaranteed to citizens respect for public freedoms, respect for the rights of citizens, a guarantee of free and transparent elections, segregation of duties, and the existence and respect for the opposition, as well as the possibility to control the powers and safeguard the system through mechanisms of political action, the protest, the organization beyond the political parties.

In the words of Boron (2006; 152-153)

"Suffice it to say that in reality the policies pursued in our region, far from having introduced reforms" - that is, gradual changes in the direction aimed toward improving equality, social welfare, freedoms for everyone ... what they did was precisely the opposite empower a series of transformations that cut former citizens rights, dramatically reduced social benefits, payments from the State and consolidated a society much more unjust than existed at the beginning of the reformist stage".

In this last part, we can appreciate a breakthrough in recognizing the subjective character of democracy as a regime. Coming to establish and is the position from this paper that it is not enough to the formal existence of a set of institutions rules, procedures, demarcated within an institutional design derived from the constitutional policy letter, to declare a model or political regime as democratic, (elections, declaration of a State of Law, division of powers).

In that way, we could point to cases evidently as non-democratic regimes to Cuba or Venezuela, where there are limitations sensitive to fundamental rights, despite being regimes based on the number of elections managed by institutions without independence from the executive branch.

It is required that the citizens exercise their full citizenship, from the satisfaction of guarantees of fundamental rights; social, political, economic, ecological, spiritual and communication, access to services, freedom of establishment, and others.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AS IDEOLOGICAL POINT OF CONVERGENCE

Since the reforms of the State of the 1980s and as a product of the Washington Consensus⁵, the theme of the citizen participation became an interregnum. A concept put forward by critics of the protectionist democracy model or democracies of the welfare state, and for that of the left renewed they see in the participation of the people the leading role of changes, transformations, in such a way that participation occupies an instrumental character and assumes different interpretations and functions and teleologies from the current where we are located. The exciting thing is that both traditionally antithetical currents recognize citizen participation as a role definitory.

Then the citizen participation summarizes a set of diverse aspirations, acts as a container of concepts and interests read from opposing positions, here it is essential to what has been pointed out by Laclau (2006) when he defines populism as a form of politics, but that accepts any ideology, as well seems to occur with citizen participation, it is as a significant gap.

In such a way so that the definition of citizen participation is controversial, its epistemic drift in discussion philosophical positions and ideological. It is assumed the participation as an autonomous right of the citizen, as expressed in Cuevas (2006), participation is broader than the right to participate, is an autonomous right human, that becomes a social process, a way of doing things a shared way and to which links a set of rights, such as; freedom of expression, information, opinion, and association.

In response to this, we continue to "From that conception is must assimilate to the citizen, as an actor and participant in public affairs, supported in a citizenship that gives it its character of

⁵ The term Washington Consensus was coined in 1989 by economist John Williamson. Its objective was to describe a set of ten relatively specific formulas, which is considered to be the "standard" package of reforms for developing countries plagued by the crisis of the 1980s, born of imbalances in developed countries, according to the institutions under the orbit of Washington DC such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank and the United States Department of the Treasury. The formulas covered policies that advocated macroeconomic stabilization, economic liberalization concerning both trade and investment, the reduction of the State, and the expansion of market forces within the internal economy. After the acceptance of Williamson's phrase, and despite his emphatic opposition, the term "Washington Consensus" has become considerably used, in a broad sense, to refer to a more generic orientation towards a normally described approach of a pejorative way, such as market fundamentalism or neoliberalism.

intervention and opinion, but that exceeds... the recognition of the Nation-State because it goes beyond a set of rights and duties that you will recognize, i.e. exceeds national recognitions and gives you the privileges against the State" (Hernández & Gomez 2011:34), (Hernández & Chumaceiro 2018).

Let us take a look at what points Ochman (2004:476) "... the citizenship has a conceptual core, which constitutes a starting point... This nucleus is constituted by two complementary concepts: status and practice: Status (passive citizenship) it refers to the possibility that the person holds against the State, with their support and recognition, as a rights owner and member of a given community (different from other communities). The practice (active citizenship) implies the power and the ability to formulate laws under which is living, which postulates the possibility and the capacity to participate in discussions on the common good. As a best practice, citizenship necessarily requires a democratic regime and a set of civic competences (identity, cooperation, tolerance) for citizen participation.

"The citizens, for its part, are linked to the State, which links citizenship by nationality. The citizens are the political subject of that State, the possessor of a statute that confers on it and civil, social, economic, and political participation rights. One is a citizen. After all, it possesses a nationality, regulated by a State, valid this statute in the field of that State and additionally because it has the material and cultural media that allow using the goods that society offers" (Hernández 2010:47).

Unquestionably, the breadth of these rights and duties goes through the possibility of actively participating, equality in citizens' treatment, respecting the plurality and diversity with fault tolerance within a democratic framework. As a political system, democracy requires compliance with a minimum set of conditions:

- 1) Free access to political activity for all members of society.
- 2) Popular election of the authorities, on the part of the citizens.
- 3) Control over these authorities and their management.
- 4) The right of free association for society.
- 5) Freedom of expression.
- 6) Varied sources of information and accessible to the public.
- 7) Responsiveness on the part of the government to society, timely responses, and relevance.
- 8) Political Culture of society, the set of values, beliefs, and attitudes of a country.
- 9) Legitimacy of the political system, the citizens' acceptance by the management of political institutions. Among others.

All of these conditions listed (not conclusive) could not be realized or affect if you do not rest on convictions in patterns of action that undeniably have to match in democratic realities, and therefore in what has been called "the quality of democracy" as we have already mentioned.

In such a way, some of these principles that would integrate and citizen participation could be found in what he says (Cuevas 2006). Non-discrimination, recognition of all social actors, flexibility for the organization, autonomy, voluntary nature, shared responsibility, institutionalization, access to public resources, limits, complementarity between representative and participatory democracy, control of public management, collaboration in public management, plurality, transparency, public deliberation, and social solidarity.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AS AN INSTRUMENT

Citizen's participation requires regulatory channels to interact with society and the State at any level; this issue was tried to resolve through the State reform processes implemented in the eighties and nineties and has already been referred to in this work. Citizen participation is linked "formally to the proposals for the reform of the State administrative modernization, implementation of public management," as expressed by (Finot 2001; 84) "Stimulate citizen involvement in governance is certainly a political objective in itself, own of democratization... participation is also an essential prerequisite to activate mechanisms of efficiency in public management".

Thus, citizen participation seen from the neo-institutionalist perspective is the only one that guarantees that citizens actively participate in the design and execution of the policy. It was a type of participation that aims to guarantee efficiency. The organizational-managerial scheme developed from the State reform processes required a legitimate collective action according to the quality of the market economy's demands criteria. The citizen becomes part of public policy execution and, consequently, co-responsible for it, thus reducing conflicts and their effect on state efficiency.

In general lines, citizen participation has come to be used to designate many forms of citizens' political involvement in public affairs. We approach the definition of citizen participation offered by (Cunill 1991; 56) to point out a phenomenon that distinguishes "the intervention of individuals in public activities as bearers of certain social interests." In a space called the third sector, which alludes to the fact that it is a citizen action of public type but not the State (Bresser & Cunill 1998), and that has been expressed in the incorporation co-opted by non-governmental organizations (NGOs), groups of Residents organized, social networks, consumer group, minorities and others beyond the traditional groups represented by the worker's entrepreneurs.

Cunill (1991; 57) classifies and defines citizen participation based on the geographic or physical spaces where takes place, in such a way that identifies three types of participation: 1) The macro-participation, which takes place in the processes of national dimension, 2) The participation of intermediate level which is given to defining sectoral or regional policies and 3) The micro-participation, "referred to the matters closer to the day-to-day target individuals and small groups(...)" According to the administrative moment, citizen participation could be placed at any time of a continuum, from the diagnosis of social situations, economic policies, defined cultural, passing through the elaboration of options or decisions or policies formulation, program or project development, and execution until the phase of evaluation and control ".

Citizen participation is a particular instrument that integrates the managerial scaffolding implicit in the State's institutional redesign typical of years of reforms and the 2000s decade. As a strategy to achieve more and better democracy has operated as a factor to develop efficiency in areas of social services and infrastructure associated with the economy (essential services, water, electricity, roads, ports, airports), which means that when you move management functions or co-management to communities, the decentralized administration allows reducing the typical conflicts arising from such provision. However, when dealing with infrastructure competencies associated with the economy, citizen participation would introduce (according to these approaches) an element of conflict that acts against the grain of efficiency.

As Cunill (1991;12-13), "in any way, it should be noted that in the context of the capitalist regimes developed, the theme of participation finds both a political and economic basis. According to the State, a crisis is a crisis of representativeness or efficiency. First, it appears linked to the need to implement forms that complement Western democracies' traditional political participation mechanisms. It is now promoted, especially in implementing the strategies of a decrease in the States' size. Either through co-production or the direct transfer of public tasks to quasi-governmental or private organizations".

The efforts of citizen participation carried out within the framework of this approach point to a technocratic nature since they are linked to the search for legitimacy for the efficiency and effectiveness of the economic and social policy of the State, to the project of reproduction of power, reelection or promotion to the presidential level and to projects that will reduce the size of the State, administrative efficiency, legitimacy, reduction in the political conflict and others.

We do not deny the contribution of some models of democratic management to effectiveness and efficiency. What we mean is that the trend of reality with which we are concerned about this, says Kliksberg (1998;42) "The insistence on popular participation, especially in the planning, has not responded only to democratic purposes, but also to the desire to ensure the effectiveness of a policy or program and its implementation."

Citizen participation has been an instrument drawn on the State's reformist approaches (downsizing) is closely associated with reducing the size and scope in the State's responsibilities (modern-decentralized) by several routes. Since the transfer of functions to the private sphere of citizens, interest groups, non-governmental organizations (Not Governmental Organizations) NGO's, organized citizens until the privatization and assignment through concessions or authorizations of operation to the private business sector, which has become a social division of labor between the State and the non-public sector.

This third sector appears as a critical strategy in the operation of the new decentralized institutions for efficiency, operates as part of the management model for uncertainty, and searches for a cooperative organization. In this connection point (Gomá & Brugué; s.f. 214), "The political authorities, therefore, must modify the kind of action to develop, set priorities and articulate a network of actors who cooperate in their realization."

In general terms, the model is based on the structuring of a network, controlled by the central government (power), which will be responsible for some issues of public administration in the different levels of power,

"State open instrumentation based on the interests and lines of expansion of the financial and speculative fractions of capital that lead to the accumulation processes at the present stage: handling of policy instruments, the definition of ad hoc policies: the State converts in matters of public priority the language, objectives, and priorities of private financial capital" (Vilas 1997; 162).

The model proposal focuses on the achievement of efficient executors of the public policy; the innovation more interesting is, in our view, regards the so-called third sector; in this sense, the authors note:

To structure the market is also the opposite of creating administrative bureaucracies publicly to provide services. This is a third way, an alternative to the liberal call to administrative programs and the so-called conservative to depart from the market. It uses public influence to shape private decisions and achieve collective purposes (Osborne & Gaebler 1994).

In this game of words, setting the supposed central value of the proposal, in our view, the matter is to structure this model, which aims toward strengthening organizational efficiency. Let us take a look at what points out Cunill (1991: 16); "Tendentially, the practice of citizen participation will prevail only after a technocratic basis linked to the need to use it to increase the efficiency of the administration" These models that have been implicit in the public administration modernization processes require increasing control by the State on citizenship, basically on their interests and demands, mainly in the more sensitive areas such as social interest.

To agglutinate through networks, the organizations that carry these interests in geographically determined spaces allow greater control of the State and greater efficiency. The result of such type of participation would be submitted as the product of shared negotiations, by establishing in this way, basic levels of legitimacy for the sake of the lessening of the conflict and thus preserve the domination of the State through this model of public management, hiding the identifiable process of co-optation that comes inoculated in such strategies.

That is to say; citizen participation has become more an instrumental strategy of public management, which has facilitated co-optation by the State rather than a mechanism for the deepening of democracy.

CONCLUSIONS

This work's objective was to characterize the complex issues involving the political culture and its relationship with the concept of democracy and the citizen action involved in citizen participation as an expression of that political culture. The discourse highlights many concepts that coincide between the democratic culture and citizen participation, such as; the citizen-citizenship, democracy, plurality; and the principles that complement, all as central factors that allowed for the respective linking theoretically beyond concepts of democratic quality built from political science and law.

The linking of democratic culture and citizen participation begins in recognition of a political regime that, like democracy, facilitates citizens' inclusion in the affairs of public nature (complementary principles: participation, willingness to participate, public deliberation, plurality).

Political culture is a phenomenon of historical character, not a static that involves changing visions which are incorporated into the aspirations of citizenship the Political Culture assumes an ethos composed of significant symbologies that serve as a mechanism of relations between citizens that point to an ideal that is associated with a particular conception of power, being able to explain a diverse

phenomenon that from the political history of our region have marked our future, like populism, the centralist, authoritarianism, and even the shift to authoritarian regimes of the 21st century.

The result of the citizen management in conjunction with the public management and governments keeps close competition with the provision of services, policies definition, and generation of laws, enforceable efficiently. These define the satisfaction of economic, social, cultural, and productive demands, which ultimately lead to development in general (participation, positive assessment of public criticism, collaboration in public management, access to public resources, and control of public management).

This from an ideological perspective that values in a meaningful way the economy and the market, which has constituted a limitation to understand and make to society more democratic, what evidence the advance of clearly undemocratic regimes as in Venezuela, and to processes of delegitimation of key political actors of the political parties such as in the cases of Argentina, Nicaragua, and Colombia to mention three cases.

The linking of the citizens in public spaces from the public management in the different cohabitation instances, local, regional, and national, is established through participatory mechanisms derived from the constitutional rule and the socio-political, cultural practice. The State has led to participation mechanisms. Despite this, the citizens have seen his trust in the institutions diminished, acceptance of freedom, for the absence of autonomy, organizational flexibility, among others.

The character of joint intervention between the State and the citizen, for the construction of an inclusive, democratic, plural, alternative society must involve an axiological and teleological content of relations, based on the spirit of moderation, distrust of redeeming proposals, institutionalization, limits, complementarity between representative and participatory democracy, among others.

Democracy as a government system is characterized by its authentic expression of representation and participation. This implied a global interaction between rulers and ruled, where the citizen has the necessary mechanisms to participate directly or be represented in the different instances.

It is necessary to promote a representative and participatory democratic culture with supreme values that promote human, social, and collective development integrally. In response to that, societies need a consensus on values and norms that support their political institutions and legitimize their processes.

REFERENCES

- Almond G, Verba S 1980. *The Civic Culture Revisited*. Little Brown, Boston. Available in <https://scholar.harvard.edu/verba/publications/civic-culture-revisited> (Date of consultation 10 January 2018).
- Boaventura de S 2013. *El Milenio Huérfano [The Fatherless Millennium]*: rehearsal for a new political culture in the *Revista Historical Sociology*, University of Murcia, Spain. nro. 2- 2013.
- Bobbio N 1993. *Liberalismo y Democracia [Liberalism and Democracy]* The Economic Culture Fund. 2nd. Edition. Mexico.
- Bobbio N 1994. *El Futuro de la Democracia [The Future of Democracy]*. Tr. José Fernández Santillán, Fondo de Cultura Económica, (Mexico).
- Boron A 2006. *Después del Saqueo. El Capitalismo Latinoamericano a Comienzos del Nuevo Siglo [After the Looting. The Latin American Capitalism at the beginning of the New Century]*. Political and Social Movements in the world. Lessons from Africa, Asia, and Latin America. P. 147-178. Clacso, Buenos Aires (Argentina). Available in: http://biblioteca.clacso.edu.ar/clacso/sur-sur/20100711040609/7_PIIcuno1.pdf Retrieved: 10.12.2016
- Bresser PL, Cunill N 1998. *Lo Público no Estatal en la Reforma del Estado [The public not State-owned in the Reform of the State]*, Latin American Center for Development Administration (CLAD), Cambridge, Buenos Aires (Argentina).
- Cordova E 2009. *Los Modelos de Administración Pública y Espacios de Participación Ciudadana en Venezuela [The Models of Public Administration and Spaces for Citizen Participation in Venezuela]*. In *Political Reflection, Journal of the Institute of Political Studies at the Autonomous University of Bucaramanga-Colombia - Year 9 Nro. 18 December 2007. Pp. 100-116*
- Cordova E, Avila F 2017. *Democracia y Participación Ciudadana en los Procesos de Administración Pública [Democracy and Citizen Participation in Public Administration]*. In the *Journal Option*. University of Zulia. Year 22, Nro. 82, Maracaibo, Venezuela. Pp. 134-159
- Cuevas M 2006. *Derecho a la Participación [Right to participation]*. In: *Participation, Citizenship, and Human Rights*. The University by the effective observance of Human Rights. Some authors. UCAB. First edition. Caracas.
- Cunill N. 1991. *Participación Ciudadana [Citizen Participation]*. Latin American Center for Development (CLAD), Caracas (Venezuela).
- Cunill N 1997. *Repensando lo Público a Través de la Sociedad, Nuevas Formas de Gestión Pública [Rethinking the Public Through Society, New Forms of Governance]*. Latin American Center for Development (CLAD), New Society. Caracas (Venezuela).
- Eckstein H 1988. *To culturalist theory of political change*. *The American Political Science Review*. 82, Number 3
- Finot I 1999. *Elementos para una Reorientación de las Políticas de Descentralización y Participación en América Latina [The Elements of a Reorientation of Policies of Decentralization and Participation in Latin America]*. *Reform and Democracy in the Journal of the CLAD*, 15:1-24. Caracas (Venezuela). Available

Judith Josefina Hernández García de Velazco, Edgar Córdova Jaimes, Ana Cecilia Chumaceiro Hernández

in: <http://old.clad.org/portal/publicaciones-del-clad/revista-clad-reforma-democracia/articulos/015-octubre-1999/elementos-para-una-reorientacion-de-las-politicas-de-descentralizacion-y-participacion-en-america-latina> Retrieved : 22.02.2017

Finot I 2001. *Descentralización en América Latina [Decentralization in Latin America]: Theory and Practice*. Ilpes. Eclac, Santiago de Chile (Chile).

Hernández GJ 2010. *Modos de Gestión de Participación Ciudadana en Venezuela. Del Pacto de Punto Fijo a los Consejos Comunales [Modes of Citizen Participation Management in Venezuela. From the Covenant of Punto Fijo to the Communal Councils]*. Doctoral Thesis. Phd in Social Sciences Mention Management. LUZ.

Hernández J, Gomez J 2011. Transitando Espacios de Participación Ciudadana, Hacia las Redes Sociales [Transiting Spaces for Citizen Participation, Toward Social Networks]. *Strategos Journal*, 4(7):33-39. University of Guayana.

Hernández G. De Velazco JJ, Chumaceiro Hernandez AC 2018. Una discusión epistemológica sobre gestión de la participación ciudadana / An epistemological discussion on citizen participation management Opción, Año 34, No. 87: 856-883 ISSN 1012-1587/ISSNe: 2477-9385 <file:///C:/Users/CUC/Downloads/23900-37567-1-SM.pdf>

Hopenhayn M 2005. *Integrarse o subordinarse? Nuevos cruces entre política y cultura [Be integrated or subordinated? New crossings between politics and culture]*. CLACSO, Latin American Social Sciences Council, Buenos Aires, Argentina. Available in <http://bibliotecavirtual.clacso.org.ar/clacso/gt/20100912054515/2Hopenhayn.pdf> (accessed 15 December 2017).

Jorge JE 2016. *Cultura Política y Democracia en Argentina [Political Culture and Democracy in Argentina]*, Edit, Silver, Chap. 2, pp. 75-82. text edited by the author in January 2016

Kliksberg B 1998. *Seis Tesis no Convencionales sobre Participación [Six Unconventional Thesis on Participation]*, *Venezuelan Journal of Management*, 3(6):1-17 University of Zulia, Maracaibo, Venezuela.

Ochman S 2004. *Sociedad Civil y Participación Ciudadana [Civil Society and Citizen Participation]*. *Venezuelan Journal of Management*. No. 27. pp. 473-489 Universidad del Zulia.

Osborne D, Gaebler T 1994. *La Reinención del Gobierno: La Influencia del Espíritu Empresarial en el Sector Público [The Reinventing of Government: The Influence of Entrepreneurship in the Public Sector]*. Cambridge Editions, Barcelona, (Spain).

Paz S 2013. *Los Componentes de la Cultura Política en el Régimen Democrático Venezolano: Años 1989-2009 [The Components of the Political Culture in the Venezuelan Democratic Regime: Years 1989-2009]*. Doctoral Thesis. Phd in Political Science. URBE. Tutor HERNÁNDEZ, Judith.

Peschard J 2001. *La Cultura Política Democrática [The Democratic Political Culture]*. Federal Electoral Institute. Fourth edition. Mexico D.F.

Laclau E 2006. *La razón populista [the populist reason]*. The economic culture fund, Mexico. D.f.

Judith Josefina Hernández García de Velazco, Edgar Córdova Jaimes, Ana Cecilia Chumaceiro Hernández

Masilla HCF 2009. *Notas Introductorias Sobre el Populismo y la Cultura Política en el Área Andina de América Latina [Introductory Notes on Populism and Political Culture in the Andean Region of Latin America]*. In Social Science Journal Unisinos, Vol. 45 Nro. 2 May - August. Pp. 85-98. Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos, Brazil.

Morlino L 2009. *La Calidad de Democracia [The Quality of Democracy]*, Keys of Practical Reason, n. 193, Spain, Pablo Iglesias Foundation.

Morlino L 2014. *La Calidad de la Democracia en América Latina [The Quality of Democracy in Latin America]* Report for International IDEA. San. José Costa Rica.

Reales Utria A 2016. La democracia representativa en el marco de los derechos humanos en Colombia. [Representative democracy within the framework of human rights in Colombia]. *JURÍDICAS CUC*, 12(1):9-16.

Vilas CM 1997. *La Reforma del Estado como Cuestión Política [The Reform of the State as a Political Issue]*. *Journal Culture and Politics*, 8:147-185. Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico City (Mexico).

Cultura Política E Participação Do Cidadão: Transitando Do Espaço Político

RESUMO

As sociedades constroem sua própria interpretação e representação sobre os diferentes fenômenos em seus processos sociais, históricos e políticos, assim também a cultura política contém um conjunto de crenças, idéias, mitos, normas, que lhe conferem identidade, valores e fins. Consequentemente, a partir da cultura democrática, o cidadão é incentivado a se movimentar no espaço público, determinado por ações e práticas. Como resultado dessas relações, são institucionalizados mecanismos de participação para a emancipação ou defesa dos cidadãos contra o papel do Estado que é dominação. Caracterizar os aspectos que envolvem cultura política, participação e ação cidadã no espaço político democrático é o objeto central desta dissertação. A revisão sistemática, análise bibliográfica, documental e crítica, facilita o método e a obtenção de resultados, conclui-se que a democracia como sistema de governo se caracteriza por sua expressão factual de representação e participação, o que implica uma interação global com a negociação do esquema de interesses entre governantes e governados.

Palavras-Chave: Cultura Democrática; Democracia; Participação Cidadã; Espaço Político.

Submission: 07/10/2019

Acceptance: 25/11/2020