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ABSTRACT

Civic engagement is a fundamental component of a healthy democracy, contributing to higher government accountability and overall improvement in “good governance”. Civic engagement is particularly critical to subgroups which are under-represented in formal political structures, such as women, as it affords these groups the opportunity to voice their unique concerns. However, women participate less in many important forms of civic engagement. The United Nations and other international organizations have emphasized the importance of increasing women’s voice and empowerment in an attempt to improve women’s overall well-being, particularly in the developing world. Individual and contextual factors have demonstrated contributions toward influencing levels of civic engagement, but these effects only serve in partially explaining why women are less engaged. This study adds to this discussion by examining gender differences in the development and contribution of social capital (measured by networks and trust) to civic engagement within two young and developing democracies; Ecuador and Peru. The study finds that gender differences exist in how social capital is formed, but these differences don’t explain women’s decreased likelihood for engagement. Thus, social capital can be used to build civic engagement among both genders.
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CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In the late 1990’s political scientist Robert Putnam popularized the concept of social capital, with a study of associational life and regional differences in government in Italy. Putnam argued that higher levels of participation in social networks would foster a more politically engaged citizenry, ultimately leading to a more effective democracy (Putnam, 1993). Social capital can be defined as the accumulation of benefits or resources associated with membership in social networks or larger social structures (Portes & Landolt, 2000). With the growth in popularity of social capital research since the 1990’s, policymakers across the world have become interested in social capital based programs (Ahern, 2001; OECD, 2001; Woolcock & Narayan, 2000). For example, the World Bank promotes building social capital in developing countries, and links it with outcomes including more effective bureaucracy, more government accountability and legitimacy, and a stronger democracy (World Bank, 2011). As a resource, social capital has been associated with various outcomes ranging from better health related quality of life and higher economic prosperity, to increased political participation (Halpern, 2005).

Support of social capital is often thought to be a catalyst for improving livelihoods, as relationship development provides a safety net during times of need. However, the critical role that women play in the development of these relationships is often understated. As primary care givers within a family, women are an essential component of the early growth of social capital through relationship development and child-rearing (World Bank, 2011; Picciotto, 1998).
Women are often found at the center of voluntary self-help schemes, supporting those without access to public assistance. Moreover, women are frequently active supporters of community activities and social life (Molyneux, 2005). However, prevailing social capital literature underinvestigates the importance of gender in social capital, both in terms of the impact of women on aggregate measures of social capital, as well as differences in social capital between the genders.

The limited research on women’s social capital has indicated that women may not only develop social capital differently, but also utilize it differently than men (Schmitt, 2010; Everitt, 2006; Lyon, 2003). Women are often part of more informal networks, and are more likely to have friendship or familial ties (Neuhouser, 1995). Women’s social capital is also less likely to be driven by material interest (Molyneux, 2005). In analyses of poverty alleviation programs which use social capital as a resource (microfinance development schemes), research has demonstrated social capital can actually be detrimental to the development of economic capital among women (Mayoux, 2002; Molyneux, 2002). The dearth of research in this area is a significant shortcoming in the field, principally because so many social capital building programs are targeted towards women.

Recognizing the need for this research, there has been a small growth in studies of the influence of social capital in women’s micro-finance development schemes. However, empirical studies analyzing the influence of social capital on democratic factors, such as civic engagement, are much rarer, especially in newer democracies. Civic engagement is defined as “any activity, individual or collective, devoted to influencing the collective life of the polity” (Macedo et al., 2005, 6).
Civic engagement is particularly important for women because levels of formal representation in politics are much lower than men’s. According to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, as of 2012 women only represented a total of twenty percent of members of seats in congress and parliament worldwide. This indicates that women’s issues may need to be expressed at a lower level, through the various channels provided by civic engagement. It is through active public discourse and deliberation that societal goals are defined, and policy measures carried out. This civic engagement requires evenly balanced participation from all sectors of society. Although electoral participation in terms of voting is one mechanism to measure civic engagement, active participation involves various other activities including campaign activity, communal activity, contacting of public officials, protest, and grassroots activism. Moving beyond a sole analysis of electoral participation is crucial, as voting only allows a citizen to express opinions on previously identified issues. Other forms of civic engagement can be particularly useful to allow marginalized groups to identify issues unique to them.

Social capital is a product of the historical, political, and cultural setting in which it is being studied (De Silva, Harpham, Huggly, Bartolini, Penny, 2005). However, the most common setting for social capital research is within the United States and Western Europe (Booth & Richard, 2012; Schmitt, 2010). As social capital scholar David Halpern notes, “Policy is something that needs to be fashioned in the particular context” (Halpern, 2005, p.285). Improving the understanding of social capital as a construct involves studying it under unique constraints- including different cultures, and political systems.
As a region with many newer democracies, Latin America presents a unique case to study women’s social capital and civic engagement. Not only did most countries transition to democracy as recently as the 1980’s, but the region varies in terms of levels of democracy, based upon factors such as voter security, civil liberties, and free and fair elections. Some countries boast high levels of democracy and political freedom, while others are still only considered partly free (Freedom House, 2013). Although limited, existing research in Latin America has also been indicative of a vibrant civil society (Booth & Richard, 1998; Krishna, 2002; Seligson, 1999). Additionally, women’s movements have historically been critical elements of political life in Latin America, resulting in a unique power dynamic (Icken Safa, 1990).

Although women’s status in Latin America has improved over the last decade, shortcomings remain. For example, significant gender gaps exist in labor participation (World Bank, 2011). Adolescent fertility rates remain high (averaging 73 per 1,000 women age 15-19) (Chioda, 2011). Additionally, indigenous women fare much worse than non-indigenous women in terms of literacy, income, and access to health care (World Bank, 2012). It is critical that these urgent issues are addressed. A mechanism for speaking on these issues lies in the power of civic engagement. This research aims to fill the gap in the literature by analyzing the effects of social capital on civic engagement among women in two Latin American countries; Ecuador and Peru.

Ecuador and Peru were selected for various reasons. To begin, both countries share a large proportion of indigenous people. This is significant because of their tendency to have lower literacy, health, and socioeconomic status, especially among women (World Bank, 2012). This indicates a need for civic engagement and participation in politics, advocating for their unique needs. Perhaps for this reason, many development organizations have focused on Peruvian and
Ecuadorian women as recipients of microfinance schemes which utilize social capital (Copestake, Dawson, Fanning, McKay, Wright-Revolledo, 2005; Uquillas, Nieuwkoop, 2003; Molyneux, 2002). However, little research has been conducted to analyze the way women utilize social capital, and existing research indicates that gender differences exist (Molyneux, 2002). Moreover, the results of this study could be generalizable to other Latin American countries with large indigenous populations such as Bolivia, Guatemala, and Mexico.

1.2 Study Significance

In 2002 the international community, through the leadership of the United Nations, set eight targets for world development. These targets, known as the Millennium Development Goals (MDG’s), are focused on improving basic quality of life around the world. The targets include: (1) Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, (2) Achieve universal primary education, (3) Promote gender equality and empower women, (4) Reduce child mortality, (5) improve maternal health, (6) Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria, and other diseases, (7) Ensure environmental sustainability, and (8) Assist in global partnering for development (United Nations, 2014). The initial time frame for achievement of these goals is set for 2015. As the deadline draws near and the international community reflects on the outcomes of projects addressing these targets, several gaps remain.

The third MDG, targeting gender equality and the empowerment of women, is an area that has demonstrated noteworthy improvement, but still requires significant progress. It has been recognized that gender equality is a critical pre-condition to success for many of the other MDG’s because women make up a disproportionate amount of the worlds poor (United Nations,
Often, women are also primary caregivers, taking charge of education and health of their families (Picciotto, 1998). According to the Deputy Executive Director of the UN Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women), there are three core concerns for the future. These concerns include (1) ending violence against women, (2) providing equal access to resources and opportunities, and (3) equal participation for women in all sectors of society (United Nations, 2013).

One sector of society in which women’s participation is critically low is with respect to political participation. In looking to the future of development, UN WOMEN states:

Voice and influence in decision-making has both intrinsic value as a sign of an individual’s and groups’ enjoyment of democratic freedoms and rights, and can serve the instrumental function of ensuring that group-specific interests are advanced. In the case of women, this could include influencing public priorities and spending patterns to ensure adequate provision of services as well as economic and social security, and to guarantee their physical integrity and reproductive rights (UN WOMEN, 2013).

It is crucial that women’s interests are equally represented in the decision making process, however current research shows that there is a significant gender gap in civic engagement (Schwindt-Bayer, 2011). Civic engagement encompasses a multitude of activities ranging from attending party meetings and signing petitions, to voting and participating in campaigns. Research shows that with the exception of voting, where women’s participation is equal or higher than men’s, there is a significant gender gap in most other forms of civic engagement in Latin America (Schwindt-Bayer, 2011).

Existing research demonstrates that civic engagement is an important component of ‘good governance’ (World Bank, 2014). Particularly in newly established democracies, civic engagement is associated with higher democratic norms and more stable democracies (Booth,
2009). In addition to the importance of civic engagement for representing women’s needs, civic engagement is a critical component of effective democracy.

While modern literature generally agrees that social capital and civic engagement are highly related, prior evidence shows that women’s social capital is not ‘spent’ in the same way as men’s (Lowndes, 2004). In order for social capital to be used as a political resource, a variety of factors need to be considered including the circumstances in which social capital is capable of mobilizing for positive outcomes. Identifying factors, such as gender differences, that contribute to these outcomes is crucial for policy-makers to explore ways to influence social capital development.

Although debate exists over whether social capital can be intentionally constructed, many development organizations have been able to build social capital as a tool for development on a small scale (Durston, 1999). This is primarily done through the use of microfinance programs, in which group members must share the responsibility of repaying loans. The social capital built in these programs has shown varied levels of improvement in poverty alleviation (Cordova, 2011; Kumar, Quisumbing, 2010; Mayoux, 2001).

Francis Fukuyama, a noted scholar of social capital, provides some recommendations for areas where policymakers can increase stocks of social capital. He states that educational institutions are one venue for generating social capital in the form of social rules and norms (Fukuyama, 1999). Additionally, efficiently providing public goods provides an environment for increased trust which promotes the building of social capital. Finally, entities need to ensure that they do not undermine existing forms of social capital by undertaking activities that need to
remain a part of civil society. Essentially, people become dependent on the organization and lose the spontaneous ability to work together (Fukuyama, 1999).

Understanding how social capital is earned and used according to gender could provide insight to policy makers aiming at improving women’s livelihoods. If differences exist in social capital development and use, intentional action needs to be taken to ensure that women are developing social capital that provides them with the same opportunities as men. For example, women could be encouraged to establish more formal ties through membership in formal organizations. Formal ties are more likely to ensure that ties persist over time (Sander & Lowney, 2006). Research also suggests incorporating development of civic identity and civic education targeted towards women, into primary and higher education (Lowe & McLaughlin, 2010). Simultaneously, encouraging men’s involvement in the development of informal ties could reduce time constraints potentially restricting women from using their social capital in a similar fashion. Increasing opportunities for “father work”- men’s positive roles in raising and caring for children- would also be a mechanism for reducing gender role stereotypes that contribute to different uses of social capital (Women’s Commission for Refugee Women and Children, 2005). Furthermore, additional research needs to examine gender differences in social capital use related to different outcomes- health, education, and economic opportunities are also critical issues for women. A better understanding of these conditions can serve as a guide for future policy aimed at improving women’s voice and influence in decision making.
1.3 Conceptual Framework

This study aims to fill a gap in the social capital literature with respect to the issue of gender as a moderating factor in producing positive outcomes of social capital. The expectation that gender roles are important in determining behavior can be explained through the use of social role theory. According to social role theory, differences in behavior among men and women “reflect gender role beliefs that in turn represent people’s perceptions of men’s and women’s social roles in the society in which they live” (Eagly & Wood, 2012). This theory supports the claim (as indicated in the literature) that social capital and its outcomes will be different based on gender. The use of social role theory coincides with social capital scholars’ suggestion that social capital be analyzed differently based on specific context.

In contrast to social role theory, the construct of social capital has a variety of definitions, with an even larger number of measures trying to encompass this indefinite construct. In one definition, social capital “refers to the norms and networks that enable people to act collectively” (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000). According to Woolcock and Narayan, the term first appeared in reference to enhancing school performance as written by Lyda Hanifan. “If an individual comes into contact with his neighbor, and they with other neighbors, there will be an accumulation of social capital…which may bear a social potentiality sufficient to the substantial improvement of living conditions in the whole community” (1916:130). Other scholars attribute the initial concept to Alexis De Toqueville’s study Democracy in America, in which he discussed the concept of social capital, although not by name, as a tenet of political life in the United States. Contemporary scholars in the field of social capital include the renowned scholar Pierre Bourdieu, recognized by many as the founder of social capital theory. Bourdieu initially
discussed the concept of social capital as distinct from other forms of capital (human capital, cultural capital, etc.) and recognized the potential benefits of these networks (1986). Building upon this work, James Coleman and Robert Putnam expanded upon this concept, including trust as a component that enables people to pursue these shared objectives (Coleman, 1990; Putnam, 2001).

Robert Putnam’s analysis of social capital and civic engagement in America is one of the most widely known studies of the relationship between social capital and political participation. Primarily, Putnam posits that increased social capital and trust lead to a lower cost for collective action, resulting in a more engaged citizenry (1993). It is also expected that inclusion in a group (associational membership) will increase enforcement of social norms, for example civic duty such as voting or paying taxes (Gerber, Green, and Larimer, 2008). Social capital researchers emphasize however that social capital should not be used as a ‘cure-all’ for the ills of society, as negative externalities of social capital do exist. For example, scholars distinguish between two forms of social capital, ‘bonding’ and ‘bridging’ capital. While ‘bonding’ capital links people within a group, ‘bridging’ capital cuts across communities (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000). This is of particular importance with respect to women, who are often considered to have more bonding rather than bridging social capital (Molyneux, 2010). These are also called “thick” or “thin” social ties (Rubio, 1997). In some cases, these social ties can be so “thick”, that networks become isolated and development is actually hindered.

Given the limited research, this study seeks to investigate women’s use of social capital and its relationship to civic engagement for women in comparison to men. As there is a growing debate about the causal relationship between social capital and civic engagement, scholars have
suggested looking at other factors that moderate the relationship between social capital and civic engagement, as will be outlined in the literature review. This study intends to fill this gap utilizing social role theory to explain differences in social capital and civic engagement among men and women, in two similar Latin American countries- Ecuador and Peru.

1.4 Research Questions

The study aims to address the following research questions, with respect to the populations in Ecuador and Peru that are included in this study.

1. Do gender differences exist in levels of civic engagement?
2. Do gender differences exist in the types of associational memberships that make up social capital?
3. Do gender differences exist in the levels of trust that make up social capital?
4. Do gender differences exist in the direction and strength of the relationship between social capital and civic engagement?

1.5 Methods

1.5.1 Context of the Study

To allow for more generalizable results, Ecuador and Peru were selected as the countries for analysis in this study. Ecuador and Peru are unique due to their large proportion of indigenous populations, which tend to have lower literacy, health, and socioeconomic status, particularly among women (World Bank, 2012). Additionally, many development organizations are active in these two countries and attempt to utilize social capital within their development programs (Copestake, et al., 2005; Uquillas, Nieuwkoo, 2003; Molyneux, 2002). Although not
generalizable across Latin America, the results of this study could be applied to countries with similar population demographics including Bolivia, Guatemala, and Mexico.

These two countries were selected based on their similarities in population demographics, cultural influences, economic status, human development, and political and civil liberties. Although Peru is slightly larger in terms of population size, the two countries share similar cultural traditions that may influence gender roles, and are similar in terms of human and economic development. Moreover, Ecuador and Peru have similar levels of civil and political liberties, and both countries enforce compulsory voting. Although these cases are similar, controls have been included in analytical models to account for variations in individual socioeconomic variables.

1.5.2 Data Sources

The primary source is Vanderbilt University’s Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP). The LAPOP collects probability samples of public opinion data in 26 countries throughout the Americas. The survey uses face-to-face interviews with voting age adults given in all major languages within each country. The probability sample uses a stratified multi-stage cluster sample design, with quotas at the household level, and stratified samples by major regions of the country, size of municipalities, and by urban/rural areas. Fieldwork dates for data collection ranged from January 15th-22nd, 2012 (LAPOP, 2012). This data is used in the development of the World Bank’s governance indicators, as well as by the Inter-American Development Bank and the United Nations. The survey instrument includes questions regarding
membership and participation in various community activities, as well as questions regarding government trust, likelihood to vote, and participation and acceptance of political protest.

1.5.3 Measures

As previously mentioned, the social capital construct lacks definitive measures. A similar study analyzing social capital in Latin America utilizing the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP) provides a basis for measurement of social capital, utilizing survey questions about institutional trust, community trust, and associational membership (Booth & Richard, 2012). A limitation of this dataset lies in its lack of sufficient information on informal ties including family and kinship. However, formal ties and communal memberships are captured in the survey. Civic engagement will be measured through a variety of participation gauges, including protest, information exchange, voting, contact of public officials, and party membership. A number of additional socio-economic variables are included as controls to account for other resources which may influence social capital (Bourdieu, 1986).

1.5.4 Analytical Methods

This study utilizes Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) as the primary analytical method. SEM was selected for its ability to measure latent, or unobserved, constructs. SEM is unique in its ability to rigorously assess the quality of models, and suggest potential improvements that enhance model fit (Gau, 2010). This is particularly useful for validating measures for unobserved constructs, such as social capital and civic engagement. The first component of the analysis involves running Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) in order to evaluate the reliability of the selected measures. In the CFA process, measurement models are constructed and revised based
both on the statistical reliability and theoretical components of the constructs. Once these measurement models have been adequately revised to reflect a better model fit, these models are combined into a final structural model. The final model is tested for each gender in order to examine the strength of gender as a moderating variable.
CHAPTER TWO - LITERATURE REVIEW & THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

The following chapter presents a review of the literature relevant to women’s social capital and civic engagement in Latin America. To provide a basis for understanding related studies, the first section of the literature review will focus on the development and applications of the social capital construct using a chronological approach. After reviewing the foundations of social capital, the next section will detail modern applications of social capital. This is followed by a review of civic engagement literature and an explanation of the relationship between social capital and civic engagement. To explain women’s differences in social capital and its related outcomes, social role theory is also explained. The subsequent section will review existing studies examining social capital and civic engagement among women in Latin America. Finally, a brief overview of the context of the study will be provided, covering the historical, cultural, and political context of the Ecuadorian and Peruvian cases. The chapter will conclude with a conceptual framework.

2.1 History of the Social Capital Construct

Although the concept of social capital is not new, the use of the term has only recently been widely recognized. As a starting point, social capital can be referred to as “the accumulation of benefits or resources associated with membership in social networks or larger social structures” (Portes & Landolt, 2000). The complexity of this construct and its application in various disciplines contribute to the multifaceted definition for the term, which will be discussed in this section. Additionally, unlike other forms of capital such as human and
economic capital, social capital resides within relationships, making it difficult to produce an all-encompassing standard measure. This section will highlight the historical development of the social capital construct, as well as provide a summary of the various components that make up social capital. The historical development of social capital is displayed in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexis DeTocqueville</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>“An association unites the energies of divergent minds and vigorously directs them toward a clearly indicated goal.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emile Durkheim</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>“A nation can be maintained only if, between the state and the individual, there is interposed a whole series of secondary groups near enough to the individuals to attract them strongly in their sphere of action and drag them, in this way, into the general torrent of social life.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.J. Hanifan</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>“Tangible assets that count for most in the daily lives of people; namely, good will, fellowship, sympathy, and social intercourse among the individuals and families who make up a social unit.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Granovetter</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>“The strength of a tie is a combination of the amount of time, emotional intensity, intimacy, and reciprocal services which characterize the tie.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Loury</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>“The social context within which individual maturation occurs strongly conditions what otherwise equally competent individuals can achieve.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Bourdieu</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>“Social capital is the sum of resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or a group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Coleman</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>“Social capital is defined by its function. It is not a single entity but a variety of different entities, with two elements in common: they all consist of some aspect of social structures, and they facilitate certain actions of actors – whether persons or corporate actors – within that structure.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Putnam</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>“Social capital here refers to features of social organization, such as trust, norms, and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actors.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portes &amp; Landolt</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>A source of social control; a source of family-mediated benefits; a source of resources mediated by non-family networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Fukuyama</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Social capital is an instantiated informal norm that promotes cooperation between two or more individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Burt</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>“Social capital is the contextual complement to human capital. The social capital metaphor is that the people who do better are somehow better connected.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolcock &amp; Narayan</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Bonding- ties between like people; Bridging- distant ties; Linking- connects unlike people, outside the community or across social layers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan Lin</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>“Social capital theory conceptualizes production as a process by which ‘surplus value’ is generated through investment on social relations.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Schuller</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>“Social capital requires attention to be paid to the relationships which shape the realization of human capital’s potential for the individual, and collectively.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrom &amp; Ahn</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>“Social capital is a set of values and relationships created by individuals in the past that can be drawn on in the present and future to facilitate overcoming social dilemmas.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The origins of the social capital construct are debatable (Halpern, 2002; Field 2001). The table notes some of the seminal works that are considered to have contributed to the development of social capital theory, however there are hundreds of varying definitions of the term. To properly produce a working definition for this study, it is important to understand the historical development of the theory.

Although not referred to by name, social capital can be dated back to French scholar Alexis DeTocqueville, who upon review of American democracy noted that interpersonal relationships were important to the nature of American democracy. De Tocqueville posited that part of the strength of American democracy resided in the strength of associations in American society (1840). Furthermore, in the late 1800’s Emile Durkheim noted that groups served as facilitators for sharing ideas and expressing opinions of individuals to the state (1893). The first recorded use of the term social capital however, is attributed to Lyda Judson Hanifan, who noted that a when individuals came into contact with one another they accumulated a resource, by the name of social capital, which had the potential to improve living conditions of the whole community (1916).

Mark Granovetter’s “strength of weak ties” thesis, formulated in 1973, is an idea that came to be associated with social capital. Granovetter posited that individuals’ “strength of weak ties” from acquaintances or other informal relationships, allow them to gain access to information or other benefits of networks (Fulkerson & Thompson, 2008; Granovetter, 1973). The introduction of this thesis provides the basis not only for Pierre Bourdieu’s seminal piece (discussed later in this section), but also for future social capital literature analyzing differences
between strong and weak social ties. Granovetter’s work is closely related to social capital, though it has been more influential in the foundation of network theory.

Similarly, Glenn Loury’s work on racial economic inequality provides a new thesis explaining the impact of community and family on racial income differences. While Loury does not use the term social capital, his work does provide new insight explaining how relationships influence economic opportunities. For example, he states “word-of-mouth referrals and informal contacts have always played an important role in the job allocation process” (Loury, 1977, p.156). While Loury cites various other factors that contribute to racial income inequality, this is one of the first works to emphasize the important role of social capital (although not by name) in economic opportunity.

While many scholars will credit Hanifan with the first use of the term, there is little ownership over the first contemporary application of social capital (Fulkerson & Thompson, 2008). In 1986 French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu provided one of the first contemporary systematic analyses of social capital—by name. This analysis is arguably one of the most theoretically refined definitions of social capital in contemporary literature (Portes, 1998). Bourdieu views social capital not only by the amount of social connections that the individual has, but also by the amount of resources that are accrued for the individual as a result of membership in community groups (1986). According to Bourdieu, social capital can be used in an exchange, similar to economic capital. However, this exchange involves more uncertain obligations and rests in an expectation of reciprocity on behalf of the parties involved (Carpiano, 2006). Bourdieu’s work contributes greatly to the social capital literature, being one of the first to note the potential negative aspects of social capital that result from exclusionary group
practices (Carpiano, 2006). This foundation is the basis for some of the present day social capital literature, further dissecting the social capital construct into ‘bonding’ and ‘bridging’ social capital which emerges in the 2000’s.

Although Bourdieu’s work was seminal to social capital literature, James Coleman is one of the authors that can be credited with popularizing the concept among academicians. Coleman shared many of Bourdieu’s views about social capital, including the intangible nature of social capital as an asset. They also agree that attainment of other forms of tangible capital such as economic capital, would be impossible without social capital (Halpern, 2005). However, Coleman devoted a great deal of focus on the imposition of obligations and norms with respect to social capital. According to Coleman, there are three forms of social capital which including obligations, information sharing channels, and norms and sanctions for breaking obligations (1988). This enforcement of norms becomes a distinctive feature of social capital in future debates. Furthermore, Coleman views social capital primarily as a collective good, rather than an individual level resource. This is shared by Robert Putnam, whose work emerges shortly after Coleman.

Bringing social capital research to the masses, political scientist Robert Putnam explored the concept in depth in his piece *Making Democracy Work*, in which he analyzed the nature of social relationships in Italian associational life. Moreover, in 2001 Putnam published arguably his most popular piece titled *Bowling Alone* analyzing the decline in civic engagement in the United States, as related to a decrease in social capital. This piece played an influential role in displaying the practical implications of diminished social capital- a decline in community health, education, and well-being, ultimately leading to a lower quality of democracy (Sobel, 2002;
Putnam categorizes three focus areas of social capital—networks, norms, and social trust (2001). According to Putnam, social capital allows for the collective good by establishing a trustworthy environment, and reducing the costs for collective action.

Putnam measures social capital at the community level, differing from Bourdieu who believed social capital to be an attribute of individuals (Bourdieu, 1986). This is one unique component of Putnam’s work as well as a source of criticism (Carpiano, 2006; DeFilippis, 2001). This has presented a threat to validity for current researchers, who will often measure individual level social capital but refer to it as a property of communities (van Beuningen & Schmeets, 2012; Brehm and Rahn, 1997). Furthermore, Putnam includes varying definitions of social capital in his various pieces, in some cases including healthy community institutions and civic engagement as components of social capital rather than outcomes of it (Carpiano, 2006). Unfortunately these inconsistencies have left many gaps in the literature, and have contributed to some of the confusion regarding what social capital really is and how it should be measured.

2.2 Modern Applications of Social Capital

Since Putnam, there has been a dramatic increase in social capital research. As a result of the broad applicability of the construct, the literature branches into multiple disciplines including, but not limited to, economics, public health, criminal justice, education, and political science (Halpern, 2002). This later literature attempts to refine the social capital construct by examining it in different contexts, and analyzing the sometimes ambiguous measures that make up social capital. This section will highlight some of the most significant additions and critiques of social capital in modern literature, as they apply to the study at hand.
One of the key additions to modern social capital literature is the distinction between “bonding” and “bridging” forms. In essence, while bonding social capital links a homogeneous population within a group or community, bridging social capital cuts across communities (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000; Gittell & Vidal, 1998; Rubio, 1997). The effects of these different types of social capital are a major factor in the outcomes of how the social capital is used. While one is not necessarily better than the other, bridging social capital is considered less likely to lead to negative externalities such as exclusionary or sectarian groups like drug cartels and gangs (Putnam, 2003; Rubio, 1997). While bonding groups can have tremendous benefits for their members, there is a risk of heightened exclusion resulting in dysfunctional consequences for society as a whole by exacerbating existing social inequalities (Norris & Inglehart, 2006). More recently, “linking” social capital has been conceptualized as similar to bridging social capital, but derived from relationships between people across levels of hierarchy and power (Kim, Subramanian, & Kawachi, 2006; Szreter, S., Woolcock, M., 2004). With respect to gender, bridging groups are considered to be more inclusive across the sexes bringing together men and women. In contrast, bonding groups may be more segmented. A potentially negative consequence of bonding social capital, for example, could be lack of female participation in businesses dominated by males (Norris & Inglehart, 2006).

As the basis of social capital lies in associational memberships, another common approach to analyzing social capital is through vertical or horizontal segmentation of associational membership. “Vertical segmentation refers to differences in the density of associational memberships” while horizontal segmentation refers to differences in the types of associations (Norris & Inglehart, 2006). Research within the United States indicates that men are
traditionally part of business organizations, while women are more likely to participate in organizations focused on domestic or community affairs (McPherson, J., Smith-Lovin, L., 1982). Differences in this type of horizontal segmentation can also lead to different types of outcomes of social capital, however this phenomenon has not been widely explored (Lowndes, 2004).

Introduction of new concepts in social capital has coincided with the critique of the range of measures that encompass the construct. According to Fukuyama, there are two broad approaches to measuring social capital. The first is to take a census of groups and group memberships, and the second is to measure trust and civic engagement (Fukuyama, 1999). Fukuyama adds to the existing debate by emphasizing the importance of what he calls a “radius of trust”. This is “the circle of people among whom cooperative norms are operative”, and can range from friends and cliques up through NGO’s and religious groups (Fukuyama, 1999, p.2).

In an attempt to shed light on these issues, Fulkerson & Thompson conduct a meta-analysis of the contested meanings of social capital. According to the authors, the following seven concepts are most associated with social capital in mainstream sociological literature: networks, resources, relationships, trust, reciprocity, individuals, and norms. Based on the results of these analyses, the authors have grouped social capital into two categories (a) resource social capital and (b) normative social capital (2008). Resource social capital reflects the expectation of return when individuals make investments in relationships. Personal benefits are expected as a result of their participation. In contrast, normative social capital focuses on collective action, and the capacity of social capital to lead to social good (Fulkerson & Thompson, 2008). This categorization assists with understanding that the level of measurement (group vs. individual) is a significant contributor to understanding the application of social capital in various contexts. As
previously mentioned, one of the major drawbacks to social capital research is measuring it at the individual level, and mistakenly associating these measures as features of communities (van Beuningen & Schmeets, 2012; Brehm and Rahn, 1997).

In terms of individual level social capital, which will be utilized for the purposes of this study, social capital can be measured by an individual’s sense of belonging in a family, community, profession, or civic association (Kilby, 2002). Others argue that more formal associational membership is a mechanism for measuring social capital, either by belonging in organizations or by frequency of attendance in activities (Inglehart, 1997). Narayan and Cassidy further test this application and find that a dimension which they title “group characteristics” is an important measure of social capital. “Group characteristics” are measures of associational membership including the total number of groups a person is involved in, how frequently they attend meetings, how much decision making they hold, and the nature of the group (community, religious, etc.) (Narayan & Cassidy, 2001). Through this, the authors are able to include group dynamics when measuring social capital at an individual level.

Although there has been an abundance of social capital research since it’s popularization in the late 1990’s, analysis of social capital is still largely based on the foundations set forth by Bourdieu, Coleman, and Putnam. However, their seminal pieces have left many gaps in the literature with respect to gender, as well as potential differences in social capital affected by different cultural and historical influences. This study attempts to add to this literature in two ways. It will first investigate gender differences in the development and use of social capital. Additionally, social capital will be analyzed in a less investigated context. Utilizing data from Latin America, this study will be able to explore social capital in two countries with similar
institutions and population demographics. This particular study explores the relationship between social capital and civic engagement. However, this study could also serve as a basis for exploring the relationship between social capital and its many other outcomes in other developing countries.

2.3 Contributions of Social Capital to Civic Engagement

The implications of social capital are not limited to any specific discipline, issues, or outcomes. One area that is closely related to social capital, is civic engagement. Similar to social capital, civic engagement encompasses a variety of activities, and thus can be defined in many ways. Additionally, the term civic engagement is often used interchangeably with terms such as “political participation”, and “political engagement”. Adler and Goggin review several of these definitions, and their results are highlighted in Table 2. For the purpose of this study, civic engagement is defined as “any activity, individual or collective, devoted to influencing the collective life of the polity” (Macedo et al., 2005, 6).
Table 2: Definitions of Civic Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.C. Diller</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>“An individual’s duty to embrace the responsibilities of citizenship with the obligation to actively participate, alone or in concert with others, in volunteer service activities that strengthen the local community.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Delli Carpini</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>“Individual and collective actions designed to identify and address issues of public concern”. “The combination of Civic Awareness and Civic Participation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Benshoten</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>“The means by which an individual, through collective action, influences the larger civil society.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hollister</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>“Collective action more than the behavior of individuals…pursuing community issues through work in all sectors not just government.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernie Ronan</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>“Work that is done publicly, benefits the public, and is done in concert with others.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Cooper</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>“People participating together for deliberation and collective action within an array of interests, institutions and networks, developing civic identity, and involving people in governance processes.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Zlatareva</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>How citizens form, shape, and articulate collective actions with other institutions at the national and local levels, and with non-governmental actors such as NGOs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Latin American region presents a unique case for analyzing civic engagement. “For democratic leaders and citizens of [Latin America], the foremost question is no longer how to avoid democratic breakdowns or erosions, but rather how to promote effective governance under competitive regimes” (Mainwaring & Scully, 2010). Many countries experienced long periods of authoritarian rule and several countries are still plagued with extreme social inequality. Although democratic quality in terms of free participation has improved in the past twenty years democracy in the region is still relatively young and faces many challenges and opportunities as the region develops (Carillo-Florez & Petri, 2009). As has occurred in many developed democracies, the Latin American region has experienced waves of democratic movements following the end of dictatorial rule. Although many countries have passed laws for suffrage and inclusion in the political process, the levels of civic engagement in the region remain highly
saturated with those belonging to higher social classes. As posited by political scientist Morris Fiorina, this exclusion in participation, represents the dark side of civic engagement, diminishing a country’s democratic quality. The only solution to this problem, as stated by Fiorina, is more civic engagement (2000).

Active engagement of the citizenry is a fundamental component of democracy. In many established democracies however, observers make the claim that citizens are becoming apathetic about their democratic rights, as can be seen in the downturn of voter participation (Dalton, 2008). In developing countries, because of the paucity of available data, voting is one of the most commonly used measures of civic engagement or political participation. Thus, most studies primarily cover characteristics that contribute to voter turn-out. Unfortunately, voting figures often overstate the extent to which citizens actually participate in decision making, as people can be forced to vote, have a lack of choice in competing candidates, or be threatened into voting (Krishna, 2002). Particularly in Latin America, analyses of voter turnout should always be considered with caution, as several Latin American countries practice compulsory voting. While compulsory voting laws don’t necessarily coincide with universal compliance, they do increase the potential costs for nonparticipation. Consequences for abstention may vary; however, the fear of punishment can contribute to higher voter turnout with a lack of information, attention, or care in public decision making (Krishna, 2002). Electoral participation however only represents one of the most basic forms of civic engagement. Active participation involves a number of other activities that occur far more often than every election cycle.

on these modes by adding protest and internet activism. Both authors argue that these activities are not often interchangeable; a citizen will select an action based upon the type of influence they intend on achieving. Dalton states that voting may require little effort, cooperation, or information on behalf of the citizen, and can have a more uncertain policy focus. Alternatively, campaign activity and contact of public officials requires a higher investment of time, and is often more motivated by a particular policy demand (2008). This argument demonstrates the importance of measuring civic engagement with multiple indicators, to create a more accurate portrait of civic engagement at the individual level. More specifically, voting only gives citizens the opportunity to express opinions on issues that have already been identified. Identification of these issues, particularly for marginalized groups, occurs at a different level of the democratic process.

A review of civic engagement in the United States presents a conceptual model involving six dimensions, leading to what the authors call “citizen-centered collaborative public management.” This emphasizes the role of the public in decision making, and promotes various positive outcomes including trust among citizens, trust in government, citizen competence, government legitimacy, and government responsiveness (Cooper, Bryer, Meek, 2006). In the six dimensional approach leading to citizen centered collaborative public management, the electoral approach is second to last in terms of the most citizen-centered types of civic engagement. This article depicts a similar model to the one represented by Dalton, moving from least likely to most likely to contribute to collaborative public management.

Sherry Arnstein presents a typology of citizen participation with an eight step ladder measuring the extent of citizen power in influencing government behavior. She emphasizes the
role of the ‘have-nots’, or those that are typically excluded from decision making. According to Arnstein, participation that is hypothetically ‘higher’ within the ladder, enables the ‘have-nots’ to deliberately be included in the future of their community. She differentiates lower and higher levels on the ladder by noting that lower levels are rituals, which leave no real power to affect decision making. Within these 8 levels, the first two are manipulation and therapy which essentially enables power-holders to educate the population. Next are informing and consultation, which allow for the ‘have-nots’ to hear and be heard, but does not involve follow through from the side of the power-holders. Next is placation, in which citizens serve in an advisory capacity with no guarantee of decision making change. The final two steps in the ladder involve the largest levels of citizen power and are partnership and citizen control, in which the majority of decision making or full managerial power is left to the citizens (Arnstein, 2007).

The adversarial approach is the least likely to lead to collaborative public management. This approach involves protest, demonstrations, strikes, and disputes, and is also least likely to develop government trust in citizens. The electoral approach includes voting, and although this may increase feelings of governmental legitimacy, it is not often helpful when dealing with bureaucracy. Legislative and administrative information exchange involves citizens exchanging thoughts with legislators by attending government meetings. Civil society involves associational activity, which does not necessarily focus on interaction with public administrators or politicians. Finally, the last level before reaching collaborative public management involves a deliberative approach, which involves consensus-based rule making and is the most likely to build citizen trust in government and citizen competence (Cooper, Bryer, Meek, 2006). Although this study refers specifically to the United States’ governmental system, many of these components can be
transferred to analysis of Latin American civic engagement, as the public administration systems are widely based on U.S. foundations.

Understanding the many activities that encompass civic engagement, studies have attempted to understand factors that contribute to increases or decreases in engagement. Among these, scholars have identified wealth, status, age, education, access to information, and institutional factors as some of the many contributors (Kapucu, 2011; Lipset, 1994; Mainwaring & Scully, 1995). However, social capital is also considered to be a major factor influencing levels of civic engagement.

Social capital is typically measured in different ways including norms, networks, and reciprocity. Associational or group membership contributes to each of these components of social capital- as membership has the capacity to influence group norms, extend an individual’s network, and increase reciprocity or trust sharing between members. Thus, associational membership provides an operational measurement of social capital, often times in conjunction with other measures (Booth & Richard, 2012). As a component of this, social capital is able to build civic engagement by “shaping democratic dispositions, teaching critical political skills, increasing political efficacy, affecting civic attitudes, and realizing deliberative democracy” (Delli Carpini et al., 2004; Fung, 2001). Through building opportunities for members, associational membership also increases access to resources, and is capable of decreasing transactional costs associated with civic engagement (Putnam, 2001). By increasing social capital, it is expected that individuals and communities will be more trustworthy and create a bond to foster increased and more effective collective action (Kapucu, 2011). It is also argued that social capital leads to greater democratic participation when citizens become involved in
formal organizations (Marsh, 2005). As people develop relationships in voluntary organizations, they build trust and gain secondary relationships and an appreciation for activities that may be beneficial to the community (Pilalli, Diaz, Basham, Ramirez-Johnson, 2011). In these ways, social capital is expected to contribute to an increase in civic engagement. While this has been tested in many developed countries, research in less developed countries lags behind due to a paucity of data sources.

Menon and Daftary, two of the major scholars of civic engagement in developing countries, utilize structural equation modeling to analyze the relationship between associational membership and political engagement in Brazil and India (2010). Within this study, the authors differentiate between social associations and political associations, and add a latent variable for political interest. Their findings reveal that although there is no statistically significant relationship between different types of associational membership and political engagement, societal membership actually had a negative effect on political engagement. These relationships were also mediated by political interest in Brazil, however political interest had no effect on the relationship in India (Menon & Daftary, 2010). This study requires further investigation, looking deeper into the contextual differences experienced in India and Brazil.

Furthermore with respect to women’s civic engagement, conventional wisdom holds that women often participate more in social associations rather than political ones- indicating that perhaps social capital related to associational membership will behave differently reflecting gender differences. This study also indicates a need to analyze why social associations don’t have the same effect- are transaction costs for political engagement only reduced through political associational membership, or is political interest lower in women?
One major work analyzing this relationship within Latin America utilized the 1999-2001 World Values Survey in 2005 (Klesner, 2006). This particular study measures social capital with two separate constructs; one being interpersonal trust, the other being non-political organizational membership. For comparative purposes, the author specifically analyzes Argentina, Mexico, Chile, and Peru (Klesner, 2006). Although prior to this publication other studies had analyzed the factors that influence political participation at the community level, the individual level was largely unexplored. This study reveals that higher levels of interpersonal trust do promote political participation. However, compared to other regions worldwide, Latin American organizational membership and trust are relatively low (Klesner, 2006).

A study conducted in 2012 examines the relationship between social capital and political capital (operationalized as different types of civic engagement) in Latin America, using this relationship to explain levels of democracy (Booth & Richard, 2012). The authors utilize data from the 2004 Latin American Public Opinion Project to explain changes in the democracy level with a six year lag, analyzing democracy scores for 2010. The study finds that increases in social capital are related to increases in some types of political capital, but did not have an impact on basic democratic attitudes. Interestingly, the authors find that involvement in school related groups and community improvement groups most frequently lead to increased levels of political capital such as voting, party campaign activism, and contacting of public officials. Although the authors failed to control for the fact that some of the countries in their sample practice compulsory voting, it is interesting that these activities are associated with higher levels of political capital as these are commonly activities in which women participate. This finding is parallel with the higher levels of voter turn-out for Latin American women, although campaign
activism and public official contact levels are not known. However contrary to their predictions, the findings indicate that increased social capital actually led to reduced democracy levels, a potential effect of more ‘bonding’ rather than ‘bridging’ social capital (Booth & Richard, 2012).

Although there is an overabundance of research on social capital, many questions are still unanswered. As noted, debate still exists over whether social capital should be measured at the individual or group level. Furthermore, the utility of the various measures for social capital are criticized and scholars and practitioners alike have yet to achieve a consensus of measures (Fulkerson & Thompson, 2008). The relationship between social capital and its various outcomes, in this case civic engagement, is also debatable as a lack of research exists measuring the relationship in multiple contexts. This study attempts to contribute to work in this area by analyzing social capital within Peru and Ecuador. Moreover, with all of the existing knowledge of social capital, the impact of gender in deciding both how social capital is formed and how it is used is largely unexplored.

2.4 Civic Engagement and Good Governance

“Governance” can be defined as the method in which the government earns and exercises its authority to provide and manage public goods and services (Levy, 2007). There has been an increased focus on so called ‘good governance’, emphasizing the need for government to provide citizens with an increased role in the governance process (Kapucu, Yuldhasev, Bakiev, 2010). The World Bank “Worldwide Governance Indicators” collect data on six dimensions of governance: voice and accountability, political stability and absence of violence, government effectiveness, regulatory quality, rule of law, and control of corruption (World Bank, 2014). The
concept of ‘voice’ refers to the ability of citizens to influence the government (Schiavo-Camp & McFerson, 2008). Voice and accountability measures the extent to which a country’s citizens are able to participate in selecting their government, freely express opinions, have access to free media, and freely associate (World Bank, 2014). Although this is an adequate measure of potential for voice, it is essential that all citizens participate in order to impact government decisions. Civic engagement is crucial to set limits on government behavior, and encourage attention to public needs (Booth, 2009). The expectation of increased civic engagement, is an overall improvement in the government’s ability to adequately address the needs of its citizens, and effectively represent the entire population.

A 2009 study of social capital, political capital, and political systems in eight Latin American countries confirms these expectations. The study finds that although social capital alone does not have an effect on overall democracy, higher participation in politics is associated with higher levels of democracy. Greater activity in political parties and protest are present in countries which have a greater push toward democracy (Booth, 2009). These findings support the need for examining social capital among different types of citizens, demonstrating that increased civic engagement is likely to lead to more effective governance.

2.5 Women’s Social Capital

As is apparent through the literature that has been reviewed thus far, the major works in social capital have not emphasized the role of gender. Most existing literature only uses gender to explain overall trends in social capital as an aggregate national measure- for example, in Bowling Alone Putnam partially attributes the decline in social capital to the entry of women into
the workforce (Lowndes, 2004; Putnam, 2001). However this analysis does not take into consideration that women may develop and use social capital differently than men.

Absence of gender in social capital research may not create a gender neutral understanding of social capital, but may arguably create a male bias. Putnam originally acknowledged that women typically have more associational involvements than men, and notes that women’s entry into the workforce was in part responsible for the decline in social capital in the United States (Gigengil & O’Neil, 2006; Putnam, 2001). He later states “whether by choice or necessity, women invest more time in associational life than the average man” (Putnam, 2001). In contrast, Peter Hall states that women’s entry into the British workforce increased their number of associational memberships and filled in where men’s involvement was diminishing, thus maintaining stocks of social capital (2002). However, no further analysis was conducted by these authors to determine the strength of influence that gender has on what makes up social capital, and how it is used. This is concerning because both Putnam and Hall measure associational membership in male dominated activities such as sports club and pub attendance (Lowndes, 2004; Hall, 2002; Putnam, 1993). While associational membership is one component of social capital, multiple measures should be taken into consideration.

While few quantitative studies on women’s social capital have been conducted in Latin America, women’s social capital has been investigated in the United States and other developed countries (Lowndes, 2004; Norris & Inglehart, 2006; O’Neill, 2006). A study examining women’s social capital in the United Kingdom claims that although women’s levels of social capital are slightly higher than men’s, this does not necessarily translate into higher political engagement. Rather, women utilize their social capital as a mechanism to ‘get on’ with the
activities of daily life, and are less likely to enter into the political domain. For example, a woman might use her social capital to find a ride to afterschool activities for her child, rather than garner support for a political party. The authors note that women will often participate in specific political campaigns, using their participation as a means to an end while men enter the political arena and are more likely to continue up the political ladder (Lowndes, 2004).

Furthermore, women are less likely to serve as board members or take on leadership roles on committees or task-forces (Gilroy, 1996). The evidence from Latin America supports this claim, as there are relatively fewer women in positions of power.

A seminal piece examining the gendered nature of social capital, was published by Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart. The authors utilize data from the 2001 round of the World Values Survey to analyze differences in associational membership and trust (conceptualized together as social capital) among men and women around the world. Their findings reveal that segmentation exists in types of organizations- some clubs, or groups are more dominated by males or females. More importantly, the authors find that men and women differ in the composition of their informal social networks. Women are more likely to spend time with family and immediate relatives, and this is less likely to lead them to join formal organizations and community groups. In contrast, men spend more time with workmates and friends and this is positively correlated with participation in formal organizations (Norris & Inglehart, 2006). This study demonstrates that women may be less networked in terms of formal and effective change. However, more research is necessary to understand the level of this relationship, particularly within various contexts.
Utilizing data from the 2000 Canadian Election study, research confirms that gender is an important mediating factor when analyzing the impact of social capital on political participation (Everitt, 2006). Employing an analysis of social roles, the researcher groups women based on their beliefs about the importance of maintaining traditional gender roles. The study reveals surprising results, as women who were more ‘traditional’ were more likely to participate in politics. Further, this study emphasizes a need to include analyses of social capital and civic engagement in further research as the author discovers social capital was more influential in predicting civic engagement among women who accepted more ‘modern’ views of gender roles. As these women tended to be younger, these will be the women who present the future of women’s civic engagement. Another important finding of this study indicates that gender segregated organizations are more influential in increasing women’s civic engagement, and further research is needed in this area (Everitt, 2006).

Insight on the gendered nature of social capital can also largely be provided by literature in economics. After the boom in social capital research in the late 1990’s, many international development organizations began using social capital theory as a basis for microfinance programs aimed at decreasing poverty among women. A microfinance program is one that provides financial services to low income individuals, with the expectation that with this access, individuals will be capable of lifting themselves out of poverty (Kiva, 2014). Within this structure, development organizations require women to participate in microfinance projects as part of a group, under the expectation that this will strengthen their social capital and provide them with added resources to assist them in rising out of poverty (Mayoux, 2001). In turn, the funding agency reduces their supervisory responsibilities because the group will want to
maintain norms and enforce obligations. While poverty alleviation is not the basis for this study, the study of women’s social capital in microfinance programs is one of the few areas where there has been significant research in women’s social capital. This research has suggested that social capital may be formed and utilized differently by women, and indicates that further research on the gendered nature of social capital is required (MacLean, 2010; Molyneux, 2002).

2.6 Social Role Theory

Based on the previous literature, we can speculate that women’s social capital may be a product of different types of components when compared to male counterparts. In general, most existing literature posits that women participate in more informal networks, and as a result of this, often use their social capital differently. A common assumption is that women are likely to be more social than men, but have differences in how they maintain their social ties (Rountree & Warner, 2006). It is important to understand not only that women’s social capital is different, but why women tend to participate in different types of activities. One theory that addresses this question is Alice Eagly’s social role theory.

Social role theory is based on the understanding that there are gendered divisions of roles and labor (Eagly, 1987). These are commonly referred to as ‘gender roles’, which according to Eagly are defined as “shared expectations about appropriate conduct that apply to individuals solely on the basis of their socially identified sex” (Eagly & Wood, 1991, 4). These roles are cultural norms that may exclude women from participation in public life, while also excluding men from participation in the domestic sphere. According to Eagly, social role theory “reflect(s) gender role beliefs that in turn represent people’s perceptions of men’s and women’s social roles
in the society in which they live” (Eagly & Wood, 2012). Essentially, this theory explains gender differences in behavior by noting that the cultural division of roles has produced differences in expectations of behavior.

Social role theory is particularly useful within the Latin American context as a factor to measure the impact of cultural norms of machismo and marianismo. These refer to “ideal attributes of males and females”, distinguishing a male as bold, assertive, dominant and aggressive, while the female is viewed as selfless, submissive, and spiritual (Zimmerman, n.d.). These expectations coincide with Eagly’s theory of social roles- reinforcing gendered divisions of roles and labor (1987). Although the impact of these norms are expected to have diminished with the entry and increase of women in the labor force, this can also place an unequal burden on women who are expected to not only be responsible for affairs within the home, but additionally take on roles as income-earners to sustain the family.

As Putnam posits in Making Democracy Work, women within the United States accounted for a large percentage of the social ties in the community (Putnam, 1993). Although research within Latin America is not as established, under the assumption that women also maintain more social ties, it is clear that costs for participation in other activities can be relatively high, even with social capital benefits. Women are typically responsible for maintaining the home, maintaining ties with friends and family, and utilize their strong social ties as a resource for help with various responsibilities. The results of losing these social ties by taking the time for participation or competition, could potentially be greater than the potential benefits earned by civic engagement (McLean, 2010). As the literature indicates, women’s social ties are often necessary to maintain and manage their domestic roles- as women will use networks when they
need help. Thus, the increased time commitment required for civic engagement may actually cause women to *incur* costs, resulting in less civic engagement.

### 2.7 The Importance of Women’s Civic Engagement in Latin America

Understanding the contributions of social capital to civic engagement, and the potential differences in women’s social capital, this chapter concludes with a review of women’s social capital and civic engagement in Latin America. This research coincides with the closing stages of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals, of which one specific goal is aimed at increasing gender equality and women’s empowerment. According to UN Women, many of the targets for improving gender equality have demonstrated advances; particularly improving education of young girls (UN Women, 2013; World Bank, 2011). However, when looking ahead there are several gaps that must be addressed. Among these, the promotion of women’s influence in decision making at all levels is paramount to increasing gender equality and women’s empowerment. The capacity of women to influence decision making not only improves their enjoyment of democratic freedoms, but also serves as an instrumental mechanism for ensuring that group specific interests are addressed (UN Women, 2013). One formula for improving the capacity for decision making through collective action could lie in unleashing the potential of social capital. However, as the previous studies have noted, awareness of the contextual differences of social capital is key to understanding its outcomes.

It is argued that social capital is a product of the historical, political, and cultural setting in which it is being studied (De Silva, Harpham, Huggly, Bartolini, Penny, 2005). One can therefore assume that groups operating in Latin America are different than bowling clubs or
sewing groups in the United States (Molyneux, 2002). Women in Latin America account for a majority of the region’s poor, with a significantly higher number among the regions’ many indigenous groups. Most current literature on the topic indicates that women depend on the community as a means to ‘get by’, similar to the social capital research in the highly developed United Kingdom (Molyneux, 2002). However, decades of involvement in community development from the Catholic Church, a tradition of populist government, transitions from authoritarian dictatorships, and popular mobilizations make the nature of overall social capital in Latin America unique when compared to other regions of the world. Latin America is often considered to have a comparatively active civil society, as a result of these and other historical and political factors (Molyneux, 2002).

Although studies in Latin America and other developing countries are far scarcer than those in the developing world, this lack of data has not impeded development organizations from utilizing findings from other contexts in promotion of development or aid programs. These studies are the basis for various development projects funded by international organizations such as the World Bank and the United Nations, which encourage social capital as a tool for reduction of poverty (Schmitt, 2010). However, limited research has taken place in developing countries, and there are differences of opinion with respect to the transferability of findings from industrialized countries. Schmitt conducts a study to fill this gap in the literature by analyzing predictors of civic engagement in thirty-three rural communities in the Ecuadorian province of Cotopaxi. Although this particular study analyzes civic engagement at the group level, some of the findings can be applied to analysis at the individual level. For example, the study found no differences in civic engagement with respect to ethnic hetero or homogeneity. Additionally,
contrary to empirical studies in developed countries, the study found a negative relationship in connection with civic engagement and level of education. The most robust predictor within this particular model is the proportion of indigenous people within the community— which the author attributes to levels of reciprocity and helpfulness that are rooted in indigenous cultural tradition (Schmitt, 2010). This finding indicates that social capital can be a significant contributor to civic engagement, as found within developing countries.

Women’s groups in Latin America have a rich history of involvement in several sectors of society. The “Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo” are one of the most famous resistance groups in the world, still currently in operation engaging public action for disappearances during Argentina’s “Dirty War” years. However, are the dynamics of social capital different for women involved in these types of activities? Maxine Molyneux provides a critique of programs claiming to build social capital for women as a mechanism of empowerment. Molyneux cites several examples within Latin America where women are targeted for work in education and health programs, however often times this work goes unpaid. In fact, she notes that NGO’s and other organizations depend on women’s free or poorly paid labor for project support. Although these interactions may increase social capital among it’s female participants, this does not translate into political capital or actual empowerment because women are already busy with domestic responsibilities and other employment, and are left with no time to use this social capital to advance (Molyneux, 2002). She suggests that development organizations take a deeper look into the gendered dynamics of social capital for women, and consider if in building social capital, women are actually able to utilize it to ‘get ahead’ rather than just ‘get by’.
A study analyzing the impact of women’s social capital in microfinance schemes in Bolivia echoes this finding. Using an ethnographic approach, the author investigated how women utilized the social capital earned from participating in microfinance schemes in both a rural and urban area in Bolivia. She finds that women were often too busy with their jobs to be able to utilize their social capital for ‘bridging’ purposes. One of the objectives of the microfinance program was to allow women to engage in competitive commercial activities, however the author found that women in rural areas (where bonding social capital was higher) were less likely to engage in competitive activities because it would cost them a loss of the social capital they had earned with their peers (McLean, 2010).

Studies in more established democracies show that women are traditionally less interested in politics, less likely to vote, and less likely to have large amounts of political knowledge (Almond & Verba, 1963). Considering the Latin American history of authoritative government, some scholars argued that the banning of traditional participation channels like labor unions and political parties, actually favored women’s involvement due to their participation in religious and small community groups (Espinal & Zhao, 2015). A 2012 study notes that women who participated in the workforce were more likely to join political campaigns (Seligson et al.).

A 2015 study examines the effect of participation in various groups- community groups, economic groups, parent groups, religious groups, and sports groups on three measures of engagement- voting, attending political party meetings, and participating in protest. This study also utilizes the 2012 wave of the LAPOP survey. The findings reveal that although there are differences in levels of group participation by gender, the effect of group participation equally
contributes to levels of engagement. The authors note however, that the magnitude of the effect varies depending on the type of engagement, and suggest that other contributing factors be considered (Espinal & Zhao, 2015). Some factors that could be considered are trust, as a noted component of social capital, as well as country level factors.

In contrast, De Silva et. al's study of the “Glass of Milk Program” in Peru demonstrates that social capital is capable of allowing women to ‘get ahead’. This program, designed to distribute milk and cereal to young children and pregnant or lactating women, is a government program run by small groups of local women (Cueva & Millan, 2000). Interviews of women participating in this program reveal contrasting results. Depending on the setting (urban vs. rural) some women were able to utilize the program to both ‘get by’ and ‘get ahead’. In some cases, women were unable to incorporate further involvement outside of distribution of the goods due to the long distances required to travel for distribution. Not only did this limit the interaction between the women operating the program, but it also diminished the quality of the services to the participants. However, in other areas women were able to utilize the resources provided by the program, and join in additional activities as a result of working in the group. These women joined other programs, and took leadership roles within the community as a result of their participation (De Silva, et. Al, 2005). These studies reveal contrasting results; though they signal a need for further research in the area.

2.8 Case Background

As noted, social capital has been studied extensively in many established democracies. However, research in young democracies is lacking. Context is an important factor to consider
when studying social capital and civic engagement (Oxendine, Sullivan, Borgida, Riedel, Jackson, Dial, 2007). In order to fully understand social capital, research is needed in other contexts. The Latin American region provides a unique opportunity for research with many newly established democracies. Of the Latin American countries, Ecuador and Peru are highly representative in terms of indigenous populations, demonstrating another unique factor for selection of these countries. Often, these groups tend to have the lowest socioeconomic status, particularly among women.

2.8.1 Ecuador

Ecuador achieved independence from Spain in 1882. Today, Ecuador remains one of the Latin America’s most largely indigenous countries, with up to 45% of the population considered to be of an indigenous background (Picari, 2005). As a developing country, Ecuador suffers from profound economic inequality, although current government administrations are making attempts at reducing this inequality (Freedom House, 2012). Ecuador is currently considered a medium-income country (UN, 2014).

In 1929 Ecuador became the first Latin American country to give literate women the right to vote (Picari, 2005). Like many Latin American countries, a military dictatorship was instituted in the 1970’s, and the country returned to democracy in 1979. As an electoral democracy, Ecuador has an extensive political party system, however this system has been plagued by corruption and hostile political activity. The country experiences frequent peaceful protests, though recently institutions have criticized the government of criminalizing protest by applying more aggressive police tactics (Freedom House, 2012).
In the past decade, Ecuador has seen a significant increase in women’s political participation. Ecuador has a unicameral legislature, and currently 41.6% of the seats are held by women (Inter-parliamentary Union, 2014). This can be considered to be the result of a 1997 quota law requiring at least 20% of names on party lists to be women. Additionally, the political participation law of 2000 set this quota to increase by 5 percent with each election until equitable representation is reached. It should be noted, however, that quota laws do not require women to be elected (Picari, 2005). Currently, Ecuador has a score of .429 according to the United Nations Human Development Gender Equality Index, indicating a 42.9% disparity in equality between males and females in terms of reproductive health, proportion of parliamentary seats, proportion of males and females with secondary education, and participation in the labor market (UN, 2014).

2.8.2 Peru

Similar to Ecuador, Peru gained independence from Spain in 1821 and has also experienced alternating periods of civilian and military rule. Interestingly, women’s suffrage was granted during a period of authoritarian rule, in 1956. Democracy was reinstated in 1980, although the 1990’s were strife with guerilla conflict and corrupt political practices. Unlike Ecuador, Peru has experienced widespread violence as a result of the guerilla group, the Shining Path, which had previously been noted for committing crimes against members of opposing political factions (Freedom House, 2014).

Peru also has a unicameral legislature, with 22.3% of seats held by women (Inter-Parliamentary Union, 2014). This number is below the country’s 30% quota. There is significant
variation in the seats held by women in different levels; while women account for 26% of municipal council members, less than 3% of mayors are women (IDEA, 2014). Currently, Peru has a score of .387 in the UN HDI Gender Equality Index (UN, 2014).

2.9 Theoretical Framework

Figure 1 illustrates the theoretical framework utilized to analyze the relationship between social capital and civic engagement, including gender as a moderating variable. The independent variable, social capital, is measured by a variety of indicators as outlined by social capital theorists Putnam and Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 1986; Putnam, 2001). These indicators include associational membership through group involvement, social trust, and trust in institutions. The dependent variable, civic engagement, is measured by five indicators including protest, information exchange, voting, civil society involvement, and contact of public officials. These variables reflect the civic engagement dimensions postulated by Cooper, Bryer, and Meek (2006). In order to examine the effect of gender, it is proposed that this model be measured separately for males and females. This is guided by social role theory, indicating that gender roles are an important contributor in the development and use of social capital (Eagly, 1987). Finally, socioeconomic variables including age, education, income, marital status, and ethnicity are included as control variables.
This study analyzes the moderating effect of gender on the relationship between social capital and civic engagement, utilizing samples from Ecuador and Peru. The purpose of this study is to add to gender analyses in social capital literature, while also informing policymakers of possible reasons for gender gaps in civic engagement. Thus, the first component of this analysis is to examine the gender gap in various forms of civic engagement in the selected countries. Civic engagement is measured using five indicators based on the study presented by Cooper, Bryer, and Meek (2005). These indicators are adversarial engagement, information exchange, electoral engagement, deliberative engagement, and civil society. Based on existing research, it is expected that a gender gap will exist in all forms of civic engagement with the exception of voting as a result of compulsory voting laws in both countries.

\[ H_1: \text{Gender is a statistically significant predictor of civic engagement.} \]

\[ H_{1a}: \text{There will be a statistically significant difference between the genders in levels of participation in adversarial civic engagement.} \]

\[ H_{1b}: \text{There will be a statistically significant difference between the genders in levels of participation in civic information exchange.} \]
\( H_{1c}: \) There will not be a statistically significant difference between the genders in levels of participation in electoral engagement.

\( H_{1d}: \) There will be a statistically significant difference between the genders in levels of participation in deliberative engagement.

\( H_{1e}: \) There will be a statistically significant difference between the genders in levels of participation in civil society.

The second part of the analysis involves examining gender differences in the development of social capital. Based on the theoretical perspectives and literature review, it is expected that there will be gender differences in the types of indicators that encompass social capital (Molyneux, 2002; Norris & Inglehart, 2006).

\( H_{2a}: \) Gender differences exist in the types of memberships that encompass social capital.

\( H_{2b}: \) Gender differences exist in the types of trust that encompass social capital.

Finally, it is hypothesized that these gender differences will have an impact on the strength and direction of social capital in influencing civic engagement. According to the literature reviewed, social capital can serve as a burden rather than a resource, thus inhibiting the positive effect on stimulating civic engagement (Lowndes, 2011).

\( H_{4}: \) There will be a negative relationship between social capital and civic engagement among women in Latin America.
CHAPTER THREE – METHODS

This is a cross-sectional, quantitative study, utilizing secondary data from the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP). Ecuador and Peru were selected for study, in order to provide a more generalizable sample. These countries were selected based on their similarity in human development, economic status, political freedoms, form of government, and cultural norms. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is used as the statistical technique for analyzing data. The following section will outline the comparability of the selected cases; the data collection process used in the LAPOP survey; provide an operational definition for variables used in the study; and outline the procedure for data analysis.

3.1 Selection of Cases

To date, there has been no cross-country analysis of the relationship between social capital and civic engagement among women. A cross-country analysis allows for an increased level of generalizability of the results of the study. It has been noted that multiple-case designs are often considered to be more compelling and robust than single-case designs (Herriott & Firestone, 1983). Moreover, criticisms of single-case studies often reflect fears of the potential for distinctiveness of the case selected (Yin, 2009).

The selection of cases for this study follow the recommendations outlined by Robert Yin’s Case Study Research Design and Methods (Yin, 2009). The two cases in this study were carefully selected with the expectation that they would yield similar results. As such, various economic, cultural, and political variables were examined in order to ensure that the two cases
are similar. These qualitative assumptions were supported in the final model, as country was not a statistically significant predictor of the outcome.

Among the multiple factors that were considered for selection of these cases, a similar cultural and historical background was a primary feature. Due to the nature of the “social role” variable, cultural backgrounds are considered an important factor contributing to the applicability of social norms, especially pertaining to gender. Thus, demographic statistics of these two cases were compared. Ecuador and Peru both account for two of the largest concentrations of indigenous peoples in South America, second and third only to Bolivia. Both Peru and Ecuador share a common native culture, dominated mostly by Aymara and Quechua Andean cultures, which are based around a structure of communal labor (Hardman, 1976). According to the 2010 census, 71.9% of Ecuadorians were considered “mestizo” or of mixed Amerindian and Spanish heritage (INEC, 2010). In Peru, Amerindians account for approximately 45% of the population, with 37% classified as mestizo (CIA, 2013).

Not only do Peru and Ecuador share a common cultural background, the two nations are also similar in terms of human development. The United Nations Human Development Index (UNHDI) compiles measures of human achievement in various areas including health, education, and standard of living (UN, 2014). In 2012, Ecuador was given a score of .708; Peru a score of .734. This positions both countries into the “high human development” category.

Furthermore, Ecuador and Peru are comparable in terms of gender equality. As part of the UNHDI, gender inequality is measured by calculating a ratio of inequality in achievement between men and women in terms of reproductive health, empowerment, and participation in the labor market (UN, 2014). Both countries fit into the “high human development” category, with
Ecuador scoring .429 and Peru .387 (UN, 2014). In this case, a score of 0 denotes perfect gender equality.

Political freedom was also examined to ensure that the cases were comparable. According to Freedom House data for 2012, both countries shared a score of 3/7 (with 1 being absolute freedom) in terms of civil liberties. Civil liberties include freedom of expression and belief, associational and organizational rights, rule of law, and personal autonomy and individual rights. In terms of political rights, Ecuador scored 3, while Peru performed better in this category with a score of 2. Political rights include electoral process, political pluralism, and participation (Freedom House, 2014). Furthermore, measures of civic engagement related to voting need to be considerate of the impact of compulsory voting laws on voter turn-out. Both Peru and Ecuador have implemented compulsory voting, although penalties for abstention are considered to be stricter in Peru than Ecuador. Penalties in Peru, according to Peruvian law, include restriction from banking or other public administrative transactions as well as a financial penalty. In Ecuador, a fine is imposed; however those aged 65+ and those considered illiterate are not required to vote (Electoral Commission, 2006).

Finally, Ecuador and Peru also share similar economic status. Ecuadorian GDP per capita in 2012 was $5,648; Peru slightly higher at $6,825 (World Bank, 2014). However, the countries differ slightly in terms of population statistics. The population of Ecuador in 2012 was approximately 16 million, while the population of Peru was double at approximately 30 million (World Bank, 2014). Additionally, the countries differ in terms of their population density, with Ecuador at 63 and Peru at 24 people per square kilometer (World Bank, 2014). In order to
control for this difference, a measure for rurality was included as a control variable in the analytical model.

3.2 Data Source

Vanderbilt University’s Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP), also known as the AmericasBaromenter, originated in the 1970’s, and has grown to become one of the primary public opinion databases in Latin America. LAPOP data has been used in over 150 publications in various journals as well as local studies, since its creation in 1970 (LAPOP, 2013). The project is funded in part by the United States Agency for International Development, and has been cited as being “state of the art” in external evaluations (Mishler & Bratton, n.d.). The questionnaire is frequently updated to ensure content validity. Additionally, several modules are created and piloted within countries, particularly individual country surveys, to ensure that they are a proper fit for local contexts and user needs. Mishler and Bratton’s external evaluation tests the validity of the questionnaire against other estimates of democratic attitudes, and finds that the measurements are reliable and valid, with the exception of a potential oversampling of urban areas (n.d.). However, the LAPOP recently introduced a new sampling procedure which attempts to address this issue by stratifying the sample based on urban/rural areas. 2012 is the first year of this new sampling technique.

Data for 2012 is utilized for the purposes of this study. More specifically, fieldwork in Ecuador was conducted from February 4th - February 10th 2012 and fieldwork in Peru was conducted from January 20th - February 10th, 2012. This particular data set is based on interviews of a nationally representative survey of voting age adults conducted in all major languages. Only
those who were non-institutionalized were eligible to participate in the study, therefore the sample excludes inmates, those in hospitals, police academies and military barracks. Only one respondent is interviewed per household, and most questions are specifically focused on the opinions of that single respondent, unless otherwise indicated.

3.3 Sampling

The sample was selected using a multi-stage probabilistic design with quotas at the household level, and are stratified by major regions of the country, size of municipality and by urban and rural areas within municipalities. In the first step, the sample is stratified based on municipality size, urban/rural status, and region (LAPOP, 2012). Individual country surveys are available with specialized questions, however to allow for valid comparison only data from the standard core questionnaire is used in this study.

3.4 Sample Size

The unit of analysis in this study is at the individual level. The sample size for Ecuador and Peru’s LAPOP surveys are both 1,500 with a sampling error of ±2.5%. This large sample size reduces the likelihood of committing a Type II error, and provides significant power for the number of variables measured within the study. While there is no standard agreement on an exact sample size for Structural Equation Modeling, it is generally agreed upon to determine an appropriate sample size as a ratio of cases/observed variables. With strongly kurtotic or non-normal data, it is argued that there be between 10-20 cases per observed variable (Hoogland & Boomsma, 1998; Kline, 1998).
3.5 Operationalization of Variables

The following table lists the variables measured in the study, as well as their corresponding indicators and related survey questions. The indicators for each variable are based on the theoretical foundations outlined in the literature review. The first set of indicators covers social capital. These indicators expand on previous studies by including indicators for formal memberships, communal group memberships, interpersonal and institutional trust. Prior studies have shown that participation in nonpolitical organization stimulates civic engagement (Putnam, 2001; Inglehart 1997; Knack & Keefer, 1997; Olsen, 1972; Verba & Nie, 1972). This study will examine the effect of associational membership through both formal associations such as professional associations and merchant groups, and communal group memberships, including church, sport, or religious organizations. Trust is also considered an essential component of social capital, as trust serves as a basis for cooperation (Stolle & Rochon, 1998). Thus, a set of indicators is included measuring social trust. For the social capital relationship to foster engagement, trust in government is also necessary therefore trust toward public institutions and public officials are also included (Stolle & Rochon, 1998).

The second set of indicators measures the dependent variable; civic engagement. This study utilizes various measures encompassing the five dimensions of civic engagement as modified from the review of collaborative public management by Cooper, Bryer, and Meek (2006). These indicators include measures for adversarial engagement (through signing petitions or participating in protests); information exchange, electoral participation (voting), deliberative engagement (contacting public officials), and civil society (helping to solve community problems, and attending political party or other town meetings).
Socioeconomic and demographic factors are also measured in the model, including education, income, ethnicity, age, marital status, and urban/rural settings. Table 3 provides the operationalization of all the variables in the study and their associated survey item. Complete survey questions are located in Appendix A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Variable Type</th>
<th>Survey Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital</strong></td>
<td><strong>Membership</strong></td>
<td>Latent Exogenous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Association</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>Cp6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents Association</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>Cp7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Improvement Committee</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>Cp8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional, merchant, manufacturer, farmer</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>Cp9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports or Recreation Group</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>Cp21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td>Community Trust</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>It1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justice System</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>B10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supreme Electoral Tribunal</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>B11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Legislature</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>B13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Police</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>B18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Parties</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>B21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President/Prime Minister</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>B21a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supreme Court</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>B31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local/Municipal Government</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>B32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic Engagement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Adversarial</strong></td>
<td>Latent Endogenous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signed a petition</td>
<td>Endogenous Indicator</td>
<td>Prot6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participated in demonstration or protest march</td>
<td>Endogenous Indicator</td>
<td>Prot3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared political information online</td>
<td>Endogenous Indicator</td>
<td>Prot8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would vote</td>
<td>Endogenous Indicator</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requested help from member of congress/parliament</td>
<td>Endogenous Indicator</td>
<td>CP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requested help from local public official</td>
<td>Endogenous Indicator</td>
<td>CP4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requested help from federal or state agency or institution</td>
<td>Endogenous Indicator</td>
<td>CP4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sought assistance/presented request to any office, official, councilperson</td>
<td>Endogenous Indicator</td>
<td>NP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended political party meeting</td>
<td>Endogenous Indicator</td>
<td>CP13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended town/city council/other meeting</td>
<td>Endogenous Indicator</td>
<td>NP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helped solve a community problem</td>
<td>Endogenous Indicator</td>
<td>CP5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic and Socioeconomic Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>EdCat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>IncCat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>ETID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Moderator and Exogenous Indicator</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 Analytical Methods

3.6.1 Data Cleaning

Datasets for Ecuador and Peru were combined and imported into SPSS (PASW ® Statistics 17), and SPSS was used for all data cleaning and descriptive analysis. Frequency distributions, means, and standard deviations are used to describe data characteristics prior to multivariate analyses. After excluding variables that were not going to be used in the study, the dataset contained a total of 33 variables reflecting social capital, civic engagement, and demographic characteristics. Variables were re-coded to ensure that all responses were coded in the same direction – with a lower score indicating a stronger level of agreement (i.e. 1 for yes 2 for no). Frequency tables for the data were run, and revealed that missing values were present for more than one variable in the dataset.

In order to perform list-wise deletion or imputation methods to deal with missing data, data must be examined to ensure that it is Missing at Random (MAR). Utilizing the missing value analysis feature in SPSS, a visual scan of the data indicated that missing cases were randomly distributed. The results of this analysis can be found in Figure 1. Although MAR is an un-testable assumption, it is still considered acceptable for further analysis (Rubin, 1976).
Figure 2: Missing Value Analysis

Demographic characteristics were also similar in both the full sample and the sample with missing cases removed. Therefore, list-wise deletion was performed to removing missing data from the sample. The remaining sample has a size of 1,895 with a 37% reduction in the sample size. The new sample was slightly larger for Ecuador with an increase in ratio of 1.2%.

Multiple imputation was initially run in order to address missing data, however, there is not currently software available that has the capability to produce modification indices or assess goodness of fit for models with imputed data. Therefore, list-wise deletion was selected to address missing data. Factor loadings and between factor
from the original sample. Although a large percentage of the data was removed, the sample size remained large enough to perform the data analysis with a significant level of power.

3.6.2 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Data is analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) through Mplus 7.3, a graphics and text-based software (Muthen & Muthen, 1998-2012). “SEM is a statistical technique that simultaneously assesses the reliability and validity of the measures of theoretical constructs and estimates the relationships among these constructs” (Kline, 1998). SEM is a popular technique to use when measuring social capital because of its ability to measure latent constructs. For example, Narayan and Cassidy use SEM in order to test the validity of various measures of social capital, as related to latent outcomes such as political engagement, peace, crime, and safety (2001). Van Beuningena and Schmeets also incorporate SEM into their development of a two dimensional social capital index, based on participation and trust (2012). Similar to the study by Van Beuningen and Schmeets, both participation and trust are broken down into several categories and measured by various indicators within this study.

“SEM allows factor analysis to be conducted within a confirmatory framework…[CFA]. In CFA, factor structures are hypothesized a priori and tested for correctness” (Gau, 2010). This ability is unique to SEM, and adds to its fit as an appropriate technique for analysis for this study. Other methods of analysis offer superficial reliability statistics, but do not speak to the uni-dimensionality of the underlying constructs in question (Gau, 2010; Schmitt 1996). Moreover, SEM has the unique capability to analyze multi-group data in models that account for

correlations were analyzed for imputed data, and they closely matched the dataset in which list-wise deletion was performed.
complex relationships (Bou and Satorra, 2009). In this study, the central concern is whether or not components of the measurement and structural models are equivalent across gender—both in terms of the items encompassing the measurement of the latent factors as well as the equivalence of paths specified in the causal structure, which can be measured with SEM (Byrne, 2012).

Individual measurement models are created to analyze each indicator variable for its goodness of fit to the latent constructs. “The measurement model tests the reliability and validity of the indicators for the corresponding construct, while the structural model validates the hypothesized paths among constructs” (Kline, 1998). Initially, each indicator must be statistically significant with a p value of .05 or smaller in order to be included. Further, goodness of fit statistics are reported including the Chi Square (x²), as well as the Root Mean Square Error Approximated (RMSEA), Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and Tucker Lewis Index (TLI). The desired range for these goodness of fit values are reported in Table 4. It should be noted that values within the thresholds listed below are ideal, however, data that is non-normal (high kurtosis or skew), and data sets with large sample sizes inflate chi-square and absolute measures of fit (Byrne, 2012; Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993).

Table 4: Goodness of Fit Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Definition (Byrne, 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square (x²)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Non-normed index of proportionate improvement in model fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker Lewis Index (TLI)</td>
<td>&gt;.95</td>
<td>Normed index of proportionate improvement in model fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>&gt;.95</td>
<td>Measures the degree of model adequacy based on population discrepancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>≤.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once the model has been fitted, it is modified to reflect the results of the factor analysis. The structural model is then used to predict theoretically derived paths in the proposed model by examining standardized factor loadings. The thresholds listed in Table 4 are also applicable to the goodness of fit of the final SEM model.

### 3.7 Analytical Framework

The following section presents the analytical models for each independent and dependent variable (before modification), and concludes with a presentation of the final structural model which is tested for each gender.

It should be noted that all of the data utilized in this study are either dichotomous or ordered categorical. As such, the general Weighted Least Squares estimator was not used. According to Brown, the Robust Weighted Least Squares (WLSMV) estimator performs best in the modeling of categorical data (2006). The WLSMV estimator has been shown to yield accurate test statistics and other estimates with both normal and non-normal distributions, however it was designed specifically for use with small and moderate sample sizes (Byrne, 2012). With a sample size in this study of over 1,000 it should be noted that chi-square values will be inflated, and this potentially influences the calculation of modification indices. However, WLSMV is considered a superior method when using data with a low number of categories (Beauducel and Herzberg, 2006).

#### 3.7.1 Measurement Model of Social Capital

Social capital is the independent, or exogenous variable, within the study. It is measured by two separate latent variables. The first is Membership (Mem). This variable is measured by
five indicator variables, consisting of survey items looking at frequency of attendance at various types of meetings including religious organizations, professional organizations, parents’ associations, community improvement associations, and sports groups. The second latent factor making up social capital is Trust. Trust is made up of eleven indicator variables including one indicator of community trust, and ten indicators of trust in institutions.

In order to assess differences in “stocks” of social capital based on gender, an index was created using SPSS for each measure of social capital, utilizing the CFA to assess the validity and reliability of the indices. Chi-square analyses were run for membership, institutional trust, and interpersonal trust separately. Inter-personal trust was not included in the index with institutional trust as the items are measured on different levels.

Figure 3: Measurement Model of Membership
3.7.2 Measurement Model of Civic Engagement

The dependent variable, or endogenous variable, is civic engagement. Civic engagement is measured by eleven indicator variables representing the various dimensions of civic engagement, as discussed in the literature review. These indicators include measures for adversarial engagement (through signing petitions or participating in protests); information exchange, electoral participation (voting), deliberative engagement (contacting public officials),
and civil society (helping to solve community problems, and attending political party or other town meetings).

Figure 5: Measurement Model of Civic Engagement
3.7.3 Socioeconomic Status

Various measures of socioeconomic status are included in the study. These include education, income, marital status, ethnicity, urban/rural location, and age. An attempt was made at combining these indicators in order to develop a latent variable titled “Socioeconomic Status”. However, the indicators failed to produce adequate fit for a latent construct, and therefore each factor is included individually in the final model. This also provides additional information on how demographic and socioeconomic factors contribute to civic engagement.

3.7.4 Structural Model of Social Capital and Civic Engagement

Below, the structural model of social capital and civic engagement is presented. In order to assess gender differences and adequacy of the model for the entire sample, an initial full structural model was run after testing each measurement model for goodness of fit, and adjusting the models for the latent factors based on the CFA. As gender was found to be statistically significant, further analysis was conducted. The additional analysis included running CFA models for the latent variables separately for each gender, and combining these models into a full structural model to also be tested for each gender. A final comparison of factor loadings and confidence intervals in the structural model was utilized to make an assessment about the strength and direction of the relationship between social capital and civic engagement by gender.
Figure 6: Initial Full Structural Model
CHAPTER FOUR – RESULTS

Data analysis was conducted in four phases: (1) running descriptive statistics to explain the sample demographics and responses, (2) developing measurement models and conducting Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to revise for goodness of fit and form a baseline model (3) testing a causal model with the full sample (4) completing steps 2 and 3 for each gender. The results provided in this chapter follow these phases of analysis.

4.1 Demographics

As noted in Chapter Three, many cases within the dataset included missing values. List-wise deletion was performed to ensure that the data set was clean, as modification indices are not provided when a dataset contains missing values, and thus model fit cannot be improved. In addition to utilizing the Missing Values Analysis feature in SPSS to search for patterns in missing data, demographic characteristics were compared with the original dataset and the new dataset. The demographics are provided in Table 5. Only slight variations in demographics were present, all less than 3%.

Within the sample, there was an almost even distribution of males (50.5%) and females (49.5%). The majority of the sample identified themselves as Mestizo (81.7%), or of mixed Amerindian and European descent. The sample was representative of all age groups, with a majority under the age of 45. The most common monthly income ranged from $131-$530 per month. The majority of the sample had also completed at least a secondary education and respondents were more frequently resided in urban areas (60%).
Table 5: Demographic Data, Comparison of Total Sample with Complete Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Total (n=3,000)</th>
<th>Complete (n=1,895)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mestizo</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mulatto</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66-75</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76+</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Family</td>
<td>$2111+</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$531-$2110</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$311-$530</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$131-$310</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0-$130</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Level</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Education</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Descriptive Statistics

4.2.1 Civic Engagement

As noted in Table 6, most items are heavily skewed indicating a lack of civic engagement, with the exception of voting and helping to solve a community problem. As discussed in the literature review, voting figures for these two countries should be considered
with caution as both countries practice compulsory voting and thus voting is a form of forced participation. Additionally, the LAPOP survey actually included four potential options regarding voting. The question asked “If the next presidential elections were being held this week, what would you do?”, with the options (1) wouldn’t vote, (2) would vote for the incumbent candidate or party, (3) would vote for a candidate or party different from the current administration, (4) would go vote but would leave the ballot blank or purposely cancel my vote. For the purposes of this study, all options that included going to a polling station were included as a “yes” response, under the assumption that purposely cancelling a vote is a form of protest rather than abstention from the political process. Although further argument of this case was not the focus of this study, future research could analyze the impact of cancelling votes.

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics for Civic Engagement Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adversarial</strong></td>
<td>Participated in protest or march</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signed a petition</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Info. Exch.</strong></td>
<td>Shared political information online</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electoral</strong></td>
<td>Would vote</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliberative</strong></td>
<td>Requested help from member of congress/parliament</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requested help from local public official</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requested help from federal or state agency or institution</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sought assistance/presented request to any office, official, or councilperson</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil Society</strong></td>
<td>Attended political party or political organization meeting</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended a town/city council/other meeting</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helped solve a community problem</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to analyze differences in participation in the types of activities encompassing civic engagement, chi-square analyses were run for each gender. Chi-square tests are utilized for variables that are nominal or dichotomous, each consisting of two or more attributes. Chi-square
testing in this case is used to validate the assumption that there are differences in levels of civic engagement between the genders, and examine in which activities these differences occur.

Table 7: Chi-Square Analysis for Civic Engagement Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adversarial</td>
<td>Signed a petition</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participated in demonstration or protest march</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. Exch.</td>
<td>Shared information online</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral</td>
<td>Would vote in next presidential election</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberative</td>
<td>Requested help from a local public official</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requested help from member of congress/parliament</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sought assistance/presented request to any office, official, councilperson</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>Attended political party or political organization meeting</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended a town/city council/other meeting in the past 12 months</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helped solve a community problem</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicates statistical significance at p ≤ .05

Based on the chi-square analysis, it can be noted that statistical significance was achieved at the .05 level for 6 of the 10 measures encompassing civic engagement. The results are presented in order reflecting the dimensions leading to “citizen-centered collaborative public management” with the least collaborative listed first and the most collaborative listed last. Based on these results, no gender differences in participation were found with respect to voting, requesting help from public officials, members of congress/parliament, or officials and councilpersons. However, gender differences are noted in all other measures. This finding validates the need for the study, demonstrating that women lack participation in several areas which are critical to shaping policy decisions, as well as agenda setting in the policy process.
4.2.2 Social Capital

Social capital measures encompass both membership in community organizations, (measured by attendance at various types of meetings) as well as levels of inter-personal and institutional trust. Descriptive statistics for the measures encompassing social capital are presented in this section.

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics for Frequency of Attendance at Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Once/week</th>
<th>Once or twice/month</th>
<th>Once or twice/year</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Org.</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Assoc.</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Assoc.</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Assoc.</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport or Rec. Group</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 provides statistics on frequency of attendance at meetings, a measure for associational membership and a component of social capital. Over half of the sample (56.5%) reports attending a meeting of a religious organization at least once per year, with almost a quarter (24.2%) reporting that they attend once per week. In measures of attendance at parents’ association meetings the group was split, with approximately half (49.8%) of respondents indicating that they attended a meeting at least once per year, although 30.7% attended a meeting at least once per month. Participation in community improvement association meetings was low, with 69.4% of the sample reporting that they had not attended one of these meetings at all in the last 12 months. Similarly, attendance at meetings of sport or recreation groups was also relatively low, with 67.1% of the sample reporting that they had not attended one of these meetings at all in the last 12 months.
Table 9: Descriptive Statistics for Interpersonal Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Trustworthy</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Trustworthy</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Untrustworthy</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Untrustworthy</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 provides the descriptive statistics for levels of interpersonal trust. A majority of the sample (59.1%) reported feeling that people in their community were at least somewhat trustworthy.

Table 10: Descriptive Statistics for Institutional Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/Official</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice System</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Electoral Tribunal</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Legislature</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Police</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Parties</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President/Prime Minister</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/Municipal Government</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures of institutional trust were gauged on a 7-point Likert scale, with a score of 1 indicating a lot of trust, and a score of 7 indicating no trust. Respondents were asked about various institutions and public officials. These results are reported in table 10. The statistics indicate that among all of the institutions and officials, the President was the most trusted, while political parties were found to be the least trusted institution.
4.3 Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Full Sample

4.3.1 Social Capital

The model to be tested postulates that Social Capital is a two-factor structure consisting of Membership and Trust. CFA for the full sample concluded that all indicators for both factors were statistically significant at the .05 level. However, goodness of fit statistics indicated that the model could be improved. After revision, goodness of fit statistics indicated an acceptable fit, with RMSEA (.084), CFI (.928), and TLI (.912). Table 12 and 13 provide the standardized and unstandardized parameter estimates for social capital using the full sample. As demonstrated in the table, findings indicate that the strongest contributor to the membership factor was participation in a community improvement committee or a professional association, while religious associations and sports groups only contributed minimally. With respect to trust, trust in the Supreme Court, justice system, and national legislature were the strongest contributors of the factor, while inter-personal trust was the weakest. Comparison of goodness of fit statistics between the initial model and the revised model are provided in Table 11, with a graphical representation provided in Appendix B.

Table 11: Goodness of Fit Statistics for Social Capital (Full Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Initial Model</th>
<th>Revised Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X^2$</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1218.245</td>
<td>1078.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>&lt;.08</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt;.9</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>&gt;.9</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12: Standardized and Un-standardized Parameter Estimates for Membership (Full Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model (1=original, 2=final)</th>
<th>Un-standardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>P (sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Community Improvement Committee</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Professional Association</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Religious Association</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Parents’ Association</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sports or Recreation Group</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community Improvement Committee</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professional Association</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Religious Association</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parents’ Association</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sports or Recreation Group</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicates statistical significance at p≤.05

Table 13: Standardized and Unstandardized Parameter Estimates for Trust (Full Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model (1=original, 2=final)</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>P (sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interpersonal Trust</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Justice System Trust</td>
<td>4.547</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Supreme Electoral Tribunal Trust</td>
<td>4.294</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. National Legislature Trust</td>
<td>4.255</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. National Police Trust</td>
<td>3.485</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Political Party Trust</td>
<td>3.948</td>
<td>.0014</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. President Trust</td>
<td>3.397</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Supreme Court</td>
<td>4.881</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Local/Municipal Government Trust</td>
<td>4.003</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interpersonal Trust</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Justice System Trust</td>
<td>4.409</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supreme Electoral Tribunal Trust</td>
<td>4.102</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. National Legislature Trust</td>
<td>4.352</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. National Police Trust</td>
<td>3.612</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Political Party Trust</td>
<td>3.933</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. President Trust</td>
<td>3.374</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supreme Court</td>
<td>5.115</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Local/Municipal Government Trust</td>
<td>3.987</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicates statistical significance at p≤.05

4.3.2 Civic Engagement

Initial goodness of fit statistics for civic engagement indicated that improvements could be made to the model. As demonstrated in Table 15, ‘voting’ was not found to be a statistically
significant contributor to the civic engagement factor. This is likely due to the lack of variation in responses, as voting is compulsory in both countries included in the sample. Additionally, chi-square analyses revealed that gender differences in voting were not statistically significant. This finding reflects previous assertions in the literature. Furthermore, voting is considered to be a form of civic engagement that is less useful in shaping the policy agenda. Thus, the voting indicator was removed from the Civic Engagement model. Factor loadings in the revised model reveal that the strongest contributors to civic engagement were requesting help from public officials at all levels, and signing petitions. In contrast, sharing political information had the weakest factor loading. The final revised model, including covariance of related error terms, produced an appropriate, although not ideal fit with RMSEA (.077), CFI (.804), and TLI (.715). The model was deemed acceptable to proceed with further analysis based on the RMSEA value fitting within the appropriate threshold. However, it is possible that the CFI and TLI values are less than ideal as a result of inflated chi-square values, as these were dichotomous variables with non-normal distributions. A comparison of goodness of fit statistics between the original and revised models are provided in table 14, with a graphical representation provided in Appendix C.

Table 14: Goodness of Fit Statistics for Social Capital (Full Model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Initial Model</th>
<th>Revised Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X²</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1218.245</td>
<td>1078.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>&lt;.08</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt;.9</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>&gt;.9</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15: Standardized and Un-standardized Parameter Estimates for Civic Engagement (Full Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model (1=original, 2=final)</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>P (sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sign Petition</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Protest</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Share Info</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Vote</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Req. help congress</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Req. help local official</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Req. help federal</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Req. help any office</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Attend political party mtg.</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Attend town/city mtg.</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Help solve problem</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicates statistical significance at p≤.05

4.4 Structural Model for Full Sample

With the revisions to the measurement models and covariance of error terms, a revised structural model was developed including socioeconomic and demographic variables. The initial structural model fit well, meeting all of the necessary thresholds for goodness of fit. Within the full model, country, income, marital status, ethnicity, and trust were not found to be statistically significant. These results indicate that the cases selected were appropriate, as no country differences were found. Furthermore, trust was not found to be a statistically significant predictor of civic engagement among the participants in this sample. However, membership was strongly
related with a factor loading of .877. Final goodness of fit statistics indicate that the model fit very well with RMSEA (.038), CFI (.918), and TLI (.909).

The model including the full sample was run in order to assess the importance of gender as a predictor of civic engagement, and to provide base models for which to test each gender in further analysis. The model revealed that gender was a statistically significant predictor of civic engagement, even after controlling for other factors. This result supports the need for further analysis, with separate models for each gender and validates the hypothesis that gender is a statistically significant predictor of civic engagement. Within this sample, women were less likely to participate overall. Un-standardized and standardized coefficients for the structural model are found in Table 16, with a graphic representation of the full model and the co-variances in Figure 3.

Table 16: Un-standardized and Standardized Coefficients for Structural Model (Full Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model (1=final)</th>
<th>Un-standardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>P (sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Country</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Urban/Rural</td>
<td>-.213</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Education</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Income</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Marital Status</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ethnicity</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Trust</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Membership</td>
<td>2.047</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicates statistical significance at p≤.05
Figure 7: Initial Full Structural Model
4.5 Confirmatory Factor Analysis by Gender

4.5.1 Social Capital

CFA was conducted for social capital using the two factor measure for each gender. In order to assess the validity and reliability of the factors for each gender, the related co-variances from the full sample were utilized as a base model. All of the social capital indicators were found to be statistically significant for both groups, however comparison of factor loadings and confidence intervals revealed differences in the strength of the factors by gender. Examination of confidence intervals (CI) is utilized in order to examine the degree of statistical significance of the difference in strength between factor loadings, as a method of Null Hypothesis Significance Testing (NHST). Values within the CI are related to the p-value. “Any value outside the CI, when considered as a null hypothesis, gives two-tailed p<.05. Any value inside the CI when considered as a null hypothesis, gives p>.05” (Cumming and Finch, 2005).

In a comparison of the factor loadings for both models, results show that religious associations were a stronger component of social capital for females and sports and recreation associations had a stronger factor loading for the male sample, although these differences were not significant as there was overlap in the confidence intervals for these indicators. Significant differences were noted in membership in parents’ associations, with a stronger contribution to social capital among the male sample. Furthermore, the female sample had a slightly stronger factor loading for inter-personal trust, although this was not to a significant degree. Finally, a significant difference was found in trust in local/municipal governments, with a stronger contribution for the female sample.
Table 17: Standardized and Un-standardized Parameter Estimates for Membership by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Female Un-standardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>P (sig.)</th>
<th>Male Un-standardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>P (sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Community Improvement Committee</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Professional Association</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Religious Association</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Parents' Association</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sports or Recreation Group</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Indicates statistical significance at p≤0.05

Table 18: 95% Confidence Intervals for Membership Factor by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Female Lower 2.5%</th>
<th>Upper 2.5%</th>
<th>Male Lower 2.5%</th>
<th>Upper 2.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Professional Association</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Religious Association</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Parents' Association **</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sports or Recreation Group</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sports or Recreation Group</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19: Standardized and Un-standardized Parameter Estimates for Trust by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>p (sig.)</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>p (sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Un-standardized coefficients</td>
<td>Standardized coefficients</td>
<td></td>
<td>Un-standardized coefficients</td>
<td>Standardized coefficients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Interpersonal Trust</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Justice System Trust</td>
<td>3.646</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>5.316</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Supreme Electoral Tribunal Trust</td>
<td>3.494</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>4.778</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. National Legislature Trust</td>
<td>3.329</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>5.107</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. National Police Trust</td>
<td>2.913</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>4.321</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Political Party Trust</td>
<td>3.335</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>4.561</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. President Trust</td>
<td>2.788</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>4.002</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Supreme Court</td>
<td>4.175</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>5.765</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Local/Municipal Government Trust</td>
<td>3.504</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>4.454</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicates statistical significance at p ≤ .05**

Table 20: 95% Confidence Intervals for Trust Factor by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower 2.5%</td>
<td>Upper 2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Interpersonal Trust</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Justice System Trust</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Supreme Electoral Tribunal Trust</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. National Legislature Trust</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. National Police Trust</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Political Party Trust</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. President Trust</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Supreme Court</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Local/Municipal Government Trust**</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to assess differences in overall “stocks” of social capital based on gender, indices were created based on the results of the CFA. An independent sample test testing was conducted for membership, institutional trust, and interpersonal trust. The results indicate that there is not a statistically significant difference in overall membership or levels of institutional trust, while there is a statistically significant difference in levels of inter-personal trust, with males more likely to be somewhat or very trusting of people within their community.

Table 21: Independent Samples Test for Social Capital Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall membership</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional trust</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-personal trust</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicates statistical significance at p≤.05

4.6 Structural Models by Gender

Noting the differences in social capital based on gender, the final analysis involves modeling the relationship between social capital and civic engagement for each gender. The purpose of these models is to examine the direction and strength of the relationship between social capital and civic engagement, as well as to examine the effect of other socioeconomic and demographic factors.

A comparison of the goodness of fit statistics demonstrates that the model fit well for both groups. Goodness of fit statistics are reported in Tables 22 and 23. In a comparison of the models, only two major differences were found. Age was found to be a statistically significant predictor of civic engagement among the female sample, but not among the male sample. However, confidence intervals related to this indicator overlapped for the groups. Furthermore,
ethnicity was found to be a statistically significant predictor for males, but not for females. The strength of membership and trust, the two factors utilized to measure social capital, did not drastically vary from males to females. Membership was found to be a statistically significant predictor of civic engagement among both groups, while trust was not statistically significant for either group. Parameter estimates and confidence intervals can be found in Tables 24 and 25, and a graphical representation of the full model for both genders can be found in Figures 7 and 8.

Table 22: Goodness of Fit for Structural Model (Females)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Model Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X^2$</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>889.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>&lt;.08</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt;.9</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>&gt;.9</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: Goodness of Fit for Structural Model (Males)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Model Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X^2$</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>924.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>&lt;.08</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt;.9</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>&gt;.9</td>
<td>.912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24: Standardized and Un-standardized Parameter Estimates for Structural Model by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Female Un-standardized coefficients</th>
<th>Female Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>p (sig.)</th>
<th>Male Un-standardized coefficients</th>
<th>Male Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>p (sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/Rural</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.237</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.028**</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.036**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>1.503</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>2.272</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicates statistical significance at p≤.05

Table 25: 95% Confidence Intervals for Structural Model by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Female Lower 2.5%</th>
<th>Female Upper 2.5%</th>
<th>Male Lower 2.5%</th>
<th>Male Upper 2.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/Rural</td>
<td>-.276</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.341</td>
<td>-.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>2.354</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>3.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>-.655</td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8: Structural Model (Females)
Figure 9: Structural Model (Males)
4.7 Hypothesis Testing

The aims of this study were to (1) test for gender differences in the types of indicators that make up social capital and (2) examine if the relationship between social capital and civic engagement is the same for both genders. The purpose of this analysis is to evaluate potential reasons for lower levels of civic engagement among women. Thus, the first component of the analysis involved examining what these differences in civic engagement were among the study sample. Additionally, the model tested the effect of other socioeconomic and demographic variables in terms of their influence on civic engagement. Based on the theoretical framework and literature review, the following hypotheses were tested in this study through the results provided in this chapter:

\( H_1: \) Gender is a statistically significant predictor of civic engagement.

The first hypothesis addresses the impact of gender on levels of civic engagement. Before analyzing whether social capital differences could potentially impact lower levels of civic engagement among women, this hypothesis tests the assumption that women participate less. The results of the analysis supported this hypothesis, with a p value of .001, and a standardized regression coefficient of .125 in the structural model for the full sample.

\( H_{1a}: \) There will be a statistically significant difference between the genders in levels of participation in adversarial civic engagement.

\( H_{1b}: \) There will be a statistically significant difference between the genders in levels of participation in civic information exchange.
\( H_{1c} \): There will not be a statistically significant difference between the genders in levels of participation in electoral engagement.

\( H_{1d} \): There will be a statistically significant difference between the genders in levels of participation in deliberative engagement.

\( H_{1e} \): There will be a statistically significant difference between the genders in levels of participation in civil society.

The second set of hypotheses further examines gender differences in civic engagement, by examining participation in each of the five dimensions measured in this study. Hypotheses 1a, 1b, 1c, and 1e were supported. Women were less likely to participate in adversarial engagement, civic information exchange, and civil society. This is further broken down in the chi-square analysis, demonstrating the specific measures of each of the categories in which women participated less. There was no statistically significant difference in electoral or any of the items measuring deliberative engagement.

\( H_{2a} \): Gender differences exist in the types of memberships that encompass social capital.

Hypothesis 2a analyzes differences in the components of social capital based on gender, in terms of memberships. This hypothesis was partially supported, as differences were found among males and females. Results show that religious associations were a stronger component of women’s social capital, while sports and recreation associations were stronger components of social capital for the male sample. Examination of confidence intervals demonstrated that parents’ associations were significantly stronger contributors to social capital for males.

\( H_{2b} \): Gender differences exist in the types of trust that encompass social capital.
Hypothesis 2b analyzes differences in the components of social capital based on trust. This hypothesis was partially supported, with a slightly stronger influence of inter-personal trust on women’s trust, and a statistically significant difference in trust in local/municipal governments, with a stronger contribution for the female sample.

\( H_3: \text{There will be a negative relationship between social capital and civic engagement among women.} \)

Given differences in how social capital is formed, it was hypothesized that social capital will have an inverse relationship with civic engagement for females. This hypothesis was not supported. A comparison of the structural models for each gender demonstrates that the strength and direction of the relationship between social capital and civic engagement is very similar for males and females. Membership was statistically significant for both groups, with a standard regression weight of .806 for females and .840 for males. Trust was not significant for either gender, with a standard regression weight of .086 for females and .012 for males.
Table 26: Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_1$ Gender is a statistically significant predictor of civic engagement.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{1a}$ There will be a statistically significant difference between the genders in levels of participation in adversarial civic engagement.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{1b}$ There will be a statistically significant difference between the genders in levels of participation in civic information exchange.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{1c}$ There will not be a statistically significant difference between the genders in levels of participation in electoral engagement.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{1d}$ There will be a statistically significant difference between the genders in levels of participation in deliberative engagement.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{1e}$ There will be a statistically significant difference between the genders in levels of participation in civil society.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{2a}$ Gender differences exist in the types of memberships that encompass social capital.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{2b}$ Gender differences exist in the types of trust that encompass social capital.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_3$ There will be a negative relationship between social capital and civic engagement among women.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE – DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In an effort to evaluate potential explanations for lower civic engagement among women, this study examined the impact of social capital. Given the findings of the study, this section provides a discussion of the results, and presents theoretical and practical implications. The chapter concludes with limitations of the study, and recommendations for future research.

5.1 Civic Engagement in Ecuador and Peru

Results of this study speak not only to the engagement of women, but to engagement of citizens of Ecuador and Peru as a whole. This study demonstrated that overall civic engagement tends to be quite low—regardless of gender. While compulsory voting appears to have been successful in getting citizens to the polls, other forms of engagement are rare.

Reflecting back on Arnsteins’ ladder of participation (1969), this type of engagement would at most be considered consultation, as it invites citizens to express their opinions and preferences on representatives and identified issues, but does not allow them to raise concerns or guarantee that their concerns will be addressed. This is particularly true in Latin America, a region that is known for the practice of ‘bait-and-switch’ politics (Drake, 1991). It is not uncommon for candidates to campaign on populist platforms, which are likely to benefit the poor, and abandon these policies after winning elections as a result of various other pressures (Adelman, 1994). Although this study focuses on the engagement of women, the results speak to overall levels of civic health within these two countries. Participation is a cornerstone of democracy however its significance is only reflected in the quality of participation. Participation should serve as a method of citizen empowerment, and be associated with results that reflect
citizen needs. Citizen engagement also helps promote ‘good governance’. Good governance relies on the ability of citizens to freely express opinions, freely associate, participate in selecting government, and influence government priorities. Groups that are more engaged are also better equipped to monitor local government; keeping government accountable, responsive, and equitable.

Interestingly, the second most common form of citizen engagement among this sample was helping to solve a community problem. Based on Cooper et al.’s dimensions of citizen centered collaborative public management, this would fall under one of the most influential forms of engagement, civil society (Cooper et al., 2005). Further research needs to explore engagement in this activity. As Dalton notes, contact of public officials requires a high investment of time, and is often motivated by specific policy demands (2008). Based on the responses, it appears that citizens are trying to solve community problems without requesting assistance from government offices or public officials, at the local, regional, or federal level. This indicates that citizens may be engaged, but for reasons unspecified in this study prefer to help their communities without consulting with government. Although this result may not reflect positively on the government, it does provide a positive outlook for the future of civic engagement within these two countries, as it demonstrates a feeling of community investment among the population.

5.2 Women’s Civic Engagement

Focusing now on women’s civic engagement, the results of this study coincide with the expectations set forth in the literature. Women participated less in all forms of civic activity, with
the exception of requesting help from government, in which participation in all groups was very low. The literature provides us with several explanations for women’s lower tendency to be civically engaged. These explanations include political socialization, discouraging women from playing an active political role; family responsibilities; and an overrepresentation of women in demographic groups that have low participation (Welch, 1977). Gender continued to serve as a statistically significant predictor of civic engagement, as expected. Other contributing factors included urban/rural setting, age, and education. When the models were broken down based on gender, ethnicity was noted as a statistically significant predictor of civic engagement for males, but not for females. This finding is reflective of the long history of indigenous women’s movements in both countries (Yashar, 1998). Although not the focus of this study, this finding suggests that further exploration into the effect of ethnicity is needed.

5.3 Gender Differences in Social Capital

This study empirically validated many of the assumptions put forth in the literature about women’s social capital. For females, religious groups were a stronger component in forming the membership portion of social capital. For males, sports and recreation groups played a stronger role. These results are not surprising, but they provide further support that men and women don’t acquire their social capital in the same ways. Furthermore, this is the first study to examine the impact of both membership and trust on gender differences in civic engagement. The findings show that women actually tended to be less trusting of people within their community, although this did not have a significant effect on their likelihood for civic engagement. Furthermore, trust
in local/municipal government was a stronger contributor to the trust component of social capital for women.

5.4 Implications

5.4.1 Theoretical Implications

Although social capital has been broadly studied in a variety of fields, few studies consider the importance of gender differences in how social capital is acquired, and the effect that this has on the positive outcomes associated with it. In a classic example, Robert Putnam measures social capital by involvement in sports groups (1991). However, based on the results of the current study it is clear that sports groups are a more appropriate measure for male social capital than female social capital. Thus, in an overall assessment of social capital within a community, the measurement is flawed to display a lack of social capital among females. In Putnam’s seminal work, he argues that part of the decline in social capital in the United States can be attributed to the entry of women into the workforce (1995). However, it is possible that this decline is more related to a lack of consideration for the ways in which gender affects the formation of social capital. This study provides some insight related to future measurement of the social capital construct, and needs further testing in a variety of political and cultural contexts.

Social capital and civic engagement are dependent on the cultural and political context in which they are being studied. This study provides further evidence of this phenomenon, as it analyzed two countries with very similar historical, cultural, and political experiences. In contrast to the findings of a similar study conducted on all 18 Latin American countries included
in the LAPOP survey (Espinal & Zhao, 2015), this study finds no significant differences in civic engagement between the two selected countries. This suggests that the similarities in these contexts account for the lack of an observable difference between countries. The importance of context is also notable in the lack of significance of ethnicity as a predictor for civic engagement among women in this sample. Due to the historical nature of indigenous movements, and the high proportion of indigenous people within these two countries, the context of the study affects the way social capital and other factors interact with civic engagement. In order to understand these relationships in other contexts, the study needs to be replicated with variation in political, historical, and cultural factors.

In assessments of social capital for both genders, professional and community association memberships consistently demonstrated stronger impacts on social capital. This finding is reflective of Norris and Inglehart’s analysis of formal and informal group memberships (2006). It is generally argued that social capital increases civic engagement by reducing transaction costs for acquiring political knowledge (Warren, Sulaiman, Jaafar, 2015), and promotes collective action by building a stronger sense of community (Kapucu, 2011). Depending on the ways in which social capital is built, measured by the type of associational memberships an individual is involved with, it is possible that the outcomes of social capital may vary. Professional associations and community improvement groups have a clear connection with public policy. Thus, one can expect that during these meetings there will be some discussion of the ways in which policy shapes the actions and capabilities of these organizations. In contrast, religious and sports groups don’t always have a clear linkage with public policy and thus involvement in these
groups may not have as significant an effect on civic engagement, even though members feel embedded in the community.

Given the results of this study, the traditional notion of social capital having a positive impact on civic engagement has been partially supported. Group membership had a strong relationship with civic engagement, however trust was not a statistically significant factor. This is contradictory to some findings (Benson & Rochon, 2004), and supportive of others (Cuvale, 2013). This is another factor that could be context specific. As young democracies, levels of trust in government could be in a period of fluctuation. It is interesting to note that among the various types of government trust presented in the survey, citizens were most trusting of the president. This finding could be related to the fact that citizens are very likely to turn out to vote in a presidential election. This finding supports the need for civic engagement, as it could be associated with higher levels of government trust.

Social role theory was applied to this study as an explanation for gender differences in social capital and civic engagement (Eagly, 1987). Given the findings of the study, the theory is applicable in two ways. Primarily, the study demonstrated that significant differences exist in levels of civic engagement between men and women. Although both groups had similar stocks of social capital, women still tended to be less engaged. The model provides some additional explanations for this, reflecting what previous research has found with respect to age, rurality, education and income. However, other factors need to be considered in further research with respect to social roles. For example, this study was unable to account for the impact of domestic time constraints, familial or kinship ties, and childcare. Additional study can examine the effect of these factors to further contribute to the applicability of social role theory.
Second, differences were found with respect to how social capital is acquired based on gender. These differences indicated that religious organizations were a stronger contributor to social capital for women. This finding coincides with the traditional expectation that women are more involved in informal relationships, and can be traced back to the Latin American history of women’s involvement in the Catholic Church. Thus, although gender differences in social capital did not contribute to differences in civic engagement, social capital can still be considered to be sensitive to the influence of social roles.

5.4.2 Practical Implications

The impact of social capital extends well beyond the outcome of civic engagement. In an ethnographic study of women’s social capital and microfinance schemes in Bolivia, the author observes that women earn a great deal of social capital, but that maintaining their relationships can be a burden (McLean, 2010). In this case, women did not have time outside of the microfinance project to participate in other community activities, and they were also afraid to get ahead of any other members of the project as they didn’t want to lose any of the valuable social capital that they had earned. The fear of leaving the community to sell goods that they had produced was actually detrimental to their development, although they were able to maintain their stocks of social capital by respecting the norms of the community. This is one example in which gender differences in social capital formation were not considered prior to implementation of a program. Although the present study does not focus on economic development, it provides further support that consideration needs to be taken on how social capital is formed in order to understand its effects, particularly in situations where it is being intentionally built. The
implications of this could apply to the many outcomes linked with social capital including crime, health, and education.

With respect to civic engagement, this study finds that although women earned their social capital differently, they utilized it in the same ways as men. This would lead us to believe that if social capital and civic engagement are linked, women must have less social capital. However, comparison of overall “stocks” of social capital indicate that there is little difference between men and women- with the exception of women having significantly less inter-personal trust (although this was not associated with civic engagement). What this suggests is that there are other factors that need to be considered in determining why women participate less.

Prior research has provided cues for understanding gender gaps in civic engagement including women’s lower access to critical resources (especially income), however many of these studies note that even when these factors are held constant women still participate less, have less knowledge about politics, and are less interested (Verba, Burns, Schlozman, 1997). The hypotheses presented in this tested the notion that gender differences in social capital could be a potential factor resulting in less participation, however this hypothesis was not supported. With many of the common factors explored, this signals a need for further investigation of the effect of historical and social explanations. Other studies have noted a difference in female expectations as a result of social cues noting that politics is a “man’s world”, although these effects have been slight and under explored (Verba, Burns, Schlozman, 1997).

Studies of political socialization could point to other explanations for the gender gap in participation. This could explore the way gender roles, or social expectations, shape civic education at a young age. It is possible that a lack of sufficient information about politics is
delivered to girls, or that involvement in politics is more encouraged for boys. Moreover, some research has suggested that women participate less due to having fewer signals and role models that motivate participation. This argument is heavily debated, and serves as part of the support for establishing gender quotas. It is expected that women who receive signals of being ‘fit’ to be involved in politics, and have female role models to demonstrate this, will be more engaged. However, evidence of this is contradictory, especially within the Latin American region (Zetterberg, 2009). It is possible that this effect needs more time to become embedded into the political culture, and that young girls who are currently being raised in an environment with more numbers of females in elected office will have greater levels of engagement. Additionally, due to a lack of sufficient available data, this study was unable to further explore differences in participation as explained by the domestic burden of childcare, however this is a critical component that needs to be analyzed in future research.

Furthermore, participation in formal groups (such as community or professional groups) was a strong indicator of overall social capital. For organizations interested in increasing women’s civic engagement, a mechanism to encourage engagement in the political process could be initiating engagement in a professional or community group. While gender is the focus of this study due to the lower level of engagement among women, this recommendation is applicable both to males and females. Community or professional group membership could be an avenue for those who may lack political interest or knowledge to gain political information, and understand the ways in which their engagement would affect their community life and professions. This could also be a component for increasing deliberative engagement— in the form of contact of public officials. As Dalton notes, contacting public officials is often utilized for
addressing specific policy concerns (2008). With membership in a group with particular goals and interests, citizens could be more likely to participate in deliberative engagement. It could also teach critical political skills, such as how to find information, and how to participate in other forms of the political process.

5.5 Limitations

Although this study attempts to control for issues related to validity and reliability, it is not without limitations. To begin, debate exists over which variables are defined as determinants or outcomes of social capital (Narayan & Cassidy, 2001). This study utilizes existing research to construct measurement models for social capital, however with a construct that is not concretely defined, there is a potential for issues with endogeneity. Additional work is needed in the measurement of social capital, and this study aims to contribute to fill this gap in the literature. Within this study, model revisions allowed for an appropriate fit of the measurement model for social capital to the data. However, either due to the categorical nature of the data, its non-normality, or the large sample size with WLSMV estimation, some of the models did not meet the suggested thresholds for goodness of fit. This finding indicates that there are possibly better measures for social capital that were not included in this study.

While this study attempts to capture an accurate measure of social capital, the LAPOP survey lacks a measure for informal ties (as measured by the importance of family or kinship ties). While other similar surveys, such as the World Values Survey, measure informal ties, they lack the large variation in measures for civic engagement. Future research should focus on the
inclusion of informal ties as well as various civic engagement measures into one instrument to allow for this analysis.

Furthermore, measures for civic engagement were limited to include only measures available in the existing data from the LAPOP. For instance, the item for “information exchange” was measured by sharing political information online, limiting the type of engagement that is captured. According to research conducted by the LAPOP, there is only a small gender divide in regular internet usage in Latin America (42% for males and 37% for females), however this could serve as an additional explanation for the gender gap in information exchange (Zechmeister, Saunders, Brunelle, 2012). The survey item measuring voting was also transformed to a dichotomous (yes/no) measure, however the survey included four available responses encompassing differing activities. The researcher included any form of voter turn-out; however the option including a blank ballot could be interpreted as a non-vote. Although this was not the focus of this study, further research should investigate whether purposely nullifying votes should be included as a measure of civic engagement.

Debate exists over the best level of measurement for social capital- aggregate of individual (Newton, 2001). This study uses individual level data; however future studies of group level data could also be useful within this particular context. Furthermore, external studies have indicated that there is a potential over-sampling of urban areas, which could possibly affect the results of the study.
5.6 Generalizability

The impact of cultural factors on development of social capital is under-explored in the literature. With the limited existing research on social capital in Latin America, further studies could explore the generalizability of these findings to other countries in Latin America. Although countries within the region share a similar historical past, cultural differences are difficult to measure, but expected to exist. Using ethnic population demographics as an example, these findings could apply to other countries with large numbers of indigenous populations such as Bolivia, Guatemala, and Mexico which may share more cultural similarities. Outside of Latin America, the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) reports that the Asian region hosts the largest number of indigenous groups. The results of this study could potentially apply to groups in the Asian region which share similar cultural values.

5.7 Future Research

As noted, research on social capital using secondary data sources is limited in the types of memberships and ties that are measured. Considering this limitation, future research should emphasize various types of memberships and incorporate these into social capital measures. Of particular importance are familial and friendship ties, which were not measured in this study. There is the potential that women could have a greater density of ties in these areas, which would add further explanation to differences in social capital. Future research needs to incorporate these measures.

---

2 Data from the WVS was explored in order to examine this effect at a superficial level. Based on WVS data for Ecuador and Peru from 2012, there was not a significant gender difference in ‘family or kinship ties’, therefore this
Furthermore, qualitative research would add richness to the data provided in these types of studies. Although the large sample size allows for greater generalizability and more robust results, qualitative research could add more value that would be of use to policy makers. Some of the information that this qualitative research could capture would include information on differences in the availability of time resulting from unequal shares of child care or domestic responsibilities. Interviews and observations could also be conducted to understand how women use their social capital in other ways. For example, Lowndes suggests that women in Britain use their social capital to ‘get by’ with their daily activities, such as asking a friend or neighbor for assistance with childcare, while men use their social capital to ‘get on’, seeking employment or other opportunities for advancement (2004). Qualitative research could delve into this question further- understanding if time constraints, domestic responsibilities, or the nature of the differences in how social capital is formed contribute to variations in how it is used in other contexts.

Finally, political socialization is an under-explored area, and could provide additional insight about the social factors that contribute to gender gaps in participation. Small scale studies, including experimental studies, could explore the importance of ‘signals’ and ‘role models’ and their effect in encouraging civic engagement among women and girls. Taking these factors into consideration, policy makers interested in increasing engagement among women could gain ideas about developing programs to encourage engagement.

is not considered to be a significant threat to the study, however its inclusion would allow for more theoretically robust results in the future.
5.8 Conclusion

This study examined gender differences on the impact of social capital on civic engagement in Ecuador and Peru. The study empirically tested the assumption that women’s social capital is different than men’s. Results indicated that although differences exist in what social capital ‘looks like’ by gender, the impact of social capital on civic engagement is the same for males and females. Both groups benefit from the relationships, reduced transaction costs, and information attained as part of their social capital. The findings also demonstrated that some of the conventional knowledge on women’s civic engagement needs to be re-assessed, as ethnicity is not a significant predictor of civic engagement for women. This study is unique in that it explores the viability of social capital measures based on context and one individual factor (gender). The findings suggest that group membership plays an important role in promoting civic engagement, and that this can be utilized as a mechanism to increase the overall levels of civic engagement within communities.
APPENDIX A: RELEVANT SURVEY QUESTIONS
Excerpts of Master Core Survey Items Utilized in Study

Country – 9 Ecuador; 11 Peru
IDNUM – Questionnaire number
UR
(1) Urban
(2) Rural

Q1 [Note down; do not ask] Sex:
(1) Male
(2) Female

Q2 Age (18-89)

Cp2
“Sometimes people and communities have problems that they cannot solve by themselves, and so in order to solve them they request help from a government official or agency. In order to solve problems, have you ever requested help or cooperation from a member of congress/parliament?”
(1) Yes
(2) No

Cp4a
“Sometimes people and communities have problems that they cannot solve by themselves, and so in order to solve them they request help from a government official or agency. In order to solve problems, have you ever requested help or cooperation from a member of a local public official or local government for example, a mayor, municipal council, councilman, provincial official, civil governor or governor?”
(1) Yes
Cp4
“Sometimes people and communities have problems that they cannot solve by themselves, and so in order to solve them they request help from a government official or agency. In order to solve problems, have you ever requested help or cooperation from any ministry or minister (federal), state agency or public agency or institution?”

(1) Yes
(2) No

Np1
“Now let’s talk about your local municipality. Have you attended a town meeting, city council meeting, or other meeting in the past 12 months?”

(1) Yes
(2) No

Np2
“Now let’s talk about your local municipality. Have you sought assistance from or presented a request to any office, official, or councilperson of the municipality within the past 12 months?”

(1) Yes
(2) No

Cp5
“Now, changing the subject. In the past 12 months have you tried to help solve a problem in your community or in your neighborhood? Please tell me if you did it at least once a week, once or twice a month, once or twice a year or never in the last 12 months?”

(1) Once a week
(2) Once or twice a month
(3) Once or twice a year
(4) Never

“I am going to read you a list of groups of organizations. Please tell me if you attend meetings of these organizations once a week, once or twice a month, once or twice a year, or never”.

(1) Once a week
(2) Once or twice a month
(3) Once or twice a year
(4) Never

Cp6 Religious organization
Cp7 Meeting of a parents’ association at school
Cp8 Meetings of a community improvement committee or association
Cp9 Meetings of an association of professionals, merchants, manufacturers, or farmers?
Cp13 Meetings of a political party or political organization?
Cp20 Meetings of associations or groups of women or homemakers?
Cp21 Meetings of sports or recreation groups?

It1
“Speaking of people from around here, would you say that people in this community are:”

   (1) Very trustworthy
   (2) Somewhat trustworthy
   (3) Not very trustworthy
   (4) Untrustworthy

Prot3
In the last 12 months, have you participated in a demonstration or protest march?

   (1) Yes
   (2) No

Prot6
In the last 12 months have you signed any petition?

   (1) Yes
   (2) No

Prot8
In the last 12 months, have you read or shared political information through any social network website such as Twitter or Facebook or Orkut?

   (1) Yes
   (2) No

I am going to ask you a series of questions. I am going to ask that you use the numbers provided in the ladder to answer. Remember, you can use any number. (1 not at all – 7 a lot)

To what extent do you trust:

   B10a The justice system
   B11 The supreme electoral tribunal
   B13 The national legislature
   B18 The national police
   B21 Political parties
   B21a
If the next presidential elections were being held this week, what would you do?

1. Wouldn’t vote
2. Would vote for the incumbent candidate or party
3. Would vote for a candidate or party different from the current administration
4. Would go vote but would leave the ballot blank or would purposely cancel my vote

How many years of schooling have you completed

1. Primary 1-6
2. Secondary 7-12
3. University 13-18+

Into which of the following income ranges does the total monthly income of this household fit, including remittances from abroad and the income of all the working adults and children?

(REVERSE CODED 0-16 MORE THAN $2110=00, re-coded into smaller groups)

00 No income
01 Less than $40
02 $40-$90
03 $91-$130
04 $1131-$180
05 $181-$220
06 $221-$260
07 $261-$310
08 $311-$350
09 $351-$400
10 $401-$460
11 $461-$530
12 $531-$790
13 $791-$1060
14 $1061-$1580
15 $1581-$2110
16 More than $2110
What is your marital status?

(1) Single
(2) Married
(3) Common law marriage
(4) Divorced
(5) Separated
(6) Widowed

ETID

(1) White
(2) Mestizo
(3) Indigenous
(4) Black
(5) Mulatto
(7) Other
APPENDIX C: MEASUREMENT MODEL FOR CIVIC ENGAGEMENT (FULL SAMPLE)
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