

Citizenship and Political Participation in Colombia: How Orientations Toward Citizenship Associate with Political and Civic Behaviors

MATTHEW BARNIDGE
TIMOTHY MACAFEE
GERMAN ALVAREZ
HERNANDO ROJAS

University of Wisconsin–Madison, USA

This study identifies social-psychological variables that predict various types of political and civic behaviors in Colombia. While previous research shows declines in civic-group membership, it also shows increases in other forms of participation. Using data from a national biennial survey of an urban adult population, we construct a two-by-two typology of political efficacy and trust in governmental institutions. We use subsequent hierarchical regression analysis to show that citizenship orientation is a significant factor in predicting interactive-interpersonal, community, and online engagement.

Keywords: citizenship, online communication, political efficacy, trust in government, Colombia

Historically, assessing the “health” of democracy has been popular among academics. Putnam (2000) famously argues that declines in a democratic society’s social capital resulted in its declining health. Almond and Verba (1965) links a society’s social-psychological dispositions with democratic stability. Both theoretical perspectives make normative claims about what a healthy democracy should be. For Putnam (2000), a healthy democracy is characterized by voluntary civic participation. For Almond and Verba (1965), a healthy democracy has a civic culture comprised of the right mix of social-psychological orientations. Yet these perspectives fail to consider larger structural conditions that facilitate or constrain the factors they examine.

Matthew Barnidge: mbarnidge@wisc.edu

Timothy Macafee: macafee@wisc.edu

German Alvarez: gaalvarez@wisc.edu

Hernando Rojas: hrojas@wisc.edu

Date submitted: 2012–06–10

Copyright © 2014 (Matthew Barnidge, Timothy Macafee, German Alvarez & Hernando Rojas). Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial No Derivatives (by-nc-nd). Available at <http://ijoc.org>.

"Democracy," Papacharissi (2010) argues, "is often treated as a static concept" (p. 11). However, implementing rule by the people is bound by "the unique economic, cultural, and political conditions of each society" (Papacharissi, 2010, p. 11). Free elections and free information exchange remain indicators of a functioning democracy (Przeworski, 1991), yet the structures of political institutions and the mass media may promote or constrain the efficaciousness of specific political behaviors (Papacharissi, 2010). Therefore, it is important to consider how communication patterns shape individuals' perceptions about the government and their political orientations (McLeod, 2001; McLeod et al., 2001; Shah, McLeod, & Yoon, 2001) while also recognizing that these behaviors are constrained by institutional structures. This study addresses this problem by examining communication, citizenship, and political participation in a different context than those that have been previously studied. Colombia is a developing Latin American nation whose democratic institutions have gained renewed legitimacy after years of political and social turmoil. The study examines how patterns of communication in Colombia relate to social-psychological attitudes toward the state—attitudes that help to define citizenship—and how both these patterns and attitudes associate with various forms of political behaviors. We recognize that political participation is but one indicator of democratic functionality, which is facilitated and constrained by institutional and structural factors, and we further assume that political-engagement repertoires are diversifying worldwide (Bennett, 2008; Dalton, 2009; Norris, 2001; Perez & Rojas, 2010).

Theories of Citizenship

Although some social critics claim that civic and political participation has recently declined in Western societies (Delli Carpini & Keeter, 1996; Putnam, 2000), others have argued against this idea, suggesting that individuals are engaging with politics in new ways that differ from traditional political engagement (Bennett, 1998; Norris, 2002). While many still consider activities such as voting or joining civil-society organizations to be central to civic participation, a growing number of individuals are less interested in such civic obligations and more interested in individualized engagement, including consumerism and volunteering (Bennett, 2008). These observations have led some to theorize that people have adopted new styles citizenship (Bennett, 2008; Dalton, 2008, 2009).

Some have defined citizenship as an identity that situates an individual within a society (Conover, Crewe, & Searing, 1991). Others define it as a relationship between an individual and a state (Van Deth, 2007). We adopt this latter definition, arguing that social-psychological orientations shaped by communicative patterns facilitate an individual's relationship with the state and society. A growing chorus of scholars has observed changes in citizenship styles, arguably caused by technological, social, and economic changes (Bennett, 2008; Bennett, Wells, & Freelon, 2011 Dalton, 2009; Denters, Gabriel, & Torcal, 2007; Van Deth, 2007). Some citizens have changed the ways they engage as the state and society have changed. The older *dutiful* style involves a large group mentality, a willingness to serve in public office for the greater good, a focus on local affairs and community, and a trust in government and elections (Bennett, 2008; Dalton, 2008, 2009). The newer *actualizing* citizenship style emphasizes autonomous political expression and sees civic duty and engagement in individualistic terms. Actualizing citizens connect specific events and issues with their personal lives rather than view themselves as insignificant parts of a greater whole. Other literature supplements or extends this work, examining citizenship styles in the international context (Norris, 2001; Perez & Rojas, 2010). For example, Norris

(2001) shows that the shrinking digital divide facilitates looser networks of affiliation and participation in a wider range of national contexts, while Perez and Rojas (2010) have previously examined changes in Colombian citizenship. One common theme in this literature is that an individual's citizenship style is related to the forms of political participation in which he or she engages.

H1: Citizenship styles will associate with forms of political participation.

Communication and Citizenship

Almond and Verba (1965) suggest that an individual's orientation toward citizenship is influenced by contextual factors. One such factor is communication. Indeed, democracy places a premium on free information exchange, through a free press and post. But information exchange itself has been subject to society-wide technological shifts. Examining the impact of these changes on individual communication and participation patterns is especially important (Bennett, 2008; Schudson, 1998). Empirical evidence shows that communication patterns influence the ways individuals orient themselves toward politics and civil society (McLeod, 2001; McLeod et al., 2001; Shah et al., 2001). Interpersonal and mediated communication helps people develop notions of what it means to be a citizen, including their political priorities and principles (Canclini, 2001; Dahlgren, 2004, 2005; Papacharissi, 2010). Further, communication patterns help individuals to develop social-psychological dispositions such as governmental trust and views of political efficacy (Cho et al., 2009; Jung, Kim, & Gil de Zúñiga, 2011; Shah et al., 2007). Moreover, communication can reinforce or change the way an individual approaches the political process. An individual develops a disposition toward citizenship through attention to mediated information and interpersonal interaction, and this disposition can have a substantial impact on that individuals' political and civic participation (Canclini, 2001; Dahlgren, 2004, 2005; Papacharissi, 2010). While it is clear that communication patterns should relate to political orientation, the question of how communication patterns associate with citizenship orientation remains.

Online social networking sites afford individuals the opportunity to create public or semipublic profiles and connect with other users within a bounded system (boyd & Ellison, 2007). These media make possible many-to-many interpersonal connections as individuals create links in a public space. The social networks these media enable allow for easy coordination of social and political activity (Rheingold, 2008). These personalized and interactive communication platforms arguably increase the autonomy of an individual to receive or produce information and form associations online (Benkler, 2006).

That digital media combine interpersonal connections and mass-mediated information exchange means that they may help shape orientations toward citizenship. Bennett (2008) suggests that emergent actualizing citizens favor community action facilitated by loose social ties that are maintained by interactive information technologies. Political organizations that exist primarily offline use the Internet to reproduce a traditional citizenship framework. However, political organizations that exist largely online have moved away from established conventions and encouraged civic self-expression (Bennett et al., 2011). Thus, digital media may facilitate political action in peer-to-peer networks (Loader & Mercea, 2011). Overall, digital media provide new ways to seek and share information with specific social contacts

or with egocentric networks. These affordances have likely altered the ways some people understand what it means to be an engaged citizen.

Empirical evidence suggests that digital media do associate with newer forms of political engagement. For example, online social interaction and information seeking are antecedents of online expression about news and politics online (Puig-i-Abril & Rojas, 2007). Likewise, sending political e-mails or news stories to friends and associates with sending e-mails to news-media editors and political candidates and signing online petitions (Gil de Zúñiga, Veenstra, Vraga, & Shah, 2010). Finally, attention to political blogs is associated with online political participation (Gil de Zúñiga, Puig-i-Abril, & Rojas, 2009). On social networking sites specifically, frequent users also tend to volunteer and engage with their communities (Zhang, Johnson, Seltzer, & Bichard, 2009). In addition, turning to these sites for news relates positively to political consumerism and online political messaging (Gil de Zúñiga, Jung, & Valenzuela, 2012). Finally, sharing information and opinions has been shown to relate to offline participation (Macafee & De Simone, 2012). In all, the literature suggests that individuals who use digital media to get political information and share it with others are also likely to engage in emergent political behaviors. Generalizing from this evidence, we hypothesize that communication patterns should associate with citizenship styles.

H2: Communication patterns will associate with the styles of citizenship.

Measuring Citizenship

Recent research has defined and measured citizenship as a social norm (Dalton, 2009; Denters et al., 2007; Shah, McLeod, & Lee, 2009; Thorson, in press; Van Deth, 2007) that can influence the ways people participate in politics (Dalton, 2009). Further, the effects of norms on participation are typically mediated through communication (Shah et al., 2009; Thorson, in press). This article complements this literature by examining social-psychological orientations rather than norms, and Bennett (2008) lists several orientations that associate with citizenship styles. Dutiful citizens have more trust in government institutions than actualizing citizens, who prefer extra-institutional means of influencing the government. These social-psychological orientations—trust in the government and views of political efficacy—are presented in a two-by-two typology in Figure 1. Different people have different mixtures of these orientations, and these differences probably have implications for behavior (Almond & Verba, 1965; Perez & Rojas, 2010).

These variables were an integral part of Almond and Verba's (1965) civic-culture studies. They suggest that democratic stabilization during African decolonization can be explained by examining an aggregate of social-psychological variables. They also argue that a healthy civic culture thrives on having the right mix of these variables. Thus, this study shares much with Almond and Verba's, as it uses social-psychological variables to create a typology of citizenship. Our approach recognizes the possibility that people could adopt different orientations at different times but places importance on how an orientation adopted at a particular point can influence political behavior. There are also important differences between this study and Almond and Verba's. Because social-psychological orientations are individual variables, this study examines individual behaviors as outcomes. Furthermore, the study does not assume that

orientations comprise a culture or determine democratic health. Rather, we argue that citizenship orientations help to explain the range of individual political behavior, given the economic and institutional constraints that facilitate or constrain those behaviors.

Political efficacy, here, is more accurately described as a combination of external and internal self-efficacy. Citizens who feel they have little power to understand and influence civic and political affairs have low political efficacy, whereas citizens who feel empowered to exact political change have high political efficacy, an actualizing orientation (Bennett, 2008). These individuals feel informed and empowered to influence the government. Their more traditional dutiful counterparts are likely to have low political efficacy, as they believe in the group and institutional participation rather than in individualized action. Low trust in government institutions could also be considered an actualizing orientation toward citizenship, while high trust could be characterized as a dutiful orientation. Actualizing citizens feel dissatisfied with institutional political and civic engagement and seek alternative outlets for engagement. Some people may feel high levels of efficacy and high levels of trust. These citizens most closely resemble *integrated* citizens (Perez & Rojas, 2010), who emphasize duties and rights equally and are likely to participate in many ways. Conversely, people with low levels of each are not expected to engage in politics at all.

Context of the Study

These ideas about citizenship have been developed in the United States and other Western nations, but it is also important to understand how these ideas might be applied in the developing world. This study uses data from a national representative sample of Colombian adults in urban areas. Hence, these data provide an excellent opportunity to analyze citizenship in a different national setting from previous analyses. Because international politics and global corporatism have promoted changes in citizenship (Bennett, 2008; Norris, 2001), it seems plausible that new citizenship styles might also be prevalent in developing nations. Furthermore, Colombia's violent and polarized history has resulted in a decline in trust in the federal government and a rise in efforts to promote transparency and responsiveness in local government, particularly in urban areas (Rojas & Puig-i-Abril, 2009). These conditions should make it more likely that emergent citizenship orientations would arise in Colombia. One important consideration, however, is that the digital divide might be greater in Colombia than in the United States, where the divide has shrunk. About half of the respondents in the survey do not have Internet access. Only about 12% participate in politics online. These data align with previous findings (Norris, 2001) suggesting that Internet use in Latin America is significantly lower than the worldwide average. However, recent data collected by Nielson Online and the International Telecommunications Union suggest that Internet use is growing in Latin America at the third highest rate in the world and that Internet penetration in the region is the highest in the developing world (Internet World Stats, 2010).

Low Efficacy	High Efficacy	
Dutiful Orientation	Integrated Orientation	High Trust
Nonparticipatory Orientation	Actualizing Orientation	Low Trust

Figure 1. Typology of citizenship orientation based on political efficacy and trust in governmental institutions.

Methods

Sample and Data

This study uses survey data collected between July 29 and August 20, 2010, in 10 cities in Colombia by the Universities of Wisconsin and Externado de Colombia as part of their biennial study of communication and political attitudes in Colombia. The sample was designed to represent Colombia's adult urban population—76% of Colombia's 44.5 million inhabitants live in urban areas, according to the 2008 study. Survey respondents were selected using a multistep, stratified sample procedure that selected households randomly based on city size and census data. Once the number of households was determined for a given city, a number of city blocks were selected randomly according to housing districts and the Colombian national household energy strata. Then, individual households were randomly selected within each block. Finally, the study used the "adult in the household who most recently celebrated a birthday" technique to identify an individual respondent at random. Surveyors made up to three visits to each household (if necessary) to increase participation in the survey. A local professional polling firm, Deproyectos Limitada, collected the data, obtaining 1,064 face-to-face responses for an 85% response rate.

Measures

Citizenship orientation. The citizenship-orientation variables were created from two source variables: political efficacy and trust in government. The political efficacy variable averaged standardized scores from five survey items using 4-point or 6-point scales ($\alpha = .75$, $M = .00$, $SD = .07$). The efficacy

variable combines the dimensions of external and internal efficacy. For example, questions ask respondents to what extent they agree (0 = Totally Disagree, 5 = Totally Agree) that people like them can have an influence on local government, that the national government cares what people like them think, and that the city government responds to the initiatives of the people. Other questions ask respondents to what extent they agree (0 = Totally Disagree, 3 = Totally Agree) that they are more informed about politics and government than most other people, and that they understand the most important political themes in the country. The trust-in-government variable spans eight survey questions measured on 6-point scales ($\alpha = .91$, $M = 1.97$, $SD = 1.08$) and includes questions asking about the respondent's level of trust (0 = None, 5 = A Lot) in the congress, in judges, in political parties, in the national government, and in the supreme court. Other questions ask how well the congress, the attorney general, and the comptroller perform their oversight functions (0 = Very Badly, 5 = Very Well), and the final variable uses the average of the eight items.

Using the political-efficacy and trust-in-government variables, we created a binary (0 = Low, 1 = High) dummy variable for each, using the midpoint of the scales as split points (0 for the standardized political-efficacy variable and 3 for the trust-in-government variable). A two-by-two typology was created using these binary variables (see Figure 1). High efficacy but low trust is considered an actualizing orientation (38%). The opposite orientation—low efficacy and high trust—is considered a dutiful orientation (8.1%). High levels of both represent an integrated orientation (10.2%), while low levels of both represent a nonparticipatory orientation (43.7%). We entered three of the four citizenship-orientation variables into the regression models and used the fourth variable—the nonparticipatory variable—as a control comparison group. This analytic method is described in more detail below.

Political and civic participation. We created the political-participation variable by adding together five survey items asking whether (0 = No, 1 = Yes) in the last 12 months respondents had attended a political rally, a political protest, a city meeting, or a city council meeting or had signed a petition ($\alpha = .71$, $M = .57$, $SD = 1.07$).¹ The community-participation variable was created by summing five survey items (0 = No, 1 = Yes) asking whether in the last 12 months respondents engaged in activities such as volunteering, participating in a community project, donating to an NGO, donating to a church, or attending a community meeting ($\alpha = .71$, $M = 1.03$, $SD = 1.36$). Finally, the online-participation variable sums two survey items (dedicate your status on a social network and volunteer online for a political campaign) measured on 6-point scales (0 = Never, 5 = Frequently; $r = .70$, $M = 0.59$, $SD = 1.91$).

Communication. The analyses examine a range of communication variables: political talk network size, political talk diversity, television news, print news, Internet access, online news, online political messaging, and social network site (SNS) network size. Political talk network size was measured

¹ We also assessed the relationship between citizenship orientation and voting, but no significant relationships were found using logit and OLS regression analysis. Each Colombian presidential election has a general round and a run-off round. Hence, we measured and analyzed voting in two ways: voting in the first round only (64%), and voting in both rounds (54.6%). Yes-or-no questions were used for both rounds, and combining the responses yielded $\alpha = .82$, $r = .69$, $M = 0.61$, $SD = 0.44$.

by adding four survey items asking respondents to recall the number of family members, acquaintances, neighbors, and friends with whom they talk politics ($\alpha = .66$). The average respondent talks politics with between 8 and 9 people ($M = 8.72$, $SD = 11.30$). Political talk diversity was measured by averaging six items measured on 6-point scales (0 = Never, 5 = Frequently) that asked respondents how often they talk politics with people who have different ideas from their own, with people on the left, with people on the right, with people of a different socioeconomic status, about the guerrilla issue in Colombia, and about the issue of gay marriage in Colombia ($\alpha = .86$, $M = 1.76$, $SD = 1.32$). The correlation between the two interpersonal talk variables is .48 ($p < .001$).

The television-news variable was created by adding together five survey items measured on 6-point scales (0 = Never, 5 = Frequently) asking respondents how frequently they watch national television news, international television news, political talk shows, television news about the 2010 presidential election, and the televised 2010 presidential election debates ($\alpha = .68$, $M = 14.84$, $SD = 5.77$). The print-news variable was created by adding together four survey items measured on the same 6-point scales asking respondents how frequently they read a national newspaper, a local newspaper, a news magazine, or print news about the 2010 presidential election ($\alpha = .70$, $M = 7.68$, $SD = 5.18$).

The Internet-access variable uses a single survey item asking respondents whether they have used the Internet in the last 12 months (Yes = 54.7%). Those who answered no skipped the remaining survey items about online activity. The online-news variable was created by adding together five survey items measured on 6-point scales (0 = Never, 5 = Frequently). Items asked how frequently respondents looked for news and information online, commented on an online news or opinion article, visited political blogs, looked for government information, or looked for information about the 2010 presidential election ($\alpha = .74$, $M = 6.31$, $SD = 6.04$). The online political-messaging variable was created by adding together four items measured on the same 6-point scale asking respondents how frequently they send or receive political information via e-mail, engage in discussion forums online, express their opinions about current events on social networking sites (SNSes), or mobilize their SNS contacts for social or political causes. Because some respondents indicated they did not belong to an SNS (21.6% of full sample, and 39.6% of those with Internet access), their responses for the SNS expression and mobilization items were recoded from "missing" to 0. The resulting variable formed a reliable index ($\alpha = .72$) and had a mean of 3.77 ($SD = 4.63$). Finally, the SNS network size variable asked respondents to recall how many SNS contacts they currently have. The average SNS user has about 150 contacts ($M = 157.35$, $SD = 217.56$).

Control variables. The analyses control for sex, age, education, socioeconomic status, political interest, political knowledge, and ideological extremity. Of the total number of respondents, 51.7% were female and 48.3% were male. The average age of the respondents is 41.6 years old ($SE = 16.25$). Education was measured on an 8-point scale (0 = none, 7 = postgraduate), and the average respondent has some high school education ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.49$). Socioeconomic status was measured using the Colombian system of national household energy level, which ranges from 1 to 6 ($M = 2.88$, $SD = 1.07$). This measure essentially captures the physical size and energy usage of respondents' households. Higher values indicate bigger houses and more energy usage.

The political-interest variable was created by averaging three items measured on 5-point scales ($\alpha = .92$, $M = 2.23$, $SD = 1.62$). Questions asked about interest in local, national, and international politics (0 = None, 5 = A Lot). To create the political knowledge variable, respondents were asked a series of multiple choice questions about national and international politics, all of which had factually correct answers. If respondents answered an item correctly, they received a score of 1 for that item, and they received a 0 if they answered incorrectly or indicated they didn't know the answer. Each individual's item scores were then added together to create the final variable, which ranges from 0 to 10 ($M = 0.11$, $SD = 0.10$). The ideological extremity variable was created by asking respondents to rate their political ideology on an 11-point scale (0 = Left, 5 = Center, 10 = Right). The scale was then folded so the center is equal to 0 and left and right are both equal to 5, and the average respondent is only slightly more extreme than the center ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 1.84$).

Analysis and Results

Eight logistic regression (logit) models, shown in Tables 1 and 2, assess the antecedent relationships between communication and citizenship orientation. Because the citizenship variables are binary, the models assess the probability that an individual belongs to a particular citizenship group based on associations between communication and citizenship. Two models were analyzed for each of the four citizenship orientations: one including only a binary variable for Internet access, and one including the other online variables (but not the Internet access variable). The reason for this, as discussed in more detail below, is that the inclusion of the online variables reduces the number of cases analyzed because many respondents indicated they do not have Internet access. The first set of logit predictors for each citizenship style was used in the models assessing the offline forms of political and community participation, while the second set was used to assess online political participation. Therefore, it seems appropriate to assess both sets of antecedent relationships.

Table 1 shows the relationships between communication and actualizing and dutiful citizenship, respectively. These citizenship styles were included on the same table because they are opposites—the actualizing group is high in efficacy but low in trust, while the dutiful group is low in efficacy but high in trust. None of the communication variables are significantly related to either of the citizenship groups in the full sample. However, in the subset of Internet users, online news is positively related to actualizing citizenship ($\beta = .06$, $SE = .03$, $p < .05$).

Table 2 shows similar models for the integrated and nonparticipatory citizenship groups. Once again, these groups are opposites—integrated citizens have high efficacy and high trust, while nonparticipatory citizens have low efficacy and low trust. Several of the communication variables, including political talk network size, television news, and print news, show an increased probability of belonging to the integrated group ($\beta = .02$, $SE = .01$, $p < .05$; $\beta = .08$, $SE = .03$, $p < .05$; $\beta = .07$, $SE = .02$, $p < .05$, respectively). Political talk diversity, on the other hand, decreases the probability of belonging to the integrated group ($\beta = -.28$, $SE = .10$, $p < .05$).

Table 1. The Predictors of Actualizing and Dutiful Citizenship Orientation in Colombia.

	Actualizing Citizenship		Dutiful Citizenship	
	Full Sample ^a	Online Only ^b	Full Sample ^a	Online Only ^b
Constant	-2.14*** (.39)	-2.40*** (.75)	-3.35*** (.67)	-1.69 (1.44)
Sex (1 = Female)	-.09 (.15)	.54* (.26)	-.31 (.26)	-.15 (.51)
Age	.00 (.01)	.01 (.01)	.00 (.01)	-.05 (.23)
Energy Stratum	-.08 (.08)	-.02 (.12)	.07 (.13)	.41 (.23)
Education	.17** (.07)	.17 (.13)	-.06 (.11)	-.30 (.25)
Pol. Interest	.22*** (.05)	.25** (.09)	-.17* (.09)	.08 (.18)
Pol. Knowledge	1.44* (.64)	.19 (1.11)	-1.67 (1.25)	-4.30 (2.54)
Ideological Extremity	-.08* (.04)	-.20** (.08)	.18** (.07)	-.02 (.14)
Pol. Talk Network Size	-.00 (.01)	-.00 (.01)	.01 (.01)	.03 (.02)
Pol. Talk Diversity	.09 (.07)	.31* (.12)	.20 (.11)	.10 (.22)
TV News	.03 (.02)	-.03 (.03)	.05 (.03)	.04 (.06)
Print News	.03 (.02)	-.06 (.03)	-.01 (.03)	.03 (.06)
Internet Access (1 = Yes)	-.12 (.19)	--	-.12 (.33)	--
Online News	--	.06* (.03)	--	-.05 (.06)
Online Political Messaging	--	.04 (.04)	--	-.03 (.07)
SNS Network Size	--	.00 (.00)	--	-.00 (.00)
Pseudo R^2	.11	.17	.03	.05
Log Likelihood	1161.65	383.48	493.09	133.78

Notes. Cell entries are logit coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$, two-tailed tests of significance; ^a $N = 955$; ^b $N = 322$.

Of these relationships, only the negative relationship with political talk diversity and the positive relationship with print news remain significant in the model including the online variables. For dutiful citizenship, both television and print news show a decreased probability of belonging to the group in the full sample ($\beta = -.07$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$; $\beta = -.05$, $SE = .02$, $p < .01$, respectively), while online news shows a decreased probability of belonging to the nonparticipatory group in the subset of Internet users ($\beta = -.09$, $SE = .03$, $p < .01$). Ultimately, these antecedent relationships illustrate clear patterns of difference between the citizenship styles in terms of communication and media use, lending support to Hypothesis 2. For example, actualizing citizens seem to rely on online news, while integrated citizens rely on interpersonal and offline forms of mass communication. Communication variables are not related to dutiful citizenship, while both offline and online communication are negatively related to nonparticipatory citizenship. Three OLS regression models assess the relationships between citizenship orientations and political and community participation. Because the citizenship-orientation variables represent categories of citizenship, they are treated as dummy variables (0 = No, 1 = Yes) in the models. Hence, the coefficients for the three types of citizenship included in the models (i.e., actualizing, integrated, and dutiful citizenship) are interpreted as conditional mean differences from the comparison group (nonparticipatory citizenship). The comparison group is not included in the models because observations in the other groups provide all necessary information about observations in the comparison group.

The first two models, shown in Table 3, examine non-electoral and community participation in the interpersonal context. In other words, the forms of participation assessed in Table 3 require a physical presence and interaction with other people. Because the inclusion of online variables reduces the number of cases to analyze, these models were estimated using a binary variable for Internet access (0 = No, 1 = Yes), which was a survey item that all respondents answered. The models also control for sex, age, education, and household energy stratum (a proxy for socioeconomic status), political interest, political knowledge, and ideological extremity, as well as several interpersonal and mass-communication variables.

The models in Table 3 illustrate how citizenship orientations associate with political and community participation. For political participation, the conditional mean for the actualizing citizenship group is significantly greater than the conditional mean for the nonparticipatory group ($\beta = .19$, $SE = .08$, $p < .05$), while the conditional means for the other citizenship groups are not significantly different from the comparison group. The beta coefficient indicates that the actualizing citizenship group engaged in about 6 acts of political engagement for every 5 acts in the nonparticipatory group. For community participation, on the other hand, it is the conditional mean for the integrated citizenship group that is significantly different from the nonparticipatory group ($\beta = .30$, $SE = .15$, $p < .05$), while the conditional means for the other citizenship groups are not. The coefficient indicates that the integrated group engaged in roughly 4 acts of community engagement for every 3 acts in the nonparticipatory group.

Table 2. The Predictors of Integrated and Non-participatory Citizenship Orientation in Colombia.

	Integrated Citizenship		Non-participatory Citizenship	
	Full Sample ^a	Online Only ^b	Full Sample ^a	Online Only ^b
Constant	-3.67*** (.61)	-2.97** (1.10)	2.20*** (.40)	1.70* (.79)
Sex (1 = Female)	.17 (.23)	-.02 (.37)	.11 (.15)	-.52 (.28)
Age	.01 (.23)	.01 (.02)	-.01 (.01)	-.01 (.01)
Energy Stratum	-.21 (.12)	-.31 (.18)	.14 (.08)	.10 (.14)
Education	-.05 (.10)	-.11 (.19)	-.14 (.07)	-.01 (.14)
Pol. Interest	.16* (.08)	-.03 (.14)	-.24*** (.05)	-.25* (.10)
Pol. Knowledge	-1.55 (1.02)	1.35 (1.52)	-.26 (.69)	.30 (1.26)
Ideological Extremity	-.05 (.06)	.01 (.10)	.04 (.04)	.24** (.08)
Pol. Talk Network Size	.02* (.01)	.02 (.01)	-.01 (.01)	-.03 (.02)
Pol. Talk Diversity	-.28* (.10)	-.42* (.19)	-.04 (.07)	-.19 (.13)
TV News	.08* (.03)	.07 (.05)	-.07*** (.02)	.00 (.03)
Print News	.07* (.02)	.10* (.05)	-.05** (.02)	-.01 (.03)
Internet Access (1 = Yes)	.24 (.31)	--	.04 (.19)	--
Online News	--	.03 (.04)	--	-.09** (.03)
Online Political Messaging	--	.05 (.05)	--	-.08 (.04)
SNS Network Size	--	.00 (.00)	--	-.00 (.00)
Pseudo R^2	.05	.09	.17	.26
Log Likelihood	591.52	218.05	1133.73	327.85

Notes. Cell entries are logit coefficients (with standard errors in parentheses); * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$, two-tailed tests of significance; ^a $N = 955$; ^b $N = 322$.

Of the communication variables, Internet access is positively and significantly related to both forms of participation ($\beta = .31$, $SE = .09$, $p < .001$ for political participation, and $\beta = .39$, $SE = .11$, $p < .001$ for community participation). Likewise, television news ($\beta = .02$, $SE = .01$, $p < .05$ for political participation, and $\beta = .04$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$ for community participation) and political talk network size ($\beta = .01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .01$ for political participation, and $\beta = .01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .01$ for community participation) are significantly related to both forms of participation. Political talk diversity is positively related to political participation ($\beta = .07$, $SE = .03$, $p < .05$), but not community participation.

The third model, shown in Table 4, estimates the relationships between citizenship orientations and online political participation. Because Internet access is necessary for online participation, it makes sense to examine the subset of the sample that has Internet access and answered the online activity survey items. Hence, this model does not include the Internet access variable but replaces it with three online activity variables: online news, online political messaging, and social network site (SNS) network size. The advantage of this approach is that the analysis focuses on those for whom it is at least possible to engage online. The disadvantage is that the inclusion of the online variables cuts the number of cases analyzed from 955 to 322, increasing the uncertainty of the estimates. However, the low number of cases in the model makes it more difficult to uncover significant coefficients, making them more conservative.

For online political participation, the conditional mean for the actualizing citizenship group on a 6-point scale is 0.94 higher ($SE = .35$, $p < .01$) than the conditional mean for the nonparticipatory group, while the other groups' means are not significantly different from the nonparticipatory group. This result indicates that among SNS users, the actualizing citizenship group engages in 2 acts of online political participation for every 1 act in the nonparticipatory group. Of the communication variables, only online news is significantly related, with a beta coefficient of .09 ($SE = .03$, $p < .01$).² Generally, the results show that citizenship styles associate with forms of political participation, lending support to Hypothesis 1.

Discussion

Previous literature suggests that repertoires of political participation are expanding globally (Bennett, 2008; Dalton, 2009; Norris, 2001; Perez & Rojas, 2010). We assume that the range of political behavior has broadened in democracies worldwide, facilitated in part by digital media (Bennett, 2008;

² The models also use estimates for political participation, community participation, and online participation, determined by the source variables for the citizenship orientations: political efficacy and trust in the government. In all three models, efficacy was significantly and positively related to the outcome, but trust in the government was not. One might interpret this finding as an indication that efficacy carries all or most of the explanatory weight in the citizenship orientation variables. However, if trust in the government explained nothing, then the actualizing and integrated citizenship variables—both being high in political efficacy—would not *differentiate* between forms of political and community participation. Also, different patterns of communication would not make it more likely that an individual would adopt actualizing over integrated citizenship. Our analyses show that actualizing and integrated citizens have different patterns of communication and participation, and hence we argue that through the reduction of information, our analytic approach is both theoretically and quantitatively valuable.

Norris, 2001; Papacharissi, 2010). This study examines how communication patterns associate with citizenship styles, and how communication and citizenship styles associate with political behaviors in a democratic society that is emerging from decades of political and social turmoil.

Our study provides valuable insight into the ways communication patterns are associated with citizenship styles. Integrated citizens tend to rely on print news, television news, and their interpersonal networks to develop civic skills necessary to participate in politics and in their communities (Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995).

Integrated citizens tend to pay attention to newspapers and television news and have relatively homogeneous interpersonal talk networks. Actualizing citizens, on the other hand, tend to rely on digital media and their interpersonal networks, at least for the subset of the sample that has Internet access. So, actualizing citizens tend to pay attention to online news websites and have more heterogeneous interpersonal talk networks. The results paint different pictures of these two citizenship styles, the difference between them being trust in the government. Integrated citizens, who are high in trust, rely on traditional news and have homogeneous networks. On the other hand, actualizing citizens, who are low in trust, rely on digital media and have more diverse networks. Meanwhile, dutiful citizenship appears not to be related at all to communication. These individuals are ideologically extreme, but otherwise seem publically disengaged.

Generally, these findings support the idea that the rise of digital media is associated with changes in citizenship worldwide (Bennett, 2008; Bennett et al., 2011; Norris, 2001; Papacharissi, 2010) and the idea that mediated communication may help people develop social-psychological orientations that facilitate their relationships as citizens with the state (Canclini, 2001; Cho et al., 2009; Dahlgren, 2004, 2005; Jung et al., 2011; Papacharissi, 2010; Shah et al., 2007). Finally, these findings complement literature about changing citizenship norms (Dalton, 2009; Denters et al., 2007; Shah et al., 2009; Thorson, in press; Van Deth, 2007).

The relationships illustrated in this analysis indicate a strong connection between communication and citizenship. In fact, the communication variables account for most of the differences among the citizenship styles. The analysis highlights the need for future research on the digital divide (Norris, 2001) in Colombia and other Latin American countries, as it relates to changes in citizenship. Only about half of the sample had Internet access at home, work, or a public library. Given that online news use is positively associated with actualizing citizenship, it seems reasonable to conclude that those without Internet access would have a narrower range of political behavior.

The analysis also shows that citizenship styles associate with political behaviors. Integrated citizens engage in more community participation than nonparticipatory citizens, while actualizing citizens engage in more interpersonal-interactive participation and online participation than nonparticipatory citizens. Dutiful citizenship, on the other hand, is not significantly different from the comparison group for any forms of participation. For actualizing citizens, the combination of mistrust in government institutions and the belief that individuals can influence those institutions is related to personalized participation in interpersonal and online settings. Increasingly, political protests and other forms of interperson

Table 3. The Relationships Between Citizenship Orientations and Participation in Colombia.

	Political Participation ^a		Community Participation ^a		Online Participation ^b	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Constant	-.35*	.18	-.00	.22	-1.40	.80
Sex (1=Female)	-.11	.07	.16***	.09	-.22	.28
Age	.01	.00	.01	.00	.00	.01
Household Energy Stratum	-.06	.04	-.08	.05	.09	.13
Education	.01	.03	.01	.04	.01	.14
Political Interest	.02	.02	-.14***	.03	.20	.10
Political Knowledge	.54	.32	1.32***	.39	1.16	1.22
Ideological Extremity	.03	.02	-.06**	.02	.03	.08
Political Talk Network Size	.01**	.00	.01**	.00	-.01	.01
Political Talk Diversity	.07*	.03	.05	.04	.10	.14
Television News	.02*	.01	.04***	.01	.00	.03
Print News	.01	.01	.01	.01	-.01	.04
Internet Access (1=Yes)	.31***	.09	.39***	.11	--	--
Online News	--	--	--	--	.09**	.03
Online Political Messaging	--	--	--	--	.05	.04
SNS Network Size	--	--	--	--	.00	.00
Actualizing Citizenship	.19*	.08	.16	.10	.94**	.35
Integrated Citizenship	.22	.12	.30*	.15	.22	.48
Dutiful Citizenship	-.16	.13	-.05	.17	-.43	.60
Adjusted R^2	.13		.11		.20	

Notes. Cell entries are unstandardized beta coefficients and standard errors from OLS regression analyses. Coefficients for the citizenship variables (0 = No, 1 = Yes) can be interpreted as mean differences from the coefficient for the comparison group (nonparticipatory group), which is not included in the model. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$, two-tailed tests of significance; ^a $N = 955$; ^b $N = 322$.

participation are based on loose affiliation networks rather than on group membership (Bennett, Breunig, & Givens, 2008; Loader & Mercea, 2011; Rheingold, 2008). Individuals can more easily choose their affiliations, and therefore their participation is more of a personal choice than an obligation to a defined group (Bennett, 2008). Likewise, online participation personalizes political campaigns, and users can more easily engage with campaigns or express candidate preferences. These affordances arguably enhance political autonomy and promote individualism (Benkler, 2006).

These findings fit Bennett's (2008) discussion of the actualizing citizen and Dalton's (2009) discussion of the engaged citizen. These individuals believe they can affect lasting political change through personalized participation in both institutional and noninstitutional ways. People with an integrated orientation, on the other hand, are likely to engage with community institutions such as NGOs and the Catholic Church but are unlikely to participate in politics online or attend protests. These citizens resemble Putnam's (2000) ideal citizen, who is actively involved with civic groups and institutions but not likely to voice dissatisfaction with the state.

Communication also directly relates to political and civic participation. Attention to television news, Internet access, and political talk predict the offline forms of political and civic participation (Cho et al., 2009). In general, this research corroborates existing research about traditional media consumption and participation in the United States (McLeod et al., 2001). Last, our findings support previous literature discussing online communication and online political participation, specifically studies showing that online information seeking is positively related to online political engagement (Gil de Zúñiga et al., 2009; Gil de Zúñiga et al., 2010). The study's primary limitation is that the models differentiate citizenship groups only from the comparison group (nonparticipatory group). Some of the point estimates for the integrated group are actually higher than the actualizing group's. However, because the integrated group's confidence interval is so high, it overlaps both the intervals for the actualizing and nonparticipatory groups. This pattern is repeated in the online-participation model and inverted in the citizenship-participation model. From this analysis, we can only confidently conclude that the means for the significant variables are statistically different from the comparison group, which is to say that the variable is different from the control condition, which is low in both trust and efficacy. Other limitations include typical limitations associated with secondary analysis of cross-sectional survey data. We are unable to make causal inferences. None of the orientations were significantly related to voting in presidential elections. Other antecedent factors may be better predictors of voting in Colombia.

Despite these limitations, our analysis has demonstrated clear patterns of difference in citizenship styles that relate to patterns of both communication and participation. Therefore, we argue that the citizenship typology presented herein offers both a conceptually sound and empirically useful measurement of citizenship based on social-psychological variables that complement ongoing efforts to measure other dimensions of citizenship (Dalton, 2009; Denters et al., 2007; Shah et al., 2009; Thorson, in press; Van Deth, 2007). Our study is generally consistent with these claims about the role of digital media and changing citizenship (Bennett, 2008; Bennett et al., 2011; Norris, 2001; Papacharissi, 2010) and offers evidence from an international context. Digital media are associated with new citizenship styles in Colombia, and both digital media and newer citizenship styles are associated with personalized forms of political participation, both online and offline.

References

- Almond, G. A., & Verba, S. (1965). *The civic culture: Political attitudes and democracy in five nations*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Benkler, Y. (2006). *The wealth of networks*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Bennett, W. L. (1998). The uncivic culture: Communication, identity, and the rise of "lifestyle politics." *P.S.: Political Science and Politics*, 31, 41–61.
- Bennett, W. L. (2008). Changing citizenship in the digital age. In W. L. Bennett (Ed.), *The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Series on Digital Media and Learning. Civic life online: Learning how digital media can engage youth* (pp. 1–24). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bennett, W. L., Breunig, C., & Givens, T. (2008). Communication and political mobilization: Digital media and the organization of anti-Iraq War demonstrations in the U.S. *Political Communication*, 25(3), 269–289.
- Bennett, W. L., Wells, C., & Freelon, D. (2011). Communicating civic engagement: Contrasting models of citizenship in the youth Web sphere. *Journal of Communication*, 61(5), 835–856.
- boyd, d. m., & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210–230.
- Canclini, N. G. (2001). *Consumers and citizens: Globalization and multicultural conflicts*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cho, J., Shah, D. V., McLeod, J. M., McLeod, D. M., Scholl, R. M., & Gotlieb, M. R. (2009). Campaigns, reflection, and deliberation: Advancing an O-S-R-O-R model of communication effects. *Communication Theory*, 19(1), 66–88.
- Conover, P. J., Crewe, I. M., & Searing, D. D. (1991). The nature of citizenship in the United States and Great Britain: Empirical comments on theoretical themes. *Journal of Politics*, 53(3), 800–832.
- Dahlgren, P. (2004). Theory, boundaries, and political communication: The uses of disparity. *European Journal of Communication*, 19(1), 7–18.
- Dahlgren, P. (2005). The Internet, public spheres, and political communication: Dispersion and deliberation. *Political Communication*, 22, 147–162.
- Dalton, R. J. (2008). Citizenship norms and the expansion of political participation. *Political Studies*, 56(1), 76–98.

- Dalton, R. J. (2009). *The good citizen: How a younger generation is reshaping American politics*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Delli Carpini, M. X., & Keeter, S. (1996). *What Americans know about politics and why it matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Denters, B., Gabriel, O., & Torcal, M. (2007). Norms of good citizenship. In J. W. Van Deth, J. R. Montero, & A. Westholm (Eds.), *Citizenship and involvement in Europe*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Gil de Zúñiga, H., Jung, N., & Valenzuela, S. (2012). Social media use for news and individuals' social capital, civic engagement, and political participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 17*, 319–336.
- Gil de Zúñiga, H., Puig-i-Abril, E., & Rojas, H. (2009). Web logs, traditional sources online, and political participation: An assessment of how the Internet is changing the political environment. *New Media & Society, 11*(4), 553–574.
- Gil de Zúñiga, H., Veenstra, A., Vraga, E., & Shah, D. (2010). Digital democracy: Reimagining pathways to political participation. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics, 7*, 36–51.
- Internet World Stats. (2010). [Online database]. Retrieved from www.internetworldstats.com
- Jung, N., Kim, Y., & Gil de Zúñiga, H. (2011). The mediating role of knowledge and efficacy in the effects of communication on political participation. *Mass Communication & Society, 14*(4), 407–430.
- Loader, B. D., & Mercea, D. (2011). Networked democracy? Social media innovations and participatory politics. *Information, Communication, & Society, 14*(6), 757–769.
- Macafee, T., & De Simone, J. J. (2012). Killing the bill online? Pathways to young people's protest engagement via social media. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 15*(11), 579–584.
- McLeod, J. M. (2001). Media and civic socialization of youth. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 27*, 45–51.
- McLeod, J. M., Zubric, J., Keum, H., Deshpande, S., Cho, J., Stein, S., & Heather, M. (2001, August). *Reflecting and connecting: Testing a communication mediation model of civic participation*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Washington, DC.
- Norris, P. (2001). *Digital divide: Civic engagement, information poverty, and the Internet worldwide*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Norris, P. (2002, August). *Democratic phoenix: Agencies, repertoires, and targets of political activism*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, MA.
- Papacharissi, Z. (2010). *A private sphere: Democracy in a digital age*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Perez, I. B., & Rojas, H. (2010). Comunicación y cultura ciudadana [Communication and civic culture]. In H. Rojas, I. B. Perez,, & H. Gil de Zúñiga (Eds.), *Comunicación y comunidad* [Communication and community]. Bogotá, Colombia: Universidad Externado de Colombia.
- Puig-i-Abril, E., & Rojas, H. (2007). Internet use as an antecedent of expressive political participation among early Internet adopters in Colombia. *International Journal of Internet Science*, 2, 28–44.
- Przeworski, A. (1991). *Democracy and the market*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Rheingold, H. (2008). Using participatory media and public voice to encourage civic engagement. In W. L. Bennett (Ed.), *The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Series on Digital Media and Learning. Civic life online: Learning how digital media can engage youth* (pp. 97–118). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rojas, H., & Puig-i-Abril, E. (2009). Mobilizers mobilized: Information, expression, mobilization, and participation in the digital age. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14(4), 902–927.
- Schudson, M. (1998). *The good citizen: A history of American civic life*. New York, NY: Martin Kessler.
- Shah, D. V., McLeod, J. M., & Yoon, S. (2001). Communication, context, and community: An exploration of print, broadcast, and Internet influences. *Communication Research*, 28(4), 464–508.
- Shah, D. V., McLeod, D. M., Kim, E., Lee, S-Y., Gotlieb, M. R., Ho, S. S., & Breivik, H. (2007). Political consumerism: How communication and consumption orientations drive “lifestyle politics.” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, (611), 217–235.
- Shah, D. V., McLeod, J. M., & Lee, N-J. (2009). Communication competence as a foundation for civic competence: Processes of socialization into citizenship. *Political Communication*, 26, 102–117.
- Thorson, K. (in press). *We left it up to you: Making sense of citizenship in a do-it-yourself world*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Van Deth, J. W. (2007). Norms of citizenship. In R. J. Dalton & H.-D. Klingmann (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political behavior*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

1850 M. Barnidge, T. Macafee, G. Alvarez & H. Rojas International Journal of Communication 8(2014)

Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zhang, W., Johnson, T. J., Seltzer, T., & Bichard, S. L. (2009). The revolution will be networked: The influence of social networking sites on political attitudes and behavior. *Social Science Computer Review*, 28(1), 75–92.