INTERESTS, AGENDA AND SPORT IN THE COMMITTEE OF EDUCATION, CULTURE AND SPORT IN THE MUNICIPAL LEGISLATIVE OF SÃO PAULO

Edmilson Santos dos Santos1
Alessandra Dias Mendes2

Abstract: There is little empirical evidence for the participation of the legislative branch in extending the right to sport in Brazilian municipalities. In this sense, this study sought to analyze the content and the actors involved based on the agenda of the ordinary meetings of the Committee in Education, Culture and Sport of the Municipality of São Paulo in the 2013/2016 Legislature. Despite being responsible for the smaller number of bills that rose to the decision-making agenda, compared to those of education and culture, the data revealed important aspects such as: lack of sporting expertise for most proponents, privilege of mass sport and projects that expand public spending and the policies in order to meet demands and specific audiences.
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1 Introduction

Although it is a field of study that has already been consolidated in Brazil, especially in Political Science, the role played by Congress in the production of public sports policies has been understudied. Two papers on legislative output stand out, and both address the role of Bancada da Bola (Congress members who defend the agenda of elite football clubs) in the intermediation of interests. In an inaugural way, Silva (2013) analyzed that caucus’ behavior in Rio de Janeiro’s City Council. Mendes (2017) analyzed its behavior in the National Congress and in the Sports Committee. Both studies show how that interest group articulates in the legislative environment to promote its agenda.

There are two important challenges in this study. The first, as highlighted by Ayres, Oliveira and Gimenes (2017), is the little attention given to municipal legislatures. The second is to understand the right to sport in light of the behavior of municipal legislatures. On the other hand, analyzing legislative output within the scope of the sports agenda in the municipality of São Paulo becomes important for four reasons: (1) there is a role to be played by the Legislative
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4 Here, agenda concerns issues acknowledged by public authorities as problems that require their participation in their solutions (HOWLETT; RAMESH; PERL, 2013).
Branch in ensuring the right to sport; (2) São Paulo City’s fiscal capacity; (3) the sports agenda is included in a standing committee, despite de fact that it is part of a multi-agenda; (4) the lack of studies analyzing the behavior of the committee that deals with sports in the municipality of São Paulo for the provision of sports policies.

The analysis of the committees’ work can be performed under different aspects. The concern here is to analyze which topics comprised the sports agendas of the City Council’s Education, Culture and Sports Committee (CECE-CMSP). In other words, those that reached the decision-making agenda, were reported by a rapporteur and included on the committee’s agenda.

Therefore, this study aimed to analyze the content and the actors involved in the sports agenda on the decision-making agenda of the Education, Culture and Sport Committee of São Paulo’s City Council. The following aspects were observed: weight of the sports agenda in the committee (discussed initiatives that refer to sports), distribution by sports event type (educational, performance and participation 5), type of agenda (bills or invitations), content of proposals (provisions of services or regulation of activities) and political actors involved and affected by policies.

In addition to the introduction, the study is organized so as to present the necessary relationship between the right to sport and the legislature’s participation in its configuration in the theoretical fundamentals. Next, the methodological decisions made and the discussion of results are presented. Finally, the conclusion.

2 Legislatures in the production of public sports policies

Among the various research challenges in the field, it is necessary to incorporate legislative studies into the agenda within the scope of public sports policies. Two motivations are pressing for this incursion: (1) the 1988 Federal Constitution, in its Art. 24, placed public sports policies as a competitive topic in legislative environments (SANTOS and FREITAS, 2015); (2) in complex societies, the democratic regime provides an important role to the Legislative Branch in the production of public policies (ROCHA and COSTA, 2012). It is important to highlight that the Legislative Branch should not be interpreted as antagonistic to the Executive Branch, but rather complementary (FIGUEIREDO and LIMONGI, 2009). These factors place the Legislative Branch as a preponderant actor in the realization of the right to sport.

Therefore, observing what happens in the legislative environment can help us to better

5 The definition of sporting events is given by Law 9.615/1998 in Art. 3: I - educational sport, practiced in teaching systems and in unsystematic forms of education, avoiding the selectivity and hypercompetitiveness of its practitioners, with the purpose to achieve the full development of individuals and their training for the exercise of citizenship and leisure practice; II - sport for voluntary participation comprising the sports modalities practiced in order to contribute to the integration of practitioners in the fullness of social life, in health and education promotion and in environmental preservation; III - performance sports, practiced in accordance with the general provisions of this Law and national and international sports practice rules, with the purpose of obtaining results and integrating people and communities in the country, and the latter with those of other nations.
understand how public sports policies are produced in a federation that has 5,570 municipal legislatures, 27 state legislatures and 2 legislatures at the federal level (Chamber of Deputies and Senate).

Among subnational levels, municipalities and states (including the Federal District), there are different fiscal capacities that impact public spending and, consequently, the provision of sports policies. In locations where these resources may be scarce, it is unreasonable to think that there is a high margin of expenditure for the implementation of sports policies. Thus, the Legislative Branch may be pressured to implement policies, in the discretionary spending agendas, as long as there is fiscal capacity to do so. It is in the larger cities in the southern and southeastern regions that municipalities with the capacity to produce their own spending agenda are found (SPEROTTO, 2009; AFONSO and LOBO, 1996; ABRUCIO and COUTO, 1996).

Despite the inexistence of regulations within the federation that condition the participation of municipalities in the provision of public sports policies, some studies have been carried out in Brazil showing their power (SANTOS and MENDES, 2020; SANTOS, 2020; SANTOS; MENEZES and LIMA, 2019; SANTOS, et al, 2019). Even considering that these studies did not advance from the point of view of policy analysis, that is, by identifying the variables that affect the result of policies, the expenditure of Brazilian municipalities on sports policies indicates that there is great pressure for the implementation of this agenda and for who the main actors in the realization of the right to sport are.

It is noteworthy that the policies produced by the Legislative Branch are those that have the longest standing, as opposed to government policies. Therefore, it is the policies produced by this environment that have the greatest continuity (PINTOS, ATHAYDE and GODOFLITE, 2017) and permanently mark the public budget. The agenda power of municipal legislatures is not marginal to the provision of the right to sport. Legislatures have instruments to affect the Executive Branch’s spending capacity, especially when we take into consideration what is provided for by Clause I of Art. 30 of the Federal Constitution (BRAZIL, 1988).

Among the Brazilian cities, São Paulo shows the most favorable conditions for public policy provision. Except for the federal and São Paulo state governments, the city has the third largest budget in the Brazilian federation. Therefore, it has a differentiated capacity to provide public sports policies, with the potential to expand the agenda through the Legislative Branch’s performance. Despite being understudied, they are important actors in the provision of public policies, including innovative events, such as Virada Esportiva. São Paulo city is also one of the municipalities with outstanding clubs in the country in terms of sports infrastructure.

In general, legislative proposals begin to be considered by standing committees. In such committees they are analyzed and, under the terms of house regulations, they can play a conclusive role in certain issues. Committees can ensure important gains to the legislative process, such as providing the decision-making process with the greatest amount of information (PARO,
2014); providing opportunities for debating issues (SANTOS and BAIRD, 2019); guaranteeing efficiency gains to the plenary (LIMA, 2009); helping to structure the actors’ preferences (AGUIAR, 2013); facilitating the participation of organized groups (RICCI and LEMOS, 2004); allowing legislators to have exchange gains (ZAMPIERI, 2013). However, especially in relation to issues that affect public spending, there are political instruments that can adjust legislators’ preferences to those of the Executive Branch’s members (NASCIMENTO, 2012; ROCHA and COSTA, 2012).

In the legislative process, there is a long way to go before a particular demand is placed on the agenda for decision-making. A parliament’s agenda can be observed in the set of topics on which it is called to discuss, ranging from the oversight of the Executive Branch to the production of norms. Not all registered bills are able to reach the committee’s decision-making agenda. Such agenda, as reported by Capella (2006), refers to the subset of topics that are ready to be decided on, to be appraised and voted on. In order to face this path, it is necessary to gain internal support and ensure that political negotiations around the issues take place.

To address sports, the committees can be exclusive, as in Curitiba’s City Council, among others, or multi-agenda, as in São Paulo: the City Council’s Education, Culture and Sports Committee (CECE-CMSP). In multi-agenda environments, there may be greater attention to certain agendas due to their institutionalization level, the number of stakeholders involved in the construction of policies or the volume of resources handled.

Three theoretical models have been used to explain how legislative work functions: distributivist, informational and partisan. Despite the reservations about the possibility of using these models in Brazil, different studies have attempted to test their hypotheses. In short, the main characteristic of the distributivist theory is that legislators seek to distribute gains to their electoral districts (pork barrel), allowing advantageous exchanges between voters and legislators (MUELLER, 2009; RICCI and LEMOS, 2004). In the informational theory, the gains in specialization by the commissions would allow better structuring policies, thus reducing uncertainties about their effectiveness (ROCHA, 2011; NASCIMENTO, 2012). In the partisan theory, the role of representatives is to ensure that decisions can follow party guidelines (MUELLER, 2005; PARO, 2014).

3 Method

The empirical investigation is based on CECE-CMSP’s participation in the production of sports policies in the 16th Legislature (2013-2016). Based on the universe of initiatives that comprise the committees’ roles, provided for by the Internal Regulations of São Paulo’s City Council, we analyzed the agendas of ordinary meetings published by the Council’s website in the period (http://splegisconsulta.camara.sp.gov.br/).

The choice of period is associated with the ideological profile of the party ruling the city,
the Workers’ Party (PT), because, unlike the center-right parties, the expansion of public spending is perceived as important, since that party shows concern with the guarantee of rights. Thus, there would be an expectation that the vetoes to the expansion of public spending would be fewer, especially when referring to social rights, such as access to sports. The public power would appear as an important actor in the provision of services that would allow the reduction of inequalities (BORSANI, 2003). The Executive Branch’s preferences would produce less resistance regarding the expansion of public spending.

Legislative output was analyzed at three levels: elementary, intermediate and specialized. At the elementary level of analysis, we seek to diagram the agenda based on the internal classification by the City Council for legislative work: invitations/calls and normative output. Invitations are associated with the monitoring or oversight of the Executive Branch’s work.

Normative output is separated into symbolic norms and norms that impact the provision of public services or the regulation of activities. The normative output comprises four types: Bills (Bs), Legislative Decrees (LDs), Organic Law Amendments (OLAs) and Resolution Bills (RBs). Bearing in mind that they could be presented on more than one agenda, since the meetings might not have a quorum or have their agenda unfinished, we consider only the last entry on the agenda. Duplicates have been discarded.

Symbolic norms deal with titles and honors, designations of equipment and places and of dates and events (SANTOS and BAIRD, 2019). They do not impact the expansion of the right to sport. The production of norms that impact the provision of services or regulation of sports activities was classified according to four criteria: education, culture, sports and mixed (when it involves more than one agenda). The agenda was classified by reading the title of the norm. When there was doubt about the best classification, its summary was read.

At the intermediate level, we seek to classify the norms by sporting events and by the nature of the policy, its provision or regulation (PR). As for sports events, the bills were classified into: income, participation, educational [as provided for by Law no. 9,615, dated March 24, 1998 (BRASIL, 1998)] and sports. The ‘sports’ classification was used for those that encompass more than one event. As for nature: service provision (SP) or regulation of sports activities (RS).

At the specialized level, we have made the most detailed scrutiny of legislative work in relation to the sports agenda. The normative output was analyzed in order to know the authors, their sports expertise, bills, parties (elected); rapporteurs, parties and reports (favorable, with or without a substitute amendment, or contrary); and the groups affected by the policy.

To analyze CECE-CMSP’s agendas, we proceeded as follows: retrieved the agendas from São Paulo’s City Council website; entered their dates on an Excel spreadsheet; classified the bills (number, title of the proposition, summary of the proposition, author, author’s party, rapporteur, rapporteur’s party, report, invitations/calls) and the invitations (topic and invited person).

At the elementary and intermediate levels of analysis, descriptive statistics was used in
order to identify the percentages of variable distribution. At the third level, two strategies were used: descriptive analysis and interpretation of the context of norm production.

4 Results and discussion

At the elementary level, the legislative work sought to learn about the decision-making agenda in two aspects: invitation and normative output. Normative (NO) and symbolic (SO) output is that which produces the provision of services or regulation of sporting activities (PR). The symbolic agenda concerns titles and honors (TH), denomination of public places and facilities (D) and dates and events (DE). According to Sabbag (2017), the two latter aspects have a neutral effect, as they do not produce economic costs and become a picture of the legislature’s emptying. In PR, we identified the agenda sections: education, culture, sports and mixed.

The first aspect to be observed in Table 1 is that invitations occupy a small part of the agenda (2.7%), in comparison with NO, and this varied in the period. In 2016, a municipal election year, such monitoring and inspection instrument was not used. It is also possible to observe that legislative work decreases its productivity in election years (2014, national and state elections; 2016, municipal elections).

The symbolic agenda (SO) occupied the most space on CECE-CMSP’s agendas. Since it does not entail costs for the public administration and does not involve conflicts of interest, it allows meeting representatives’ individual agendas in search of prestige or recognition by a given public. As they do not involve conflict, they are norms that allow mutual support exchanges among representatives (SANTOS and BAIRD, 2019). This explains, to a large extent, the weight of the symbolic agenda in CECE-CMSP’s work. Its lowest percentage was in 2014 (51.7%: 62) and the highest, in 2016 (67.4%: 64). In other words, in years when they run for re-election, greater attention is paid to the norms that guarantee visibility to certain audiences.

PR bills are those agendas in which disputes of interests may arise in relation to altering or maintaining the status quo on a given agenda and confronting the interests of the Executive and Legislature Branches. In issues concerning PR projects, conflicts can intensify and produce their own dynamics in the Legislative Branch, requiring negotiations (ZAMPIERI, 2013).

The year when PR proposals most occupied the committee’s agenda was 2014 (45%: 54). The lowest indicator was 2016 (32.6%: 95). As these are issues that may require intense negotiations, which takes representatives’ action time, the year of municipal elections (2016) put downward pressure on their participation in the CECE-MCSP’s work agenda. It reached the lowest level in the period due to the smaller number of meetings, mainly in the second semester (when political campaign activities begin).

---

6 Considering that the committee has deliberative power as to certain issues, the decision-making agenda may be the committee or the plenary if the former has no power to deliberate or limited power when the topics are brought to the plenary’s decision. The meaning here is for those issues that are decided in the committee’s plenary.
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Table 1 – Distribution of legislative output by CECE-SP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislative output</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO SO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Study data. NO: normative output; SO: symbolic output; PR: provision of services or regulation of sporting activities; TH: titles and honors; D: denomination of public places and facilities; DE: dates and events.

As can be seen in Table 2, within the sectorial agenda, the issues involving the committees’ topics, the education field receives the most attention, as it is responsible for 67% of Bs. This means that, in multi-calendar committees, the primacy of one(s) over the other(s) may occur. This differential can be a demand or a value problem of the agenda itself in the parliament’s decision-making agenda. Municipal governments are constitutionally obliged to spend 25% of their income on education. Such percentage does not exist for spending on culture and sports, which pushes for more attention to that agenda. Therefore, as long as there is no legal determination to do so, the constitutional right to sport will be compromised.

The cultural and sports agendas occupied the least space on the committee’s agenda. For these two areas of less visibility, perhaps it can be explained by the lower volume of resources distributed in these policies and the by the lack of minimum spending percentages. It is also not possible to disconsider the symbolic weight of the agendas, as compared to that of education. The participation of the other norms, which occupy 41.1% of CECE-CMSP’s agenda, is due to regulatory aspects (mandatory assessment by more than one committee).

Table 2 – Distribution of Bs according to CECE-SP’s sectoral agenda (SA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manifestation</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% T</th>
<th>% SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Study data.
At the elementary level, it was possible to observe that: (a) there was little attention to invitations to public authorities; (b) there is a monopoly of norm analysis; (c) in election years, the committee’s productivity is lower; (d) symbolic bills outnumber normative bills; (e) Bills addressing education are the majority on the committee’s agenda.

At the intermediate level, PR norms were analyzed according to sporting events and policy nature. As for the sporting events, only the educational sports were not represented. Unlike a specific sports committee, which could transfer the debate on educational sports to the education committee, in this study, the committee also absorbs educational topics. Even so, such debate was not present.

Mostly, 60% (9) of the norms deal with participation sports (even those that are privately provided by clubs and fitness centers, for example). Next is performance sport, with 26.7% (4) and then education sport with 13.3% (2). In other words, legislators are concerned about providing policies that can reach the largest number of people.

Despite studies at the national level that show the power of pressure from groups associated with performance sports (MENDES, 2017; BUENO, 2008; ALMEIDA and MARCHI JÚNIOR, 2010), this aspect seems to have less impact on the local scale. In 2019, the expenditure of 4,563 (81.9%) Brazilian city administrations that invested in the Sport and Leisure Function (SLF), only 7.54% (344) did so in the Performance sport subfunction. In terms of spending, this represented 5.4% of the total in SLF. In the municipality of São Paulo, such expenditure was even lower, 1.5% (data from the National Treasury).

Therefore, performance sports received marginal attention from the point of view of adherence and handled resources. Perhaps this signaling is sufficient for legislators to adjust their preferences to those presented by the Executive Branch, as Figueiredo and Limongi (2009) point out.

The provision of some type of service accounts for 80% (12) of the norms, and regulation, for 20% (3). This result illustrates that there is more attention to the norms that expand access to sports through the injection of public resources applied directly. Strangely, the committee that deals with the topic of education did not include educational sports to the agenda. Educational sports is a topic that is completely absent from discussions in São Paulo’s City Council, and it is not a priority, as provided for in the constitution.

At the third level, we carried out a more detailed scrutiny of the legislative work regarding CECE-CMSP’s decision-making agenda. It was analyzed so that we could learn about the context of production of norms and the groups affected by them.

The first aspect concerns the number of representatives who spent time and prestige to raise their demands associated with sports to the decision-making agenda, which was 30.9% (17) of the councilors in São Paulo’s City Council. This means that there are political actors (internal
and external to the legislature) who are paying attention to public problems that affect sports practice in the city of São Paulo and are willing to make this agenda move forward in the legislature.

One of the ways to evaluate representatives’ interest in the sports agenda is to follow up on the proposals that reach the committee’s decision-making agenda. The focus here is not on describing its agenda based on the demand of all bills registered in the house, but on those that have surpassed all political and technical stages and reached the committee’s agenda to be decided. Therefore, they are agendas that are marked by their signatories’ political commitment.

The topics of interest to representatives can be diffuse. They include different or specialized topics that favor a certain agenda. For the purposes of this analysis, we will use, as a criterion to identify the interest in the sports agenda, the fact of having managed to introduce in the legislature more than one norm associated with the topic of sports. Only two representatives fit this criterion: Aurélio Miguel and Paulo Frange.

Aurélio Miguel, from PR (Republican Party), has a history of success in the sports sector as an athlete. He was an Olympic medalist twice and director of the São Paulo Judo Federation. Therefore, he has sports expertise associated with performance sports. In theory, as occurs with the election of representatives associated with soccer (Silva, 2013; Mendes, 2017), the appreciation of the agenda related to performance sports could be one of his main preferences for acting in the parliament.

In the period, his normative output involved 10 bills, among LDs, Bs and RBs. Four bills, that is, 40% of his output, are associated with the sports agenda: 2 THs, 1 DE and 1 Service provision bill (in Table 3). The THs were: Anchieta Medal and Diploma of Gratitude from the city of São Paulo to Sérgio Toshioki Hisaoka (Karate-Do trainer); institution of the Medal of Honor to Sports Merit. DE was the inclusion of the São Paulo Kart Circuit in the sports calendar. The bill that provides a service created PRÓESPORTE, a project that guarantees tax incentives for fitness centers and sports clubs that enroll low-income students from the Public Education Network.

It is also noteworthy that Councilor Aurélio Miguel was responsible for 20% of the sports bills placed on CECE-CMSP’s agenda. In this case, expertise acted to enhance the sports agenda in the legislative output of São Paulo’s City Council. However, 60% are not related to this topic.

Paulo Frange, from PTB (Brazilian Labor Party), is a cardiologist, and he added two bills to the decision-making agenda: making sunscreen lotion available to users of swimming pools in the municipal facilities providing them and the institution of Kyokushin Karate Day. The former is at the intersection of sports and health, as it protects the health of public swimming pool users in the city of São Paulo.

As can be seen in Table 3, only two (11.8%) representatives who managed to introduce bills to CECE-CMSP’s agenda have sports expertise. This shows that sports expertise is not a
conditioning factor for including sports bills in the committee’s decision-making agenda. Representatives linked to 10 parties gained space on the agenda, which shows that this demand has capillarity in terms of party representation. The party that most included bills in the agenda was PT, with 3 (17.6%), followed by PR, PRB, PSDB and PTB with 2.

Jean Madeira, from PRB (Brazilian Republican Party), was an athlete and a Jiu-Jitsu instructor. Of the six bills with his signature that were analyzed by the committee, only one refers to sports, the bill creating the Martial Arts Festival. In the 2013/14 biennium, he participated as a full member of CECE-CMSP along with another councilor who had sports expertise, Orlando Silva (PC do B). Orlando Silva was the former Minister of Sports during Lula’s term of office. However, in the period, he did not lend his experience in the production of norms for the sports sector. Therefore, in the case of Aurélio Miguel, having expertise, as the informational theory assumes, is not a condition to occupy space in the committee that deals with sports issues or to promote such agenda with bills in that area, if participating in it.

Except for councilors Agnaldo Timóteo and Valdece Cabrabom, who had 100% of their bills put on the sports agenda (they had only one bill on the CECE-CMSP’s agenda), most of the others’ output was related to another area. This result suggests that, regardless of the sporting trajectory, representatives need to advance on other areas as a way to ensure greater support and/or political visibility.

Councilors Atílio Francisco and Sandra Tadeu, who showed closer percentages of bills associated with the sports agenda to that of Aurélio Miguel (33.3%), as can be seen in Table 3, achieved such result due to the small number of proposals that reached the decisional agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councilor</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>OLA</th>
<th>%SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnaldo Timóteo; Goulart</td>
<td>PR/PSD</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfredinho</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arselino Tatto</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atílio Francisco</td>
<td>PRB</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurélio Miguel</td>
<td>PRB</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurélio Nomura</td>
<td>PSDB</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvo</td>
<td>MDB</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudinho de Souza</td>
<td>PSDB</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Bill No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalton Silvano</td>
<td>PV</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Soares</td>
<td>PSD</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Madeira</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana Cardoso</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laércio Benko</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulo Frange</td>
<td>PTB</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 28.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Tadeu</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdecir Cabrabom</td>
<td>PTB</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Study data. SE: sports expertise. %SA: percentage of bills on the sports agenda among the total number of bills; Bills (Bs), Legislative Decrees (LDs), Organic Law Amendments (OLAs) and Resolution Bills (RBs).

Of the bills included on the agenda, 25% (5) are symbolic norms [titles and honors (2), and dates and events (3)]. Three bills aim to regulate services. Two propose to regulate activities related to fitness centers: accessibility for people of short stature (Bill 130/2013 by David Soares) and an amendment to Law no. 11.383/93, which deals with the regulation of physical and sports-activity practice in fitness centers and in similar facilities (Bill 378/2014 by Sandra Tadeu). The other one deals with safety and comfort conditions for fans to access major events (Bill 247/2010 by Agnaldo Timóteo and Goulart).

Most of the bills included on the agenda address the provision of services by the Executive Branch (60%: 12). Therefore, they are norms that affect public spending. As for 16.7% (2) of the bills, they serve interests that cannot be associated with only one event. They are Bill 174/2012, by Juliana Cardoso, which institutes the Vila Progresso Olympic Center, and Bill 338/2011, by Claudinho de Souza, which provides tax incentives for sports projects.

Three bills address performance sports: Bill 360/2013, by Jean Madeira, which creates the Martial Arts Festival in the city of São Paulo; Bill 192/2015, by Aurélio Nomura, which deals with the payment of cash prizes to athletes who win street races, marathons, half marathons and the like; and Bill 137/2015, by Valdecir Cabrabom, which creates Paragames in the city of São Paulo.

Projects that deal with participation sports meet the demands of various sectors of society, as can be seen in Table 1. What can be noticed is pressure for segmenting the participation-sport agenda. There are claims for specific activities and specific audiences. Considering the difficulties of the Executive Branch in allocating preferences in the sports field, these sectorized claims subsidize the extension of the right to sport. In this case, as highlighted by Figueiredo and Limongi (2009), the Executive Branch and the legislature eventually act in a complementary fashion, rather than antagonistically.
The priority of bills that provide services is to serve specific population segments with policies that affect these groups’ participation in the practice of sports activities. The legislature operates, in this case, as another space for dialogue between society and the State in order to meet the legitimate demands of society. However, the question that remains is why the demands of educational sports fail to reach the decision-making agenda, which is, undoubtedly, the greatest defect of the normative output analyzed here. Is it due to a lack of propositions? Is it due to a lack of proponents? Is it an uninteresting topic to the committee? In other words, this scenario needs to be better known so that we can have a more integrated understanding of the sports agenda.

The Executive Branch has political instruments to produce constraints on bills proposed by legislative initiative that oppose its preferences in terms of expanding public spending. Except for Bill 232/2007, which reached the decision-making agenda in 2016, all the others were included on the agenda when the committee’s president was a member of the mayor’s party. Perhaps this is the main indication that there was a connection between the preferences of the Executive Branch and those of the legislature.

The expansion of public spending, an agenda commonly associated with left-wing parties, could explain the committee’s behavior with regard to the demands of the sports sector. Only one bill, reported by a PSOL (left-wing party) councilor, was opposed, and that was Bill 109/2012 by Councilor Alfredinho (PT), which deals with the hiring of physical education professionals to work in parks and squares as a personal trainer. In this case, there appear to be other factors that indicated the rapporteur’s vote against it. Conditions were favorable for the approval of issues that increase public spending: the mayor was a member of the proposer’s party, the rapporteur was a member of a left-wing party, and the committee was chaired by the mayor’s party. The set of positive political aspects was insufficient to indicate the passing of the bill.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Councilor</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>352/2010</td>
<td>Dalton Silvano</td>
<td>Practical provision of skates at Parque da Independência</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468/2013</td>
<td>Paulo Frange</td>
<td>Provision of sunscreen lotion to swimming pool users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109/2012</td>
<td>Alfredinho</td>
<td>Hiring personal trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252/2012</td>
<td>Atlfo Francisco</td>
<td>Sports practice for the elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232/2007</td>
<td>Calvo</td>
<td>Training supervised by physical education instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391/2013</td>
<td>Laércio Benko</td>
<td>Construction and implantation of skating rinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490/2012</td>
<td>Aurélio Miguel</td>
<td>Encouraging sports practice in fitness centers and sports clubs for low-income students from public schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Study data.
The rapporteurs’ party composition guaranteed that the leftist-parties could pass three bills that would increase public spending (25%), and the center-right parties, nine (75%). Of the bills reported by the center and right-wing parties, all of them had a favorable report, with or without a substitute amendment. Therefore, the parties’ positions regarding their restrictions or not to public spending cannot be equated only by analyzing their positions in relation to the expansion or not of public expenditure. Interests around the decision-making agenda, pressure from stakeholders and negotiations involving representatives can put pressure on certain results. Even though the pork barrel concept cannot be applied to sectoral agendas, the distribution of sectorized benefits may have to do with political calculations in the terms put forward by the distributivist theory.

The characterization of the target audience of the proposals that reached the decision-making agenda points to the greater democratization of sports practice, highlighting and privileging specific interests. There are demands associated with specific audiences, such as skaters, the elderly, low-income youth, practitioners of martial arts, walkers, street running athletes, physical education professionals, the Vila Progresso community, para-athletes and spectators and practitioners of truck races. In other words, the representatives’ performance moves towards meeting legitimate sectorial demands of society. Sports policies are the result of demands that seek to meet specific interests.

Invitations to public agents were an underused instrument at CECE-CMSP in the 16th Legislature. From a sporting point of view, the committee’s agenda was only occupied twice. The first time, in 2014, the General Manager of the Interlagos Race Track was called in to clarify the activities and services provided at the race track. The following year, the Secretary of Sports was called in to present his Department’s Action Plan. In the other years, the work did not need to be shown. This was a residual tool for promoting the sports agenda in the parliament.

The results presented here point to the important participation of São Paulo’s City Council in the provision of sports policies under the terms set out in Item X of Art. 24 of the 1988 Federal Constitution. This means that the Legislative Branch the city of São Paulo has been active and participatory in providing sports policies.

5 Conclusions

A more comprehensive understanding of the provision of the right to sports cannot neglect the Legislative Branch’s participation. Therefore, looking into the role played by the Legislative Branches of the different entities in the federation can help us to better understand the current stage of development of public sports policies in Brazil. From this perspective, this study was structured in order to shed light on CECE-MCSP’ legislative output.

The three levels of analysis enabled us to understand important aspects of legislative work. In the first, it was possible to observe that the normative output is privileged and little
attention is given to agendas that seek to monitor and/or supervise management. The Secretary of Sports was called to present his work plan only in 2015, and the General Manager of the Interlagos Circuit was asked to explain issues associated with the functioning of this public equipment. Therefore, management oversight during the period studied was not a relevant political aspect, despite its being one of the important functions of the Legislative Branch.

At the intermediate level, we could observe that there is greater attention to the educational agenda at CECE-CMSP, despite the absence of educational sports and of the fact that the sports agenda occupied the least space in the decision-making agenda. Considering that not all the bills proposed to the City Council were analyzed, we do not know if it is a problem related to demand or to the agenda valorization within the legislative house. The more attention given participation sports is also noteworthy.

At the third level, which allowed a more detailed scrutiny of CECE-CMSP’s participation, it was possible to observe that: (a) representatives from various parties are recipients of sports demands; (b) not only representatives with sports expertise mobilize attention to this agenda; (c) representatives with expertise had different behaviors, such as councilors Aurélio Miguel and Orlando Silva; (d) the decision-making agenda was adjusted to the preferences of the Executive and Legislative Branches; (e) considering the public affected by the policies, it is possible to assume that the parliament’s demand aims to produce sectoral effects; (f) participation sports are the sporting events that best fit the parliament; (g) demands for public spending increase are not only associated with left-wing parties.

The initial scrutiny points to the need to produce analyses within the scope of policy analysis, that is, to identify which variables affect the outcomes of legislative work. It becomes important to identify what variables these are and what the weight of sports expertise is in the electoral competition and performance of the sports agenda in legislative environments. It is necessary to know the variables, whether institutional or not, that affect the performance of the proposals and what the conditions are for them to ascend to the decision-making agenda. And whether the committees’ structure, being exclusive or multi-agenda, has an impact on the production of public sports policies.

Therefore, by considering the legislative environments of the Brazilian federation, an important work agenda opens up for us to understand the challenges posed to guaranteeing the right to sports in Brazil. This work agenda must also take into account the main limitation to the study, which was to consider only the decision-making agenda. On the demand side, we are unaware of the inputs of the sports agenda in the legislative environment and its stakeholders.
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