Dr. Ateeq - Ur Rehman
Shefalika Narain

DEMOCRACY AMONG SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

ALEXIS PRESS
JERSEY CITY, USA

DEMOCRACY AMONG SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

DEMOCRACY AMONG SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Dr. Ateeq - Ur Rehman

Shefalika Narain

ALEXIS PRESS

ALEXIS PRESS

Published by: Alexis Press, LLC, Jersey City, USA
www.alexispress.us

First Published 2022

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Democracy Among Social Movements by *Dr. Ateeq - Ur Rehman, Shefalika Narain*

ISBN 978-1-64532-126-2

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES AND VISIONS OF DEMOCRACY IN THE GLOBAL JUSTICE MOVEMENT

Dr. Ateeq - Ur Rehman, Associate Professor
Department of Political Science, IIMT University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India.

ABSTRACT:

The worldwide Justice Movement GJM is a collection of grassroots groups, campaigners, and individuals who are working to promote social, economic, and environmental justice on a worldwide level. In order to understand how these structures support group action and democratic decision-making processes, this research study examines organisational structures and democratic visions inside the GJM. The research explores the non-hierarchical, horizontal networks, and participatory methods that promote inclusion and empowerment in the movement. It examines how the GJM upholds democratic norms by embracing many viewpoints, advancing gender parity, and addressing power disparities. The study also looks at difficulties the movement encountered, such preserving unity and coordinating acts across many settings and cultures. To evaluate the GJMs efficacy, influence, and potential for revolutionary change on global justice concerns, it is essential to comprehend its organisational structures and democratic aspirations. The research also emphasises how this information may be used to advance human rights and global justice via democratic participation, global governance, and social movements.

KEYWORDS:

Global Justice Movement, Grassroots Activism, Horizontal Networks, Participatory Democracy, Social Movements.

INTRODUCTION

A basic criticism of traditional politics is also more or less clearly expressed by social movements, which shifts their focus from politics itself to meta-politics. Social movements do not only deliver demands to decision-makers. These individuals' views are in line with an ancient element of democratic theory that calls for an organisation of collective decision-making referred to in various ways as classical, populist, communitarian, strong, grass-roots, or direct democracy against a democratic practice in contemporary democracies labelled as realist, liberal, elite, republican, or representative democracy. Their criticism has often focused on the democratic principle of representation and called for public involvement. While democratic deliberation has long been located in voluntary groups, social movements, protest arenas, or more generally, enclaves free from institutional power, some recent developments can be usefully discussed in light of the growing literature on deliberative democracy, with its focus on communication. Deliberative participatory democracy refers to decision-making procedures where, in the presence of equality, inclusivity, and transparency, a communicative process based on reason the persuasiveness of a strong argument may transform individual preferences and result in decisions that are focused on the welfare of the public.

Although there is a growing focus on discourse quality, certain aspects of this definition are similar to those found in the participatory models we just outlined as characteristic of social movements. Deliberation occurs among free and equal people as free deliberation among equals, but deliberative democracy requires some forms of apparent equality among citizens

A ll citizens must be able to develop those capacities that give them effective access to the public sphere and once in the public sphere, they must be given sufficient respect and recognition so that they can influence decisions that affect them in a favorable direction. Power derived from force as well as an uneven weighting of participants as representatives of various organisations with varying sizes or as more powerful people must be excluded from the deliberation process [1], [2].

The focus on inclusivity is another element that conventional ideas of participatory democracy share. Every person who has an interest in the choices being made must be included in the process and given the opportunity to voice their opinions. This indicates that the deliberative process occurs in a context of diversity of values, including individuals with various viewpoints who share a similar set of issues. This is also a fundamental tenet of deliberative conceptions since discussion or even communication is predicated on the idea that, although I may not necessarily give up my position, I could learn something if I pay attention to what the other person has to say. Furthermore, direct, participatory democracy resonates with transparency since assemblies are often public forums that are available to the public. According to Joshua Cohens definition, a deliberative democracy is an association whose affairs are governed by the public deliberation of its members.

The focus on choice transformation with an orientation to the notion of the public good, however, appears notably novel in the theory of deliberative democracy and in the practises of several current organisations. Democracy requires the transformation of preferences in interaction it is a process through which initial preferences are transformed in order to take into account the points of view of the others. Deliberative democracy is distinct from ideas of democracy as the accumulation of exogenously created preferences in this regard [3], [4]. Finding a shared goal or good is much easier in a deliberative atmosphere According to Cohen, under this democratic paradigm, the political debate is organized around alternative conceptions of the public good and draws identities and citizens interests in ways that contribute to the public building of public good.

Deliberative democracy places a special emphasis on reason, debate, and discussion because it believes that the stronger argument will persuade others. According to Habermas debate is built on horizontal communication flows, various content providers, ample possibilities for interaction, confrontation based on reasoned argument, and a willingness to listen to one another. Participants accept arguments as acceptable while making decisions Additionally, these notions often make reference to consensus-based decision-making techniques as opposed to majority rule, which relies on votes to legitimize choices. The vision of democracy in social movement organisations is the main topic of our study. However, instead of quantifying levels of democracy, we want to conceptualize the many, more or less pure types of democracy that exist. Our study is predicated on the fundamental idea that democratic concepts, such as power by the people, may be united in many ways and with various weights, such as representational vs participatory and majority versus deliberative. We presume that the range of democratic ideals expressed by current movements reflects the multitude of repertoires we have discovered in them.

We examine how social movement organisations SMOs see democracy. The resource mobilization strategy has placed a focus on social movement organisations, and its proponents emphasise both the rational-economic assumptions and formal organisational thrusts. For example, how social movement organisations must mobilise resources from the environment, whether directly in the form of money or through volunteer work by their followers. They must also defeat opponents and increase support from both the general public and the elites. A social movement organisation is described as a complex, or formal,

organisation which identifies its goals with the preferences of a social movement or countermovement and attempts to implement those goals, emphasising its instrumental role in the movement. SMOs, however, also serve as forms of identification for the supporters of movements as well as for its detractors and the general public. SMOs, which are described as associations of persons making idealistic and moralistic claims about how human personal or group life ought to be organized that, at the time of their claim-making, are marginal to or excluded from mainstream society, in fact serve an identification function.

In this book, we examine organisations as places for discourse and the creation of values as well as agents of mobilization. In writing on social movements, the first strategy has dominated. The recent emergence of the resource mobilization viewpoint, as stated. Attention to organisation seems antagonistic to research of culture and interaction. The cultural content of Organising and the meanings communicated by organisational forms were marginalized as research topics since organisations were only seen as useful tools. However, in more recent theories, SMOs are increasingly seen as contexts for political conversation, each with its own conventions This progression is a reflection of shifts in organisational sociology from closed to open system approaches to neo institutionalism. The proportional weighting given to environmental impact and organisational agency allows us to differentiate between these methods. As organisational sociology advanced, the closed system approach identified internal organisational elements as the fundamental causal agents in accounting for the form and conduct of organisations.

A garbage can metaphor was later used to describe decision-making in situations of high preference ambiguity and low information on environmental constraints and opportunities. In the 1960s, an open system approach instead stressed the technical interdependence of organisations and their environments. The emphasis has lately switched from the technical to the social environment according to the neo-institutional approach in organisational theory. The new institutionalism in organisational theory and sociology comprises a rejection of the rational-actor models, an interest in institutions as independent variables, a shift towards cognitive and cultural explanations, and an interest in properties of sovran-individual units of analysis that cannot be reduced to aggregations, claim two proponents of this approach [5], [6].

DISCUSSION

Some of the issues raised by the neo institutional approach in an effort to merge the study of environmental effects with a special emphasis on the cultural component with those of organisational decisions as dictated by their norms. First, we take into account the role that organisations play as norm-creating actors that do not just constrain options: they establish the very criteria by which people discover their preferences. Therefore, organisations serve as both platforms for experimentation and tools of mobilization. Next, we examine both official and informal practises. The relevance of relationships was no longer defined by the formal organisation chart; forms of coordination grounded in personal networks as well as non-authoritative projects of mobilization were made visible, as well as influences that transgressed the official boundaries of an organisation. In order to better understand each organisation, we will look at its practises and core values rather than just its official organisational charts.

Thirdly, we share an emphasis on cognitive processes with the neo-institutional approach: organisations do not naturally adapt to their surroundings; instead, external influences are mediated via organisational actors' views. Assuming that organisation members discover their motives by acting, neo-institutionalists marked a shift from Parson's conception of

internalisation with utilitarianism derived from Freud to an emphasis on cognitive processes, derived from ethnomethodology and phenomenology, and their focus on daily action and practical knowledge. Bourdieu defined habitus as a system of regulated improvisation or generative rules that represents the internalization by actors of past experiences on the basis of shared typifications of social categories, experienced phenomenally as people like us. This concept is crucial for this analysis. In this study, we want to analyse both official organisational positions and informal practises, as well as general values and involvement in protest movements. Although we think that organisations have a significant and active role in influencing their surroundings, environmental restrictions may be essential in influencing organisational conduct. The organisation is thus not just a means, but also an aim in itself for social movements, just as it is for other social actors [7], [8].

Multi-method research: advantages and caveats

one where social problems and unions are more prominent. Surveys of movement activists, an analysis of documents and websites from GJM organisations, semi-structured interviews with movement organisations, and participant observation of movement groups and their experiences with deliberative and participatory decision-making make up the research we present here. We wanted to gather data on a reasonably high number of organizations/groupings per nation and on very various organisational forms, in contrast to most social movement research conducted in the past. We blended qualitative in-depth investigation of a small number of organisations with quantitative analysis of a large number of instances in the different sections of our research. The variability of the GJM, especially in terms of organisational designs, was one of the justifications for increasing the number of chosen examples. We have to choose a lot of different groupings in order to show this variability. This book includes the findings of an investigation of 266 SMOs websites, 244 SMOs foundational documents, and interviews with 210 SMO officials.

The first section of our study focuses on e-democracy as it is conceptualized and used on the websites of 266 social movement organisations engaged in global justice protest campaigns. Social movement organisations utilise the Internet as a tool for information dissemination, identity construction, recruiting new members, and mobilizing both online and offline. The number of movement organisations having an online presence has significantly increased in recent years due to its cheap cost and possibilities for horizontal engagement. The analysis of the GJM organisations websites was conducted using a structured codebook in order to gather information on the characteristics that might affect the degree to which online organisations fulfil the democratic potential of the Internet, building on prior research on Eastern European on European parliaments. The following dimensions served as the framework for the codebook:

general information provision, with variables for measuring information dissemination and analysing how information is organised on the website identity building, with a set of variables for using a Web site for internal, multilateral communication, transparency, with a set of variables for the online publication of information on statutes, organisational structure, work agenda, and other relevant information. The study in this book is a component of the DEMOS Democracy in Europe and the Mobilisation of Society project, which examines the views on democracy held by social movement groups operating in the GJM. The study, which examines transnational and social movement organisations from six European nations Italy, Germany, France, Spain, Great Britain, and Switzerland covers a very small portion of the GJM. Many of them took part in the European Social Forums, where hundreds of organisations and tens of thousands of activists have gathered and networked in order to create another Europe since the inaugural edition in Florence in 2001. But it also tackles the

two major constellations that came together to form the GJM, particularly in Central and Northern Europe, where NGOs sometimes deriving from the New Social Movements of the past are more prominent [9], [10].

The Internet is not only a fascinating subject of study, but it is also a great resource for researching and studying social movement organizations textual output. Despite not only depending on the Internet, a second portion of our study examined the key papers of 244 social movements. Organisations focuses on the ongoing conflicts between representational and deliberative patterns, both within social movements and in their interactions with institutions. This section of the study focuses on the organisational philosophy rather than the actual operation of the organizations groupings which will be covered in subsequent DEMOS project sections based on interviews, Web analysis, and participant observation. The underlying premise is that when an organisation has strong normative statements regarding internal democracy, these values often appear in visible documents like the organizations constitution, mission statement, about us page on its website, and so on. We are aware that in certain situations, constitutions or mission statements may be strategically useful; that is, they can be modified to meet the needs of outside sponsors, government agencies, and other entities in order to gain support and influence. However, formalised decision-making processes have a tendency to limit an organizations institutional framework. The following organisational papers were the subject of the analysis the organizations constitution; a declaration of core principles and aim; a formal programme the mission statement; the about us part of the website;

These resources were accessible on the websites, although not all of them. We examined the Web sites and then got in touch with the organisations to ask for any missing papers in an attempt to finish, as much as feasible, our collection. We created a codebook for the quantitative portion of the study with the intention of conducting an organised examination of democratic aspirations. From the standpoint of methodology, this section is fairly fresh. These analyses had the advantage of thick description but were challenging to summarise in larger comparison. The following sets of variables served as the foundation for our codebook general information on the organizational characteristics including country and date of foundation, territorial level of activity, numbers of individual and collective members identity and conceptions of democracy including references to internal organizational values such as limitation of delegation, inclusiveness, deliberation, general democratic values such as participation, equality, and dialogue; themes covered, such as democracy, social justice, human rights, and ecology; specific functions of the organization, such as protest or lobbying.

These resources were accessible on the websites, although not all of them. We examined the Web sites and then got in touch with the organisations to ask for any missing papers in an attempt to finish, as much as feasible, our collection. We created a codebook for the quantitative portion of the study with the intention of conducting an organised examination of democratic aspirations. From the standpoint of methodology, this section is fairly fresh. These analyses had the advantage of thick description but were challenging to summaries in larger comparison. Organizational structures and decision-making methods including, if mentioned, the role of assemblies, executive committees, and presidents or general secretaries; their composition and functioning; methods for choosing delegates limits on delegation; incompatibility rules, relationships with public institutions distinguishing among collaboration, democratic control and refusal of relationships with local institutions, national institutions, and international governmental institutions, as well as with economic actors.

Identity and conceptions of democracy including references to internal organizational values such as limitation of delegation, inclusiveness, deliberation, general democratic values such

as participation, equality, and dialogue; themes covered, such as democracy, social justice, human rights, and ecology; specific functions of the organization, such as protest or lobbying. Since our sample was not chosen at random, it cannot be said to be an accurate representation of the makeup of the GJM worldwide. Random sampling is only one method of case selection, while it has some clear benefits and challenging application requirements. According to King et al., among others, Random selection might not be feasible in qualitative research, and indeed in much quantitative research, because the universe of cases is not clearly specified Since there was no official list of GJMOs in our situation, random selection was really not an option. Additionally, random selection is not necessarily a wise technique to use, even when it is feasible. since there is a chance of missing important cases. This observation also pertains to the study design we used, in which we were only able to choose between 30 and 40 groups per team due to the time-consuming nature of document collection and coding. King et al. advise us against abandoning randomization if we must, which is often the case in political science research.

In reality, we aimed to choose the organisations in the center of the Global Justice Movement in each nation and at the supranational level rather than using randomness as a factor in our selection technique. We also made an effort to represent the diversity of the movement via the topics we covered and our ideological inclinations. In keeping with the principle that the best intentional design selects observations to ensure variation in the explanatory variable and any control variables without regard to the values of the dependent variables, we took care not to sample on our dependent variables. We cannot claim that our national samples are representative of the universe of GJM organisations in any nation due to our sampling methodology. We are confident that the selection decisions did not affect the statistical correlations among the coded variables, though, as our case selection adhered to the rule that we must not search for those observations that fit our a priori theory. When feasible, comparable organisations were replaced for the lists used for the analysis of the documents in the sample approach for the interviews. This occurred in 19.5% of the cases; these cases were concentrated in the Spanish and transnational samples with about 50% substitutions each, whereas they ranged from 0.0 % substitution in the Swiss case to 2.7 % substitution in the Italian, 7.7 % substitution in the German, 10.7 % substitution in the French, and 13.8 % substitution in the British.

CONCLUSION

Social movements, global governance, and democratic action may benefit from the information obtained from researching the GJMs organisational structures and democratic aspirations. The use of these ideas may promote transformational change and enhance human rights and global justice. In conclusion, further study in this area is necessary to improve our comprehension of the GJMs significance and potential for revolutionary change. Putting inclusive and participatory practises first may increase the movements credibility and efficacy. Additionally, advancing global justice and building a fairer and more equitable world depend on sustaining democratic values and tackling underlying injustices. The GJMs objectives and democratic values must be advanced above all else, and this calls for a focus on cooperation and solidarity among all players.

REFERENCES:

[1] T. Kössler, Republic of hope and fear: Visions of democracy in pre-Civil War Spain, *Journal of Modern European History*. 2019. doi: 10.1177/1611894418820246.

[2] P. Sekhsaria en N. Thayyil, Technology vision 2035 visions, technologies, democracy and the citizen in India, *Econ. Polit. Wkly.*, 2019.

[3] S. Pasundan, Endang Komara, *SOSIO Didakt. Soc. Sci. Educ. J.*, 2019.

[4] E. Peruzzotti, Post-liberal and Post-populist Democracy: Rethinking Democratic Representation, *Chinese Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s41111-019-00123-3.

[5] D. F. White, Ecological democracy, just transitions and a political ecology of design, *Environ. Values*, 2019, doi: 10.3197/096327119X15445433913569.

[6] M. P. García-Guadilla en A. Mallen, Polarization, Participatory Democracy, and Democratic Erosion in Venezuelas Twenty-First Century Socialism, *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0002716218817733.

[7] M. Laruffa, How to defend the democratic principle when elections and parchment barriers fail. A realistic approach to constitutional democracy, *G. di Stor. Cost.*, 2019.

[8] H. Rydenfelt, Pragmatism, social inquiry and the method of democracy, in *Practices of Citizenship in East Africa: Perspectives from Philosophical Pragmatism*, 2019. doi: 10.4324/9780429279171-3.

[9] J. T. Dalton en A. Logan, A Vision for a Dynamic World: Reading Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy for Today, *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3418511.

[10] D. Yanow en P. Schwartz-Shea, Political Science as History A Reflexive Approach, in *Interpretation and Method*, 2019. doi: 10.4324/9781315703275-27.

CHAPTER 2

GLOBAL JUSTICE MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS: THE ORGANIZATIONAL POPULATION

Dr. V.P Rakesh, Professor
Department of Political Science, IIMT University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India.

ABSTRACT:

A wide range of organisations, including grassroots activists, non-governmental organisations NGOs, social movements, and other members of civil society, make up the Global Justice Movement GJM. This study intends to map the organisational population inside the GJM, illuminating the many forms, configurations, and roles of organisations engaged in promoting problems of global justice. The research explores the geographic distribution of GJM organisations and looks at their contributions to worldwide efforts to solve social, economic, and environmental issues. It examines the tactics used by these organisations to influence public policy, inspire group action, and raise awareness. The paper also examines the difficulties GJM organisations confront, including lack of coordination, limited resources, and preserving group cohesiveness. For evaluating the movements variety, overall influence, and capacity for revolutionary change, it is essential to comprehend the organisational population inside the GJM. The report also emphasises how this information may be used to increase the campaign for international justice, promote interorganizational cooperation, and advance sustainable development objectives.

KEYWORDS:

Civil Society Actors, Global Justice Issues, Grassroots Activists, Non-Governmental Organizations, Social Movements.

INTRODUCTION

The Global Justice Movement is the subject of our study. Since they are made up of loose networks, have a diverse action repertoire, and lack a collective identity that is organised inside precise organisational bounds, social movements cannot often be described as unified actors. This is especially true for the actor under investigation, who has been characterised as organizationally flexible, strategically wide-ranging, and accepting of variety. As a consequence, there has been discussion over whether there really is a global justice movement. Activists and academics alike debate whether to use the singular movement or the plural movements to refer to the networks and groups mobilising for global justice, with opinions reflecting in part the degree of agreement or disagreement in mobilisation at the national level.

The diversity of the movement, which is viewed as a strength by activists who refer to a movement of movements, has been interpreted differently by different scholars. Some have argued that the heterogeneity of the movement indicates that the mobilisations on global issues do not share enough common meaning to qualify as social movements others have argued that it reflects internalised values of inclusion and tolerance. The degree to which activists identify with the movement, the uniformity of diagnostic and prognostic frameworks, the density of mobilising networks, and the consistency of action have all been examined in an effort to answer the issue of whether there is a movement.

The usage of the single or the plural differs among campaigners. The Italian protest organisers who planned the Genoa 2001 G8 summit protest identified as members of A movement of movements. The Assembly of the Movements stated, We, women and men from social movements across Europe, came to Athens after years of common experiences, fighting against war, neoliberalism, all forms of imperialism, colonialism, racism, discrimination, and exploitation, against all the risks of an ecological catastrophe, at the conclusion of the fourth edition of the European Social Forum a most notable gathering of the European groups involved in the GJM [1], [2].

Beyond the mere presence of a movement, the topic of the phenomenons worldwide scope is also addressed. Some academics emphasise that social movements continue to organise and grow around national issues, whereas international organisations are often ad hoc alliances with little autonomy and personal commitment. It is often observed that protest activity, which primarily depends on national political possibilities and attempts to specifically target national administrations, only very seldom occurs outside of national boundaries. The lack of longevity of international networks and campaigns has been noted as evidence of weakness on other tenets of social movements, such as action and networking, along with the rarity of transnational protest events.

The degree to which we can identify changes in organisational methods, problem framing, and action repertoires in the recent mobilisations on global justice is also up for debate. Cycles of protest have historically served as testing grounds for novel concepts, and burgeoning groups have often carried new standards and regulations. The concept of new social movements, however, was already under dispute by the 1980s, and the propensity to find novelty in each new wave of protest was viewed with distrust. This was especially true for the global justice mobilisations, which have either been hailed or derided as a return of the Left due to their interest in materialist themes as well as the organisational support given by both left-wing parties and unions. The information we have gathered enables some clarification of these obviously complicated problems. As I present some descriptive data on the organisational population studied in this volume in terms of cultural frames, forms of action, and organisational models, I will discuss the existence of a movement, the strength of its transnational dimension as well as its innovative versus traditional elements. Finally, Ill outline the organisational notions of democracy that the rest of this book will generally relate to [3], [4].

Framing global issues

The creation of a discourse that highlights a shared identity and the object of the protest on a worldwide scale is a prerequisite for the emergence of a global movement. Organisations involved in movements should conceptualise their initiatives in terms of global identities and issues, referring to themselves as members of a global movement and focusing on global enemies within a global. The first conclusion from our study is the existence of strong levels of identification with a global movement, which is supported by the poll of activists at the 4th ESF in Athens. We questioned participants in our interviews with representatives of social movement organisations how closely connected they felt to the GJM. Around 80% of respondents said that they totally identified, while only a very small percentage of groups indicated that they did not see themselves as being a part of the movement or that they did not have a common opinion on the matter. The manifestation of a sense of belonging to the movement is all the more important given the wide variety of organisations that expressed a sense of belonging, ranging from NGOs to political parties, from unions to more traditional new social movement organisations. The media, which we tested as being supportive of the social forum process, as well as more radical for example, anarchist organisations, often

stated a lack of affiliation. Furthermore, the data show that organisations that existed before the GJM emerged had a high degree of identification with it we did not discover a significant relationship between the year of formation and feeling of membership to the movement.

In order to determine how much different actors and campaigns adhere to an analytical definition of social movements that emphasises the requirement to subscribe to a shared belief, it may not be sufficient to look at actors' self-definitions of the movement in terms of its existence and emotions of membership. The question of whether a movement of movements really has enough fundamental agreement to be considered such is still up for dispute in both politics and the social sciences, as was previously stated. In order to address these difficulties, it would be useful to look at the replies to an open question we asked of SMOs about the key goals of the GJM. The delegates that were questioned expressed a variety of and various perspectives on the Global Justice Movement. Re-aggregating the responses to an open question, reveals that more than one-third of groups consider the movements primary goals as worldwide, while more than two-thirds define them as social. More than half of our groups highlight topics related to recent social movements, and over a quarter emphasise the problem of democracy.

In a cross-national comparison, transnational groups are more likely to mention international goals than national groups with the exception of Swiss groups, which tend to focus on social issues. Swiss and Spanish groups address more issues specific to the new social movement, while a sizable number of British, French, and Italian organisations see democracy along with unrestricted access to information as the movement's central tenet. The majority of our respondents particularly the British and international groups endorse the movements proactive assertions, while only around 40% mainly the French and Spanish groups acknowledge its negative features. Regarding the type of statement made, the majority of groups around 80%, particularly Swiss and international groups advocate for broad statements such as equality for all, societal transformation, whereas one-third, particularly Spanish and international groups, advocate for specific issues and policy proposals such as climate change, peace, the Kyoto Protocol, corporate accountability law, and so forth [5], [6].

DISCUSSION

Looking at the whole responses, we can see that organisations often see the movement as a place where their own unique issues can reach a wider audience. Our responses do concentrate on a few key concerns that have come together in global justice mobilisations. Organisations operating in the South of the globe make up a significant portion of our mobilisations. For them, the GJM is an opportunity to create new regulatory frameworks for markets, trade, and development, to advance a vision of the world based on the dignity of the person and the respect for human rights, to call for global legislation for the protection of labour rights in accordance with ILO norms, and to promote a vision of the world based upon the in actuality, the Jubilee Debt Campaign places reducing poverty and promoting economic fairness at the forefront of its priorities. According to Medico International, the movements key goals are to give permanently disadvantaged people access to resources like education and health care; to combat the logic of evaluating people according to their potential for economic profit. The developmental paradigms influenced by the neoliberal orthodoxy are criticised by the Italian Consortium of Solidarity.

War and peace-related issues are also crucial. The GJM Stop the War Coalition regards peace and human security as its core principles. In order to establish peace through justice, it is believed that poverty and hunger must be eradicated, as the GJMs primary goals are to prevent wars, achieve disarmament, and implement international standards. According to

ecological organisations, the movement is seeking alternatives to the capitalist system that widens the gap between the rich and the poor and depletes natural resources. In this context, ecological organisations emphasise environmental concerns.

The unions and left-wing political parties portray traditional social justice issues as being of utmost importance. By fighting for a different model of globalisation that places decent work at the centre of development and trade, the GJM seeks to ensure basic human rights, democracy, and social justice, according to the International Metalworkers Federation, and it seeks to provide global solutions that are not only based on profit. The connotations of the have nots place a strong emphasis on equality and, conversely, the fight against inequality. The GJM is thought to support the battle against inequality, provide visibility to the excluded, and support the cause of a guaranteed income that doesn't impoverish its recipients. In parallel, the Coordination fights against precarious work, the Italian emphasises the fight against the western model conceiving other peoples as colonies, and the Muslim Association of Britain advocates for equal rights. The goal of the movement is to make the struggles of undocumented migrants known [7], [8].

Despite these distinct languages and agendas, there is ground in common. Beyond the various accents, respondents' common concerns are highlighted via bridge themes. The responders repeatedly identify four key issues as the GJMs underlying motivations: demands for rights, social justice, democracy from below, and the movements worldwide scope. First of all, almost all organisations speak in terms of rights, with varying degrees of emphasis on particular rights. This is characteristic of unions and groups more closely aligned with the goals of the New Social Movement. Campaigning groups in the South of the globe propagated a vocabulary of human rights, which in the GJM quickly evolved into global rights. The GJM is focused on the promotion of human rights and of social sustainable development through strategies against poverty, illiteracy and exploitation, according to the spokesman of the European Global March Against Child Labour. But the movement seldom confines itself to certain demographic segments; instead, it is described by broad categories like citizens of the humanity. People from democratic nations are not the only ones who speak about human rights. The concept of citizenship is addressed, although it also applies to non-residents. Gay organisations also emphasise civil rights. According to the spokesman of the biggest Italian homosexual rights organisation, Arcigay follows the GJM as we believe that in addition to economic globalisation, civic and social rights should also be globally standardized.

Second, most responders bring up social concerns in one form or another. The most often mentioned goal is social justice. The GJM seeks to Engage on concrete issues: stating equality among human beings, emphasising human rights and reducing differences, as underlined by the Italian Emergency. The word social justice may be used to sum up these objectives. Depending on the tradition, social justice is defined differently. Social concerns could be discussed in terms of poverty in the language of NGOs or religion. In order to expose the scandal of poverty, to help in practical ways to root it out of the world, and to challenge and change the systems which favor the rich and powerful over the poor and marginalized, Christian Aid works as part of the GJM; for the Catholic Pax Christi, the movement seeks to change the laws of economics. The GJM challenges capitalism and all of the negative effects that it has on people, according to the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party, since social concerns are traditionally couched in terms of exploitation.

In contrast, social justice is seen as the broker frame that links all others. According to a representative of Espacio Alternativo, there is a great diversity, but there is also a trend to unify them in a general, pluridimensional idea of social justice social, ecological, between

genders, between peoples and cultures, democratic-participative, and for the defence of the common good. According to the Groupe pour Suisse sans Armée GSsA, the GJM works to advance social justice in all of the world, give human beings precedence over profit, reduce or redistribute economic, financial, cultural, and military power, and seek economic, political, and social alternatives to the preexisting model in a decentralised and non-hierarchical manner.

The movement, according to Friends of the Earth International, bridges environmental and social issues; it challenges the current model of economic and corporate globalisation, promotes the creation of solutions for environmentally sustainable and socially just societies. The mission of Greenpeace is to found a globalisation based on social and environmental rights, human rights, environmental respect, cultural diversity, and pacifism. Social justice is often included at the head of lengthy lists of objectives that also include disarmament, new economic models, globalisation of human rights, media democratization, environment and biodiversity protection, but not only by more political parties.

a) Redistribution of wealth, peace, freedom of movement for men and women everywhere, critics to all forms of intellectual propriety.
b) Right to education, culture, and housing, reform of international institutions,
c) European social constitution, fight against precarity, more investments on developmental cooperation, politics strategic role in sustainable development, and development cooperation.
d) Participative democracy, sustainable development, alimentary sovereignty, gender equality, etc.
e) No war, social rights, ecology, end poverty, womens rights, migrants.
f) Trade justice, debt cancellation, more and better quality and quantity aid, human and workers rights, social, cultural, economic, and political rights such as the ability to hold governments accountable, eradication of poverty.
g) Political, social, economic and cultural alternatives to globalisation and to international, regional, or national policies.
h) Economic, social, and environmental justice with a special focus on the economic, but not excluding other issues.

A third connecting thread is the search for a different democracy that is built from below, which is invariably related to social justice. According to the Seattle to Brussels Network, the movement is primarily focused on establishing another economy and a new democracy that goes beyond national and delegated institutions. According to ATTAC Italia, their goal is to reconstruct a public space and democracy. Attention to democracy is articulated in terms of the reform of international governmental organisations, particularly by transnational organisations. The movement seeks to improve international law and institutions, democratize the global system, achieve democratization and accountability of international institutions EuroIFI, network for the reform of International Financier Institutions, and challenge and alter prevailing economic policies and the global decision-making framework European Network on Debt and Insolvency.

The more conventionally political organisations emphasize here the need to reform current institutions, the development of democratic institutions without mercantilist aims, a more democratic governance of globalisation, opposition to economic power and multinational corporations, and support for UN reform. But democracy is also seen as the creation of venues for participation and deliberation. Democracy requires an innovation of the culture of traditional parties, promoting a good politics coming from a vibrant and reactive civil society, democratic participation at all levels, as well as raising awareness of all actors. The

movements mission, according to the Venezia Social Forum1, is to spread direct participation and citizenship to defend common goods from private economic aggression and to re-establish the priority of politics over economics. Participation of the public is suggested as a prerequisite.

It is usual to call for a restoration of politics pitted against the market. The movement is often perceived as being focused on recovering and expanding the spaces that were lost for the community to the advantage of the financial power; to oppose all state renunciations of competences that tend to priorities the rights of investors and traders. The movement is seen as aiming to create effective means of democratic control at all levels - local to global, according to the British journal Red Pepper, and Euro movement emphasises the organisation of politics under principles of participation and self-governing in order to achieve global common goods. A network connecting squatted social centres and related collectives, Rete Noglobal, describes the proposed solutions as a radical change in the forms of political decision and conditions of economic democracy. The solutions range from the regulation of global financial markets to greater co-management rights for the civil society.

The usage of terms like global, or world frequently indicates that there is an explicit or implicit reference to a global dimension. The GJM, according to a participant in an interview with the Organisation for Cooperation and Solidarity International, pursues a change in the existing global structures that are based upon a neoliberal economic model that privileges that maximization of profits over distribution, equality, and justice of human rights. Different frames also apply to the international domain, the global viewpoint, and the world's attention. In the definition of the GJMs objectives, we have references to, using Swiss organisations as examples: Balancing the power struggle between the North and the South, democratic consultation for international market regulations Seeking a fairer international economic order and give a human face to international relations changing the world to allow for more equality and in search of a more equitable world. It is, in essence, a movement for the redistribution of global wealth that seeks to stop welfare cuts on the national, European, and international level, to the realization of social justice through reallocation of wealth from top to bottom.

Indeed, our data from the document analysis on the fundamental themes and values mentioned in organisational documents confirms the bridging function of concepts like alternative globalisation and democracy about half of the groups mention them, as well asocial justice almost two-thirds of our groups, global justice, and workers' rights about half mention both. Additionally, ecological principles stand out as being highly significant about 50% of the organisations mention ecology, and a similar percentage mention sustainability; animal rights are mentioned considerably less often. About half of the organisations urging solidarity with developing nations cite the Global South, but just as many emphasize the value of human rights, and one-third make reference to fair trade. Women's rights, peace, and migrant rights are all frequently mentioned topics in half of the groups studied. However, our groups cite the major ideologies of the past less often socialism: 7.8%; communism: 3.3%; anarchism: 3.7%; religious principles: 7%.

CONCLUSION

Understanding the methods GJM organisations use to deal with issues like resource shortages and coordination presents potential for enhancing their group efforts and effectiveness. The information gleaned by mapping the organisational population inside the GJM may be used to encourage interorganizational cooperation and advance sustainable development objectives. Civil society actors may have a greater influence and create dramatic change by

working together. In conclusion, further study in this area is necessary to advance our comprehension of the organisational variety and overall effect of the GJM. Resource sharing and cross-organizational cooperation should be prioritized to increase the movements effectiveness. Additionally, it is essential for sustaining democratic values and amplifying the voices of marginalized groups for GJM organisations to promote inclusive and participatory practises. The GJMs goal of global justice and sustainable development must be realized, and this requires placing a strong emphasis on cooperation, solidarity, and collaborative advocacy activities. Understanding the methods GJM organisations use to deal with issues like resource shortages and coordination presents potential for enhancing their group efforts and effectiveness. The information gleaned by mapping the organisational population inside the GJM may be used to encourage interorganizational cooperation and advance sustainable development objectives. Civil society actors may have a greater influence and create dramatic change by working together in conclusion, further study in this area is necessary to advance our comprehension of the organisational variety and overall effect of the GJM. Resource sharing and cross-organizational cooperation should be prioritized to increase the movements effectiveness. Additionally, it is essential for sustaining democratic values and amplifying the voices of marginalized groups for GJM organisations to promote inclusive and participatory practises. The GJMs goal of global justice and sustainable development must be realised, and this requires placing a strong emphasis on cooperation, solidarity, and collaborative advocacy activities.

REFERENCES:

[1] O. Gore, J. Hammond, S. Bailey, K. Checkland, en D. Hodgson, Not every public sector is a field: evidence from the recent overhaul of the English NHS, *Public Manag. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/14719037.2018.1503703.

[2] M. V. Lopatina, M. V. Popovich, en O. M. Drapkina, The WHO European action network on measuring population and organizational health literacy: Perspectives for the participation of the Russian federation, *Profil. Meditsina*, 2019, doi: 10.17116/profmed201922051112.

[3] H. Purwantoro en Y. Bagyo, Citizenship organizational behavior ability to increase the effect of organizational climate, work motivation, and organizational justice on employee performance, *Manag. Econ. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.18860/mec-j.v3i2.7455.

[4] S. Limbarwati en F. Lukiastuti, Pengaruh kepemimpinan dan budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja pegawai yang dimediasi oleh komitmen organisasi pada Rumah Sakit Umum Daerah RSUD Kabupaten Brebes, *J. Magisma*, 2019.

[5] M. I. Hendri, The mediation effect of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on the organizational learning effect of the employee performance, *Int. J. Product. Perform. Manag.*, 2019, doi: 10.1108/IJPPM-05-2018-0174.

[6] C. Dietscher, J. Pelikan, J. Bobek, en P. Nowak, The Action Network on Measuring Population and Organizational Health Literacy M-POHL: a network under the umbrella of the WHO European Health Information Initiative EHII, *Public Heal. Panor.*, 2019.

[7] T. Fitrio, R. Apriansyah, S. Utami, en H. Yaspita, The Effect of Job Satisfaction to Organizational Citizenship Behavior OCB Mediated by Organizational Commitment, *Int. J. Sci. Res. Manag.*, 2019, doi: 10.18535/ijsrm/v7i9.em01.

[8] I. W. R. S. Putra en I. G. A. D. Adnyani, Pengaruh Komunikasi, Budaya Organisasi Dan Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan Ramada Bintang Bali, *E-Jurnal Manaj. Univ. Udayana*, 2019, doi: 10.24843/ejmunud.2019.v08.i04.p05.

CHAPTER 3

DETERMINATION OF MULTILEVEL AND MULTIFORM PROTEST

Dr. Amitesh Anand, Associate Professor
Department of Law, IIMT University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India.

ABSTRACT:

Protests with several levels and formats are becoming more common in modern social movements, reflecting the variety of methods and techniques activists use to confront challenging social concerns. In order to understand how different levels of activism and the various types of protest utilised by social movements interact, this research article will concentrate on the dynamics of multilevel and multiform protest. The research explores how international networks and alliances have grown, allowing for coordinated operations across boundaries. It looks at how direct action, internet activism, creative forms of resistance, and grassroots mobilization work together to produce successful campaigns. The study also looks at how multilevel protest affects decision-making processes, undermines established power structures, and promotes social change. In order to evaluate the efficacy, difficulties, and revolutionary potential of modern social movements, it is essential to comprehend the intricacies of multilevel and multiform protest. The report also identifies prospects for achieving social justice and equality by using this knowledge in support of human rights, environmental justice, and inclusive government.

KEYWORDS:

Direct Action, Grassroots Mobilization, Online Activism, Social Movements, Transnational Coalitions.

INTODUCTION

A movement must use transnational modes of activity in order to be considered global. Economic globalisation and multilayer governance may be predicted to shift protest to the transnational level, against foreign players, just as protest activities tended to concentrate at the national level with the establishment of the nation-state. Some of the new protest movements that have formed after Seattle are in fact international in character, despite the fact that research on protest events has emphasised that the nation-state continues to be the focus of most claims-making. In order to draw attention to criticisms of international policies on problems like the depletion of natural resources or the violation of human rights, the promotion of communication rights or the fight against copyrights on seeds, counter summits take advantage of the media attention and windows of opportunity provided by summits of international organisations. Global days of action draw attention to global concerns, while global or macroregional social platforms encourage conversation across boundaries [1], [2].

Transnational protest events, which may be infrequent in absolute terms, are particularly important due to their capacity to foster networking and their symbolic significance. Examples include protests against international intergovernmental organisation reform, fair trade, debt relief, capital taxation, and poverty in the South. Even before reaching the national level, contacts between various groups often began at the global level. Campaigns like the Euro mayday against precarious work, the Global Day of Action against the war in Iraq, and the European Marches on unemployment and exclusion have created opportunities for encounters in action between activists from various national and social backgrounds, both at the protest events themselves and during their planning. Representatives of local

organisations or activists from various nations frequently came together at the transnational level with more receptivity and interest in one another's histories than at the national level, where social movement cleavages have consolidated along historical fault lines and personal animosities.

Our respondents regarded the global level as more significant than the national and local ones when questioned about involvement in events organised by the GJM and the regularity of this engagement attests to a continuity that goes beyond ad hoc mobilization. In fact, nearly 80% of the organisations had taken part in a transnational event like a World Social Forum and/or European Social Forum; a comparable percentage had participated in Global Days of Action that is, against war; and nearly 75% had taken part in counter-summits held in conjunction with meetings of international governmental organisations [3], [4]. The groups in the French and Italian samples seem to be the most involved in the GJM events we described, in terms of national specificities. This is a reflection of the organisation of significant movement events in those nations during the previous ten years, particularly the European Social Forums and G8 counter-summits. The third European Social Forum 2004 in London was especially crucial for the British organisations, but national and local social forums were also key occasions for German, Swiss, and transnational groups such as the national social forum of Erfurt. For the French, Italian, and Spanish factions, international days of action were significant. Moving from local to national and international actions enhances participation in the GJM demonstrations in every other country, with the notable exception of the German and Swiss samples.

The responses to the question about the five organisations, initiatives, and networks addressing global justice problems with which the groups most actively contact provide further evidence of the centrality of the transnational component for our groups. The topic and the geographic scope of these campaigns' networks. Around half of them are social concerns more so for France and the UK, more than two-thirds are international even more so for the Swiss and transnational groupings, and between 10 and 20 percent are national democracy or new social movement issues. German and Italian campaigns networks focus particularly on national concerns, Spanish organisations are mostly concerned with democratic issues, while British and international campaigns networks are predominately concerned with new social movement issues. The data on the territorial level of the campaign confirms that the majority of groups network globally nearly 85%; especially French and transnational organisations, with less emphasis on national level campaigns nearly 70%; especially German, French, and British groups, and very little participation in exclusively local campaigns 4%; with slightly higher percentages for Spanish, Swiss, and British groups [5], [6].

Although the majority of our organisations engage in global action, their tactics do differ since there are so many different issues and ideals that need to be addressed. It is important to note that the portions of the research based on documents and interviews helped to confirm the presence of a broad and varied repertoire, ranging from lobbying to direct action, from educational campaigns to public protest. While a sizable portion of our groups 69.3% mention protest in the documents of the sampled organisations, a sizable portion also mentions influencing the media, disseminating alternative information, and raising awareness as key functions of their groups 68.0%, and nearly half of the organisations mention the political education of citizens 42.6%. Even if the percentage of groups stating political representation 11.5%, protection of particular interests 18.4%, advocacy 27.5%, service provision 21.7%, and self-help 13.9% is considerable, it indicates that the majority of

organisations participate in a variety of activities. Lobbying is mentioned by even higher numbers 35.7%.

The majority of our organisations combine many techniques instead of sticking to just one. The interviews produced outcomes that were similar. As over 90% of the groups place a high priority on cognitive activities including sharing knowledge, planning meetings, seminars, and workshops, publishing research papers, etc. About 75 percent of the organisations say they participate in protests, and a similar number say they build actual alternatives. About half of the organisations use a lobbying tactic that puts direct pressure on elected officials. Contrary to the notion that protest and lobbying are opposing tactics utilised by separate actors, we discovered evidence that a large portion of our organisations did both.

DISCUSSION

Similar situations, where various plans and methods were put into action. Organisations from various nations, at least in our samples, prefer various techniques. While lobbying is more common among organisations from northern European nations especially Britain and at the transnational level, protest is more common among those from southern European nations especially Spain. The majority of French, Swiss, and international organisations reported using a strategy targeted at creating tangible alternatives, but almost all German and Swiss groups reported investing in the political education of people. We may see that few groups less than 10%, when numerous techniques are used, concentrate on only one. While just one-fifth use only two distinct techniques, more than two-thirds use at least three at once.

There is a higher likelihood that groups from southern European nations will be significantly involved in various types of action both conventional and unconventional. Most of the organisations we studied more than 75% employ petitioning and demonstrations. More extreme and/or creative kinds of protest, such as boycotts which are notably popular in Italy, Spain, and the UK, blockades which are specifically highlighted for France, Germany, and Spain, occupations, and civil disobedience which are particularly frequent in France and Spain, are less common. Most groups place a high importance on the creative and symbolic aspects of collective action; as a result, over two thirds of our organisations participate in artistic and cultural performances particularly in southern European nations and the UK. While the strike in certain nations is still exclusive to organisations that represent workers, it has moved beyond the trade union sector to the social movement sector in others such as Italy and Spain.

The responses to the open question concerning the movements primary goals, where respondents also addressed the methods in which the movement may aid in achieving them, indicate the diversity of the repertory of action of our sampled organisations. The notion of the primary mechanisms by which the movement operates is likewise impacted by different viewpoints. In fact, respondents place a strong emphasis on political pressure Swiss Radio LoRa quotes the movement as saying that it Promotes better understanding of global links, brings together critical proposals, and increase parliamentary and extra parliamentary pressure in order to achieve a fair distribution of material wealth and political power; public education [7], [8].

Although creating alternatives is often seen as important in our organisations. The word alternative appears 42 times in the database of string variables with responses to the open question of what the movement is. However, only three times does the word protest appear, and then only with the qualifier protest as the basis for the construction at the political level, not sterile protest. Alternatives are envisioned as tangible, actual solutions: according to Rete Lilliput, creating evident contradictions through alternative practises is necessary for the

construction of other possible worlds. As stated by Unisono, the campaign must publicize alternatives already practiced in the Global South. However, the term alternative is sometimes understood to mean something completely different, since the movement strives to unveil make visible denounce the different forms that the capitalist systems use to legitimize itself and activate proposals or alternatives to this system Balade. According to the Italian Tavola Della Pace, it entails radical change of society and lifestyles and the Swiss Les Communists, it offers an alternative to the capitalist model.

As a conclusion, document data and interviews attest to the centrality of international protest activities in terms of networking and symbolic significance for the organisations taking part in the GJM. At least for our organisations, involvement in such events does not seem irregular or infrequent; rather, a significant portion of them often participate in a wide range of global activities. The Global Justice Movement appears to be primarily about action, not just at the local or national level but also and even more so at the transnational level, in the perceptions of our activists, despite the lack of data on the role played by transnational events for other movements for example, meetings of the Socialist International. Action repertoires seem to be both multilevel and multiform. Additionally, our sample includes groups who choose different types of methods. However, most organisations also have a tendency to blend different activities that were originally seen to be highly dissimilar, if not incompatible such as protesting and lobbying. The positioning of alternative practises as possible utopias is noteworthy as a recent mobilization innovation [9].

Networking: A movement of movements

If social movements are networks of people and organisations, then a global movement should consistently include organisational nets operating in different nations. The Internet and other modern technologies have made it easier to create worldwide networks, yet both material and symbolic constraints still exist. Global gatherings like the World Social Forum are uncommon and typically involve a cosmopolitan elite, which has led to the emergence of networks like No Vox to protest the marginalization of the have nots both in society and within the movement. These organisations support the presence of marginalized groups, especially at transnational gatherings where the effects of the ownership of cultural and material resources are more relevant. Furthermore, even when counter-summits are planned by transnational coalitions, the majority of the attendees are still from the host country. With very few exceptions, global networks, campaigns, and social movement organisations have very limited autonomy. Last but not least, the convergence of various groups each with their own organisational models has occurred in the context of the global justice mobilization. This diversity, in the opinion of some theories, would make the creation of universal even flexible structures all the more challenging.

The GJM is pluralistic and varied, with a wide range of organisational structures existing within the same movement, according to our findings from interviews on the organisational traits of the sampled groups. Resources differ first and foremost. Our organisations membership sizes, both individually and collectively, differ widely. Approximately half of the population has between 100 and 10,000 members, while the remaining one-third has more than 10,000. Only 21.6% have less than 100 members. One-fifth of the almost 65% of our organisations with collective members have ten or less members, whereas one-third have more than one hundred. Regarding their budget, 16.7% say it is changeable or restricted, and 25% say they have less than €50,000. The remainder is split evenly between those who say they have between €50,000 and €500,000 and those who say they have more than €500,000. The presence of paid personnel varies similarly, with barely one-third of our organisations stating none, 44.4 percent up to 16, 14.1 percent between 16 and 100, and 11.2 percent more

than 100. The groups are evenly split among those who claim fewer than 16, those who declare between 16 and 100, and those who declare more than 100 volunteers.

We have been able to identify a variety of extremely distinct organisational traits on the basis of the organisational papers. A significant portion of our groups 59.4% scored favorably on an index of structural participation that we created by giving organisations where the assembly meets more frequently than once a year and where the members of the executive president/spokesperson are elected by the general assembly a positive value. A lower percentage of 39.3% receives a higher rating on the structural inclusiveness index due to the absence of membership restrictions other than accepting the organizations ideals and expulsion clauses. The average for our sample is 0.42 on an additive formalization score that takes into account the existence of a constitution, a statement of core principles, a programme that has been officially accepted, formal membership, and membership cards normalized to range from 0 to 1. We could also categorise our groups as belonging to various organisational fields: 34.9 percent are grass-roots organisations, 34 percent are modern networks, and 9% are unions, parties, cooperatives, or NGOs. The remaining 1.2% are other groups.

However, if these disparities are significant and support the idea of a colored, heterogeneous mobilisation, then our findings indicate to certain shared characteristics. First off, the organisations in our sample provide services at various levels of territory. As previously indicated, our groups actively participate in international umbrella organisations, conferences, campaigns, and days of action. Three-quarters of the organisations in our sample 74.2% believe that having a local presence is crucial. This is especially noteworthy given the fact that our sample, by definition see above, does not include local groups. The international level, where nearly one-third of our organisations claim to be organized, is likewise quite significant, as is the national level with 83.6%. We can find hierarchical single organisations such as Greenpeace, 6.6% of our sampled groups, traditional federations such as ETUC, 11.5%, modern/loose networks such as ATTAC-International, 11.5%, and campaigns such as Euro mayday, 8.2% among the supranational organisations.

The high prevalence of network organisations is particularly relevant for the GJM; in our sample, this is mirrored by the fact that nearly half of our cases represent networks federations or ad hoc umbrella organisations. The fact that approximately half of the organisations in our sample permit collective membership is another sign of the high reticulitis of GJM organisations. Additionally, nearly 80% of our organisations mention networking and cooperation with national SMOs in their publications, and a similar number with transnational SMOs. About one-third of the organisations that mention cooperation or networking somewhat higher at the international level highlight the importance of engaging with groups that are focused on different topics than they are.

A theme that often appears in our interviews and unites the various strategic perspectives is the movements function as a venue for networking. First of all, the movement is seen as a place for interactions, discussions, networking, as well as for mass mobilization. We feel close to the movement because we think it represents an umbrella of different movements. Similarly emphasised are the development of better working relationships among NGOs Oxfam International, the strengthening of the coordination among national campaigns Our World Is Not for Sale, and the creation of ample social coalitions for an emancipatory movement that presents an alternative to neo-liberal capitalism. The dissemination of knowledge via the internet is often seen as crucial. Numerous interviewees highlight the GJMs rich intellectual diversity, which aims to spread, reflect, and debate the different struggles at the local level Indymedia Euskal Herria and encourages the cross-cutting debate between the different social movements, international networking Forum Social Suisse. The

movements' major goal is to enable all forces that oppose the neoliberal mondialization to know each other and converge Forum social local dIvry, as well as to provide a forum for an exchange of struggles and savoir faire DAL - NO VOX. This mutual understanding is then made possible via information. The common struggle is then made possible by reciprocal knowledge, as this movement aims at an internationalization of resistances, to unite and coordinate the local resistances federates social struggles Lautre Davos, allows the convergence of the struggles against neoliberalism French Cedetim, represents the nets of resistance in all their forms Fédération Syndic

In conclusion, even if again we are unable to quantify or contrast the level of networking inside our organisations and more broadly throughout the GJM, we can determine that the formation of international alliances is in fact seen as a key objective for our organisations. Beyond variation in size, resources, and age, a variety of organisational structures seem to be present in our sample. Beyond this, our organisations appear to share an interest in networking that was less overt in past waves of protest. The prevalence of groups that permit group membership, that are by constitution networks of organisations or even networks of networks, seems to be a major advance from an organisational point of view. Furthermore, a lot of these organisations emphasize transnational networking as a key organisational strategy and are structured at several geographical levels.

Visions and practices of democracy

One of the key questions for our research is which conceptions of democracy correspond to the variations in issue focus, forms of action, and organisational structures. This acknowledgement of a mixture of similarities and differences, old traditions and innovations, local and transnational struggles, leaves these questions open. What democratic ideas and methods evolve in response to the new problems posed by international and diverse actors? Our study's primary goal is to analyse democratic forms that are developed from below. Although representative models of democracy continue to be the most prevalent, as mentioned in the introduction, they are under threat from a crisis of legitimacy as well as efficiency: a decline in the use of traditional forms of political participation is accompanied by the perception that representative democratic governments are performing below par. As a potential remedy for representational democracy's flaws, other models of democracy are reemerging; experiments with participatory and deliberative democracies are now being conducted by political institutions as well as individual political and social actors. distinct ideas about democracy coexist in this setting, each emphasising distinct aspects of democracy. The broad concepts of democracy representative vs participatory, majority versus deliberative, etc. may be mixed in many ways and with varying balances, which is a key premise of our study.

As a result, rather than attempting to quantify the degree of democracy, we sought to identify several kinds of democracy that exist in GJM organisations in a more or less pure form. In this regard, we examine in depth the diversity of democratic practises and beliefs that our selected groups articulated. We have created a typology of democratic internal decision-making processes with an emphasis on democracy inside movement organisations. The first dimension, which deals with the level of delegation and participation, sets certain groups apart from others with dominance of an executive, a leader, or other restricted bodies by emphasising their central role in the organizations decision-making assembly. The second dimension pertains to deliberation majority voting and examines the relative importance of decision-making processes that provide public discourse, the common good, logical reasons, and the change of preferences a specific significance. By emphasising the decision-making process as a whole, the consensus approach especially embeds and valorizes these features.

We divided groups using the consensus approach from all other organisations using various decision-making techniques simple majority, qualified majority, mixed techniques, etc. based on this dimension. The typology we created for the Demos project crosses the two previously mentioned dimensions of participation referring to level of power delegation, inclusiveness, and equality and deliberation referring to decision-making process and communication effectiveness. Although we utilised the same typology throughout our study, the variables we used are somewhat varied as a result of the numerous research tools and sources we employed. We operationalized the two aspects as follows after analysing the key papers of GJM organisations. Delegates make up either an assembly or another decision-making body in an associational form. The majority vote is used to make decisions. Deliberative representation is used when delegates, in accordance with the documents chosen, decide on a basis of consensus. We have either an assembler model, where decisions are taken by majority, or deliberative participation, where consensus and communicative processes based on reason are mentioned as important values in the documents, when decisions are made by an assembly that includes all members or whoever wants to participate.

CONCLUSION

Opportunities for promoting social change and improving social justice are presented by understanding the function of multilayer protest in influencing decision-making procedures and upending power systems. The understanding obtained from researching multilayer and multifaceted protest may be used to promote inclusive government, environmental justice, and human rights. The advancement of social justice, equality, and sustainable development may result from the use of these tactics. In conclusion, further study in this area is necessary to improve our comprehension of the complexity and revolutionary potential of modern social movements. For movements to be successful and resilient, diverse and networked activism should be prioritized. Fostering comradery among social movements may also strengthen their combined voice and effect. To achieve the goal of a more fair and equal society espoused by modern social movements, protest activities must priorities teamwork, innovation, and inclusion.

REFERENCES:

[1] R. Peccei en K. Van De Voorde, The Application of the Multilevel Paradigm in Human Resource Management–Outcomes Research: Taking Stock and Going Forward, *J. Manage.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0149206316673720.

[2] T. J. M. Mom, Y. Y. Chang, M. Cholakova, en J. J. P. Jansen, A Multilevel Integrated Framework of Firm HR Practices, Individual Ambidexterity, and Organizational Ambidexterity, *J. Manage.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0149206318776775.

[3] J. F. Hair en L. P. Fávero, Multilevel modeling for longitudinal data: concepts and applications, *RAUSP Manag. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.1108/RAUSP-04-2019-0059.

[4] W. C. Wang en X. L. Qiu, Multilevel Modeling of Cognitive Diagnostic Assessment: The Multilevel DINA Example, *Appl. Psychol. Meas.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0146621618765713.

[5] S. van Vliet en M. Doebeli, The role of multilevel selection in host microbiome evolution, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2019, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1909790116.

[6] J. C. Jackson, V. K. Choi, en M. J. Gelfand, Revenge: A Multilevel Review and Synthesis, *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2019. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-103305.

[7] L. S. Liebst, Exploring the sources of collective effervescence: A multilevel study, *Sociol. Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.15195/V6.A2.

[8] T. Sitzmann en J. M. Weinhardt, Approaching evaluation from a multilevel perspective: A comprehensive analysis of the indicators of training effectiveness, *Hum. Resour. Manag. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.04.001.

[9] J. Z. Casterad, J. Sevil-Serrano, J. E. Bois, E. Generelo, L. Lhuisset, en A. Aibar-Solana, Centre for the promotion of physical activity and health CAPAS-City: A pyrenean cross-cultural structure to lead the way in the design, implementation, and evaluation of multilevel physical activity interventions, *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/ijerph16193631.

CHAPTER 4

PARTICIPATORY TRADITIONS: GLOBAL JUSTICE MOVEMENT

Mr. Naveen Gaur, Assistant Professor
Department of Law, IIMT University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India.

ABSTRACT:

The Global Justice Movement GJM is built on participatory traditions, which encourage inclusion, empowerment, and democratic decision-making among activists. In order to better understand how these traditions encourage cooperation, group action, and transformational change, this research study will examine numerous participatory practises within the GJM. The research explores the participatory democracy, consensus-building, and horizontal Organising tenets that support the action of the movement. It looks at the ways that participatory traditions empower marginalized groups, provide various perspectives a platform, and encourage bottom-up thinking. The study also looks at difficulties in putting participatory practises into practice, such as dealing with power dynamics and preserving unity in big, heterogeneous groups. In order to evaluate the GJMs legitimacy, efficacy, and possibility for accomplishing its objectives for global justice, it is essential to comprehend the relevance of participatory traditions within the movement. The report also emphasises how this information may be used to support diverse social movements, develop international cooperation, and advance social justice and equality.

KEYWORDS:

Consensus-Building, Global Justice Movement, Horizontal Organizing, Participatory Democracy, Social Activism.

INTODUCTION

Social movements support the validity though not the predominance of alternatives to representational democratic forms, criticizing traditional politics more or less directly. These individuals' views are in line with an ancient element of democratic theory that calls for an organisation of collective decision-making referred to in various ways as classical, populist, communitarian, strong, grass-roots, or direct democracy against a democratic practice in contemporary democracies labelled as realist, liberal, elite, republican, or representative democracy. Direct engagement is important in this situation, both as a value and as a practise. Social movement organisations have attempted to implement these concepts inside their organisational structures at least since the 1960s, not just for ideological but also for the strategic value that can be found in democratic decision-making. The restriction of delegation and the direct engagement of all members in internal decision-making were key characteristics of the many models established. This was a definite break from the organisational models used by institutional political players, including the Old Lefts institutional friends of emerging social movements.

The Global Justice Movement, on the other hand, has been referred to as a movement of movements, one that is characterised by networking between truly new international groupings and organisations that emerged from earlier waves of mobilization, including new social movement and Old Left organisations As a result, it may be considered that many participation traditions coexist inside the GJM in terms of both ideals and internal practices [1]. I will examine these various traditions in the sections that follow and talk about how they affect GJM networking and interactions with government agencies. Participation will be

explored as a value and as an internal practice of GJM organisations, based in particular on a qualitative and quantitative examination of essential documents of organisations involved in the social forum process.

The relationship between participatory ideals and the level of delegation in the internal decision-making of the sampled organisations is the focus of the first section. The second section examines the many participation traditions that are present within the GJM while taking organisational and cultural aspects into consideration. The third section is devoted to the influence of participatory ideals and the level of internal decision-making delegation on networking among GJM organisations as well as on these organizations' relationships with state authorities. Our data show that participatory ideals encourage networking and cooperation among movement groups inside the GJM, but that internal delegation levels are more important in determining how movement groups interact with state entities [2], [3].

Participatory values and organizational structure

The information gathered as part of the DEMOS project, specifically the analysis of the founding documents of 244 organisations involved in the social forum process, allows us to examine participation from two perspectives: the explicit mention of participation as an internal principle or as a general democratic value, and the presence of an organisational structure with a low degree of participation. We see the degree of delegation in addition to participation principles as a sign of a particular participatory tradition. The relationship between the two dimensions is covered in the section that follows.

The 244 sampled organisations from France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the transnational level frequently mention participatory values in the fundamental documents we analysed and coded: 27.9% explicitly mention participatory democracy as a general principle of internal debate and decision-making, and 51.2 explicitly refer to participation as a general democratic value.1 In more than 90% of the organisations, the internal principle is mentioned together with the democratic ideal. For the following, we make a distinction between the 113 organisations that do not mention participation as a value in their founding documents, the 63 organisations that do so only as a general democratic value, and the 68 organisations that do so also or exclusively as an internal principle.

The majority of the time, the papers under analysis included sufficient information about the selected organization's organisational structure to distinguish between four levels of delegation for internal decision-making valid cases: 200. A conventional organisational structure, with an assembly of delegates gathering less often than once per year and an executive committee with significant decision-making authority, characterizes high delegation 25 percent of genuine instances [4], [5]. Medium-high delegation 33% differs from the earlier model in that it includes more avant-garde elements like required delegation or frequent assembly sessions. Medium-low delegation 26.5% combines the presence of a powerful executive committee with an assembly of all members or anybody who wishes to participate. Low delegation 15.5% was described as organisations with an assembly of all members or anybody who wishes to participate and a feeble executive committee with merely coordinating powers [6], [7].

There are no consistent findings for elements that social movement studies have connected to organisational values, such as political possibilities or a groups size or age, when participative values and degree of internal delegation are considered independently. However, the impact of organisational age and size on internal delegation levels and participative ideals varies. Our findings seem to support the iron law of oligarchy in relation to the latter. Larger movement organisations may find it more difficult than smaller ones to guarantee that all

members have the chance for full involvement. Effective decision-making in particular may not seem conceivable without a certain amount of delegating. Delegation in internal decision-making is, in fact, linearly and significantly linked with the number of individual members in the tested organisations Crammers V=0. 385; the more members an organisation has, the more likely it is to exhibit greater levels of internal delegation. However, the findings for participation values are not statistically significant, but they do provide a preliminary indication of the existence of diverse participatory traditions within the GJM. In fact, both extremely big organisations more than 100 000 members and relatively small groups between 101 and 1000 members had the largest percentages of mentions of participatory ideals [8], [9].

DISCUSSION

In movement organisations, oligarchy has also been linked to an organizations age in addition to its size. In fact, among the selected organisations that were established between 1968 and 1989 and between the years 2000 and later, respectively, strong movement mobilization eras, an organisational form with low degrees of internal delegation is crucial. A strong executive committee and an assembly of all members are combined in 45% of organisations founded between 1969 and 1989, while an executive committee with only coordinating responsibilities is featured in 43% of organisations founded in 2000 and later. These two periods, however, had different dominant models. Organisational frameworks with significant internal delegation predominate before 1968 and between 1990 and 1999. Similar conclusions are drawn from the data on participatory values. There are two noticeable rises in the mention of participation as an internal principle, first for the years 1969 to 1989 and subsequently for the years 2000 and after. However, from 1990 to 1999, there is a steep decline in the mention of involvement as a general democratic value, before it reaches its peak from 2000 forward.

However, rather than addressing these topics independently in the following, we are more interested in examining the relationship between participative ideals and level of internal delegation. In fact, there is a statistically significant link between the mention of participatory ideals and the level of delegation in internal decision-making Cramers V=0. 181. From high delegation to intermediate categories to low delegation, the mention of involvement rises. Above all, twice as many organisations with a low level of delegation as compared to the other groups identify participation as an organisational concept. The embodiment of participatory principles, or at least something closely similar to them, may consequently be observed in an organisational structure with little delegation of internal decision-making authority. However, only about half of the organisations with low levels of internal delegation and around two-thirds of those with medium-low levels do not include participatory democracy as an internal tenet. On the other hand, clear allusions to participatory principles, including as an internal principle, are not excluded by a conventional organisational structure [10], [11].

The propensity of more informal groupings to not develop the kinds of papers including references to organisational ideals cannot adequately explain these findings.4 The findings instead seem to point to the existence of several participatory traditions within the GJM, with participation ideals associated with both low and high levels of internal delegation. In reality, organisational characteristics like the existence of a constitution or the formalisation of membership are very weakly or never associated with participation as an internal principle or a generic democratic ideal. The powers given to the assembly stand out as an exception, demonstrating a significant association between participation as an internal principle and the assembly designation as the primary decision-making body Cramers V=0. 277. Furthermore,

this connection essentially vanishes for organisations with medium-low and low levels of internal delegation and is very significant for those with medium-high and high levels 0. 383. Different participative traditions are present within the GJM, as further confirmed by some contradicting findings for various organisational aspects. For example, companies that highlight participatory ideals do better than average in terms of having an executive committee and explicitly rejecting it.

It is hardly surprising that businesses with high levels of delegation also explicitly mention participative principles. Whatever level of decision-making delegation exists within a social movement organisation, member participation is crucial, if not essential. Numerous papers from the selected organisations make mention of its relevance. For instance, Amnesty International France medium-high delegation states that the members are the heart of the movements life and participate in all its instances and decision-making in the section of the about us section of its website devoted to internal democracy. The international level also contains similar claims. Our World is not up for grabs OWINFS 2008 states on its websites about us page that the active participation of OWINFS members is what drives our collective work forward.

A requirement for participation in the decision-making processes of each local group for Indymedia low delegation is the individuals labour contribution to the group. Some organisations, such as the Italian gay and lesbian association Arcigay, which is characterised by high delegation, or the German section of Pax Christi, with medium-high delegation, even state in their bylaws that members have a duty to participate. Other organisations founding documents make explicit mention of the need to actively seek out members participation, regardless of their delegation level high delegation, as in the case of the Italian communist party RI Fondazione communist, medium-high delegation, as in the case of the Italian new media association Isolenella rete, medium-low delegation, as in the case of the British ecologist organisation Friends of the Earth, or low delegation, as in the case of ex low delegation.

The Different Participatory Traditions within The Gjm

the variations in participation traditions by examining both cultural and organisational elements, focusing on the first on the field of movement and the second on the field of organisation to which the sampled groups may be assigned. In terms of movement areas, we separate organisations from the Old Left, New Left anarchist autonomous groups, groups working on new social movement topics, solidarity human rights/peace organisations, and groups focusing on particular new global issues. In terms of organisational domains, we divide them into labour unions, political parties, party youth organisations, and party foundations, NGOs and formal SMOs, co-operatives, grassroots SMOs, and modern networks. According to statistics, levels of participation are much less connected with movement domain and organisational domain than is the level of delegation. These findings reflect the existence of several participatory traditions within the GJM, which is supported by a qualitative interpretation of the founding texts of the sampled organisations, with the importance of including internal involvement associated with both low and high levels of internal delegation.

Participatory values and practices in the various movement areas of the GJM

The numerous movement zones to which the selected organisations might be assigned are distinguished by considerable variances in terms of organisational age and size. Seven Old Left organisations typically date back to before 1968 and have more than 100,000 members each. Most independent, New Left, or anarchist organisations were started between 1969 and

1989 and are more likely to have between 100 and 1000 members. While most new social movement organisations were created around this time, they often had a bigger membership 1000–10,000 members. Solidarity, peace, or human rights organisations typically have between 1000 and 10,000 members and were created mostly between 1990 and 1999 but several were also established before 1968 or between 1969 and 1989. The majority of the new worldwide organisations, which have been formed since the year 2000 and only have up to 100 members, are modest. While there is a high association between movement area and the level of delegation in internal decision making, crossing movement area with the mention of participatory principles produces no meaningful findings. For solidarity, peace, or human rights organisations, there is a significant correlation between ideals expressed and actions taken: they speak less about participatory principles than any other group and clearly choose organisational structures with high levels of internal delegation.

However, when it comes to the level of internal delegation, the two movement areas groups that most frequently mention participation both as a general value and as an internal value exhibit very different preferences: nearly 85% of Old Left groups exhibit high or medium-high delegation, whereas 52% of new social movement groups adhere to an organisational model with medium-low or low degrees of delegation. Only for participation as an internal value do new Left, anarchist, or autonomous organisations and new global groups have more mentions than average; for participation as a general value, they stay at a low level, comparable to solidarity, peace, or human rights organisations. The groups from both movement areas translate their participatory values into low levels of internal delegation, with one exception: while new global groups favor low delegation, the New Left, anarchist, or autonomous groups favour a model with medium-low delegation.

The diverse participatory traditions that these findings suggest for the various movement sectors may be discussed in further detail via a qualitative analysis of the core texts of the sampled organisations. Organisations of the Old Left frequently combine participatory ideas with a conventional organisational structure. In actuality, historically speaking, left-wing organisations placed a high value on member mobilization and contributions. The Old Left organisations involved in the social forum process did not give up on participatory principles in response to the recent steady decline in membership engagement; rather, they continued to reinforce them. The Italian left-wing trade union confederation CGIL, for example, highlights the guarantee of the highest participation of all members, personally or through delegates as one of the cardinal aspects on which the democratic life of the organisation depends in Article 6 of its constitution.

There seems to be a deliberate reappropriation of the original participation ideals for the Old Left organisations participating in the social forum process, motivated not only by periods of crisis but also by connection with new social movements.8 These processes appear especially likely for the one-third of Old Left organisations that were established between 1990 and 1999. For instance, the Italian ARCI the long-standing cultural and social club of the Italian Communist Party, rebounded in 1994 openly admits to reappropriating ideals. A recovery of the original values is referenced in the organizations history as provided on its website, one of which is the active and informed engagement of people in democratic life ARCI 2008. However, we can also surmise that the organisational model and the aforementioned ideals are incompatible in the case of Old Left organisations.

In fact, Old Left organisations with high delegation cite participatory ideals more often than Old Left organisations with medium-high or medium-low delegation, but the opposite is true for new social movements and particularly new global groupings. According to a study done by the DEMOS team during the European Social Forum in Athens in May 2006, Old Left

activist's perceptions of democracy inside their organisations and their normative notions about democracy, which largely favor direct democracy, are inconsistent. In their own organisations, the same activists expressed the least satisfaction with the democratic process.

Old Left organisations tend to make more references to participatory values in their documents than New Left, autonomous, and anarchist organisations, which typically combine an assembly of all members with the presence of an executive committee. This is especially true of participation as a general democratic value. They do, however, get an above-average rating for citing involvement as an internal principle, as was already indicated. Additionally, we must take into account the fact that many autonomous or anarchist organisations use vocabulary that does not include the word participation, instead using words like direct democracy, horizontality, or self-organization. The grass-roots trade union COBAS in Italy specifically compares conflict and self-organization from below with a negative understanding of participation COBAS 2002.

Additionally, a democratic centralism concept is used by many Trotskyite organisations. According to our Athens study, New Left activists had high levels of satisfaction with democracy in their organisations and low levels of incongruence with their normative notions about democracy. The less participative mindset and the relationship between specialization, professionalization, and centralization in decision-making highlighted for single issue movements should be anticipated for solidarity organisations. In actuality, solidarity organisations rank lowest for mentions of participation, both as an internal concept and as a broader democratic ideal. Both groupings are mostly conventional organisational structures like Old Left groups. Similar goals are highlighted by the British Catholic Agency for Overseas Development Catholic Agency, while Christian Aid lists empowerment of people to change the systems that keep them in poverty as one of its visions and values Christian Aid 2005. The Italian Consortium of Solidarity states in its section on humanitarian aid on its website that it tries to root itself and to sustain the local democratic civil society and an idea of development and cooperation founded upon human rights, substantive democracy, and active participation in the places where it intervenes.

CONCLUSION

Opportunities for enhancing and preserving participatory traditions within the GJM are provided by understanding the difficulties involved in putting participation practises into practice, such as dealing with power dynamics and maintaining togetherness. Studying participatory traditions within the GJM may provide information that might be used to support inclusive social movements and promote social equality and human rights. By putting these ideas into practice, we can promote revolutionary change and move global justice forward. The relevance and transformational potential of participatory traditions within the GJM must be better understood, hence further study in this area is crucial. The legitimacy and resiliency of the movement may be enhanced by giving bottom-up organizing and participatory decision-making top priority. In addition, promoting international solidarity and cooperation across social movements is essential for realizing the goal of universal justice that the GJM promotes. To achieve a more fair, egalitarian, and sustainable society, activism must priorities inclusion, empowerment, and democratic principles.

REFERENCES:

[1] Y. Xiong, M. Cho, and B. Boatwright, "Hashtag activism and message frames among social movement organizations: Semantic network analysis and thematic analysis of Twitter during the #MeToo movement," *Public Relat. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2018.10.014.

[2] T. Fronius, S. Darling-Hammond, H. Persson, S. Guckenburg, N. Hurley, and A. Petrosino, "Restorative justice in U.S. schools: An updated research review," *Relig. Matters Contemp. Relev. Relig.*, 2019.

[3] R. Bauböck, "Mare nostrum: the political ethics of migration in the Mediterranean," *Comp. Migr. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1186/s40878-019-0116-8.

[4] A. Foerster, "Solidarity or Sanctuary? A Global Strategy for Migrant Rights," *Humanity Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0160597618817456.

[5] J. E. Givens, X. Huang, and A. K. Jorgenson, "Ecologically unequal exchange: A theory of global environmental injustice," *Sociol. Compass*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/soc4.12693.

[6] W. G. Roy, "How social movements do culture," *Int. J. Polit. Cult. Soc.*, 2010, doi: 10.1007/s10767-010-9091-7.

[7] S. A. Soule, "Social Movements and Markets, Industries, and Firms," *Organ. Stud.*, 2012, doi: 10.1177/0170840612464610.

[8] S. Allen, A. M. McCright, and T. Dietz, "A Social Movement Identity Instrument for Integrating Survey Methods Into Social Movements Research," *SAGE Open*, 2017, doi: 10.1177/2158244017708819.

[9] D. Mitlin, "Beyond contention: urban social movements and their multiple approaches to secure transformation," *Environ. Urban.*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/0956247818791012.

[10] P. Nirmal and D. Rocheleau, "Decolonizing degrowth in the post-development convergence: Questions, experiences, and proposals from two Indigenous territories," *Environ. Plan. E Nat. Sp.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/2514848618819478.

[11] P. Almeida, "Climate justice and sustained transnational mobilization," *Globalizations*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/14747731.2019.1651518.

CHAPTER 5

FOSTERING PARTICIPATION: VALUES AND PRACTICES IN GJM'S ORGANIZATIONAL FIELDS

Ms. Sakshi Solanki, Assistant Professor
Department of Law, IIMT University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India.

ABSTRACT:

The Global Justice Movement GJM is fundamentally based on participatory principles and practises, which permeate all organisational domains within the movement. In order to better understand how participatory ideals and practises empower activists and encourage group action for global justice, this research study will examine the many ways in which they are expressed in various GJM contexts. The research dives into grassroots organisations, non-governmental organisations NGOs, social movements, and international networks participatory decision-making procedures. It looks at the ways that participatory principles support the movements inclusion, diversity, and gender equality. The study also looks at how activists may co-create campaigns, gather resources, and participate in advocacy activities using participatory practises. For evaluating the GJMs efficacy, legitimacy, and transformational potential, it is essential to comprehend the role of participatory ideals and practises in the many organisational areas. The paper also emphasises how this information may be used to further social justice, participatory democracy, and international cooperation.

KEYWORDS:

Grassroots Organizations, Non-Governmental Organizations, Participatory Decision-Making, Social Movements, Transnational Networks.

INTRODUCTION

Movement space and organisational areas are intimately related. In our sample, the Old Left makes up around 60% of the trade unions, while the New Left makes up roughly 30%. The Old Left dominates political parties, party youth organisations, and party foundations in a similar fashion. By contrast, 16% of people identify as New Left/anarchist/autonomous and 25% as ecologists. About three-fifths of NGOs and formal SMOs are solidarity, peace, or human rights organisations, whereas the majority of cooperatives have New Left, anarchist, or autonomous roots. Modern networks and grassroots SMOs are both primarily new international organisations [1], [2]. The precise effects of organisational restrictions are shown by examining the relationship between organisational fields on the one hand, and the mention of participatory ideals and level of internal delegation on the other. In fact, participative ideals are specifically mentioned in several organisational sectors. In addition, the organisations in the different areas adhere to varied participatory traditions and blend participatory principles with differing levels of internal delegation. Numerous references to participation, both as a general democratic value and as an internal principle, are made by political parties, party youth organisations, or party foundations, with 31.8% mentioning the former average = 26.1% and 59.1% mentioning the latter average = 28.2%. Political parties have a unique character that is shown by the fact that trade unions, which are also controlled by institutionalized groups with an Old Left past, cite participatory principles far less often. However, compared to parties, union organisations are often bigger. They were also mostly started before 1968 or between 1969 and 1989, as opposed to political parties, which were primarily launched between 1990 and 1999.

It is due to the nature of these organisations and the particular kinds of papers they create that 90% of political parties, party youth organisations, and party foundations recognise participation as a fundamental democratic ideal. One of the main goals of party foundations is to encourage political engagement. Regardless of whether they are more moderate or more radical, or whether they have an Old Left or an ecologist background, the majority of parties and party youth organisations involved in the social forum process have policies that call for strengthening participatory processes in political decision-making. While the post-communist Madrid chapter of Izquierda Unida Jovenes calls for a revolution in participation, the moderate left youth organisation Sinistra Giovanile in Italy emphasises the need to move from representational to participatory democracy 2005. Fausto Bertinotti, secretary general of the Italian postcommunist party Rifondazione comunista, highlighted the development of participatory democracy as a key goal to be attained by joining a center-left government coalition during the partys 2005 convention Rifondazione 2005. The French Green Party calls for the implementation of participatory democracy at all levels of public decision-making in its 2007 programme, To Change Society, Invert the Trend: Make of Each Citizen a Conscious Actor Les Verts 2007. This will allow everyone to participate in the formulation of the decisions that affect them. We may presume that party organisations, at least in part, react to requests put out by civil society in general and the GJM in particular with these programmatic stances [3], [4].

Political parties, party youth organisations, and party foundations highlight participation as an internal concept more often than other organisational domains. The Italian RI Fondazione comunista says in Article 7 of its constitution that one of its major duties is to encourage all members to engage in political and democratic action and to organize political activity in a manner that encourages the widest possible involvement. The Spanish sister party of Rifondazione, Izquierda Unida, presents its internal operations as a new way of making politics in Article 8 of its constitution, where the involvement of all of its constituents is the distinguishing practise of its organisation. However, the majority of political parties have organisational traits that anticipate conventional forms of delegation and mention participatory democracy as an institutional ideal. In reality, none of the tested party organisations had low degrees of delegation, and more than 60% of them exhibit high or medium-high degrees.

The democratic and participatory operation of Izquierda Unida is based on the primacy of the assemblies at the higher territorial levels composed of delegates, according to Article 8 of the partys constitution, which ensures that the ensemble of decisions is made from top to bottom. Political parties have the distinct quality of combining internal delegation with high levels of internal engagement as a value. In actuality, parties with an assembly of delegates than parties with an assembly of all members emphasise participation as an internal ideal far more often. On the contrary, this tendency is reversing in NGOs/formal SMOs and particularly in modern networks. The similar discrepancy between organisational ideals and practises as was mentioned above for Old Left organisations in general may be hypothesized for political party organisations.

We believe that the party, which consists of both men and women who choose to join a political community in order to work together to realise a social project, is essential for bridging and penetrating with a unitary project of struggle the society, the economy, and the state organisation, whether it be national or international, and that in the face of the crisis of democracy and the nation state it continues to do more than just that. This dedication may also be seen as a reappropriation of original ideals, at least in part. Just modern networks, an organisational structure that has just recently emerged, are an organisational area that

mentions participatory ideals more often than the norm apart from political parties. One of these modern networks, Our World Is Not for Sale, characterizes itself as a loose association of groups, activists, and social movements in the about us portion of its website OWINFS 2008. In truth, these groupings might be described as informal networks of already-existing organisations that often though not always come together to pursue certain objectives or carry out particular campaigns [5], [6].

Modern networks feature a few unique traits. Approximately one-third of the analysed networks are not membership organisations, meaning they have neither official nor informal membership, like grassroots SMOs. Of those having membership, over a third only have collective members, which naturally results in significant levels of delegation; in fact, more than 50% of modern networks have high levels of internal delegation, but this is paired with member organisations autonomy. Furthermore, modern networks tend to be quite young; 58% were created in or after the year 2000, compared to 20% on average within the sample. Additionally, they are especially prevalent 58%; average: 32% in the new global mobility sector. Political parties do not emphasize participatory qualities nearly as often as networks with an assembly of all members or anyone wishes to participate. This is especially true for the internal concept of involvement. We are obviously dealing with a different kind of participation than political parties, one that translates democratic principles into modest levels of delegation. Ad hoc organisations with a flexible structure, like campaigns, exhibit this as well. For instance, the British Stop the War Coalition 2008 emphasises the need of frequent, inclusive meetings for local organisations.

Modern networks are especially prevalent as an organisational structure at the transnational level, where they make up 60% of the transnational organisations in the sample, compared to an average of 33%. References often allude to a more comprehensive commitment, including internal procedures, even if participation is frequently mentioned as a general democratic ideal at the international level. The World Social Forum 2002 states that it would defend respect for the principles of genuine and participatory democracy in Point 10 of its Charter of Principles. Reclaim Our UN 2005a frames its work as an inclusive and transparent approach. Additionally, there are some particular allusions to internal involvement. Peoples Global Action 2002 discusses the need of creating a variety of direct democracy-based organisational formations at various levels [7], [8].

Despite having a relatively small representation among the studied organisations, two categories' cooperatives and grass-roots SMOs were kept in the categorization of organisational domains. This choice was made based on the assumption that grouping them alongside others would skew the findings. This conclusion was formed, in large part, from a qualitative reading of the relevant core texts. The groups in both categories allude to participatory ideals very seldom, for various reasons. The foundational documents of cooperatives reflect the reality that they are primarily commercial entities. There aren't many papers of the kind we examined produced by grassroots SMOs, which makes it challenging to categorise these organisations based on how much internal decision-making is delegated to them. Both groups unmistakably prefer hierarchical organisational structures, or those with little internal delegation and an all-members assembly. However, cooperatives have powerful executive committees, which are often lacking in grassroots SMOs, in part due to explicit statutory requirements [9], [10].

DISCUSSION

Participatory traditions and external relations

The influence of diverse participation traditions and their elements on the external relations of the sampled organisations is the focus of the section that follows. Depending on whether we consider relationships with other movement actors or with state institutions, the degree of internal delegation and the value of participation really function differently. Participatory ideals, regardless of the level of internal delegation, serve as a unifying factor inside the GJM and serve as a foundation for networking and cooperation across tolerant identities della Porta 2005c. The level of internal decision-making delegation seems to be more crucial for interactions with regional, governmental, and international organisations.

Participatory traditions and relations within the GJM

Cramers V=0. 396, equality 0. 349, general inclusiveness 0. 340, dialogue/communication 0. 263, difference/plurality/heterogeneity 0. 256, and transparency 0. 240. In contrast, only the consensual approach 0. 312 and difference/plurality/heterogeneity 0. 262 have a substantial link with delegation level. Additionally, it is unconnected to the other factors but somewhat linked to internal inclusivity 0. 226 and transparency 0. 219. The strong correlation that participation as a value shows with the fundamental themes on which the sampled organisations work serves to further emphasise the importance of participatory values as a connecting element within the GJM and as a foundation for collaboration and networking, regardless of the level of internal delegation. We compiled the single themes addressed in the examined texts on the basis of bivariate correlations between them, and created normalised additive indices. Participatory values have a strong correlation with new globalism, which is another globalisation, democracy, and social justice Cramers V=0. 314; ecominority, which is ecology, womens rights, and antiracism Cramers V=0. 330; and peace and nonviolence Cramers V=0. 294; as well as with peace and nonviolence. Above notably, a greater link between participation values and an additive index of all fundamental themes is found Cramers V= 0.401, supporting their function as a unifying factor in the GJM.

On the other hand, none of these indices are connected with the level of internal delegation. When considering whether or whether networking with other social movement organisations is addressed, only involvement as a value emerges as being relevant at the national Cramers V = 0. 173 and transnational Cramers V = 0. 203 levels. However, there is a correlation between the mention of participation as a value and the amount of internal delegation and the methods of networking. On a national scale, organisations that do not specifically specify participatory ideals tend to network more with organisations working on related issues, while those that only specifically mention participation as a generic value tend to network more broadly. Additionally, the organisations that highlight participation as an internal concept do rather well when it comes to networking with organisations working on various topics. No matter how much internal delegation there is, these networking patterns continue. With regard to the latter, a clear preference emerges: groups operating in the same subject area network with organisations with a high degree of delegation the most. Medium-high and medium-low delegation groups disclose networking in general, whereas low delegation groups additionally indicate networking with organisations working on unrelated topics to their own. Similar trends may be seen in the international networking findings.

In conclusion, collaborative and networking inside the GJM seem to be especially dependent on participation principles, independent of the level of internal delegation. This is further supported by data gathered as part of the DEMOS project, which was based on interviews with influential figures from groups involved in the social forum process.14 The interviewees

were also questioned about their organizations feelings towards the GJM. The degree of delegation in internal decision-making is not substantially connected with this variable, but it is strongly correlated with the mention of participation as a value Cramers V = 0.199.

Participatory traditions and relations with state institutions

We may get an initial impression of an organizations relationship with state institutions by looking at the tactics and action repertoires that they claim to use. Most of the goals and duties listed in organisational documents lobbying, representing particular interests, self-awareness and self-help, advocacy, offering and providing services to the constituency, influencing the media and raising awareness, political education of the populace, legal protection and denunciation of repression as a specific issue are unrelated to participatory values. The exceptions are political representation Cramers V = 0. 201 and protest/mobilization Cramers V = 0. 223, both of which are specifically related to the statement of participation as an internal concept. In this case, it appears that different participatory traditions more conventional forms of political participation used, in particular by political parties of the Old Left as well as newer or more recent social movement organisations and the New Left are associated with internal participation.

Regarding the level of internal delegation, there is a correlation for a number of goals and duties mentioned in organisational documents, all of which are prioritised by high and medium-high delegation organisations. These include representation of particular interests Cramers V = 0.305, advocacy 0. 225, lobbying 0. 213, and service provision 0. 208. Both political representation and protest/mobilization are insignificant, yet all organisations with low levels of delegation engage in the former while none do the latter. According to a neo-institutional perspective March and Olsen 1989; Boli and Thomas 1999, organisations with more centralised decision-making structures tend to pursue the majority of the strategies and action repertoires that result in a collaborative relationship with state institutions.

These findings seem to show that, in contrast to relationships inside the GJM, relationships with state institutions are more impacted by organisational aspects than by values expressed. In reality, participation as a value is at best marginally connected with cooperation with state institutions as judged on the basis of interviews with representatives of the sampled institutions.15 Less cooperation is shown towards national and international institutions by the organisations that emphasise participation as an internal ideal, and a greater proportion of these organisations reject collaboration or stay uninterested. Only with regional organisations do they display a more cooperative approach. The vast majority of the organisations express cooperation with limitations as opposed to participation as a general democratic ideal.

In contrast to these findings, the degree of internal delegation clearly has a higher influence, especially on international and national organisations Cramers V = 0.412 and 0.413, respectively. The degree of internal delegation has a considerably reduced influence on local institutions Cramers V=0.227. In actuality, small groups with low levels of delegation also interact with local institutions, even if cooperation with national and international institutions is performed mostly by organized organisations. These tendencies are supported by a study of allusions to cooperation, democratic control, or resistance as characteristics of relationships with local, national, and worldwide governmental entities in organisational papers. Uncritical collaborators were defined as organisations that just mentioned cooperation. Groups were classified as critical or selective collaborators if they combined cooperation with either democratic control or rejection. While hesitant controllers or objectors either combine democratic control with refusal or expressly reject participation with state institutions, democratic controllers make no mention of unconditional collaboration or refusal.

There is no statistically significant association between relationships with local, national, or international governmental agencies and the inclusion of participation as a value in key organisational documents. The groups that just identify participation as a fundamental democratic principle, however, are more inclined to seek out the position of critical or selective collaborator. While not disliking uncritical cooperation or democratic control, organisations that highlight participation as an internal policy come out as more of a hesitant controller or objector. These findings further demonstrate that stating a specific internal value participation does not produce definite preferences in one's interactions with state entities. In actuality, the degree to which participatory ideals are integrated with various levels of internal delegation seems to have a greater impact on relationships with state institutions than the mere existence of participatory principles. High or medium-high delegation groups show a tendency to become critical or selective collaborators, but they may also become uncritical collaborators especially medium-high delegation groups. Uncritical cooperation loses value in organisations with medium-low delegation levels, whereas democratic control increases. Low delegation organisations make fewer allusions to cooperation with state institutions than do other organisations, but when they do, the denial of cooperation is conspicuously more prominent.

A statistically significant relationship between the mention of participatory principles, particularly as an internal concept, and an organisational structure with low levels of delegation appears for organisations involved in the social forum process. However, a significant proportion of organisations with high levels of delegation also include participation in their founding papers, as well as an internal value. Additionally, the relationship between participatory values and organisational characteristics is shaky and sometimes contradictory, and there are significant disparities across the studied groups in terms of how much weight they place on the organization's contribution to the realization of participatory ideals. Since different participatory traditions exist in the context of GJMOs, some groups associate the importance of including internal involvement with high delegation levels while others associate it with low delegation levels.

The many participation traditions found within the GJM may be linked to both the organisational field that an organisation can be accredited to and the movement region. In the social forum process, Old Left organisations often make heavy allusions to participation as an internal value, but they primarily follow an organisational style with a lot of delegating. There seems to be a deliberate appropriation of original principles by these organisations, but there may also be a misalignment between stated beliefs and organisational practises. Organizationally, solidarity, peace, and human rights organisations are similar, although they mention participatory principles far less often. New social movement organisations emphasize participation as a general and internal value, much like the Old Left, although they often convert these principles into lower levels of internal delegation. More than the average amount of references is made to participation as an internal value by both New Left and New Global organisations. The former combines a meeting of all members with a powerful executive, while the latter often forgo any internal delegation. The region of the new global movement stands out for having a strong utopian component and confirming participatory practises as prefigurative politics.

Political party organisations and modern networks have a special influence on participative traditions when it comes to organisational sectors. The nature of political party organisations and the distinct 70 Democracy in Social Movements sorts of papers they create must be blamed for the very high frequency of references to participation as a fundamental democratic ideal. In general, appeals for the improvement of participatory processes in

political decision-making can be seen in the plans of party organisations involved in the social forum process, at least in part in response to demands put out by civil society in general and the GJM in particular. Political parties also emphasize the importance of internal involvement, albeit they often combine it with high levels of internal delegation, in order to support a particular history of political engagement and the organisational structure in which it has traditionally taken place. On the other hand, modern networks represent a distinct understanding of involvement and translate participatory qualities into modest levels of delegation. Modern networks are especially prevalent at the international level since the GJM. Even while internal procedures are emphasised as part of a broader general commitment, participation is specifically highlighted as a democratic ideal at this level.

Different effects for participation values and internal delegation levels are shown in GJMOs external interactions. Participatory ideals serve as a connecting thread within the GJM in terms of interactions with other movement players. Participation as a value serves as a foundation for cooperation and networking among tolerant identities due to its close connections regardless of the level of internal delegation with a group of other democratic values and with the fundamental ideas that guide the sampled organisations work. On the other hand, the level of delegation in internal decision-making takes a higher relevance in terms of contacts with local, national, and international governmental entities. Organisations with high internal delegation levels often collaborate with state institutions in a critical or selective manner, while organisations with low internal delegation levels frequently adopt a reluctance-based approach.

CONCLUSION

Understanding how participatory principles and methods operate in diverse organisational spheres presents chances to boost the movements efficacy and revolutionary potential. Global solidarity, social justice, and participatory democracy might all benefit from the knowledge obtained by researching participatory principles and practises in the GJM. Applying these ideas may strengthen the movements credibility and magnify its voice as a whole. To sum up, further study in this area is necessary to improve our comprehension of the importance and transformational potential of participatory principles and practises in the GJM. The efficacy and durability of the movement may be increased by emphasising inclusive and collaborative methods. In addition, promoting interdependence and global solidarity across organisational sectors is crucial for sustainable society requires action that places a strong emphasis on participatory principles and methods.

REFERENCES:

[1] O. A. Acar, M. Tarakci, en D. van Knippenberg, Creativity and Innovation Under Constraints: A Cross-Disciplinary Integrative Review, *J. Manage.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0149206318805832.

[2] R. Teichert, Digital transformation maturity: A systematic review of literature, *Acta Univ. Agric. Silvic. Mendelianae Brun.*, 2019, doi: 10.11118/actaun201967061673.

[3] C. Blanka, An individual-level perspective on intrapreneurship: a review and ways forward, *Review of Managerial Science*. 2019. doi: 10.1007/s11846-018-0277-0.

[4] M. Good, M. Knockaert, B. Soppe, en M. Wright, The technology transfer ecosystem in academia. An organizational design perspective, *Technovation*. 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.technovation.2018.06.009.

[5] A. Kücher en B. Feldbauer-Durstmüller, Organizational failure and decline – A bibliometric study of the scientific frontend, *J. Bus. Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.05.017.

[6] A. Klammer en S. Gueldenberg, Unlearning and forgetting in organizations: a systematic review of literature, *Journal of Knowledge Management*. 2019. doi: 10.1108/JKM-05-2018-0277.

[7] L. Lambert, T. Dedeurwaerdere, M. Nyssens, E. Severi, en O. Brolis, Unpacking the organisational diversity within the collaborative economy: The contribution of an analytical framework from social enterprise theory, *Ecol. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.05.023.

[8] R. Palumbo en R. Manna, Making educational organizations able to change: a literature review, *International Journal of Educational Management*. 2019. doi: 10.1108/IJEM-02-2018-0051.

[9] H. Shen, Work-life balance, in *Public Relations: Competencies and Practice*, 2019. doi: 10.4324/9781315148106-13.

[10] L. Tomat en P. Trkman, Digital Transformation – The Hype and Conceptual Changes, *Econ. Bus. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.15458/ebr.90.

CHAPTER 6

RESOLUTE UNITY: UNDERSTANDING DETERMINATION AND CONSENSUS IN MOVEMENTS

Dr. Ashutesh Anand, Assistant Professor
Department of Law, IIMT University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India.

ABSTRACT:

The idea of consensus is essential to social movements because it embodies the values of inclusion, cooperation, and group decision-making. This study attempts to investigate the idea of consensus in social movements, with a particular emphasis on how it influences successful group decision-making and decision-making processes. The research dives into the numerous strategies for achieving agreement throughout various movements, including consensus-building approaches, participatory democracy, and horizontal organizing. In order to give activists more control over the movement's agenda and objectives, it examines how the search of agreement strengthens the credibility and cohesiveness of movements. The study also looks at difficulties in coming to a consensus, such dealing with different ideas and resolving disagreements. For evaluating a social movements efficacy, resiliency, and transformational potential, it is essential to comprehend the idea of consensus. The research also emphasises how this information may be used to further social justice, human rights, and equality, as well as democracy action.

KEYWORDS:

Collective Decision-Making, Consensus-Building Techniques, Horizontal Organizing, Participatory Democracy, Social Movements.

INTRODUCTION

Many additional organisations connected to the Global Justice Movement also include consensus as a core organisational objective, much as these social movement organisations. Consensus has not often been a major buzzword for social movements, although being relatively popular currently across borders. Neither for political organisations in general nor for movement organisations. Similar to social movement studies, which have emphasised conflict as the dynamic component of contemporary society, consensus as a notion has not been important. New social movements have been seen by the European tradition in social movement studies as possible bearers of a fresh primary conflict in our post-industrial societies, or at the very least of a developing constellation of conflicts. The resource mobilization strategy responded to the then-dominant view of conflicts as pathologies in the American tradition. Anthony Obers hall 1973 described social movements as the primary carriers of societal conflicts in his widely read book Social Conflicts and Social Movements.

It's no accident that the notions of social movements and conflict were related in the first book series to focus on social movements, Social Movements, Conflicts and Change. The earliest systematic studies of social movements, from Michael Lipsky 1967 through Charles Tilly 1978, sprang from study traditions that emphasised power struggles in politics and society. Contrasted with the second phrase I shall cover in this chapter, consensus, conflict appears times in the introduction of the same book. However, even though the existence of conflicts cannot be denied, since the 1990s in particular, a growing focus on the development of political arenas as spaces for consensus building has challenged or at the very least balanced the notion of politics as a forum for the expression of conflicts. Political theory saw

an emphasis on consensus within the discussion of deliberative democracy, highlighting in particular the significance of communication quality for democratic process consensus definitions of the common good. Social movements and similar organisations have been seen as the primary settings for the growth of these consensual processes by certain proponents of the normative deliberative vision of democracy [1], [2].

Again, attention to consensus emerged specifically within the study of civil society, and it was also emphasised in normative theory as well as in the empirical research on decision-making. In fact, governing communities by permission rather than compulsion is referred to as one of the key meanings of civil society. According to this interpretation, civility includes respect for others, being courteous, and being accepting of strangers. Civil society is often cited as having the ability to resolve conflicts between particularism and universalism, plurality and connectivity, variety and togetherness. Civil society is a sphere of solidarity in which a particular kind of universalizing community comes gradually to be defined and to some extent enforced. Concepts like free spaces in social movement studies highlight the role movements play in creating public forums for addressing social concerns.

Deliberative practises have, in fact, drawn more or less explicit attention in the GJM. This idea holds that politics is a place where shared identities may be created to resolve conflicts of interest, and dialogue is a means of resolving even the most contentious topics by fostering understanding among participants about the common good. The tension between conflict and consensus can be addressed by conceptualizing different political arenas: conflictual ones, where conventional and unconventional forms of political participation are used in a power struggle, and consensual ones, where relatively minor conflicts among potentially compatible actors are addressed through discourse and the search for consensus. The leading proponents of the idea of civil society, social movements construe the cultural models, norms, and institutions of civil society as the main stakes of social conflicts, this seems to be the position they adopt.

But this is not a simple fix. In general, the idea of politics as a place for mutual understanding is in intrinsic contrast with the image of politics as fight for power, even if it is rather typical to have distinct views for internal and exterior democracy. Second, it might be difficult to define the boundaries between the two arenas of politics. This is especially true for movements of movements, where organisational loyalty still exists despite networking and discussion among many players being normatively proclaimed. Large, established, official, well-organized organisations are a crucial component of the movement due to their strong reputation and historical legacies. In reality, as well see, the Globa contains a variety of concepts.

Consensus is bridged by Global Justice Movement Organisations GJMOs, which have different organisational principles and practises. By examining how consensus is defined and approached by GJMOs, I will indirectly address this contradiction between ideas of conflicts and consensus in what follows. I depend on qualitative and quantitative datasets created from the founding texts of 244 social movement organisations in my attempt. First, I'll go through a few fundamental democratic principles that are often cited in the writings of those organisations section 2. The consensus definitions of democracy will be explained in both different epistemological senses of social science explanation in the parts that follow. In the third part, I use triangulation techniques to examine the quantitative data for statistical relationships between the mentions of certain democratic principles including consensus by GJMOs and independent variables pertaining to organisational resources and cultural norms. I also stress, from an interpretive standpoint, the many connotations that consensus has for various sorts of actors [3], [4].

DISCUSSION

Consensus as a multidimensional concept

References to consensus have been seen in the Global Justice Movement as being part of a quest for new methods of decision-making intended at getting above the limitations of delegation and assemblers. Emerging approaches for the social forum process combine limited and controlled recourse to delegation with consensus-based instruments appealing to dialogue, to the transparency of the communicative process, and to reaching the greatest possible consensus. According to our study, various approximately a quarter and varied organisations active in the GJM cite consensus. Consensual approaches have been seen as ineffective, dragging down decision-making to the point that action is jeopardized. They were first advocated within the student movement and afterwards adopted more vehemently by the feminist movement.

Many global justice organisations resurrected the consensus model while creating new, more or less formalized norms to aid in removing obstacles to decision-making brought on by disagreements or the swaying of the process by a select few people. Our qualitative and quantitative research of the organisational ideals on democratic concerns reveals a strong emphasis on consensus and certain bridged conceptions. In order to differentiate between democratic principles expressed specifically in relation to the internal operations of our organisations and broad democratic values, we have coded references to democratic values in our study of the organisational papers. Additionally, the symbolic settings in which these values were stated have been thoroughly examined. In general, the topic of democracy stands out as being quite pertinent for our GJMOs since the majority of the organisations we studied include democratic principles in their founding documents. Our quantitative data shows that the democratic conceptions of the Global Justice Movement organisations we have studied often refer to three sets of values. The normative theorists and empirical researchers linked with the aforementioned notions of participatory democracy, deliberative democracy, and civil society share many of these ideals, as we shall show in this section.

A first set of values highlights various GJM deliberative attributes like open areas. Consensus is important in normative models of deliberative democracy since choices are made through persuading others of one's own position. choices must be acceptable to all participants, as opposed to majoritarian democracy, where choices are justified by the results of voting. The deliberative notion of democracy comprises standards of equality, inclusiveness, multiplicity of values, high-quality dialogue, and transparency, as described see Introduction to this book. The idea of civil society also has a discursive component. To the extent that this solidarity community exists, it is exhibited by public opinion, has its own cultural codes and narratives in a democratic idiom, is patterned by a set of peculiar institutions, most notably legal and journalistic ones, and is visible in historically distinctive sets of interactional practises like civility, equality, criticism, and respect. The consensual approach is cited by 17% of our groups as an internal value, and deliberative democracy by 7%. In the documents of as much as half of our sample, references to plurality, diversity, and heterogeneity have been emphasised as significant democratic components, with a value very close to that of the reference to more conventional participation [5], [6].

Specific guidelines are created in horizontal communication and dispute resolution among the groups most dedicated to experimenting with consensual methods: consensus tools include good facilitation, various hand signals, go-rounds, and the breaking up into small and larger sized groups. At the beginning of each session, the facilitator should explain these techniques; however, if you are interested in learning more about how we are using them, please get in

touch with one of the process group members present Dissent. A Network of Resistance against the G8. Aiming to include all points of view in the discussion and enforcing rules for good discussion, from the limited time allotted to each speaker to the maintenance of a constructive climate, facilitators or moderators are used for example, for the British Rising Tide or the Italian Rete Lilliput. In a similar spirit, the Spanish website Espacio Alternativo 2008 outlines the following principles for effective communication: In this path, the following requirements must be fulfilled:

1. Attempting to generate fruitful discussions on what, if any, actual distinctions exist.
2. Identifying these differences.
3. Being aware of how prevalent a particular viewpoint is among member organizations.
4. Disseminating information about them through the federation's communication channels.
5. Supporting the rights of individuals and collectives to differ on particular issues, in words as well as in acts.

The focus on consensus-building techniques as a means of enhancing communication is consistent with the movements widely held goal of creating public platforms for conversation and good communication. This is demonstrated, for example, by the Spanish organisation Derechos para, which emphasises: our goal is to contribute to the spreading of debates, not by limiting spaces but by opening them to all those who are critical of this globalisation that results in exploitation, repression, and exclusion. No system alternative to the one in place today can be said to be the real one. In other words, we aim to provide a place where people may think and engage in civic and social reform.

The idea of the organisation as a platform for discussion and consensus-building reflects attention to these aspects as important in and of themselves. The organisation describes itself as a place, where political processes of learning and experiences are made possible; in which the various streams of progressive politics discuss with each other, in order to find a common capacity of action together ATTAC. According to the Foro Social de, decisions are made by consensus in this permanent space for encounters, debates, and support for collective action. In reality, the forums description as a meeting place of different visions and positions with some common denominator, not an organisation that has to reach a unique position is a favourable assessment of the pluralist character of the forum [7], [8].

The ideals of consensus decision-making have undoubtedly been propagated thanks to national and international dissemination mechanisms. It is common to cite the Zapatistas experience as an inspiration. About 2000 people attended the Bologna founding assembly of ATTAC Italy in June 2001, which created a provisional directory but decided on a Zapatist consultation as far as the drawing up of a constitution. Similar effects were felt when consensus was mentioned in the World Social Forums constitution. For instance, all Sicilian Social Forums state that decisions must be made bymassima conditioner maximal level of sharing. The Genoa Social Forum emphasised the importance of the consensus-building process in March 2001, describing it as a way to work on what we have in common and continue discussing what divides us So that all can feel the decisions taken as their own, although with different degrees of satisfaction quoted. International campaigns and discussion boards supported reciprocal learning on the methods that promote consensus decision-making. So, for instance, the Italian metalworker's union FIOM learned about and began to value the employment of facilitators at international meetings. On a national scale, social movement organisations often make reference to certain papers created by people and groups advocating the consensus approach by creating particular communication guidelines.

Participation, a crucial element of the social movements notion of democracy that has new significance in the GJM, is the focus of a second set of principles expressed in the founding papers. Some normative conceptions of deliberative democracy, which go beyond the classic views of participatory democracy Pateman 1970, are claimed to enable participatory visions since deliberation is believed to necessitate some forms of apparent equality among citizens. Power derived from compulsion, as well as an uneven weighing of participants as representatives of organisations of varying sizes or influence must be excluded. The idea of civil society is connected to the idea of participation in what is referred to as a utopian version: It is a definition that presupposes a state or rule of law but insists not only on restraints on state power but on a redistribution of power. It is an expansion of participation and autonomy as well as a radicalization of democracy.

Regarding the GJMOs values on internal democracy, one-third of the organisations listed participation as an internal value and more than half mentioned it as a general value. Participation is referred to as a fundamental principle by trade unions and left-leaning political parties as well as the more traditional social movement organisations. Additional qualities, however, start to define and set apart the many participatory democracy ideas. As internal organisational ideals, limitations on delegation, the rotation principle, required delegation, and criticism of delegation are all present but not predominate each stated by between 6 and 11% of our groups. Non-hierarchical decision making is regularly cited 16%, while inclusion is discussed even more frequently 21 and 26%. In a non-hierarchical decision-making index, 23.4% of the replies had favorable ratings for the categories of criticism of delegation, limitation of delegation, non-hierarchical decision making, and required delegation. Significantly, just 6% of our organisations cite representational values.

As the idea of civil society relates consensus to principles of autonomy, a third set of values may be characterised under the heading of autonomy and are compatible with those advanced in normative theories of civil society. The guiding principles of democracy and rights are compatible only with a model of civil society that institutionalizes democratic communication in a multiplicity of publics and defends the conditions of individual autonomy by liberating the intimate sphere from all traditional as well as modern forms of inequality and unfreedom. The independence of member organisations 33% and local chapters 38.5% is often cited in our database. If we incorporate references to cultural and personal liberty along with other general principles, we find that 39.8% of the studied organisations share these values.

Explaining consensus: Structures and cultures

Organisational design and ideals have historically been connected to political potential in social movement studies. The spatial distribution of competences and the functional division of power are two institutional factors that are seen to be important for social movements. The reduction of institutional avenues for challengers brought forth by territorial centralization and functional concentration of power results in increasingly radical conceptions of alternative, participatory forms of democracy. Strong governments often have more bureaucratic movement organisations; in contrast, decentralised states should support decentralised movement organisations, which are also more horizontal.

The United States and found that while the grass-roots level of the movements was much stronger in the two federal states, the United States and Germany, there was also a very strong interest group type of social movement structure. Parallel to this, inclusive cultural practises need to permeate civil society organisations. Relationships might, however, be more challenging. In fact, Rucht himself contends that strong executive power structures in a given

political system tend to induce a fundamental critique of bureaucratic and hierarchical political forms, which is then reflected in the movements emphasis on informal and decentralised structures, while strong executive power structures in a given political system tend to induce a fundamental critique of bureaucratic and hierarchical political forms. This indicates that there is greater room for engagement generally and that professional and grassroots organisational structures exist in federal states. Similar to this, more open-minded regimes that encourage participation have supported the growth of large, well-organized, and formalized groups.

Smaller organisations, however, have experimented with different organisational structures in opposition to the institutionalization and moderating of those organisations. Our cross-national research reveals that a variety of democratic principles are present in all the nations we looked at and at the global scale, but there is no obvious relationship between these values and the features of political opportunity. The more highly mobilized Italian 51.2% and Spanish 35.1% organisations, but also the Swiss 40%, make more frequent mentions of internal engagement. Both majoritarian Great Britain 34.2% and consensual Switzerland 42.9% make frequent mentions of inclusivity. Decentralised Spain 21.6% and centralized France 28.1% both have higher rates of delegation criticism than decentralised Spain 21.6%. Spain 35.1% and Germany 22.6% also have high mention rates for consensus approaches.

In Switzerland and internationally, the values of outward inclusion, diversity plurality heterogeneity, as well as dialogue/communication and transparency, are much more commonly discussed. Participation as a general value and equality the latter also by the British groups are seen more often in the founding papers of Italian and Swiss organisations. Our prior knowledge of the GJM in the different nations suggests that it is internally heterogeneous in each of the countries we chose, notwithstanding the possibility that part of these findings are related to our sample technique. In any case, we must look at certain characteristics of the organisations themselves in order to comprehend the disparities in focus on various values. Ill examine both organisational and cultural resources in keeping with the basic theories in social movement and organisational studies that were outlined in the volume's introduction. Ill provide some broad assumptions in each of the following two paragraphs and test them by comparing some chosen values to indicators of organisational structure and standards.

CONCLUSION

Understanding the difficulties in coming to a consensus, such as dealing with different points of view and settling disagreements, presents chances for enhancing and maintaining group decision-making in social movements. Studying the idea of consensus in social movements may help one become more active in supporting democracy, promoting social justice, and expanding equality and human rights. These ideas may be Put into practice to further social justice and transformational change objectives. For improving our comprehension of the relevance and revolutionary potential of agreement in social movements, further study in this area is crucial. Putting an emphasis on open and cooperative decision-making may increase the efficacy and resiliency of movements. Additionally, it is crucial for realizing the goal of social justice and equality supported by social movements to promote unity and embrace variety of viewpoints within movements. For a more fair, egalitarian, and inclusive society to be realized, activism must place a strong emphasis on consensus-building and participatory practises.

RFERENCES:

[1] M. Metwally, Forensic organizational psychology: shedding light on the positive repercussions of ethical leadership in forensic medicine, *Egyptian Journal of Forensic Sciences*. 2019. doi: 10.1186/s41935-019-0125-7.

[2] R. Darracott, B. Lonne, B. Cheers, en I. Wagner, The Influences on Practice in Social Care: An Australian Study, *Hum. Serv. Organ. Manag. Leadersh. Gov.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/23303131.2018.1564713.

[3] I. Skute, K. Zalewska-Kurek, I. Hatak, en P. de Weerd-Nederhof, Mapping the field: a bibliometric analysis of the literature on university–industry collaborations, *J. Technol. Transf.*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s10961-017-9637-1.

[4] Y. A. M. Qasem, R. Abdullah, Y. Y. Jusoh, R. Atan, en S. Asadi, Cloud Computing Adoption in Higher Education Institutions: A Systematic Review, *IEEE Access*, 2019, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2916234.

[5] M. Rachinger, R. Rauter, C. Müller, W. Vorraber, en E. Schirgi, Digitalization and its influence on business model innovation, *J. Manuf. Technol. Manag.*, 2019, doi: 10.1108/JMTM-01-2018-0020.

[6] Z. Gong, Y. Chen, en Y. Wang, The Influence of Emotional Intelligence on Job Burnout and Job Performance: Mediating Effect of Psychological Capital, *Front. Psychol.*, 2019, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02707.

[7] L. Tomat en P. Trkman, Digital Transformation – The Hype and Conceptual Changes, *Econ. Bus. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.15458/ebr.90.

[8] G. Santoro, F. Fiano, B. Bertoldi, en F. Ciampi, Big data for business management in the retail industry, *Manag. Decis.*, 2019, doi: 10.1108/MD-07-2018-0829.

CHAPTER 7

DEMOCRATIC VISIONS: EXPLORING DETERMINATION, CONSENSUS, AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES

Dr. Pradeep Kumar, Assistant Professor
Department of Law, IIMT University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India.

ABSTRACT:

The operation and efficacy of social movements and activist organisations are shaped by a variety of interrelated factors, including democratic visions, consensus-building, and organisational structures. This study attempts to investigate how organisational structures, consensus-building procedures, and democratic ideologies interact within social movements and activist organisations. The research explores the many democratic ideologies that underpin these movements, with special emphasis on the concepts of inclusion, democratic participation, and group agency. It looks at how consensus-building procedures help activists come to agreements and take choices as a group that are in line with the movement's ideals and objectives. The study also looks at the organisational structures that support and promote democratic practises inside the movement, such as horizontal organizing and decentralised networks. In order to evaluate the movements legitimacy, cohesion, and transformational potential, it is essential to comprehend the interactions between democratic ideals, consensus-building, and organisational structures. The research also emphasises how this information may be used to further social justice, human rights, and equality, as well as democratic action.

KEYWORDS:

Collective Agency, Democratic Activism, Horizontal Organizing, Participatory Decision-Making, Social Movements.

INTRODUCTION

In this manner, the Italian Rete Lilliput connects the consensus-building process to certain unique organisational traits, most notably a participatory structure, with restrictions on delegation and a focus on full and equal participation from all members. Some organisational structure traits have been considered as having an impact on democratic principles and consensus decision-making. Organisational structure has been associated with democratic conceptions and practises more generally. Either organisational structures restrict democratic conceptions or, conversely, values guide organisational model selection. We can discover various explanation ideas that detail this link in the social science literature. According to Mansbridge 2003, organisations without other effective methods of persuading members to operate as a group benefit most from a consensus-based decision-making paradigm. Compared to more hierarchically structured organisations like Friends of the Earth, more informal organisations like Earth First seem to be better equipped to foster effective communication. Regarding the Global Justice Movement, more decentralised networks, such Rete Lilliput Veltri 2003, seem to place a higher focus on consensus than more centralised ones, like ATTAC-Italia.

Additionally, it seems that transnational networks counter-summits or social forums are more adept at integrating various organisations via the creation of master frames and are more sensitive to deliberative ideals. Negotiations between representatives of social movement organisations are frequently a part of mobilization during specific national or local campaigns against the war, for immigrant rights, or on labour issues. We can define organisational

structures in terms of amount of resources as indicated by size of membership, presence of paid staff, size of budget, as well as by organisational model as indicated by degree of formalizability [1], [2]. We observe a low overall impact of organisational structures on expressed democratic values examining the interaction between organisational characteristics and democratic values while excluding the participatory values, even though associations that do appear frequently but not always tend to confirm our expectations.

First, when we look at organisational resources, as expected, smaller organisations with lower budgets and no paid staff are more likely to mention consensual methods 32% for groups with fewer than 100 members, 25% for groups with between 100 and 1000 members, but only about 9% for groups with more than 1000 members. Organisations with less than 1000 members and little budgets tend to emphasize criticisms of delegation and non-hierarchical principles more often 30% of organisations with no budget mention such values, compared to just 8.3% of those with a budget of more than 500 000 euros. However, the same factors have little to no effect on mentions of the other values, which sometimes seem to rise with organisational resources. The number of territorial levels covered 68.7% have three or more territorial levels, the size of individual membership 62 percent of the organisations mentioning this value in their documents have more than 1000 individual members, and the autonomy of local chapters and organisational members are all related. Similarly, groups with higher individual membership and multilevel organisations 59.5% with three or more levels cite autonomy more often. [3], [4]

Mentions of ideals like equality, chapter and member organisation autonomy, as well as criticism of delegation, are all positively correlated with the formalization index. The likelihood that ideals like consensus, internal inclusiveness, equality, and horizontality are articulated rises when the executive is explicitly rejected. Additionally, references to horizontality, discourse, and consensus are all connected favorably with the assembly's importance. In conclusion, although most relationships follow the predicted patterns, it seems that many universal ideals are only loosely connected to organisational traits. These principles seem to be highly universal participation, inclusivity or to have numerous meanings equality, individual and collective autonomy, yet they are really shared by a variety of organisations and resource groupings. For smaller and more participative groups, however, the criticism of delegation and the appeal to consensus values seem to be more common. The allusions to democratic principles, however, are not particularly well explained by structural organisational features.

Consensus, themes, identities

The ability to be inclusive demands innovative meeting design strategies. We all too often fall prey to our own self-imposed schedules, time restrictions, and procedural procedures. This does not imply that schedules or processes are not significant. Instead, it implies that we should think of them flexibly, as our own inventions that we can alter to suit our needs rather than as our gods dictating our lives. The practises of consensus-seeking improve relationships, trust, communication, and understanding. All too often, we respond with conventional programming or quick cuts at the first stalemate in order to save time. Voting-based decision-making, on the other hand, reproduces the social connections we are trying to avoid by establishing power blocs, power games, and hegemonic techniques, including excluded and included hierarchies. Our managers and our bosses share the same productivism mentality; they are all so focused on results, forgetting the life process that goes into producing those results, hiding the voices excluded for the sake of results, and excluding alternative results that would be possible if those voices were included. We have the opportunity to redefine democracy for ourselves and set a positive example for others.

The London Social Forums adoption of the consensus approach is related to how the group sees itself, namely expressing a preference for prefigurative politics above efficacy. Debating various choices in terms of their practical impact is undoubtedly a time- and energy-consuming process, but it also has ethical ramifications. For instance, attempts to offer limited delegation for certain mandates or majority vote on specific matters were made inside Rete Lilliput, which publicly supported the consensus approach. This was done in the name of efficiency and to confine consensus to essential choices. The recommendations were, however, rejected due to a normative claim about the validity of the consensus method which is said to have permitted even in its complexity to experiment with horizontality, diffuse leadership, and participatory methods. We have sought consistency between means and aims, between form and substance, as the group put it: We have learned to reason collectively. Rete Lilliput, who valued consensus, rejected the idea of writing a document about the world we want, stating that we agree that we all dream of a different world, but it is not at all clear that we all want the same things; we are not able to write a document on which consensus can be reached; it does not make sense to freeze the idea of the world we want in a written document, the challenge is to work together in order to invent and construct the alternative cited

It may be assumed that a movements ideology influences how it views democracy. Nevertheless, empirical study and theoretical work have long ignored the connection between internal decision-making and general values. Only a small amount of attention has been paid to how cultural processes affect internal organisational structures since the resource mobilization strategy focused on the instrumental role of institutionalization in achieving movement objectives. The spirit of Michels infuses resource mobilization arguments through a sort of syllogism: organisations are resources; effective organisations are hierarchies; therefore, hierarchical organisations are valuable resources for movements. In fact, organisational structures have only lately been examined in connection to the cultural significance that activists give them. In reality, organisational structures have been referred to as a component of a larger social movement repertory. Organisations that are normatively oriented may serve a prefigurative purpose, anchoring the social connections that activists want to see in the outer world.

The issue of whether values are associated with which democratic vision becomes important if organisational values are seen as goals in and of themselves The relationships between individual values and organisational values have been examined in earlier research on this topic see, for example, on tolerant identities on anti-hierarchical values; between democratic values and other organisational values for instance, on autonomous values; and between organisational values and general cultural values for instance, on values of social responsibility. Environmentalists who care about social justice have been observed to invest more in the creation of and member involvement in channels of communication Describe a certain perspective on democracy that emphasises inclusiveness, equality, and fair democratic practises.

Consensual decision-making has been seen in the GJM as being consistent with principles like non-violence and tolerance for minorities. The development of a master frame linking the various meanings given to the protest and culturally integrating the various organisations were both made possible by consensus decision-making, according to research on the decision-making processes of international protest events such as counter-summits, involving many and different groups. The degrees of specialization, centralization, and professionalization tend to co-vary in single-issue movements, which seem to be less participation-oriented. Prefigurative views of politics encourage inclusive organizing,

consensus decision-making, interpersonal communal ties, and a sense of personal belonging as represented in the quest for intrinsically satisfying kinds of activity like occurrences.

Different variables that we use in our study enable us to control for the impact of culture on the three sets of democratic principles outlined earlier. First of all, our findings support the idea that multi-issue organisations have stronger democratic concerns. When democratic principles are compared to an additive index of the aforementioned topics, there are strong and substantial correlations. Additionally, democratic principles are connected to certain movement types, which we operationalized by identifying the Old Left, New Left, and anarchist autonomous organisations, as well as new social movements, solidarity movements, and new global movements. While equality is more often stated in Old Left, New Left groups, and new social movement organisations, dialogue is particularly highlighted by new global and new social movement organisations. Particularly evident in the writings of New Left/anarchist and autonomous organisations are values of autonomy. Together with the New Left and new social movements, the new global organisations emphasize anti-hierarchical ideals, engagement, and inclusivity more than the others. Contrarily, the internal values of individual and collective autonomy, equality, and inclusiveness also by the New Left and, for inclusiveness, the Old Left are more frequently mentioned by the new social movements but also by the Old Left. Representative democracy was mentioned more often by the Old Left [5], [6].

DISCUSSION

The organisational population that a group belongs to partially reflects these relationships. Parties, unions, cooperatives, NGOs, informal SMOs, official SMOs, and new networks were specifically identified as distinct entities in this context. When comparing these to organisational formulas, we found that contemporary networks connected to the GJM more frequently place an emphasis on values like consensus, participation, inclusivity, and horizontal decision-making in the latter case, in collaboration with grass-roots SMOs and unions, as well as transparency, heterogeneity, and dialogue with parties and formal SMOs. In addition, mentions of several themes are connected with allusions to each of the aforementioned topics apart from criticisms of delegation.

If we examine the organisational generations, which are classified according to the year of establishment, compatible conclusions become apparent. The propensity of various forms of political organisations to continue to be shaped by the particular circumstances and decisions taken at the time of their creation has been highlighted through research on these organisations. Political parties that had to provide individual incentives when they first started out tend to maintain clientelist structures, while left-wing parties tend to replicate the democratic centralism they choose when they were created. Similar to this, social movement organisations tend to retain some of the qualities they had when they were founded, while having far lower survival rates. Italian women's organisations, for instance, continued to rely on the small size structures and affinity groups that were typical of the consciousness-raising groups that had been so crucial in the 1970s phase of high mobilization despite institutionalization processes.

Similar to this, autonomous squatted youth centres continued to value their autonomy, which was frequently demonstrated by their refusal to occupy spaces that had been formally assigned to them in favor of illegally squatted spaces, despite becoming more effective at selling cultural goods and more receptive to collaborative interactions with local institutions.

The ability of the GJM to reactivate groups that had developed during earlier protest cycles is one of its traits. Looking at the year of foundation, we can see that groups founded after 2000

mention consensus more frequently 27.9%, compared to 6.1% of groups founded before 1968, 8% of groups founded between 1969 and 1989, and 18.8% of groups founded between 1990 and 1999, as well as some related general values like difference, dialogue. Additionally, these more recent groups exhibit a greater sensitivity to participatory values, citing them more frequently than the other organisations, including internal participation 36.6, compared to 18.2 for those founded before 1968, participation as a general value 66.2%, compared to 42.4% for those founded before 1968, inclusiveness both as a value mentioned in relation to the internal life of the organisation and as a more general value, and criticism of delegation 3. In contrast, earlier organisations 1969–1989 include significantly more references to individual and cultural autonomy, and these references, together with those to equality and transparency, appear to be rather constant through time [7], [8].

Understanding conceptions of consensus

The quotations he chose properly capture both the many ways that the word consensus is used throughout various traditions as well as the rising interest in consensus that is characteristic of many GJMOs. The qualitative analysis of our documents, which highlights the various meanings that consensus has for different organisations as this emerging value is bridged with earlier organisational cultures, allows for a better understanding of the relations between democratic values and other organisational characteristics while still allowing us to identify some associations between references to consensus and other characteristics of our organisations. I specifically differentiate between communitarian and multiple notions of consensus, each linked to various traditions.

The first is a multifaceted understanding of agreement reached via excellent conversation. This is a really creative interpretation of the consensus-building process, which often distinguishes network organisations. Consensus is seen as being functional for safeguarding the unitary-plural nature of the movement as well as members demands for individual protagonist, similar to how it is seen in many social forums. The consensus technique is promoted in networks and campaigns as enabling for working on what unifies, notwithstanding the disagreements. According to the Spanish publication, the method for clarifying differences has to be consensus and wide agreement on the basis of achieving unity beyond these differences. We thus believe that we must continue our discussion until we have come to an understanding of the issues, working to find common ground and agreement. If they are not feasible, information of the agreements and discrepancies would be made known via our public communication.3 the worldwide network We Are Not Here to Buy further connects networking and the consensus mechanism explicitly.

The previous Dissent meeting came to the following conclusions: First, The Dissent! Network has meetings every two months. Email lists and online discussion boards are not the places where Network decisions are decided; only the Gatherings have this authority. Local organisations have complete independence from one another and are free to act as they see fit. Network groupings shouldn't represent the network as a whole. Local organisations should take into account, nevertheless, that their activities will truly have an impact on the When organisations place a strong emphasis on internal diversity, consensus choices seem to be even more important. For example, ATTAC Italia's Charter of Intent states that the organisation wants to be a democratic and open association, transversal and as much as possible pluralistic, composed of diverse individuals and social forces. It wants to contribute to the renovation of democratic political participation and favors the development of new organisational forms of civil society. We want to continue to build shared associational forms, based on participation and the consensual method, fit for letting diversities meet and work together and develop democratic decision-making practises, the country's national parliament

said. Because we want to collectively reclaim democracy as the most significant component of the common good. 2007 ATTAC Italia. In this view, participation and the consensus-building process are seen as the two primary manifestations of democracy as a common good. Consensus resonates in reality with a focus on the respect for diversity, coupled with demands for inclusivity, inside the notion of the organisation as an open space a metaphor that our groups often employ in particular, but not solely, for networks. For instance, according to the Turin Social Forum [7], [8].

There is no dominating voice, according to the French Réseau Intergalactiques Charter, which was created around the creation of a self-managed area during the anti-G8 meeting in Evian. It is what we refer to as a horizontal manner of working since no tiny group makes decisions. Thus, there are not little hands and feet on the other side and thinking heads on the other. The objective is to make it easier for each participant to be included in the conversation and decision-making. In organisational life prefigurative vision also adopts consensus-based strategies. They share the goal of bringing about social change not just via political choices but also through profound adjustments in daily routines and attitudes. Because a social transformation cannot be realized through purely political decisions. For anti-militarism to positively affect life options and a fight, the actions must correspond to the needs and wants of the people. Consensus, considered as a procedure intended to attain the most amicable agreement for everyone, would be used to construct this.

Growing attention has lately been paid in both fields to consensus, which may be thought of as the antithesis of conflict. Social movements have generally been seen as conflictual actors, and social movement studies have historically connected movements with conflict. This focus is consistent with ideas like deliberative democracy and civil society, which are becoming more and more important in social and political thought. Although the terms conflict and consensus are used to describe relationships between social movements and their external opponents and relationships within the movement, respectively, there is still a tension between the two ideas because they tend to construct different visions of politics as antagonistic and the scene of power struggles or, alternatively, deliberative and focused on dialogue. The political discussion is characterised by a battle between hegemonic and counterhegemonic discourses, and there is no common good in this sense. Conflicts are seen as being intractable in this notion. In the second, disputes may be resolved via dialogue discourses or at least effective communication support the creation of a shared understanding of the common good, which is democracy, which is in fact thought of as the most significant common good. This argument resonates not just within social movement studies, but also in social movement organisations themselves. It is open in political theory with the criticism of the Habermas Ian model of deliberation and social theory with the rejection of a neoliberal image of the civil society [9], [10].

According to the findings of our study, references to consensus did in fact appear in the Global Justice Movement and were promoted as a new ideal, particularly by freshly founded organisations. Consensus values and the consensus technique, often expressed in capital letters in the publications of the one-fifth of our organisations that mention it tended to be connected to other values resonant within the social movement heritage as they travelled from the Zapatistas Sierra Lacan Dona to Europe. Consensus is linked to ideals like pluralism, discussion, inclusivity, horizontality, involvement, and openness in the documents of our organisations and, notably, in ideas on deliberative democracy and civil society.

However, we also observed that mentions of consensus and other values tended to fluctuate. In terms of structural traits, we discovered that organisations with fewer memberships and resources, no paid staff, and a greater dependence on the assembly made more frequent

allusions to consensus. Consensual approaches are stated more often by smaller organisations, which is expected and supports the hypothesis that communication is simpler the smaller the organisation. The express rejection of an executive and the high significance placed on the assembly both point to some consistency between the pursuit of agreement and horizontal organisational arrangements. The justification of comparable ideals, such as the criticism of delegation, follows similar trajectories. However, the ability of these organisational components to explain various democratic principles varied, with certain values including inclusivity, discourse, and equality proving to be prevalent across various organisational forms. Instead, the mention of many ideas that seem to be pertinent in the GJM has greater explanatory value.

In reality, social movement organisations may be seen of as spaces for the development of ideals. Notably, allusions to democratic principles are often related with discussions of anti-globalist concerns, but anti-capitalism and conventional left-wing themes have far less explanatory power. According to the assumption that this kind of organisation necessitates greater attention to the formation of agreement among the different nodes of the network, references to consensus are increasingly common in networks. Consensual values as well as other related values are particularly prevalent in the organisations that were founded during the most recent wave of protest on global issues, that adopted the most recent organisational forms such as networks, that praised horizontal linkages, as well as among the more multi-issue organisations, confirming some hypotheses that have emerged in the social science literature. The GJMs most recent organisations, those that are growing inside it and reflecting its concern with democracy from below, seem to pay greater attention to democracy in general. In more recent organisations and newer varieties of networks, references to consensus as a democratic virtue appear to be increasingly common. Additionally, due to their requirement to foster cross-cultural dialogue, transnational social movement organisations place a strong emphasis on inclusivity and place a high value on diversity.

But after doing a more thorough qualitative investigation of our papers, we found that when consensus encountered various organisational cultures, it took on new meanings. We might point out in particular a view of consensus that emerged primarily in network organisations, which exhibit significant variety. Here, effective communication is seen as being even more necessary to enhance discussion among many players. The assembler tradition is combined with the technique of consensus in a separate, horizontal tradition. Here, assembler collective decision-making by agreement is a mechanism for the group to develop its collective identity. Our organisations share a focus on creating open venues for excellent discourse amongst many, different actors. If creating public places has always been considered as the goal of social movements, the GJM has made several recent improvements that need notice. Traditional notions of participation are closely related to notions of deliberation, which uphold the principles of inclusivity, diversity, conversation, clear communication, autonomy, and consensus that are reflected in notions of public places. Consensus, although having several meanings, is especially important as a normative foundation for the building of public places. In actuality, organisational forms like the social forum portray themselves as places where many actors may interact and have a conversation centre on information sharing and mutual understanding.

CONCLUSION

The understanding acquired from researching how democratic ideals, consensus-building, and organisational structures interact may be used to advance social justice, human rights, and equality as well as democratic activity. To achieve social justice and transformational change, these concepts may be put into practice as a result, further study in this area is vital to

improving our understanding of the dynamic interaction between democratic aspirations, reaching agreement, and organisational structures in social movements. Putting inclusive and cooperative practises first may increase the efficacy and resiliency of movements. Furthermore, promoting unity and upholding democratic ideals inside movements is crucial for realizing the social justice and equality that social movements strive for. For a more fair, egalitarian, and inclusive society to be realized, activism must place a strong emphasis on consensus-building and participatory practises.

REFERENCES:

[1] V. Ramos *et al.*, Analysis of organizational power networks through a holistic approach using consensus strategies, *Heliyon*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e01172.

[2] C. P. Subbe *et al.*, Quality metrics for the evaluation of Rapid Response Systems: Proceedings from the third international consensus conference on Rapid Response Systems, *Resuscitation*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2019.05.012.

[3] A. U. Shah en M. I. Khan, HRM-performance perspectives: An overview of theoretical challenges and prospects, *Eng. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.5755/j01.ee.30.3.9550.

[4] J. Stanford, K. Charlton, A. T. McMahon, en S. Winch, Better cardiac care: Health professionals perspectives of the barriers and enablers of health communication and education with patients of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander descent, *BMC Health Serv. Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.1186/s12913-019-3917-4.

[5] T. Pawlicki, T. Atwood, K. McConnell, en G. Y. Kim, Clinical safety assessment of the Halcyon system, *Med. Phys.*, 2019, doi: 10.1002/mp.13736.

[6] G. Zons en A. Halstenbach, The AfD as a ‚Leaderless Right-Wing Populist Party. How the Leadership-Structure Dilemma Left an Imprint on the Partys Leadership, *Polish Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.2478/ppsr-2019-0003.

[7] H. Luo, M. Das, J. Wang, en J. C. P. Cheng, Construction payment automation through smart contract-based blockchain framework, 2019. doi: 10.22260/isarc2019/0168.

[8] E. Proctor, C. Hooley, A. Morse, S. McCrary, H. Kim, en P. L. Kohl, Intermediary/purveyor organizations for evidence-based interventions in the US child mental health: Characteristics and implementation strategies, *Implement. Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.1186/s13012-018-0845-3.

[9] M. E. M. Van Wingerde, Towards inter-organizational business process governance through blockchain, 2019.

[10] D. T. Engelman *et al.*, Guidelines for Perioperative Care in Cardiac Surgery Enhanced Recovery After Surgery Society Recommendations Clinical Review & Education JAMA Surgery | Special Communication, *JAMA Surg*, 2019.

CHAPTER 8

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND MULTILEVEL GOVERNANCE: THE EXTERNAL DIMENSION OF DEMOCRACY

Dr. Mithilesh Kr Yadav, Assistant Professor
Department of Law, IIMT University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India.

ABTSRACT:

Within and beyond of national boundaries, social movements are essential in influencing governing structures and promoting democratic ideals. This study examines how social movements and multilevel government interact, concentrating on the democratic process exterior aspect. The research looks at how social movements interact with global forums, transnational networks, and international institutions to shape global policy and advance democratic principles. In order to solve global issues, promote human rights, and advance social justice on a multilateral platform, it looks at the methods social movements utilise. The study also examines the challenges and possibilities encountered by social movements as they navigate the complicated system of multilevel government. For evaluating their influence, efficacy, and potential for revolutionary change, social movements and multilevel governance must understand the exterior component of democracy. The report also emphasises how this information may be used to advance human rights and equality, promote inclusive government, and advance global democracy.

KEYWORDS:

Global Governance, Human Rights, Multilevel Governance, Social Justice, Transnational Networks.

INTRODUCTION

Social movement organisations have a history of interfering in normal politics, seizing political chances, and fighting for adjustments to the polity, politics, and sometimes policy. Political parties have partnered with both old and new social groups, sometimes even supporting the latter or at the very least giving them fresh life. However, there has been a depoliticization of social movements, particularly since the 1990s, and visions of anti-political or populist movements, or at least ones focused on a single subject, have developed. Political discussions and political sciences have stigmatized social movements in general, and the Global Justice Movement in particular, as anti-political, or at the very least populist, players. Activists often identify as anti-institutional and emphasize a different political philosophy that comes from below. The most recent movements have been defined as being more interested in changes in daily life than in political transformation, of either a revolutionary or a reformist nature. This is in contrast to the labour movements historical strong ties to party systems and the birth of new social movements that led to the creation of new parties [1], [2].

The revival of the idea of civil society displays a concern about personal autonomy, self-organization, private space, which was inspired by new social movements and the campaign for democracy in Eastern. In truth, the literature on civil society has emphasised the separation of the social and political spheres, even if this emphasis often comes with a discussion of the particular and politically implemented rights required for the complete development of a democratic civil society. A global civil society is the result of the pre-1989 social movements being institutionalized, becoming professionalized, and organized around

specific causes. It also results from the decline of old civic associations like unions and their transformation into NGOs [3], [4].

A return to politics at the national level as well as the politicization of supranational levels of governance, which had previously been thought of if considered as highly technical and justified by the output, have been interpreted as recent waves of protest on global issues. In fact, International Governmental Organisations IGOs have offered opportunities for the growth of transnational networks of protest and global frames in a variety of ways, serving as a coral reef for movements that transcend national boundaries, as suggested. Even though some have been viewed as primary targets for protest particularly the International Financial Institutions like the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and World Trade Organisation, others have provided some discursive and political opportunities for access by social movement organisations.

The EU is a popularly talked and researched example of the latter. European institutions started debating different methods of including individuals in decision-making as a means to address the difficulties of inadequate electoral accountability and the loss of legitimacy by output. One of the key tenets of the White Paper on European Governance European Commission, 2001 is the notion of involvement via open dialogue with individuals and their organisations. This focus on civil society is in line with a broader shift in the EUs legitimation tactics, which Schmidt 2006 describes as a fragmented democracy split between governance for and with the people at the EU level, and governance by and of the people at the national level. Civil society organisations may be consulted, and even services and material support for their operations can be contracted out in the name of government with the people.

However, as we shall show in this chapter, the GJM organisations we studied did not come across as being anti-political; on the contrary, they asserted a political nature and engaged in a variety of intricate interactions with institutions of multilevel governance. Only a small portion of their activities, protest is seen as unquestionably significant but often ineffectual if not coupled with more direct engagement with the government and public agencies. The way social movement organisations deal with representative democracy is by working both with and against representative institutions. Our GJMOs really use a number of tactics and exhibit a range of views towards institutional politics when attempting to influence institutional choices.

Furthermore, as more organisations mention connections with representative entities at the local, national, or international level, these relationships seem to be becoming more multidimensional. Many international institutions seem to both elicit dissent and open avenues of communication with civil society organisations, while being nominally closed to actors from below, not directly answerable to an electorate, and seldom held to account in public. first make an effort to categorise these encounters in the text that follows in light of both the organisational philosophy as it is stated in foundational documents and the details on organisational procedures supplied by the leaders and spokespeople of the organisations who were questioned. After classifying the various attitudes and behaviours that SMOs exhibit towards political institutions, I will attempt to explain them by examining some key theories that have been created in the field of social movement studies, taking into account both the internal resources of our organisations and their settings.

DISCUSSION

Mapping attitudes towards institutions of multilevel governance

Initially, social movement organisations were seen as societal actors with few ties to politics. The connections between social movements and politics have come under scrutiny as impacting the forms, techniques, and results of unconventional politics ever since the creation of a political process approach to protest for a summary. Social movements have campaigned for institutional reforms towards more grass-roots control in addition to protesting for changes in policy. Administrative decentralization has been occurring in several European nations since the 1970s as a result of this pressure, opening up new avenues for communication with local decision-makers. Within the regulatory organisations established to carry out objectives likewise backed by movement activists, new chances for conflictual cooperation emerged \. Collaboration took many different forms, including consultation, inclusion in committees, authority transfer, and outsourcing of services. Some regulatory bureaucracies created in response to movement mobilizations see activists as possible allies as movement activists are hired as staff members by particular public bodies, or, in the other direction, administrative personnel at public bodies assist movements.

First, the organisations we looked at support a keen interest in politics. It is common for basic organisational papers to openly indicate this expressed political interest, which contrasts with perceptions of social movement organisations as only participating in street protests or even as being anti-political in character. Politics is regularly included in the papers of our organisations, but with various emphasis and interpretations; in fact, many of our organisations regard politics as an integral component of their own self-definition. Since the building of a basis union must start with the material conditions, but at the same time aim at the definition of values and general elements, in short, an identity that opposes the social development founded on neoliberalism, the critical union believes it essential to give a political breath to our initiatives. Through the activation of nonviolent political instruments helpful for conditioning, controlling, and verifying from below the functioning of local institutions, ATTAC seeks to contribute to innovate democratic political participation and favor the development of new organisational forms of the civil society ATTAC Italia 2003c. Rete Lilliput 2004 summarizes a discussion in its General Assembly and lists among the benefits of being a political subject the ability to exert pressure on institutions while also having a disinterest in power that makes us more free, independent, and strong.

Giovani Communistic, the youth organisation of the Party for a Communist Refoundation, sees politics as an expression of conflict. Sinistra Giovanile, the youth association of the Democratic di Sinistra, sees politics as a means of resolving conflict. Giovani Verdi, the youth organisation of the Italian Greens, sees politics as a moment of growing. The non-profit organisation promotes a political commitment focused on having an impact on the causes of war singled out in the neoliberal economic policies and human rights violations by the powerful states, despite the fact that it views politics as primarily the promotion of solidarity through public awareness [5], [6]. We discovered that many social movement organisations were amenable to interacting with multilevel governance institutions within the context of this political ideology. Institutional views do, however, differ, just as in politics. We identified attitudes towards local, national, and worldwide governmental organisations as well as economic entities by coding references to various attitudes towards institutions, ranging from outright rejection to cooperation. Although only about half of our groups concentrated particularly in some countries mentioned relationships with institutions, our data show that when they did, they were actually quite receptive to interaction with them. They weren't just emphasising a disapproving message, but they frequently welcomed collaboration on

particular issues. As comments of outright rejection of cooperation are uncommon 11.5% in respect to representative institutions as a whole, but attitudes of either collaboration or democratic control are more common.

The opinions towards the different geographical levels of administration vary to some extent. Although less common than with state institutions, collaboration between IGOs and economic players is nonetheless important. Additionally, national institutions are referenced more often than local or supranational ones when it comes to the denial of participation. At the national level compared to the supranational level where relations of control are more prevalent, statements regarding ties of cooperation are more common. The fact that there are little differences in attitudes towards institutions at various geographical levels suggests that these sentiments tend to propagate from one institution to the next. The changes are less pronounced than one would have anticipated, even if the frequency of encounters rises as one move from the local to the international and from the state to the market.

One-fifth of our organisations, or those that identify links with institutions in their papers, specifically acknowledge the international level as a crucial institutional level for cooperation. However, our organisations often criticised institutions because they see their own work as actively participating in citizens control of institutional politics via the establishment of discursive accountability mechanisms. Fundamental document statements are a reflection of organisational ideology, and as a result, they provide a clear picture of the disparities in GJM views towards institutions. However, we have to account for the bias brought on by some missing data, particularly in the case of tiny and grassroots organisations. Additionally, records describe how groups debate rather than their actual behaviour. By comparing the claims made in the papers with the views represented by the GJMO representatives who were questioned, we may broaden the scope of the information to include additional groups and increase the degree of claimed practises.

The outcomes of our interviews regarding proclaimed practises and organisational philosophy are quite similar. First and foremost, responses to the query How does your group relate to public institutions at different territorial levels? demonstrate our organisations willingness to institutional cooperation. Refusal of any kind of partnership is still quite uncommon; it ranges from a very low 8.4% for local institutions to 11.8% for the national level and 13.5% for the international level. IGOs have the greatest rejection rates, however they are still just a few percentage points more than national institutions overall and still relatively low. There are more organisations, but they are nevertheless confined to between one-fifth and one-third at the local, national, and international levels due to either apathy towards ties with institutions or rejection by institutions. The remaining organisations in our sample have a tendency to work, particularly with local institutions up to 70% and national institutions 67% but also with IGOs more than 50% of our sample. Several parties simultaneously announce cooperation with multiple territorial levels, demonstrating an adjustment to multilevel government. However, in this instance as well, our respondents often describe their relationships with institutions as being either critical or selective, with less critical views towards local governments and rising criticism towards the supranational and national levels.

A qualitative examination of the organisational papers, with a focus on the Italian groups, enables the identification of the numerous distinct methods in which GJMOs engage with institutions. Local governments can cooperate with social movement organisations by hosting events, signing petitions they've started such as one calling for the elimination of poor countries foreign debt, or supporting other social movement initiatives like the website Unimondo.org, which disseminates knowledge about world peace, civil rights, and sustainable development. The Tavola della Pace 2008, which aims to strengthen the sense of

responsibility and the effectiveness of civil society, communities, and local institutions, includes a constitutive element that calls for the establishment of dense networks of groups and local governments to develop political proposals, change politics, and stimulate politics. Which aims to deter banks from investing in weaponry by implementing good practises in public administration, specifically targets sympathetic municipal governments. In particular campaigns, comments against international treaties like the GATTs that are said to be undermining local governments and local democracy are also approved by local city councils [6], [7].

Organisations providing a range of services to the public administration from environmental education to social support for underprivileged populations also encourage cooperation with local governments. Local governments may sponsor certain projects, like in the example of Un, whose website states that it depends on volunteer work from its members as well as funding from local governments for particular projects. Examples abound, even when concentrating just on Italian organisations. In order to further its cultural initiatives, the 1991 constitution of Peace link, a nonprofit organisation promoting the growth of internet discourse on human rights and peace, encourages partnerships with educational institutions and government agencies. Ligament creates suggestions on sustainable tourism or the public management of water, highlighting the significance of citizen, community, and local government engagement.

In order to find organisational headquarters and economic resources to activate help-desks, formation activity or new social instruments of interventions as, housing for young gays sent away by their family or lonely old ones works with local institutions on projects and in coordinating tables aimed at popular education against discrimination. Similar to this, the Italian Consortium of Solidarity emphasises dialogue with institutions based on specific projects such as in solidarity with intervention in the former Yugoslavia and addresses the need for social practises of development from below by assisting the local civil society. The Campagna Banche Armata calls for a revision in the law to promote more openness and active citizen control over how banks finance the weapons trade. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that social movement organisations and campaigns contact governments at various levels to demand certain legislation.

According to Rete Lilliput 2003, the exact definition of a campaign is actions of pressure and sensitization that aim at obtaining very concrete objectives, and last until that objective is attained. For ATTAC, which really addresses a wide range of particular demands notably on fiscal policy to both national and EU parliaments, a proposal for a bill introducing a Tobin Tax often had a significant mobilization and identification potential. Similar to this, the Campaign for the Abolition of the Foreign Debt of Poor Countries supported legislation in that direction. For instance, in Italy, the Law 209/2000 urges the Italian government to promote debt remittance at the international level in addition to imposing debt remittance. A list of demands on specific policies is included in the World March of Women documents, which were organized by 3000 organisations from 140 countries. These demands range from a significant cut in military spending to a social salary for women, as well as criticism of the lack of women in parliaments, governments, and high positions in the judiciary and central banks. Against the privatisation of public services, cuts to social expenditures, the dismantling of the public welfare and health systems the critical union CUB 2002 proposes specific recommendations. Social movement organisations track the consequences of such legislation, as seen by the campaign Sdebitarsis documentation, and often bemoan their lack of implementation.

Claims are also focused on procedural matters, such as the confrontation with institutions in order to activate participatory practises, inclusive and plural Venezia Social Forum 2001, given the movements well-documented preoccupation with democracy. The Internet cultural association Isolenella Retes constitution, which is intended to support the self-organization of grassroots activist organisations, explicitly defends freedom of information. The papers of the critical unions often make mention of workplace democracy and, on occasion, demand for special legislation to protect union rights and democracy as well as a universal public service COBAS. The Botteghe del Mondo makes particular requests for legislative standards in favour of alternative commercial practises and makes specific objections to reductions in local services. In its foundation declaration, Rete Lilliput states that it opposes economic choices that jeopardise democracy, emphasising that the forms of democracy and politics as we traditionally knew them, strictly tied to the national state, are largely inadequate. In a broader sense, unions commitment to building democracy alongside social rights is characterised as include engagement in the struggle against neoliberal globalisation FIOM.

The organisational papers qualitative examination also identifies some key areas of criticism and, sometimes, suggestions for democratizing public institutions. Our organisations are first worried about IGO accountability. The quest for a democratic alternative to neoliberal globalisation is proclaimed as a primary goal for instance, Torino Social Forum 2008, and the international economic organisations WTO, World Bank, and FMI are stigmatised as being antidemocratic. Even in the Catholic Pax Christi 2001, which criticizes the serious involution of democracy that, from a participatory project of organising social life according to the parameters of equality, freedom, justice, international solidarity, and peace, is transforming itself more and more in a mechanism of competitive management of power, dominated by a utilitaristic logic, and subject to the dominion of the few over the many, the critique of an involution of democratic politics is present [8], [9].

In reality, opinions towards the UN or the EU are particularly indicative of the drive towards democratizing and strengthening global governance institutions. The international campaign Reclaim our UN 2005b in particular advocates for the reform of that organisation based on values of multilateralism, international cooperation, strengthening of international law, creation of democratic international institutions, submission of IFIs to the UN, extension of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, establishment of an international judiciary police, and promotion of global citizenship with responsible participation. If not all of our organisations share this confidence in the reform ability of the UN, there is a strong need for transnational economic process control and a return to politics in opposition to the markets hegemony.

Similar to this, macroregional governance organisations, such as the EU, are seen as essential to limiting the harm caused by economic globalisation. The enormous number of corporate lobbyists in Brussels would confirm to the claim that the EU protects the interests of companies. Via Campesina suggests a multilayered intervention to persuade national governments to reform their policies as well as pressure from better IGOs like the UN and some of its affiliated organisations. The Seattle to Brussels Network 2008 asks the EU to promote enhanced transparency and democratic participation and accountability in EU trade policy making, including consultations with parliaments and civil society groups cf. also Zola and Marchetti 2006, after criticizing the opaque, nontransparent, and deeply undemocratic nature of EU trade policy-making. Additionally, organisations criticised the democratic deficit that is attributed to the absence of legislative oversight of the government. The European Council, which is appointed by the governments of the Member States and can issue directives that constrain Member States, is one of the things that ATTAC criticizes.

Because neither the national nor the European parliaments have influence over the policy of competition in this area, there is a democratic gap that works to the powerful benefit. The construction of a democratic constitutive European process that starts from the peoples, which rejects the neoliberal process of a Europe of the powerful and the governments, is one of the five key goals of the Italian National Council of ATTAC Italia. A European social model is being defended as an alternative to the American one at the same time, mainly by trade unions for more information on the Italian FIOM and CGIL.

In contrast to a Europe of the market, of commerce, of the elites, of the governments, undemocratic, and subordinate to the US, ATTAC typically favors a social Europe, a Europe of civic and social rights for all inhabitants, a Europe of the people, and a Europe that fosters peace. The creation of a public space in Europe is the tool offered. It claims that in the last two years a new public sphere was born in Europe it has been promoted not by the consensus-catching sent by the commission to look for some dialogue with the civil society, but the oppositional movements. The Italian ATTAC criticizes the Convention for the Constitutional Treaty's failure to involve at least part of the civil society. However, it would be a mistake to look back and maintain the delusion that the national states are the stage on which the movement can perform its democratic examples given the myopia of the European governments and their often-factual complicity with imperial activities. 2002, ATTACI Italia.

Similar to this, the Italian Consortium of Solidarity advocates for the open and inclusive constitutional process to likewise empower and democratize a social and democratic EU. A Europe from below is advocated by the International Consortium for Solidarity Italia 2004, which places emphasis on the centrality of democracy, rights, and social cohesion within the process of European unification. Rete Lilliput 2008c states that the current Europe is not the Europe we want and identifies the qualities of that continent.

The lack of responsibility for national and even municipal governance is also emphasised. A lack of openness and public accountability is also perceived as undermining national democracy, in addition to the rising influence of non-democratic IGOs on national decision-making. For instance, Friends of the Earth stigmatizes the connections between political parties and businesses, claiming that the latter dominate the former via sponsorship. The main demand is for the growth of a real, or participatory, democracy with regard to both local and national political spheres. An open inquiry on the organisations views towards current trials with participatory public decision-making leads to the identification of both openness to engagement with institutions and unhappiness with prior experiences. These projects, based on the idea that normal citizens should participate in public forums for discussion, have developed over the last 20 years, particularly at the municipal level, taking the shape of people Juries, Planungszellen, Consensus Conferences, Conferences de citoyens, and similar events. Social movement actors have been involved in the growth of some of these processes, sometimes as boosters, sometimes as adversaries from outside the movement.

A sizable though not majority portion of our sample showed interest in this area as well, along with some cynicism and criticism. Over one-third 38.5% said that these participatory experiments increase the quality of political choices; the remainder roughly one-fifth 19.2% were doubtful. 42.3% of the groups had not addressed this subject or had no clear view on it. When asked to qualify their opinions of public decision-making experiments, nearly one-fifth of the groups discussed benefits and risks, roughly half highlighted the positive aspects, and nearly one-third highlighted the experiments negative aspects, which show up on both the input and output sides of the decision-making process. An interest in institutional politics is evident in the replies, even when it is paired with substantial suspicion of the established institutions.

First and foremost, proponents of these experiments see a resonance between them and their own ideals in them: Participation is one of the main elements of our strategy Rete Lilliput. Participatory experiments are described as one of our means of action in order to increase civil society dialogues. We push for a renewal of decision-making processes Alliance Sud; to stimulate civic responsibility one of the principles we push for at a political level, we also monitor the quality of implementation of participation in practice European Network on Debt and Development - EURODAD; one of the principles we push for at a political level Party socialiste suisse. In reality, many organisations emphasize their support for democratic participation and greater participation of citizens and their groups in democracy, beyond voting. Civicus.

CONCLUSION

Understanding social movements potential and constraints in multilevel governance opens up possibilities for improving their efficacy and managing the challenges of global action. In order to advance global democracy, promote inclusive governance, and advance human rights and equality, it may be useful to learn about the external component of democracy in social movements and multilevel governance. To achieve social justice and transformational change, these concepts may be put into practice. The external component of democracy in social movements and multilevel governance must be better understood, hence further study in this area is crucial. To increase the efficacy and resiliency of movements, cross-border action should be prioritized. In addition, promoting human rights and democratic principles on a worldwide scale is essential for realizing the goal of inclusive and equitable global government. It is essential for achieving a more fair, democratic, and sustainable society to place an emphasis on participation practises and cooperation across social movements.

REFERENCES:

[1] B. Kurniadi, Indonesia Political Development: Democracy, Political Parties in the Political Education Perspective, *Int. J. Multicult. Multireligious Underst.*, 2019, doi: 10.18415/ijmmu.v6i9.613.

[2] K. Mross, First Peace, then Democracy? Evaluating Strategies of International Support at Critical Junctures after Civil War, *Int. Peacekeeping*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/13533312.2018.1557052.

[3] B. Kurniadi, Democracy , Political Parties in the Political Education Perspective, *Int. J. Multicult. Multireligious Underst.*, 2019.

[4] C. Pierobon, EUs support to civil society in Kazakhstan: A pilot evaluation of the social capital generated, *Evaluation*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1356389018796023.

[5] S. Beetz, The UNDP and the EC in Democracy Promotion – Roles, Democracy Definitions, Priorities and Strategies of the Actors, in *External Democracy Promotion and Diversity Among International Agencies*, 2019. doi: 10.2307/j.ctvddzfcn.10.

[6] P. Ilowski, Populism and International Relations. Comparison of the United States and Central and Eastern Europe, *Stud. Eur. - Stud. Eur. Aff.*, 2019, doi: 10.33067/se.3.2019.3.

[7] L. Morlino en F. Raniolo, Neo-populism and the subversion of democratic quality, in *Multiple Populisms: Italy as Democracys Mirror*, 2019. doi: 10.4324/9781351115742-3.

[8] W. Weikun en Z. Dexiang, Study on the Current State of Textual Expression in Private University Charters in China: Based on Textual Analysis of the Charters of 105 Private Undergraduate Universities, *Chinese Educ. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/10611932.2019.1608750.

[9] S. Beetz, Analytical Framework – External Actors and Democracy Dimensions, in *External Democracy Promotion and Diversity Among International Agencies*, 2019. doi: 10.2307/j.ctvddzfcn.8.

CHAPTER 9

POLITICAL DETERMINATION: A STUDY OF POLITICALLY-ORIENTED ORGANIZATIONS

Dr. Brijesh, Assistant Professor
Department of Law, IIMT University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India.

ABSTRACT:

Organisations with a political bent play an important role in democratic politics by representing a variety of interests and pushing for legislative reforms and social reforms. The purpose of this research study is to examine the landscape of political organisations with an emphasis on their roles, tactics, and effects on democratic government. Political parties, advocacy groups, interest-based organisations, and members of civil society are only a few examples of the many sorts of politically motivated organisations included in the research. It examines how these organisations interact with political parties, take part in elections, and shape public opinion. The study also looks at the difficulties political organisations confront in supporting democratic ideals, correcting power disparities, and ensuring inclusion. For evaluating their impact on pluralistic governance, policy creation, and public participation, it is essential to comprehend the function of politically-oriented organisations in democratic politics. The report also emphasises how this information may be used to advance responsible government, enhance democratic institutions, and encourage political engagement.

KEYWORDS:

Advocacy Groups, Civil Society Actors, Democratic Governance, Interest-Based Organizations, Political Parties.

INTRODUCTION

Since participation is a fundamental element of democracy Italian union FIOM-CGIL, participatory instruments are fundamental even if they are often used to gain consensus, Italian environmentalist association Legambiente, and allow for the full expression of citizenship, Venezia Social Forum, especially the more politically oriented organisations appreciate the legitimating potential of this type of experiment. Given the crises of representative institutions, participatory experiments are seen as being even more crucial in this regard. The institutional involvement initiatives are welcomed because, according to Euro movement, they both signal a crisis of conventional politics and represent a good direction where to look to overcome this crisis. Since the gap between social dynamics and their institutional representation widens as systemic complexity grows, permanent engagement of citizens is fundamental Italian union CGIL [1], [2] .

Participatory democracy brings citizens closer to politics, introducing an element of transparency in the decision-making it becomes clear why a specific decision is taken, which enhances institutional responsibility Youth group of the Italian Green Party, NGOs, and other organisations active in the field accentuate the advantages of participatory decision-making from an output perspective. Participation ensures the input of the grassroots Jubilee Debt Campaign, helps to make decisions more equitable decisions more sound overall as international cooperation should also actively involve the population on which it focuses Italian Consort. Participatory decision-making enables better acknowledgment of the field reality, the proximity allows for a better understanding of the complex reality and a bridging of traditional political gaps, while its transparency allows catching ideas and problems of

citizens, according to the Italian Greens, since If decisions are public and transparent their quality improves, according to the Tavola della Pace. The functioning of democracy is often equated with transparency and citizen control see, for instance, the French Agir ici and the British Catholic Agency for Overseas Development. The cognitive enlargement that arises from involvement from below is also addressed. Participatory experiments, according to a spokesman of the network Campagna Banche Armate, which campaigns against the purchase of weapons, help create a civil society that can pressure politicians towards the public good and produce a better political elite.

Local knowledge is highlighted in this context since, according to Sdebitarsi, decisions improve through proposals and ideas coming from concrete experiences of movements and the civil society. As stated by Red con Voz, the contrast of ideas always ends up with a change, even small, of the initial positions, and as facilitated by participatory processes by Ver.di, Vereinte Dienstleistungsgewerkschaft, solidaristic solutions can be found through participatory processes. Some interviewees also emphasise the value of the discussion per se. Participatory experiments involve the acceptance of each persons dignity, especially but not only for religious organisations. Due to the fact that we assign a fundamental value to personal dignity, which has to be considered as the beginning and the end of all social, political, and labour action, the spokesman of the Spanish Hermanidad Obrera de Acción Católica HOAC promotes participative public decision-making. According to Associazione Botteghe del Mondo, creating more responsibility among people who are involved and more sharing of the decisions has a beneficial impact on people [3], [4].

Even if the idea of participatory democracy is endorsed, several attempts with it have received criticism for the way they were carried out the Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire, for instance. Many contributors clarify their views on participatory experiments by highlighting various institutional frameworks. According to Peacelink, not all public decision-making processes supported by institutions produced a real improvement in the quality of political decisions, and in some cases, there is the possibility of institutional changes, in other cases not Ecologistas en Accion. As a result, participation experiments are split into real and fake ones. We support these processes if they are real and not artificial, the Attac Italia official said. Bottom up experiments represent the majority of real experiments. One of the creators of the Rete Nuovo Municipio, which encourages participatory experiments, a representative of the weekly Carta, says they prefer when these initiatives are promoted directly by the citizens. The Abruzzo Social Forum spokesperson echoed this sentiment, saying, we attempted to participate in them, but they became places for specialists since a task of true marketing is lacking. It is difficult for them to be successful when they don’t originate from below.

Additionally, real experiments are ones that count, or, as Espacio Alternativo puts it, execute, choices made in participatory forums. Many people worry that the most conventional processes hack at the branches and don’t get at the roots of challenging the laws governing property rights, corporate hegemony, and the debt-based interest-bearing monetary system, in the words of the representative of the British organisation Global Justice Movement. Even the Rete Noglobal, which coordinates organisations in the vicinity of the youth institutions that have been occupied, expresses its willingness to join, but only when it is not a rhetorical artefact and when citizens can make decisions on significant resource. The majority of criticism is related to a perceived lack of tangible results, which labels participation as often placebo politics ATTAC Germany or a smokescreen Syndicate des. Section gene Voise or a simulacrum of democracy the decisions that are then made do not take into account the opinions expressed by these bodies. Confédération Paysanne. Accordingly, street mobilisation

and the empowerment of these bodies are related Colectivo de Solidaridad con la Rebelión Zapatista de Barcelona. Participation in these processes is also accompanied by a fear of cooptation, which is stigmatized as PR for governments at the cost of the activists Bundesko ordination Internationalismus or as a co-optation trap World Economy, Ecology and Development, risking too strong a bond with established structures Welt friedensdienst [5], [6]. In conclusion, the GJMOs routinely engage with the institutions of representative democracy despite their critical perspectives. Our organisations really have a positive attitude towards public institutions; rather than emphasising a negative message, they often provide specific recommendations and work together to solve particular issues. However, they also often criticise such institutions and see themselves as actively participating in citizen control of institutional politics and establishing avenues for discursive responsibility.

DISCUSSION

Explaining attitudes towards institutions

Both datasets revealed a variety of views regarding cooperation with institutions within the same movement, within the specified overall openness to contacts with institutions but also distrust. Even though a tiny minority of organisations reject contacts with institutions, there are differing views on the value of such cooperation and the need of top-down management. Some of our groups favor participatory democracy initiatives, including those funded by movement organisations, while others view them skeptically. What justifies these variations? In the sections that follow, I analyse contextual factors first while drawing on internal structural and cultural traits that the literature on Social Movement Organizations SMOs has deemed important for making this kind of strategic decisions.

Environmental characteristics

Environment has an obvious impact on organisations. Social movements are not born outside of the customs and institutional foundations of the wider society in which they are embedded, noted. Instead, the cadre and networks of supporters and activists draw on, rely on, and use the action repertoires, institutional structures, and physical resources of the greater society. The environment may impose, approve, encourage, acquire, imprint, integrate, or circumvent organisational structures. Insofar as the greater the extent to which the organisations in a field transact with agencies of the state, the greater the extent of isomorphism in the field as a whole, dependence on state agencies would enhance pressure for isomorphism. The requirements for obtaining tax breaks, preferential postal rates, and public and private support have an impact on the organisational setup of organisations looking to take advantage of these opportunities. In fact, made the claim that resources and institutional dependencies fundamentally shape movement development, as do competitive pressures that determine processes of organisational founding, survival, and change. Although compliance with such incentives is voluntary, a tangle of incentives provides advantages to certain organisational forms over others.

There is a common belief that social movement organisations work more cooperatively the more inclusive the political system. However, we cannot generalize the claim that formal organisations will inevitably be favorably incorporated into an open institutional structure that provides resources to citizen organisations. However, an open, decentralised political system may also facilitate similar trends towards decentralization and informality among movement organisations. Firstly, formal, hierarchical structures have frequently been established to better fight a hostile state apparatus [7], [8].

Multiple organisational forms may be accommodated within the same system, contrary to the presumption that there is a fixed link between the shape activists give to their organisations and the features of the institutional system in which they function. This emphasises the flexibility social movement actors have when attempted to creatively adapt to their surroundings as opposed to having it dictate to them - even if these flexibility margins are limited by historically defined repertoires of organisational structures. Country disparities are evident in our data, but not necessarily in the manner that one would anticipate. Although attitudes of collaboration and democratic control are also mentioned more frequently than in the other countries, the Swiss case, as well as the French and British samples, have more organisations mentioning their refusal of relationships with institutions in their fundamental documents. Transnationally and in Switzerland, where control of institutions is also often emphasised, collaborative attitudes are more prevalent. In Spain and Italy, the topic of democratic control is less commonly brought up. With the exception of Spain, democratic control is typically the attitude that people have towards international organisations and cooperation with local authorities' data not displayed, but accessible upon request.

Differences across countries may be seen in the interviews when it comes to how people feel about institutions. Collaborations with international governmental organisations are common, while those with Spanish and Swiss organizations most of which operate locally are less common. For the Spanish and British samples, the refusal to cooperate rises to about one-fourth. While critical selective cooperation is especially common among French, German, British, and transnational groupings, unconditioned collaboration affects up to 39% of Swiss and 52% of transnational organisations. In terms of the interaction with national institutions, we found that the Spanish sample had a lower rate; French, German, and British respondents cited it more often; and Swiss and transnational groups employed unconditioned cooperation with institutions the most. Regarding local institutions, groups from Germany, Spain, and Britain tend to mention refusal of collaboration more frequently; groups from France, Germany, and Italy tend to mention selective collaboration more frequently; and groups from Switzerland and, once more, Italy where the lack of contacts with local authorities is almost nonexistent tend to mention unconditional collaboration more frequently. We cannot assess the representativeness of our groups given the sampling approach we used, but we can say that in all of our countries we see a range of attitudes towards authorities that drive the search for answers based on the internal features of our groups [9], [10].

Movement organizational structures

Resources used by social movement organisations vary in size and nature. The term organisational capacity refers to an organizations financial and human resources as well as the administrative knowledge and capabilities to implement procedures and programmes relevant to movement-related goals. varied SMOs have varied organisational capacities. Organisational resources have often been linked to organisational ideas of democracy. Resources are considered to be necessary for the creation of formalized models, while bureaucratization and centralization are seen to make fundraising easier Knoke. On the other hand, informal SMOs are claimed to promote participatory democracy via reasoned arguments followed by group decisions since they are based on face-to-face contact among individuals who know each other personally. In general, it has been thought that formalization and resource availability would make it more likely for SMOs to work with public institutions.

Research on labour relations has already shown that there is a greater degree of co-optation of economic interest groups in national public forums, when these organisations have more resources and are more organized and professionalized. Relations with labour movement

organisations had a tendency to spread to new groups that were integrated into public decision-making venues, particularly in neo corporatist nations. This inclusion coincided with tendencies towards professionalization, organisational structuration, and rising resource levels. Our findings support the idea that certain organisational structure traits have a strong capacity for explaining interactions with institutions.

Our study shows that certain organisational traits are substantially and considerably connected with the attitudes towards institutions that emerge from basic texts. The association coefficients between a few organisational structure characteristics and combined statements of cooperation, control, or rejection of connection with any of the specified institutions. The likelihood that institutional rejection is mentioned decreases and the likelihood that institutional collaboration at all levels is mentioned increases are indicators of organisational structuration, such as the presence of structural accountability and participation elements. The groupings trend towards relationships of cooperation and democratic control simultaneously and in a similar manner as their formalization and geographical degrees of contact increase. Similar to this, the possibility that a connection of collaborative control with institutions is indicated rises with the availability of organisational resources in the form of substantial person membership.8

With additional clarification for the various degrees and modes of cooperation, the results from interviews demonstrate comparable connections between organisational structure traits and attitudes towards institutions. First off, there is a strong and substantial association between organisational resource indicators and relationships with international NGOs particularly, national and local institutions less so, as well as volunteer numbers, budget size, and individual and collective member counts. A sign of professionalization like the existence of paid personnel dummy and the aforementioned markers of interaction with institutions show a comparable, and equally high, link. Correlation coefficients are also high when discussing relationships with IGOs, but they are lower when discussing relationships with local governments, where party allies are more likely to hold office. At all three levels of governance, cooperation between NGOs and formal SMOs and unwillingness to cross links with institutions and organisational forms more often arose among grassroots SMOs, as did collaboration with limits between unions and contemporary networks.

Some internal decision-making qualities of the organisation have an impact on relationships with institutions. Our internal democracy typology was found to be helpful in describing how the institutions in both datasets related to one another. Focusing on the organisational ideology as expressed in fundamental documents, if we compare models of internal decision-making with relationships with institutions, associations and deliberative representative models tend to mention collaboration more frequently Cramers V = 0.274 and democratic control more frequently Cramers V = 0.2224, whereas deliberative representative, delibe representative, or associational models tend to mention refusal more frequently. When examining the opinions towards local, national, and international organisations independently, similar images came into focus. According to our interviews, collaboration with international institutions is more likely to happen for organisations that have lower levels of participation i.e., when the assembly is not the primary decision-making body; this is especially true of collaboration with international and then national institutions. Collaboration at these two levels is also often discouraged by a consensual decision-making process in the main body but not at the local level. The democratic model, which affects interactions at all three levels but more so at the two highest levels: 0.345; 0.371; and 0.162 for IGOs, national, and local levels, respectively, is more generally accurate in this regard. The existence of an executive committee has a similar facilitative impact on teamwork. We

may infer those decisions made on internal organisational structure, or at least structural traits of SMOs, and their attitudes and behaviour towards institutions, are strictly correlated. This is especially true on a global scale, where cooperation is far more probable the more organized, qualified, and resourceful an organisation is. Particularly, the decision to cooperate with institutions is discouraged the more organisations embrace democratic and deliberative decision making.

Movement themes

While some approaches have connected decisions about how to interact with institutions to organisational resources, others have looked at cultural factors, suggesting that in social movement organisations, decisions about organisational strategies are made more in light of their symbolic appropriateness than their effectiveness or efficiency. In general, decisions on how to interact with institutions are not just strategically motivated but also include significant identity issues. The labour movement has historically been split between revolutionary and reformist factions based on how they feel about the state. More recently, it has been said that certain movements like the environmental movement tend to be more instrumentally oriented towards authorities, while others like the women's movement concentrate on establishing one's identity.

We categorized democratic ideals on internal decision-making as well as more generally in our collection of organisational papers. First, we compared organisational principles about democracy with views towards institutions as reflected in basic texts. The assumption here is that the existence of broad democratic ideals that are closer to, or at least consistent with, those articulated by such institutions may facilitate partnerships with those institutions. Our results demonstrate that broad sentiments regarding democracy have an impact on attitudes towards institutions. It shows that references to participation only positively correlate with expressions of rejection of relationships with institutions, while references to inclusiveness positively correlate with both expressions of rejection and democratic control. Critical mentions of delegation tend to raise mentions of rejection and decrease mentions of cooperation. Additionally, references to individual, collective, and local chapters or member organisations autonomy all appear to strengthen the propensity towards democratic control and discouragement of cooperation.

For increasingly collaborative and control-oriented organisations, references to deliberative ideals rise. There seems to be a correlation between a lower propensity to cooperate and explicit references to democratic values that are different from if not opposed to those upheld by representative institutions. This correlation appears to be particularly strong when it comes to emphasising the role of civil society in holding institutions accountable. The same relationships occur for territorial levels, but they are less for the local level data not shown, but accessible upon request. Deliberative ideals are connected with a communicative attitude towards existing institutions, although deliberative organisations tend to highlight notably their function.

Values and organisational areas seem to be related. The Old Left, new social movements, and solidarity/peace groups are more likely to have collaborative attitudes than the New Left/anarchists and the new global organisations when comparing movement areas with relationships to institutions Cramers V = 0.358. While democratic control is evenly distributed throughout groups, rejection of cooperation is more prevalent in the final two regions Cramers V = 0.278. Similar relationships appear from the interviews, with NSM and solidarity organisations more focused on working with both IGOs and national institutions Cramers V = 0.222 and 0.208, respectively. Groups in the new global region tend to show

themselves as critical collaborators more often, while the New Left and anarchists' express rejection more frequently. At the local level, these changes are less important and not statistically significant.

Parties and NGOs/formal SMOs exhibit a higher propensity for collaboration, though with statistical significance above 0.05 Cramers V = 0.217, Sig. 0.094, whereas informal SMOs and contemporary networks developed as organisational forms within the GJM are more critical Cramers V with refusal of collaboration 0.211, Sig. 0.094. Over all organisational types, attitudes towards democratic control are more equally distributed. With a Cramers V coefficient of 0.230 for the mention of cooperation nonsignificant for rejection and democratic control, our data on organisational documents show that collaboration tends to rise with the age of the organisation. With values of, respectively, 0.242, 0.266, and 0.181 for collaboration with international, national, and local organisations, the connections become even stronger in the interview database. These findings seem to point to some moderation with age, or at the very least, a more critical approach on the part of younger organisations.

Movements and institutions

Our study does not support the notion that anti-political social movement organisations are envious of their independence. First of all, it became clear that our groups were mostly receptive to relationships with institutions, although critically and selectively. In actuality, they are engaged to politics and back another politics. Even though our sampling strategy may have resulted in a greater proportion of organisations with institutional ties, we can still conclude that many of the most important and visible organisations in the GJMs primary intervention areas are actually very interested in communicating with policymakers in a variety of ways. The GJM itself symbolises, to some degree, a time of repoliticization of the civil society organisations. Many NGOs, culturally-oriented groups, trade unions, and voluntary associations began to bridge their frames and competences and to target the institutions of multilevel governance after becoming disenchanted with the meagre results produced by the type of division of labour between political and social actors that had developed in the 1980s and 1990s.

In addition to interacting with institutions, the vast majority of our organisations also address them at various geographical levels of administration. As with national and multinational SMOs, local-level organisations often disclose relationships with other geographical levels. Street protests and even personal reform initiatives do not exclude discussion of politics and public policy formulation. In reality, the GJM exhibits interest in the establishment of governance institutions at different territorial levels since it advocates a return of the state against the market. In particular, there are significant calls for alternative institutions and policies as a result of the stigmatization of the democratic gap in the operation of international governmental organisations.

In this sense, our organisations support a global democracy that can control economic globalisation rather than a return to nation-state sovereignty Marchetti 2008. In this view, paying attention to the transnational level is crucial because, although being very difficult, developing a democracy from below at the global level is seen as important. This is especially true in regards to the EU, as the majority of organisations fiercely criticised the organizations real policies and politics while also highlighting the need of democratic European institutions and a social Europe. Identitarian views of European integration have sometimes been backed by civil society organisations, while other times they have been among the most vocal opponents of the integration process. A no vote was vigorously promoted by various social movement organisations during the French referendum campaign

on the Constitutional Treaty. Recent research has questioned whether to classify those organisations and activists as euro-sceptics, suggesting that they should be referred to as critical Europeanists, who are not inherently opposed to giving more powers to European institutions but are unhappy with their current politics and policies. The current Europe of the market is decried in this context as promoting neoliberal policies, and a replacement social Europe is demanded. Despite internal disagreements, the organisations of our movement do not seem to support a return to the nation-state's exclusive dominance, but rather aim to develop a process of Europeanization from below that involves the creation of European identities and organisational networks. Support and resistance often relate to the integration process form and substance, as opposed to just or mostly the integration process itself. The war over Europe has really been symbolically linked with other concerns as the argument over it has heated up, adding new cleavages on top of the original geographical ones.

This interest in politics and policy is not exclusive of institutional distrust and coercion anxiety. Although collaboration with institutions is often not precluded, our organisations typically designate themselves a position that focuses on democratic control. In actuality, collaboration is characterised as critical and selective. Participation is emphasised as a core principle under this idea of democratic governance, but it is also paired with a protection of the civil societys independence from the state. First and foremost, democratic decision-making should be open to the public and transparent. Public institutions should provide individuals with a growing number of involvement options in order to be held responsible. The majority of the time, mistrust in public institutions is expressed as a result of direct or indirect experiences rather than as a matter of principle. But the internal diversity of our GJM organisations views and practises towards institutions also became apparent. In this study, we focused on the role of internal environmental factors and external features on views towards institutions. Instead of addressing them as competing theories, we examined how each theory affected our dependent variable as it was operationalized in the organisational foundational documents.

First, contextual factors became significant, but association patterns did not readily support the theory that more cooperative SMOs were found in more inclusive and consensual nations particularly in central-northern Europe and more rebellious ones were found in more exclusive and violent nations particularly in southern Europe. In actuality, the level of variety inside each nation was more important. Particular context-related effects are filtered via a kind of imprinting during the formation of our groupings. Instead, our study shows that key structural organisational traits have a very high explanatory power, enabling us to distinguish between two primary organisational constellations. The resources, organisation, and professionalism of the organisations that are more receptive to cooperation are often greater, and they typically have a bigger membership. The less important ones, however, are tiny, underfunded, volunteer, and grassroots organisations. When dealing with international institutions instead than local ones, this is much truer.

This does not imply, however, that views towards institutions are always determined by the kind of resources that are accessible. Not only is the causal relationship unclear, but views towards institutions also seem to be a component of larger identities that include wider ideals. According to this perspective, the more a group emphasises the democratic principles of participation and discourse, the more critical they become of the institutions that already exist since, in their eyes, they don't uphold those principles. Organisations associated more with control than with rejecting interactions with institutions, which instead increases for the more traditional anti-capitalist values, emerged in the Global Justice Movement, particularly those that assumed a novel network structure. Actually, a groups generation has an impact on how

they feel about institutions. Younger organisations those founded during the GJM have become more important to their mutual cooperation.

CONCLUSION

The difficulties political organisations encounter, such preserving inclusion and dealing with power disparities, provide chances for enhancing their democratic practises. In order to develop political engagement, advance responsible governance, and strengthen democratic procedures, it may be useful to research politically-oriented organisations. The strengthening of democratic institutions and citizen representation may be achieved by putting these concepts into practise. In conclusion, further study in this area is necessary to improve our comprehension of the function and influence of political organisations in democratic politics. Within these organisations, emphasising diversity and democratic principles may improve their credibility and efficiency. Furthermore, encouraging public advocacy and involvement is crucial for creating responsible and participatory government. To achieve the goal of a lively and responsive democratic society, it is essential to emphasize the role of politically motivated organisations in democratic politics.

REFERENCES:

[1] B. R. Fulton, M. Oyakawa, en R. L. Wood, Critical standpoint: Leaders of color advancing racial equality in predominantly white organizations, *Nonprofit Manag. Leadersh.*, 2019, doi: 10.1002/nml.21387.

[2] D. K. Jensen-Ryan en L. A. German, Environmental science and policy: A meta-synthesis of case studies on boundary organizations and spanning processes, *Sci. Public Policy*, 2019, doi: 10.1093/scipol/scy032.

[3] M. Hadani, J. P. Doh, en M. Schneider, Social movements and corporate political activity: Managerial responses to socially oriented shareholder activism, *J. Bus. Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.10.031.

[4] S. Lago Martinez, Innovation, appropriation and creation of digital technologies: entrepreneurship culture in Argentine creative industries, *EPTIC*, 2019.

[5] J. H. Turner, The More American Sociology Seeks to Become a Politically-Relevant Discipline, the More Irrelevant it Becomes to Solving Societal Problems, *Am. Sociol.*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s12108-019-09420-5.

[6] K. Mori, New regionalism or asian ambiguity? Japan and the 1995 APEC action agenda, in *Teaching International Affairs With Cases: Cross-national Perspectives*, 2019. doi: 10.4324/9780429308246-9.

[7] G. C. Wiedenhöft, E. M. Luciano, en J. B. Porto, Impacts of the spirit of initiative and identification with the organization on IT governance effectiveness perception in public organizations, *Rev. Gest.*, 2019, doi: 10.1108/REGE-01-2018-0014.

[8] D. Schoeneborn, T. R. Kuhn, en D. Kärreman, The Communicative Constitution of Organization, Organizing, and Organizationality, *Organ. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0170840618782284.

[9] E. M. Bunnik *et al.*, Comparative 3D genome organization in apicomplexan parasites, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2019, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1810815116.

[10] J. Bin Atan en N. H. N. Mahmood, The role of transformational leadership style in enhancing employees competency for organization performance, *Manag. Sci. Lett.*, 2019, doi: 10.5267/j.msl.2019.7.033.

CHAPTER 10

GLOBAL JUSTICE MOVEMENT'S INTERNAL DECISION MAKING: STRUCTURAL AND CULTURAL DETERMINANTS

Dr. Neeru Choudhary, Assistant Professor
Department of Arts & Humanities, IIMT University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India.

ABSTRACT:

Diverse organisational frameworks and cultural norms that affect the Global Justice Movements internal decision-making processes define the GJM. In order to understand their influence on successful activism, this research article will examine how structural and cultural elements interact to shape internal decision-making inside the GJM. The research explores the movements many organisational forms, including coalition-building, horizontal organising, and decentralised networks. It looks at how these structures affect the dynamics of decision-making, the allocation of power, and the inclusiveness of movement members. The study also looks at cultural norms and principles, such as tolerance for other points of view and participatory democracy, that influence decision-making procedures inside the GJM. To evaluate the GJMs efficacy, legitimacy, and transformational potential, it is essential to comprehend the structural and cultural factors that influence internal decision-making inside the movement. Additionally, the research emphasises how this information may be used to advance social justice, human rights, and equality as well as to build inclusive and democratic engagement.

KEYWORDS:

Decision-Making Processes, Global Justice Movement, Horizontal Organizing, Participatory Democracy, Social Activism.

INTRODUCTION

Social movement organisations have quite different approaches to decision-making and, more broadly, to democratic ideals and practises. This chapter examines potential reasons for the variations in internal decision-making seen among Global Justice Movement organisations. In fact, there are significant differences in how various democratic models are adopted by the study's included organisations 1ive models, and far behind them is the assembler model, according to data gathered from the organisations online and offline documents as well as a structured questionnaire that was sent to them. Therefore, discussion is the preferred style of decision-making for half of the organisations, and the deliberative participative model is used by around one-fourth of them.

The chart also demonstrates that different nations employ democratic models differently, notably the deliberative participative model for a more thorough explanation of the typology of democratic models. Except for Spain, where the deliberative participative form is more common, the associational approach is dominant there. Comparatively speaking, the latter approach is significantly less common in France, Germany, and Switzerland than in the other nations, including Spain. While these variations undoubtedly result from our sample methods see Introduction, they may also be attributable to the movements higher sensitivity to participatory and deliberative democracy in Spain and, to a lesser extent, in Britain. However, because no clear pattern appears to be emerging, it is difficult to interpret them as being caused by variations in national political opportunity structures. In our analysis, we will add a more aggregated measure of nation variation based on Lijphart 1999 typology of democratic

systems, specifically his contrast between majoritarian and consensual democracies, in order to study this issue.

However, this chapter's major goal is not to explain why different democratic or decision-making models are adopted differently across different countries. Instead, we look at key structural and cultural factors that influence whether or not organisations involved in the movement adopt a deliberative participatory form. The deliberative participatory model, which is often emphasised in the vocabulary of the Global Justice Movement, is the area in which we concentrate more intently. This democratic model best exemplifies the threat to established forms of representative democracy due to its focus on the value of consensus and widespread involvement in democratic processes Indeed, the GJMs key ideals include involvement and consensus.

We put out a number of theories about the effects of three structural elements that have to do with the internal organisation of the organisations and three cultural factors that have to do with the tradition of conflict that serves as the foundation for their mobilization. We also take into account the country's larger institutional framework, including the sort of democracy in which the organisations are based. hypothesis based on the findings of two different types of analysis on a combined sample of organisations from the study's six participating nations.1 To determine which organisational traits are influential and to determine their relative weight, we first conduct a logistic regression. Second, to investigate numerous and conjunctural impacts, we use qualitative comparative analysis QCA. However, we must first discuss our theoretical predictions and how they were operationalized before moving on to the analyses finings [1], [2].

Structural and cultural determinants of deliberative democracy

Our goal is to explain the democratic methods used in the Global Justice Movements decision-making processes, not only to describe them. We concentrate on internal factors, both institutional and cultural, that contributed to our sample's acceptance of the deliberative participatory form of democracy. We specifically look at the influence of the organization's internal organisation level of formalization, size, and geographic scope as well as the tradition of conflict that underpins their political mobilization belonging to the new social movement and Global Justice Movement region, identification with the GJM, and historical period in which the organisations were founded. We put up a theory regarding how each factor would affect democratic models, particularly the deliberative participatory model. But rather than being in a confirmatory mindset, we are in an inquisitive one. As a result, rather than serving as predictions to be checked against actual data, these hypotheses are meant to serve as a tool to direct the investigation.

The first two factors deal with how the organisations are set up within. Resource mobilisation theory has placed an emphasis on these features in the study of social movements for a summary. According to this idea, the quantity of resources and the degree of internal organisation within social movements are essential for the creation and mobilisation of movements. The internal structure of the organisations affects how they evolve through time. As an example, Kriesi 1996 suggests four aspects for the examination of organisational development: organisational growth and decline, internal and external structure, as well as goal orientations and action repertoires. Here, we concentrate on internal structure, which is the second factor. We focus on the effects of two indicators: size and formalisation level.

The key issue is whether the internal organisation of the organisations can be credibly connected to the democratic form of decision-making that they use, particularly the deliberative participative model. We predict that organisations with a lower level of

formalization for instance, in terms of paid staff, budget, and formal membership will be more likely to adhere to the deliberative participative model for a review of the literature on the function of organisation in social movement research. Contrarily, organisations that are more formalised have a tendency to give the most crucial choices to a select few leaders. This is partially due to the fact that these organisations are more professionally run and have a limited, experienced committee to make and carry out decisions. As a result, formalized organisations would prefer majority vote over debate and representation above participation.

Additionally, a consensus rule of decision-making rather than a majority rule, which more accurately replicates the practises of a professional board and of formal organisations in general, is expected to be related with a lesser degree of formalization. We anticipate organisations with a lesser level of internal structure to embrace a deliberative participatory form of democracy if we combine the two elements [3], [4]. The same argument may be made about organisational size for more information. Once again, it makes sense to assume that bigger organisations will be less supportive of consensus as a technique of decision-making than smaller ones and more supportive of power delegation in the decision-making body. In bigger groups, participation and discussion are more difficult to achieve. So, we anticipate that smaller organisations will adhere to the deliberative participatory democratic paradigm.

Size and formalization level are internal organisational features, strictly speaking. The geographical reach of the organisations may be seen as a third factor that contributes to the internal structure of the organisations for more information. In this section, we make a distinction between organisations having an international or transnational reach and those with a domestic-only local or national scope. One could argue that domestic organisations are more likely to adopt the deliberative participative model because they can afford to be more open to participation and deliberation to the extent that they have a more limited reach, even though it is more challenging to advance a clear-cut hypothesis for this aspect. Contrarily, since they are more complicated, international/transnational organisations need more efficient decision-making processes, which can only be provided by a high level of delegation and a majority rule. Being involved on both the local and the international transnational levels implies a multilayer game, which makes it more challenging to achieve agreement and widespread engagement.

The final two characteristics might be considered as cultural conditions since they speak to their cultural origins, while the first three aspects are all structural conditions of the democratic models that organisations have embraced. The importance of social and cultural divisions for the creation and mobilization of social movements has been emphasised by social movement scholars, particularly those from the European tradition. Many people have emphasised the distinct cultural foundations of the new social movements in comparison to previous movements, most notably the labour movement reviews may be found. Others have examined the sociological foundations of the new social movements, contending that they represent a struggle within the new middle class and that this conflict is essentially the basis of their ability to mobilize people According to this viewpoint, the structural and cultural changes that have marked the postwar development of the European nations are the primary sources of the new social movements [5], [6].

Here, we use this line of thinking to look at how the movement region that the organisations under study are a part of affects their tendency to adhere to a certain democratic model. This allows us to gauge how the organisations deeper cultural divisions have affected their overall standing. Regarding this, we might speculate that organisations that represent the cultural cleft symbolized by the new social movements should be more prone to embrace a

participatory and deliberative form of decision-making. The new social movements support civil society actors' engagement and softer methods of making choices as a group. As a consequence, we could anticipate that they'll be more inclined to agree that consensus should be used more often and with less delegation to reach decisions. Contrarily, organisations that do not follow this legacy of conflict should be more focused on delegation and majority rule when making decisions. This ought to be especially true for conventional parties and unions, which favor representation above participation and are often less likely to look for agreement.

DISCUSSION

The extent to which people identify with the Global Justice Movement also trends in the similar way. An organisation may be considered to share the movements principles and claims to a greater or lesser extent. As a result, we might anticipate that groups that exhibit a high degree of identification will be more likely to embrace a deliberative participatory form of democracy since they will be more inclined to value consensus and participation as organisational ideals. We also take a look at the organisations founding years. This is done to gauge the historical era in which the organisations first appeared. Despite the fact that this aspect has received less attention in the literature on social movements, we believe it will likely have an impact on the traits of the organisations under investigation and, most importantly, their conceptions of democracy. We make a distinction between businesses established before 1989 and those established after 1989. This year marks a turning point in both the history of political conflict and the history of Europe.

Following the collapse of the Berlin Wall, organisations and movements encountered a completely new climate that was less bound by ideological cleavages and more willing to operate within them. What we now refer to as the Global Justice Movement is considered to have originated around that period, which is very significant for our current goal. According to our hypothesis, organisations founded more recently after 1989 will be more likely to embrace a deliberative participatory form of democracy. These are the groups that emerged during the GJM-led wave of protest. Since this movement emphasises the need for an inclusive and open democracy, we may anticipate that the organisations that make up its core will adopt this philosophy of democracy in their daily operations.

Finally, we use a variable that is related to the larger institutional context of the nation where the organisations are situated to control our findings. We specifically aim to determine if variations in the nations democratic system may be used to explain why certain organisations are more likely than others to adopt more deliberative practises. We achieve this by using the popular typology of democratic systems developed by Lijphart 1999, which differentiates between majoritarian and consensual democracies. France and particularly Britain are instances of majoritarian democracies among the nations in our analysis, while Germany and particularly Switzerland are examples of consensual democracies. We may add mixed instances, intermediate circumstances in which the nation has a high score on the executive-parties dimension and a low score on the federal-unitary dimension, or vice versa, to these two pure varieties. This is the situation for Spain and Italy according to our statistics. The justification for using this typology is that, given that the larger institutional environment is already receptive to inclusive, consensual, and horizontal forms of governance, we may anticipate such organisations adopting participatory decision-making models. However, given that they are situated in more exclusive, unitarian, and vertical systems, organisations from majoritarian democracies are predicted to be less likely to adhere to this democratic paradigm. Organisations in mixed democracies should occupy a middle ground.

In conclusion, we have put forth a number of hypotheses regarding the circumstances that might motivate an organisation to implement a deliberative participatory model of democracy in internal decision-making one that emphasises the pursuit of consensus and wider participation in order to make a good decision. We also anticipate that newly founded, smaller organisations with a low level of formalization, a domestic territorial focus, a position close to the cultural cleft represented by the new social movements, and strong identification with the GJM will embrace such a democratic model. Additionally, we anticipate that organisations with a consensual political system will be more likely to adhere to the deliberative participatory model than those with a majoritarian political system.

We may first challenge these assumptions with the available actual data using a multivariate regression analysis. However, unlike a more conventional statistical technique, our research does not only seek for the net impact of each of the five variables under control of the others or merely examine these hypotheses independently. We are also interested in learning more about the combinations of factors that influence organisations to choose participation and agreement over delegation and majority rule when making internal decisions. In doing so, we go beyond a linear and additive logic of describing democratic models in the GJM and instead adopt a technique that enables us to recognised potential combinations of elements influencing the selection of a particular democratic model as well as several potential routes influencing such a selection. Such complex conjunctural causality is well suited for QCA research.

A structured questionnaire that was sent to a sample of organisations involved in the Global Justice Movement in each of the six countries was used to gather the data. Only 168 of the 225 organisations in our sample were used in the empirical studies. We need non-missing data for each variable in order to properly apply the QCA. Organisations are left out of the analysis since this is not the case. Even if a significant portion of the instances approximately a quarter of the original sample were lost, our analysis shouldn't be harmed by this. First off, 225 organisations made up our first sample, which is not thought to be statistically representative.

Although it would be problematic for representative samples if the cases discarded were not distributed randomly across the variables, this is not statistically significant to our study. Second, and perhaps most significantly, the missing instances are spread at random among the primary variables. Therefore, we may presume that the removal of the missing examples has no impact on the general significance of certain types of organisations. As previously mentioned, there are seven explanatory components in our model six for the QCA. The majority of them are just immediately operationalized using the information from the structured questionnaire. However, there was an excessive amount of data missing for several variables. Missing values were supplemented using information from other variables or with information found in the papers created by the organisations in order to avoid omitting too many instances. The operationalization of the variables used in the study is then presented, beginning with the dependent variable [7], [8].

Democratic models

We used both the information from the structured questionnaire and the information derived from the organisation's internal documents, starting from the former and obtaining missing information from the latter, to categorise the chosen organisations in accordance with the typology of democratic models. This made it feasible for us to include as many examples as we could into the study. A complex operationalization involving a number of indicators allows us to categorise an organisation on the two dimensions of the typology delegation of

power vs. participation in the decision-making body, and consensus vs. majority rule as a decision-making method. This definition of a given organisation as assembler, associational, deliberative representative, or deliberative participative the type in which we are interested is based on this operationalization.

Degree of formalization

The size of the workforce number of paid members, the organizations budget, and the availability of membership cards were the three factors we considered when calculating the measure for the level of formalization of the organisation. First, dummy variables were created for each of the three factors with the following values: a paid staff of more than 30, a budget of more than 10,000 euros, and the presence of a membership card. The criterion for paid employees and the budget was determined by the median value for each factor. With the three indicators, we then built an additive index. The next step was to recode the index into a dummy variable high and low degree of formalization.

Size

The size of the organization was computed through a variable measuring the number of individual members. If the number of members is higher than the median value 775 members, the organization is considered as large. When available, missing information on this variable was replaced by a variable measuring the number of people participating in the assembly if higher than 100, then the size is considered as large and two variables created based on the information retrieved from the documents produced by asking for information directly from the organizations: one measuring the number of individual members large size if higher than the median value of the distribution and another measuring the number of collective members large size if higher than the median value. This was done for 123 cases.

Territorial Scope

The top tier of the organization's campaigns served to operationalize its geographical reach. For the latter, the highest geographical level of the campaigns the organisation typically runs local, national, or international/transnational was directly questioned. The domestic local and/or national level and the global/transnational level were differentiated. When available, missing data on this variable was substituted with a question about the organization's involvement in international organisations; if the answer was affirmative, the highest campaign level was deemed to be the international or transnational one. This was carried out in 101 instances**.**

Movement Area

We employed a variable that categorizes the organisations based on multiple sources online and offline papers as well as the structured questionnaire to quantify the organizations affiliation with a certain movement area. This variable makes distinctions between six key areas: New social movements, anarchism, autonomy, solidarity, peace, human rights, the old and new lefts, as well as other concerns.

Year of Establishment

By utilising 1989 as a threshold, the year the organisation was founded was operationalized in a straightforward way. Organisations established before 1989, which is seen as a turning point in the history of conflict in Europe and in current history in general, are referred to as old, and those established after 1989 are referred to as new.

Support for the Global Justice Movement

The issue of whether the group sees itself as a part of the larger movement served as the operationalization of the variable assessing the organizations level of identification with the Global Justice Movement. When information was available, it was replaced by a variable assessing whether the organisation actively engaged in the GJMs events if so, it is seen as identifying with the movement. This was carried out in 83 instances.

Democracy type

Lijpharts 1999 distinction between majoritarian and consensual democracies operationalizes variations in the institutional environments in which the organisations are based. According to him, nations may be categorised using a two-dimensional map that is constructed using the executive-parties and federal-unitary axes. We classified our nations into one of these two categories using the ratings he determined for each nation in his research based on these two aspects. As a result, Germany and Switzerland are regarded as consensual democracies, Italy and Spain as mixed examples, and Britain and France as majoritarian democracies.

We test our hypotheses using a triangulation of logistic regression and QCA since our analyses are conducted on what is frequently referred to as a medium-sized sample formed, in our instance, by 168 valid observations. We can establish the relative weights of each explanatory component on the organisations preferred democratic model with the use of logistic regression. However, in general, we do not anticipate highly significant findings given the size of our sample. When dealing with a small number of instances, QCA offers a more trustworthy instrument.

Furthermore, it offers significant logical and methodological benefits, particularly for small to medium-sized samples. First, the technique is based on the Boolean logic, a basic algebraic logic that is readily understandable. The binary form is used to insert the variables into the model since it is the most straightforward format. Additionally, by differentiating between required and sufficient circumstances for the existence of a certain outcome, QCA findings are presented in a concise but thorough manner. This makes it possible to grasp the outcomes directly and right away. Second, the main objective of QCA is to include the contexts complexity into the analysis. It incorporates the interactions between contextual or causal factors to achieve this. According to Scharpf 1997, this approach emphasises multi-causality and does not necessary presuppose that variables are independent since it focuses on combinations of variables. Additionally, the QCA contains an equifinal or functional equivalent perspective, which states that several context configurations might result in the same result.

Our sample size is the main issue with QCA in this situation. The risk that no deterministic solution will be discovered rises when the sample size is too small, according to the literature on the topic. A sparse solution is impossible in this situation due to the large number of conflicting options. Additionally, a large number of independent variables exponentially increases the number of possible factor combinations, increasing the likelihood that no deterministic solution will be discovered. In this chapter, we provide an empirical approach that will help us deal at least in part with these two issues that arise when the sample is too large.

Regression Analysis

Our major objective is to investigate some of the structural and cultural aspects that influence the adoption of a deliberative participatory form of democracy in internal decision-making by

organisations involved in the Global Justice Movement. In this initial phase, logistic regression is used since our dependent variable is binary a deliberative participatory model is present or absent. We performed three independent models to evaluate the explanatory power of each set of components considered separately: one with only the three structural variables, another with the three cultural variables included, and a complete model with the control by type of democracy included. Notations: + p.10, p.05, p.01, p.001.

Comparing the first two models reveals that model 1s structural variables have much greater explanatory power than model 2s cultural components. In fact, adding the latter only raises the explained variance by less than 10% whereas the former's explained variance is equivalent to 40% for the first set of variables. The whole model produces a sizable influence on the institutional variable but contributes nothing to the explained variation. Particularly, as compared to organisations in mixed systems category of reference, majoritarian democracies are less likely to adopt a deliberative participatory approach. The probabilities for the group of consensual democracies are similarly lower than 1, indicating a negative link. It is true that the impact is only significant at the 10% level. This conclusion does, however, imply that the institutional context has an anticipated impact on the adoption of a deliberative participatory form of democracy.

Organisational size is by far the most crucial of the three structural characteristics we included in our research model 1. It really exhibits the only statistically significant impact. Furthermore, the likelihood of the deliberative participative model occurring is quite high: when other variables are taken into account full model, small organisations are about 40 times more likely to adopt this democratic form than big ones. Additionally, the impact is strong since it holds true across all three models. This result is in line with our theory on this factor. Insofar as it is more challenging to include each member in a decision-making process intended to take into account the opinions of all, larger organisations may be seen as posing a material obstacle to effectively deliberative and fully inclusive decision making. The number of members is an indicator of organisational size. In contrast, the level of formalization and the geographic breadth are unimportant. Therefore, organisations with looser organisational structures and those that concentrate on domestic issues in their campaigns are not more likely to use an inclusive internal decision-making process [9], [10].

The influence of cultural elements is less substantial, but it is still significant, and all three of them are statistically significant model 2. Identification with the Global Justice Movement has the most impact; organisations that strongly identify with the movement are ten times more likely than the rest to use a deliberative participatory model full model. However, this impact is only appreciably at the 10% level. A statistically significant and powerful influence is also shown by formation after 1989 and membership in the new social global movement area. When democracy type is taken into account, all three impacts are strong and continue to be substantial. Most significantly, they all support our hypotheses: Organisations whose mobilization is based on the tradition of conflict initially borne by the new social movements and more recently by the GJM are more likely to embrace the deliberative participatory model in their internal decision-making, which confirms our assumptions. We converted the outcomes of the logistic models into expected probabilities of occurrence in order to better appreciate the significance of the involvement of the statistically significant components produced by the regression analysis.

All three instances follow a fairly similar pattern. Starting with the impact of movement area and size it is clear that small size and membership in the new social movement and new social global movement area both significantly increase the likelihood of using a deliberative participatory democratic model, which is what we discovered using logistic regression.

Comparing the two categories on the horizontal axis will show the influence of organisational size, which is very powerful, while comparing the two segments on the vertical axis will show the impact of movement area. The presence of a strong interactive effect is the most significant finding here, though, as it shows that smaller organisations particularly benefit from the distinction between organisations associated with the new social movement and new social global movement area and those associated with other movement areas. In fact, there is hardly any variation among bigger organisations, but the deliberative participative models estimated probability for smaller organisations vary from around 20% to more than 50%. To put it another way, tiny organisations affiliated with the new social global movements are considerably more likely to embrace this democratic approach than huge organisations associated with other movement sectors.

CONCLUSION

Understanding how structural and cultural factors interact with one another presents potential for promoting inclusive and democratic activity inside the GJM. Enhancing the movements credibility and coherence requires balancing power dynamics and welcoming many viewpoints. Potential uses for the information acquired from researching the internal decision-making procedures inside the GJM include enhancing social justice, human rights and equality, and encouraging inclusive advocacy. The realization of the movements objectives and transformational change may both be facilitated by putting these concepts into practice. In conclusion, further study in this area is necessary to improve our understanding of the structural and cultural factors that influence internal decision-making in the GJM. The efficacy and resiliency of the movement may be increased by emphasising inclusive and democratic decision-making. In order to realize the GJMs objective of social justice and equality, it is crucial for the movement to promote unity and embrace cultural variety. For a more fair, egalitarian, and sustainable society to be realized, participatory practises and cooperation among movement members must be prioritized.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. Huraerah, Accessibility of the Poor in Healthcare Service in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia, *KnE Life Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.18502/kls.v4i13.5324.

[2] H. Mukti Amrullah en H. Herdiansyah, Socio-Cultural and Settlement Factors That Influence Pro Environmental Behavior on Rural-Urban Citizen, 2019. doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/1424/1/012043.

[3] H. Holovanova, Management mechanisms of commodity specialization of agricultural enterprises, *Actual Probl. Innov. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.36887/2524-0455-2019-3-8.

[4] M. Noland, Comment on Geographic Concentration in Indian Manufacturing and Service Industries: Evidence from 1998 to 2013, *Asian Econ. Policy Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/aepr.12253.

[5] M. Esch, B. Schnellbächer, en A. Wald, Does integrated reporting information influence internal decision making? An experimental study of investment behavior, *Bus. Strateg. Environ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1002/bse.2267.

[6] G. Shi, Q. LYU, Z. Shangguan, en T. Jiang, Facing Climate Change: What Drives Internal Migration Decisions in the Karst Rocky Regions of Southwest China, *Sustainability*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11072142.

[7] N. Gupta *et al.*, Model-Informed Drug Development for Ixazomib, an Oral Proteasome Inhibitor, *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics*. 2019. doi: 10.1002/cpt.1047.

[8] M. Manic, The regional effects of international migration on internal migration decisions of tertiary-educated workers, *Pap. Reg. Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/pirs.12379.

[9] D. L. DeAngelis en S. G. Diaz, Decision-making in agent-based modeling: A current review and future prospectus, *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*. 2019. doi: 10.3389/fevo.2018.00237.

[10] A. Rajan, S. N. Siegel, Y. Liu, J. Bengson, G. R. Mangun, en M. Ding, Theta Oscillations Index Frontal Decision-Making and Mediate Reciprocal Frontal-Parietal Interactions in Willed Attention, *Cereb. Cortex*, 2019, doi: 10.1093/cercor/bhy149.

CHAPTER 11

UNDERSTANDING SOCIAL MOVEMENTS: EXPLORING QUALITATIVE COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Dr. Richa Atri, Associate Professor
Department of Arts & Humanities, IIMT University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India.

ABSTRACT:

A reliable tool for comprehending the dynamics and complexity of social movements is qualitative comparative analysis QCA. The purpose of this research article is to examine how QCA may be used to investigate social movements, as well as its advantages and drawbacks. The research explores how to utilise QCA to examine many facets of social movements, including as their tactics for mobilizing the public, attempts to form coalitions, and effectiveness in enacting legislation. It explores how QCA helps academics to spot patterns and causal combinations that support the creation and growth of social movements. The study also looks at the benefits and difficulties of using QCA to analyse the complexity and variety of social movements. It is essential to comprehend how QCA is used in social movement research in order to judge how well it will help us understand these dynamic phenomena. The research also emphasises how QCA may be used to develop policies and strategies that are supported by data in order to solve social concerns and advance social justice.

KEYWORDS:

Comparative Analysis, Causal Configurations, Qualitative Research, Social Movements, Strategy Evaluation.

INTRODUCTION

The influence of the numerous explanatory variables on the adoption of a deliberative participatory model of democracy is one of the things that the regression analysis points to. The very small number of examples for this kind of analysis, however, places a constraint on it. Additionally, it provides no information on the combined impact of the chosen factors. As a result, other methods must be used to supplement the results of the logistic regression. Applying QCA to our data is one approach to do this. CA, which is based on non-linear logic, is best suited for small-N samples when a group of explanatory variables are anticipated to work in concert to explain the presence or absence of a certain result in our instance, a deliberative participatory democratic model.

Theoretically, QCA is less stable and dependable when there are too many observations the so-called medium-sized sample. Due to the rise of conflictive routes i.e., identical configurations of independent components that result in different outcomes, or identical configurations of independent factors that lead to different outcomes, in such a configuration, the risk that no deterministic solution will be discovered is significantly increased Hicks 1994. Even though this issue is present in our sample, we still use QCA to examine the impact of structural and cultural factors on the adoption of a deliberative participatory paradigm. However, we must modify the traditional crisp-sets QCA in order to lower the danger of non-determination since our sample is too large. We do this by proposing a pseudo-probabilistic methodology that accounts for the likelihood that any conjunctural route will result in the desired result. Using this method, likelihood L and occurrence O scores are produced for each route that makes up the final causal equation. Likelihood, which is based on the weighted ratio between the two distinct solutions produced by conflictive

combinations, quantifies the likelihood that the route will really result in the QCAs anticipated outcome.

The possibility that a combination leads to one is 90%, for instance, if it consists of 9 instances going to 1 and 1 case leading to 0. A straightforward weighting approach is used to determine the probability of a minimization based on the number of instances connected to each route that led to the minimising. Simply said, occurrence quantifies the relative significance of each route. In a N = 40 examination, for instance, if a route is constructed using 10 examples, we would claim that it has a 25% occurrence O. When both scores are near to 1 100%, which is given in a standardised format, the results are superior. The acceptance or rejection of a causal route may then be determined by setting a threshold, just as it is done in conventional probabilistic statistics. In this analysis, we came to the conclusion that a path cannot be reliably accepted as relevant if it does not lead to the predicted outcome in at least 50% of the cases on which the path is formed L 0.5 and if it is not based on at least 20% of the cases entered in the model after resolution of the contradictions O 0.2 [1], [2].

These criteria are utilised to comprehend the QCAs findings and are compatible with what is written in the literature. These two scores provide a number of benefits. First, they provide a quick and easy method for determining the relative weights of each causal route that makes up the QCA solution. The researcher may then more accurately evaluate the findings and identify the contributing factors that are most crucial to the outcome. Second, they enable us to run the QCA models on a larger number of examples. As we previously said, the more examples there are, the more likely it is that no deterministic solution will be discovered due to the rise in conflicting combinations. As the contradictory examples are immediately included into the computation of a probability score via a weighting mechanism, our technique eliminates many of the issues caused by an excessive number of conflicting situations. In short, our technique mitigates some of the key issues that often arise in such circumstances, enabling the researcher to run QCA models with not-too-small samples.

To determine the conjunctural impact of the chosen factors on the existence or absence of a deliberative participatory model, we conducted a first QCA. Even after our process of contradiction resolution, the initial QCA not displayed did not provide any results. This is likely caused by a ratio between instances and conditions that is too small. Excluding the variables with the least empirical and/or theoretical relevance is one way to deal with this issue. We made the decision to eliminate the variable relating to the institutional framework of the nation in which the organisations are situated since it was only included in the logistic regression as a control variable, despite being one that was founded on particular theoretical predictions. The outcomes for QCA without this variable are much more pleasing and may be summed up as follows: The causal equation generated by the QCA is constructed of four separate causal routes, or combinations of circumstances that result in the expected outcome, in this instance, the existence of a deliberative participatory democratic model. The probability and occurrence ratings are shown in brackets to indicate the relative significance of each route. Only the first two pathways shown in italics should be regarded as adequately dependable given our data if we take into consideration the above-proposed criteria $L_{0.5}$ and $O_{0.2}$, which are rather restricted [3], [4].

The presence of a deliberative participatory model in the first path results from the confluence of five factors: small organisational size, recent foundation after 1989, strong identification with the Global Justice Movement, membership in the new social global movement area, and domestic local and national territorial scope in terms of campaigns. This course is entirely in line with what we anticipated, and it clearly illustrates how structural and

cultural variables work together to influence the adoption of the deliberative participatory model. Degree of formalisation, which was similarly unimportant in the logistic regression, is the sole explanatory variable we are examining that does not seem as a need for this democratic model. It is crucial to emphasise that only when all of these circumstances exist at once does the result occur. When seen separately, they don't reflect the prerequisites for this democratic system to exist.

The chance that the desired result would occur through this initial causal pathway is fairly high L = 0.69 and it is supported by a reasonable number of examples O = 0.30.A recent foundation, strong identification with the Global Justice Movement, membership in the new social global movement area, and an international transnational territorial scope are the four elements that make up the second route. The first three requirements are once again in line with what we would anticipate, but the fourth is not. Here, contrary to what we discovered in the first route, we discover that having activities that extend beyond the national level works in conjunction with the other three elements to promote the adoption of the deliberative participative model. Small organisations probably focus more on the domestic level, so when small size is not part of the causal path, having an international transnational territorial scope enters the explanation. The fact that size does not matter here may give us a clue to explaining this apparent contradiction.

The crucial thing to note, however, is that the QCAs findings point to three prerequisites for an organisation to adopt a deliberative participatory model of democracy:12 being founded after 1989, identifying with the GJM, and being a part of what we called the new social global movements. For a deliberative participatory model to be accepted, all three of these requirements YEAR, IDGJM, and NSGM must be present at the same time. In other words, although it does not rule out the potential of additional elements combining with these three, this democratic paradigm cannot be accepted without their combined presence [5], [6].

All three circumstances support our assumptions. As they developed within the protest wave led by the Global Justice Movement, we anticipated that organisations founded more recently would be more likely to embrace a deliberative participatory model of democracy. We anticipated that the institutions that make up this movement's backbone would adopt this understanding of democracy in their internal operations given the movements emphasis on the need of an accessible and inclusive democracy. The outcomes of the QCA support this. Similar to this, we anticipated that the more an organisation identified with the GJM, the more one could say that it shared its claims and principles. Because the organisation would be more inclined towards agreement and participation as organisational ideals, a strong connection with the movement was anticipated to boost the likelihood that a deliberative participatory form of democracy would be adopted. Once again, the QCAs findings are consistent with this theory. Last but not least, it was anticipated that organisations associated with the new social global movement area, which prioritizes consensus and widespread involvement, would be more likely to embrace the deliberative participative democratic model. The QCAs findings in this area also support what we predicted.

All three of the components that make up the required condition YEAR, IDGJM, and NSGM are considered to be cultural determinants of democratic regimes. This agrees with the outcomes of the regression analysis that we conducted before. In fact, the logistic regression models demonstrated that all three cultural factors have a statistically significant influence on the existence of a deliberative participatory model that is progressing in the predicted direction. These elements seem to be essential for the Global Justice Movement organisations to embrace this democratic approach.

Additionally, the first causal route combines the existence of a modest organisational size with the required condition. This is also consistent with the findings of the regression analysis, which showed that the organisational size was the best predictor of the deliberative participatory form of democracy. The QCA, however, contends that the organisations geographical reach also counts, whether positively or negatively. In the logistic regression, it was shown that this component was not statistically significant. Finally, the QCA reveals that the level of formalization has no effect, proving that our assumption on this element was inaccurate. Similar to the logistic regression, if we simply take into account the first two causal pathways, this element does not appear in the QCA as a criterion leading to the deliberative participative model indicating that a minimizing has taken place. The QCA findings, however, seem differently if we ignore the two relevance scores Likelihood and Occurrence and interpret all four causal channels as the study suggests.

The third and fourth approaches, which produce unexpected consequences, are really far more difficult to comprehend. If we take a look at the third path, for instance, the deliberative participatory model appears to be, as expected, the result of the small organisational size, but also together with earlier year of foundation, belonging to another movement area, international/transnational territorial scope, and high degree of formalizations. The following four circumstances all seem to contradict our hypothesis and are incompatible with the regression analysis findings. An earlier year of establishment and an international/transnational territorial scope are two unexpected circumstances that are combined with two characteristics that are consistent with our assumptions small organisational size and low degree of formalizations in the fourth route. Furthermore, if we exclude the relevance ratings, the QCA findings show that there is no essential requirement. However, as we have said, we believe that ignoring them would put our findings in doubt. Particularly, both instances are exceedingly rare. This indicates that just 2% third route and 3% fourth path of the instances are used to determine the result. The probability of the fourth route is also quite low. In these circumstances, it is clearly impossible to make definitive judgements [7], [8].

DISCUSSION

In recent years, deliberative democracy has gained popularity. Although there are many normative explorations of this idea in the literature on political theory, little is known about how deliberation functions in actual situations is an exception to this rule. We still don't fully understand the motivations for social movement organisations to emphasize agreement and involvement in internal decision-making, in particular. This is especially crucial since the Global Justice Movement and the new social movements that came before it placed a lot of focus on these elements.

In this chapter, wave concentrated on a number of structural and cultural factors that might help to explain why groups involved in the Global Justice Movement in a number of European nations adopt a deliberative participatory model of democracy that emphasises the pursuit of consensus and widespread internal participation. Regression analysis, based on a linear logic and looking at the net effect of each variable, on the one hand, and QCA, in order to examine multiple and conjunctural causation, on the other, were two types of analysis that we conducted, also with the idea of triangulating them. The results demonstrate that in order to understand why this democratic model was adopted, it is important to consider both the internal organisation of the organisations structural variables and the history of conflict upon which their mobilization is based cultural elements. On the one hand, the logistic regression reveals that the most important factor is organisational size.

Smaller organisations are particularly more inclined to adopt a deliberative participatory democratic style. Additionally, it demonstrates that organisations that were founded after 1989, strongly identify with the Global Justice Movement, and belong to what we called the new social global movement area are more likely to adhere to the deliberative participative model. All of this is consistent with our theories. The QCA, on the other hand, emphasises the significance of the cultural variables above everything else, further supporting our assumptions. In particular, we have discovered that the adoption of the deliberative participative model requires the coexistence of the three cultural variables. The QCA findings are in line with those of the regression analysis, which shows that the three cultural elements are all significant influences on the decision to choose a certain model of democracy for internal decision-making.

The QCA adds to the explanation by demonstrating that the cultural factors combine qualitatively to influence the organisations choice of the deliberative participative democratic model, even though the regression analysis also suggests that one of the structural factors, namely organisational size, has the strongest impact in quantitative terms. As a last point, we should emphasise a result that was not the focus of our research but is nevertheless deserving of attention. We are referring to Lijpharts 1999 typology finding that organisations based in majoritarian democracies are less likely to use the deliberative participatory democratic model for internal decision-making. Organisations based in consensual democracies are less likely to adhere to this democratic model, therefore this impact does not compare well to the other sort of democracy that Lijphart pointed out. However, this result raises the possibility of an institutional isomorphism between social movement organisations and the larger institutional context in which they operate.

Organizational Size and Democratic Practices

The absence of democracy in international financial organisations IFIs like the G8, International Monetary Fund, and World Bank is one of the main issues raised by the Global Justice Movement. These organisations are known for their lack of democracy and rely on a small group of elite politicians who often have strong biases in favor of the interests of Western businesses to make decisions. They, the smallest and least representative minority in the world, claim to have a mandate from the people when they do not, and then they accuse us of being unconstitutional. Their rule is sovereign while being unproven and unapproved. It becomes a specific challenge for Global Justice Movement Organisations GJMOs to guarantee that they themselves do not lack democratic elements in their own decision-making since this sort of criticism of IFIs is a cornerstone of the GJMs framework. If GJMOs do not live up to their own ideals, it is disingenuous of them to support a minority's criticism of the status quo that disregards the will of the majority.

As a result, GJMOs itself should avoid being run by a tiny, unrepresentative minority and should include rank-and-file movement members in decision-making in order to prevent accusations of hypocrisy. To do this effectively, beautiful decision-making that is inclusive, open, transparent, and accountable must be used. Such decision-making is satisfying for its members and promotes the flourishing of creative freedom. It is the opposite of ugly decision-making, which discourages involvement and artistic freedom in favour of organisational effectiveness. As a consequence, the process becomes restricted, exclusive, opaque, and unaccountable, which irritates participants.

However, it may be challenging to put elegant decision making into practice, particularly in huge organisations that, as is often said, have a tendency to grow more oligarchy-like as they expand their resource base. Undoubtedly, as GJMOs have grown in size and popularity and

strive to deal with difficult problems with local, national, and international implications, many of them have formalized and complicated their organisational structures. But is it accurate to say that smaller GJMOs, which have fewer resources and fewer members, appear to find it simpler to implement beautiful decision making than their larger and better resourced counterparts? This is what the literature on the subject generally tends to predict. In other words, do smaller GJMOs do better than bigger ones in putting democracy into practise? Are they more adept at employing prefigurative politics to build the perfect democratic environment, or do they also have some democratic flaws? Do big businesses necessarily have oligarchic structures, or can they find methods to include their employees in decision-making? Or, regardless of their size or formality, have GJMOs been able to effectively escape the oligarchy that they so loathe at the level of setting foreign policy?

We can propose that smaller organisations have a higher probability of avoiding oligarchy than bigger ones. However, as we will show, this straightforward explanation ignores the propensity for small groups to have informal oligarchs in the lack of rules, such as rotation of facilitation, circular seating arrangements, transparency, and the use of hand signals. Additionally, it overlooks GJMOs propensity to experiment with novel forms of involvement, regardless of their size, which makes them less vulnerable to oligarchy than certain other kinds of SMOs. The first section of this chapter reviews the research on oligarchy and organisation in social movements using Schumachers 1973 maxim that small is beautiful as a framework. To determine if it is accurate to say that bigger GJMOs are more oligarchic than smaller ones, the study then examines the findings of a survey of the decision-making procedures of 210 GJMOs of varying sizes. Next, it examines whether or not there are policies designed to avoid the growth of informal oligarchy, such as rotation, transparency, working groups, seating arrangements, and hand signals.

This will help determine how beautiful both big and small organisations really are. Before coming to a conclusion, it will examine two opposing multinational GJMOs in further detail: ATTAC, which, at least in France, matches the description of large and ugly, and Indymedia, which is best described as large but beautiful. The examination of ATTAC will compare its decision-making to ideal small group politics and show that its activists consider its non-participatory character to be ugly, in line with scholarly criticisms of oligarchic decision-making systems. The exploration of Indymedia, by contrast, will show how a vast network has been able to avoid oligarchy by simulating the ideal beauty of small group decision making. In his key economic treatise, Small is Beautiful 1973, Schumacher explicitly acknowledged that an organizations size counts, even though he was writing about economic organisations. He emphasised the necessity to strike a balance between oligarchy, which suppresses participation and creative freedom, and structure lessness, which decreases order. Smaller organisations are apparently more likely to lack structure, whereas bigger organisations are more likely to exhibit oligarchy. However, Schumacher argues that small organisations are desirable since they foster creative freedom and prevent businesses from degenerating into moribund and a desert of frustration. Tiny organisations are particularly advantageous when the organisational activity is active and intimate, which is true of most social movement activities.

In social movements, its crucial to strike a balance between order and clarity on the one hand, and chaos and creative freedom on the other. Resource mobilization theorists have attempted to demonstrate for instance, that a certain organizational structure is required in order to unite individuals in the pursuit of a shared goal. However, as others have cautioned most notably Michels 1959, too much organisation may lead to the majority becoming alienated by a select group of decision-makers. In a small organisation, the majority members are less likely to get

estranged from their cadre since they can more readily get together and have in-depth conversations. Due to the time commitment and organisational challenges, it is not always feasible for all members of a large organisation to engage in such active participation. Therefore, achieving a balance between organisational scale and efficient decision-making is a difficulty for social movement organisations. Decision-making in small organisations may be inclusive and innovative, but also disorganized. Instead, we would anticipate more order, but also greater annoyance and less creative flexibility, in bigger movement organisations.

This iron law emphasises how oligarchy will inevitably come from widespread organisation: It is organisation which gives birth to the dominion of the elected over the electors, of the mandatories over the mandatories, of the delegates over the delegators. Who says oligarchy, says organisation. Because they are far better equipped to promote the engagement of all members, smaller, or informal organisations, are said to be better able to prevent this tendency. But is big business adherence to the iron law truly required? Because of its widely acknowledged support for open and inclusive decision making and its refusal to succumb to the same criticisms it levelled against its main rivals, the International Financial Institutions IFIs, the GJM presents an interesting challenge to the iron law and a novel case upon which to test it. For instance, showed that agreement and discussion are both desired and attainable in social forums, such as the GJMs debate arenas, which draw in and welcome involvement from thousands of people. Well see, but it's possible that GJMOs are unique circumstances to which the iron rule does not apply.

But first, let's go back to the academics whose theories confirm Michels claim. Among the researchers whose results support the notion of an iron law are Jordan and Maloney 1997. They contend that many contemporary advocacy groups, including Friends of the Earth and Amnesty in Britain, have sizable and inactive memberships that don't participate in decision-making and can only be heard by leaving. These protest businesses are elite-run and lack internal transparency. Regarding the work of Jordan and Maloney, there are three points to note. The first is that, in line with Michels, they consider the absence of decision-making involvement to be unattractive or ugly.

This is due to the fact that it limits volunteers' involvement in protest enterprises to menial jobs and keeps them out of the firm's actual work. According to them, this process entails organisations hiring full-time staff, decreasing their reliance on volunteers, and subsequently eroding and ultimately removing adherents control over the organisation. Thirdly, and perhaps most significantly, they lack an independent variable to explain why campaign organisations have evolved into bureaucratic and, therefore, oligarchic structures, similar to McCarthy and Zald 1973. Is it due to their advanced age, their stature, their need for efficiency, or something else entirely? Other researchers have mostly used age and size as their dependent variables when examining the iron rule.

For instance, Rucht 1999 found that the iron rule was considerably simpler to bend than previous academics had suggested by using age as the independent variable to determine oligarchy in environmental organisations in Germany. He said that environmental organisations move through stages and sometimes make conscious efforts to fight against oligarchizing, or as Michels put it, to paralyses it. This was a goal shared by the New Left, which Breines 1980 praised highly. Richt, however, ignored the significance of organisational scale in favor of focusing on age. To ignore organisational size, which is likely one of the most crucial aspects in establishing decision-making frameworks, seems very odd. Despite the correlation between organisational age and size, it's important to remember that the two don't necessarily grow together. Older organisations that have made an effort to maintain their informal, non-professional nature may nonetheless be more participative than their

formal, professional, and huge equivalents. Regarding size, it is obvious that a political party or, by extension, any type of social movement organisation with tens of thousands of members cannot do any practical work upon a system of direct discussion and that such a gigantic number of persons belonging to a unitary organisation cannot do any practical work upon a system of representation. As a result, organisational size should be considered a crucial independent variable in identifying oligarchic tendencies since it tends to produce representative forms of democracy that are often presided over by a small number of people without the majority having a voice.

Scholars have not ignored the idea that big organisations have a propensity to devolve into oligarchies. Tan 1998 found that bigger political parties had more complicated decision-making procedures and tended to be less participative than their smaller counterparts in his research of political parties in Europe. However, he also discovered that certain complex organisations, even though they were a minority, genuinely engaged their grassroots networks, leading to their complexity. Most parties and unions have fairly elaborate governmental structures designed to allow, or to ensure, rank and file control over the leadership. Thus, it is clear that past research points to a trend, but not an inevitable, decline in participation with increasing SMO and political party size. But does this inevitably mean that less formal, more democratic small organisations are good examples of democracy in practice? Previous studies indicate that the answer seems to be no; tiny does not necessarily equate too beautiful.

The same way that formal and informal organisations may exist side by side, so can official and informal oligarchs. While informal oligarchs are likely to control collectivist institutions illegally, formal oligarchs may be lawfully in command of bureaucratic systems. This argument is consistent with Jo Freemans seminal paper on the tyranny of the structure lessness, which she says may result in what Leach 2005 refers to as informal oligarchs due to a lack of formal regulations. Social movement activists who are the most sociable or who belong to the strongest friendship groupings tend to be informal oligarchs because they automatically assume unreliable group leadership. Small and informal decision-making processes, in Freeman's opinion, are only beautiful when there is delegation, accountable authority, distribution, rotation, and allocation, diffusion of knowledge, and equitable access to power.

CONCLUSION

Understanding the difficulties in applying QCA to the study of social movements provides potential for improving and enhancing the methods use in analysing dynamic and evolving phenomena. Developing evidence-based policies and strategies for resolving social problems and advancing social justice may benefit from the information obtained from researching the use of QCA in social movements research. Applying QCA may improve comprehension of successful mobilization tactics and coalition-building initiatives. To sum up, further study in this area is necessary to improve our comprehension of the possibilities and constraints of QCA in social movement research. When used in conjunction with other techniques, QCA may provide a thorough and in-depth investigation of movement dynamics. Additionally, using QCA in policy research may lead to more effective social problem interventions and evidence-based decision-making. In order to fully grasp QCAs potential to further our knowledge of complex social phenomena and foster good social change, it is imperative to emphasise its usage in social movements research.

REFERENCES:

[1] C. C. Wang en J. C. Hung, Comparative analysis of advertising attention to Facebook social network: Evidence from eye-movement data, *Comput. Human Behav.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2018.08.007.

[2] J. E. Egner, Hegemonic or Queer? A Comparative Analysis of Five LGBTQIA/Disability Intersectional Social Movement Organizations, *Humanity Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0160597618782582.

[3] G. Tóth, Circular economy and its comparison with 14 other business sustainability movements, *Resources*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/resources8040159.

[4] S. Halvorsen, B. M. Fernandes, en F. V. Torres, Mobilizing Territory: Socioterritorial Movements in Comparative Perspective, *Ann. Am. Assoc. Geogr.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/24694452.2018.1549973.

[5] T. Skotnicki, Unseen suffering: slow violence and the phenomenological structure of social problems, *Theory Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s11186-019-09343-7.

[6] T. Askanius en J. M. Hartley, Framing Gender Justice, *Nord. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.2478/nor-2019-0022.

[7] L. Sebastien, J. Pelenc, en J. Milanesi, Resistance as an enlightening process: a new framework for analysis of the socio-political impacts of place-based environmental struggles, *Local Environ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/13549839.2019.1592133.

[8] J. Haryatmoko, The Pathology of Tribal Nationalism According to Hannah Arendt: Uncovering Religious Populism Mechanisms Which Jeopardize Cultural Diversity, *J. Kawistara*, 2019, doi: 10.22146/kawistara.40876.

CHAPTER 12

MEASURING OLIGARCHY AND ORGANIZATIONAL SIZE: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

Dr. Beena, Associate Professor
Department of Arts & Humanities, IIMT University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India.

ABSTRACT:

A power structure known as an oligarchy, in which a small number of people hold disproportionate authority over decision-making, may have major effects on the dynamics and efficiency of an organisation. This study intends to investigate how oligarchy is measured and how it relates to organisational size in diverse social and political organisations. The paper examines several approaches and metrics for measuring oligarchic tendencies in organisations, taking into account things like resource distribution, leadership concentration, and decision-making power. It examines the relationship between organisational size and oligarchic inclinations, taking into consideration differences between small-scale groupings and major institutions. The study also looks at how oligarchy affects how well organisations function, innovate, and respond to various stakeholder interests. For the purpose of analysing power structures inside organisations and their effects on democratic practises and societal consequences, it is critical to comprehend how oligarchy is measured and how it relates to organisational size. The research also emphasises how this information may be used to advance more responsible, inclusive, and participatory organisational governance.

KEYWORDS:

Decision-Making Authority, Organizational Effectiveness, Oligarchy Measurement, Power Structures, Resource Allocation.

INTRODUCTION

The degree of involvement in GJMOs primary decision-making bodies. Because the word oligarchy is often used carelessly in the literature, it is imperative that we operationalize it in the context of this chapter. For instance, Since Plato and Aristotle, most writers who discuss oligarchy fail to define the concept, apparently because they assume the word is understood in light of its Greek etymology the rule of a few explanations of oligarchy so far has suggested, but not officially stated, that it essentially entails a decision-making elite that the majority is excluded from. We define oligarchy in this context as ruling power that belongs to a low proportion of SMO membership, to put it simply. The oligarchy score, which divides the number of people in the primary organisational decision-making body whether it be a president one person, an executive committee five people, a thematic group ten people, or an assembly number as specified in the questionnaire by the total number of members, has been calculated for the purposes of this chapter.

Because a tiny cadre dominates highly oligarchic organisations as predicted, they have low oligarchy scores. A high score, on the other hand, indicates a low level of oligarchy since many members are involved in making decisions. For instance, a group with 10,000 members but a president who makes all the decisions is very oligarchic since power is concentrated in the hands of a relatively tiny minority. As a result, its oligarchy score is low 1 divided by 10,000 equals 0.0001. A high oligarchy score 1000 divided by 200=2.0 is achieved by an organisation with 500 members that makes its major decisions via an assembly of 1000 people including 500 non-members, which is non-oligarchic [1], [2].

When involvement is limited to a tiny cadre, deliberation alone cannot make it meaningful since such a practice still excludes the majority from organisational practises and might be seen as oligarchic. Since we already know that many big organisations, including democratic representative organisations, do employ it, we do not investigate how the level of debate is impacted by organisational size. In any event, oligarchic practises may still be applied to deliberative representative organisations provided their methods of discussion continue to exclude the vast majority of participants. Instead, we will investigate whether it is accurate to say that GJMOs with low member involvement in decision-making tend to be big, whereas those with strong member involvement tend to be smaller. To categorise organisations as large or small, we look at their yearly operating budgets, the total number of members individual and collective, where necessary, and the number of paid employees and volunteers.

We define an organisation as large if it meets at least one of the following requirements: it has an operating budget greater than 500 000 Euros; it has more than 100 volunteers; it employs more than 50 people; it has more than 10,000 individual members; and, if it is a network, it has more than 100 collective members. Less than 60 organisations fit the bill in each category, making these metrics of largeness the best representation of the biggest one-quarter of the organisations in our sample. If an organisation has at least one of the following characteristics fewer than 15 volunteers, no paid staff, an annual budget of less than 1000 euros, and between one and 100 individual members we consider it to be small with the exception of groups with collective members exclusively.4 The cut-off numbers for smallness were selected because they roughly indicate the point at which it becomes difficult to execute optimal small-group decision making due to size constraints [3], [4].

Remember that the criteria for large and small organisations are not mutually exclusive categories when interpreting the data based on these measures. For instance, at the worst extreme, 45.1% of the organisations that are large according to their budget are classified as small according to the number of volunteers. Because of this, it's crucial to view the various organisational size measurements primarily independently of one another and as approximations of size. However, it should also be highlighted that compared to the measure of budgets, most metrics of largeness are more exclusive. As an example, none of the organisations with large numbers of individual members have small staff sizes, only around a quarter have small budgets, and only 6.1% have small numbers of volunteers. The information comes from Work Package of the Demos Project and was collected via structured interviews with leaders of 209 global social movement organisations in western Europe. Interview questions aimed to elicit specifics about genuine organisational decision-making procedures.

Relationship between oligarchy score and organisational size metrics. If so, which size metrics are the most discriminating? Does oligarchy appear to grow along with size? bigger organisations tend to have more oligarchic tendencies. When an organisation expands in terms of personnel, yearly spending, and the number of volunteers and members, oligarchy seems to rise gradually. On all measures, the biggest GJMOs are the most oligarchic, with an oligarchy score of less than 0.1. The number of volunteers and the number of members, both individual and collective, are the most discriminating factors. The relationship between the amount of individual membership and the degree of oligarchy is especially striking: although 93.9% of organisations with more than 10,000 members are very oligarchic, just 25% of those with less than 100 members are.

By no means can we, however, draw the conclusion that tiny organisations are immune to oligarchy. The majority of small and big organisations have a high degree of oligarchy by the majority of size criteria, with the exception of the number of individual members.

Additionally, it is rather unsettling how often tiny organisations lack regulations intended to prevent the dominance of informal oligarchs displays the percentage of tiny organisations, cross-tabulated by metrics of smallness, that claimed to adopt certain sorts of regulations that may lessen informal oligarchy in their assemblies' meetings. Less than ten percent of our small organisations use at least one of these guidelines overall. The most typical, if occasional, uses are circular seating configurations and hand gestures. However, just four small organisations cited rotation of moderation or facilitation, one of Freemans 1970 suggested tactics to avoid the tyranny of the structure lessness.

However, big organisations seem to utilise specialised oligarchy-prevention measures even less often at their meetings. Among our sample, just one organisation had more than 100 volunteers. Some of the bigger groups in our sample also contradict the related idea that big is ugly, as some of the smaller ones in our sample do. We can see that certain GJMOs with substantial budgets and sizable personnel have been able to avoid oligarchy, even if they are not as prevalent as their more oligarchic equivalents, which is in contrast assumptions. For instance, the flood of democracy from below that has risen with the GJM has an impact on even conventionally organised labour unions. The CGIL also states that it seeks to protect minorities rights, to cut back on unnecessary bureaucracy, and to guarantee participation. However, many socialist organisations still have a hierarchical structure, which makes them generally oligarchic. Their philosophy, particularly their desire to create a top-down revolutionary socialist movement, is what matters to them, not their age or size. Still, some GJMOs have engaged in heated discussions concerning their internal decision-making or have purposely eschewed hierarchy. Those who have avoided hierarchy have done so by imitating, whether consciously or unintentionally, the elegance of small, non-oligarchical organisations [5], [6].

DISCUSSION

Beautiful decision-making includes widespread involvement in the organization's actual politics. Decision-making must resemble ideal small-group decision-making for this to happen. It must be pluralistic, open, and inclusive as was said in the opening. It must also be responsible and transparent to its members and supporters. To summaries, it also calls for members to share their abilities, have equal access to information, and cycle leadership responsibilities in order to avoid the emergence of power connections. The debate that follows will show how ATTACs members express dissatisfaction precisely because these qualities of a strong internal democracy are absent. The debate of Indymedia, however, shows how it is feasible for a huge organisation to approach elegant decision making. It is true that widespread involvement in an organizations actual politics may compromise effectiveness, as these situations show. However, sacrificing efficiency may be better than the desert of frustration, that arises from limiting involvement.

The fight for control inside ATTAC has been the foundation of the desert of frustration brought on by the limitation of grassroots engagement, particularly in France. Contrarily, there has been considerable worry in Indymedia about the efficiency loss that comes with widespread involvement. In contrast to ATTAC, however, Indy medias quandary over its internal democracy is caused by long-established open publishing principles rather than a power struggle. These two examples were chosen because, despite the fact that they are both big organisations, their oligarchy ratings are quite different for instance, 0.06 for ATTAC France, which makes it very oligarchic, compared to 1 for Indymedia UK, which is widely open to and participatory for its members.

ATTAC

ATTAC was founded with the growth of GJM, but it has failed to live up to the democratic expectations of its grassroots membership. The other reason ATTAC is a suitable case study is because it enables us to examine national branches of various sizes to see how their decision-making processes differ without having to fear that any discrepancies, we uncover are the result of sharply divergent beliefs. On the other hand, if we compared the ways in which socialist and autonomous organisations made decisions, we would anticipate finding disparities that are more related to ideology than to size or, in fact, to anything else. ATTAC is a crucial case study because it shows how a democratic crisis can arise as a direct result of organisational expansion. When the organizations membership was small, there were fewer people who were disempowered by exclusion, so its oligarchic decision-making was not seen as a problem.

We will discuss the democratic challenges that ATTAC has encountered in France, Germany, and Italy starting with the founding organisation, ATTAC-France after comparing the oligarchy scores of various ATTAC organisations. We will focus on what makes ATTACs decision-making ugly - both theoretically and for its activists. Despite using various methods of decision-making, some more deliberative than others, all three of the ATTAC organisations for which we have data have low oligarchy scores 0.06 for Germany, 0.1 for France, and 0.13 for Italy. The biggest, ATTAC France, adopts an associational style of decision-making few participating, with significant voting usage, with 25 000 individual members and 50 collective members. The other two, which are much smaller and have fewer members roughly 15 000 use a deliberative representative type of organisation few participate in consensus; deliberation is strongly employed. Does this imply that the iron rule of oligarchy has prevailed in explaining the distinctions between the bigger and smaller ATTAC groups? Would ATTAC Germany and ATTAC Italy also become associational if they added another 10,000 members?

It doesn't seem like this is the case. The various ATTAC organisations decision-making processes seem to be unaffected by size. The fact that ATTAC France was always associational, even when it was a tiny, fledgling organisation, is one of the issues with the assumption that size causes associational conduct in this situation. As it has expanded, its oligarchy score has decreased, indicating more oligarchy, and it has become clear that its grassroots are disgruntled. Additionally, ATTAC Germany and Italy saw the unpopularity of associational decision making from its forerunner and, rather than as a function of their size, developed somewhat more deliberate decision-making methods as a result of their reflections on ATTAC Frances experience. However, the oligarchy scores of all three ATTACs are low, which, as we will see, has not been well received by its grassroots supporters.

ATTAC was established in 1998 in France by a number of influential figures from the assistance, commerce, and development sectors. It was Bernard Cassens idea. The primary need was to make sure there was a tax on global financial institutions in order to start a development fund and stop stock market speculation. Since then, it has grown to include broader campaigns against unjust trade laws, the World Trade Organisation, tax havens, and other global development concerns. ATTAC France operated during the first two years of its existence in accordance with its founding constitution, which was unable to handle the extensive network of local organisations that quickly grew. The issue, in the eyes of the local groups, was that they were not given the opportunity to take part in decision-making, which seemed to be controlled by the leadership. Thus, openness, inclusivity, and pluralism were among the essential qualities of beautiful decision-making that were lacking. Local organisations thus started constantly denouncing the absence of democracy Combes and. A

Board of Directors-Local Committees CA-CL was created in response to local organisations discontent with the national organizations democratic practises in order to look into potential constitutional amendments that would offer local groups more meaningful opportunity to contribute. Thus, local group representatives could be accepted to the ATTAC Board; however, this was only a partial success since they were still unable to cast a vote.

Minority aspirations for participatory budgeting and more local involvement met with failure, which stoked dissent. By 2004, the gulf between the local and national organisation was almost at a breaking point. The turning point seems to be when the leadership came under intense suspicion of planning the formation of 100% No Global Candidates for the European elections behind the backs of both national and local board members. As a result, it became clear that ATTAC Frances decision-making lacked the beautiful characteristics of accountability and openness, which fueled unhappiness even further. Despite the initiative's failure, the events that came before it left behind two opposing factions: one made up of current leaders who were unwilling to cede control to locals, and another made up of the founding members leaders of associations and unions who desired for locals to have more influence and the ability to join as co-presidents. 70% of attendees at the 2005 general assembly said that they wanted grass-roots members to have stronger representation, and 59% supported co-presidency. Despite this, the leadership still seems to be oligarchical. In contrast to idealized small group beautiful politics, there is a lack of inclusion, a tiny, unaccountable leadership continues to rule, and the leaders obstinately hold onto their positions of leadership.

Local ATTAC activists have complained about and become impatient with their mother organizations lack of democracy in other countries as well. Local group members in Germany are only permitted to participate in assembly sessions as delegates, and participation is quite formalized. From its inception, ATTAC in Italy aimed to be democratic and transparent. To achieve efficiency, it quickly had to give up on discussion, adopting the motto federative but not fragmented, participatory but not inefficient. ATTAC Italia is willing to vote even though it prefers to reach decisions by agreement most of the time. It has also been criticised for being excessively vertical and for being far more centralised than some Italian campaigners like. These critiques have some merit since the national council has the necessary authority, determines which topics are important to the network, establishes the agenda for the assembly, and selects consultation topics. Beautiful small group decision-making is totally different from this. However, the leadership in Italy and Germany is far more accommodative to participation than the centralised leaders of ATTAC France, who are loath to cede their authority.

Regarding ATTAC, there are three other crucial issues to mention. First off, it serves as an example of how demand for striking a balance between orderliness and creative flexibility is realised in reality. The very identical motto of ATTAC Italia, federative but not fragmented, participatory but not inefficient, best captures this. The difficulty appears particularly pressing in the case of ATTAC France, which tends to value organisational effectiveness above grassroots engagement. The second point relates to the causes of the democratic crisis in ATTAC France, which manifested due to two factors: the internal power struggle between local committees and the centralised leadership and the quick growth of an organisation unprepared for a model of participatory democracy.

However, it might also be argued that Bernard Cassen has a disproportionate amount of ATTAC Frances decision-making authority, which is well outside the purview of democratic oversight. Therefore, before it can be said that it doesn't do what it teaches, ATTAC France may want to consider taking action to correct the issue. The development of an effective

movement organisation might be destroyed by such a disconnect between speech and practises. Indymedia is a network of free communication that seeks to deliver passionate telling of truth through stories uploaded from independent journalists and activists around the world. At the time of the 2005 general assembly, 17% of activists had already left Combes, many of them likely disillusioned with its lack of participatory democracy. It is enabled via online discussion boards and a public website that anybody with an Internet connection may visit.

Three Indymedia collectives, all categorized as deliberative participative in our study of the democratic practises of GJMOs, were included: Indymedia Italia, EH Euskal Herria, Basque Country, and UK inside the UK, although the abbreviation stands for United Kollectives. This is true even if Indymedia Italia has 400 members compared to Indymedia EHs 10, while having a far higher membership overall. All members regardless of organisational size have a voice in decisions since all three organisations have oligarchy ratings of 1. The iron law is obviously broken in this scenario since it does not seem that being big results in oligarchic inclinations. But how did Indymedia manage to evade the iron laws sway?

Indymedia organisations, like Indymedia EH, have in-person meetings to hold deliberative conversations. Others, however, such as Indymedia Italia, also have physical meetings but also conduct what refers to as a telematic assembly, which consists of up to 400 participants. Because of its worries about the network's early evolution into a free for all, lack of editorial quality, and lack of structure, Indymedia in the UK has formalized parts of its decision-making. Although it prioritises the creation of news stories above bureaucracy, it nonetheless adheres strictly to the ideals of horizontality and openness, even in the UK, like in other Indy medias, there has been an effort to consciously avoid the hierarchical decision-making paradigm that is parodied in the work of many Left-leaning organisations. Indymedia has been experimenting with a spoke's council concept on a worldwide scale, allowing for at-a-distance facilitation via the use of internet communication technologies.

It takes a lot of effort to conduct inclusive and consensus-based decision making throughout the worlds Indymedia network, which consists of some 5000 people, 150 organisations, and 50 nations across six continents. The ideals of unity, which refers to as the radical democratic principles of inclusivity, pluralism, diversity, openness, transparency, and accountability have not been entirely adhered to, even if only somewhat. Sixth principle from this Nevertheless, various organisations may define consensus differently, with some even including majority vote. Additionally, disagreements over strategy and cultural and international differences are difficult to overcome. Overall, however, it seems that despite numerous conflicts, the standards of consensus and participation remain guiding principles, especially during times of dispute. For instance, how the worldwide Indymedia network overcame a contentious discussion on whether to accept Ford Foundation financing for an international conference in 2002. The worldwide network has really made an effort to uphold these ideals even when organisational efficiency and reason may have been desirable, underscoring the need of striking a balance between efficiency and innovation.

A big portion of Indy medias open, inclusive, and consensus-based decision-making approach may be linked to its familiarity with electronic decision-making processes that enable direct democracy even in larger groups for more information on parties. Open email lists and Internet relay chat rooms provide open and horizontal decision-making in ways that face-to-face meetings alone could not readily do, in part due to physical space constraints. It is unquestionably true that people with the greatest time or knowledge may become de facto leaders in any Indymedia, notwithstanding its exceptional achievement at radical democracy.

However, several organisational techniques that resemble those suggested by Freeman 1970 to avoid informal oligarchy in informal organisations have emerged to maintain the balance of power. The introduction of vibes watchers, who can highlight covert power structures or unspoken discontent, rotating spokes positions, facilitation, and empowering certain groups and individuals to operate in an ad hoc manner beyond consensus, and relying on rational self-selection are just a few examples of these practises used by Seattle Indymedia. Therefore, even if it has occasionally been challenging for Indymedia to put beautiful decision-making ahead of efficiency, it has often been effective. With its open and democratic attitude, skill-sharing objective, rotation of leadership positions, and the presence of regulations to avoid the tyranny of the structure lessness, Indymedia is thus practically a classic exemplar of large but beautiful decision making. All of this is made possible by its dedication to radical democratic ideas, which have permeated every aspect of the company, as well as its creative Internet use [7], [8].

CONCLUSION

Understanding how oligarchy affects organisational performance presents chances to encourage more inclusive and democratic governance. Correcting power disparities may help organisations respond more effectively to the needs of various stakeholders. Developing democratic practises and improving organisational governance may benefit from the information acquired from researching oligarchy and its relationship to organisational size. Promoting openness and accountability might lessen the detrimental effects of oligarchic tendencies. In conclusion, further study in this area is necessary to advance our knowledge of organisational power structures and how they relate to organisational size. Organisations that are more effective and responsive may benefit from addressing oligarchic inclinations. To achieve inclusive and equitable organisational governance, it is also essential to advance democratic practises and participatory decision-making. For the creation of a more equitable, democratic, and sustainable organisational environment, it is essential to emphasize the measurement of oligarchy and its repercussions.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. Budhiraja, M. Malhotra, en N. Kaushik, Employees risk taking capabilities and learning organisation: Moderating role of organisational size, *Int. J. Knowl. Learn.*, 2019, doi: 10.1504/IJKL.2019.099366.

[2] M. K. Abdelsalam en A. M. Kamaruddeen, The impact of organisational size on the relationship between government policy and medical waste management practices, *Int. J. Innov. Creat. Chang.*, 2019.

[3] Z. A. Rasit en C. R. Isa, Relative comprehensiveness of performance measurement system: Organisational ownership structure and size, *Int. J. Financ. Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.5430/ijfr.v10n3p380.

[4] K. Einarsen, D. Salin, S. V. Einarsen, A. Skogstad, en R. J. Mykletun, Antecedents of ethical infrastructures against workplace bullying: The role of organizational size, perceived financial resources and level of high-quality HRM practices, *Pers. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1108/PR-10-2017-0303.

[5] P. Khosravi, C. Newton, en A. Rezvani, Management innovation: A systematic review and meta-analysis of past decades of research, *Eur. Manag. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.emj.2019.03.003.

[6] O. Anne, P. K. Obonyo, en F. Muindi, Organizational Performance, Firm Size and Chief Executive Officers CEOS Compensation for Firms Listed in Nairobi Securities Exchange, Kenya, *Int. J. Sci. Res. Manag.*, 2019, doi: 10.18535/ijsrm/v7i6.em04.

[7] H. Shen en H. Jiang, Engaged at work? An employee engagement model in public relations, *J. Public Relations Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/1062726X.2019.1585855.

[8] W. S. Rini, G. Chandrarin, en P. Assih, The Effect of Performance Management Practices and Company Size to Innovation and the Impact on Organizational Performance Case Study: Regional Public Hospitals at South Kalimantan Indonesia, *Int. J. Bus. Appl. Soc. Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.33642/ijbass.v5n8p5.

CHAPTER 13

FORMS OF ACTION IN GLOBAL JUSTICE MOVEMENT GROUPS: AN ANALYSIS

Dr. Rachana Sharma, Assistant Professor
Department of Arts & Humanities, IIMT University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India.

ABSTRACT:

Diverse organisations working for social, economic, and environmental justice on a worldwide level make up the worldwide Justice Movement GJM. The purpose of this research article is to examine the different types of action used by GJM groups to achieve revolutionary change. In-depth analysis of these organizations' strategy and methods, including boycotts, lobbying campaigns, protests, and demonstrations, is included in the report. It looks at the strategies GJM organisations use to mobilize support from people all around the world, influence politicians, and increase awareness. The study also looks at how GJM organisations activities affect public discourse, business practises, and policy consequences. Analysing the efficacy, resiliency, and potential of GJM organisations to realize global justice objectives requires a thorough understanding of their modes of operation. The research also emphasises how this information may be used to advance social justice on a global scale, encourage group action, and create unity.

KEYWORDS:

Advocacy Campaigns, Global Justice Movement, Online Activism, Protests, Social Justice Strategies.

INTRODUCUTION

The Global Justice Movement Organisations GJMOs have employed a variety of modes of action, from prayers and petitions to marches and blockades to the destruction of property, to make their criticism of neoliberal politics known. This intricate pattern of activity is a reflection of the often-touted variety of the movements calling for a fair and peaceful globalisation. However, it is very improbable that the exact types of action employed dispersed at random over the GJMOs. Instead, structural and ideational variables impact the choice of various activities from the stock of accessible resources. The majority of research on action repertoires to far has focused on individual decision-making and protest event analysis. Studies examining movement organisations repertoires our main point of reference have a tendency to concentrate on small samples see, for instance. By examining the relationship between GJMOs and their environs and their action repertoires, we contribute to the body of literature.

In this chapter, we will first define our key categories and provide typologies of protest action forms as well as theoretical justifications for the circumstances and factors that influence the choice of action types. Second, we will outline our database and how we operationalized the GJMOs preferred course of action. Third, we provide a descriptive analysis of the empirical distribution of action forms, our dependent variable, and the co-relationships between these forms. The investigation of elements, both internal and external to GJMOs, that correlate with their action repertoires is the focus of the fourth and primary part. Finally, we provide a summary and analysis of our key results [1], [2].

Conceptual and theoretical reflections

Forms of action may be very generally construed to include all varieties of internal activities carried out by movement organisations for instance, gathering information, debating issues, welcoming new members, and cultivating alliances. However, we concentrate on activities that have an external emphasis and are intended to further the cause of the organisation. Many of these actions come under the category of collective protest or collective conflict since we are examining social movement organisations. There are various ways to conceptualize different types of action, from very specific activities like street theatre, hunger strikes, and tabling to somewhat broader categories like violent or confrontational acts to generic types or overarching strategies like protest or public education. We, the international team of researchers who conceptualized the study and gathered the information used to support this chapter, did not produce a detailed list of acts that may comprise dozens of categories. Even yet, we continue to differentiate between certain fundamental and commonplace acts, such as protest, strike, and building occupation.

These actions are components of a repertory of contention, a set of means has for making claims of different kinds on different individuals or groups. As a grammar of interaction between a challenger group and its target groups in a certain historical context, he proposed the idea of action repertoire. This repertory may be studied in terms of breadth, or the variety of alternative ways accessible in a certain circumstance, and structure, looking at how various modes of action interact as compatible, distant, etc. Researchers makes the assumption that groups only have access to a limited set of routines that are learned, shared, and acted out through a relatively deliberative process of choice rather than the complete range of the theoretically possible repertory. Although repertoires are learnt cultural productions, they don't derive from abstract philosophy or take form as a consequence of political propaganda; instead, they are the product of conflict. As a result, the decisions made by a single group or a larger group of groups also reveal something about how these groups see the conflict and the targets of that struggle. An organisation selects a small subset of the possible ways as an effective and practical strategy to achieve, or at the very least approach, its objectives [3], [4].

Different types of action rely on various conditions and convey various meanings. Take a look at a few illustrations. The strike is a traditional form of protest that is often lawful. It is organized by a specific social group workers or employees to press demands against an employer, such as for a higher wage or better working conditions. State authorities are not, or not directly, addressed, unless there is a true political strike. Contrast this with a civil disobedience act, like as blocking a military camps entrance to voice opposition to the use of nuclear weapons. In this instance, the protest tactic is not indisputably linked to a particular social group. Additionally, it targets governmental agencies rather than a private company. Additionally, it often requires breaching the law. As a result, it is an unlawful and non-institutionalized form of protest. The protest, whether it be a strike or a blockage, may be very taxing on the participants and may carry the possibility of consequences like losing their jobs or receiving a judge's punishment. When it comes, for instance, to signing a petition encouraging a local government to establish a children's playground, personal commitment and risk are essentially missing. Additionally, this action is not disruptive and does not need the actual presence of all protesters.

Social scientists have used scales with a variety of graduating levels in various efforts to categorise and systematize various sorts of contentious acts. For instance, offers a tripartite classification of collective action based on a more specialised list of types of action, dividing conventional from confrontational symbolic and violent forms of action. Between these two extremes, according to Dalton, are four categories of unorthodox activities:

1. Petitions, slogans, legitimate protests.
2. Boycotts.
3. Informal strikes, such as rent strikes.
4. Illegal demonstrations, occupations, property destruction, and violence.

Direct action is what is meant by the forms assigned to things 2 to 4, unlawful activity is meant by items 3 and 4, and violent action is meant by item 4.3 It is believed that a threshold must be reached before conduct may shift from being more conventional to being more unorthodox. According to survey research, the more radical an activity is, the fewer people engage in it in modern democracies when things are normal when there are no major crises or even civil wars. This, obviously, has something to do with both the moral standards of the majority of individuals as well as the increased danger of punishment in situations of extreme action. They see breaching the law as either undesirable or justifiable in very rare circumstances. And a very small part of the populace supports political players that use violence to further their objectives.

Political organisations like GJMOs may be categorized in a manner like that of Marsh and Dalton. The total number of GJMOs encompasses a wide range of activities, such as conventional politics, moderate forms of unorthodox, and violent behaviour such as violent encounters with law enforcement, arson attacks, but not the most destructive types, such as bombing and guerrilla warfare. The organisational field of these movements is, however, ideologically and in other ways highly different, as shown by the research on GJMs such that most organisations are far from integrating all three kinds of activity. These groups show a predilection for certain types of activity but not others, depending on the context. They are more inclined to adhere to a particular style or sub-field of action. This is due to the fact that selecting an action repertoire is not only an instrumental necessity made in response to a specific circumstance. It is dictated by a habitus that makes the employment of one sort of action seem nearly normal while other forms are viewed as irrational and improper and, as a result, are not even given consideration.

It is often believed that certain organisations, especially the group made up of the more formal NGOs, have a pragmatic bent and are willing to communicate and even work with both state governments and private businesses. Radical organisations, in contrast, reject such cooperation and favor the use of disruptive tactics, albeit they don't always exclude all types of moderate action. For instance, in Germany, we have shown the presence of two rather distinct clusters that are, nonetheless, connected by a reasonably potent intermediate cluster that has ambiguous feelings towards both the moderate and the radical branch. We anticipate the GJMOs to fall into two moderate or disruptive or three moderate, confrontational, disruptive broad categories when it comes to their preferred modes of action since this intermediate cluster is weak or practically nonexistent in certain other nations for instance, France.

The level of knowledge is rather inconsistent when it comes to the subject of what influences the action repertoire or simply what elements determine it. Both theoretical presumptions and empirical results on the micro-level, or the involvement of people, are based on in-depth study. For instance, it has been shown that those with higher levels of education are more interested in politics and more active in both conventional and unconventional forms of political engagement. It has also been discovered that highly educated and youthful individuals are more likely than less educated and older persons to engage in unorthodox and more extreme behaviours. However, the questions that are often asked in this kind of survey study decontextualize political engagement, making it difficult for us to identify for what political purposes, within what organisational structure, and in which particular struggle the

respondents took part. The understanding of repertoire choices at the level of social movement organisations is fairly patchy. We presume that contextual elements such as the political regime, the direction of the government, and the presence of allies as well as organizationally specific factors such as ideology, political goals, organisational type, structure, and resources are at work [5], [6].

This prompts us to develop further theories. According to our hypothesis 2, organisations with a moderate reformist ideology choose confrontational means of action, while so-called antisystemic groups, in this instance, anti-capitalist organisations, favor the reverse. We also believe that organisations who advocate a strong democracy are more likely to utilise confrontational action than those that support representative democracy, both within their own ranks and on a societal level at large hypothesis 3. The previous groups also have a stronger propensity towards formal and professional institutions hypothesis 4. Finally, its crucial to grasp the social movement organisations background in order to comprehend their decisions. While SMO structures and values are the greatest explanation for differences within an area, national trends in political culture and political opportunity may be used to explain differences across regions. We hypothesize that organisations in nations with a pronounced left-right split and nations with strongly conservative governments are more likely to engage in confrontational types of activity than organisations in other nations.

DISCUSSION

Dataset and operationalization

The study in this chapter is based mostly on interviews with GJMO representatives across six different nations N = 210.7 Representatives or activists were questioned over the phone or in person about their organisation size, structure, and principles, participation in the demonstrations, and interaction with government authorities. One inquiry asked, has your group engaged in any of the following forms of action within the last five years? focused on the GJMOs tactical decisions. Eight different types of action were included in the connected list, while there was also room for other action types to be added. For the analysis, we combined the answers to this question with the findings from the lobbying question that was strategically presented throughout the interview. Although lobbying was listed as the organizations main strategy for achieving its objectives, we assume that the customary practises of meeting with political and administrative officials can also be viewed as a tactical option, much like planning a protest or blocking a road. No questions on violent forms of action were posed during the interview because we believed that GJMOs seldom ever employ violence and that, even if they did, their leaders would be reluctant to acknowledge their organizations involvement in the damage of property or the use of violence against individuals.

We may rely on the responses from the interviews and, to a lesser degree, on information from a review of the written papers from the GJMOs to identify the independent variables. On this foundation, we may recreate the groups internal structures and values as well as details about how the groups interact with their surroundings. We must be certain about the samples makeup in order to evaluate the analyses findings. The selection criteria for the sample prefer big, formalised organisations that are noticeable on the national level and those that are most relevant with relation to a particular sector in the context of the country for information on the sampling approach. An analysis of contentious repertoires would have produced different results if the sample had been specifically designed for each national branch of the GJMs in countries where the GJMs inherit a strong horizontal network structure from the new social movements such as Switzerland, Spain, and Germany, as opposed to

being dominated by parties and trade unions as in France and Italy. However, this approach would have made it harder to compare the mobility sectors of different nations.

Descriptive findings on action repertoires: Not dichotomy but plurality

The respondents identified up to nine action forms when asked which ones their group had used often all the alternatives provided by the interviewer. More than two approaches were mentioned by seventy percent of the respondents. The introduction of this book chapter previously provided the distribution of the samples most prevalent action types. As can be seen, a relatively substantial percentage of all organisations utilise protesting almost 80% and petitioning about 76% whereas just around a quarter of them have used aggressive methods like blockade and occupation. This preliminary discovery has to be looked at in more detail. We conducted a hierarchical cluster analysis linking the action types based on the replies of the respondents in order to evaluate our first hypothesis. The study supports the existence of two separate sets of activities. Insofar as strike, blockade, boycott, occupation, and civil disobedience emerge as one distinct cluster, while petition which includes the gathering of signatures, demonstration, lobbying, and artistic or cultural performance comprise another, the theoretical distinction between confrontational and nonconfrontational forms of action is supported.

Blockade and building occupation, the two action modes with the largest costs in terms of probable police conflict and legal repercussions, seem to be most closely related in the first cluster. Blockade and occupation are closely related to civil disobedience, a word with greater ambiguity that often means breaking the law or other formal restrictions. Both boycott and strikes, which are heavily controlled forms of protest, contribute to the cluster. Civil disobedience and strikes are nonetheless confrontational, despite their lesser intensity, in that they aim to hurt their opponents either materially or symbolically [7], [8].

The second category of action forms is most closely related to petition and demonstration. The most typical use of both strategies Next, we associate creative, public displays of opposition via artistic or cultural performances. The second cluster includes lobbying, a strategy that is not directed at the general public and is often hidden from outsiders while having the greatest distance from other types of activity. The contrast between combative and non-analysis of social movements strategies is mentioned above.1Scholars, however, have a tendency to see this divergence as a dichotomy. This is mostly because it is used to evaluate protest occurrences as a whole.

When action repertoires are analysed at a macro level, protests are typically categorized according to newspaper reports using the dichotomous categories of non-violent violent, moderate radical, conventional unconventional, in order to make comparisons and analyse trends However, an examination at the mesa level shows that moderate and confrontational modes of activity are not incompatible with GJMOs. Almost all groups questioned utilise nonconfrontational action, or at least one type that falls under this category, often.

In addition to this, various organisations argued their points in a combative manner.64.4% of the 202 organisations used at least one aggressive tactic in addition to their more restrained arsenal. This result defies our first theory. GJMOs don't fit into categories where some use moderate kinds of action and others use extreme ones. Instead, the moderate repertory is expanded to include combative action patterns. The Bund für Umwelt und Mateschitz Deutschland BUND instance from Germany serves as an example of how diverse action modes may be used concurrently. In the 1990s, this environmental NGO took part in UN conferences on environment and development, which were a turning point in world

governance. The organisation also participated in protests against the official summits outside the conference sites at the same time.

For the rest of this chapter, well assume that moderate and confrontational forms of action are used simultaneously and make a distinction between organisations that just use non-confrontational forms of activity and those who also employ confrontational tactics. This straightforward sample bisection will serve as the foundation for the analysis repertoire decisions. The percentage of groups that utilise the moderate repertoire is often larger among those groups that also employ confrontational action perhaps because these groups are typically highly driven and demonstrate high levels of activity. The use of lobbying, which is more prevalent among organisations that only utilise moderate activities 63.0 vs 52.3%, is the lone exception to this tendency.

The actions that respondents added to the pre-existing list offer a sense of the range of protest tactics that the organisations really use. For instance, GJMO representatives included street theatre, alternative walking tours, protest camps, and demands for ethical purchasing. Additionally, a lot of the highlighted actions in the interviews highlight the significance of knowledge-based kinds of action. Representatives of the GJMO identified significant modes of activity as conferences, speeches, screenings of films, leafleting, and the creation of publications.

The influence of democratic values and structures

Are internal routines and preferences for certain organisational models our first group of independent variables connected to the adoption of conciliatory or confrontational acts our dependent variable for instance? The relationships between these two groups of variables demonstrate that organisational values and structures do in fact matter. GJMOs that implement the idea of delegation and are hierarchically organized are less likely to engage in contentious behaviour than those that embrace horizontality and first-person-politics. When the dependent variable is crossed with the four-fold table based on the level of delegation and the consensus vs the majority principle the relationship between the two becomes clear. The employment of confrontational modes of action is closely correlated with the two fields the assembler and the participative deliberative that suggest a low degree of delegation. Only one of the five groups who choose the assembler model uses only moderate actions; the other four all favour aggressive behaviour.

More precisely, the kind of action taken is connected to how inclusive the primary decision-making body is. GJMOs that make decisions largely through assemblies are more likely than other organisations to use confrontational strategies like blockade, boycott, or civil disobedience. The preferences for particular organisational models and related processes support the structurally discovered relationship GJMOs supporting the notion of non-hierarchical decision making are less likely than other groups to limit themselves to the moderate repertoire of action. The other axis in the four-fold table does not seem to be a significant determinant, despite the fact that the degree of authority delegation appears to be a very strong predictor of action repertoire. The usage of moderate and aggressive modes of action, respectively, does not reflect the distinction between organisations that follow the majority rule and those that follow the consensus principle. The usage of the consensus vs majority principle in general, or the assembly's manner of decision-making in particular, show no appreciable distinctions between these groups. Regarding theory , our data supports the idea that democratic values within the groups have an impact on the chosen action repertoire. When arguing their points, GJMOs who amour horizontal decision-making and

who are ostensibly critical of the representative system as a whole often use aggressive tactics.

A second supposition is that organisations that rely on outside funding, particularly those from state governments, may have a tendency to be more restrained in their choice of course of action than groups that are financially independent. For instance, a lot of organisations working on environmental or immigration concerns at the level of EU politics have this relationship. A significant amount of the European Union's operating expenses go to the European Environmental Bureau, an umbrella organisation of national environmental organisations that spans the whole EU. It is unavoidably more moderate than, for example, Friends of the Earth Europe, which gets minimal income from the EU, and Greenpeace European Unit, which flatly rejects sponsorship from the government and business. Thirdly, Dalton 1994 demonstrated a significant relationship between environmental organisations ideological tendencies and their chosen course of action.

We find that groups associated with the new sector are most likely to engage in confrontational actions when organisations in our study are assigned to broader social movement segments based on the context in which they originated, their ideological leanings, and their affiliations to large networks. Old Left organisations come next, then the movements we classified as new social movements. Although one might anticipate that groups focusing on peace and human rights would not strongly tend towards disruptive actions, it was surprising to find that the groups assigned to the new global category the youngest cohort of groups that most closely relate to the GJMs are least likely to use confrontational actions. This contrasts sharply with how those groups are portrayed in the majority of the media. Additionally, organisations based on collective members are less likely than those based on individual members to engage in aggressive behaviour.

In particular, when organisations have a nominal leadership that may be held responsible for unlawful actions, we think that this latter outcome can be explained by the higher unwillingness of organisations as a whole relative to individuals to take risks. Additionally, it makes sense that in the setting of a GJMO, individual members are more likely to endorse aggressive acts than are collective members due to organisational logics and internal dynamics. We find a predictable and obvious conclusion when examining solely the organisations that are overtly anti-capitalist in their self-descriptions. The employment of confrontational tactics is substantially more likely among anti-capitalist GJMOs than it is among all other organisations.

Other group characteristics, such as group age categorized in various ways, self-attribution to the GJMs, number of volunteers, budget size, presence of fee-paying members, and existence of formal laws, do not significantly correlate with the kind of activity. In light of Robert Michels writings on the iron law of oligarchy, it is important to examine the roles of two additional organisational characteristics, including degree of formalizations and professionalization. Both organisational tendencies are frequently seen as leading to ideological and tactical moderation, ultimately making the group toothless.

A correlation between the type of action and the five formalizations indicators that are currently available may be discovered. However, only two of the five indicators namely, the presence of an officially accepted programme and a formal membership whether of persons or groups have been used to support this conclusion. These two traits have a definite correlation with the usage of combative behaviour. The conclusion remains true even when trade unions, where a formal membership and programme are the norm, are not included in the research. This result goes against Michels presumption. The only possible answer is that

radical organisations may also adopt a formal resolution or sort of agenda and depend on official membership, as is the case with most Trotskyist organisations. However, the outcomes in terms of professionalization are entirely consistent with Michels and many others hypotheses. Groups with higher levels of professionalism have a stronger propensity for moderate behaviours. When taking into account the number of paid members and the presence of outside financing as opposed to funding by members, significant connections might be identified. When combined, the data on formalizations and professionalization present us with an ambiguous pattern regarding widely held beliefs on the relationship between organisational characteristics and forms of activity. The results for formalizations are equivocal, but Michels hypotheses on the effect of professionalization on the action repertoire are verified.

CONCLUSION

Understanding the effects of GJM group activities provides chances to increase group activity and promote global unity. GJM organisations are essential for furthering the causes of marginalized communities and social justice. The information learned through examining the modes of operation of GJM organisations may be used to advance transformational change and advance global social justice. A more fair, equitable, and sustainable global society may be achieved through supporting and participating in the efforts of GJM organisations. In conclusion, further study in this area is necessary to improve our comprehension of GJM group tactics and their effects on global justice objectives. Making inclusive and participatory activism a priority may help GJM groups remain strong and productive. In addition, promoting worldwide unity and cooperation among various movements is essential for realizing the social justice and equality that the GJM promotes. It is essential to emphasize the GJM groups modes of action if we are to achieve a more fair, egalitarian, and sustainable world.

REFERENCES:

[1] P. Almeida, Climate justice and sustained transnational mobilization, *Globalizations*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/14747731.2019.1651518.

[2] P. Almeida, Climate justice and sustained transnational mobilization, *J. World-Systems Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.5195/jwsr.2019.946.

[3] L. London, I. K. Joshi, E. Cairncross, J. Gilmore, en L. Claudio, Environmental justice: An international perspective, in *Encyclopedia of Environmental Health*, 2019. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-409548-9.11886-X.

[4] R. OGorman, Water marks and water moves: Community arts and thinking with water, *Community Dev. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.1093/cdj/bsy053.

[5] A. G. Mahler, South–South Organizing in the Global Plantation Zone: Ramón Marrero Aristy, the novela de la caña, and the Caribbean Bureau, *Atl. Stud. Glob. Curr.* , 2019, doi: 10.1080/14788810.2018.1489569.

[6] P. Nirmal en D. Rocheleau, Learning and Evaluation Program Manager, Women, Peace and Security Program, *Nat. Sp.*, 2019.

[7] B. Fladvad en J. Glöckler, Engaging in the multi-territorial site of the political: Political practices of Latin American Landless movements in the struggle for food sovereignty, *Erde*, 2019, doi: 10.12854/erde-2019-448.

[8] *Comrades in Health*. 2019. doi: 10.36019/9780813561226.

CHAPTER 14

THE IMPACT OF GROUP ENVIRONMENT: A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS.

Dr. Kauser F Jafaree, Assistant Professor
Department of Arts & Humanities, IIMT University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India.

ABSTARCT:

The environment in which an organisation works has a significant impact on the dynamics and effectiveness of that organisation. The purpose of this research article is to examine how different elements of organisational functioning are impacted by the group's surroundings. The research explores how organisational culture, leadership philosophies, market circumstances, technical developments, and legal frameworks affect the groups decision-making, resource allocation, creativity, and performance as a whole. It looks at the relationship between a group's resilience and long-term success and how well it can navigate and adapt to its environment. The study also looks at how ties with other organisations and stakeholder participation affect groups influence on the community at large. It is essential to comprehend how the groups environment affects its ability to deal with problems, take advantage of opportunities, and accomplish its purpose and goals. The research also emphasises how this information may be used to advance organisational performance, sustainability, and social impact.

KEYWORDS:

Decision-Making, Organizational Culture, Regulatory Frameworks, Stakeholder Engagement, Technological Advancements.

INTRODUCTION

Organisational characteristics cannot fully account for the activities of social movement organisations. When advocating for political and social change, GJMOs engage in complicated political interactions with target groups, adversaries, and third parties. This may be seen in certain models that emphasize the importance of both objective and perceived political chances First off, the structural and conceptual traits of the groupings mentioned above are already impacted by outside forces. For instance, organisations that place a strong emphasis on grassroots democracy are likely to do so in opposition to and as a substitute for representative institutions, which are seen as having relatively little opportunity for involvement. Similar to this, organisations that support grass-roots democracy may be critical of some of its friends who depend on formal, hierarchical institutions.

The struggles of GJMOs to effectively frame issues, bring about or obstruct political decisions, and make marginalized groups visible are also based on prior experiences and imply ongoing interactions with reference groups like governments, other political organisations, and an audience like bystanders or the general public. Their ideas of democracy and social change influence how GJMOs approach these reference groups and, therefore, the precise kinds of action they choose. These ideas change and develop in an interactive process. For instance, the left-radical black bloc, which is present at many significant GJM demonstrations, indicates disengagement from and resistance to the state and its officials. The black bloc represents opposition to efforts by the government to embrace and quell dissent even in terms of appearance. By sending out riot police in response to the

black bloc, official institutions create feelings of exclusion that serve to reinforce the blocs symbolic distance from the state [1], [2].

As predicted, our data show that GJMOs without strong ties to state institutions and those that do not seek them out are more likely to engage in confrontational types of activity. Organisations that tout rejecting connections with representative institutions as a good attribute are more likely to take aggressive measures. Of course, these organisations have no favorable interactions with the government that may be endangered by conflicts. More significantly, these organisations believe that using their arsenal of confrontational tactics will help them to maintain their challenger status in the conflict arena. Confrontational behaviour is associated with the position that one will not cooperate with state institutions at any level of geography, although this association is only substantial at the national and international levels. However, there seems to be some reluctance in dealing with governments at the municipal level. The Berlin Social Forum, which tends towards confrontational acts, serves as an illustration of this. Although they would not see working with authorities favorably, the group was forced to negotiate with the district mayor in order to ensure the existence of an occupied social facility.

Many other organisations with a mostly confrontational action repertoire have similar experiences of being driven into discussions to achieve short-term aims. Once GJMOs make a request for state funding or indicate that they want to work with state institutions a goal that, clearly, not all organisations share they are likely to refrain from aggressive behaviour. The desire to be seen as a responsible spouse who merits support and a reasonable participant is the apparent motivation for this self-control. For organisations on the extreme Left spectrum, the situation is different. These organisations wouldn't beg for money, and the government wouldn't want to give it to them. But even Greenpeace, which can hardly be described as a left-radical organisation, rejects governmental funding in order to preserve its independence. After all, civil disobedience was how Greenpeace got its start and is being used today [3], [4].

Dependence on state funds is one sign of a close connection with the state. Government-backed GJMOs had a significant propensity to utilise moderate actions for results comparable to these in other situations. The same holds true for organisations that accept funding from non-governmental organisations outside of their own ranks. The Bundeskoordination Internationalismus BUKO, a German network of leftist organisations supporting solidarity with the global south, serves as an example of the power of nongovernmental money. The Protestant Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst EED provided financial assistance for the network and its annual conference for a number of years. In 2005, the EED withdrew its support when attendees at a BUKO-congress referred to stealing as a legitimate political tactic. It is clear that other organisations decisions are influenced by the fear of financial loss, even if in this instance the BUKO chose to accept a significant financial loss rather than denounce the techniques of political thievery.

It is hardly unexpected that extreme Leftist organisations accuse moderate NGOs of sacrificing their objectives and range of options in order to get outside financing. Self-restriction in terms of action repertoire happens in relation to more than just the desired state. Boycotting, which is largely used to protest companies, may be dangerous and should only be used under extreme circumstances. Because they have limited faith in the level of consumer awareness, some organisations do not see boycotts as an effective strategy. They worry that if a boycott call is only partially heeded, its proponents would suffer more damage than the boycotted firm since they will lose their image and potential power over businesses and decision-makers. For instance, the Italian organisation Campagna Banche Armate, which

opposes financial institution's role in the manufacture and trafficking of weapons, opts not to advocate boycotts. Instead, it organises mailing activities and disseminates information to maximise support [5], [6].

We must remember that GJMOs grow in broad political and cultural settings in addition to their specific interactions with their environs. In reality, the concept of action repertoires was first created to describe the nature and extent of conflict in a national setting. According to academics, national societies have come to agree on what actions are normal and suitable as opposition expression. In times of transnational mobilisation, this domestic protest culture does not, or does not considerably, disappear. Instead, non-domestic and foreign forces alter and infiltrate national environments. According to our results the frequency of a moderate or confrontational action repertoire is in fact highly related to national background. Roman nations, which often have a more pronounced left-right divide, are known for their combative protest cultures. Switzerland, Germany, and the UK, in contrast, seem to have created somewhat successful procedures to lessen conflict, such as opening up governmental institutions to dealing with issues that are expressed from below. This may be seen in these nations where GJMOs are less likely to use aggressive tactics [7], [8].

For instance, civil disobedience is pervasive even among official organisations like the communist trade union Confédération générale du travail CGT and the green party in France, the country in our sample where confrontational activities by GJMOs are most prevalent. Rather than being limited to a radical minority, actions like supporting immigrants facing deportation or destroying genetically modified crops are broadly supported. In civil disobedience, Left-leaning elected officials display their mayoral insignias or wave the French flag.Another aspect on the national level seems to be important in addition to national protest cultures. In hypothesis 6, we presupposed that the political inclination of the national government affected the repertoire choice. In fact, over the five years before to the interviews, aggressive types of action were used in nations with conservative governments.

DISCUSSION

Unconventional Politics Online

The Internet, like other communication technologies, has an impact on how people and organisations behave, interfering with interaction at both the individual and group levels. In comparison to traditional forms of communication like the press, telegraph, radio, television, telephone, and fax, it seems that social scientists anticipate the electronic revolution to bring about significant changes that will need the use of specialised ideas. The terms e-participation, e-governance, and e-voting all describe a broader revolution brought about by new technologies, to the point of advocating a e-democracy, which is characterised by increasing chances for people to engage in politics because of the Internet. As with other technologies, the argument over their benefits and drawbacks has long divided onlookers into sceptics and supporters. From this vantage point, the discussion and study around the Internet and the different aspects of democracy that this book addresses have become linked.

The Internet has been touted as a technology that might increase not just the quantity of information consumers, but also the quantity of information producers, in contrast to television and other costly forms of communication. The more information that is given to people, the easier it will be for the less powerful to participate, hence lessening inequality belief has been refuted by studies on the digital divide, which highlights the fact that, like previous technologies, the Internet benefits those who have more access to both individual and communal resources It has been proposed that the Internet might enhance democracy's deliberative nature by enhancing communication standards and aiding in the development of

an alternative public realm. From this vantage point, the Internet has undoubtedly enhanced both the number and diversity of information sources accessible. Additionally, its usage is linked to deeper interpersonal connections. However, more pessimistic opinions have also surfaced in this area about the ability of new technology to foster communication across ideological and social boundaries. Online and offline communication environments don't seem to vary much in terms of communication quality. The initial research, which focused on political players and institutions, emphasised how little interaction there was on the websites of political parties and institutions.Political parties and politicians use the Internet in much the same way they use other media technologies in this regard, as potentialities are limited not only or not so much by material resources but also by deeply ingrained cultural practices.

Social movement organisations SMOs, loose networks, and unorthodox forms of politics in general have developed as more open to experimentation and permeable to technological developments, with a more inventive and dynamic use of the Internet, due to their greater flexibility. Particularly, it seems that new technologies have given those players a quick and affordable means of communication across borders, encouraging mobilization and promoting looser and more adaptable organisational structures. However, some writers have expressed a gloomier perspective on the Internet's democratic potential, even in the area of social movement studies, due to the restricted availability of interactive channels as well as the poor use of these applications when they are available. Indeed, although the Internet offers players with little resources new options, it also poses new obstacles to their collective action since, it seems, both conventional and non-traditional political actors struggle to fully use its democratic potential

In our empirical research, we addressed the general issue of social movements using the Internet by introducing specific questions in a survey of attendees at the 4th European Social Forum in Athens and in our questionnaire to organisations involved in the Global Justice Movement GJM in our selected countries, as well as by systematically analysing some general qualities of the websites of 261 organisations belonging to the GJM. The information that follows will initially provide information on the Internet use of GJM organisations and activists. Then, we will concentrate on the pertinent characteristics of websites, evaluating the empirical performance of our population of websites on indicators related to information provision, identity construction, transparency, mobilization, and reduction of user's access and usage disparities digital divide. After examining the internal correlation between the various qualities, we identified, we will assess the influence of contextual and organisational characteristics on the qualities of Web sites. Next, we will identify potential explanations for the disparate attention given to various potential qualities of the Web sites [9], [10].

Unconventional politics online: How activists use the Internet and how they perceive its impact

The Internet may be used for many different things, much like previous communication channels. Some of these goals have received significant attention in research on social movements. First off, it has been said that the Internet increases the ability to mobilize people via the spread of alternative information and through protest. Epistemic communities and advocacy networks highlighted the negative effects of economic globalisation, potential alternatives to neoliberalism, and various struggles in various parts of the world with the aid of the Internet for more on the paradigmatic case of the Zapatistas. These organisations assisted in the development of the GJM by offering alternate perspectives on certain topics, access to and exposure on the Web, and connections between organisations operating in various regions of the world. The mounting of international campaigns has benefited greatly from inexpensive communication. There is mounting evidence that protests are increasingly

conceived, planned, implemented and evaluated with the help of the Internet. Computer-Mediated Communication made it possible to use e-petitions, which have also been used to protest specific human rights violations, pressure governments to abolish the death penalty, and target European institutions and the net-strike, which involves many users connecting to the same domain at once at a predetermined time in order to jam a site that is seen as a symbolic target and prevent other users from accessing it.

Second, it has been noted that the administration of social movement organisations makes significant use of the Internet. In reality, computer-mediated communication may alter organisational structures, making more decentralised organisational structures feasible. The fundamental characteristics of the types of social movements developing in the Information Age are compatible with the Internet. By way of historical analogy, the industrial factory served as the organisational hub for the labour movement during the industrial era. Similarly, the internet is not just a technology; it is a communication medium and the physical foundation of a particular organisational form called the network. The usage of the Internet, is shaping the movement on its own web-like image, with hubs serving as the focal point of activity and spokes that link to other centres, which are autonomous but interconnected. In reality, global campaigns have benefited from the Internet by becoming longer lasting, less centralized managed, harder to start and stop, and more flexible in terms of networks and objectives.

Third, the Internet has been commended for fostering the development of new collective identities by providing a public forum for discussion. Social movement academics have emphasised how the Internet may create new identities. The Internet offers potential for reflexivity, as shown by our earlier study on the usage of SMOs Web sites during the mobilization against the G8 in Genoa in 2001. Online discussion groups and mailing lists foster discussions on particular decisions such as action plans, coalitions, slogans, and so forth before a protest occurs as well as a group evaluation of a demonstration's success or failure among remote activists. True, the Internet contributes to the collective identities of social movements primarily by consolidating those that already exist the Internet can be helpful in organising and educating within social movements, but it is a useful but limited tool in terms of expressing identities.

Internet use among activists in the Global Justice Movement is confirmed by the DEMOS poll of attendees at the Athens ESF May 2006 on the inaugural ESF in Florence in 2002. Between 75 and 85% of respondents use the Internet to express their political opinions, exchange information with their own group, and engage in moderate online protests less than one-third use more extreme forms, such as net-strikes The Internet is often utilised as a tool for information sharing with one's own group and is frequently used for lobbying and campaigning by over half of respondents, at least once per week. Opportunities to express political beliefs online are there but less common. Internet usage is connected to the degree of activity of the respondents, as the more mobilized populace also uses the Internet more although gender and education show no relationship with frequency and kind of use. With movement identification, numerous organisational memberships, engagement in GJM protest activities, and the employment of many modes of political activity, the various Internet usage all rise.

Offline and online demonstrations are closely connected and often feed off of one another, as has previously been mentioned elsewhere. More activists utilise the Internet to engage in civil online action and to voice their political beliefs, both inside and outside of their own organisation, the more they identify with the GJM. The significance of belonging to one or more organisations is further shown by the fact that activists utilise the Internet more often to

voice their political beliefs and to oppose politics the more groups they are engaged in. If we take into account the degree of mobilization as determined by participation in GJM protest events and other action repertoires, we may see similar tendencies. The peculiar characteristics of these activists, who tend to belong to particular types of loose organisations that is, alternative media and social centres, are confirmed by the lower scores of correlation coefficients regarding Internet use for net-strikes and activists performing other radical forms of online protest. These activists also have a repertoire of action that is more oriented towards radical forms of protest than the rest of the sample.

When we questioned the speakers for GJMOs about the impact of the Internet in general and their organisations websites in particular on their communication with various actors and constituencies, the results at the individual level are highly compatible with what they said. Over 40% of the organisations reported a favorable effect, but the general assessment of the Internet's influence on contact with public officials is mostly negative. Only one-fifth of interviewees provide a negative opinion of the influence on relationships with the media, while more than 70% of respondents say that the Internet has enhanced communication with the media, according to interviews with GJMOs. Finally, optimism is prevalent, especially when respondents are questioned about the role that the Internet plays in connecting with supporters and members. Negative assessments in this scenario are very rare and were only seen in southern European nations, where around one-quarter of the groups displayed a mixed view.

A representative of a local social forum summarizes the widely held beliefs on how the Internet has affected various publics, saying: I don't seem to think that the Internet has favored more interactions with public decision-makers. Instead, people typically disregard the ineffectual acts taken through the Internet. In this instance, we launched a cyberattack on the National Institute of Nuclear Physics website as part of our campaign against the massive infrastructure projects the Berlusconi government had planned. During the debate over regulations pertaining to topics like genetically modified food, water, and the Bookstein Directive, we also organised a mail-bombing at the European level using the email addresses of MPs, but it proved ineffective. This is a result of public decision-makers lack of knowledge about these internet behaviours. Regarding our relationship with the media, I believe that the Internet is crucial since press releases, images, and documents are posted on our website and utilised as sources for stories by journalists.

Nevertheless, I think that the Web site primarily helped us draw in educated and interested visitors; nevertheless, it didn't prove to be particularly efficient for reaching out to the general public since TV and in-person contacts are more crucial for that. Our activists do not completely reject computer-mediated communication with public officials and politicians, despite it being less trustworthy. Rete Lilliput, an Eco pacifist organisation, has a spokeswoman who claims that the Internet has a pivotal and strategic role for us; it is part of our strategy of communication and pressure. We are utilising it in a really innovative manner to plan online pressure campaigns against national lawmakers as well as against local legislators. We have utilised mail-bombing to target political figures, and the results have been fascinating.

It is important to note that most respondents broached the topic of Internet communication outside of our particular questions and framed it as being vital over the course of our study. Some interviewees note how new technology might make it easier for power to be shared and distributed, particularly in relation to how the Internet affects organisational internal life. Particularly, online resources like email lists become becoming permanent assemblies. Some organisations use open publishing and open management systems to increase involvement in

organisational life and democratize the organisation, preventing the concentration of power in the hands of a select number of highly qualified technologists. In fact, several respondents stigmatize the potential for new inequities since technological competence tends to provide authority to a select few. Fear of alienating some activists caused people to limit the use of new technology and favors face-to-face communication in some cases. In other cases, people formed groups dealing with Internet-specific issues in an effort to educate their members about Internet use.

Additionally, GJMOs may choose not to employ interactive tools because they believe it would be too time-consuming. Particularly more established organisations like unions are concerned about this. The opening of a forum would mean a different management of the website because it would entail dedicating one person to the forum but we don't have that option, according to the webmaster of the Italian left-wing metalworker's union we don't give users the possibility to express themselves directly and to publish their judgement on platforms and agreements even if this is what they ask us for more. When it comes to conceptualizing and understanding the Internet, some of our interviewees mention a generational gap between old and traditional organizations members and new and innovative groups, with older generations failing to see new media as significantly different from old ones. Some activists emphasize the unique ability of the Internet to foster involvement and discourse, going beyond an instrumental view of it.

A leader of the Italian Young Communists claims that the use of digital technologies has revolutionized political activity. Actually, the internet is a political platform. Its more than simply a tool. It's a place where, despite the strong drive for privatisation and control, millions of people work together to create criticism and oppose the exclusive vision of the Internet that Microsoft and Windows advocate. It is also a political space since it stands for an arena of debate and conflict without parallel. However, using the Internet cannot be thought of in isolation from other forms of communication. Face-to-face interactions are crucial for the creation of virtual networks, which do not develop on their own, according to several respondents. Additionally, rather than serving as a replacement for current relationships, the Internet is often seen as something that enhances them. The internet is extremely essential to us, but it is just a tool and cannot replace other types of contact that we value highly, according to the Rete Lilliput spokeswoman. Because we believe that certain events cannot be mediated or replaced by the internet, we have decided to hold a number of physical gatherings including seminars and assemblies.

Other interviewees place a lot of emphasis on the need of making visible and physical contact. We also need to practises militancy, to make posters and write flyers, and to have direct connections with the people else we won't change the world, said a representative of a local social forum. Internet is seen as a way to increase involvement in organisational life, but it also presents issues about the potential of exclusion for those who do not have access to it, as well as the corresponding power disparities. It enables communication with journalists and fosters the development of close bonds with members. However, none of the people we spoke to believed that face-to-face interactions could be replaced by the Internet; rather, they believed that it only increased the possibilities and frequencies of connection among geographically separated people.

CONCLUSION

Understanding the importance of stakeholder involvement and partnerships with other organisations presents chances to increase the groups influence on the community at large. The groups social and environmental effect may be increased via partnerships and

collaborative initiatives. The information gathered from researching how the environment affects a group may be used to advance organisational performance, sustainability, and social impact. Strategic decision-making and resource allocation may be influenced by understanding the environmental context. In conclusion, further study in this area is necessary to advance our knowledge of how organisational dynamics and effectiveness are influenced by a groups surroundings. The resilience and success of the team may be increased by fostering a supportive organisational culture and using adaptive techniques. Achieving a good influence on the larger community also requires cultivating stakeholder participation and cooperative connections. In order to create an organisational landscape that is more efficient, sustainable, and socially responsible, it is crucial to emphasize the influence of the groups surroundings.

REFERENCES:

[1] K. C. Reilly, D. Briatico, J. D. Irwin, P. Tucker, E. S. Pearson, en S. M. Burke, Participants perceptions of C.H.A.M.P. families: A parent-focused intervention targeting paediatric overweight and obesity, *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/ijerph16122171.

[2] B. C. Chai, J. R. van der Voort, K. Grofelnik, H. G. Eliasdottir, I. Klöss, en F. J. A. Perez-Cueto, Which diet has the least environmental impact on our planet? A systematic review of vegan, vegetarian and omnivorous diets, *Sustainability Switzerland*. 2019. doi: 10.3390/su11154110.

[3] E. Peberdy, A. Jones, en D. Green, A study into public awareness of the environmental impact of menstrual products and product choice, *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11020473.

[4] A. B. Kao en I. D. Couzin, Modular structure within groups causes information loss but can improve decision accuracy, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.1098/rstb.2018.0378.

[5] Z. Li, H. Wang, en Y. Feng, Impact of vegetation pattern and wind speed on thermal environment in building group, 2019. doi: 10.1088/1755-1315/238/1/012035.

[6] D. L. M. Campbell, E. N. De Haas, en C. Lee, A review of environmental enrichment for laying hens during rearing in relation to their behavioral and physiological development, *Poult. Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.3382/ps/pey319.

[7] E. Houshyar, B. Chen, en G. Q. Chen, Environmental impacts of rice production analyzed via social capital development: An Iranian case study with a life cycle assessment/data envelopment analysis approach, *Ecol. Indic.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.07.040.

[8] Z. Zheng en L. Yang, Neighborhood Environment, Lifestyle, and Health of Older Adults: Comparison of Age Groups Based on Ecological Model of Aging, *Sustainability*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11072077.

[9] V. Zhou, J. A. Munson, J. Greenson, Y. Hou, S. Rogers, en A. M. Estes, An exploratory longitudinal study of social and language outcomes in children with autism in bilingual home environments, *Autism*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1362361317743251.

[10] A. Nazmi, M. Tseng, D. Robinson, D. Neill, en J. Walker, A nutrition education intervention using NOVA is more effective than myplate alone: A proof-of-concept randomized controlled trial, *Nutrients*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/nu11122965.

CHAPTER 15

ANALYZING THE EVOLUTION OF WEBSITE QUALITIES: A COMPREHENSIVE STUDY

Shefalika Narain, Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashta, India
Email id- shefalika@isdi.in

ABSTRACT:

Websites now form a key part of the digital world, influencing how users interact with and view online information. The goal of this study paper is to undertake a thorough examination of the characteristics of websites, taking into account factors like user experience, aesthetic design, functionality, accessibility, and performance. The research explores how website characteristics have changed over time, taking into account developments in web technology, current design trends, and user expectations. It looks at how user engagement, contentment, and conversion rates are affected by a websites feature. The study also looks at the methods companies take to improve website features and satisfy various customer preferences. Understanding website quality analysis and evolution is essential for optimising online platforms and maintaining relevance in a constantly changing digital environment. The report also emphasises how this information may be used to advance efficient digital marketing, enhance brand perception, and meet organisational goals.

KEYWORDS:

Accessibility, Digital Marketing, User Experience, Website Design, Website Performance.

INTRODUCTION

The actual implementation of these possibilities as a matter for an empirical investigation that, following some prior research, we have focused on the organisational Web sites. If our SMOs and their activists are indeed interested even more than other actors in the Internet as an instrument that might reduce the cost of communication and make it more inclusive, we considered this to be true. We also hypothesized that different Web site designs may pay attention to certain qualities in different ways. In the sections that follow, well assess several strategic decisions made while building one important piece of Internet-based technology, a website, and describe how those sites performed on certain key analytical dimensions. The dissemination of information is the Internet's first significant contribution, particularly in terms of enabling greater discourse. A website may perform a crucial task by selecting a portion of reality, organizing a collection of meanings, and offering an interpretation of that portion of reality. More than other social movements in the past, GJM-affiliated SMOs emphasize the value of developing a specialised knowledge base. The majority of the websites we examined provide a considerable quantity of information. 90% of the time, they provide possibilities for political education via articles, papers, and dossiers, and 40% of the time they even include bibliographical references. Nearly four-fifths 78% of the websites include a news section, and 53% of the websites provide conference and seminar materials that enable interested viewers to learn more about certain themes. We may remember that the Web sites of Eastern European NGOs supplied a news section in only a considerably lower 48% of instances and information about conferences in only 16% of the cases in order to put our results in a broader comparative context [1], [2].

The capacity of visitors to quickly access pertinent information on a website is another crucial factor that influences the quality of the material. Site maps and search engines should make it easier for users to locate what they're looking for quickly. It seems that SMOs

recognised this need since almost 60% of them provide a search engine, and nearly 30% do the same for a site map. However, only around a quarter of the websites give translations of the group's essential facts, and only about a fifth do so for the portion identifying them. If we take into account the very international character of the movements frameworks and actions, this appears like a rather low percentage in addition, roughly one-third of Eastern European NGOs translate at least some of their websites. Although one might argue that mailing lists rather than websites are the primary means by which borderless communication develops, it appears that despite the worlds continued globalisation, national civil society organisations still struggle to communicate with one another across international boundaries because of language barriers.

The ability of the Internet to support debate by encouraging the creation of new identities online is a second significant possibility it presents. While particular tools like forums and mailing lists encourage continuing contact and debate among activists, websites provide chances for self-presentation to the wider public. The value of Web sites for creating a record of an organizations work and for information dissemination is often emphasised by the activists we have spoken with. Websites serve as electronic business cards for organisations, reflecting their identity and prior accomplishments. The identification and history of the group itself are one sort of information that is often displayed on the websites of GJM organisations. Most of those we looked at include a press release archive, which is also a valuable resource for conventional media journalists, as well as an archive of annual reports or a timeline of the organization's history. Additionally, about two-fifths of the organisations in the survey have online collections of old leaflets informing users about the organization's history: its actions, campaigns, mobilizations, and so forth as well as records of previous assemblies that are regarded as crucial moments in their collective history. Less than 25% of the websites under analysis post the groups internal work schedule publicly, but more than 50% of them offer a newsletter that is typically available to all visitors. A members-only area may be found on the websites of organisations that are more focused on improving internal communication with their members; this is the case for one-quarter of the websites under analysis [3], [4].

This brings up a further quality that is important for the development of a shared identity via online discussions. The existence of certain apps on a website, such as forums, mailing lists, blogs, or chat lines, demonstrates the organizations dedication to multilateral interaction via the establishment of public platforms for discourse among varied individuals. On the examined Web sites, there are variably dispersed applications for multilateral interactivity.5 The majority of websites around one-third provide a mailing list or forum for asynchronous debate. This is not a particularly low percentage; according to comparable statistics, roughly one-fifth of NGOs in Eastern Europe provide involvement tools like chat rooms and bulletin boards. It also shows that the majority of our groups do not see websites as forums for open discussion. Only 10% of websites use the newest information management techniques, such as open publishing, which allows anyone to post announcements, requests for proposals, and other content without restriction. The same percentage of websites also provide the option for users to respond to specific comment requests from organisations or to surveys and questionnaires designed to gather user opinions on a range of subjects.

The enormous information storage capacity of websites also presents chances for enhancing accountability and transparency, two other crucial aspects of democracy. The vast majority of the SMOs in our sample utilise websites to increase openness regarding their internal operations. As many as 80% provide information on the organization's physical location and accessibility, which is 70% of the time either directly published on the homepage or is just

one click away from it a similar percentage was noted for Eastern European NGOs. Even more 85% post their organisations statutes or comparable documents online, and almost two-thirds of these do so with information about the groups organisational structure. Less frequently found is information about the Web site itself: only 16% of sites provide any kind of indication regarding user's access to the site, and only 25% of sites provide information about the last updating although those statistics are frequently hazy and incredibly imprecise, as well as lacking a temporal reference. Only 25% of websites give information about their organizations finances, perhaps partly due to often limited budgets [5], [6].

Contact information for those who are actively working in both the leadership and other jobs that have been identified shows that the organisation is open to public inspection and is eager to establish direct lines of connection with website visitors. In this regard, the availability of contact information signifies a move beyond one-way communication tools such as a newsletter. A generic email address for the company is provided on almost 90% of websites, 30% of which are homepages. Both the examination of European parliament's online and the instance of Eastern European NGOs revealed a comparable proportion 85 and 87%. The distribution of email addresses for other members of the organisation is not as common, though, with only 40% of the websites under analysis including the webmasters address, 31% including other members of the organisation or departments, and 14% including the person in charge of international relations. Less than half of the groups that recognised the existence of a leader share information about that individual, and approximately a quarter provide the leaders contact information to other users. The answers to an email we sent using the email addresses shown on the website requesting details about the sites administration also provide as an indication of how responsive the general information service and the Webmaster are.6 Generally speaking, the response rate ranged from 31% for the request submitted to the public email address to 46% for the one addressed to the webmaster.

As was previously indicated, activists are particularly attentive to the potential for online mobilization and the resulting increased chances for political engagement. The degree to which mobilization functions are performed on the websites of our selected SMOs varies greatly. The use of the Internet for offline protest is the most common. In contrast to Eastern European NGOs, which only post their activity calendars online in 42% of cases, more than 60% of the organisations do so A similar percentage offers specific information through handbooks or links to helpful resources on offline modes of action. About one-third additionally publishes online the action schedule of other GJM organisations. Nearly one-fifth of the websites analysed between 16 and 22% organize workshops and help desks to introduce people to offline forms of action, and about one-third of them 36% provide information on offline forms of action, cover the organisation of physical meetings for offline forms of action [7], [8].

Up to two thirds of our websites promote the organizations involvement in a protest effort. Additionally, the Internet offers tools for online protest including e-petitions, net-strikes, and mail-bombings. Many hackers are members of the GJM, fighting against copyright and for the right to privacy with their focus on the Internet and online protest Jordan 2002. However, online forms of action are promoted less frequently than offline strategies: nearly 30% of the Web sites under analysis use online petitions; nearly 18% suggest an online mobilization method like the e-postcard; and 15% provide specific details about online forms of action. If we take into account the existence of calls for net-strikes and/or mail-bombings, the proportion drops even further; other types of online mobilizations are far more common, but they are still only present on a small number of sites. A last characteristic of websites can be to bridge the digital gap and encourage engagement.

The degree to which the Internet enables the mobilization of various sectors of the population, particularly the least technologically educated, is an open subject often argued by activists and in Internet literature. Although they also highlight the role of movement organisations in introducing their members to the Internet, our own data from a survey of activists attending the first European Social Forum in Florence partially confirm the existence of a digital divide within social movements. However, it doesn't appear like the organisations we chose for our investigation are very interested in this matter. In reality, less than 10% of companies provide labs, help desks, and other electronic tools to introduce their consumers to the Internet; 5% give free email; and just 8% host Web pages or websites. Only approximately 5% of the websites provide a text-only version that makes their information accessible to users with sluggish connections or outdated hardware. On the homepage of an examined website, we very seldom found mention of the accessibility problem. Therefore, only a small number of SMOs that focus on this topic explicitly address the issue of the digital divide, while others obviously do not see it as a top concern.

DISCUSSION

Contextual characteristics, organizational features, and web sites qualities

How can we explain the different Web sites differing accentuations on the various facets of communication? The impacts of technological advancement have often been explained in terms of technology. Similar to this, technical expertise has been used to explain Web site characteristics, for instance, when political organisations websites show appreciable improvements as a result of hiring specialised Webmasters to handle their design and administration. However, recent research has discovered a number of models that adjust technology to organisational styles and tactics as well as environmental factors. Most scholars now concur in highlighting the role of the agency in shaping the online environment, refuting the technological interpretation of the Internet as being able thanks to its inherent networked logic to favors decentralization of power and empowerment of citizens. Therefore, it is believed that there is a two-way relationship between technology and its users: social interactions influence how technology is used, and technology influences how social ties are used. In our explanatory model, we specifically focus on the role of offline characteristics in shaping the online environment Web sites, taking into account contextual dimensions as well as organisational factors presuming that offline characteristics matter in explaining the online presence of

First, we examined the degree of Internet connectivity in the chosen nations in order to address the impact of context.8 We anticipated that a wider use of the Internet may account for SMOs increased spending in this platform. Where Internet use is lower, SMOs are more likely to focus just on online advertising rather than making significant investments in other areas of their websites. We also divided all the websites into groups according to the peculiarities of the GJM in each nation. The density and structure of GJM organisational networks tended to differ in the selected countries, leading to two distinct constellations of social movements that, with some qualifications, corresponded to northern and southern Europe, as we noted in other parts of our research. Different network types more polarized in Germany, Switzerland, and to a lesser extent, the UK and organisational structures more horizontal in the first constellation, more vertical in the second as well as different orientations towards unconventional collective action more protest oriented in the first, more lobbying oriented in the second distinguish these two groups.

Regarding organisational traits, attitudes towards the Internet may differ depending on the groups age, as younger, resource-poor organisations that tend to reject conventional politics

may be defined in important ways by their Internet presence, according to Bennett, while more established organisations appear to take a more conservative stance. As certain studies on political parties appear to show, the quantity of resources available to an organisation may allow a more successful use of the Internet. A well-organized, often updated, and interactive website requires a large commitment of resources, despite the fact that it is very simple and cheap to construct one and let it float in cyberspace. Therefore, we anticipate that big and resourceful organisations websites will perform better on the examined dimensions than smaller grass-roots organisations websites. We also anticipate that other organisational characteristics, like horizontality, formalizations, and the geographical level of the group, will have a variety of effects on the quality of Web sites [9], [10].

We examined a few indicators for which we gathered data throughout our study in order to account for the impact of the relevant organisational features. The organizations founding date is a clear measure of its age, and its budget shows the number of resources available. Additionally, the usage of websites may be affected in a path-dependent manner by membership in certain movement regions. We also used the definition of the group as local present in almost one-fifth of cases as an indicator of the territorial scope of the action, the presence of membership fees as an indicator of formalizations, and the absence of leadership roles or equivalent roles responsible for coordinating the activities of the organisation present in almost 70% of the groups. The two key components of our typology of democratic decision-making, participation and deliberation, were also examined.

By summing up the binary indicators used for each of the aforementioned features of Web sites, we constructed five additive indexes for the dependent variables standardized to range from 0 to 1 and examined their reciprocal associations first off, the fact that not all of the indices are connected with one another seems to corroborate that different organisations prefer to concentrate on a subset of the key tasks, picking from a range of strategies rather than being primarily driven by technology. Additionally, we discovered that information sharing is strongly connected to mobilization and identity development. Less hierarchical organisational methods and more dynamic and interactive design are characteristics of websites that do well in these three areas. Transparency is not connected with other aspects of online presence for the reasons well discuss below: websites that rank well in transparency but not in other areas are more likely to be part of hierarchical organisations and be more static and less participatory.

Third, addressing the digital gap is closely connected with both online and offline mobilization. Organisations that do well on both aspects seem to be more focused on empowering individuals by promoting their active participation mobilizing on the streets and online and introducing them to new technology. The Internet is more likely to be used as a tool for offline mobilization in the group of nations that are more protest-oriented and where Internet access is still patchy, according to correlation coefficients between the aforementioned additive indices and contextual characteristics It is more often used for information providing and identity construction in the same nations. The likelihood that the Internet will be used specifically as a tool for promoting transparency or accountability is greater in nations that are more focused on traditional modes of action and where Internet access is more widespread.

Transparency, information supply, and online mobilization are especially well explained by the initial organisational features we took into account. As informal and local groups pay less attention to formal structures, the degree of formalizations and the geographical level of organisations are both connected with the index of transparency. In fact, the existence of a role division is linked to more attention devoted to the creation and dissemination of

information on the Internet. More centralised organisations seem to spend more in information supply. The age of the organisation and the availability of material resources aid in understanding the level of transparency; it should come as no surprise that older and richer organisations are likely to be more open online. In contrast, less formal organisations tend to mobilize online, taking use of this mediums more creative features and using it as a tool to increase their mobilization capabilities. However, organisational qualities do not assist to understand how the Internet is used to bridge the digital divide or spread knowledge about offline mobilizations.

We also examined the relationship between online democracy indices and democratic model characteristics used by the organisations under analysis, such as power distribution assembly vs. executive and decision-making approach majority vs. consensus. It was shown that transparency was adversely connected with less delegation and consensus-based decision-making. This outcome was predicted since younger, less formalized, and resource-poor organisations tend to be more imaginative when it comes to democratic forms. As a consequence, they provide less budget and organisational structure information on their websites. On the other hand, we see that an organisation is more likely to address the digital gap if it gives the leadership less authority. Younger groups formed as part of the cycle of resistance to neoliberal globalisation seem to be more conscious of the danger of exclusion brought on by new technologies and more eager to devote their limited resources to what may be considered the democratic deficit of the Internet.

First, while values of correlations coefficients tend to be significant, we must note that most of them are not very high, as the GJM is a movement of movements, frequently consisting of groups and individuals that belong to other social movements. Therefore, we have controlled for the extent to which movement traditions Old Left, New Left, new global, new social movements, solidarity human rights influence our indexes of online democracy It is clear that the index of openness is adversely correlated with the new global organisations that developed with the advent of the GJM and tend to be less formalised and resource-rich than the norm. SMOs from older movement sectors, such the Old Left mostly political parties and trade unions, solidarity, and new social movements do higher on transparency for the opposite reason. While new international organisations struggle to provide information, they do a better job of leveraging the Internet to mobilize people offline and online.

It might be attributed to their more recent appearance and optimistic outlook on an original and imaginative application of modern technology. The Internet is increasingly actively utilised by SMOs that fall within the category of new social movements in order to build and enhance their online identities. Even little money is spent by solidarity, peace, and human rights organisations online to bridge the digital gap. This information reaffirms the problematic nature of this component, especially in light of the fact that many social movement sectors are primarily focused on increasing mobilization and openness.

Between virtual and real: Some conclusion

The Internet has been hailed as a democratic media in addition to being a new one. Our statistics undoubtedly show that social movement organisations and their participants utilise it extensively, particularly for internal organisational functions and public mobilizations via information-sharing and online and offline protest. The Internet enables the construction of international and cross-issue networks by lowering communication costs. It strengthens several key democratic principles, particularly the opportunities for participation and discourse, by improving internal and external communication. The research of the websites of GJM-affiliated organisations demonstrates the significance of the Internet. However, we

found that SMOs give the different Web potentialities differing amounts of attention. In general, websites are utilised mostly for information dissemination, offline mobilizations, and transparency enhancement. Contrarily, there is a notably restricted use of the Internet for online mobilizations and a lower than anticipated level of interaction as compared to comparable organisations such NGOs, but not in absolute terms.

The organisational and contextual factors contribute to an understanding of the strategic decisions made by SMOs. SMOs often priorities information supply and openness in northern nations while prioritizing identity construction and mobilizations in southern nations as a means of cultural adaptation. Our study supports the idea that actors define the particular goals that must be accomplished via the use of new technology. Deterministic assumptions are questioned by the realization that technology is not a distinct artefact that acts externally to affect social interactions, as Pickerill discovered in study on online environmental activism. In reality, different SMOs often take advantage of various technical advancements, creating websites with unique characteristics. The focus placed on certain traits is encouraged by various circumstances, and organisational models seem to be reflected in the features of websites. Less formalized groups typically use more interactive tools and identity building available online, as well as various forms of computer-mediated protest, in contrast to SMOs oriented towards more formal and hierarchical organisations, which seem to show a more traditional and instrumental use of the Internet.

The many characteristics of the Web sites are influenced by movement traditions as well as democratic ideas. Overall, our data appear to demonstrate a trend of path dependency in the characteristics of Web sites: less resourceful, informal, and younger SMOs tend to develop a more innovative use of the Internet, whereas more resourceful, formal, and older groups tend to use it as a more conventional communication medium. However, further study and empirical data are required to back up this finding. In fact, despite the fact that we discovered that tiny, unconventional organisations are more likely to innovate with new communication technologies, they often underperform on other Internet potentials. Parallel to this, certain official organisations, who often have access to more resources, are not only utilising the Internet as a source of conventional information. How Web site potentials are realized in their actual usage is a crucial subject that is still up for debate.

CONCLUSION

Understanding how website features affect user interaction and conversion rates opens up chances for improving digital marketing tactics and accomplishing organisational goals. Understanding the analysis and development of website characteristics may help you encourage efficient digital marketing, enhance brand perception, and accomplish organisational goals. A more effective online presence may be attained by putting an emphasis on performance optimisation and user-centric design. To sum up, more study in this area is crucial to improving our comprehension of website characteristics and their influence on user experiences and organisational effectiveness. It’s essential to keep up with consumer preferences and technology developments if you want to remain relevant and competitive in the digital environment. Additionally, it is crucial for creating a great user experience for all users to priorities inclusion and accessibility in website design. To create a more profitable, effective, and user-friendly online presence, it is crucial to emphasize the study and growth of website attributes.

REFERENCES:

[1] C. C. Dapas, T. Sitorus, E. Purwanto, en J. J. O. I. Ihalauw, The effect of service quality and website quality of zalora.Com on purchase decision as mediated by purchase intention, *Qual. - Access to Success*, 2019.

[2] A. Giannakoulopoulos, N. Konstantinou, D. Koutsompolis, M. Pergantis, en I. Varlamis, Academic excellence,website quality, SEO performance: Is there a correlation?, *Futur. Internet*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/fi11110242.

[3] J. Garcia-Madariaga, N. Recuero Virto, M. F. Blasco López, en J. Aldas Manzano, Optimizing website quality: the case of two superstar museum websites, *Int. J. Cult. Tour. Hosp. Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.1108/IJCTHR-06-2018-0074.

[4] S. Chauhan, R. Banerjee, en S. Banerjee, The impact of website quality and reputation on purchasing intention towards online shopping, *J. Content, Community Commun.*, 2019, doi: 10.31620/JCCC.12.19/15.

[5] H. Semuel, S. Wijaya, en Devie, The analysis website quality, intention to use the website and behavioral intention nitizen Indonesia batik-tenun traditional products of indonesia, *Int. J. Recent Technol. Eng.*, 2019, doi: 10.35940/ijrte.b1802.078219.

[6] S. Perçin, A combined fuzzy multicriteria decision-making approach for evaluating hospital website quality, *J. Multi-Criteria Decis. Anal.*, 2019, doi: 10.1002/mcda.1671.

[7] A. Satria en O. Trinanda, Pengaruh Promosi dan Website Quality Terhadap Impulse Buying Pada E-Commerce Lazada di Kota Padang, *J. Ecogen*, 2019, doi: 10.24036/jmpe.v2i3.7418.

[8] Y. T. Hung-Joubert en C. Erdis, Influence of retailers website system quality factors on online shopping in South Africa †, *African J. Sci. Technol. Innov. Dev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/20421338.2018.1551754.

[9] D. Karabasevic, D. Stanujkic, M. Maksimovic, G. Popovic, en O. Momcilovic, An approach to evaluating the quality of websites based on the weighted sum preferred levels of performances method, *Acta Polytech. Hungarica*, 2019, doi: 10.12700/APH.16.5.2019.5.11.

[10] F. S. Putra en R. Rahmiati, Pengaruh Website Quality Terhadap Online Booking Intention Dengan Mediasi E-Trust Pada Pengguna Traveloka Di Kota Padang, *J. Ecogen*, 2019, doi: 10.24036/jmpe.v2i2.6147.

CHAPTER 16

THE GENERATIONAL ISSUE: THE IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONS AGE ON VISIONS OF DEMOCRACY

Ameya Ambulkar, Assistant Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email id- ameya@isme.co.in

ABSTRACT:

Age and historical context of organisations may have a big impact on how they see democracy and how they go about implementing democratic values. This study examines how generational variations affect how organisations see governance, participation, and social change. It focuses on how organisations ages affect their conceptions of democracy. Examining how an organizations founding beliefs and early experiences shaped its democratic ideals and practises, the research digs into the historical history of organisations. It looks at how newer organisations, created in the era of social activism and internet connectedness, handle democratic involvement differently from more established, older organisations. The study also looks at how organisations lobbying activities, policy goals, and inclusion in decision-making are affected by generational viewpoints. In order to evaluate an organizations relevance and adaptability in a world that is changing quickly, it is essential to comprehend the effect of an organizations age on its democratic aspirations. The research also emphasises how this information may be used to promote more effective and inclusive government, democratic practises, and intergenerational communication.

KEYWORDS:

Democracy, Generational Differences, Governance, Organizational Age, Social Change.

INTRODCUTION

According to organisations active in the global justice mobilizations, new forms of transnational collective involvement are being developed, and they are suggesting creative methods for organizing, battling, conversing, and being together. According to this perspective, the Global Justice Movement is innovative in terms of organisational structure. A critical critique of this viewpoint is offered in many books. They stress the importance of the national origins of the global justice mobilizations and the intricacy of the link between the local and global levels. In fact, presidential victory on the French mobilizations in the 1980s must be taken into account in order to fully comprehend the rise of the GJM in France. in addition to a focus on the personal trajectories of trade unionists and activists in the late 1980s and early 1990s Similar to this, analysis of the rise of global justice mobilizations in Germany does not just focus on transnational l variables such uprising, but also emphasises the effects of the reunification process on the German protest scene [1], [2].

Furthermore, the concepts of local and global should not be mutually exclusive.] Indeed, mobilizations global can produce local. Trans nationalization is really a polysemic term that refers to at least three distinct processes: the spreading of new difficulties, the internationalisation of domestically organised demands, and the externalisation of global stakes.

Such criteria allow us to put two perceptions at a distance from one another. According to certain economists and activists, the globalisation of capitalism inevitably results in international forms of resistance. The network nature of capitalism also explains why protest is often and drawn to ideals like openness, consensus, and horizontality. Such analysis has to

be qualified: ATTAC and Peoples Global Action are notable exceptions to the rule that organisations involved in alter mondialiste mobilizations are rarely centres around transnational claims, whereas research on US social movements throughout the twentieth century demonstrates the long history of consensus-driven and horizontal forms of organisation. However, one shouldn't take these observations as a reason to fully discount the likelihood that the GJM and its organisations would develop new characteristics and a true transnational interaction. In fact, a lot of players in modern movements identify as part of the, which represents more than just a name but also a shared microculture or identity principle. The DEMOS interviews will be used in this chapter to highlight these concerns.

We will discuss generational disparities within our organisations in order to explore how time affects the organisational aspect of the global justice mobilizations including its democratic aspects and ideas. Here, well consider whether these organisations really put their purported novelty and transnationality into action by implementing specific guidelines and strategies that would make a movement out of the jumble of Social Forums, counter-summits, campaigns, and other global justice social activities [3], [4]. As the GJM is based more on the bloc recruitment of already-existing organisations, movements, and networks than it is on the direct enlistment of people, focusing on the organisational component and the role of age is especially crucial. The debate over innovative principles or new democratic forms, on the one hand, and the existence of many different organisations founded at various times ranging from trade unions founded in the late nineteenth century to affinity groups lasting only as long as a protest against the 2007 G8 summit, make the issue of organisational generations far from a peripheral one.

The meaning of age

According to our viewpoint, age is either associated with innovation and change, or stability. As a result, it is difficult to define precisely what age implies for an organisation. The meaning of age, which may be seen from numerous angles, cannot be resolved by analysing the effects of an organizations age on its practises and values. On the one hand, the study may be tied into the idea that social movements and actors change through time as they gain knowledge from their errors and work to avoid making the same ones again. This is because newly formed organisations take into account the triumphs and failures of earlier ones.

The innovations made with reference to and in contrast to prior experience may be connected to differences between the newest elements of the mobilizations on global justice and the oldest players engaging in them. On the other hand, it is important to note that each collective body goes through many stages of growth. For instance, youth may be a safeguard against institutionalization, routinization, and the loss of radicalism or, conversely, a contributor to political naiveté. The fact that not all organisations go through the same stage of growth at the same time might be used to explain differences. Therefore, while examining how age affects an organizations characteristics, claims, and practises, it is important to bear in mind that age has several meanings. We built a relevant periodization using the year that the organisations in our sample were founded in order to operationalize our notion of age. Thus, we identified four phases. The old organisations were established in the first. The 68 global mobilizations mark the end of this era since 1968 may be seen as a turning point in both the social and political spheres. The worker's movement was the dominant, if not the only, social force during the time when organisations were founded. Trade unions often had close links to left-leaning political parties, and its hierarchical, delegation-based structure required that the majority of members elect representatives to different levels of the organisation. However, not all of these old organisations are unions or political parties; numerous charitable

organisations, whether or not they are religious, were founded around the start of the nineteenth century [5], [6].

Organisations established after 1968, on the other hand, were interpreted in terms of new social movements, or cultural movements, which contested the organisation of production rather than challenging the societal foundations. The second period, which started in 1969 and lasted until the fall of the Berlin Wall, is a complex one. While worker mobilizations and strikes decreased as a result of the economic crisis of the 1970s, the so-called new social movements stabilised organizationally and were able to spread their demands. various socialist activists have utilised political violence in various European nations. Again, regional differences matter. For example, in the 1980s, François Mitterrands rise to power in France on the basis of a programme commun endorsed by socialists and communists did not have the same effect on social movements as Margaret Thatcher's neoliberal policies did in the UK.

The year 1989 may be seen as a significant global turning point since the collapse of the Berlin Wall ushered in a time of suspicion of ideologies and speculation about the end of history. Social movements distanced themselves from political parties as a result of being obliged to reevaluate the function and political significance of the communist parties. The Battle of Seattle brings to a close the time period when the collapse of the Berlin Wall began. The demonstrations against the WTO Millennium Round that were organized in 1999 by many informal networks of activists might be seen as the mediatic first act of the mobilisations on global justice. Furthermore, these events are crucial to the activist ideal since they were horizontally organised, often by a small number of activists, and heavily reliant on the Internet Barlow and Clarke 2002. In some analyses, the Internet has even been compared to the World Wide Web as an essential instrument for creating a global civil society. However, its crucial to keep in mind that global issue mobilisations did not start during or after the Seattle demonstrations. Although they only became widespread and all-encompassing in 1999, such mobilisations really date back to the early 1970s.

The distribution of the organisations under study during the four eras is as follows. According to the combined database, 14% of the organisations were founded before to 1968, followed by 19.9% between 1969 and 1989, 35.6% between 1990 and 1999, and 30.5 in or after 2000. We arrive at some conclusions on the trans nationalization of the newest groupings by looking at the spatial scales that organisations operate on. In fact, compared to previous organisations, those founded during the GJMs expansion 2000 and after are less likely to encompass worldwide levels: Only 38% of the most recent organisations have an international component, compared to 51.5% of those formed before 1968 although these later groups are often transnationally linked via networks. The national level has seen the same downward trend, going from 97.5% of organisations founded before 1968 to 64.5% of those founded in 2000 and after. However, Tilly 1986 has identified this most recent time as the most significant period for national protests. This final decade, however, is not the sole phase of denationalization; 21.4% of the organisations created between 1968 and 1989 had no national level. In contrast to younger organisations, which tend to be more drawn to smaller scales or more enmeshed in local activities, older organisations have the most multilayer structures, which are present primarily at all levels.

DISCUSSION

Organizations age and practices of democracy

It is possible to study the interior dimensions in terms of prefiguration**.** The label prefigurative has remained popular as a way to describe movement groups whose internal structure is characterised by a minimal division of labour, decentralised authority, and an

egalitarian ethos and whose decision-making is direct and consensus oriented: organisations can shape their claims and test alternative practises while engaging in concrete forms of direct democracy. In fact, the GJM has made allegations pertaining to democratic problems. Its participants work to make democracy more effective, direct, participatory, or transparent. However, they have focused on more than just these assertions and demands; the topic of democracy in the movement has been and is still being explored in workshops conducted at Social Forums, neighborhood meetings held in squats, and unofficial gatherings held at counter-summits.

Delegation

The horizontality of the Global Justice Movement has been noted. Its participants have made an effort to stay away from representative systems in favors of more direct forms of democracy, with delegation being in opposition to participation. Their activists have emphasised reticulitis and openness via public gatherings and affinity groupings. Their structure is often project-driven a project being, for example, a mobilization or a campaign. In reticular universes, projects may be regarded as the element around which cooperation will crystallize before becoming horizontally engaged. By examining several indicators connected to certain characteristics of our organisations, we may examine the degree of reticulitis and, inversely, hierarchy. Each of these factors influences how reticular GJM organisations are, and vice versa, how hierarchical they are.

Delegations may be monitored using a variety of factors, including how transparent the decision-making process is and how institutionalized the division of labour is by the presence of an executive committee. A group may assign decision-making authority to a representative body as several labour unions or federations often do. On the other hand, it may opt to exclude outsiders from its meetings entirely or even open the decision-making process to all of its members. In this way, we may assess the possible impacts of generation on group democratic practises using two variables from our survey with representatives of GJM organisations. addresses who is permitted to participate in group assemblies decision-making procedures delegates only, any group member, or any individual present at the meeting; the second focuses on the existence of an executive committee [7], [8].

Organisations that are relatively new 50 percent of the sampled organisations support transparency. In fact, it is evident that the more recent an organisation is, the more open it is: while no organisations founded before 1968 permit whoever wants to join to participate in the decision-making process, this is the case in 4.9% and 19.0% of those founded between 1969 and 1989 and 1990 to 1999, respectively. This openness may only be seen as a formal declaration when considering the actual operations of organisations. In fact, non-constitutional mechanisms can tend to close the entry, even if it is intended to be open to everyone. Friendship and affinity groups, as well as the lack of public notice of meetings, can limit attendance to the most active members, effectively excluding potential participants as effectively as, for example, requiring a membership card. delegation; just 11.7% of them describe delegates as the decision-makers. Organisations founded before to 1968, on the other hand, support delegation 577.7% describe delegates as the decision-makers at assemblies. The proportion of organisations placing members at the core of their decision-making process stays consistent if openness rises throughout the course of the four periods.

Indicators of a certain organizations democratic practises include the traits of its assemblies and the way they make decisions. A system may be chosen by groups in which only a certain subset of members is in responsibility of carrying out the choices made in assemblies. This may result in the professionalization of contestation, the effects of which have been examined

in numerous studies, some of which have highlighted its contributions to the resurgence of protest. However, groups with different sensibilities may choose not to return to a specialised body if they see flatness as a method to strengthen democracy. Here, it is clearly true that, at least when using an official executive committee to split the job, the younger the organisation, the more it resists specialization or division. In fact, just 42.2% of the most recent organisations had such a committee, compared to 90.3% of the older organisations down from 82.2% in the second and 73.5% in the third era. In addition, all organisations from the first three decades had an executive committee present at high levels; only in the most recent time are there more organisations without an executive committee than organisations with one.

The nature of organisations created after 1999, which have a tendency to be built around open assemblies as the sole venue for discourse and decision-making, may be used to explain these disparities. However, the young age of the organisations may also be a factor in their horizontality since they may still be small enough to function without an executive committee. In a similar vein, they lack the funding necessary to establish an executive committee. Indeed, as indicated by Polletta, one objective in the creation of the consensus approach is to provide places for discourses, which justifies members continued participation. Through this continued participation, holding more meetings is a method to strengthen the groups cohesiveness outside of the decision-making process.

It is possible to encourage participants to be often engaged in the group by refusing to formally establish a group in charge of the daily run-up. This involves a significant time investment, but when fledgling organisations mobilize to build the bonds among its members, time may become a resource in this situation. Young organisations are still at a period when the goal, project, and guiding principles need to be addressed since they are not always properly stabilized, seen from the same viewpoint. It is crucial to include all members in these talks as a result. In fact, it may be said that participation is all the more important for collective actors that have little material incentives to distribute and must therefore gain and maintain the commitment of their members on the basis of shared beliefs [9].

Decision-making method

One of the characteristics of the GJM has been identified as consensus, which is connected to the preference for reticular types of organisations. The variety of the entities engaged makes it challenging to come to an agreement on voting methods; some propose the notion of one organization-one vote, while others propose one member-one vote. However, it most importantly satisfies activists yearning to foreshadow the future they fight for. According to this viewpoint, consensus is preferable to more traditional organisational structures that priorities hierarchy and majority rule. agreement is less attractive to older organisations, whereas only 14.8% of organisations founded before 1968 make decisions by agreement, 24.4% of organisations founded between 1969 and 1989.

The majority of organisations founded after 1990 55,4% of those born between 1990 and 1999, and 66,1% of those founded after 2000 adopt consensus decision-making. But reciprocity is not always apparent: starting in 1990, organisations founded between 1969 and 1989 tend to vote more often than other organisations. Up until 1990, the usage of the majority vote remained mostly consistent, but the use of consensus grew with time. Consensus may be attracted to as a direct result of transparency since when delegation is prohibited, no one can speak for anybody else. Therefore, only those who are in attendance at the assembly may make choices.

Openness of the group and the meaning of membership

The groups transparency and what membership means the new forms of democracy's allure to openness would be one of its defining characteristics. Networks are designed to grow, or to link ever-more knots. For instance, the World Social Forums Charter of Principles makes unambiguous reference to this objective. A number of social science studies have contrasted more modern forms of participation, characterised by their flexibility and fluidity, with older ones, whose major characteristics would include the significance of activist's personal involvement, stability of membership through time, and formalizations of engagement. Collective identities are seen to be less stable and more prone to change. Organizationally, this would result in various membership connections. This section will focus on how organisations define membership using three different indicators: first, groups can declare themselves to be open to recruiting members, which would mean that they would distinguish between those who are members and those who are not; second, groups can formalize membership through cards or choose informality; third, membership can be free or, on the other hand, be linked to fees, which could become a valuable financial resource for the group.

Finally, we will concentrate on another important aspect of our groups: do they include just individuals or, on the other hand, only groups? Or do they adopt a hybrid nature that accepts both people and groups? Reticular universes place a high priority on variety and strive towards greater openness when it comes to other people's abilities to join in assembly. Here, well examine how the idea of openness manifests itself in our interactions with the group's members in more detail. A organisations declaration that membership is impossible really indicates that the group does not distinguish between members and outsiders. More often than more contemporary organisations, those founded before 1989 announce that they are open to membership. Additionally, shutting membership is only a possibility in the third generation of organisations those founded after 1990: 13% of the organisations founded between 1990 and 1999 say they have no members. With this percentage increasing to 23.4% in the most recent generation, the proportion increases among the youngest organisations.

Organisations founded after 2000 typically reject the whole idea of membership in favors of opening their meetings to everybody. This is also related to the distinctive culture of certain horizontal networks, which are averse to membership-based thinking. A noteworthy example is the French Integralities Network, which was established to coordinate the G8 counter-summit organisations in 2003. Jacques Ion suggested in his analysis of contemporary activism 2005 that one does not become an activist because of membership but rather because one participates in a group's activities. Membership is not based on declaration and recognition but rather on participation. As a result, its activists do not think of themselves as members but rather as participants in the group's activities.

Formalizing membership is uncommon; just 28.7% of organisations say they provide membership cards to their members. This assertion runs counter to a prevalent understanding of membership that was likely derived from the structure of working-class political parties communist, socialist, or social democratic or labour unions. To identify long-time members from new ones, new members were given a card when they joined, which was often numbered. Even in more contemporary organisations, this symbolic quality still has a place. Open letters and emails, for instance, were sometimes signed with the contributor's name and credit card number during the ATTAC France issue; the smaller the number, the more credibility it was meant to convey.

Less than one-third of the organisations claim formalizing membership, which should cause academics to reevaluate an entire period of activism history that was built on the paradigm of

working-class movement. In actuality, informality predominates even in older organizations the purportedly most classical as just 40% of them admit to delivering cards to members. In the most recent eras, this percentage drops to a relatively low 10.4% for organisations founded in 2000 and after, with 37.8% of organisations formalizing membership in the second period and 30.9% in the third.

In reality, formalizing closure need not result in closeness' the contrary, by making it obvious what the limits of organisations are, it may promote transparency. Declaring who is in and out also necessitates clearly expressing how to join, how one may join or depart, lose membership, or be rejected. Engagement may remain flexible and plastic even when there is little formalisation. The examination of feminist movements by Jo Freeman has shown the negative impact that lack of structure has on group effectiveness and democracy. The absence of formalisation, according to her, does not imply that all members are equal; rather, it means that the structure and, therefore, the distribution of power, remain implicit. This may cause issues when organisations want to expand their membership or when they decide to take part in other political activities in addition to raising awareness of a particular issue such as the oppression of women, for example Freeman, 1970.

In fact, according to Mathieu 2008, the most formal procedures very often enable the achievement of a always relative equality in participation and handling. Again, the Integralities network serves as an excellent illustration of how a lack of apparent structure affects a groups openness. In it, the phrase becoming a member simply refers to signing up for the groups mailing list, where activities are discussed. Co-optation is the basis for membership; unlike trade unions, members of the organisation do not actively seek out new members; rather, they co-opt people who approach them and express an interest in joining. Additionally, joining might be challenging since relationships that are initially weak in a horizontal network increase as a result of the group's activities, which can quickly start to become more selective. For instance, no new members have joined the email list of the Integralities network since 2006. It might be difficult for newcomers to understand how to participate in the group's activities if members choose not to differentiate between insiders and outsiders. Formalizing membership also affects the resources available to organisations since it might be either free or fee-based. If we take a look at paid dues, we can affirm that there is a trend for informal activity to grow. Through the whole time under consideration, there is a very obvious evolution: the percentage of membership without paid dues begins at 9.7% for organisations started before 1968, rises to 24.1% for those founded between 1990 and 1999, and falls to 52.1% for those founded after 1999.

CONCLUSION

Understanding how organisations ages affect their conceptions of democracy presents chances to promote intergenerational conversation and improve democratic procedures. Initiatives for governance and social change might benefit from embracing many viewpoints and cutting-edge methodologies. Studying organisations ages and democratic aspirations may provide insights that might be used to advance more effective and inclusive governance. Democratic institutions may be strengthened by promoting cooperation between various generations. In conclusion, further study in this area is necessary to advance our understanding of how the age of organisations affects democratic visions. Addressing today's issues and promoting inclusive government require bridging generational gaps and accepting multiple viewpoints. Promoting intergenerational communication may also help keep democratic institutions strong and relevant. To achieve a more inclusive, dynamic, and participative democratic environment, it is essential to emphasise the influence of an organizations age on democratic visions.

REFERENCES:

[1] E. A. Abade *et al.*, All of a sudden, the Giants have bash and flash., *PLoS One*, 2019.

[2] T. Kössler, Republic of hope and fear: Visions of democracy in pre-Civil War Spain, *Journal of Modern European History*. 2019. doi: 10.1177/1611894418820246.

[3] P. Sekhsaria en N. Thayyil, Technology vision 2035 visions, technologies, democracy and the citizen in India, *Econ. Polit. Wkly.*, 2019.

[4] E. Peruzzotti, Post-liberal and Post-populist Democracy: Rethinking Democratic Representation, *Chinese Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s41111-019-00123-3.

[5] J. Gastil en T. Davies, Digital Democracy: Episode IV—A New Hope*: How a Corporation for Public Software Could Transform Digital Engagement for Government and Civil Society, *arXiv*. 2019.

[6] E. M. Fox, Should Chinas Competition Model be Exported?: A Reply to Wendy Ng, *Eur. J. Int. Law*, 2019, doi: 10.1093/ejil/chaa010.

[7] Y. Sozen, Populist Peril to Democracy: The Sacralization and Singularization of Competitive Elections, *Polit. Stud. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1478929918814613.

[8] D. Yanow en P. Schwartz-Shea, Political Science as History A Reflexive Approach, in *Interpretation and Method*, 2019. doi: 10.4324/9781315703275-27.

[9] J. T. Dalton en A. Logan, A Vision for a Dynamic World: Reading Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy for Today, *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3418511.

CHAPTER 17

GENERATION AND INSTITUTIONAL INTERACTIONS IN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS: AN ANALYSIS

Yukti Khajanchi, Assistant Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email id- yukti@isme.co.in

ABSTRACT:

The various experiences and viewpoints of several generations influence social movements. This study intends to investigate how interactions with institutions within social movements are influenced by generational cohorts. The research examines the effects of age-related variables on various generations activism and advocacy tactics, including historical occurrences, cultural influences, and technology developments. It looks at how young activists may challenge powerful institutions and advance creative strategies for social change. The study also looks at how senior citizens influence institutional structures and social movements by sharing their knowledge and expertise. For evaluating the changing character of social movements and the possibility for intergenerational cooperation, it is essential to comprehend generation dynamics and interactions with institutions. The research also emphasises how this information may be used to promote inclusion, intergenerational communication, and group effectiveness in social change initiatives.

KEYWORDS:

Activism, Advocacy, Generational Cohorts, Institutional Interactions, Social Movements.

INTRODUCTION

Institutional relationships are intricately crafted by GJM organisations. These groups do make an effort to connect global and local concerns We won't end this chapter without analysing this relationship as reported by the representatives of the organisations included in our sample because, , surprisingly little attention has been paid to interaction between social movements and the state. Organisations founded before to 1968 67.7% and between 1968 and 1989 59.1% engage with local institutions the most on a proportionate basis. Path dependence is refuted by the fact that organisations founded in 1968 who at the time fervently supported their autonomy now regularly work with regional political authorities. Only 34.4% of organisations created in the most recent era collaborate, suggesting that connections with local public institutions may be affected by the organization's recent formation. Nevertheless, this has to be placed into context since, despite their recent existence 2000 and beyond, only 14.8% reject partnership. The fact that many organisations announce a critical or selective partnership depending on the kind of authority, the thematic focus, and/or the political leanings of the local institutions should also be emphasized [1], [2].

When examining relationships with public institutions at the national level, similar findings are found: the GJM organisations work with national institutions more when they are older and less when they are younger. However, just 19% of the newest organisations say they won't work together, and only 23.8% say they don't care about institutions. In fact, it is apparent that organisations are less apathetic about institutional cooperation the older they are. Finally, the distribution is the same when analysing relationships with public institutions on a global scale: the more organisations interact, the older they are. One should also take notice that the unwillingness to cooperate remains steady, at little over 9%, over the three time periods before to 2000 before 1968, 1969-89, and 1990-99. On the other hand, it rises to 21% for organisations founded after 1999.

Therefore, regardless of the institutions size local, national, or worldwide, organisations belonging to the same generation have rather constant views about institutions. This is unmistakably the case, for instance, with resistance to cooperate, which is rather consistent regardless of degree and never varies by more than 5% within the same generation. The institutions profile is more significant to organisations. The scale is not a sufficient factor to determine whether to partner with an institution, according to representatives of various French organisations. They noted that they would not view UNESCO and the World Bank similarly, or the Ministry of Social Affairs and the Ministry of the Interior. According to a French Foundation Copernic executive committee member we spoke with, it depends on the proximity of the institutional actors to the association the State is plural. It is hard to provide a blanket statement other than to say that we have good relationships with certain institutions similar to the Foundation Copernic's principles but none with neo-liberal organisations.

We should also think about adopting a more accommodating mindset that accepts lobbying and pressure in order to achieve tangible outcomes on particular topics rather than steadfastly defending universal ideological beliefs. Additionally, engagement in advisory authorities is often a supplement to mobilizations and protest action depending on the administrations, governments, and themes. There is no reason to think that protest and traditional political activity should be replacements, with organisations giving up the former as they grow capable of using the latter, as Jack Goldstone observes. While certain groups may sometimes be more in, meaning that they are more in line with and integrated with the institutional authority, other groups may occasionally be more out. Thus, the dynamics of protest and a groups incorporation into institutionalized politics are intricately linked.

Generally speaking, we may see a rising trend towards critical cooperation or involvement in advisory bodies as being focused on regulating public institutions. Through supervision, opposition, and evaluation, the goal is then to make sure that elected officials fulfil their promises, and to find ways to maintain the initial demand of a service for the common good in this active disobedience. However, when it comes to how the group evaluates the effects of trials with participatory public decision making, generational differences have relatively little of an influence. Regardless of the age of origin, about 20% of organisations feel that such trials do not increase the quality of political choices, while around 40% think that they do The stances of the other organisations are not well established [3], [4].

The organisational elements of global justice mobilizations have a variety of practises and traits. Consensual decision-making is used less often in older organisations than in more recent ones. While more modern organisations tend to eschew delegation in favors of horizontal forms of involvement, these older groupings are nevertheless drawn to it. Similarly, successive generations have varied ideas about what it means to belong. Age affects how people relate to organisations because it affects the geographic areas that a particular organisation serves. When discussing the concept of the Global Justice Movement as a whole, these distinctions matter. Even if there are disparities, it is not impossible to organize the diverse group of players participating into a movement. But it forces us to characterise this movement in terms of its diversity, adaptability, and the pragmatic alliances that its participants forge thanks to a shared democratic microculture. According to this viewpoint, cooperation for time-limited enterprises like campaigns evolves around common ideals. Indeed, the increase of ad hoc campaigns and the collapse of single group are accompanied by these project-driven organisations.

As a result, the differences between organisations from different generations may be related to shifts in how political projects and perspectives are conceptualized: organisations themselves have a tendency to be increasingly defined by their activities and projects rather

than by their collective and conscious identities. This redefining of borders seems to be a key novelty of more modern organisations, whose definitions of limits tend to differ from those of earlier models: openness to and aversion towards centralization are strengthened by an attraction to consensus-driven decision-making procedures. However, informality and the intention of openness do not imply that this openness is consistently materialized.

Contrarily, informality might preserve obstacles while making them more difficult to recognised and, thus, to get around. As our poll has shown, organisations that place a strong emphasis on open assemblies may also refuse to discriminate between members and non-members since their definition of membership differs from that of more established organisations. Again, membership will become centres on ad hoc viewpoints and particular initiatives, driven as much by shared affinities as by objective and strategic partnerships. This isn't only the outcome of a wise decision made by the founders of more recent organisations who refused to repeat the mistakes of their forebears. By definition, younger organisations are less institutionalized than older ones. They must overcome a paucity of physical resources, therefore they innovate to mobilize other resources that are more easily accessible [5], [6].

Ad-hoc coalitions may in fact be quite important. Our investigation has shown that the organisations taking part in the global justice mobilizations do not have the same views on democracy. They thus tend to coalesce behind particular campaigns rather than broad ideological ideas very fluidly. The form of this container is flexible enough to accept organisations with various democratic practises while yet upholding shared democratic expectations and claims. As a result, it provides a highly effective setting for the exchange of various resources, allowing, for example, younger organisations to take part in global mobilizations. In this sense, the organisations that take part in global justice mobilizations directly anticipate diverse types of democracy.

DISCUSSION

Crossing Borders: Transnational Activism in European Social Movements

The Global Justice Movement GJM has been a significant player on the world political scene since the late 1990s. A rising number of cross-border mobilizations on a variety of international topics including justice, peace, and democracy have been effectively organized by it. How was it possible for this spike in international activism? This chapter examines the intricate forces, both internal and external to social movements, that have made global concerns the focal point of transnational activity in European nations as well as everywhere else in the globe. In this chapter, we aim to identify the key sources and dynamics of transnational activism as well as the characteristics of the organisations of major European countries that are most active in cross-border mobilizations. The rest of the book discusses the visions and actions of GJMOs and their conceptions and practises of democracy as a fundamental element of their cross-border mobilizations. The relevant literature is examined in the next part, which also examines the conceptual frameworks used and studies of the causes and processes of cross-border mobilizations. The final part examines the GJM organisations polled for the DEMOS project in terms of the contentious topics, levels, and types of international action. In the fourth part, a quantitative study is conducted to investigate the key factors influencing international action. Several results are then offered.

The dynamics of transnational contention

Social movement literature has historically focused on the connections between domestic political processes and state authority when addressing contested politics in national settings.

A technique like this has lately been used to several cross-border mobilizations. A first group of studies looked into the development of particular locally or nationally based campaigns that also had some cross-border components, such as access to or provision of information, resources, support, or political alliances with activist organisations and occasionally also institutions of other nations. Common examples include North-South solidarity actions on development, child labour, popular economy projects, and so forth; assistance with the defence of human rights against oppressive governments, aiding indigenous peoples, and so forth; and environmental issues climate change, the building of dams, the preservation of forests, and so forth. In these studies, the internal conflict often centres on the choices, actions, or attitudes of national governments, sometimes in response to pressure from supranational organisations, more potent nations, or international companies. National mobilizations fought such policies, often relying on networks with experience dealing with the same external forces and able to forge connections beyond the nation.

The benefits of transnational connections for domestic mobilizations and proposed that a boomerang effect might be at play when national activism gains from ties to global social movements or institutional actors in the pursuit of domestic political change. The defence of human rights may be the most straightforward instance in which disagreement centres on a single government action - the option of oppressive regimes to ratify internationally recognised human rights accords, or to prohibit abuses or noncompliance by its authorities. The arrangement of political actors, and the context of interaction are still primarily influenced by national factors in this case, even though a transnational dimension has been introduced. A second line of research has focused on movements in opposition to or favors of supranational organisations, such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organisation, or the International Criminal Court. In these situations, international activism plays a significant role and is often coordinated by vast networks of movements or organisations spread over several nations. The multilayered structure of governance of certain concerns, including trade, finance, development, and crimes against humanity, is the subject of contention.

While the importance of most national governments diminishes, social movements engage in conflict over the choices, policies, and actions of supranational organisations, which are significantly influenced by the most powerful state players, such as the US and the EU. In actuality, disagreements at the national level often centre on the governments limited role in the development of a worldwide consensus and the effects that international choices will have on the nation, including the necessary policy responses. In these situations, the complex systems of governance governing these concerns are inherently reflected in the structure of political opportunity, the arrangement of political players, and the environment of interaction. However, rather than social movement dynamics, these studies have generally concentrated on issues with global governance, international relations and political economy, or civil society involvement; a transnational perspective on contentious politics and social movements has not yet been articulated in this literature.

A third line of more focused research has focused on the emergence of the Global Justice Movement, which was exemplified by the 1999 Seattle WTO protest, the spread of continental and world social forums, and the 15 February 2003 Global Day of Protest against US war preparations against Iraq. The distinctive feature of these mobilizations is their emphasis on global concerns, despite the fact that they include a broad range of activities, from locally or nationally based ones to campaigns on supranational organisations. These mobilizations are somewhat similar in that they share three fundamental traits. First, the fact that multilevel government is usually ingrained with globally significant disputed concerns.

Second, new models for global mobilizations have arisen, based on global campaigns and cross-border networks. Third, it seems that these movements are being accompanied by the emergence of new identities that are conscious of global responsibilities, accepting of variety, and capable of forging broad coalitions.

The originality of tactics and action repertoires is another factor. GJMOs commonly deploy both radical scale and paradigm adjustments in simultaneously. However, similar processes have often been seen in national settings of social movements that have grown quickly, therefore they do not seem to be unique to the GJM. In these mobilization's, the domestic settings of dispute maintain their importance but as a component of a larger, global problem; the global and national or local elements are both present from the outset and mirror the multidimensional structure of governance. Therefore, it has been discovered that there are still regional distinctions in movements cultural perspectives, political chances, and action repertoires.

All three strategies emphasize certain aspects of the process while addressing the novelty of global mobilizations. However, they often come to different conclusions about the crucial elements of the study of transnational movements. As with the first of the methods outlined above, some writers emphasize the continuity between national and transnational mobilizations. This result, however, is hard to square with the situations covered by the second study viewpoint, where mobilizations originate around multilayer political and governance institutions and major conflict dynamics occur on a global scale. The variety and uniqueness of these mobilizations have made it difficult to develop an acceptable conceptual framework for global disagreement, which limits the second category of works [7], [8]. The examination of transnational activism, which starts with the growth of different sorts of cross-border mobilizations, is an attempt in this regard. While examining the linkages between non-state actors, states, and international politics as well as the impacts of transnational activism on social actors, their claims, and tactics, it does not explore the causes of such mobilizations in the first place.

The approach emphasising the Global Justice Movement seems to be a potential viewpoint for creating an acceptable multilayered framework for global contentious politics, moving beyond its conception of global concerns. The purpose of this chapter, which builds on the literature discussed above, is to advance knowledge of the factors that influence the transnational activism associated with the Global Justice Movement by highlighting GJM organisations in Europe and illuminating the dynamics of global or multilevel conflict. With a variety of hypotheses that will be put to the test in the empirical analysis of the following sections, we analyse the significance of the elements mentioned above as important aspects of GJM mobilizations. The first is the variety of the global issues they tackle, which are in various ways characterised by political opportunity structures shaped by multilevel systems of governance, by political actor configurations centres on global networks and institutions, and by cross-border contexts of interaction.

Therefore, we may anticipate that the significance of transnational activism will increase in proportion to how strongly the problem at stake is transnational particularly in the circumstances of commerce, finance, and development, and perhaps in the cases of peace and environmental concerns. The second trait relates to elements that social movements have inside them, particularly their organisational structures. We have previously argued that transnational networks of social organisations and movements have played a significant and new role in mobilizations on global concerns. There is no denying that having more resources may lead to more sustained transnational activism, even though such coalitions have largely helped make cross-border activism possible for small organisations or activist groups with

little resources of all kinds: staff, knowledge, finance, experience, etc. So, it stands to reason that GJM organisations with more resources, membership in networks or campaigns, or both may be linked to a higher level of global involvement.

Third, it's important to think about the complicated issue of identities. It is probable that both people and organisations will need to be highly motivated to mobilize on global problems, which may be seen even by activists as being far from daily concerns and local conflict. We may anticipate that a group identity that is substantially based on engagement in such global concerns may be connected with a larger involvement of organisations in transnational activism both as a consequence of and as a contributing factor. The employment of tactics and action repertoires by the organisations is a fourth aspect that has to be investigated. As was already said, it is difficult to distinguish the GJM from other national social movements in this area, thus no definitive explanation can be put up. The permanence of national features, which are anchored in variations in national political settings, opportunity structures, and movement cultures, should also not be overlooked, as was noted above and shown in the country studies. These elements are empirically studied in the following sections.

The empirical findings presented in this chapter is based on the DEMOS project survey of 210 organisations, of which 210 were involved in diverse global concerns and 85% were national organisations from France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, and the UK.8Here, we focus our attention on data that is important for illuminating the characteristics and forces that shape international activity. The four factors problems, organisational structures, identity, and tactics that are anticipated to have an impact on cross-border mobilizations involvement are described first. Second, we look at several global activism movements and provide a composite metric for gauging their influence on GJMO activity [9], [10].

The factors that influence global activism

The first topic to be covered relates to the global points of dispute that have shaped particular cross-border mobilizations within the GJM. The primary areas of focus for the organisations examined are eight main categories of global issues: The following topics are covered by the GJM:

1. Democracy and human rights.
2. World economic issues.
3. Development, international solidarity, and cooperation.
4. Environment.
5. Peace.
6. Social, citizenship, and labour rights.
7. Media and think tanks connected to the gjm.
8. Political parties, political organisations, and trade unions taking part in the GJM.

The Appendix contains a thorough explanation of the actions included in these concerns as well as instances of relevant organisations. The distribution of the organisations examined among various activist fields. Political organisations and labour unions are the most well-represented field; other important areas include democracy and human rights, social, citizenship, and labour rights; they are followed by media think tanks, development and cooperation, and international economic concerns. The least prevalent problems among the organisations surveyed are those related to peace and the environment.

Different levels of national or international activity define these concerns. Even when they are linked to GJM mobilization's, national political organisations, parties, and unions, as well as media and think tanks, are deeply rooted in domestic opportunities and contexts and tend

to focus the majority of their activism at the national level. In the case of social and labour rights, since initiatives for their preservation are often carried out within particular national settings, a similar direction might be anticipated. It should come as no surprise that we discover that these activities are more common among national organisations and are mostly irrelevant to transnational organisations. Contrarily, as was previously said, the global aspect of the dispute is more important when it comes to global economic difficulties, as well as development and cooperation areas where transnational organisations are more prevalent than usual. The importance of transnational activism will therefore depend on the stance of the particular organisations surveyed. Democracy and human rights, peace, and environmental issues all share a strong global nature and significant contention with national governments, who have major decision-making power on such matters.

The second factor to be taken into account is to organisational structure, including the kind of organisation and the quantity of its resources. The organisations included in this research are equally split between single organisations and networks or campaigns. The former are more prevalent among national groupings and are often made up of media/think tanks, parties/trade unions, while the latter are networks or campaigns. The latter, which predominates among multinational organisations, tend to address problems related to global democracy and global economics in particular. The capacity of networks and campaigns to accommodate variety and adapt to various sociopolitical settings, fusing a practical constraint with a demand for local autonomy and plurality, is related with this outcome. Size of the organisation is probably a key factor in cross-border activity. In order to address complex global concerns, significant financial resources and specialised individuals are often required. Networks and campaigns have lower budgets and fewer paid employees, while organisations with greater budgets often the older ones typically have more paid personnel and volunteers.

More over 90% of the groups polled said they believe themselves to be a part of the GJM in response to the DEMOS surveys third question, which asks about the identification of GJM organisations. The fourth factor relates to organisations action plans and toolkits. Nearly 90% of the organisations questioned used political education and awareness-raising as a method, followed by protest and alternative promotion 75% and lobbying 50%. The use of numerous techniques in this context is a crucial trait: In order to make an influence on a multilevel system of governance and transnational opportunity structures, 70% of the studied groups use a multi-focus approach comprising three or four strategies. More techniques are used when there are more budgets.

CONCLUSION

Promoting intergenerational cooperation and inclusion in social change initiatives may benefit from the information obtained through researching generation and interactions with institutions. Promoting varied age cohorts' abilities may result in advocacy that is more successful and long-lasting. In conclusion, further study in this area is necessary to improve our comprehension of generation dynamics and interactions with institutions in social movements. Fostering revolutionary social change and tackling complex societal issues need embracing intergenerational discourse and cooperation. Additionally, encouraging diverse age groups to actively participate in social movements may strengthen lobbying efforts and increase their potency. It's essential to place an emphasis on generation and interactions with institutions if we want to create a social movement environment that is more diverse, effective, and cohesive.

REFERENCES:

[1] P. B. Burow, K. McConnell, en J. Farrell, Social scientific research on the American West: Current debates, novel methods, and new directions, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 2019, doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/ab4030.

[2] M. Pickersgill *et al.*, Biomedicine, self and society: An agenda for collaboration and engagement, *Wellcome Open Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15043.1.

[3] R. C. Phillips, The Predictive Power of Social Media within Cryptocurrency Markets, *Dr. thesis, UCL University Coll. London.* , 2019.

[4] K. Marsh, Music as dialogic space in the promotion of peace, empathy and social inclusion, *Int. J. Community Music*, 2019, doi: 10.1386/ijcm_00002_1.

[5] J. Toubøl, From democratic participation to civic resistance: the loss of institutional trust as an outcome of activism in the refugee solidarity movement, *Br. J. Sociol.*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/1468-4446.12622.

[6] A. R. Garifzianova en K. A. Ozerova, Construction of Historical Memory through Youth Music: Example of the City of Kazan, *J. Hist. Cult. Art Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.7596/taksad.v8i4.2366.

[7] S. M. Webb, The Delphian Society and Its Publications: A Historical and Cultural Analysis of a Primer for Middle-Class Womens Education, *Journal. Hist.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/00947679.2019.1603055.

[8] L. A. Bell, *Storytelling for social justice: Connecting narrative and the arts in antiracist teaching: Second edition*. 2019. doi: 10.4324/9781315101040.

[9] C. R. Nascimento en I. D. V Goulart, The Child and The Language Development: A Look at Educational Practices With Literary Reading, *Rev. Educ. E LINGUAGENS*, 2019.

[10] N. Mekki, Le rôle des principes de paris dans linstitutionnalisation des droits de la personne en droit interne étude axée sur quelques états arabes, *Quebec J. Int. Law*, 2019, doi: 10.7202/1070484ar.

CHAPTER 18

TRANSNATIONAL ACTIVISM IN ACTIVE SOCIAL MOVEMENTS: A CONCEPTUAL EXPLORATION

Zuleika Homavazir, Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email id- zuleika.homavazir@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

Modern social movements have seen the rise of transnational activism, which crosses national borders to address global concerns and encourage group action. This study intends to investigate the dynamics of global activism within dynamic social movements. The research explores how cross-border advocacy and cooperation are made possible by globalisation, digital communication, and international networks. In order to mobilize support across many cultures and communities, it looks into the techniques and tactics used by transnational activists. The study also looks at possibilities and problems that international groups encounter, such cultural differences, power relationships, and coordinating efforts. In order to evaluate the dynamics of transnational activism and determine how it affects social transformation, human rights, and international justice. The report also emphasises how this information may be used to advance international cooperation, promote inclusive policy reforms, and deal with urgent global issues.

KEYWORDS:

Cross-Border Advocacy, Globalization, Global Justice, Transnational Activism, Social Movements.

INTRODCUTION

Organisations affiliated with the GJM have created several sorts and formats for cross-border mobilisation. The first variable indicates if the organisation has taken part in international days of action such as those opposing the Iraq War, conducted since 2003 or parallel summits, which are conferences held concurrently with formal summits of the G8, WTO, IMF, or WB. These events are significant because they have served as significant and well attended controversial meetings of social movements on international problems; 75% of the studied organisations have participated in at least one of these events Identification of the many components of transnational activism and the development of an accurate mechanism for measuring them are required in order to properly capture the originality of the GJM. Four different cross-border projects undertaken by GJM organisations have been taken into consideration. They consist of:

1. Two categories of cross-border interactions with other groups represented by two binary variables.
2. Two types of involvement in international events expressed by two binary variables:
    a) Global days of action or parallel summits.
    b) World and European social forums.

The second factor is the involvement of the organisations surveyed in the World or European Social Forums. Social Forums have served as the primary global and regional gathering place for social movements since 2001. Once again, over 75% of organisations took part in these activities with French and Italian groups claiming even greater involvement. In contrast, less than 66% participated in local and national social forums. The third variable displays how organisations participate in international campaigns, either as participants or as promoters.

Transnational campaigns have grown in importance as a means of cross-border mobilizations during the 1990s. Eighty percent of the organisations questioned participate in international campaigns, including British, Italian, and international groups. Campaigns on social concerns account for 40% of instances, and campaigns on democracy for 25% [1], [2] .

The fourth variable examines how involved the surveyed organisations are in international networks. We have previously made note of the significance of the organisations in the survey participating in networks and the significance of these networks in cross-border mobilizations contend that although an organisation that participates fully in transnational mobilization's wouldn't engage in any of the four categories of activities, an organisation that is solely national wouldn't. As a result, a group actively engaged in cross-border mobilizations would have an organisational structure formed by strong ties to global networks and an activism style that include involvement in cross-border campaigns. As part of these efforts, it would take part in both narrower and often specialised parallel summits and more general GJM events, such the World and European Social Forums. As a result, we suggest the transnational activism index TN4, which has values ranging from 0 when an organisation did not participate in any event, nor to transnational campaigns and networks to 4 when an organisation did participate in at least one Global Day of Action parallel summit, one Social Forum, one transnational campaign, and one transnational network. The ranking gives organisations with several projects the edge over those that are only committed to one [3], [4].

We contend that this index is a useful indicator for gauging GJMOs level of international activity. We need to look at the factual cross-border activism patterns that this index reveals in order to support this claim. displays the values of the index of transnational activity and the four factors that make it up for all organisations as well as for the seven country groupings. With a TN4 score of 2.96, the examined organisations generally exhibit a high level of cross-border involvement. Inter-organizational relationships are less common than involvement in international events when the four factors are included. The most frequent cross-border activity is involvement in global days of action and parallel summits 90% of organisations, which is followed by Social Forums 80%, while networking 73% of organisations is more prevalent than campaigning 53%.

It's amazing to see how other countries operate. Given that all of the transnational organisations in our study participate in transnational networks, it should come as no surprise that they demonstrate the greatest level of cross-border engagement, with an average score of 3.59. While Spanish and Swiss cases are at the bottom of the rankings with 22% and 21% for campaigning, and 54% and 67% for participation to Social Forums, respectively, Italian and French organisations are also ranked highly in terms of transnational activism, showing extremely high percentages of participation in GJM events. British and German organisations are positioned in the middle. Cross-border activism is significantly influenced by the problem of activism. Organisations working on international economic concerns are the most trans nationalized, followed by unions, political parties, and organisations working on peace, development, and the environment. The majority of groups interested in global economic concerns have high ratings across the board, and transnational networks have become a strong and realistic paradigm for the contestation of economic dominance. Groups engaged in development and cooperation follow a similar trend. While ignoring engagement in networks and campaigns, political parties and trade unions participate most often in events where they may gain attention and influence; environmental organisations exhibit the reverse tendency. Last but not least, organisations working to promote social, labour, and citizenship rights as

well as media/think tanks are mostly engaged at the national or local level, with little involvement in all cross-border operations [5], [6].

Organisational structure has a significant impact on how cross-border mobilizations are shaped. We find that networks and campaigns tend to be more transnational than single organisations when we look at the values of the index of transnational activism by type of organisation. In instance, they engage in parallel summits at greater rates and, despite already being networks or campaigns, they often join other networks and campaigns, creating a dense web of connections. The two sorts of organisations values are the same while participating in Social Forums. Although financial resources could be a barrier to an organizations high degree of trans nationalization, human resources are not similarly constrained. It takes fewer people to engage in cross-border activism than you might think, and smaller organizations those with fewer than 100 paid employees and fewer than 15 volunteers tend to be more transnational than larger ones. Organisations with no budget are the least transnational. the outcomes with regard to the identification problem.

Strongly GJM-identified organisations are moderately more globally diverse than those that deny this. 90% of the organisations with a GJM identity take part in international days of action or alternative summits, compared to 79% for organisations without a GJM identity and 74% for transnational networks. The contrast between the two categories is most obvious when it comes to involvement in international campaigns, when the number of organisations without a GJM identity is least less than 40%. Organisational strategies have a less definite impact. There is minimal difference across the four factors on transnational activities, and the lobbying and alternative-promoting organisations exhibit slightly greater levels of transnational activity. The finding that is most pertinent to this discussion is that having diverse methods increases an organizations likelihood of participating in cross-border projects. The level of cross-border activity among organisations working with multiple institutions varies just little. The degree of trans nationalization is greater among those working with international organisations than it is among those engaged at the national and local levels, as may be predicted.

Summarizing the empirical data so far, we can claim that the 210 European organisations included in the DEMOS survey offer a pertinent representation of the traits, pursuits, and activism strategies we have proposed, capturing the range of cross-border pursuits and offering a composite representation of the level of transnational activism of European organisations involved in the GJM. These groups participate in international activities, join networks and campaigns focused on global concerns, and develop a strong sense of identity within the GJM. However, the diversity of organisations results in a significantly distinct pattern of mobilizations among EU nations. Nationalism continues to matter. For example, the sociopolitical climate in nations like France or Italy is better suited for cross-border mobilizations.

Returning to the four variables that, according to our hypothesis, may have an impact on how transnationally active European groups are, we find that the four factors differ significantly among organisations, with those involved in global economic and development issues demonstrating a higher level of transnational activism. Networks and campaigns seem to be more practical forms of cross-border organisation within the GJM, hence organisational structures are important. Having a global identity has an impact on cross-border action. Although there aren't many distinctions in tactics amongst organisations, there is a correlation between more cross-border action and the existence of numerous strategies [7], [8].

DISCUSSION

Exploring the determinants of transnational activism

Building on the empirical data described above, we investigate the factors that influence cross-border activity in this section using a quantitative analysis that links important traits of the surveyed organisations to the ideals represented by the index of transnational activism. In this approach, we may put to the test the aforementioned assumptions and evaluate the impact of numerous elements that have prompted social movements in Europe to mobilize beyond national boundaries in response to global challenges. We are able to conduct this analysis because to the DEMOS database, which contains a substantial number of instances and provides an accurate picture of European mobilizations.

In this analysis, we seek to account for the diversity of national contexts while explaining the values of the index of transnational activism TN4, dependent variable with a set of independent variables that reflect the four factors mentioned above: issues, organisations, identity, and strategy. The independent variables used are the eight, which serve as indicators of organisational structures, the sense of belonging to the GJM, which takes identity factors into account, the adoption of distinct strategies and forms of action, which helps to record action repertoires, and the presence of multiple strategies. With the exception of the size of the staff and the number of tactics, all variables have a binary yes/no response. Additionally, country dummies are included in the study to take into consideration regional variations. Due to the nature of the dependent variable, which may take values between 0 and 4, an ordered logit model is used for the analysis. When an independent variable changes from 0 to 1 or moves to a higher rank while all other variables stay the same, the model returns odds ratios that show the likelihood that the TN4 values would change to a higher rank. The model also offers data on the importance of independent variables. If the odds ratio is less than 1, the independent variable is probably going to have a negative impact on the TN4 index.

The fraction of instances whose TN4 values are properly predicted offers a clear evaluation of the models strength in ordered logit models, where the R-square is not a direct measure of the quality of fit. For two variants of the model, the major findings of the ordered logit estimates, together with the odds ratio and the significance of each coefficient. The findings indicate that the model does an excellent job of explaining how transnationally active the examined organisations are. The first models' findings are in the first column of the table, and they show that the degree of transnational activism seems to be strongly and substantially connected to the participation of organisations in contentious global economic problems and to a lesser extent to development. Organisational structures, as measured by staff size, are very important since more cross-border activity is possible with a bigger team. The GJM identification variable has a high value and is very significant, and the existence of numerous tactics also greatly increases transnational activism.

It is important to clarify the odds ratios significance. Organisations engaged in global economic concerns are more likely than those in other disciplines to be more trans nationalized by a factor of more than four, whilst those engaged in development issues are more likely by a factor of two to be transnational in their activity. The likelihood of becoming more transnational is more than five times higher for groups that claim membership in the GJM than for those who deny it. On the other hand, a bigger staff and the cohabitation of many techniques, such as protest, lobbying, alternative promotion, and teaching, only somewhat increase the likelihood of higher cross-border action [9], [10].

With regard to transnational organisations, which are not included in the regression, the model has controlled for country of origin; when an organisation is based in the UK,

Germany, Spain, or Switzerland, there is a small but significant probability that it will exhibit less transnational activism. When we compare the dependent variables predicted scores from the model with the actual values, we discover that the prediction is correct in 54% of the time. Most of the above-stated assumptions about the variables influencing transnational activism seem to be supported by this model, which seems to be an effective summary of the correlations between organisational traits and the level of cross-border activism. The nature of the GJM identity variable, which is, as we mentioned in the conceptual discussion above, both a determinant and a result of transnational activism, may be a potential shortcoming of this model. As a consequence, a second iteration of the model has been estimated without include that variable; the outcomes second column.

With this image, the results hardly alter. The variables on global economic concerns continue their great influence and relevance, while the variables on development raise both of these variable's importance together with the two pertinent issues of activism. A bigger staff has a more limited effect, and the variables significance to the organizations network or campaign character has changed. Similarly, the inclusion of the variable pertaining to the use of demonstrations as a form of action is combined with a slight weakening of the impact of the existence of multiple strategies; generally, the impact on transnational activism anticipated from the variables on organisations and strategies is roughly half that resulting from points of contention.

If the country of origin is Germany, Spain, Switzerland, or the UK the latter loses relevance, the country controls in this model corroborate the negative impact. In 50% of situations, the TN4 projected values are accurate. This second model supports the earlier findings and widens the scope of pertinent factors that were covered in the empirical research of the previous section and that affect transnational activism. After analysing these findings, it shows that the creation of transnational activism by European organisations is related to the four variables mentioned above - contentious topics, organisational structures, identity, and tactics but with significantly different levels of importance. Organisations working on the global economy and international development are particularly pulled towards cross-border mobilization's because these topics have a significant transnational component to their opportunity structures and governance systems. An organisational identity connected to the GJM plays a crucial role as well, but it also has an impact on cross-border activities. The characteristics reflecting the organizations nature, its strategy, and national background have a more constrained impact.

This indicates that for GJM organisations, the transition from national to transnational activism is not a straightforward process; rather, it is shaped by the contentious issues brought up by European movements, by the chance for groups identities to develop, by the option of choosing an organisational model based on networks or campaigns and the presence of a larger staff, and by the capacity to challenge authorities using a variety of tactics. We further examined if the inclusion of these organisations, which by definition have a larger inclination towards cross-border action, may have distorted the findings given that the questioned organisations included a group of transnational ones without a clear place of origin. As a result, only national organisations have been used to estimate the two models, leaving out instances of transnational organisations. The primary distinction is that in models 1 and 2, the activity domain of development and cooperation loses relevance and weakens. Additionally, model 2 does not consider the numerous tactics variable to be relevant. The transnational group which was not included in the independent variables was assigned as the country controls in the models. The results show that Italian and French nationality have a highly

positive and significant influence, while German and UK origin have a more subdued positive impact.

The findings of this investigation into the factors that influence cross-border activism seem to be resilient to modifications in the model and the dataset. Therefore, we may claim that these models adequately account for key factors influencing GJM organisations in Europe's transition to global activity. Large-scale GJM mobilizations in Europe, which started in the late 1990s and have persisted to the present, could only be maintained with the systematic participation of organized groups, whether single organisations, networks, or campaigns. This chapter has looked at the elements that encouraged several social movement organisations in Europe to participate in the kind of international mobilization's that the GJM was known for. Both philosophically and experimentally, a number of crucial elements of the developing dynamics of international conflict have been recognised. They set apart approaches to social movements that primarily concentrate on domestic political conflict from analyses of GJM mobilizations.

The complexity of the process leading organisations to cross-border activism is a general lesson that emerges from our analysis. In order to achieve high levels of transnational activity, several complementary developments in issues of contention and identities, strategies, and resources must be present. A few important aspects stand out in such a multifaceted procedure. Transnational activism has been on the increase, and one of the main reasons for this is the engagement of organisations in controversial topics with a clear multilevel governance framework. Trade, finance, and economic policy issues, as well as those related to cooperation and development poverty, assistance, fair trade, are sectors that powerfully pull organisations towards international projects and have an impact on the shape and substance of a large portion of their engagement. Such subjects have a primarily transnational political potential structure; the configuration of political players comprises supranational organisations and multinational companies, necessitating coordinated transnational mobilizations.

The same result did not occur for equally universal issues like democracy, human rights, peace, and the environment because national states still retain significant influence in these areas. Instead, disagreement frequently centres on specific government decisions, such as those relating to democratic reforms, rights protection, military involvement, and climate change action. Additionally, a significant portion of the organisations included in the study worked on these topics at all levels local, national, and international, reacting to political opportunities on all dimensions. There is less cross-border activism since organisations working on social and citizenship rights, in the media, and in think tanks often take action at the national and local levels. The political parties and trade unions in our survey are a special case because they demonstrated strong involvement in the GJM and participation in international events, but not in networks and campaigns. It is possible to infer that they shared the ideological motivation of the GJM and saw participation in parallel summits and Social Forums as a means of gaining influence and visibility, but they kept to their traditional methods of political contestation.

The significance of a strong organisational structure based on networks and campaigns also emerges from our results. This methodology is characteristic of the GJM, and in particular of the mobilizations on global economic and political concerns, as we have previously said. In reality, as we have shown previously, transnational networks have served as the backbones of the GJM, facilitating connections between disparate concerns and preparing and sustaining the numerous waves of mobilizations on particular topics. The strength of identification is another important element; transnational action is directly linked to a feeling of belonging to

the Global Justice Movement and a new transnational political goal. This function may resemble, in some respects, the influence of ideology in earlier waves of national social movements: a shared opposition to neoliberal globalisation may serve as the basis for a common identification with international battles.

However, the GJMs identity encompasses many other aspects, such as the creation of pluralistic and tolerant identities, which have enabled the wide coalitions that are characteristic of the GJM. The combination of a unifying transnational political project a vision of resistance to globalisation, or of globalisation and a highly plural model of cross-border activism based on significant events, networks, and campaigns may be at the heart of the widespread identification with the GJM by European social movement organisations. Greater engagement in cross-border activities may have resulted from increased knowledge of global conflict, which in turn fostered even deeper identification with the GJM. As a consequence, cross-border mobilisations have increased and a wide range of organisations, social groupings, and cultural sensitivities have developed strong bonds with the GJM.

The capacity to combine protest with the offering of alternatives, lobbying, and education seems to be what leads to international efforts in this process rather than any one technique. A flexible and multifaceted strategy of contention is likely to characterise the organisations with greater levels of transnational activism. Global concerns are often characterised by a complex pattern of confrontations and possibilities for engagement with international institutions. These findings support the thesis put forward in this book on the originality of the Global Justice Movement, with its multilevel and multiform activities and its capacity to engage with and challenge national and transnational institutions The need to address global issues and take on multilevel governance systems, along with internal movements developments like evolving identities, the emergence of adaptable network structures, and the adoption of multiple strategies, have all been found to play a significant role in the causes of cross-border activism. Numerous chapters in this book explore various aspects of these changes, including the significance given to the idea of democracy in the GJMs quest for successful democratic practises as well as in disputes with authorities. With its widespread transnational action, bringing fresh demands for political change to the global stage, and ongoing challenges to national political systems, this development has supported the growth of the Global Justice Movement.

CONCLUSION

Within social movements that are actively engaged, transnational activism has grown to be a powerful force that crosses national boundaries and cultural barriers to address global issues. This study looked at the dynamics of transnational activism, highlighting its importance in setting global agendas and encouraging group action. The research emphasised how cross-border lobbying and cooperation are made possible by globalisation, digital communication, and international networks. These resources are used by international activists to rally support and increase public awareness of global concerns. The study also illustrated the variety of techniques and tactics used by transnational groups to influence public policy, advance human rights, and advance international justice. Understanding the difficulties and possibilities that transnational activism faces present chances to promote international cooperation and promote inclusive policy proposals. Cross-border cooperation may be improved by addressing cultural differences and power dynamics.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. L. Davis, T. P. Love, en P. Fares, Collective Social Identity: Synthesizing Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory Using Digital Data, *Soc. Psychol. Q.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0190272519851025.

[2] J. O. Terradillos, J. M. I. Grass, en A. L. Ureta, Feminisms outraged at justice: the online conversation on La Manada case, *IC-REVISTA Cient. Inf. Y Comun.*, 2019.

[3] L. Larri en H. Whitehouse, Nannagogy: Social movement learning for older womens activism in the gas fields of Australia, *Aust. J. Adult Learn.*, 2019.

[4] G. Rossolatos, On the discursive appropriation of the antinatalist ideology in social media, *Qual. Rep.*, 2019, doi: 10.46743/2160-3715/2019.3578.

[5] S. H. Daud en K. Othman, Awareness of social business in social media in malaysia, *Manag. Account. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.24191/mar.v18i1.832.

[6] M. Syafar, M. Ikhsan, I. F. Ibnu, en R. Rahim, The effect of health education on tuberculosis case-finding based on advocacy, communication and social mobilization ACSM movement in Majene district, west Sulawesi, Indonesia, *Rev. Bras. Gest. e Desenvolv. Reg.*, 2019, doi: 10.3844/ajidsp.2019.9.14.

[7] F. Ferretti, Mapping do-it-yourself science, *Life Sci. Soc. Policy*, 2019, doi: 10.1186/s40504-018-0090-1.

[8] T. Bareka, H. Panhofer, en S. Rodriguez Cigaran, Refugee children and body politics. The embodied political self and dance movement therapy, *Body, Mov. Danc. Psychother.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/17432979.2019.1614668.

[9] R. S. Foa en Y. Mounk, Youth and the populist wave, *Philos. Soc. Crit.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0191453719872314.

[10] B. Saikia, Interactive computer mediated technology: Social media and indian politics, *Int. J. Innov. Technol. Explor. Eng.*, 2019, doi: 10.35940/ijitee.J1107.0981119.

CHAPTER 19

THE STUDY OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS: RECURRING QUESTIONS, PARTIALLY CHANGING ANSWERS

P. Ramakrishnan, Assistant Professor
Department of ISDI, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email id- ram@isdi.in

ABSTRACT:

Political science and sociology have long placed a heavy emphasis on the study of social movements. The purpose of this research paper is to examine the recurrent issues that have influenced social movement studies as well as the changing solutions that have developed through time. The research explores the major themes and ideas that have been present in the analysis of social movements, including collective action, mobilizations, framing, and resource mobilizations. It looks at how societal dynamics shifts, technical developments, and political environments have affected how social movement scholars' approach and analyse social movements. The study also looks at how various theoretical viewpoints and methodological techniques have helped us comprehend social movements. For identifying the gaps and possibilities in the discipline as well as expanding our understanding of collective action and social change, it is essential to comprehend the history of social movement research. The paper also emphasises how this information may be used to inform campaigning, social activity, and policy initiatives.

KEYWORDS:

Collective Action, Framing, Mobilization, Resource Mobilization, Social Movements, Theoretical Perspectives.

INTRODUCTION

The world seemed to be experiencing significant, dramatic changes in the late 1960s some even called it a revolution. American civil rights and antiwar movements, the Mai 1968 uprising in France, student protests in Germany, Britain, or Mexico, the worker-student alliances of the 1969 Hot Autumn in Italy, pro-democracy demonstrations in places like Francoist Madrid and communist Prague, the development of critical Catholicism from South America to Rome, the forerunners of the women's and environmental movements that would shape the new politics of the 1970s all these movements and events have influenced the politics. As a result, research on social movements has grown significantly at an unprecedented rate. If critics lamented the crudely descriptive level of understanding and a relative lack of theory at the end of the 1940s Strauss and in the 1960s that social movements have received relatively little emphasis in the study of social changes, collective action research had become one of the most vigorous areas of sociology by the middle. Commentators towards the end of the 1980s noted that theoretical and empirical studies on social movements and collective action had exploded in the last ten years [1], [2].

Today, there are several specialised journals, book series, and professional groups dedicated to the study of social movements. Even if the booming 1960s are long gone, the study of grassroots activity is still necessary and essential despite the social and political developments of the last 40 years. Contrarily, social movements, protests, and more broadly political groups that are not affiliated with the main political parties or labour unions, have grown to be an integral feature of Western democracies. Protest politics, grassroots involvement, and symbolic challenges can no longer be labelled as unconventional. Instead, allusions to a movement society appear more and more likely.

Undoubtedly, the level of collective actions radicalism, its precise manifestations, and its ability to have an impact on the political process have all varied significantly during this time. Forecasts that the late 1960s wave of protest would swiftly die down and business as usual, represented by interest-based politics organized along conventional political lines, would resume in its aftermath, have been largely disproven. Various kinds of protest have continued to develop in recent years. These protests have taken many different forms and have a variety of aims and ideals. Not only that, but at the dawn of the new millennium, perhaps for the first time since 1968, the wave of mobilization's for a globalisation from below often known as the global justice movement appears to have the potential for a global, generalized challenge, fusing themes typical of class movements with themes typical of new social movements, like ecology or gender equality [3], [4].

In reality, it would be quite deceptive to associate phrases like global justice movement with monolithic, uniform actors. The campaigns against neoliberal globalisation are highly diverse and aren't always related to one another. They cover a wide variety of topics, including the use of child labour by multinational corporations, deforestation, human rights in developing nations, and military interventions by Western powers. And they do it in a number of ways, including via individual declarations of dissent, individual actions, large-scale gatherings of people, and from a range of perspectives. They provide a clear illustration of what social movement analysis entails. Most researchers that investigate social movements concentrate on either persons, organisations, or events in their research, best attempting to represent their interrelationship.

First, those who oppose neoliberal globalisation may be seen as a group of people who have differing ideas on many subjects and support or oppose societal change. Unevenly across nations and socioeconomic groups, globalisation has undoubtedly stoked both anxieties and expectations in equal measure. Public opinion polls consistently show that there are general concerns about how globalisation will affect people's lives, both economically and politically. Globalisation is clearly at the center of the public's attention these days, even if it may be less of a worry in western Europe than in the USA or perhaps more so elsewhere. A distinct and outspoken segment of the population is opposed to it and is often hostile. Their opinions are developed and strengthened through conversations with a variety of influential public figures who expose the drawbacks and costs of globalisation from both a Western and an Eastern perspective, such as the Indian writer Arundhati Roy, the Filipino sociologist Walden Bello, the Australian journalist John Pilger, or the economist and Nobel.

Individual concerns and beliefs can manifest themselves in a variety of political and social activities. Then, parallel to moral and philosophical worldviews and strongly held beliefs, there are particular efforts made by people to halt dangerous trends, right wrongs, and promote alternatives to the way social life and economic activity are managed. Therefore, concentrating on those people who actively voice their resistance to neoliberal management of global processes is one method to examine the global justice movement. Individual citizens can take action by signing petitions calling for the cancellation of developing countries debt, making financial contributions to groups like Attack or Greenpeace, mobilizing to stop the construction of dams in India or the clearing of forests in Brazil, denouncing police behaviour in Genoa in July 2001, attempting to stop ships exporting toxic waste to developing countries, or attempting to stop trains carrying military equipment in preparation for the 2003 attack on Iraq. They may also do this by taking measures that have an impact on people's private lives and behaviour, perhaps even more so than on the public realm. Recent years have witnessed the growth of fair-trade organisations and methods across the West [5], [6].

Individuals may attempt to change the balance of economic power on a large scale by buying certain goods or opting to do business exclusively with banks dedicated to upholding moral and ethical norms. Ant globalization, however, cannot be boiled down to groups of people that share the same opinions and conduct. It might be more interesting to focus on the characteristics of events that feature conflictual interactions between powerful people and their rivals, as well as events where people and organisations that identify with a cause come together to discuss tactics, develop platforms, and go over their agendas. Assaulting opponents' events or organizing their own has proven especially effective for global justice campaigners, having a powerful emotional impact on both participants and the general public. Before Seattle, regular gatherings of international organisations that support the neoliberal agenda, such as the World Trade Organisation, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, or the G8, offered the chance for a number of highly visible, extremely well-attended protests attempting to both disrupt the particular gatherings and draw attention to alternative agendas.

The World Social Forum meetings in Porto Alegre and Mumbai, their European counterparts in Florence 2001, Paris 2003, or London 2004, and the African Social Forum, which held its first meeting in Bamako, Mali, in January 2002, have all been promoted by global justice activists and have all attested to the strength of the movement of movements Pianta 2001a. On February 15, 2003, protesters against the invasion on Iraq took to the streets in millions across five continents as a result of hundreds of antiwar demonstrations that took place throughout the world Walgrave and Richt forthcoming. This is perhaps the largest coordinated political rally in history. Thousands of actions, from confrontational protests to the delivery of reports or news releases, from religious vigils to squatting at military facilities, have been supported by globalisation sceptics below the global level. These activities, which take place everywhere from the national to the most local levels, also corroborate widely held beliefs regarding the existence of a separate antilocalization movement.

Other times, when we refer to the global justice movement, we primarily mean the organisations working on such concerns. Broad coalitions of organisations, often with a transnational foundation, have been leading the fight to neoliberal globalisation. Some of them probably the majority had a protracted history of political and social involvement, spanning the whole political spectrum. Established political parties participated in the protests in Genoa and Seattle, mostly or exclusively from the left, along with trade unions, farmers associations, and other workers organisations, as well as groups representing native and immigrant populations, ethnic groups, consumer advocacy groups that opposed multinational corporations, churches and other religious institutions, environmental organisations, women's organisations, and radical autonomous youth groups.

However, neoliberal globalisation criticism has also given rise to a number of distinct organisations, such as Attack, which supports the so-called Tobin tax to lower financial gains in the global stock market; Peoples Global Action, a coalition of hundreds of groups in the North and the South; or the Rete Lilliput, a network of groups, associations, and individuals active in Italy on environmental, fair trade, and social justice issues. Particularly noteworthy is the function played by non-political organisations. In the West, there are extensive networks of cooperatives and small retail businesses that attempt to strike a balance between morally motivated public action and commercial demands, which helps to expand fair-trade practises. The existence of alternative cafes, bookshops, social and cultural centres, which provide meeting points and occasionally lodging to people identifying with radical milieus, also helps to facilitate the reproduction of countercultural networks connecting radical activists from all over.

From a completely different angle, it is also possible to see the network of Islamic schools, mosques, and other organisations that support fundamentalist interpretations of Islam as providing the administrative framework for the spread of that specific form of opposition to Western globalisation. Organisations provide continuity to collective activity, regardless of their specificity, even when the possibility for spontaneous, unmediated involvement suddenly declines. They also provide avenues for the development and propagation of allegiances and collective identities, as well as possibilities for action to be escalated when conditions are more favorable. While acknowledging the significance of organisations working inside movements, we should be careful to avoid confusing the two. Compared to other movements, such as environmentalism, where large international organisations like Greenpeace, WWF, or Friends of the Earth sometimes wind up taking center stage, possibly unintentionally, the global justice movement has been less vulnerable to this danger thus far [7], [8] .

DISCUSSION

Four Core Questions for Social Movement Analysis

Studying social movements necessitates concentrating on at least some of the dimensions we have just introduced, as well as, most importantly, on how ideas, people, events, and organisations are linked to one another in larger processes of collective action, with some continuity over time. This is what the example of global justice campaigning suggests. It is not surprising that social movements might be treated in relation to a wide range of philosophical topics given their complexity and multidimensionality. We will concentrate on four generally defined groupings of them in this book. Well make an effort to connect them to the more general theoretical and practical issues that have motivated the study of civic activism and cultural resistance since the 1960s.

The link between structural change and adjustments in social conflict patterns is the subject of the first set of inquiries. Can social movements be seen as conflict expressions? And what disputes? Have the major conflicts that social movements have focused on changed? And in what direction? Concerning the part played by cultural representations in social conflict, there are further concerns. How are social issues seen as possible targets for group action? How can some social actors come to feel like they belong to the same collective we and acquire a feeling of shared identity? And how does a particular protest event come to be seen as a part of a larger conflict? Where do the cultures and ideals of social movements come from?

The method through which beliefs, preferences, and ideas are translated into collective action is the subject of a third group of problems. How is it feasible to organize and take on the expenses and hazards of participating in protest activity? What functions do identities and symbols, feelings, organisations, and networks serve in understanding the emergence and tenacity of group action? What forms do organisations choose in an effort to maximise the force of group challenges and their results? The question of how a particular social, political, and cultural setting impacts social movements chances of success and the shapes they adopt has also been raised extensively. What explains how acts of collective violence and other forms of public protest against those in positions of power grow in intensity over time? Do the characteristics of political systems and their perspectives on people needs affect the effect of challengers in the political sphere? How and why do protest tactics and strategies evolve over time?

These issues have undoubtedly contributed significantly to the development of conversations over the years, even if they undoubtedly do not fully capture the depth of contemporary debates on collective action and social movements. In fact, the 1960s were significant

because they witnessed a shift in the primary sources of conflict as well as a rise in new kinds of political engagement. Social movements historically had a strong emphasis on labour and national problems; but, since the 1960s, new social movements have formed that are more concerned with themes like women's liberation, environmental preservation, etc. Social scientists' methods for tackling such concerns underwent substantial improvements as a result of these shifts in the number and quality of protest. The structural-functionalist model and the Marxist model, which were the two main theoretical frameworks available at the time for the understanding of social conflict, both came to be seen as entirely insufficient.

When faced with the emerging protest movement in Europe, academics often turned to Marxism. Their efforts to explain changes in conflict forms in the 1960s had run into a number of issues, however. The capital-labor conflicts relevance has been questioned by the socioeconomic changes that followed the conclusion of World War II. Widening access to higher education or the massive influx of women into the workforce had raised the importance of other social stratification factors, such as gender relations, and had opened up new structural possibilities for conflict. Even a casual observer of the 1960s could not help but notice that many of the actors involved in those conflicts' youth, women, and new professional groups had only tenuous ties to the class struggles that had been the main source of political division in industrial societies. However, issues concerning the persistence of the working class in postindustrial society did not serve as the only factor undermining Marxist interpretations; the explanatory model's logical consistency was also questioned.

The deterministic aspect of the Marxist paradigm, which held that the dynamics of class relations and the degree of development of productive forces were major determinants in how social and political conflicts developed, was rejected by critics. They also supported the tendency, which is particularly strong among orthodox Marxists, to downplay the variety of issues and conflicts that exist within actual movements in favors of creating ludicrous pictures of movements as uniform actors with superior strategic skills. American academics, on the other hand, often saw group behaviour as crisis behaviour. Psychologically derived theories defined social movements as the manifestation of feelings of deprivation experienced by individuals in relation to other social subjects and of feelings of aggression resulting from a wide range of unmet expectations.

These theories reduced collective phenomena to the summary of individual behaviours. A rapid and unexpected end to periods of economic prosperity and increased expectations on a global scale, or mechanisms based on status inconsistency, were thought to be the causes of phenomena like the rise of Nazism, the American Civil War, or the movement of black Americans. From a somewhat different but related perspective, the rise of political extremism was also linked to the creation of mass society, where integrative social relationships rooted in the family or community tended to become dispersed. Isolation and dislocation resulted in people with less access to intellectual, professional, and political resources who were more susceptible to the allure of right- and left-wing antidemocratic organisations [9], [10].

The most well-known application of the structural-functionalist theory, that of Neil Smelser 1962, which regarded social movements as the results of too quick social change, shared some of these issues. In a system made up of balanced subsystems, Smelser claims that collective behaviour shows pressures that homoeostatic rebalancing processes cannot temporarily absorb. The emergence of collective behaviours during periods of rapid, widespread change, such as religious cults, secret societies, political sects, and economic utopias, has a dual meaning, reflecting both the inability of institutions and social control mechanisms to reproduce social cohesion as well as attempts by society to respond to crisis situations by forging new foundations for communal solidarity. The six phases in Smelser's

value-added model of group behaviour are as follows: structural conduciveness, which refers to a specific arrangement of social structures that may encourage or inhibit the emergence of particular types of collective behaviour; structural strain, which refers to the fact that at least one feature of the social system is perceived by a collectivity as a source of tension and issues; growth and spread of generalized belief, which refers to the emergence of a shared interpretation of social actors circumstances and issues; precipitating factors.

Given the significance of Marxism in contemporary intellectual discussions in Europe, it is not surprising that social scientists in that continent were the keenest to explain the emergence of the movements of the 1960s and 1970s via an explicit criticism of Marxist theories of social conflict. Both the most structuralist currents of Marxist thought which derive class struggle directly from the mode of production and those who are concerned in the development of class consciousness or class in itself were subject to criticism. There is little doubt that others were aware of these issues in addition to researchers of the new movements. The same issues had been brought up by individuals who had studied the labour movement in an effort to explain how a collective actor formed, questioning the widely held belief that structural stresses virtually automatically change into conscious behaviour.

By considering the novelty in the forms and substance of current movements, researchers connected with the so-called new social movements approach often moving from a Marxist background made a significant contribution to the advancement of the debate of these topics. The fight between the industrial classes is no longer as important, and it is therefore no longer possible to describe movements as mostly homogenous subjects, according to scholars of new movements. The focus, however, varied depending on whether it was possible to pinpoint the new primary struggle that would determine the paradigm of the developing society, which was often described as postindustrial, post Fordist, technocratic, or programmed. Alain Touraine, a well-known proponent of this strategy, was most forthright in defending it, saying that social movements are not a marginal rejection of order, they are the central forces fighting one against the other to control the production of society by itself and the action of classes for the shaping of historicity the overall system of meaning which sets dominant rules in a given society.

Claus Offe, a German sociologist, emphasised the distinction between movements of the industrial society and new movements in the 1980s 1985. In his opinion, movements, in the name of a radical democracy, establish a fundamental, metapolitical criticism of the social order and of representative democracy, questioning institutional assumptions surrounding traditional methods of doing politics. A critical ideology in relation to modernism and progress, decentralised and participatory organisational structures, defence of interpersonal solidarity against the great bureaucracies, and the reclamation of autonomous spaces, rather than material advantages, are among the key innovations of the new movements, in contrast to the workers movement.

Melucci described contemporary societies as highly differentiated systems that invest more and more in the development of individual autonomous centres of action while also requiring closer integration and extending control over the motivations for human action. Melucci drew inspiration from Jürgen Habermas's metaphor of the colonisation of lifeworlds. According to him, contemporary social movements work to counter the market and the states encroachment into social life by reclaiming people freedom to choose their own identities and to control their private and emotional lives in opposition to the systems pervasive and all-encompassing manipulation. In contrast to the workers movement, contemporary social movements, in Meluccis opinion, do not restrict themselves to the pursuit of monetary gain but instead contest the nebulous ideas of politics and society. New actors specifically oppose

the rise of political-administrative intrusion in everyday life and defend human liberty rather than calling for more government action to provide security and well-being.

Speaking about the new social movements approach without recognizing that its main proponents have significantly altered their opinions over time would be deceptive. The impact of conventional political activity on movement practises as early as the late 1980s. Melucci focused more and more on the processes through which specific worldviews, as well as personal and societal identities, are created and change over time for more on this. He even went so far as to say that the discussion around the newness of modern movements was unimportant or out of date see, for instance. Nevertheless, there were, and still are, a number of advantages to this viewpoint. First, it involved a quarrel at a period when disputes outside of a class were often disregarded. Theorists of new social movements had two distinct advantages over Marxists: they restored actors to the center of the stage and they grasped the creative traits of movements that no longer defined themselves primarily in terms of the production system. We also shouldn't ignore the important field of study that was primarily sparked by their initial theories.

The link between social structure and collective action is by no means limited to the new social movements concept, despite its importance. Marxism has continued to influence a large number of collective action analysts who continue to place a significant emphasis on the idea of social class. In many ways, Marxist structural theories may be seen as the forerunners of the growing field of study on global justice problems today. Scholars have attempted to situate the recent wave of popular mobilizations in developing nations as well as the Western world in the context of much larger processes of economic restructuring on a global scale and from a long-term historical perspective. Scholars from this perspective view the crisis of the workers movement in the 1980s and 1990s, following financial restructuring at the global level, as a largely conjunctural phenomenon, in explicit critique of analyses suggesting the demise of social conflict and its individualization, and most explicitly the end of conflict about distributive stakes.

Following the dynamics of mass migration, a new wave of sustained class conflicts will be fueled by a systemic failure to satisfy the needs of the working class in developing countries. These conflicts will also reflect the growing feminization of the labour force and their stronger ethnic component. These claims seem to be supported by the growing importance of global justice as a primary issue. Additionally, and perhaps surprisingly, social movements have emerged in the South, connecting frames and organisational frameworks with their Northern equivalents. Gramscian approaches were often used in the development of social movement research, which stressed the importance of cultural hegemony, particularly in specific geographical regions such as Latin America and the Far East.

By highlighting the significance of consumption processes, particularly collective consumption of public goods and services, for class relations and shifting the focus of class analysis from capitalist relations in the workplace to social relations in the urban community, Castells made a significant contribution to our understanding of the emergence of urban social movements in an earlier phase of his work. Later, Castells made a connection between the increasing importance of identity issues in both the W French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu has served as an inspiration for yet another novel attempt to connect structural analysis with social movement analysis. Bourdieu's insights have been used by researchers who study cultural habits or the cultural predispositions produced by socialization processes as well as their structural determinants to examine particular political conflicts, highlighting their cultural meanings within the specific fields to which individuals belong.

Beyond just financial concerns, several academics have noted that social movement involvement really involves pursuing wants and aspirations that stem from cultural or field-specific norms and ideals. Action is thus reasonable rather than logical has proposed a new theoretical model using Bourdieus main ideas of habitus, structure, and agency from a different perspective and with explicit reference to general theory. This model is able to include insights from both historical European and American perspectives. He has done this by moving forward concurrently with other theoretical works within the larger context of structuration theory The assumption that certain traits, such as middle-class origins of activists or loose organisational forms, where fundamental character rustics of new social movements was a major criticism of the theory of new social movements.

The failure of structural methods in general to define the processes connecting structural tensions to action has also been criticised. To be honest, this critique does not apply to Meluccis work and only partly to Touraine's, but it is unquestionably applicable for world-system theorists or researchers like Offe or Castells, whose research obviously does not concentrate on micro or mesa processes. In any event, the concepts discussed below should be seen as theories of social conflict, especially the effects of structural changes on the stakes and types of conflict. And it's fair to suggest that other philosophical traditions have more persuasively addressed the issues that are directly tied to the growth of collective action.

In the 1950s and 1960s, scholars of collective behaviour had a tendency to group together phenomena like crowds, movements, panics, manias, trends, and so on under the same title. As a result, there were two issues. Students of collective behaviour on the one hand focused more on unanticipated dynamics, such cyclical responses, than on intentional organisational methods or, more broadly, on strategies developed by actors, even though many of them classified movements as purposeful events. The idea that conditions of resentment, rootlessness, hardship, and social crises invariably result in revolts reduces collective action to an amalgam of individual behaviours. Functionalism disregards the processes that lead to macro-occurrences like social movements or revolutions from micro sentiments experienced at the human level.

Symbolic interactionists associated with the so-called Chicago School, who are credited with creating the study of collective behaviour as a subfield of sociology, have provided one answer to these theoretical shortcomings. The idea of collective behaviour, as opposed to that of collective psychology, denoted the change in focus from individual motivation to their audible acts. The pioneers of this approach collective phenomena do not just reflect social crisis but also produce new norms and new solidarities. They also saw social movements as change agents, particularly in relation to value systems. Other students of group behaviour were then expected to refer to the Chicago Schools principles while concentrating on instances of quick changes to social norms and structures. Large-scale organisation tendencies, population movement, technological advancement, mass communication, and the deterioration of old cultural forms were all seen to be new factors that were causing people to look for new forms of social organisation.

In reality, collective behaviour was characterised as behaviour concerned with change and social movements were seen as both an essential component of society's everyday operations and the manifestation of a larger transformation process. The modern school of collective behaviour, which has its roots in symbolic interactionism, emphasises the significance that actors attach to social structures. The less organized the circumstances that an individual faces, the more important this feature seems to be. New norms develop to define the current situation as unfair and provide a rationale for action when existing systems of meaning are insufficient to serve as a foundation for social action. Collective behaviour is situated outside

of established norms and structured social relationships since it was born outside of predetermined social standards. Thus, the study of collective behaviour focuses on how emerging normative meanings affect institutional behaviours to change them. These meanings emerge when a persistently changing circumstance conflicts with the conventional normative framework.6 In reality, efforts to change established standards are accompanied by the introduction of new laws and regulations.

Social movements are born out of the coexistence of opposing value systems and groups at odds with one another. New concepts form in people's thoughts as a result of cultural evolution, which is how changes in social structure and normative order are perceived. Traditional standards must be challenged by a person via different types of nonconformity when they are unable to provide a sufficient framework for behaviour. When a sense of discontent becomes widespread and institutions are too rigid to react, a social movement emerges. Many of the discoveries in the sociology of social movements come from collective behaviour school pupils. Collective movements are being recognised for the first time as significant actions that often result in positive social change. Additionally, observations of interactions governed by collective action serve as crucial stepping stones for those who, more recently, have taken on the challenge of comprehending movement dynamics. The focus on empirical research has encouraged experimentation with novel approaches, resulting in a legitimate integration of archive data using a variety of field research methodologies.

The processes of producing symbols and creating identities, both of which are crucial aspects of collective behaviour, have been emphasised since the 1980s by the interactionist version of the theory of collective behaviour. Rochon writes that movements are responsible for translating the chronic problem as described by the critical community into an acute problem that will attract media attention. However, in the 1990s, some researchers particularly those familiar with resource mobilizations theory like Snow and Benford grew dissatisfied with a perspective on the role of culture in collective action that they felt was overly strategic and rationalistic and began to emphasize emotion's role in the creation and propagation of social movements once more. They contend that symbolic creation incorporates more sentiments and emotions than is just or mostly strategically motivated.

Individual mobilizations typically begin with moral shocks that arise when firmly held rules and norms are violated; protest groups actively strive to convert fear into moral outrage and rage. Movements are efforts to change established norms that are accompanied by the establishment of new rules and norms. Social movements are born out of the coexistence of opposing value systems and groups at odds with one another. New concepts form in people's thoughts as a result of cultural evolution, which is how changes in social structure and normative order are perceived. Traditional standards must be challenged by a person via different types of nonconformity when they are unable to provide a sufficient framework for behaviour. When a sense of discontent becomes widespread and institutions are too rigid to react, a social movement emerges.

Many of the discoveries in the sociology of social movements come from collective behaviour school pupils. Collective movements are being recognised for the first time as significant actions that often result in positive social change. Additionally, observations of interactions governed by collective action serve as crucial stepping stones for those who, more recently, have taken on the challenge of comprehending movement dynamics. The focus on empirical research has encouraged experimentation with novel approaches, resulting in a legitimate integration of archive data using a variety of field research methodologies. The processes of producing symbols and creating identities, both of which are crucial aspects of collective behaviour, have been emphasised since the 1980s by the interactionist version of

the theory of collective behaviour. Rochon writes that movements are responsible for translating the chronic problem as described by the critical community into an acute problem that will attract media attention. However, in the 1990s, some researchers particularly those familiar with resource mobilizations theory like Snow and Benford grew dissatisfied with a perspective on the role of culture in collective action that they felt was overly strategic and rationalistic and began to emphasize emotion's role in the creation and propagation of social movements once more. They contend that symbolic creation incorporates more sentiments and emotions than is just or mostly strategically motivated. Individual mobilizations typically begin with moral shocks that arise when firmly held rules and norms are violated; protest groups actively strive to convert fear into moral outrage and rage.

CONCLUSION

Opportunities for enhancing social movement research as well as influencing policy interventions and social action are provided by the contributions of many theoretical viewpoints and methodological methodologies. The information gathered from analysing social movements may be used to guide advocacy campaigns and social change projects. A more thorough knowledge of collective activity may be attained by emphasising multidisciplinary and creative methods. In conclusion, further study in this area is necessary to improve our comprehension of social movements and their function in bringing about social change. Adopting multidisciplinary and varied viewpoints may improve lobbying efforts and expand studies on social movements. In order to continue to be influential and relevant in the study of social movements, it is also essential to address new difficulties and developing topics. For a society to become more equitable, inclusive, and transformational, it is essential to place a strong emphasis on the study of social movements.

REFERENCES:

[1] C. Milano, M. Novelli, en J. M. Cheer, Overtourism and degrowth: a social movements perspective, *J. Sustain. Tour.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/09669582.2019.1650054.

[2] M. Ramutsindela, Social Movements, in *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography, Second Edition*, 2019. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-102295-5.10866-2.

[3] D. J. Wang, H. Rao, en S. A. Soule, Crossing Categorical Boundaries: A Study of Diversification by Social Movement Organizations, *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0003122419846111.

[4] G. Pleyers en A. Álvarez-Benavides, The production of society by social movements, *Rev. Esp. Sociol.*, 2019, doi: 10.22325/fes/res.2018.53.

[5] Y. Romero-Padilla, A. Cerezo-Medina, E. Navarro-Jurado, J. M. Romero-Martínez, en A. Guevara-Plaza, Conflicts in the tourist city from the perspective of local social movements, *Bol. la Asoc. Geogr. Esp.*, 2019, doi: 10.21138/bage.2837.

[6] T. Niesz, Social Movement Knowledge and Anthropology of Education, *Anthropol. Educ. Q.*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/aeq.12286.

[7] S. Aguilar en E. Romanos, The extent of change: An analytical proposal about the consequences of social movements, *Rev. Esp. Sociol.*, 2019, doi: 10.22325/fes/res.2018.54.

[8] J. Spicer, T. Kay, en M. Ganz, Social entrepreneurship as field encroachment: How a neoliberal social movement constructed a new field, *Socio-Economic Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1093/ser/mwz014.

[9] V. Lima, The limits of participatory democracy and the inclusion of social movements in local government, *Soc. Mov. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/14742837.2019.1629277.

[10] M. L. Germain, P. Robertson, en S. Minnis, Protests, Rallies, Marches, and Social Movements as Organizational Change Agents, *Adv. Dev. Hum. Resour.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1523422319827903.

CHAPTER 20

DECONSTRUCTING THE CONCEPT OF A SOCIAL MOVEMENT: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY

Jayashree Balasubramanian, Assistant Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email id- jayashree.balasubramanian@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

Across disciplines, there has been discussion and interest in the idea of a social movement. The goal of this research article is to examine the many definitions, traits, and consequences connected to the idea of a social movement. The research explores the development of social movements historically and looks at key components such resource mobilizations, common grievances, and collective action. It looks at how social movements challenge conventions, promote social change, and have an impact on political choices. The study also examines the many formats and tactics used by social movements to solve social, political, and environmental problems. Recognizing a social movements influence on society, its capacity to reform society, and the difficulties it has in accomplishing its goals requires an understanding of what a social movement is. The research also emphasises how this information may be used to support social activity, fight for social justice, and advance inclusive and participatory democracy.

KEYWORDS:

Advocacy, Collective Action, Mobilization, Social Change, Social Justice, Social Movement.

INTRODUCTION

Social movements are a unique social process made up of the mechanisms by which participants in collective action: engage in conflictual relationships with clearly defined adversaries; are connected by extensive informal networks and possess a unique collective identity. collaborative activity that is tense. Actors in social movements participate in political and cultural disputes that support or oppose social change. Conflict is defined as an adversarial relationship between actors who are vying for the same stake, such as political, economic, or cultural power, and who make demands of one another that, if met, would be detrimental to the interests of the other actors. As a result, social movement action does not automatically correspond to solving shared problems, creating public goods, or expressing support for certain moral values or principles; rather, it requires the identification of specific goals for group efforts that are expressed in social or political terms.

Contrarily, it is challenging to talk about social movement processes when collective activity just focuses on the behaviour and validity of certain people, or places the responsibility for issues on humanity as a whole, natural catastrophes, or divine. For instance, collective action on globalisation issues is contentious to the point where institutions like the World Trade Organisation or the International Monetary Fund are held accountable not for the actions of their officials or specific policy errors, but rather as the representatives of various interest coalitions [1], [2].

formal networks that are dense. Dense informal networks set social movement activities apart from the many occasions when collective action occurs and is organized, often behind the walls of particular organisations. A social movement process is present to the degree that both unorganized and organized actors participate in ongoing resource exchanges in the pursuit of shared objectives while maintaining their autonomy and independence. Permanent

discussions between the people and organisations engaged in collective action are necessary for the coordination of particular projects, the control of individual actors' behaviour, and the formulation of strategy. No movement can be said to be represented by a single organized actor, no matter how strong they may be. It follows that, as opposed to when activity is focused inside formal organisations, there are greater options for highly devoted and/or competent people to take an autonomous role in the political process.

Social movements are more than just a collection of campaigns or even protests around certain subjects. Instead, a social movement process only becomes established when collective identities form that transcend beyond particular activities and projects. Recognition and the development of connectivity are closely related to collective identity Pizzorno 1996. It fosters a feeling of shared devotion to a cause and a sense of common purpose, allowing individuals and organisations to see themselves as intimately connected to other participants in a larger collective mobilization, not necessarily identical but unquestionably compatible. Membership standards within social movements are highly erratic and ultimately dependent on actor mutual recognition; in fact, boundary definition, or deciding who is and is not a part of the network, is crucial to the emergence and development of collective action.

It makes much more sense to regard the two as being involved in the same movement process in Italy than in Britain, for instance, where recent research on environmentalism suggests that animal rights activism is more distinct and less associated with environmentalism. Similar to how not all networks between like-minded individuals necessarily reflect social movement processes, many analysts do not consider the international Zapatista support network to be a social movement despite the fact that resources for solidarity undoubtedly flow through it. This is due to the lack of a focused identity and the resulting bonds. In order to create a collective identity, actors must also link various events both public and private located at various times and places that are pertinent to their experience and weave those events into bigger, all-encompassing narratives.

Organisational and individual actors engaged in collective action, as a consequence, no longer only seek particular objectives; instead, they start to see themselves as components of much wider and all-encompassing processes of change, or opposition to change. Through processes of identity-building based on organisational networking and supranational communication, for instance, participants in disparate events like the battle of Seattle and the opposition to the Narmada Valley dam in India may be linked together in the same movement. We may compare social movements to other collective-action processes by examining various combinations of these three factors. Here are a few examples, but it's important to remember that no actual instance of collective action those that we often label as environmental movements, solidarity movements, disabled movements, or the like fully matches to any pure type. Contrarily, in each empirical case of collective activity, we often identify more than one process. A key component of social movement analysis is the investigation of the relationships between these processes [3], [4].

DISCUSSION

Conflictual and consensual collective action

Broad coalitions of nonprofit organisations and other voluntary groups often mobilize around problems of solidarity, such as social exclusion in domestic politics or concerns of development or human rights from an international viewpoint, and are referred to as social movements. However, in many instances it could be appropriate to refer to them as consensus movements. Actors in both social movement and consensus movement dynamics possess a sense of solidarity and a shared worldview, which enables them to relate particular actions

and occurrences in a larger temporal context. The latter, however, does not have a conflictual aspect in prolonged group effort. Cooperative activities that don't imply or demand the identification of individual opponents, aiming to limit the resources and possibilities of one's group, or obstructing opportunities to increase them are often used to create collective goods. The proposed solutions place more emphasis on service delivery, self-help, individual and collective empowerment than on changes to power dynamics or societal structures.

Similarly, the promotion and practises of alternative lifestyles do not need the existence of opponents as they are understood socially and politically. Collective actors may fight ethereal foes without necessarily blaming any social actors for the situation they want to change, ranging from bad or conventional taste in the case of artistic and style-oriented movements to the inner enemy in the case of some religious movements. However, insisting on the presence of conflict as a distinguishing characteristic of movements need not prevent social movement analysts from looking into instances of collective action where a conflict is difficult to identify, such as those focused on delivering some form of help or assistance to an offended colleague such as the so-called human potential movement or many countercultural, alternative lifestyle networks. Instead, this viewpoint suggests that researchers should concentrate their efforts on examining how various social processes function and interact with one another within each instance of collective action.

Social movements, events, and coalitions

Single episodes of collective action that are perceived as parts of a longer-lasting action rather than discrete events indicate the presence of a social movement, as do those who participate in them who feel connected by bonds of solidarity and ideal communion with leaders of other comparable mobilizations. An excellent illustration of this dynamic may be seen in the development of the movement in the United States to manage hazardous waste. The movement began as a number of localized efforts aimed at achieving specific objectives, like preventing the construction of waste disposal facilities in certain areas. Over time, the movement expanded into a national force that was focused on a variety of issues related to the interaction between nature and society and had a much more developed cultural elaboration. A feeling of community may be maintained even after a particular project or campaign has come to an end thanks to identity-building. There will be at least two significant repercussions if these emotions don't go away.

First of all, once favorable circumstances arise again, it will make the renewal of mobilizations in regard to the same aims simpler. Movements often alternate between short bursts of intense public action and protracted latent phases, during which self-reflection and cultural output rule. A fresh wave of demonstrations gained pace in the aftermath of the Chernobyl event in 1986 thanks to the trust and solidarity ties that were ignited in the European antinuclear movements during the mobilizations of the second half of the 1970s, for instance. Second, the emergence of new movements and solidarities might be aided by the representations of the world and collective identities that emerged during a particular era via a process of incremental alteration. For instance, it has been noticed on several times that movements of the new left from the early 1970s and succeeding political ecology movements had strong ties to one another in a number of countries [5], [6].

It also demonstrates why the importance of collective identity as a characteristic of social movements may be seen in the use of other instances of informal networks of collective action, such as coalitions. In coalition dynamics, collective actors are closely linked to one another via alliances and the identification of explicit rivals, but these connections may not always be supported by solid identity connections. The networks formed by individuals

working together towards a shared objective are completely contingent and instrumental. Then, resource mobilizations and advocacy are mostly carried out via resource exchanges and pooling among various groups and organisations. The individuals' identities and allegiances are mostly derived from the latter rather than the network. Despite sharing resources to pursue certain objectives, actors do not specifically feel a sense of community or a shared future throughout the process.

Once a particular fight has been won, there is no need to seek to link the particular campaign in a more generalized framework or leave a longer-term legacy in terms of identification and solidarity. Unlike what is stated, for instance, associating movements with a particular collective identity involves no assumptions about the homogeneity of the individuals sharing that identity. Insofar as groups and/or individuals identify commonalities in their past, present, and future experiences and demand that other social or political actors be held accountable for the state of affairs under challenge, then we have a social movement identity dynamic. The extent to which members of a certain collective identity will share one or more characteristics, as well as whether that identity will be inclusive or exclusive, are empirical problems.

Social movements and organizational processes

On the premise that they all represent various political organisational approaches, social movements, political parties, and interest groups are often contrasted with one another see, for instance. They may sometimes be linked to cults and religious groups Robbins, 1988, for instance. However, social movements differ from these and other organisations not primarily due to differences in organisational traits or behavioural patterns, but rather because they are not organisations, not even of a peculiar kind. They are networks that, depending on the changing environment, may either include official organisations or not. Because of this, a single organization regardless of its defining characteristics is not a social movement. It may, of course, participate in social movement processes, but the two are not the same since they represent distinct organisational philosophies.

Indeed, a number of significant researchers in the field have frequently used the term social movement to refer to both social networks and particular organisations, such as the Sierra Club, Common Cause, or even religious sects. However, we should not apply concepts from organisational theory uncritically to social movement analysis. However, classifying Common Cause as a professional social movement does not significantly expand on the understandings offered by terms like public interest group see, among others. Similar to this, it is practical to classify a religious group like Nichiren Shoshu or Hare Krishna as a sect. When compared to social movement networks, these organisations exhibit higher organisational rigidity and a more hierarchical structure, which are taken into consideration by this notion. Additionally, it acknowledges how much more social control members are subject to. The interaction processes by which actors with different identities and orientations come to develop a shared system of beliefs and a sense of belonging that far exceeds the boundaries of any single group or organisation, while maintaining at the same time their specificity and distinctive traits, are what the terms public interest group and sect do not really capture.

Movements are by definition fluid occurrences due to the shaky link between organisational and movement identities. During the periods of creation and consolidation, bonds of solidarity and loyalty that may exist between people and certain groups or organisations dominate. When organisational identities take center stage once again or when feeling part of it refers more to one's organisation and its constituent parts than to a larger collective with

hazy borders, a movement has a tendency to fizzle out. Furthermore, by focusing on informal networks rather than distinct organisations, we may better understand the room set aside for people inside movements. Movements depend on individual engagement, and one aspect of them is the feeling of being a part of something larger than oneself, without necessarily needing to be a member of a particular organisation.

Social movements, strictly speaking, don't have members; they have participants. The individual's engagement, independent of any particular organisational allegiances, is not always restricted to specific protest actions. Additionally, it might emerge in public meetings, working groups, or committees. As an alternative when the opportunity presents itself, one might aid a movement by advancing its concepts and viewpoint among organisations, other political tables, or the media. The membership of movements, however, can never be reduced to a single act of allegiance due to the variety of available methods to become engaged.

If social movements and social movement organisations are conceptually distinct, then any organisation that participates in a social movement dynamic may be referred to as a social movement organisation. Political parties and bureaucratic interest groups could also be covered by this. We don't intend to imply that social movements are a wide theoretical category in which many forms of organisations interest groups, community groups, political parties, and so on are represented as numerous subtypes when we state that political parties may be a member of social movements. Instead, we propose that some political parties may feel like they are a part of a movement and be acknowledged as such by other movement players as well as the general public under particular and specific circumstances. This is probably more likely to be the exception than the norm and will mostly only apply to political parties with roots in social movements, such the Green parties.

One can legitimately protest that political parties, despite how strongly they identify with a movement, really serve certain duties at the level of interest representation and are, thus, distinct from social movements. There can be no doubt that there are variations at the functional level. However, social movements primary distinction does not lie in how they specifically carry out the role of interest representation. Of course, their social networks encourage the development of demands, the support of mobilizations efforts, and the development and dissemination of ideas and collective identities [7]–[9]. Each of these elements, in turn, helps to redefine the cultural and political environment in which the activity of interest representation occurs. However, if we strictly examine the function of interest representation, we do not consider how the movement carries out this function. We examine the methods used by various organisations involved in certain social movements.

Several variables, including outside opportunities, tactical and ideological concerns, and their connections to other movement players, influence whether they choose to include electoral involvement in their toolkit or not. However, just because they choose to do so does not mean that they are immediately disqualified from the movement. Instead, individuals will participate in two distinct action systems the party system and the social movement system, each of which will require them to perform a unique role. An important area of research will focus on how such roles are really developed. It goes without saying that highlighting the uniqueness of movements as informal networks does not necessitate excluding the examination of individual organisations from the purview of social movement analysts, as some critics have proposed. Instead, it challenges researchers to openly recognised the difference between social movement processes and organisational processes by defining particular categories.

We propose using a rigorous definition of movements to identify the co-presence and interaction of both movement and bureaucratic organisational processes within each of them, as opposed to considering groups as disparate as Common Cause or the Nazi party as movements and applying to them the same label used for networks of multiple organisations. By identifying these distinctions, for instance, we may more precisely define the difference between the Nazi party and the Nazi movement and examine how the two processes interact. We might plot the size and structure of the connections between the numerous right-wing and paramilitary groups that served as the Nazi party's foundation in the 1920s and late 1910s. Then, we might explain how the NSDAP and its closest allies came to assume a more prominent position within the right-wing network.

Finally, by defining formal requirements for individual party membership and b showing the party's dominance over all other organisations, including the SS, we could show how eventually formal links between the party, its individual members, and its collateral organisations came to almost completely replace the informal links between them. A perspective of a movement as an informal network of various people and organisations would help us to identify the tension between movement and organisational dynamics within complex empirical cases of collective action, and possibly to trace its evolution over time. Instead of preventing us from analysing movements which largely overlap with a specific organisation.

CONCLUSION

Understanding the various formats and tactics used by social movements provides chances to encourage social action and advance inclusive and participatory democracy. The influence of social movements may be increased by embracing various techniques. The understanding obtained through exploring the idea of a social movement may be used to encourage social activity, fight for social justice, and advance radical social change. Putting group action first and mobilizing resources may make social movements more successful. In conclusion, further study in this area is necessary to improve our comprehension of the idea of a social movement and its societal ramifications. Adopting various viewpoints and tactics may enhance social movement initiatives and lead to more inclusive and fair social change. Recognizing the difficulties social movements encounter may also help social movements develop methods for overcoming problems and achieving their goals. For a more fair, inclusive, and socially aware society to be realized, the notion of a social movement must be emphasised.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. Daniel en D. Neubert, Civil society and social movements: conceptual insights and challenges in African contexts, *Crit. African Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/21681392.2019.1613902.

[2] S. Halvorsen, B. M. Fernandes, en F. V. Torres, Mobilizing Territory: Socioterritorial Movements in Comparative Perspective, *Ann. Am. Assoc. Geogr.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/24694452.2018.1549973.

[3] N. C. Bona, Womens March and its communication, *Rev. Mídia e Cotid.*, 2019, doi: 10.22409/ppgmc.v13i1.20996.

[4] A. Luft, The contribution of social movement theory to understanding genocide: Evidence from rwanda, *Contention*. 2019. doi: 10.3167/cont.2019.070202.

[5] A. Ismail, H. Munsi, en A. Hans, Online Social Movement: Adopsi Teknologi

Informasi dalam Melakukan Gerakan Sosial di Indonesia, *ETNOSIA J. Etnogr. Indones.*, 2019, doi: 10.31947/etnosia.v4i1.5039.

[6] M. Gerlach, The Concept of Buen Vivir and the Social Work Profession, *J. Hum. Rights Soc. Work*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s41134-018-0081-4.

[7] Rianna Wati en Dwi Susanto, Islamic Children Literature in Digital Media as Religious Literacy Movement, *AKSIS J. Pendidik. Bhs. dan Sastra Indones.*, 2019, doi: 10.21009/aksis.030114.

[8] C. A. Valderrama, Black Cultural Differance in Colombia. Afrocolombian Counterpublics, *Rev. CS EN CIENCIAS Soc.*, 2019.

[9] B. Kusumasari en H. Kusumaningrum, Application of the resource mobilization theory in Indonesias environmental movements, *J. Comp. Asian Dev.*, 2019.

CHAPTER 21

ANALYSIS AND DETERMINATION OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND PROTEST DYNAMICS

Nikita Nadkarni, Assistant Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email id- nikita.nadkarni@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

Protests and social movements have been crucial in influencing societies and promoting social change. In order to better understand the dynamics of social movements and protest, this research study will concentrate on collective action, methods, and effects. The research dives into the driving forces behind social movements, looking at the elements that influence both people and organisations to participate in protests and collective actions. It looks at the many tactics used by social movements to promote their goals, such as direct action, internet activism, and peaceful resistance. The study also looks at how social movements and demonstrations affect public opinion, legislative choices, and societal change. Recognizing social movements and protests significance in bringing about social change and advancing inclusive and participatory democracy requires an understanding of their intricacies and repercussions. The research also emphasises how this information may be used to assist social activity, influence governmental decisions, and promote a more fair and equitable society.

KEYWORDS:

Collective Action, Direct Action, Nonviolent Resistance, Protest, Social Movements, Social Transformation.

INTRODCUTION

Social movement discussions up to the early 1970s focused on their noninstitutionalized character. The notion that social movements may be separated from other political actors due to their adoption of unusual political behaviour patterns is still highly prevalent today. The essential difference between movements and other social and political actors, according to some academics, may be seen in the contrast between traditional forms of political engagement such voting or lobbying elected officials and public protest. The idea that protest is a fundamental component of social movements is met with considerable criticism. First off, movements for personal and cultural transformation, religious movements, and the like seldom include large-scale public protest. Cultural conflict and symbolic problems often manifest themselves in the practises of certain lifestyles, the adoption of particular clothing or haircuts, or the adoption of rituals, which can only be seen as protest if we expand the definition of that word to a very great extent.

Furthermore, it is being questioned more and more whether protesting can still be classified as an unconventional, or even violent or confrontational, action in the political sphere. At least in Western democracies, a variety of political protest tactics have progressively merged into the established toolkit of collective action. In summary, it seems that protest is no longer only a tactic used by radical groups but is now a choice available to a much wider variety of actors when they believe their standing in the political system is in jeopardy [1], [2]. However, resistance continues to set social movements apart from other networks, such as those referred to as epistemic communities. These communities are set up around networks of people and organisations with specialised management and/or scientific skills in various policy fields. Their participants take sides in contentious matters and share a shared frame of

reference with social movements. However, the types of structural relationships and resource exchange inside such networks are distinct from those that often characterise social movements. Actors in epistemic communities are often vested with authority over decisions, specialised expertise, and frequently electoral responsibility. Instead, social movement actors often have a little role in decision-making processes and must enlist public support in order to preserve their ability to exert pressure.

In this chapter, we first identify four major concerns that have drawn the interest of social movement researchers since the 1960s as we examine contemporary global justice mobilizations. These discuss how shifts in the social structure of Western nations, particularly the shift from an industrial to a postindustrial mode of social organisation, may impact the types of collective action how social actors production of cultural and symbolic material enables the identification of social problems as deserving targets of collective action and the creation of collective identity and how organisational and individual resilience may be affected by changes in the social structure of Western nations. We have also noted some of the most significant responses offered by social movement researchers throughout the years in response to each of these concerns.

This has made it possible for us to quickly describe the most important methods that have dominated the area in recent years, notably but not solely the approaches to new social movements, collective behaviour, resource mobilizations, and political process. Although none of these viewpoints can be reduced to any of the problems we listed, some of them do so more effectively than others. The collective behaviour approach primarily theorizes the role of symbolic production in shaping collective action and the conditions for the emergence of new issues and/or identities; the new social movements perspective can be viewed as a theory of how the stakes and the key players in social conflict are modified under changing structural conditions; Finally, the political process approach examines the forms of collective action and their variation across various political regimes and points in time. It looks at the conditions leading to the emergence of collective action among people who may have more than one good reason not to engage in it.

We demonstrated how social movements might be seen as unique social and political processes in the second section of the chapter. On the basis of a common collective identity, we specifically identified and organisational players involved in conflictual connections to other actors. This has made it possible for us to distinguish between social movements and a variety of other closely comparable processes and occurrences. These include coalitions mobilizing on particular issues or events for instrumental reasons, political organisations like parties and traditional interest groups, protest repertoires, and collective actions oriented to nonconflictual goals, such as in the field of charity work [3], [4]. The issues we have raised may be of interest to a far wider range of social and political researchers, as we have stated repeatedly, and they are not limited to nor particular to social movement analysis. Nevertheless, they are unquestionably crucial to social movement research as it has evolved since the 1960s, which is why we decided to center the remainder of the book on these issues. we begin by talking at the structural underpinnings of modern movements.

This refers to both the processes by which new social groups and interests emerge, while older groups and interests that once held a dominant position begin to lose significance, as well as the effects of structural changes like the expansion of higher education and the growth and contraction of public welfare on various forms of political participation, particularly noninstitutional participation. For our consideration, the effects of globalisation processes are very pertinent. The creation of symbols demonstrates how cultural elaboration makes it easier to define social issues as the result of power imbalances and conflicts of interest and to

pinpoint their root causes in social and political variables that are amenable to human influence. We demonstrate how the formation of symbols also serves as the foundation for the emergence of sentiments of identification and solidarity, without which it is impossible to engage in collective action [5], [6].

The organisational variables that enable the development of meaning and the mobilizations of resources needed for action make up a third, crucial level of study. We analyse both the less structured aspect of the organisational dimension and informal networking. Particularly is the examination of individual engagement. We examine the processes by which people decide to participate in collective action and keep their commitment over time, but we also examine the ways in which people participate in a variety of ways to foster the growth of networks that bind social movements and oppositional milieus together. is on specific characteristics of movement organisations. It discusses the internal and external variables that drive the adoption of certain organisational forms and the implications this has for mobilizations. The relationship between movements and the political system is the fourth and most important factor. Movements represent novel, sometimes radical, features in the structure and operation of the political system.

The political systems qualities can provide or exclude crucial chances for the emergence of collective action. We may assess the influence of protest movements and their long-term effects in relation to the political system as well, if not primarily. Some of the characteristics of the protest cycles were rebuild that have characterised recent history and the collective action repertoires that emerged within them. We discuss some facets of the connection between the configurations of political possibilities and the growth of mobilizations. Finally, the issue of movement effects is covered Even if political change is at the core of our study, well make an effort to pay attention to how movements affect the social and cultural realms as well. Unquestionably, the primary concerns of our understanding of collective action are these challenges. However, our approach is anything from thorough. First off, the studies we are referring to have been heavily influenced by the experiences of new social movements and, more recently, the global justice movement. We focus on contributions that have used concepts from analysts of new movements to analyse phenomena like nationalism or working-class solidarity in America or that have become required reading for all. There is no lack of references to works on working-class conflict, ethnonationalist movements, or mobilization's that emerged in the last century in our analysis. The vast volume of literature on collective phenomena that are somehow connected to new social movements is not something we are really interested.

More broadly, our work does not represent the state of the art in this subject or adequately acknowledge all key contributions to this field of study. Thankfully, significant publications that extensively and exhaustively address social movement research from a methodological more general have been published in recent years. Instead, this book is an effort to highlight some of the major issues raised in recent discussions. Along with important studies on movement analysis, we have also picked a number of additional works that, for a variety of reasons, we believe serve as excellent examples of our point of view. In light of this, we have given special attention to studies that integrate theoretical analysis with empirical research taken in its broadest and most comprehensive sense albeit we have not done so exclusively. We have focused on the most well-known publications that to some degree deviated from the predominate theorising and research threads [7], [8]. We have decided to present the topics discussed in each chapter using examples taken from a specific movement in order to increase the coherence of our approach while selectively concentrating on the relevant research.

We were compelled by a number of factors to pay only sporadic attention to several views, all of which offered information that was very relevant to the issues we presented. These are somewhat practical because to limited space or the difficulties we have in regulating a very large body of material. However, they are somewhat theoretical as well. They exhibit the diversity of conceptual tools used to analyse movements and collective action up to this point. It is particularly harder to construct models that can handle such a wide range of local circumstances for action because of the variety of social and political environments in which movements emerge. However, incorporating all of these points of view would have required an attempt to translate concepts and theories into a homogeneous language, which still seems to be a very distant goal, not only for the two of us but for the scientific community. It is undoubtedly true that overcoming these difficulties is a central concern for students of movements.

Social Changes and Social Movements

This account of the mobilizations of the jobless in France emphasises some of the major factors that have shaped the discussion on the relationship between societal traits and social movements. First off, it shows that movements often relate to a base that is in some respects characterised by certain social characteristics. There is no denying that a society's socioeconomic structure affects the types of conflicts that arise within it, even though criticism of the breakdown theory has long since and with few exceptions, among them. The ecological movement or the women's movement were the usual subjects of this school of inquiry, which has been particularly prominent among European social movement academics since the 1970s. While the class rift that the labour movements had mobilized looked to have calmed, social movements have been seen as the carriers of post materialistic principles. The return of poor people's movements serves as a good jumping off point for the consideration of the connection between social structural changes and collective action.

Social change may have varying effects on social conflict and collective action characteristics. As the transition from agriculture to industry and finally to the service sector implies, it may promote the creation of social groupings with a particular structural location and possible unique interests, and/or diminish the significance of already existing ones. However, as the experience of the French jobless demonstrates, structural tensions do not always result in mobilizations; rather, the suffering of the unemployed discourages protest rather than encourages it. The allocation of resources that support involvement in collective action, such as education, and support the articulation of interests is significantly influenced by societal factors as well. While women's increasing access to higher education and the job market have facilitated the development of new ties between them and their emergence as a new collective actor, the shift to smaller factories and offshore production of industrial activities has played against workers capacity to act as a class.

With these sorts of consequences in mind, we will concentrate on three transformations that have captured the attention of Western nations since the Second World War: those that affect the economy, the role of the state, and the cultural realm. We won't attempt to discuss all of the numerous processes that go into what is typically referred to as the transition to a postindustrial or postmodern, disorganized, post Fordist, and so forth society instead well stick to mentioning the ones that have been specifically identified in the social movement literature as having an impact on social movements. The wider implications of these shifts for the understanding of novel kinds of collective action will next be covered. We will specifically explore two issues: how does our comprehension of terms like class conflict and class action change as a result of our exposure to new movements? And what are we to make of the overwhelming participation of people from the so-called new middle class in social

movements around the turn of the century? In the next section, we will in fact concentrate on social structural changes and how they affect political cleavages, as well as the social repercussions of political changes, and the influence of cultural changes on social movements. Well wrap off by talking about the idea that new social movements are fueling a new class war.

Social Structure, Political Cleavages, and Collective Action

By examining political cleavages, or the primary politicized conflict lines, the influence of socioeconomic features upon social and political conflicts have often been examined. Political cleavages have historically been linked to a collective action model in which actors:

1. Engaged in conflict with one another in order to advance their own political or material interests.
2. Identified themselves as members of a class, faction, or national group in relation to these interests.

In industrial society, social movements have often been structurally interpreted in terms of two basic processes. The first is concerned with the formation of the market, while the second is with the development of the nation-state and contemporary citizenship. The emergence of the market economy led to conflicts between capital and labour being paramount, but it also created a new division between the urban and agricultural socioeconomic groups. The development of nation-states was a result of territorial conflicts that pitted the core of new states against their periphery, as well as conflicts between the newly emerging lay state and those who opposed it and backed the temporal authority of ecclesiastical structures church-state conflict. These tensions have given rise to the main conflicts that have defined contemporarily societies: the institutionalization of cleavages and their consolidation have given rise to political systems and particularly their party systems that have remained stable up until the last decades of the twentieth century.

New social movements, like the ecology movement, seemed to be an innovation in this history since they lacked a defined social basis and were mostly unconcerned with the objective of capturing the state [9]. Structure impacts collective activity by posing the possibility of opposing interests as well as establishing forms of reliance amongst social groupings. The composition of collective players is also influenced by consolidated forms of social life's organisation from economic to political activity, from family to organisations. Collective action on the part of specific social groups is actually made easier when these groups are:

1. Easily identifiable and distinct from other social groups.
2. Endowed with a high degree of internal cohesion and a distinct identity thanks to social networks among their members.

Therefore, the simultaneous existence of certain category features and networks connecting the people sharing those qualities will be necessary for collective action. According to this viewpoint, the key question for the analysis of the interaction between structure and action will be whether social changes have made it simpler to establish these social relationships, to experience a sense of solidarity and belonging as a group, to recognised particular interests, and to encourage related mobilizations. The transition to capitalism not only produced aggregates of people bound together by their ownership of the means of production the capitalists or their own labour force the proletariat, but it also produced social relationship systems that made it easier for these aggregates to develop internal solidarity and become collective actors. The small number of the capitalist class, the intersection of economic and

familial connections, and access to and control over communications all contributed to its integration. The organisation of interaction within social groups is significantly impacted by many of the structural changes that are discussed in the pages that follow, such as those that relate to changes in how work is organized and how productive activities are localized.

CONCLUSION

Understanding how social movements and demonstrations affect society provides opportunity to acknowledge their influence on public policy, public opinion, and social change. Their actions support the development of a society that is fairer and just. Studying social movements and protest may provide information that can be used to encourage social activity, influence governmental decisions, and advance inclusive and participatory democracy. Understanding the strength of group action may spur constructive societal change. In conclusion, further study in this area is necessary to advance our knowledge of social movements and demonstrations, as well as the effects they have on society. Adopting various tactics and methods may help social movement initiatives succeed and lead to more profound social change. Recognizing the tenacity and influence of social movements may also help shape approaches to societal problems and advance inclusive and participatory democracy. A more equitable, inclusive, and socially aware society must priorities social movements and protest.

REFERENCES:

[1] M. L. Germain, P. Robertson, en S. Minnis, Protests, Rallies, Marches, and Social Movements as Organizational Change Agents, *Adv. Dev. Hum. Resour.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1523422319827903.

[2] Ö. Turan en B. Özçetin, Football fans and contentious politics: The role of Çarşı in the Gezi Park protests, *Int. Rev. Sociol. Sport*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1012690217702944.

[3] R. Heeks en R. Seo-Zindy, ICTs and Social Movements under Authoritarian Regimes: An Actor-Network Perspective, *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3477335.

[4] G. Negro en S. Olzak, Which side are you on? The divergent effects of protest participation on organizations affiliated with identity groups, *Organ. Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.1287/orsc.2019.1302.

[5] J. E. Cobbina, S. Chaudhuri, V. M. Rios, en M. Conteh, I Will Be Out There Every Day Strong! Protest Policing and Future Activism Among Ferguson and Baltimore Protesters, *Sociol. Forum*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/socf.12503.

[6] J. Nummi, C. Jennings, en J. Feagin, #BlackLivesMatter: Innovative Black Resistance, *Sociol. Forum*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/socf.12540.

[7] D. Cantoni, D. Y. Yang, N. Yuchtman, en Y. Jane Zhang, Protests as strategic games: Experimental evidence from Hong Kongs antiauthoritarian movement, *Q. J. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1093/qje/qjz002.

[8] S. Halvorsen, B. M. Fernandes, en F. V. Torres, Mobilizing Territory: Socioterritorial Movements in Comparative Perspective, *Ann. Am. Assoc. Geogr.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/24694452.2018.1549973.

[9] L. J. Anastasopoulos en J. R. Williams, A scalable machine learning approach for measuring violent and peaceful forms of political protest participation with social media data, *PLoS One*, 2019, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0212834.