

Chapter 17

E-Activism Development and Growth

John G. McNutt

University of Delaware, USA

Lauri Goldkind

Fordham University, USA

ABSTRACT

The use of sophisticated technology to promote social change has developed over the past three decades from tentative beginnings to an expected part of the arsenal of movement organizations and advocacy groups. The development of practical politics throughout the world has made greater use of ever more sophisticated technologies. This chapter will discuss the nature of e-activism, the development of electronic social change activities, the organizational and practice issues, the research base, and the potential future developments in the field.

INTRODUCTION

The use of sophisticated technology to promote social change has developed over the past three decades from tentative beginnings to an expected part of the arsenal of movement organizations and advocacy groups. The development of practical politics throughout the world has made greater use of ever more sophisticated technologies. This article will discuss the nature of e-activism, the development of electronic social change activities, the organizational and practice issues, the research base and the potential future developments in the field.

BACKGROUND

For the purpose of this review E-activism is defined as the use of technology tools by activists for addressing policy issues and social problems. E-activism is also called Cyberactivism (McCaughey & Ayers, 2003), Cyberadvocacy (Bennett & Fielding, 1999), Electronic Advocacy (West & Francis, 1996; McNutt & Boland, 1999), Cyberprotest (Van De Donk, Loader, Nixon & Rucht, 2004), Liberation Technology (Diamond, 2010) and Digitally Enhanced Social Change (Earl & Kimport, 2011). The important com-

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-7661-7.ch017

ponents of the practice are that it is technology enhanced, issue oriented and used by activists for policy change. E-activism as a strategy itself is issue neutral, rather it is a constellation of tools which may be applied to any social issue and similarly, it is also value and morality neutral, meaning champions on either side of an issue might employ the same strategy or tool to achieve radically different ends.

E-activism is strongly related to other concepts such as Cyber campaigning and Electronic Democracy, but there are important differences. Partisan political campaigning refers to efforts to change office holders, while E-activism looks at changing issues or problems. E-democracy (also e-participation and civic technology) often refers to the part of e-government that encourages citizen participation and involvement. The dividing line between these activities is often indistinct. The growth of civic technology has further complicated these already faint distinctions.

The techniques that e-activism uses to address issues or problems are often combined with more traditional methods used by advocacy groups and interest organizations. These traditional methods include community organizing, lobbying, administrative advocacy, petition campaigns, lawsuits and so forth. While less visible than these intervention tools, social change efforts have always been dependent on research and information gathering activities. Within the traditional advocacy arena, there is a well-established toolset for these activities that can be enhanced or replaced by technology tools.

Activists can combine community organizing, demonstrations, lobbying and electoral strategies with e-mail campaigns, mobile notifications using push technologies or short message services (SMS), social media efforts and sophisticated data analysis. Campaigns can also be waged completely online. This creates a situation where one may have online only efforts (pure e-activism), hybrid efforts using a mix of technology tools and traditional social change tools and finally, efforts which are nearly completely traditional with small amounts of embedded technology.

E-Activism is used by a wide range of organizations in a variety of situations. These include traditional advocacy organizations, social movement organizations, political organizations and other types of associations and organizations. There is some evidence that the growth of technology and its capacities to reduce transaction costs have promoted the growth of virtual advocacy organizations and leaderless organizations (Earl & Kimport, 2011; Brainard, Boland & McNutt, 2012). Recent experience with the U.S Tea Parties, Occupy Wall Street, BlackLivesMatter and the Arab Spring Demonstrations appears to support this idea. In any case, technology is moving many social change organizations away from those described in the political science literature on interest groups or the sociological literature on social movement organizations. One illustration is the role of socialization of movement actors. Some of the activists who use these technology enhanced tools are amateurs while many are highly skilled political operatives. Conventional wisdom in social movements was that people worked their way into leadership positions through long hours of work at lower levels. They then became qualified to lead movement groups and organizations. This is also reflected in the political participation literature in discussion about civic skills and the value of associations (Verba, Schlozman & Brady, 1995—See also Smith, Schlozman, Verba & Brady, 2009). The work of Earl and her colleagues demonstrates that technology can change this dynamic in important ways, creating the opportunity for new activists to conduct campaigns without previous experience (Earl & Kimport, 2011; Earl, 2007; Schussman & Earl, 2004).

Technology changes organizations in important ways. It makes them flatter and often changes the economics of productions. In terms of social change organizations, it can minimize the need for the bricks and mortar facilities that older organizations found essential and makes distributed work possible. This creates issues for theories, such as resource mobilization theory in sociology, that assume that these facilities are essential and the activities (such as fundraising) to support them are crucial. The rise of

9 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/e-activism-development-and-growth/215863

Related Content

Exploring the Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Perceptions of E-Filing Success

Lemuria Carter, Gwendolyn McFadden-Wade and Jean T. Wells (2016). *International Journal of Public Administration in the Digital Age* (pp. 43-52).

www.irma-international.org/article/exploring-the-impact-of-organizational-citizenship-behavior-on-perceptions-of-e-filing-success/143031

Digital Storytelling and Digital Literacy: Advanced Issues and Prospects

Kijpokin Kasemsap (2017). *Deconstructing the Education-Industrial Complex in the Digital Age* (pp. 151-171).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/digital-storytelling-and-digital-literacy/175417

Exploring the Factors Influencing the Adoption of Open Government Data by Private Organisations

Maaïke Kaasenbrood, Anneke Zuiderwijk, Marijn Janssen, Martin de Jong and Nitesh Bharosa (2015). *International Journal of Public Administration in the Digital Age* (pp. 75-92).

www.irma-international.org/article/exploring-the-factors-influencing-the-adoption-of-open-government-data-by-private-organisations/121537

Management Aspects of e-Government Projects: Contextual and Empirical Findings

Evika Karamagioli and Dimitris Gouscos (2014). *International Journal of Public Administration in the Digital Age* (pp. 22-47).

www.irma-international.org/article/management-aspects-of-e-government-projects/117753

A Longitudinal Study of Political Technology Use by Nonprofit Child Advocacy Organizations

John G. McNutt and Janice Barlow (2012). *E-Governance and Civic Engagement: Factors and Determinants of E-Democracy* (pp. 405-421).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/longitudinal-study-political-technology-use/60089