ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOUR AND THE STUDY OF SOCIAL MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Dr. Rajat Kumar Kujur

CENTURION
UNIVERSITY
Shaping Lives...
Empowering Communities!

Centurion University of Technology and Management
At- Ramchandrapur, Po - Jatni, District - Khurda
Bhubaneswar 752050, Odisha, India

CUTM Publications

Centurion Journal of Multi-disciplinary Research (CJMR) refereed journal, which serves as a platform for exploring the current issues, challenges and linkages in the broad areas of development, technology (engineering) and management. There is a special focus on skill development and education, its recognition and promotion in the country, especially with the 'Make in India' initiative by the government of India. The objective of the journal is to facilitate bringing together research based contributions in science, technology, management and skills that has direct implication for the development of less priviledged communities and empowering them. The journal links theory and practice in the above areas so as to have policy and programme implications, particularly in developing contexts. In addition to articles from individuals or collectives, the journal publishes book reviews.

CUTM Research Papers are prepared by the faculty, students and visiting fellows of the University to share with a wide readership results of their unfinished or on-going research on various aspects of applied science, engineering, management, development, agriculture, pharmacy and life sciences. It also includes action and inter-disciplinary research in the above areas. Papers selected for publication in the series often present empirical analysis which have policy implications and is relevant at sectoral, regional or the national level.

CUTM Workshop Reports are made available to interested individuals and institutions analytical summaries of the proceedings of various workshops/seminars/colloquia organised at the University. Such workshops generally focus on both fundamental and applied research in various disciplines to get a better understanding of practical issues in a given context.

For further information on CUTM publication, contact:

Publications Office
Centurion University of Technology and Management
At- Ramchandrapur, Po – Jatni
District – Khurda, Bhubaneswar
752050, Odisha, India

1

ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOUR AND THE STUDY OF SOCIAL MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Dr. Rajat Kumar Kujur

Acknowledgement

Writing this Occasional Paper indeed was a memorable experience for me. In the process I got support from a number of people without which this paper would not have been possible. First of all, I would like to thank almighty God whose blessings only made me write this paper in one of the most difficult period of my life. I thank Prof. Rakesh Gupta, my guide and mentor for suggesting me to write on this topic. I am thankful to Prof. Supriya and Dr. Smita of Centurion University of Technology and Management for accepting my paper and publishing it. I am thankful to Prof. Deepak Behera, Hon'le Vice Chancellor, Sambalpur University for believing in my ability of conducting meaningful research. My gratitude is due to all my colleagues from Sambalpur University for their support.

My wife Monalisa has always been my strength and I really want to thank her for believing in me. I thank my daughter Sweety and my son Adi for that much needed push. I am thankful to my parents, my brother and sisters for all their support and blessings. I want to thank my friends D.D. Bhai, Munna and Pupu for standing beside me in time of need. Last but not the least I thank all my students who always bring the best out of me.

Dr. Rajat Kumar Kujur

ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOUR AND THE STUDY OF SOCIAL MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Dr. Rajat Kumar Kujur

Abstract

Social Movements have emerged as a dominant trend in the field of social science research. Primarily this paper intends to examine the role of Movement Organizations in course of a Social Movement and vice versa. In the process the paper examines a number of theories dealing with Organizations in general and Social Movement Organizations in particular. The focus is on different dynamics of organizational behaviour and its effects on the overall functioning of a movement organization. The paper through different theories of Organizational Politics analyze social movement and constructs an useful insight into the understanding of growth and decay of social movements and the role played by Movement Organizations. While analyzing different theories, attempt has been made to look at the Movement Organizations from a conflict point of view. The paper has been divided into four sections. Section one as an introduction establishes the need for such type of a study. Section two looks in to the problem of fixing a universally accepted meaning to the concept of Movement Organization. Section three is a theoretical synthesis of

the relevant theories on Organizational Behaviour with a purpose to study the process of transformation of Movement Organizations amidst conflict dynamics. Section four as a Conclusion summarizes the arguments.

Centurion University of Technology and Management.
_____
Dr. Rajat Kumar Kujur is a Member, Board of Governors, Centurion University of Technology and Management, Odisha. He teaches Political Science at the Post Graduate Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Sambalpur University, Odisha.

ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOUR
AND THE STUDY OF SOCIAL MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS

1.0   INTRODUCTION

Historically speaking, socio-political movements; whether extremist, revolutionary or peaceful, operate through organizations. Such movements have also this unique feature of being identified with loosely structured collective conflict. As observed by Oberschall (1980), "hundreds of groups and organizations-many of them short-lived, spatially scattered, and lacking direct communication, a single organization and a common leadership- episodically take part in many different kinds of local collective action." Of course the importance of a movement lies with its underlying causes, but the success and failure of a movement are significantly affected by a variety of roles played by these organizations. Conceptually speaking social movements are collections of individuals and groups striving for some kind of change, i.e. social, political, economic or individual.   The importance of the organization within a movement can be gathered from its assigned functions which include "inducing participants to offer their services; defining organizational aims; managing and coordinating contributions; collecting resources from their environment; selecting, training and replacing members (Scott)."

Throughout the course of a movement several changes are bound to occur and these changes do have their impact on the functioning of movement organizations. Similarly, dynamics of inter organizational and intra organizational conflict also have their impact on the course of a movement. As

the organization in a movement relates to politics of goals achievement or denial, and it has a societal context that may have specific characteristics given the locale in question, the study of organizational politics assumes a great deal of importance in the analysis of any movement. The Movement Organizations are mostly characterized as loosely structured, decentralized and prone to political challenges and countercultural practices. Plurality of organizations is one important feature in social movements, especially in the revolutionary and extremist movements. As Porta and Diani (2006) puts it "Organizations differ, sometimes to a very high degree, in their response to dilemmas such as whether focusing on the mobilization of people or other types of resources, adopting some kind of formal hierarchy or a totally informal structure, targeting their efforts at opponents or also providing services and life opportunities to their own constituents."

2.0 SOCIAL MOVEMENT ORGANIZATION: CONSTRUCTING A MEANING

Over the decades a number of political theorists and sociologists have focused their study on organizational studies and social movement analysis. History of mankind has been mostly shaped by different movements, i.e. social movements, political movements, reform movements, protest movements, revolutionary movements, secessionist movements, freedom movements, anti-colonial movements and so on. In the success and failure of all these movements, different organizations played different roles in different times. On the other hand, these movements have been subject to further theoretical exploration by many social scientists and in the process the concept of 'movement organization' has become rather ambiguous. The concept has been

used in so many ways and in so many contexts that it seems it has lost its precise meaning. But this is not to suggest that the concept has no meaning, in fact the concept of movement organization has proved to be the most dynamic in the study of any form of movement. Following are two important definitions, which are worth mentioning here.

McCarthy and Zald (1987) define Social Movement Organization (SMO) as "a complex, or formal organization which identifies its goals with the preference of a social movement or counter-movement and attempts to implement these goals." On the other hand John Lofland (1996) defines Movement Organization (MO) as, "an association of persons making idealistic and moralistic claims about how human personal and group life ought to be organized that, at the time of their claims making, are marginal to or excluded from mainstream society." In a broader sense SMO can be defined as the carrier of the Movements programmes and objectives. The strength or weakness of a Movement is judged from the strength and weakness of the Movement Organization.

3.0 MOVEMENT, ORGANIZATION AND CONFLICT: A THEORETICAL SYNTHESIS

The pioneering works of Max Weber and Roberto Michels are regarded as a turning point in the field of the study of organizations. Robert. K. Merton is another sociologist who has contributed significantly in the studies of organizations. However, the process of theorization really shaped up after 1960s when a group of young scholars, like Gamson, Charles Tilly, and Mayor N. Zald, began to formulate more explicit organizational and political

arguments to explain social unrest. Credit goes to them as they shifted the earlier focus of organizational studies from "collective behavior" to more inclusive tools of 'collective action', 'social movements', and, even, 'social movement organizations'. Some of their works made successful application and expansion of Philip Selznick's theoretical perspective, which employed an institutional perspective to examine the ways in which tensions between value commitments and survival concerns shaped the development of an organization. These scholars of social movement reframed the view of protest and reform activities from one of irrational behavior – a flailing out against an unjust universe – to one involving instrumental action. Rather than stressing common grievances, Social Movement theorists focused attention on mechanisms of mobilization and opportunities to seek redress.

The following discussion on the theory of Organizational Politics has a primary aim of studying the process of transformation of movement organizations. There are a number of theorists who have studied the phenomena of social movements and social change to analyze the goal displacement process which ultimately affects the course of a movement.

3.1   Traditional School of Organizational Politics

- *Robert K. Merton & Reference Theory.*

Prior to the work of Robert K. Merton in the late 194Os, organizational studies were not typically acknowledged as a distinctive social phenomenon. The Reference Theory mainly developed by Robert K. Merton on the basis of his analysis of functional sociology, is one significant work in the field of organizational conflict as it describes how groups form, grow and dissolve and

how normative and value change take place through process of group formation and disintegration. One of the major hallmarks of analyses of organizations produced by Merton was his focus on the dynamics of social change. Merton (1949) states that 'change is likely to occur when the functional contributions of a given structural arrangement are exceeded by dysfunctions associated with that arrangement.'' This reasoning as developed by Merton led him to an explicit concern with identifying both the dysfunctional and functional consequences of given structural arrangements. Analyzing change in the context of organization Merton clearly distinguishes deviant from nonconforming behavior and links nonconforming behavior to social change. Merton (1949) writes, "…the nonconformist aims to change the norms of the group, to supplant what he takes to be morally illegitimate norms and values with norms having an alternative moral basis." Merton (1949) continues, "… the nonconformist …can… draw upon the latent store of moral indignation. In some measures, his nonconformity appeals either to the moral values of an earlier day which have been lost to view or to moral values of a time which will come to pass… His nonconformity is not a private dereliction, but a thrust towards new morality."

In his analysis of group conflict and social movement, Merton maintains that during the course of a movement the discontented group makes a claim to legitimacy for its goals, programmes and actions in the name of ideals and values that has some legitimacy. In the process while the established elites label the discontented group as deviant and in response the discontented group brands the established elites as corrupt, illegitimate and unresponsive. This inter-organizational conflict results in considerable amount of social mobilization which ultimately affects the human, material and ideological resources of the respective organizations.

- *Max Weber & Bureaucratic Organizations*

Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy assumes special importance in the field of study of organizations as it addresses itself to both the problem of the changing social organization of modern society and that of the typical features of the formal organizations that pervade it. Weber sees bureaucratization as a process of purely objective considerations that leads to the differentiation, distribution and specialization of tasks and activities to achieve technical and economic efficiency.

Weber's theoretical discourse stands on the concepts of Legitimacy, Authority, Routinization, and Succession. Legitimacy, according to Weber, is acceptance of influence because of perceived justifiability, similarly authority is the right of some to issue commands to others by virtue of normative rules, tradition, status, or charisma. Routinization is the process by which bureaucratization becomes more stable over time and succession refers to the intergenerational mechanism by which routinization occurs, and a particular form of bureaucratic authority is legitimated.

Weber emphasized on the authority structures as the core of social organizations and accordingly he identified three main types of authority which are associated with a variety of structural forms of organization. However, Weber made it clear that his concept of traditional authority, charismatic authority and rational-legal authority are "known as 'ideal types' and represent a pure form which is not expected to exist in historical reality. In practice types of authority only approximate an ideal type; they are closer to one ideal type then the other" (Haralambos, 1999). Weber presented a system of traditional authority where the authority is legitimated by the belief in the sanctity of tradition and custom. Weber pointed out to the notion of charismatic authority

where the subjects accept a superior's orders as justified because of the influence of his personality. Similarly, as according to Weber, authority can be rational-legal when the subject accepts the ruling as it is derived from a set of more abstract rules. Moreover, each form of authority is associated with a variety of structural forms of organization and administration. Legal authority, for example, is often associated with bureaucracy, while traditional authority is associated with gerontocracy, patriarchalism, patrimonialism, and feudalism. Charismatic authority may be associated with a charismatic form of organization. In comparison to others, the charismatic type is considered unstable and transitory because it lacks a succession mechanism. As a result, it becomes routinized as rational-legal, if succession occurs through norms of recruitment, or as traditional, if it occurs through inheritance or status. Effective succession requires pecuniary incentives, and renders a particular form more adaptable over time. Weber regards the process of succession as crucial for the functioning of any organization for it results in the routinization of the charismatic focus of the structure.

Most important Weber perceives the process of routinization within the larger gamut of the conflict dynamics. In the process he links several aspects of power, legitimacy, and security with the concept of organizational transformation. Weber (1970) states that "The social relationships directly involved are strictly personal, based on the validity and the practice of charismatic personal qualities. If this is not to remain purely transitory phenomenon, but to take on the character of permanent relationship forming a stable community of disciples or a band of followers or a party organization or any sort of political or hierocratic organization, it is necessary for the character of charismatic authority to become radically changed."

Through his sophisticated and voluminous studies Weber presented a theory where maintained rationalization is a long-term historical process that has transformed the modern world. His typology of forms of rationality is central to this argument. He argued that there are four types of rationality: practical, theoretical, formal, and substantive. He was most concerned with processes of formal and substantive rationalization, especially as propelled by capitalism and bureaucracy. Weber argued that rationalization has occurred in many organizations whether political, economic or religious. Weber viewed the future as one where rational-legal types of authority would become more dominant. While a charismatic leader or movement might emerge, the dominant tendency was for organizations to become more routinized, rational and bureaucratic.

- *Michels' Iron law of Oligarchy*

Roberto Michels' study on the psychology of organizations and organizational leadership in pre-World War I European labor unions and socialist parties are regarded as his greatest contribution in the field of Organizational Politics. Michels' study is characterized by the phenomenon of goal displacement in organizations. Formulating his famous "Iron Law of Oligarchy", Michels maintained that a strong organization is necessary for implementing the radical programme. Further, he explains that with the passage of time the leadership becomes increasingly concerned with revitalizing the organization and protecting it against attacks from conservative forces, even if doing so means abandoning the original radical ideas for more moderate ones to pacify the powerful opposition. In other words, Michels held that the inevitable organizational process transforms egalitarian parties or unions in to centralized bureaucracies dominated by officials and turn their radical goals into modest

reform programmes. Michel (1962) writes 'It is organization which gives birth to the domination of the elected over electors, of the mandatories over the mandators, of the delegates over the delegators. Who says, organization says oligarchy." Although Michels' Iron Law of Oligarchy was originally applied to political parties of the Left, there too exist one general line of analysis which deals with social movements in the context of Democracies. Another contribution of Michels' lies with the fact that he introduced the concept of intra-organizational power, arguing that established leaders will attempt to co-opt or neutralize their challengers in order to preserve power and control.

Broadly speaking, Michels' analysis on organization politics stand on the following concepts.

a. <u>Goal displacement</u>:   In his study of organizations, Michels developed this interesting concept of 'goal displacement' which had a far reaching impact in the study of movement organizations. By 'goal displacement' he meant the process whereby organizations subvert their original objectives and replace them with other goals, sometimes even with objectives that are alien to their original purposes. "In a rapidly progressive movement, it is not only the growth in the number of duties, but also the higher quality of these, which imposes a more extensive differentiation of function (Michels)."

b. <u>Delegation</u>: Constructing his theory of organization Michels also refers to Democracy and advocates for the need of delegation in the organization where the delegates represent the mass and carry out its will. In fact he asserts that when

organisations grow larger, it is inevitable for delegation to occur.

c. <u>Iron Law of Oligarchy</u>: Michels regard oligarchization of an organization as a matter of technical and practical necessity. According to him oligarchization refers to a process which involve a very strong tendency of political life in organizations. In other words oligarchization is the process which results in the distortion of democratic Legitimizing principles in an organization. Formulating the iron law of oligarchy, Michels (1970) writes, "It is the inevitable product of the very principle of the organization. Not even the most radical wing of the various socialist parties raises any objection to this retrogressive evolution, the contention being that democracy is only a form of organization and that where it ceases to be possible to harmonize democracy with organization, it is better to abandon the former then the later. Organization since it is the only means of attaining the ends of socialism, is considered to comprise within itself the revolutionary content of the party, and this essential content must never be sacrificed for the sake of former." In other words, Michels believe that with the increased organizational activity, every organization inevitably becomes less democratic as well, becomes divided into a minority of directors and a majority of the directed. To him, this technical indispensability of leadership is the primary cause of organizational oligarchy.

d. Democracy: Michels begins his analysis with the primary notion that democracy is invincible without organization. Having said this he makes an interesting comparison of 'the decline of democratic values' and 'the growth of organizations'. Michels (1970) writes, "With the advance of organization, democracy tends to decline. Democratic evolution has a parabolic course. … … Where organization is stronger, we find there is lesser degree of applied democracy."

e. Organizational leadership: 'Leadership growth' and 'leadership transformation' are two important concepts in the theory of Michels. In his analysis of organization, he starts by giving a negligible role to the leader. He designates the chief of an organization to be the servant of the masses and maintains that the organization is based upon the absolute equality of all its members.' But as he progresses with his theory, he argues that because of the need of the technical specialization in the organization, soon the leaders become the beholder of the power of determination. Michels (1970) writes "The mechanism of the organization, while conferring a solidity of structure induces serious changes in the organized mass, completely inverting the respective position of the leaders and the led. As a result of the organization, every party or professional union becomes divided into a minority of directors and majority of the directed."

- *Herbert Blumer and the Concept of Cycle of Change:*

In the league of the traditional theory of Organization, Herbert Blumer lay down four stages in the lifecycle of a social movement. He identifies them as the stage of social unrest, the stage of popular excitement, the stage of formalization and the stage of institutionalization. Blumer (1951) "In the beginning a social movement is loosely organized and characterized by impulsive behaviour. It has no clear objective; its behaviour and thinking are largely under the dominance of restlessness and collective excitement. As a social movement develops, however, its behaviour which was originally dispersed tends to become organized, solidified, and persistent. It is possible to delineate stages roughly in the career of a social movement which represent this increasing organization"

As developed by Blumer, the first stage that is the 'stage of unrest' is characterized by the unorganized and the unfocused agitation during which great attention is paid to the propaganda of the agitators. The second phase of 'popular excitement' highlights the underlying causes of the discontent and the objectives of actions. The 'formalization' stage of a movement is characterized by the formation of a formal organization to ensure disciplined participation and coordination of strategies. Finally, Blumer mentions about the 'institutionalization stage' where the movement becomes an organic part of the society and is crystallized into a fixed organization with a definite personnel and structure.

Taking his analysis to a different level of organizational politics, Blumer discuss three notions, i.e. the in – group – out group relation, informal fellowship and ceremonial behaviour. These three concepts are very much useful in understanding the conflict and solidarity dynamics of a movement

organization. By 'in group out group notion' Blumer (1951) describes the existence of two enemy groups in a movement and makes an interesting note that, "The belief on the parts of its members that the movement is being opposed unjustly and unfairly by vicious and unscrupulous groups serves to rally the members around their aims and values. To have an enemy, in this sense, is very important for imparting solidarity to the movement." Discussing informal fellowship, Blumer explains the emergence of different informal and communal associations and their impact on the movement. On ceremonial behaviour he attaches importance to mass meetings, rallies, huge demonstrations, and commemorative ceremony. The importance of Blumer lies in the fact that he developed these tools in the context of the functional aspect of the organization.

3.2 Institutionalization and Goal Displacement Model

This model is mainly developed from the above explained analysis of Weber and Roberto Michels. It assumes great importance as far as the study of the transformation of social movement organization is concerned. "A Weberian approach focusing primarily on bureaucratization initially dominated in the sociology of social movements as in other areas. Michels' 'Iron Law of Oligarchy', which states that in order to survive as an organization a political party increasingly pays attention to adapting to its environment rather than to its original goals of social change, was also held valid for social movements" (Porta and Diani, 2006). An integration of these two has been made possible in several studies of Movement Organizations (MO), which has now come to be known as the Institutionalization and Goal Displacement Model. This model follows quite an interesting line of analysis,

"as an MO attains an economic and social base in the society, as the original charismatic leadership is replaced, a bureaucratic structure emerges and a general accommodation to the society occurs. The participants in this structure have a stake in preserving the organization, regardless of its ability to attain goals" (Zald and Ash, 1987). In the process of preserving the organization three general changes occur within the organization, viz. goal transformation, a shift to organizational maintenance, and oligarchisation; and these changes are often fused. Understanding of these three concepts as stemmed from Michels' and Weber's analysis is very much important as it points out at several crucial aspects of organizational politics. 'Goal transformation' is the replacement of unattainable goals with diffuse goals, so that the organization can pursue a broader range of targets. In a broader sense it refers to the accommodation of organization goals to dominant societal consensus. 'Shift to organizational maintenance' is explained as the maintenance of membership, funds and other requirements of organizational existence.

3.3   Philip Selznick and Institutional or Organizational Analysis

A more general way of understanding different aspects of organizational politics is provided by Philip Selznick's (1948) 'Institutional or Organizational Analysis'. In the study of organizational politics Selznick's approach is of great importance as it analyse organizations as congeries of groups brought together in complex systems and nested in environments that support or challenge different organizational structures. His greatest contribution in the field of movement organization study is the inclusion of the non-rational dimensions of organizational behavior within the scope of organizational politics. Selznick (1949) notes that "the most important thing about organizations is that, though they are tools, each nevertheless has a life of its own". He acknowledges the

rational view that organizations are designed to attain goals; at the same time, he also maintains that the formal structures can never conquer the non-rational dimensions of the organizational behavior. Furthermore, he believes that neither the individuals act purely on the basis of their formal roles nor the organizations act purely on the basis of formal structures. Selznick distinguishes between organization as structural expression of rational action and organization viewed as an adaptive organic system, affected by social characteristics of participants as well as varied pressures imposed by environment. He maintains that over time, organizations are transformed into institutions of varying degrees.

Visualizing organizational transformation in the course of a movement, Selznick (1943) discusses a different form of goal displacement. "Running an organization, as a specialized and essential activity generates problems which have no necessary (and often opposed) relationship to the professed or original goals of the organization. The day to day behaviour of the group becomes centred on specific problems and approximate goals which have primarily an internal relevance. Then since these activities come to consume an increasing proportion of the time and thoughts of the participants, they are - from the point of view of actual behaviour – substituted for the professed goals.'" In other words Selznick points out that the mechanism of the fixation of the internal problems does have such an impact on the organization that it no longer serves its intended purpose. Formulating grounds for organizational transformation Selznick speaks of another concept, i.e. 'co-optation'. By co-optation he means a process that absorbs new elements into the leadership or policy-determining structure of an organization. The formal co-optation takes place when there is a lull between consent and

control and the co-optation is informal, when it results from pressure from a specific place of power.

Taking a functionalist position, Selznick argues that organizations have some basic needs, the most fundamental of which is the need for survival. Organizations must adapt to changing environment in order to survive, which requires changes in goals and internal arrangement of organization. This approach of Selznick regards organizational goals as problematic and as changing in response to both internal and external pressure.

3.4   Mass Society Theory

Contemporary sociologists frequently use the Mass Society Theory to explain the importance of organizations in the growth of social movements. The leading exponent of this theory Kornahauser (1959) characterizes mass society by the isolation of personal relations and the centralization of the national relations, that is, the growth of centralized bureaucratic organizations at the expense of locally controlled intermediate groups. The strength of the mass society theory lies with the fact that it tests two empirical propositions to give authenticity to its hypothesis. First, it states that extremist movement will flourish in societies with a low number and thin network of intermediate groups, where few people participate in voluntary, occupational, religious, civic and other associations. Second, it states that, it is the alienated, uprooted, nonparticipants in intermediate groups, those with weakest attachment to the class based organizations who will be the most susceptible to extremist appeals, who will be the first to join the extremist movements, who will join in large numbers and become the activists.

3.5   External and Internal Factors of Organizational Change

However, it is Mayor N. Zald and Roberta Ash, who come up with a more convincing argument. Broadly speaking their whole analysis can be divided into two parts, first dealing with the impact of environment (external factors) and second dealing with the impact of internal processes (factionalism, leadership) on the organizational transformation.

- *External Factors of Organizational Transformation:*

Mayor and Zald (1987) identify three interrelated aspects of environment which critically affect the growth and transformation of the organization. First, it is the changing conditions in the society which increase or decrease the potential support base of a movement's organization. Here they develop an interesting concept called 'ebb and flow of supporting sentiments.' "The difference between ebb and flow of sentiment for a social movement and for a given MO has important consequences for organizational growth. Under some conditions there may be strong sentiment base- at the same time there is a strong hostility to a particular organization. 'Front' Organizations are attempts to capitalize on such a situation. The dimensions are partially independent. The ideal condition for organizational growth is obviously a strong sentiment base with low societal hostility towards the movement or it's MOs." However, Mayor and Zald (1987) believe that the ebb and flow of sentiments doesn't affect organizational transformation at equal rates in all movement organizations.

Secondly, moving with their notion of ebb and flow of sentiments Mayor and Zald (1987) touch upon another important concept of inter-organizational competition on the basis of the shifting goals and tactics of a movement. They

hold that competition among Movement Organizations for support requires them to be responsive to the differences and shift in sentiment towards goals and tactics.

Third, Movement organization functions in an environment with other organizations aiming at rather similar goals. Similarity of goals causes an uneasy alliance but also creates the conditions for inter–organizational competition. Zald and Ash (1987) identify three different aspects of inter movement organization interaction: cooperation, coalition, and merger.

- *Internal Processes of Organizational Transformation:*

Shifting the analytical focus from the external variables to the internal factors, Zald and Ash (1987) identify emerging bureaucratic structures, internal ideological factions and leadership styles as the prime cause of organizational transformation. They systematically study the notion of factions, splits, leadership change, replacement of charisma, goal commitments, and leadership styles to arrive at a methodical conclusion.

The crux of the whole analysis of Zald and Ash (1987) lies with their 17 proposition as mentioned in their path braking essay. Following is the full text of the hypothesis that they formed and kept it open ended for further theoretical exploration.

"1. The size of the organizational potential support base, the amount of societal interest in the social movement and its MOs, and the direction of that interest (favorable, neutral, or hostile) directly affect the ability of the organization to survive and/ or grow.

2. The more insulated an organization is by exclusive membership requirements and goals aimed at changing individuals, the less susceptible it is to pressures for organizational maintenance or general goal transformation.

3. Goal and tactic transformation of MO is directly tied to the ebb and flow of sentiments within a social movement. The interorganizational competition for support leads to a transformation of goals and tactics.

4. MOs created by other organizations are more likely to go out of existence following success than MOs with their own linkages to individual supporters.

5. MOs with relatively specific goals are more likely to vanish following success than organizations with broad general goals.

6. MOs that aim to change individuals and employ solidary incentives are less likely to vanish than are MOs with goals aimed at changing society and employing mainly purposive incentives.

7. Inclusive organizations are likely to fade away faster than exclusive organizations; the latter are more likely to take on new goals.

8. A becalmed movement is most likely to follow the Weber-Michels' model because it's dependence on and control of material incentives allows oligarchization and conservatism to take place.

9. Inclusive MOs are more likely than exclusive MOs to participate in coalitions and mergers.

10. Coalitions are most likely to occur if the coalition is more likely to achieve goals or lead to a larger resource base – when success is close or when one indivisible goal or position is at stake.

11. The less the short-run chances of attaining goals, the more solidary incentives act to separate the organization into homogeneous subgroups- ethnic, class, and generational. As a corollary, to the extent that a becalmed or failing MO is heterogeneous and must rely heavily on solidary incentives, the more likely it is to be beset by factionalism.

12. The more the ideology of the MO leads to a questioning of the basis of authority, the greater the likelihood of factions and splitting.

13. Exclusive organizations are more likely than inclusive organizations to be beset by schisms.

14. Routinization of charisma is likely to conservatize the dominant core of the movement organization while simultaneously producing increasingly radical splinter groups.

15. If a leadership cadre is committed to radical goals to a greater extent than the membership- at –large, member apathy and oligarchical tendencies lead to greater rather than less radicalism.

16. An exclusive organization is almost certain to have a leadership that focuses on mobilizing membership for tasks, while inclusive organization is readier to accept an articulating leadership style.

17. The MO oriented to individual change is likely to have a leadership focused on mobilizing sentiments, not articulating with the larger society

are more likely to require both styles of leadership, depending on the stage of their struggle."

Broadly speaking through this theoretical construction presentation Zald and Garner attempted to provide a counter argument to the dominant assumption that the Movement organization always become oligarchical, conservative and bureaucratic. Conversely they suggest that oligarchization sometime lead to greater radicalism, rather than conservatism.

4.0 CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above mentioned theories it can be concluded that the starting point for the analysis of any type of organizational change in relation to Social Movement studies involve three principal players. The first group of player includes those individuals, groups, and organizations who tend to control the available power and resource equation in a given society. The second group includes those individuals, groups, and organizations who challenge the first group and in the process pose question marks over the fundamental structural-procedural features of the socio-political environment. The third group comprises of units of governance that exercise field level power and exercise. These three are the principal players in the scope of organizational politics and any change witnessed by the movement organization is mostly shaped by the changing equation among these three players. However, it is a time tested reality that the change or transformation is a universal phenomenon and is transported by many carriers. It may result in the transformation of existing organizations or the creation of new or hybrid

forms. It is advanced by institutionalized processes as well as by the conflict dynamics.   In the process settlements as well as more clashes do occur sometime during the course of a movement but they, in turn, give rise to different struggles among contending interests and logics. It is this dynamics of organizational conflict which has emerged as the focal point in the study of organizational politics as it shapes up the real course of a movement. However as social movement or movement organization is a complex phenomenon, no general rule of organizational transformation is possible. During the course of a movement some movement becomes more institutionalized and transforms themselves in to political parties or pressure groups. Also there is a possibility of some organizations becoming more radical and adopting more violent operational ways. Given the above theoretical premises it can be pointed out that research on social movements must also adopt an approach to study the organizational behavior which would lead towards useful insights into the understanding of growth and decay of social movements and the role played by movement organizations.

References

Blumer, H. 1951 Social Movements, in McClung Lee, A. (ed.), Principles of Sociology, Barnes & Nobles, New York.

Haralambos, M. 1999, Sociology: Themes and Perspectives, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

Kornhauser, W. 1959, The Politics of Mass Society, Glencoe, III, Free Press, New York.

Lofland, J. 1996, Social Movement Organizations, Aldine Transaction, New York.

McCarthy, J. D. and Zald, M. N. 1987, Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory. In Zald, M.N. and McCarthy, J.D. Social Movements in an Organizational Society, Transaction, New Jersey.

Merton, R. 1949, Social Theory and Social Structure, Free Press, Glencoe III.

Michels, R. 1962, Political Parties: A Sociological Study of Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern democracies, The Free Press, New York.

Michels, R. 1970, Oligarchy, in Grusky, Oscar and Miller, George A. (ed.), The Sociology of Organizations, The Free Press, New York.

Oberschall, A. 1980, Loosely Structured Collective Conflict: A Theory and an Application. In Kriesberg, L. (ed.), Research in social Movements, Conflict and Change, Vol.3, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Porta, D. D. and Diani, M. 2006, Social Movements: An Introduction, Black Well Publishing limited, Malden.

Scot, R. W. 1980, Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open System, Prentice hall, New Jersey.

Selznick, P. 1943, An Approach to a Theory of Bureaucracy, American Sociological Review, Vol. 8.

Selznick, P. 1948, Foundations of the Theory of Organization, American Sociological Review, Vol. 13 February.

Selznick, P. 1949, TVA and the Grass Roots: A Study in the sociology of formal Organizations, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Weber, M. 1970, Bureaucracy in Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller (ed.), The Sociology of Organizations: Basic Studies, The Free Press, New York.

Zald, M. N. and Ash, R. 1987, Social Movement Organizations, Growth, Decay and Change, in Barry McLaughlin (ed.) Studies in Social Movements: A social psychological perspective, The Free Press, New York.