I. Introduction

From Arab spring to Occupy movement, internet-mediated protests have overthrown governments or forced them to change policies. The speed and scale of this mobilization is unprecedented. A large volume of literature has explored the characteristics of these protests in the information age. Past research has pointed out that when channels of interaction between the public and government are blocked, the web can serve as an avenue for voicing dissatisfaction and, as a new technological medium, it has transformed the mode of interpersonal communication, which has led to changes in how social movements mobilize (Castells 2012; Anduiza, Jensen and Jorba 2012). Such movements are now able to launch large scale collective actions in a short time.

Social scientists try to provide answers for the following questions: How does the information communication technology make the protest different? Does this new medium change communication modes and the logic of organizing groups for collective action? What makes netizens take to the streets and become truly engaged and devoted to making a change, instead of staying online without getting out of their chairs?

Most early social science studies of social movements either utilize Olson’s logic of collective action (Olsen 1971) as a theoretical foundation for analysis, or theories based on it, for example, resource mobilization theory (Jenkins 1983) and the new social movement theory (Laraña, Johnston, and Gusfield 2009). The former emphasizes the importance of resources in social movements, while the latter stresses the importance of identity, which is critical to avoid the free rider problem. The goal these collective actions try to achieve is a common good which is, by nature,
something that is not divisible or selectively allotted. That is, if a movement succeeds, everyone will benefit regardless of whether or not they participated, which can lead to a freeriding problem. Certain measures can be taken to overcome the problem of freeriding. For example, a large organization or powerful leader can provide resources to serve as incentives or, from a psychological perspective, an emphasis on collective identity cause members to combine forces for action.

As a result of internet technology development, the appearance of social websites and the popularity of big data analysis technologies, social movements are transformed dramatically with respect to communication methods and organizational modes when those familiar with communication technologies participate no matter their level of technology skills. Based on the logic of collective action Bennett and Segerberg (2012, 2013) propose the logic of connective action. They emphasize two transformations brought about by internet technologies: the most important of these are personal action frame and communication technology as organization. Bennett and Segerberg point out and explain the manner in which all netizens express themselves to achieve collective actions, and how the internet itself has become a new mode of organization. These discoveries provide a new perspective for social movement theory.

March 18, 2014 became the first time the floor of Taiwan’s Legislative Yuan was occupied, an incident which received the attention of the international news media. The name “Sunflower Movement” was bestowed upon these activities, and from the moment students occupied the legislature internet technologies played an instrumental role in both organization and mobilization inside and outside the building. On March 30, protesters called the Taiwan public at large to take part in sit-ins and marching demonstrations at Ketegalan Boulevard in front of the Presidential Hall. Tens of thousands of protesters, identifiable by the black shirts they wore, swarmed into the area surrounding the Legislative Yuan, thus creating a new page in the history of Taiwan’s social movements. Furthermore, the movement received over 6,630,000 NTS in contributions within 3 short hours for posting a series of advertisements in the New York Times entitled “Democracy at 4am.” The impact of the movement on policy making is that the Legislative Yuan decided to prioritize making legislation of an oversight mechanism for the Cross-Strait agreement over reviewing and passing the services trade agreement.
This movement shocked Taiwanese society and had a great impact on political researchers. In examining the above mentioned literature on social movements, we found many aspects of the Sunflower Student Movement would be a worthwhile subject for dialogue based on this literature researching news media and social movements. Based on the logic of collective action as well as the logic of connective action, this research proposes an alternative perspective: the logic of communitive action, which supplements previous theories in three ways. Firstly, we believe communitive consciousness created by affect plays a critical role throughout a movement, and it is political opportunity which invokes public emotion. Secondly, a new type of leadership is emerging in the digital community, which means technology savvy and political knowledgeable leaders facilitate the process of organizing. Thirdly, crowdsourcing is a central means of coordinating the work involved in a movement, and communitive consciousness is the most important motivation for crowdsourcing. Our proposal of a logic of communitive action is not a denial of the logic of collective action or of connective action. Rather, we desire to provide a new perspective for internet mediated social movements through an examination of the Sunflower Student Movement.

This study is composed of five sections. The present section is the introduction. The second section provides a brief review and comments on the logic of collective action, as well as the logic of connective action. The third section is the theoretical framework of the logic of communitive action, as coined by the authors. The fourth section elaborates on how Taiwan’s Sunflower Movement demonstrates the logic of communitive action. The fifth section is the implication for democratic governance in the information age.

II. Collective Action in the Information Age

Olson’s collective action theory starts with the supposition that all people are

---

1 Here we use "communitive," a term not often used, as the adjective of community.
2 Crowdsourcing is the combining of the public’s wisdom, and the call for people with varying abilities and talents to contribute their efforts. Crowdsourcing movements involve communication over the internet. The details of this concept will be discussed in later sections.
self-interested rational actors, and asserts the problem of free riding must be overcome in order for these actors to work together as a group in accomplishing a goal aimed at the common good (Olsen 1971). Because of the self-interested actors’ considerations, as well as the costs involved with common action, the actor might anticipate other participants will achieve the desired actions and that he or she will obtain the benefits involved in collective action by the group without providing any of the necessary capital. Because common good is allotted to all, it does not matter whether an actor participates in the collective action or not. He or she will still receive the benefits if the action succeeds. Thus, if every actor has an inclination to become a free rider, and the group is a large one with members unfamiliar with one another, it will be difficult for this collective action to succeed. For this reason, Olson suggests selective incentive and coercion might be useful in overcoming the pitfalls involved with self-interested rational actors in collective action. Selective incentive refers to additional goods such as benefits allotted to workers joining a union, while coercion refers to negative selective incentives like making employment contingent on union membership.

With respect to organizational form, a strong organization is necessary as the center of collective action mobilization. In addition, a vertically connected hierarchical structure is necessary (Klandersman 1993) in order to recruit members and be a voice to the wider public and government.

Most of the scholars mentioned above make little discussion about the influence of new mediums of communication in their theories. The internet communication technologies have interjected a critical variable into theories concerning collective action, and provided a possibility for solving the above mentioned pitfalls for collective action. As stated by the theorists of collective action, people often participate in these actions because of dissatisfaction, but lack the ability to voice these grievances through official channels. The internet, a new medium of communication, has become a tool which can be utilized for voicing such grievances. When the influence of government systems fails to serve as a channel of communication for the public, people will use the internet to make their voices heard, to connect with others, and even to launch ‘extrarepresentational’ protest movements outside of the system according to a great volume of research (Anduiza, Jensen and Jorba, 2012).
There is much literature related to the internet as a mobilization tool, and many scholars have discussed the manners in which internet communication technologies overcome the pitfalls of collective action, in addition to increasing individual desire to participate. Firstly, the internet economizes the temporal and monetary capital necessary for collecting information, and this new medium characteristically creates a situation in which movement participants are not limited by their own economic or social status (Kann, Berry, Grant and Zager 2007). The internet provides them with resources sufficient for participation. Citizens can effectively obtain information concerning public issues, and this sufficiency of information further increases their motivation to participate in offline political activities (Tolbert and McNeal 2003). As Pippa (2001) suggests, digital technologies reduce the costs of “gathering information and communicating messages, with consequences that will mainly serve to benefit minor parties, smaller groups, and fringe movement activists”(p. 238). Thus, as Liao and Chen (2013) propose, the internet is the best mobilization tool for peripheral political agents. In summation, internet use decreases the costs and risks of collective action participation.

We would expect, based on the logical of collective action, while the internet medium could, for the most part, decrease cost, and provide resources, overall organizational form, or the method in which large organizations operate, would not change drastically. However, from observing the Arab Spring movement scholars discovered the changes brought by the internet as medium were not merely a reduction in cost. Rather, more importantly, the overall organizational form and communication methods were also fundamentally transformed. If this were not the case, it would have been impossible for this large scale protest to occur, or for protesters to come together so quickly.

Scholars have referred to certain revolutions as “twitter revolutions” because of the critical role social media played in connecting members of the public. Based on the logic of collective action, Bennett and Segerberg (2012) propose the “logic of connective action.” Here, they provide an analysis for internet era group organization methods, and undertake dialogue concerning the logic of collective action.
Personalized collective action

Because the internet breaks down temporal and spatial limits and connects those who use it, the name “connective action” itself, which Bennett and Segerberg (2012, 2013) propose, points to the uniqueness of the internet as tool. Their research involves the demonstrations at the 2009 G10 Summit in London, and the “indignant ones” (los indignados) protest in Spain, as well as the Occupy Wall Street movement in the United States. Most of these protests occurred because governments were unable to undertake measures to solve economic problems precipitated by the 2008 economic crisis. Rather, citizens were enraged and took to the street as a result of being asked to accept austerity measures.

What is more, because countries were preoccupied with the financial crisis, they put other critical issues, such as climate change, on the backburner, which was met by dissatisfaction by many environmental groups. The authors find the participation of organizations with longer histories in demonstration activities decreased substantially. Only 38% of participants were key organizations with brick and mortar addresses, and only 13% came from groups with membership or affiliation. In addition, the average age of protest organizations was not over 3 years (Bennett and Segerberg 2012, p.741).

These facts demonstrate large scale actual organizations with memberships are on the decline in social movements during the internet era. Given this, what is replacing these organizations which once played an important role in collective action? Bennett and Segerberg put forward these central tenets concerning the logic of connective action: 1) personal action frames; 2) communication technology and organization.

In this theory, Bennett and Segerberg (2012) emphasize the shift from group-based to individualized society resulting from the formation of an online society. There are several differences between the connective action created by this individualized society and traditional collective action: firstly, connective action emphasizes personal frame action, while collective action requires collective frame action (p.747). Community websites ensure individuals have a place in the virtual world, and provide a space in which the individual can express himself or herself. What is more, these personal expressions are imparted to the individual’s friends in the community website, and this becomes an online social network.
Social media sites are also a natural channel for expressing political dissatisfaction. Netizens desire to receive feedback from others through sharing news, videos, pictures, and script. If they are acknowledged by other netizens, then the above mentioned information is disseminated very quickly. As such, the flow of information expressing protest starts with self-motivated sharing, and then finds force in the cyberspace. Once the first person has sent out a message, others who agree with the message need not share it with others in original form. Rather, each person can use any method they like in expressing their opinion about the message, and can even alter or recreate the expressive form. This communication process itself involves further personalization.

One example involves the Occupy Wall Street Movement, in which netizens used various memes to express protest on the internet. Among these, the most famous was “We are the 99 %.” Many posts described in detail the personal challenges of living in an economically unbalanced society. As soon as a meme starts to be echoed, it gains force on the internet, and even becomes a central tool in mobilizing for on the ground action. Therefore, in comparison to connective action, collective action requires a common organizational slogan, which is difficult for individual netizens to develop. Thus, collective action cannot be a mainstream means of mobilization in the internet age.

Secondly, within the theory of connective action, internet technology is the networking agent, and is communication technology as organization, which means it does not require the large scale organizational operation necessary for collective action to provide resources, or central coordination of all actions (Bennett and Segerberg 2013, Ch.3). In addition, the internet is not monolithic. Rather, it is a “network of networks” created between various internets.

These networks, created by communication technologies, have the following utilities: first, distribute resources : report from the scene of events, circulate mass media reports, especially those news from independent media, create new discourses, allocate money, provide information regarding lodging, medical aid, food etc. Second, digitally networked action (DNA) can respond rapidly to emergencies and coordinate action, alert people to show up, avoid or confront police, take new action, etc. (Bennett and Segerberg 2013, Ch.3).

The logic of connective action views the reason for the speed at which large scale
mobilization could occur as the effectiveness of personal action frame and communication. However, we believe the logic of connective action might have the following problems. First, it fails to explain psychological factors that foster netizen action.

Here, “psychological factors” refers to communitive consciousness or feelings, a belief that “my” actions can influence others through the internet, and exhort “us” or “everyone” to improve society through action, or to influence government policy. We believe the logic of connective action over-emphasizes the individualization of society and thus downplays the role of collective identity an affect. It is difficult to build a network, or take to the streets without communitive consciousness or sentiment. Rather, you will only have low commitment netizens going online at home. Second, even with a digitally networked action it is impossible to avoid the problems involved with determining who the leader is. As Bennett and Segerberg (2013) admit, to examine the problem of how power is distributed in networks, and how this matters is crucial. This involves the problem of leadership and member relationships for all those participating.

We expect that online collective action still has a leader with the consciousness of a “we,” and it is merely that the relationship between the leader and the community undergoes a transformation in the internet age. In summation, this research proposes the logic of communitive action, which does not dispute the logic of connective action, but desires to provide a new perspective in order to shed some light on the theoretical framework of Internet activism.

III. The Logic of Communitive Action

Why communitive action?

The community has always been a critical modus for the actions of humankind, and it is traditionally believed that community is collectives of people. That is (a) the community possesses common values and beliefs, and (b) the social relationship of this group of people is a relationship of affect, and it is uniquely characterized by mutuality and emotional bonds. It is furthermore (c) characterized by frequent interaction (Bell and Newby 1971). As early as two decades ago, a number of sociologists brought up the commutative qualities possessed by social movements and
proposed the notion of a social movement community (Buechler 1990). Here, the social movement community refers to “a network of informal interactions between a plurality of individuals, groups and/or organizations, engaged in a political or cultural conflict, on the basis of a shared collective identity” (Diani 1992, p.13). The notion of a social movement community, in fact, already includes organizations which are social movement networks, and those which are not; the condition for being a social movement community is the communal sharing of values. In the internet age, scholars have proposed various communities formed as a result of the internet medium. In the article analyzing political form of Occupy Wall Street, Jensen and Bang (2013) found a “political community characterized by people doing things together in virtue, rather than despite of, their multiple social, cultural, moral, religious, and political positions and identities”(p.459).

The communitive action indicated by this paper is action undertaken based on communitive consciousness. Compared with both the logic of collective action and the logic of connective action, we put more emphasis on the importance of the role community plays as a concept. Thus we propose the logic of communitive action. This logic leads to three deductive aspects: emotion generated community, new types of leadership and communitive consciousness as crowdsourcing motivation in the digital community.

Emotion generated community

Emotion and affect are often relegated to the periphery of social science research. In particular, political analysis often neglects the importance of emotion and effect in communitive action. The importance of emotions and affective ties in collective identity formation has been highlighted by Hunt and Benford (2004) in their excellent overview of collective identity, solidarity and commitment in social movement. In recent years, literature on demonstrations and protests has started to see the role emotion and affect plays as important. For example, Castells (2012) refers to internet mobilized social movements or revolutions as “networks of outrage and hope.” Davou and Demertzis (2013) examine the emotions felt by Greek citizens as a result of the financial crisis and austerity measures, as well as the impact of these emotions on political attitudes and actions. They point out the most important variables for allowing motivation to become political action are hope and
perceived political efficacy. Wendy Pearlman analyzes the 2011 uprising in Tunisia and Egypt and expresses doubt concerning dominant rationalistic perspectives on social movement. Even though participants in these protests and demonstrations were faced with unfavorable political climates and clogged information channels, they still were willing to risk death in order to in a situation where the probability of success was not great. Emotions of pride, anger and solidarity thus played an important role in mobilizing participants to take to the streets. Emotion provides a new perspective on anomalies which structure and instrumentality cannot explain.

Because human being is an animal with a feeling of connection with society s/he is infected with the emotions created by external events, and these emotions become a central impetus for mobilization. Barbalet (1998) indicates emotion/affect is not created simply in the individual. Rather, many affects are created by the interaction between individuals or by the interaction between individuals and their social situations. In other words, public sentiment does not arise without being provoked. We believe the political opportunity suggests is an important origin for the stimulation of public mood. When the public is dissatisfied with their life under a system, with government policy, and when it lacks an avenue for expression, this rage will be disseminated through the internet, and gradually grow into a form of solidarity in cyberspace. Emotions are contagious through social medial (Kramer, Guillory and Hancock 2014). In addition, emotional ties between activists can keep activists from experiencing setbacks and help them overcome the effects of repression (Fominaya 2010).

Needless to say, if most people simply grumble online concerning their discontentment, it is impossible for concrete collective action to take place. As Davou and Demertzis (2013) state, the most important driving forces behind political actions are “desire” and “feelings of political efficacy.” That is, the netizens who not only express dissatisfaction online, but also desire to improve the present situation through action, feel greater political efficacy (Anduiza et al. 2012). Unlike netizens on community websites for entertainment, these netizens often participate in social movements out of a notion of improving others or society (Kenski and Stroud 2006).
New type of leadership in the digital community

Does social movement in the internet era need leaders? Many scholars cast doubt on the role of leadership in the internet mediated social movement. Some social movement activists in fact intentionally put more emphasis on the collectiveness of their action instead of leadership. Some of the activists are tired of a dominated way of decision making which is made by a small and exclusive group of people (Stutje 2012). While much of the literature emphasizes the lack of organization in the internet age, as though leaders are not an important element to success, some researches illustrate a group of leaders or ‘starters’ still are still crucial at the beginning to scale up the movement (Magetts, John, Hale and Reissfeider 2013).

This study believes it is not the importance of leadership has not subsided but, rather, a new form of leadership may have emerged. Social protest movements that occurred in recent years in the West and the Middle East indicate how leaders in the organized political minorities utilize the Internet. For example, the Occupy Wall Street Movement was led by many key players (Ungerleider 2011). In 2004, a group of Tunisia’s dissidents, who were familiar with Internet technology, used the open-access software WorldPress to create the Nawaat.org website. Information on the political activities was collected on this site. In the following five years, Nawaat disseminated information on Tunisia’s human rights situation through videos, pictures, and text, and made the atrocities of Ben Ali public. These forms of information were also broadcast via YouTube, Flickr, Facebook, and other websites. Several years ago, these Tunisian activists connected with Arab language bloggers, and this became the main impetus behind the Jasmine Revolution and the Arab Spring Revolution (Mackinnon 2012, pp. 21-35). The abovementioned protest groups would not have been able to express their dissatisfaction through official political participation and channels. Even though they were passively connected to the relatively free medium of the internet in the very beginning, they immediately learned to utilize that to broadcast and express their views, as well as gather like-minded groups to participate in collective action.

The difference between the logic of communitive action we propose and connective action theory lies in our emphasis on the obvious necessity for technologically and politically savvy leaders for internet based social movement success, even though it is hard to identify who are the true leaders among the network
of networks mentioned by the connective action theory.

**Communitive consciousness as motivation of crowdsourcing**

Crowdsourcing has become a very popular term recently. Crowdsourcing was first proposed as a concept in 2006. In his 2008 book *Crowdsourcing*, Jeff Howe officially defined the term as a group of people providing their own extra-professional time to collectively undertake an activity outside their own careers and without the goal of profit. Not only have businesses used this method to solve problems, but social movements have also utilized crowdsourcing to achieve their ends. It integrates public knowledge and calls on people with varying degrees of ability and different talents to connect, communicate, and make contributions.

With the advent of internet technology, crowdsourcing has become a very cost effective solution for businesses or social movements which need to find problem solvers urgently. However, the public requires a motivation for joining crowdsourcing, and certain scholars, such as Leimeister, Huber, Bretschneider and Krcmar. (2009) and Hossain (2012) indicate crowdsourcing still requires both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. While intrinsic motivation refers to the enjoyment gained from performing task, extrinsic motivation refers to material incentives such as money or prizes.

From the perspective of extrinsic motivation, the incentives stated in Olson’s logic of collection action are, as yet, critical to the success of crowdsourcing. Livingston (2010) points out the challenges faced by crowdsourcing, and demonstrates without sufficient incentives and management it will still fail. That is, in a situation where incentives and coercion are insufficient, crowdsourcing can easily fail because participants will give up halfway through the endeavor.

Therefore, we believe certain conditions must be fulfilled in order for crowdsourcing to succeed. Namely, a political opportunity which spurs communitive consciousness must exist. The community which is created can then overcome the above mentioned failure obstacles, that is, those which can cause failure. Wikipedia is a good example of success created through communitive consciousness, and it is essentially a social movement. Many scholars who research Wikipedia state it creates a community. Every Wikipedia editor must interact with other editors,
thus creating a sense of wikipedian’s own necessity within the Wikipedia community (Bryant, Forte and Bruckman 2005; Kuznetsov 2006).

Wikipedia’s success is not a random outcome brought about by technology or the contributions of millions of people. In fact, this success requires the coordination of all its editors with their common goals, customs, and traditions in the chaos created by an “order” in which “everyone is the editor” (McGrady 2009). In this self-organized community, there is no autocrat or managing organization with ultimate authority.

Yet, Wikipedia can succeed in reaching its goals in a disorganized situation where order exists. Some have referred to this phenomenon as “chaordic” a term coined by Dee Hock (1999). A portmanteau combining “chaos” and “order,” this term refers to a system which integrates chaos and order then achieves harmony in its operation. We believe communitive consciousness is extremely important in allowing coordination within a movement seeking to find harmony between chaos and order.

Wikipedia is not merely an example of crowdsourcing with each person providing creativity, and it is not the case that all editors continue to contribute because of intrinsic motivation or enjoyment. Scholars point out that Wikipedia is already a social movement providing participants with the opportunity to create a social consciousness. Its enemies are exorbitant encyclopedias like Britannica, as well as the media and even governments which attack it, such as those governments which seek to censor Wikipedia. Originally it was a movement promoting free and open source software (Konieczny 2009).

In summary, crowdsourcing has already become a major organizing method for social movements. In a chaordic system with no central management, each contributes according to his or her strengths, and work is coordinated to achieve commonly shared goals and visions. In this form of crowdsourcing, it is political opportunities which create communitive consciousness and serve as intrinsic motivation to mobilize people with various talents to contribute their efforts.

In the following section, we utilize the Sunflower Movement in discussing these various theories.
IV. Sunflower Movement and the Logic of Communitive Action

4.1 Emotion Generated Community

*Political opportunity: The 30-second incident*

The Sunflower Student Movement started after March 17, 2014. On that day KMT committee chairman Chang Ching-chung gave his 30 second announcement, which went as follows: “fifty-two are present. Thus the legally necessary number has been reached. Meeting is commenced. Let us begin discussion. Since it has been three months since the Cross-Strait Service Trade Agreement (海峽兩岸服貿協議) (CSSTA) was submitted to committee for review, it is viewed as already reviewed according to regulations, and will be sent to the Legislative Yuan general assembly. Meeting is adjourned.”

After Chang declared the agreement had already passed, a group of social movement group leaders waiting outside believed President Ma Ying-Jeou’s (馬英九) government, the group of KMT legislators led by Ma, and the KMT majority controlled Legislative Yuan had overstepped the bounds of acceptable democratic behavior, and violated the basic principles of a democracy, thus losing public trust. The outrage and dissatisfaction toward President Ma’s government and the KMT members of the legislature, and the belief this government was challenging the norms of democracy, brought people from various walks of life together.

There were 23 groups in all participating in the Sunflower Movement community. When these groups stormed onto the Legislative Yuan floor on March 18, the nearly month long Sunflower Student Movement had begun. Hereafter, tens of thousands of young students and members of the public identifying with the Sunflower Movement congregated around the Legislative Yuan and gradually formed a chaordic operating community. On March 30, close to five hundred thousand students, groups, and members of the younger generation took to the streets to protest a lack of transparency in the CSSTA process and the violation of democratic principles by the Ma government.³ The various groups participating in the

³ Yang Man-yu (楊曼瑜)(2014) and Chang Tieh-chih(張鐵志) (2014) both point to procedural problems in the Legislative Yuan as a critical element. In particular, Yang’s onsite questionnaire survey demonstrates the lack of legitimacy in procedures is the problem protesters occupying the
Sunflower Movement generated communitive consciousness based on emotions of rage. This study explains the source of these emotions and how these catalyzed community cohesion below.

*Anger & dissatisfaction*

On PTT\(^4\) and Facebook President Ma was redrawn as a dictator, as *ma-ka-rong* (a nickname given to him because he thought deer antler velvet grew out of the deer’s ears),\(^5\) or someone who pretended not to hear the demands of the younger generation. These posters all expressed the young generation’s resentment toward Ma Ying-Jeou.

This study also applied text mining technique and sentiment analysis to the digital data retrieved from Facebook fan pages of main groups launching occupying movement during the period from March 1\(^{st}\) 2014 to April 30\(^{th}\) 2014. The netizens’ narratives on those Fan Pages revealed Castells’s notion of “networks of outrage and hope”, and demonstrated the most important variables for allowing motivation to become political action. The emotion of those netizens flared up since Mar. 18\(^{th}\) when the 30-second incident caused the occupy movement. And the sentiments reached the peak on Mar 25\(^{th}\) and gradually diminished when the occupy movement entered the first week of April (See graph 1). We found the terms “*ma ka rong*” (*馬卡茸*) (N=331) and “lack of transparency” (*黑箱*) (N=102) were among the top 10 negative sentiment words used by netizens, which reflected the source of anger and dissatisfaction while “hope” (*希望*) (N=141) stood out as one of the three most used positive sentiment words.

---

4 Taiwan’s most popular Bulletin Board System Station with tens of thousands of posts per day.
5 The source of the phrase “*ma ka rong*” was an incident on March 3, 2014. While receiving foreign officials, President Ma stated deer antler velvet grew out of the deer’s ears.
In the theoretical section of this paper, we propose members of the public who wish to participate in social movements have stronger feelings of political efficacy. In the Sunflower Movement, from those participants’ age, their experiences growing up in democratic environment, and from their internet technological abilities, as well as from student movement slogans, we can clearly see the strong feelings of political efficacy held by Sunflower Movement participants.

Participants in the Sunflower Student Movement were made up primarily of the age group between twenty and forty with the following characteristics: first of all, it was comprised of students, those who had not been active in society for long, and white collar workplace members. Secondly, as stated previously in the theoretical portion of this paper, they desired to change society, but lacked actual authority, and the system gave them a feeling of powerlessness. Thirdly, at the same time, they

---

6 For example, a Google Taiwan search finds online discussion articles indicate participants were primarily between 20 and 30 years old. During the Sunflower Movement Yang Man-yu (楊曼瑜) and her friends handed out questionnaires and published the results on the Sunflower Student Movement Trade Service Civil Information Website. These results show participants were mainly between 20 and 40 years of age. Among these, the largest percentage, 50%, were between 20 and 29. Next was those 30-39(38%) (Yang 2014).
were society’s primary internet users. The experience possessed by online social movement leaders, information technology and related knowledge was integrated, and crowdsourcing was utilized to create an easy understand source of information on government. This provided the young generation, with strong feelings of political efficacy but no official channel for expressing itself, with the ability to quickly acquire knowledge, transmit messages, participate on collaborative sites, gather to participate in rallies, and seek to change their country and society (He 2012).

Yang (2014) performed onsite questionnaire surveys during the demonstrations and used text cloud method to discover the goal of the younger generation’s participation in the student movement was to make Taiwan a better country (Figure 1): “This is an opportunity to practically win back democracy and, at the same time, publicly discuss Taiwan’s future direction in a society which takes part in exchanges without fear. What is more, through the transforming the world, we will transform ourselves. So you, and those around you, should not fear conflict. Rather, do your best to communicate with one another, and Taiwan, was well as you as individuals, will be healthier and stronger for it.”

The core tenets held by the social movement group was largely exemplified by these thoughts. The younger generation making up the leaders and participants in this society believed they could protect Taiwan’s democracy in standing up to the muddleheaded government and save this imperiled country.

Figure 1: We, Taiwan Source: Yang (2014).
The student movement leaders as starters of the movement used communication and the internet to inspire feelings of political efficacy in other members of the younger generation, thus giving them the will to stand up for their rights. Political opportunity created feelings of anger and solidarity, as well as other sentiments, and brought the younger generation together in communitive consciousness. Under the impetus of this group with strong feelings of political efficacy, all participants felt, through this student movement, they could force the government to respond to the demands of the people and move “our Taiwan” in a better direction.

4.2 Leadership in Communitive Action: Chaordic Organizing

As this study previously indicates, over twenty communities participated in the Sunflower Movement. In addition, many members of the public and students joined the movement right on site. These groups, students, and members of the public had not previously been familiar with each other, nor had there been clear organization within the student movement community at the outset. However, within two days of the student movement’s eruption, several leaders started to appear before the media.

Hereafter, the gov Website\(^7\) started providing an information platform for the movement, but did not participate in movement decision making. Not long after, the media reported not all groups or members could participate in student movement leadership. The leadership class was comprised of certain part of the movement which has social movement experience which made up a decision making committee (ETTV News, 2014, Apr 3). However, the situation was more fluid concerning who could participate in decision making discussions.

According to reports, the decision making committee for the Sunflower Movement was made up of nine members. Among these, five were members of a

---

\(^7\) Gov is an online community in Taiwan that promotes information transparency, focusing on “developing information platform and tools for the citizens to participate in society”. They substitute the “o” with “0” in gov, which means the new “gov” not only stands for “rethinking the role that the government plays from the bottom up”, but also “represents the world view of 0 and 1 in the digital natives generation”. See the official website of gov: [http://g0v.tw/en-US/about.html](http://g0v.tw/en-US/about.html).
student group and four were members of social movement groups. All members had substantial experience as social movement leaders. Students and groups with no previous experience were all on the outermost periphery concerning decision making, and complained in discussion meetings prior to decision making (Appledaily, 2014, Apr 7).

Many participants were resentful of the committee and felt the decision making process was not democratic. In fact, as decisions were made by a small number of persons with experience calling the shots, the Sunflower Movements decision making process was not at all democratic. The reason for this lack of democracy was the necessity of making rapid decisions to address adversarial attacks, in addition to preventing leaks (LTN, 2014, Apr, 7). Therefore, the movement gave up on having collective or democratic decision making apparatuses (Kung & Ho, 2014, Apr 9).

Figure 2 diagrams this student movement’s structure of organizing. The highest decision making level was a nine member committee composed of five student movement leaders and four social movement group leaders. This committee could also exchange opinions with the participating community through the gov Website. However, these groups did not participate in making decisions. Students and citizens further on the periphery of this movement acted in accordance to operation commands.

The right side of the organizing diagram (gov Website, groups and citizens providing resources) is the crowdsourcing part of the community. While the gov Website and related assisting groups supported student movement operations, they also did not participate in decision making. Rather, crowdsourcing appears in the section concerning gov Website and other groups providing assistance. The student movement organization differs from other vertical top down leadership social movement organizations in that its core figures could not control or order around those under them. Rather, they provided direction, so that overall structure of community organizing could continuously change in response to the situation.
4.3 Communitive Consciousness as Crowdsourcing Motivation

Participating groups immediately demanded assistance online after the Legislative Yuan was occupied on March 18, 2014 in order to deal with the security and riot police on the outside of the building. Newspaper reports from and after 3/18 indicate thousands of police were continuously dispatched to the areas around the legislature in order to deal with the occupation. The students occupying the Yuan were in desperate need of manpower, material resources, and monetary resources.

If there was insufficient manpower, the police on the outside would be able to break through student movement barricades, and material goods were an essential necessity form sustaining manpower inside and outside of the legislature. Financial resources were necessary to the support of large scale activity operations and making pronouncements to the outside world. These all required the assistance of a competent group. The crowdsourcing involved in communitive consciousness indicates cooperation and participation based on common beliefs and ideas. Groups participating in this student movement essentially identified with its demands. Their
qualities resemble the logistic section of organizational operations, as they were of assistance to the entire operations of the student movement community. Overall, crowdsourcing can be divided into information, press releases, fundraising, and other areas.

Crowdsourcing platform

Within the student movement crowdsourcing was an example of a horizontal cooperation framework being undertaken within a vertical top down leadership community. The g0v Website platform was originally a crowdsourcing site. When it was founded, it emphasized its members came from across Taiwan. There guiding principles were freedom of speech and information transparency, as well as the pursuit of independent and transparent information concerning government. They also emphasized a goal of bringing about change and an unwillingness to resort to cynicism or apathy. Furthermore, this organization was decentralized in nature; it sought free participation and discussion in decision making. As such, it shared many similarities in its original organization and decision making methods.

Crowdsourcing information

The g0v Platform started the Congress Occupied website (http://g0v.today/congressoccupied/ project) during the student movement. Their slogan is “a new day will come.” Within this project, the g0v Website provided the following while the Sunflower Student Movement was going on:

1. Created media broadcast zone faster than satellite news gathering vehicles: "the original 3G would not work. We then set up a Wi-Fi base station Wimacx action wireless internet base. Hereafter, we extended a 60M / 15M bi-directional line onto the legislature floor to provide a wireless internet feed in addition to the wired one.”

2. Created the information portal g0v.today: this innovative network was the result of many HackFolders being reorganized on the g0v portal. People
could use the fastest Ustream to view video broadcasts, text broadcasts (including English), video recordings, and news excerpts regarding CSSTA.

3. Network management and central control: the area of network management involves responsibility for the role of MIS inside the legislature. Central control is the contact people who coordinate all work, much like PM (Atticus, 2014).

At the same time, this platform also provided channels with live broadcasts to directly view the student movement. These channels were provided by freely participating individuals. Furthermore, this platform also coordinated human power so that students and citizens participating freely in the student movement could go to the places where there was the greatest need in assisting the movement (gov, 2014) (See Figure 2).

**Crowdsourcing news**

The student movement also used crowdsourcing for news releases. Prior to the start of the Sunflower Movement, student leaders had no intention of relying on the mainstream media. Wei Liulin (柳林瑋), one of the organizers of the 1985 Alliance, also organized the creation of the Musou.tw Website during the CSSTA controversy.

Through contemporaneous video and text, the site presented the news concerning Legislative Yuan sessions. For example, it was Musou.tw which disclosed the Chang 30 second incident. In addition, if the mainstream media would present the student movement in a biased manner while it was happening, leaders of Musou.tw called on the public to participate, and created a large information network which presented news to Taiwanese and foreign media sources (such as PTT, Facebook), and constructed the Democracy at 4am Website for crowdfunding.

After the student movement started, more and more websites spontaneously joined the movement to organize and provide information. At the same time, whenever the mainstream media or government presented news disadvantageous to the movement, these sites were able to provide rapid response. Such groups included “The Democratic Front Against Cross Strait Trade in Services Agreement,”
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“the News Lens,” “Taiwan People News,” and others. These news sites were able to present an alternative to the mainstream website media format news and opinion sites. Though some of these news sites were created before the movement, they became a new news complex after attending crowdsourcing.

This division of labor made it possible for the student movement to utilize the internet in coordinating the labor division, to release news, and to use live video broadcasts to put an end to the mainstream media’s dissemination of false information. It also assisted in the allotment of duties for students inside the Executive Yuan, as well as calling for material resources, and other actions.

Crowdfunding

Social movements require funding. The white shirt brigade (白衫軍), which had used small contribution funding in movements from protests over the Hung Chung-chiu incident in 2013, in which an army corporal was forced to perform excessive physical exercises, thus resulting in his death, to the Sunflower Movement. During the Sunflower Movement, it created a dedicated fundraising planning site for social movements. Most commendably, student movement participants were able to raise 6,630,000 NT$ and publish a two day advertisement entitled “Democracy at 4 am” in the New York Times.

Social movements requiring capital can propose projects on VDEMOCRACY by posting a video and a fundraising plan on the site, as well as ideas, before commencing public fundraising. Many of the ideas held by VDEMOCRACY’s team of charter members, as seen on its Facebook page, are similar to other Sunflower Movement groups. They state “this mass fundraising site is solely for social movements, and we hope one day this will not be necessary” (Vdemocracy, 2014a). This division of labor concerning finances allowed social movement groups participating in the Sunflower Movements to efficaciously connect with those groups willing to provide capital assistance without having to deal with other fundraising organizations.

In examining crowdsourcing in the Sunflower Student Movement, we find most participants were social movement groups comprised of the younger generation. Because the larger part of them were of the younger group, or had normal jobs, the
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process of networking and crowdsourcing in and of itself was the spontaneous coming together of these groups. These crowdsourcing groups had already started to contend individually with the government over the CSSTA dispute.

V. The Implications for Democratic Governability

This study maps out a theoretical framework for successful social movements and crowdsourcing. First, we emphasize that political opportunity triggers emotions, which are contagious in cyberspace and foster a communitive consciousness of struggle against a particular target. In the case of Sunflower Movement, from the analysis of digital text we retrieved from Facebook pages, it is the government triggered the oppositional identity. Second, leaders and initiators remain crucial in the organizing process of social movements, and information technology enables the combination of horizontal and vertical networking, as well as the chaos and order. Third, more and more technology savvy individuals participate in communitive consciousness generated crowdsourcing. G0V in Taiwan is the first case of a crowdsourcing community which contributes to social movement. The logic of communitive action illustrates the important elements of a successful social movement and crowdsourcing, and also provides food for thought for democratic governance. Democratic governance in the information age places greater stress on horizontal connections than vertical ones. This fits G0V’s notion of “liquid democracy” in which people share and contribute their ideas and work in the spirit of “release early, release often,” and “patches welcome.” Liquid democracy is an organizing process of collaboration without central coordination. The government could learn from civil society generated crowdsourcing community and provide more online dialogue space with those starters and initiators during or after the movement, which renders strong democratic governability.

Such an attempt has already started as Taiwan’s Premier Jiang has invited the co-founder of gov, along with several civil servants, to take part in crowdsourcing projects three months after the Sunflower Movement. Premier Jiang consulted gov regarding open data, open sources and open government. Two months after the meeting between Executive Yuan and gov, Executive Yuan announced that from Sept 11th (Executive Yuan, Sep. 10, 2014). Youtube would provide live broadcasts of post-meeting press conferences, and each ministry would interact with netizens in Youtube chatrooms. The Executive Yuan expressed its desire for citizens to view the discussions. This move was widely well received by the media, which believed the decision to use the power of new mediums in allowing live post-meeting press conferences was in step with the times and would allow citizens concerned about government to more easily and directly attain firsthand information in a timely manner. The Executive Yuan also welcomed citizens to participate in rational dialogues concerning policy during the online broadcasts. It stated the public was welcome to express opinions at any time during the press conference and that these opinions would be taken into consideration for making improvements. Once digital channels between the government and civil society become more robust, it will be less likely that the government will take political actions which ignite feelings of anger and dissatisfaction.

In the future, it will be necessary to have more government and civil society initiated crowdsourcing projects, and to collectively allow young digital natives to become responsible and self-actualized citizens through these projects. This open government is itself a social movement and has led to the formation of an actual community because, as this paper explains, communitive consciousness is crucial for crowdsourcing to succeed. Though it is debatable whether negative emotions are more effective in terms of fostering political participation (Marcus and MacKuen 2001), it still provides an opportunity for the government to work together with the crowdsourcing communities which remain active after the social movement. Communities like gov claim that they are not anti-government, but rather anti-cynicism. The communitive consciousness comes, rather, from the emotion of self-actualization, as well as the hope they wish to bring to their own countries, as the digital texts have shown. The government could benefit from this newly emerging community, and engender robust democratic governance, by encouraging more young people join in.
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