

Nugroho, Yanuar

Working Paper

Spreading the word, broadening perspectives: Internet, NGOs and globalisation discourse in Indonesia

Manchester Business School Working Paper, No. 544

Provided in Cooperation with:

Manchester Business School, The University of Manchester

Suggested Citation: Nugroho, Yanuar (2008) : Spreading the word, broadening perspectives: Internet, NGOs and globalisation discourse in Indonesia, Manchester Business School Working Paper, No. 544, The University of Manchester, Manchester Business School, Manchester

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/50665>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Working Paper Series

Spreading the Word, Broadening Perspectives: Internet, NGOs and Globalisation Discourse in Indonesia

Yanuar Nugroho

Manchester Business School Working Paper No 544

Manchester Business School

Copyright © 2008, Nugroho. All rights reserved.
Do not quote or cite without permission from the author.

Manchester Business School
The University of Manchester
Booth Street West
Manchester M15 6PB

+44(0)161 306 1320
<http://www.mbs.ac.uk/research/workingpapers/>

ISSN 0954-7401

The working papers are produced by The University of Manchester - Manchester Business School and are to be circulated for discussion purposes only. Their contents should be considered to be preliminary. The papers are expected to be published in due course, in a revised form and should not be quoted without the authors' permission.

Author(s) and affiliation

Yanuar Nugroho

Manchester Institute of Innovation Research
Manchester Business School
University of Manchester
Harold Hankins Building
Manchester
UK
M13 9PL

Abstract

Globalisation is ambivalent. On the one hand, it brings prosperity, comfort and convenience in the form of economic growth, technological advancement, more open and democratic governance, and so forth. On the other hand, there are vast amounts of casualties from its progress, which only benefits some groups or countries. Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) in Indonesia have established themselves in pivotal positions in the social, economic and political landscape across the country, and their growth has often been linked with globalisation. But there has been little study to understand how NGOs in Indonesia engage with the issue of globalisation itself. Globalisation has actually just started to become widely discussed among civil society activists in the late 1990s. An empirical study was conducted recently to see how some Indonesian NGOs, in their endeavour to respond to globalisation issues and phenomena, and broadening the discourse on globalisation, utilise Internet technology. The study draws on several case studies to build a detailed story about how different organisations with different concerns deploy strategies to deal with the issue. In addition, the study also tried to portray the big picture of the dynamics of Indonesian NGOs in engaging with Internet technology through an exploratory survey involving some 268 organisations. It was confirmed that although currently there are a number of Indonesian NGOs embracing particular issues and concerns in globalisation, this trend is quite recent. Despite the fact that the globalisation issue is relatively difficult to comprehend at large, Indonesian NGOs seem to be able to incorporate the issues and put it into a wider, more contextual –and possibly more relevant—perspective. It is argued however, that this situation cannot be just taken for granted for it is in fact another consequence of the organisations adopting information technologies.

Keywords

Indonesia; non-governmental organisations (NGOs); globalisation; politics; Internet adoption

How to quote or cite this document

Nugroho, Yanuar (2008). Spreading the word, broadening perspectives: Internet, NGOs and globalization discourse in Indonesia. *Manchester Business School Working Paper, Number 544*, available: <http://www.mbs.ac.uk/research/workingpapers/>

Spreading the word, broadening perspectives: Internet, NGOs and globalisation discourse in Indonesia

Yanuar Nugroho

Manchester Institute of Innovation Research,
The University of Manchester, United Kingdom

Abstract

Globalisation is ambivalent. On the one hand, it brings prosperity, comfort and convenience in the form of economic growth, technological advancement, more open and democratic governance, and so forth. On the other hand, there are vast amounts of casualties from its progress, which only benefits some groups or countries. Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) in Indonesia have established themselves in pivotal positions in the social, economic and political landscape across the country, and their growth has often been linked with globalisation. But there has been little study to understand how NGOs in Indonesia engage with the issue of globalisation itself. Globalisation has actually just started to become widely discussed among civil society activists in the late 1990s. An empirical study was conducted recently to see how some Indonesian NGOs, in their endeavour to respond to globalisation issues and phenomena, and broadening the discourse on globalisation, utilise Internet technology. The study draws on several case studies to build a detailed story about how different organisations with different concerns deploy strategies to deal with the issue. In addition, the study also tried to portray the big picture of the dynamics of Indonesian NGOs in engaging with Internet technology through an exploratory survey involving some 268 organisations. It was confirmed that although currently there are a number of Indonesian NGOs embracing particular issues and concerns in globalisation, this trend is quite recent. Despite the fact that the globalisation issue is relatively difficult to comprehend at large, Indonesian NGOs seem to be able to incorporate the issues and put it into a wider, more contextual –and possibly more relevant–perspective. It is argued however, that this situation cannot be just taken for granted for it is in fact another consequence of the organisations adopting information technologies.

Keywords:

Indonesia; non-governmental organisations (NGOs); globalisation; politics; Internet adoption

Acknowledgement

Idaman Andarmosoko assisted the qualitative data collection in Indonesia; Dr. Gindo Tampubolon provided methodological advice; Prof. Ian Miles and Dr. Lawrence Green supervised the research; Adam McGovern and Kathryn Morrison proof-read the draft; and Prof. Stan Metcalfe offered review and comments. This research is supported by a number of organisations including the University of Manchester's OSS award, MIOIR's study grant, FES' grant, John Paul II's 100 scholarship award, and BNV. This paper was presented in the ICAS 5th Conference in Kuala Lumpur sponsored by HIVOS grant, Contract No. QK035I01.

Spreading the word, broadening perspectives: Internet, NGOs and globalisation discourse in Indonesia

Yanuar Nugroho

*Manchester Institute of Innovation Research,
The University of Manchester, United Kingdom*

We can use the Internet to help organising and making our advocacy works more effective, especially to deal with globalisation issue which gives birth to enormous injustices. The orientation of our organisation is to expose injustices, and you know, it needs a lot of systematic works. The technology offers these qualities to help. Why don't we use it?
(Sri Palupi, Executive Director, Institute of Ecosoc Rights, interview, 29/10/2005)

1 INTRODUCTION

Among academics, globalisation seems to be a distinguishing trend of the present moment and is certainly one of the most debated topics in the world today, but it does not seem so for many other people. While scholars are arguing whether globalisation is currently organising the world by strengthening the dominance of a world capitalist economic system, declining the primacy of the nation-state, and eroding local cultures and traditions through a global culture (Falk, 1999; Giddens, 1999; 2000; Hertz, 2001), or, whether it is an inevitable trajectory of humanity through pursuit of wealth and progress (Friedman, 1999; Fukuyama, 1992), for most people in the world, this discourse remains vague. Likewise, while social activists are building a global network of movements to protest and challenge the current manifestation of corporate-led and G8-led globalisation through various world social fora in the past five years or so (Fischer and Ponniah, 2003; Sen et al., 2004), many people at the grassroots level simply do not know what to do locally. This is among the concerns that many factions within civil society, particularly non-governmental organisation (NGO), are giving serious consideration to at the moment, for their roles have been perceived as “sites of opposition to the globalisation discourse” (Higgott, 2000; Lynch, 1998).

Despite complexities and difficulties in putting it into practice, widening participation of civic communities in response to the issues of globalisation in the local context has certainly become a priority for NGOs, including those in Indonesia. Just like in other countries in the South, in Indonesia the face of globalisation is at large recognised from neoliberal policies like trade liberalisation, financial deregulation and national asset privatisation. These policies, which have actually been around since the

1970s, became popular again since their re-introduction into the World Bank's and International Monetary Fund's 'structural adjustment programme' (SAP) responding to the economic crises in 1997-1998 (Khor, 2000; 2001; Shiva, 1999). Such policies have been problematic in the country and have done very little, if anything, to contribute to tackling acute societal problems like poverty, unemployment and environmental degradation. Even worse, in the context of the transition to democracy, such policies only become politicised and politically commodified (Bresnan, 2005).

Understandably, for Indonesian NGOs, this situation is alarming. Various activities have therefore been carried out by these organisations –from training to community empowerment, from disseminating research to organising popular gatherings–in order to raise public awareness and to encourage them to take their stance towards globalisation issues, despite problems and difficulties. In their endeavours, Indonesian NGOs mobilise whatever resources they have access to, including their adoption and use of the Internet –a technology that perhaps is the most important driver of globalisation (Castells, 1996; 1997; 1999). There are challenges, as well as opportunities, for NGOs in Indonesia in using the technology to engage with the issue of globalisation. Not only do they certainly expect to benefit from their technological use in order to achieve their purpose of shaping society's stance towards globalisation, but these NGOs actually also take the risk of being shaped by the globalisation idea.

This is what this paper is all about. It aspires to tell a story about the venture of Indonesian NGOs in adopting and appropriating the Internet in a strategic way to respond to globalisation issues and phenomena, and to broaden the discourse on globalisation in their civic engagement. It also aims to answer questions such as: What are Indonesian NGOs' views on the globalisation issue? How do they engage with globalisation discourse and to what extent do they shape the public opinion? How do they use the Internet as part of their strategies in their endeavours? What are the challenges and opportunities ahead for such strategies? As Sey and Castells (2004: 364) suggested, the answer to questions of this kind "*has to be established by observation, not proclaimed as fate*". This injunction resonates with Wainwright who states that to study *about* civil society and its activities is not to defend abstracts or universal theories, but rather to analyse it "*through several examples –some positive, some negative– the condition under which, and the ways in which, this potential is realised.*" (Wainwright, 2005: 94-95, emphasis added).

This paper, in trying to answer these questions, has briefly examined the focus of the study in the introduction. It continues with a brief exposition about how Indonesian NGOs perceive globalisation in the local context and looks at the trend of social movement as a reaction to globalisation in section two. Then, using empirical data, in section three it reveals how the organisations adopt the Internet as the

'technology of globalisation' and the implications of Internet use in the dynamics of NGOs and social movements in the country. To accompany some quantitative data, stories from three NGOs are outlined, telling of their endeavours in taking globalisation issues onboard in their activism. Then it discusses the findings in more depth and offers some critical reflection in section four. Finally, section five details the conclusion of this study.

2 GRASPING GLOBALISATION

2.1. Indonesia in a global world: Figuring out the complex nature of the issue

Indonesia's development over the last four decades is an interesting instance of the linkage between globalisation and social development. Transforming from a least developing country, in the mid-1960s Indonesia began to adopt more liberal, then neoliberal, economic policies under New Order regime. For the next three decades, until the economic crisis that hit in mid-1997, the industrial sector grew at more than 10 percent annually in most years. During this period, the most important fragment of economic development was the period of rapid economic liberalisation between the mid-1980s to mid-1990s (Bresnan, 2005). Arguably, this is part of a greater process of globalisation, which we can probably never be sure was a natural process in the country's development trajectory or otherwise, as reflected below.

[T]he pressures to globalise in the Indonesian case actually came from both external and internal sources. From the external side, Indonesia's participation in the WTO (World Trade Organisation), APEC (Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation), and AFTA (ASEAN Free trade Area) contributed to economic liberalisation, especially in the area of trade and investment. On the internal side, declining oil revenue and problems associated with a high cost domestic economy created some impetus for economic deregulation and privatisation. Taken together, the forces resulted in the rapid economic liberalisation and substantial resource reallocation which occurred in Indonesia from the late 1980s to the mid-1990s. (Feridhanusetyawan, 2000:1)

Indeed, the period from the 1980s to 1990s witnessed Indonesia's rapid integration into global markets both in the real and financial sectors, which was contributed to by many changes in economic policies: from import substitution to an export oriented approach, from government-led growth to greater private sector participation, and from a relatively closed to a more open economy (Bird, 1999; Bresnan, 2005). After a halt in this integration caused by the massive economic crisis in 1997, it resumed again with a different face. The SAP under IMF/WB, which actually aimed to rescue countries from the crisis, had become the toll-road to rapidly privatise many sectors in Indonesia. Just to take one example, in exchange for a US\$ 46 billion bail-out package, the Indonesian government was required to restore the balance of payments and to implement critical policy reforms which included the most crucial aspects,

i.e., public sector expenditure including cuts in subsidies, privatisation of state-owned enterprises and expansion of private sector participation. To support this, the WB and Asian Development Bank had provided budget support loans that were attached to a number of mandated reforms through an integrated package of adjustments (Motoyama and Widagdo, 1999).

However, this reform and adjustment was seen as something grave by many elements in Indonesian civil society (Hadiwinata, 2003). Particularly, because it was suspected that the loan was provided under a special condition that meant (i) the proportion of the government's role as a public agency to provide public goods and services had to be lessened and (ii) by doing so, it would transform many public sectors into mere commodities controlled by the private sector. Even worse, the process of taking-over the role of government was carried out with the full-consent of government and legislature through drafting tendentious laws (Nugroho, 2006). For most of Indonesian NGOs, it is all a *fait accompli* to 'forced privatisation' for the decision to do so was not subject to public consultation. Even elected representatives were often unaware of the detailed plans to reduce or eliminate the role of government¹. Up to this point, many Indonesian NGOs might have viewed a contested arena: whether most sectors of public interest will be taken over by private companies, left in government hands, or a combination of the two, despite few of them realising the complexities of this situation². As a whole Indonesian NGOs agree that the matter of privatisation as a gesture in favour of integration to the global economy, as well as the increasing Indonesian participation in the World Trade Organisation (WTO)'s agenda, is a political choice, not a technical imperative –and precisely this is the arena of struggle (Ganie-Rochman, 2000; Hadiwinata, 2003; Lounela, 1999).

However, to many NGOs in Indonesia, it is indeed not easy to get a comprehensive perspective on globalisation, particularly at the moment when the nation is grappling with so many complications in its transition from a centralised, authoritarian regime to a democratic and decentralised administration. As NGOs are fixated by the daily turmoil of events, demonstrations, and emotional political debates in the post-reform period, the majority of people in the country continue to suffer from poverty and other societal problems, and increasing degradation of environmental conditions. For example, at least 40 percent of Indonesian forest has been deforested since 1950 and half of that remaining has been converted into roads, plantations (palm oil, wood processing, etc.), or factories. It is estimated that every minute 5 hectares of forest disappears – which means that a forest area equal to the size of a

¹ Interview with Lutfiyah Hanim, 27/10/2005.

² Interview with David Sutasurya, 16/11/2005. He reflects how difficult it is for Indonesian civil society organisations (CSOs), including NGOs, to really comprehend complex issues like globalisation. It is therefore understandable, although not always acceptable, to see how the complex nature of the issue often becomes very simplified in many CSOs' understanding.

football field vanishes every 12 seconds, whilst 40-50 million Indonesian people's lives are heavily dependent on the forests. The impact on habitats is also severe as over the past 10 years the number of *orangutans* has decreased by up to 50 percent (World Bank, 2001). In Indonesia, by the end of 2002, 13 per cent of the Indonesian population lived in absolute poverty (those who live on less than \$2 a day); 13 percent of population above 15 years old was illiterate; infant mortality touched 41 per 1,000 live births; child malnutrition made up 24 percent of total children under 5 years; and only 74 percent of the population had access to improved water sources (World Bank, 2003).

This situation is regarded as not only counter-productive in building people's awareness of globalisation and its impacts and encouraging them to take a stance, but is also in impeding the effort to build NGOs' own comprehension on the complex nature of globalisation issues and discourses. Until the end of the 1990s, there was very few, if any NGOs which worked on the particular issue of globalisation³. Globalisation was comprehended by a lot of Indonesian NGOs in terms of IMF/WB-forced state's economic policies like 'privatisation', 'deregulation', and 'liberalisation', and even overly simplified as a 'new form of capitalism'⁴. However, as the network of Indonesian civil society organisations expanded, partly thanks to the advent of the Internet (Nugroho and Tampubolon, 2006), NGOs started to link their efforts, not just to pursue the democratisation agenda which had become predominant since the 1998 reforms but also to engage in the issues of globalisation. Since the end of the 1990s and the beginning of the 2000s, more Indonesian NGOs have become aware of the complexities of the issue⁵; some newly formed NGOs were even established with the main objective of taking a critical view towards globalisation⁶ and more public engagements are oriented in the direction of criticising the local practices of globalisation discourse⁷.

³ Interview with Lutfiyah Hanim, 27/10/2005; Bonnie Setiawan, 22/02/2006. There are currently a number of Indonesian NGOs working particularly on globalisation issue, but this is not before 2001, when the first Indonesian NGO focusing on globalisation, the Institute for Global Justice (IGJ), was established. As IGJ's Program Coordinator revealed, the organisation was set up because "at that time there was not even one [NGO] who said that they were working on the globalisation issue" (Hanim, interview, 27/10/2005).

⁴ Interview with Sri Palupi, 29/10/2005; Wahyu Susilo, 1/12/2005.

⁵ Interview with Lutfiyah Hanim, 27/10/2005; Bonnie Setiawan, 22/2/2006; Wahyu Susilo, 1/12/2005. It is revealed that since the beginning of 2000, more NGOs open particular 'desk' and activities that deals with the issue of globalisation.

⁶ For example, the Institute for Global Justice (established 2001), Indonesian Forum on Globalisation (established 2001), the Business Watch Indonesia (established 2002), among few others.

⁷ It is noted that various trainings on globalisation issues started blossoming by early 2000s. In 2001, Uni Sosial Demokrat started incorporating globalisation into the curricula of its Course on Politics (*Kursus Politik*, Kurpol) (see <http://www.unisosdem.org/tentang-press.php?aid=438&coid=5>, viewed 15 June 2007); the Institute for Global Justice began organising trainings on globalisation since 2001 and have regularly been publishing 'Global Justice Update' bulletin since 2003 (http://www.globaljust.org/gju_list.php, viewed 15 June 2007); many other organisations started taking globalisation issues onboard their activities in 2003 (interview with Antonius Waspotrianto, 28/10/2005; Andy Yuwono, 16/12/2005; Yulia I. Sari, 19/12/2005; Surya Tjandra, 3/3/2006)

This trend is by no means exclusive. Since the 'battle of Seattle' in November 1999⁸, large-scale protests against the WTO, the IMF, and the WB have mushroomed across the globe and are hailed as 'globalisation from below' (Kaldor, 2000). But what does this mean in the context of Indonesian NGOs? How would Indonesian NGOs perceive the idea of social movement in the course of their taking onboard the issue of globalisation?

2.2. 'Globalisation from below'? Realm of Indonesian NGO's activism

In their response to globalisation and the globalisation-related issues, there are two general approaches that Indonesian NGOs take. One is based on the-so-called 'negative-logic', i.e. by criticising and being against the negative aspects of globalisation practices. The other is based on the 'positive-logic', i.e. by promoting the alternative practices of globalisation. In their first approach, NGOs in Indonesia are often misunderstood as anti-business for they consistently advocate consumers' rights, support labour and trade union activities and protect environment from business' wrongdoings through research, lobbies and advocacy endeavours⁹. They also face risks of being blamed as anti-development because of their critical stands towards status quo policies, if not nastily accused of 'trading the state's interest' for their watchdog activities, carrying out campaigns abroad, organising testimonial sessions before international bodies like Amnesty International or Human Rights Commission at the UN, and mobilising protests against Indonesian government's policies on development in multilateral meetings like WTO or CGI (Ganie-Rochman, 2002; Hadiwinata, 2003; Lounela, 1999).

Based on positive-logic, it is also through the works of the NGOs that Indonesian small-medium enterprises (SMEs) benefit from various skills training and have better access to marketplaces; that farmers learn more about organic and sustainable farming processes; that women in rural areas now have access to micro-credit schemes and have become empowered domestically; and that consumers' interest in getting more healthy products and produces through fairer trade have been more widely promoted (Hadiwinata, 2003)¹⁰. It is also through the efforts of various non-governmental groups that in Indonesia the importance and urgency of the fulfilment of workers' rights are brought to the wider

⁸ At the end of November 1999, a massive protest involving 40,000 people from 700 organisations, trade unions, NGOs, religious groups and other representations brought the third ministerial meeting of the WTO to a halt. The meeting was proposing a new multilateral round of trade negotiations. The massive and angry demonstration was a clear signal of collective anger: at the relocation of industries to the Third World, at the dangerous and vicious work conditions in the factories and sweatshops found there, at the widespread exploitation of working people, and at environmental degradation. Although large-scale protests against the WTO, the IMF and the WB were not at all new, what was new was both the scale of mobilisation and the intensity of the protest (Chandhoke, 2001; Kaldor, 2000)

⁹ Interview with Lutfiyah Hanim, 27/10/2005; Wahyu Susilo, 1/12/2005.

¹⁰ Also based on the interview with Antonius Waspotrianto, 28/10/2005; Indro Surono and Agung Prawoto, 3/12/2005; Yulia I. Sari, 19/12/2005.

public¹¹; and that in addition to the continuous awareness of civil, political rights and human rights, the discourse of economic, social and cultural (*ecosoc*) rights has also become more public (Demos, 2005)¹².

It is in their endeavour to deal with these problems that the use of the Internet in NGOs has become increasingly instrumental. The use of the technology has enabled the organisations not only to spread their concern about globalisation across the country on a speed and scale that has never been seen before, but also to help them network with other organisations at various levels to exchange ideas, experiences and support. Yet, it can be argued that engagement with globalisation issues, too, is somewhat the result of the engagement of Indonesian CSOs with their international counterparts, and is also very much a consequence (intended or unintended) of the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs), particularly the Internet, in the organisations. Because, obviously, the Internet not only facilitates communication and collaboration of organisations within and between countries (Castells, 1996; Dutton, 1999; 2004; Warkentin, 2001), it also contributes to the spread of issues and concerns (Dutton, 2004; McConnell, 2000; Surman and Reilly, 2003) and thus plays role in the change of discourse.

How, then, can we understand the use of the Internet –the very technology of globalisation (Castells, 1999)—in Indonesian NGOs? How, and to what extent, does the Internet use in organisations impact upon the dynamics of NGOs in the country with their beneficiary groups and counterparts elsewhere?

3 ADOPTING THE ‘TECHNOLOGY OF GLOBALISATION’

Since it was introduced in Indonesia, non-governmental and civil society have been active users of the Internet (Hill and Sen, 2005; Lim, 2003; Purbo, 1996). However, not much is known about how and to what extent NGOs in Indonesia use the technology, let alone the implications of it. Triangulating methods (Danermark et al., 2002; Gilbert, 1992), this study aims to explore the features of the use and impacts of the Internet in these organisations¹³, especially in relation to dealing with globalisation issues.

¹¹ Interview with Liest Pranowo, 28/11/2005, Indro Wicaksono, 30/11/2005; Ignatius Suparno, 10/3/2006.

¹² Interview with Sri Palupi, 29/10/2005; Ari Ujianto, 24/11/2005.

¹³ The quantitative data, gathered from an exploratory survey, served as input for some statistical observation including exploratory latent-class using *Latent Gold*® (MacCutcheon, 1987; Vermunt and Magidson, 2002). The qualitative data was collected through interviews, workshops, and focus group discussions to build case studies (Eisenhardt, 1989; Stake, 1995). The overall data collection was carried out Oct 2005-April 2006.

3.1. Internet adoption in NGOs and its impact – Don't take it for granted

From a survey of 268 Indonesian NGOs where 94.03% use PCs in the organisation and 86.94% have access to the Internet, only a very small group has used the Internet for more than 10 years (5.97%). Most of them have used it between 5-10 years (28.73%) and 3-5 years (26.87%). Quite a proportion (19.03%) just started using it within the last 3 years. This study finds that 'leaders' in the Internet adoption among Indonesian NGOs are usually those who (i) are longer established, (ii) have more staff, and (iii) manage more money¹⁴. Figure 1 below shows that in general NGOs working on development or development-related issues and concerns (salient issues are coded green) are estimated to be more likely to be early adopters of the Internet, than those working on advocacy-related issues (coded blue)¹⁵.




Figure 1. Issues and concerns of each adopter category
Latent Class Analysis. BIC(LL)=5407.792; NPar=94; L²=4214.830;
df=127; p<0.0001; and Class.Err=2.6% (See Appendix 2)

¹⁴ See parameter estimation using MIMIC-LCA in Appendix 1.

¹⁵ See Appendix 2 for more detailed account. However, we should take into account that in fact in the early days of the Internet use in Indonesian NGOs, it was advocacy organisations that pioneered the use of the Internet for pushing social movement. Interview with Wahyu Susilo of INFID, 1/12/2005, reveals the birth of *Nusanet* initiated by INFID as the first secure communication exchange platform for civil society activists. *Nusanet* played an undeniably important role for Indonesian CSOs in establishing links with their partners across the archipelago in order to fight for democratisation and across the globe for mobilising global solidarity, especially in overthrowing the New Order regime. See section 3 of this paper.

What drives the adoption of the Internet in Indonesian NGOs? Internally, it is the need to obtain information and to improve organisational effectiveness and efficiency; externally, it is the need to bring about mutual relationship and collaboration among organisations instead of competition. Adopting the technology which serves such internal and external purposes empowers Indonesian NGOs in organising their movement, widens their perspectives, expands their network, and, to some extent, therefore increases their bargaining position when dealing with other actors in Indonesian politics¹⁶. This might explain why despite problems in access and availability of the Internet, civil society seems to be a sector that uses the technology dynamically, aiming to facilitate social changes in the country (Hill and Sen, 2000; Lim, 2002; 2003; Marcus, 1998). Although Indonesian civil society is by no means absent from conflicts and frictions in interest, organisational need for social esteem or status and egocentric and competitive motives are not strong drivers for Internet adoption in NGOs, unlike in other types of organisations (as found in, e.g. Coombs and Hull, 1996; Newell et al., 2003; Rogers, 2003). It should be clear here that in NGO's universe, the use of the Internet is more than just applying technology for a particular purpose, rather, it is an appropriation: it is about using technology in a strategic and political way to support the strategic and political work of civil society (as also suggested by Surman and Reilly, 2003; Warkentin, 2001)¹⁷.

The use of the Internet, arguably, has played an important role in positioning Indonesian NGOs in the contested field of globalisation discourse. It enables NGOs not only to criticise the discourse 'from outside the field' as an observer, but more importantly, 'from inside the arena' as a player. Here are some stories about it.

3.2. Networking advocacy – A note from INFID¹⁸

Among Indonesian NGOs, INFID (International NGO Forum on Indonesian Development) is regarded as probably the most advanced organisation within civil society in using the Internet (See Box 1). More significantly, INFID has been able to build its own capacity in integrating the technology into the

¹⁶ See detailed survey response in Appendix 3.

¹⁷ However, it should be noted, that the strategic realm of NGO movements actually stems from 'traditional strengths' of civil society sector, like pertinent issues and concerns, tactical social and political orientation, and distinctive activities (Deakin, 2001; Keane, 1998). Using the Internet does strengthen these strengths stronger and make potencies more realisable, but never really replace them. Therefore, what matters most in appropriation is actually mapping out the strategic uses. For more detailed account on the adoption, use and impact of the Internet in organisations within civil society, including NGOs, please consult Nugroho (forthcoming)


¹⁸ This section is based on the survey, observation, and interview with Wahyu Susilo, the MDG National Programme Officer at INFID's Indonesian secretariat (1/12/2005). INFID's international secretariat is based in Brussels and employs 30 staff. Brussels is chosen because it is the capital of European Union and that INFID considers lobbying to EU is important. Let alone, historically, INFID was –and is– supported by European organisations (INFID website: <http://www.infid.org>). The discussion in this part, however, refers only to Indonesian secretariat.

organisation's core missions and goals. After deciding to adopt and use the Internet as part of the organisation strategy in early 1990s, INFID quickly familiarised itself with the technology and at the same time both explored and exploited it. Besides serving the organisation's daily internal management (like staff coordination, regular communication, financial consolidation and reporting, and occasionally online meeting), the Internet is integrated and used mainly for external purposes, especially networking, campaign coordination, advocacy strategies and online publication. With such strategy, INFID does not only build its capability in managing the technology to help its work and integrating it into the organisation's strategy, but also its capacity as an advocacy network NGO.

To INFID, the concern about globalisation issues in Indonesia is clear: the pressure to globalise Indonesia comes through foreign loans and their conditionalities. Therefore as strategic orientation, INFID has chosen to provide inputs on the development issues to the donor countries of Indonesia. This is done by acting as watchdog on the use of bilateral and multilateral loans and the pledging sessions for new loans (Hadiwinata, 2003). It is through this loan mechanism architected by the IFIs (international financial institutions) that Indonesia is politically and economically being steered, controlled, and forced to integrate its economy into the global one by means of creating national policies in economy and development which may even put national sovereignty at risk and make the poor poorer. That is why for INFID advocacy is a strategic approach and orientation. For INFID, to critique globalisation practice is to advocate people's rights; to prove that globalisation works for the poor is to eradicate structural poverty; to make 'another world' possible is to build the capacity to improve the livelihood of the poor and the oppressed in Indonesia (INFID, 1997; 2000).

It is in this direction that the use of the Internet has been found helpful in INFID's work. As coordinator of many advocacy programmes, which must be up-dated with relevant information, INFID utilise the Internet to provide more information in a much quicker fashion than using other conventional means, and with much higher accuracy. For example, the latest and most updated data, like reports of the World Bank, other international financial institutions, or various development agencies, can always be downloaded to strengthen and to increase the quality of INFID's advocacy works, including for its lobbies and campaigns. But it does not stop there. INFID also circulates such information to its networks and coalitions, and by doing so it 'fuels' the movement.

Box 1. INFID and NusaNet



International NGO Forum on Indonesian Development (INFID) was initially formed in June 1985, under the name of INGI (Inter-NGO Conference on IGGI Matters), by several Indonesian NGOs (YLBHI, WALHI and *Sekretariat Bina Desa*) in co-operation with a number of Dutch NGOs (NOVIB, CEBEMO, HIVOS and ICCO). INGI was (and INFID is) an open and pluralistic network of 60 NGOs based in Indonesia and 40 NGOs based in other countries mostly belong to IGGI (Inter Governmental Group for Indonesia, previously – now CGI, Consultative Group for Indonesia—a consortium of donor countries). INGI transformed into INFID in 1992, following the dismissal of IGGI by the Indonesian government and the formation of the CGI (Hadiwinata, 2003:98-100).

Since its establishment INFID has been providing inputs and recommendation on the development issues to the donor countries of Indonesia by monitoring the use of bilateral and multilateral loans as well as the pledging sessions for new loans. INFID aims to facilitate the communication between Indonesian NGOs and their international partners to promote the policy to eradicate structural poverty and to build the capacity to improve the livelihood of the poor and the oppressed in Indonesia. In the Indonesian social movement INFID is seen as one of the most respected advocacy network NGOs. With its Indonesian secretariat employing 25 fulltime staff and 5 part-time staff and managing several billions IDR (or hundred thousands USD) annually* to maintain the network of 100 organisations both national and international, INFID is no doubt seen by others as a big advocacy NGOs in Indonesia.

INFID might be the first NGO that adopted the Internet in Indonesia since the early 1990s. When most Indonesian NGOs –and arguably also business firms and state’s agencies—had possibly never heard about the technology, INFID had already considered an idea to be an Internet Service Provider (ISP) for NGOs and other civic communities. INFID introduced *NusaNet* in early 1994 –an idea which at large was driven by the government’s repressive conduct and surveillance towards civil society and the need for safer communication and more effective networking among NGOs. Backed up by its international donors, INFID decided to invest quite a large amount of money to build the infrastructure in order to provide Internet connection to Indonesian CSOs. Although the service that *NusaNet* provided was very simple –dial-up access at 9.6Kbps and encrypted email exchange through generic addresses “@nusa.or.id”—it had helped many organisations, groups and activists to learn about the technology. By the end of 1996 and early 1997, a considerable number of Indonesian advocacy NGOs and many pro-democracy activists had been connected to the Internet via INFID’s *NusaNet*, which was also considered safer than commercial ISPs that could be easily interfered by the government’s military intelligence. *NusaNet* had certainly played an important part in the episode of preparing and conditioning NGOs for the Indonesian reform movement in 1998, that some scholars even claimed the reform would be impossible had the Internet been absent in the movement (Hill and Sen, 2000; Lim, 2002; 2003; 2004).

For INFID, the main motives for adopting the Internet were certainly not only to use it as a safer and quicker communication tool but also as a means for advocacy and for bringing about wider democracy, by “*linking pro-democracy actors in the [Inter]net to discuss potential actions, to prepare and to make it happen in the field*” (Susilo, interview, 1/12/2005). The motives remain unchanged until now. Although in the post-reform period *NusaNet* project ceased to exist due to the shift of financial priority (which simply made the provider unable to keep up with the technological development) and the fact that commercial ISPs were widely available, INFID keeps using the Internet in a strategic way for its strategic purposes. (*)

* exact figure was not disclosed during interview

As Indonesian NGOs usually need more comprehensive information about what happens in the international context to help their advocacy work, INFID conveniently uses email and mailing list to distribute such information to relevant national advocacy groups. Likewise, for its network abroad who typically need information about what is going in the country, INFID puts such information on the website, or on its partners' websites. This combination of work results in an effective campaign tackled from both inside and outside Indonesia. "We often update the information related to poverty eradication campaigns and joint actions to our network. The successful July [2005] meeting for anti-poverty campaign, for example, was coordinated a lot over the Internet" (Susilo, interview, 1/12/2005)¹⁹.

With such experience and intensity in using the Internet (and other ICTs), it comes as no surprise that INFID concludes and strongly suggests that advocacy will become a strategic area in tackling globalisation issues only if NGOs working in this area can and are willing to use the technology of globalisation –the Internet—effectively. Yet, INFID also reflects,

[In the context of social change] the Internet use [in Indonesian NGOs] certainly has an important historical aspect. During the [authoritarian] New Order it provided the social movement with alternative information, which was very important to build the pro-democracy coalition. But after the regime had fallen, I saw a decrease in how NGOs use it. Now, everyone has no longer been able to reply the call for *urgent action* in nearly all issues. *Urgent actions* used to be deemed important during the New Order regime or during the reform period and we always responded to them. Now, [in responding to globalisation] NGOs have become specialised. Positively it has made them knowledgeable to various global issues like international debt, etc., but negatively it contributes to the decrease in the solidarity among NGOs. (Susilo, interview, 1/12/2005, emphases indicate original wordings)

Certainly, INFID's reflection brings up a clear challenge: while the use of the Internet has helped NGOs become updated with relevant information for action, it does not and should not stop there. In advocacy work the challenge is clear: NGOs need to integrate the use of the technology into the organisations' strategy to build their capacity in order to deal with the complex nature of globalisation issues and to advocate the rights of the most vulnerable. Otherwise, NGOs will risk of being carried away by the 'technicalities' of their technological use and lose the substance which the technological adoption in civil society serves: strengthening civic actions and consolidating social movement. Because, as Wahyu Susilo, the MDG National Programme Officer of INFID, clearly addresses when concluding the interview, "[t]oday in this globalised world, information alone, although updated and accurate, is not enough to move people to respond to calls for action" (Susilo, interview, 1/12/2005).

¹⁹ This refers to "Make Poverty History" worldwide campaign. Through its MDG (Millennium Development Goals) desk, INFID actively involves in the campaign and anti-poverty network at national level.

3.3. Spreading awareness – A story of IGJ²⁰

Being based in Jakarta and probably the first NGO working particularly on the issue of globalisation, the Institute for Global Justice (IGJ) runs four main programmes. First, research and publications, which focus on identifying impacts and mitigating the negative impacts of globalisation in the country. Second, public education, which seeks to inform policy makers and the general public on globalisation issues, including the role of global institutions particularly the WTO (World Trade Organisation) and their connection with national and regional policies, by means of training workshops, public dialogue, discussions, and hearings with parliament and line ministries. Third, advocacy campaigns to bring about critical awareness of globalisation-related issues, particularly about the on-going negotiations at the WTO and the preparation for its periodical Ministerial Meetings. Last, networking is established with other groups or CSOs that work on and are interested in globalisation issues, including experts and students.

In IGJ, the use of the Internet has been integrated into the organisation's daily works. It is not only research and publication and advocacy campaign programmes that benefit from the technology use, but also public education programmes, like training on globalisation, enjoy a lot of help from Internet technology. For research purpose, the Internet has been a valuable resource for data and information, including journal articles and publications, which would have been very difficult, if not impossible, to access. The Internet has also extended the IGJ's researchers' network with their colleagues from other parts of the world and encouraged more research collaboration between them. As IGJ closely monitors the issues related to institutions like the World Trade Organisation (WTO), the Internet helps IGJ to keep updated with the latest relevant news and information²¹, which is often needed for various research. Then, when the research has been concluded, the Internet is again used to channel the publication of the results to various groups including policy makers, NGOs and the general public, which is useful both for public education and lobbying.

²⁰ This account is based on the survey, direct observation with IGJ, and interviews with Lutfiyah Hanim, IGJ's Programme Coordinator (27-28/10/2005 and 23/05/2006) and Bonnie Setiawan, IGJ's Executive Director (22/02/2006)

²¹ Usually, when resources are available, IGJ would send staff or delegate(s) to be present at the relevant meetings (e.g. WTO Ministerial Meeting) as observer or as participant in parallel sessions commonly organised by International NGOs. The staff then use email to send the 'live report' from the venue directly to relevant mailing-lists, or to IGJ's office which will then convert it into more digestible version (e.g. translate it from English to Indonesian) and distribute it to its network. Considering all works involved, it was quite impressive that, for example in the last WTO Ministerial Meeting, IGJ managed to update the network in daily basis, and even in important occasions or issues, in 6-hourly basis. However, when resources are not available for IGJ to send a participant or observer in an important meeting, they will closely follow the "press room section" and forward all important news to its network. With this, Indonesian NGOs within IGJ's network are kept updated with the last minute progress of the meetings (Hanim, interview, 28/10/2005).

Box 2. IGJ and *Global Justice Update*



The Institute for Global Justice (IGJ) is a research-based advocacy NGO established in 2001, facilitated by INFID and some individual members of the Indonesian NGOs Monitoring Coalition on World Trade Organisation (Koalisi Ornop Pemantau WTO, or KOP-WTO). Rooted in Indonesian social movement with the aim of being part of global civil society network, IGJ envisions a 'global justice order through social movements' and aims to 'deconstruct globalisation and facilitate social transformation in order to be critical towards globalisation through research, advocacy, education and networking activities'. There are three objectives that IGJ aspires to achieve, i.e. the development of critical awareness of the public about globalisation; the existence of local, national and global policy to protect and to appreciate life values and livelihood and a new world order based on pluralism, diversity, sustainability and justice (IGJ, 2001).

IGJ works with some 6 full-timers and a similar number of part-timers and manages annual turnover between IDR1-2 billion (approx USD111-222K). Being established in the era when the Internet has been widely available in the centre of the metropolitan city Jakarta, IGJ has adopted the technology since it was established. Using the 24/7 broadband connection, although with fluctuating access speed as can always be expected in Indonesia, IGJ seems to be able to reap the benefit of the Internet to help achieve its objectives. And as IGJ works closely with its network, the benefit is also enjoyed by its partners.

The publication of *Global Justice Update* (GJU), IGJ's periodical, for example, is spread not only to close partners in Java, but also to numerous civil society organisations in the four corners of the archipelago. Currently distributed to around 500 readers once every two weeks, mostly through direct emails and a few mailing-lists, GJU is the most successful of IGJ's public communication channel so far. Unlike other NGOs' publications which only target other NGOs or similar organisations, GJU also reaches out to a broader audience: students, policy makers and press. And since the topics brought out in this periodical were found to be quite informative and interesting (or simply provocative) by the general readers, it is not surprising to find the electronic version of GJU being re-distributed to wider audience or in various mailing lists which IGJ did not initially target. Originally dedicated to presenting the latest update about what is going on in the World Trade Organisation (WTO) to its network which works particularly on the globalisation issues, GJU has now evolved into a public education tool to build knowledge on globalisation. To IGJ, Internet has been playing an important role in supporting the continuity of GJU for it reduces dramatically the printing and distribution cost which hampers most of other Indonesian NGOs' publication programmes. With the approximate printing and distribution cost at no less than IDR1.5 million (approx USD167) per GJU's edition, the amount will be astronomical to keep GJU in regular publication for a quite long period. Thus, distributing GJU electronically as a compressed PDF-file email attachment or as a downloadable link in IGJ's website has meant IGJ has been able to save a significant amount of money.

This approach is deemed to be strategic, because IGJ would need a critical mass when it comes to organising movements: to run advocacy campaigns, to preparing advocacy works, or to mobilise the wider public to take certain actions. Having public and various groups knowledgeable about the issues that IGJ and its networks are advocating have proven important for the success of such campaigns. It is also for the sake of maintaining the network and to keep the continuity of the publication that IGJ recently changed the electronic format of GJU from portable document (PDF) into rich text (RTF) format following suggestion from many other NGOs which can only access the Internet via slow, low bandwidth connection. Clearly, for IGJ, the use of the Internet has facilitated the evolution of GJU from a mere publication into an effective organisational tool for public education, networking, campaign and advocacy. This all is central in contributing to the work of IGJ as a NGO taking a critical position about globalisation issues in the Indonesian context. (*)

Not only is the Internet used to promote books, documentary films or other types of IGJ's publication, it has been used as the medium for publication itself, which impacts on the success of other programmes. *Global Justice Update* (GJU), IGJ's bulletin, is one example how IGJ turns the Internet into a convivial medium for its work (See Box 2). However, working on the globalisation issue also impacts IGJ's use of the Internet. IGJ might be among the first Indonesian NGOs to formally take the issue of "open source application" on board as a direct consequence of their use of the Internet and engagement with globalisation issues. For IGJ, which closely follows WTO issues including property rights, it is important to take a clear position towards this issue as a representative of civil society. As its Programme Coordinator states,

We were initially unaware of this issue. We did not even know what *open source* meant. But then we learned about it. Thanks to our sources like [Mr.] Idaman who forced us to learn about the issue, we then become aware that using Microsoft products has actually many serious implications for us, civil society group, when we scrutinise the IPR issue. It is not just a use. There is deeper ideological issue there. The idea of *open source* matches our organisation's values not only because it is cheaper. *Open source* is more democratic, more open, and overall, we are convinced that it will be much better for civil society movement in the future. And, to our surprise, it is actually in the heart of the IPR debate that we have been engaged so far (Hanim, interview, 28/10/2005, emphases indicate original wordings)

With such understanding, taking the risk, IGJ makes its move to migrate to open source platform, which is not easy, for most staff are already familiar with proprietary software²². And although IGJ understands that the process is not easy due to the fact that most staff are mere users, it believes that this is the right course of action because as a NGO who is critical to globalisation "[W]e have to be consistent. We have to walk what we talk" (Setiawan, interview, 22/02/2006).

Such determination is indeed important for IGJ, especially when realising its position in the Indonesian NGOs network on globalisation issues. Because, being known as probably the most advanced Indonesian NGO in globalisation issue, IGJ has often been referred by its networks, both national and international, not only as source of information but also as active animator in the Indonesian social movement. Indeed, as a part of an international network *OWINS* (Our World Is Not for Sale), IGJ has taken the initiative and been involved in facilitating the birth of the *FSI* (*Forum Sosial Indonesia*, Indonesian Social Forum) network and keeps itself active in the *KOP-WTO* network, as well as in other networks. For this purpose, mailing lists are the most effective tools that IGJ uses to maintain the networks and spread awareness of globalisation. IGJ is also known as a resource for Indonesian decision makers, especially ministries and state bodies which work in the area of international trade

²² To ease the process, Windows®-based Open Office™ is introduced across the organisation so that staff can start familiarise themselves with the new software. When the interview was conducted in the end of 2005 and early 2006, IGJ targeted to have completely migrated to open source platform by the end of 2007 or beginning of 2008.

and economics. Through *Forum WTO*, whose members are mainly from the government and private sector, IGJ actively represents Indonesian civil society in discussing important issues. The *Forum WTO*, also run over mailing-lists and is a medium for IGJ's lobby works. Although the 'real lobbying' often happens outside the cyber-world, IGJ benefits from the use of the Internet in the *Forum WTO* as the organisation is able to convey crucial messages and information, which then became useful for the 'real lobbying'.

Working with this relatively new issue (for most Indonesians) of globalisation, IGJ has been able, through using the Internet, to strategically bring the issue to the attention of more elements in Indonesian civil society. As result, not only do more Indonesian NGOs and the general public become more familiar with various globalisation issues, but they are also encouraged and stimulated to strengthen the network to respond to the issue. In other words, by using the Internet strategically, IGJ has been able to help the changing the role of NGOs from merely consumers of issue, into more active participants that shape the issue. This is possible because IGJ has integrated the Internet in a way that not only transforms the organisation's works, but also transforms the organisation itself and, in turn, changes the way that the technology is understood is used.

3.4. Broadening perspectives – An experience of YDA²³

Yayasan Duta Awam (YDA) is a local farmer advocacy NGO based in Central Java province but works in other regions, namely Riau, West Kalimantan, Bengkulu and South Kalimantan provinces, in close networking with tens of other local NGOs working in similar issues. In addition to its international networking with international organisations like *Catholic Relief Service* and *Ford Foundation*, YDA is also an active member of *SatuDunia*, a national Indonesian civil society network, part of *OneWorld.Net*²⁴. Together with its networks, YDA is now championing the monitoring of the implementation of CERD (Community Empowerment for Rural Development), a nation-wide project funded by ADB's loan. For YDA, the abstract globalisation issue has in fact a very real face in rural development, and the face is often frightening and intimidating for ordinary farmers in Indonesia. There are at least three facts that concern YDA. One, globalisation has transformed the country's rural sector into a sector of misery which is being sacrificed for urban development and industrialisation through land ownership

²³ This section is based on the survey and interview with YDA's Executive Director, Muhammad Riza (30/11/2005)

²⁴ *SatuDunia* is a newly established Indonesian node of the global network OneWorld.net (www.oneworld.net), which was established since 1995 and currently has more than 1,600 partners internationally. *SatuDunia* is an initiative of HIVOS, Yayasan Jaring and OneWorld UK and was officially set-up on 16 December 2006. See <http://satudunia.oneworld.net/article/view/144597/> (viewed 20 June 2007).

conversion into industrial purpose, and through the loss of human resources in the rural sector²⁵. Two, mainstream farming and agricultural policies based on the green-revolution have destroyed a lot of rural area across the archipelago that become very difficult, if not impossible, to restore to their natural fertility. Third, more farmers are losing their own lands and become mere 'workers' (*petani penggarap*) and earn so little in return for their hard work. These all make farmers and rural inhabitants suffer from structural poverty and they have very little space to decide things about their own life.

The face of globalisation and its implication in the rural sector is a bitter picture for farmers –the beneficiaries that YDA works for and with. Unfortunately, apart from realising that they are poor, many of these farmers do not understand the bigger picture and thus they lose hope in their life. YDA aspires to give this hope back to the farmers. At the policy level, this is done by advocating their rights; at the practical level, it is carried out by widening farmers' perspectives about the complexities of the situation – not to get them lost in the complexities but to let them decide what is best for their own life. To YDA, farmers should be the main actors determining their own lives. They should not and must not be neglected in the rural development policies and practices.


It is this spirit that sheds light on all YDA's activities, including the use of technologies like the Internet. YDA throws away the perception that the Internet is the technology only for 'people of the city', the haves, or even the '*techy-literate*' – Internet is also the technology for farmers, for 'people of the villages'. YDA set up two web communities and a mailing list that farmers can join and participate in²⁶. Although these online communities, very possibly the first farmers' online ones in Indonesia, are formally set up to help YDA to promote important agricultural-related issues to its NGO networks, YDA also encourages farmers to be active users of the Internet, to be aware of the global issues in agriculture and rural development, and to engage with international farmers' networks as the Internet has become more available in some villages through *warnet*/telecentres²⁷. The result of this effort, for YDA, is sometimes beyond expectation (see Tukimin's experience in Box 3).

²⁵ Ample studies on the literature on poverty demonstrate that land tenure or land ownership is a critical factor implicated in poverty incidence. There is also effect of out-migration of productive labour from villages to urban and sub-urban areas in search of work, mainly in industrial sector (Aidit, unknown; Raynolds, 2002; Tjondronegoro, 1984).

²⁶ They are <http://agrodev.multiply.com> and <http://indosl.multiply.com>. The mailing list is <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/agrodev/>

²⁷ *Telecentre*, or *warnet* (in Indonesian), literally means *internet kiosk*. It is a public internet access points often available in area where internet infrastructure is not well developed (James, 2006). Lim argues that to understand 'Indonesian Internet' is to understand *warnet* (Lim, 2002; 2004; 2006).

Box 3. YDA and Advokasi



Yayasan Duta Awam (YDA), set up in Solo, Central Java in 1996, is a NGO working on the issue of farmers advocacy and civil society empowerment. Working with 16 full-timers, YDA aims particularly to empower the farmers so that they can advocate themselves independently in the future, when agricultural and rural development issues are projected to escalate politically in Indonesia. This goal is to be achieved through three main strategic activities: participatory research and monitoring, stakeholder dialogue forums and grassroots media. As a "Farmers' Institute for Advocacy" YDA has clearly formulated its strategy to empower and increase farmers' capacity through educations, trainings and mobilisation; advocacy; development of public discourse; database; and capacity building for institutions and organisations

To help run the organisation, YDA has been using the internet since 1998, when Internet was firstly introduced to public in Solo and was probably the first NGO in the area which adopted the Internet. For YDA, the main reason for using the Internet was very clear: the increasing need for up-to-date information, both for the organisation and mainly for its beneficiaries, namely farmers and rural communities. As a part of the organisation's strategy, the Internet is introduced to YDA's staff, networks, and their beneficiaries: local farmers. Not only is the farmer's bulletin "Advokasi" made available online, but despite difficulties, YDA has also endeavoured to pioneer online communities for farmers and its NGO networks. The result of YDA's engagement with the Internet sometimes goes beyond what can be imagined. It would certainly be simplifying to claim that farmers' broadened understanding about global political-economy issues surrounding agricultural development and policy is the result from YDA's (and its network's) use of the Internet. But clearly it is very difficult, if not impossible, for YDA and its networks to keep updated with the latest development in agricultural development policy, including the global issues surrounding it, if they do not adopt the Internet.

To give an example, Tukimin, an ordinary farmer from Kiram Village, Banjar, and a regular reader of Advokasi, confidently argued with an Asian Development Bank (ADB)'s project executor when he saw the mismatch between the planning and the actual project undertaking during CERD project. He insisted that there should be participatory approach in the project instead of top-down implementation, because "This project is being financed by the government's debt to ADB, and it is us, the people, who will have to pay it back", replying against the statement of an ADB's engineer that the project was possible merely because of ADB's fund (Advokasi, 2007:12). Using the Internet for dissemination of awareness and broadening perspectives, YDA helps farmers like Tukimin to understand the direct impact of globalisation in their local context. (*)



"After queuing for oil, now, queuing for national poverty"; "Public participatory advocacy in Riau: Advocacy was successful and not anarchic"; "Tip for planting coffee and rice"; "Participatory development in Talang Bunut"; "Is state still there for the poor?" Source: Farmer's bulletin **Advokasi**, Edition 21, downloaded from <http://www.dutaawam.org/> (15 May 2007)

YDA itself has reaped the benefit of the Internet use. Its staff have become familiar in using email not only for regular communication with their colleagues and networks, but also for reporting activities and information searching through the WWW has become common practice to help with participatory research and advocacy works. YDA has also changed its website from a show-window-type of web into *blog-styled* website that reflects the organisation's vision of a shared community. Internally, to help staff use the Internet better, YDA created 'social learning', or *pendampingan* (which literally means 'companionship'). Staff who use the Internet less intensively are accompanied by others who use it more intensively. This approach, apparently, does not stop at the organisation level.

Pendampingan [(companionship)] is the best way [to work with our beneficiaries]. Unfortunately, our NGOs colleagues, to our observation, are still minimal in sharing farmers' issues. Only few do it properly. Whereas we know that there are abundant issues related to farmer and rural development out there, in national and global scale ... like genetics engineering or [chemical] pesticide. ... That's why I think we should help these [NGOs] to use the Internet more strategically in long-term perspective, and not just for [organisations'] visibility and social status. Because, in many cases, although they can access email and Internet [WWW] they still come to us, YDA, to ask questions to which the answers can actually be found in the Internet very easily. I wonder why this happens (Riza, interview, 30/11/2005)

Apparently, by creating a space for social learning, both at the organisation and network level, not only does familiarisation with the Internet become much easier for the organisations and the networks, but the benefit of such technological implementation can also be enjoyed relatively more quickly, especially by the beneficiaries they work with: the farmers.

4 SOME REFLECTIONS

Scholars have argued that social movements are best conceptualised as sustained interactions between specific authorities and those who challenge their authority, rather than as coherent groups of people (Crossley, 2002; Della-Porta and Diani, 2006; Diani, 2003; Tilly, 1984). Because this interaction is critical to contestation, changes in the locus of power alter the nature of how protest is organised, its forms, and the collective identities of the protestors (Johnston and Laxer, 2003). In the 18th century, when power accumulated in national politics and embodied in state administration, shifting from local communities, social movement emerged at national level as contentions against the state's power structure (Deakin, 2001; Edwards, 2004; Kaldor, 2003; Keane, 1998). Today, the dominant discourse on globalisation hypothesises that power has also shifted, but twofold: (i) from national to transnational levels, and (ii) from state to business or market. Thus, resistance was also twofold: (i) at a transnational level manifested by the emergence of global civil society and global social movement and (ii) in the widened contested area from state to include markets and businesses.

This account resonates with the stories told in this paper. The terrain of Indonesian civil society, particularly NGOs, has considerably changed in the past decade: from a fairly focused concern about state-centrist issues, to a much broader interest moving beyond state-centrist, giving more attention to the role of non-state actors like business and private sectors. It is intriguing to see that the focus of issues and concerns of Indonesian NGOs today are not only about building social awareness against the state's repressive power and promoting the democracy and human rights that were present in the past (as observed by Bird, 1999; Eldridge, 1995; Fakhri, 1996; Sinaga, 1994; Uhlin, 1997) but also about enlightening society with contextual issues and societal concerns which stem from globalisation. This can be seen in the inclusion of globalisation issues (which started in the late 1990s) and the emergence of new NGOs working particularly in globalisation and globalisation-related issues and concerns (since the beginning of 2000s).

This study argues that this change, while not easy to deal with for many NGOs, is very much a consequence of the use of new information and communication technologies, particularly the Internet, in many organisations within civil society. Evidence shows that not only does Internet use impact upon NGO's performance in terms of internal management, but more importantly, that such use has contributed to the widening of organisational perspectives, the expansion of organisational networks and has thus increased organisational influences in society. In fact, this technological use, to some extent, can also be seen to be part of the strategy of Indonesian NGOs to build critical views towards the practices of globalisation through their engagement with various civic groups.

The three cases presented here suggest that NGOs have potential –and can indeed realise such potential—to use the Internet strategically and politically in dealing with globalisation issues. In INFID's case, the strategic use revolves around the idea of networking movement. While networking with global civil society is undoubtedly important today, in order to tackle global issues, networking with local and national organisations has never been this substantial. Why? Social movement is all about networking: of ideas, of awareness, of organisations, and of activism (Diani, 2003; McAdam, 2003). It is thus important, in the civil society perspective, to channel global issues into local concerns and to widen direct involvement of organisations and their beneficiaries. In this sense, INFID has tried to appropriate the Internet not only to help expand and animate networks of Indonesian NGOs for advocacy works, but also to facilitate the process of their understanding about the complex nature of globalisation issues in their local development context. It is very clear that for NGOs, Internet use affects the dynamics between global vs. local political activism. It has the potential to globalise local socio-political dynamics (like resistance to authoritarian practices and the movement towards democratisation) and to localise global issues (such as liberalisation, privatisation, fair trade and

intellectual property, etc). The case of INFID shows that fuelled by the use of technological artefacts like the Internet, networks of social movement in an country like Indonesia is no longer just an instrument for civil society to mobilise resources and action: it has become a locus of power in society; a powerful fabric of social change. The Internet itself, working as a driver of these networks, as a direct consequence, should be viewed as more than just a communication tool.

IGJ's case, which shows that the Internet is no longer seen as a 'foreign' element but is already integrated into organisation's properties and routines, reflects how the technology is being used to spread awareness about globalisation to a wider and general public. As the Internet is appropriated to bring globalisation issues into the wider public arena, the benefit of technological use is enjoyed both by organisations and by their beneficiaries. Not only do IGJ's staff and researchers benefit from the use of the Internet for their quest, research and advocacy works on various global issues, but through online distribution of *Global Justice Update*, more people can become aware of what is going on in the WTO and what direct consequences global issues may have on their own lives. For its advocacy work, the Internet has strategically been used by IGJ for 'smart advocacy', i.e. an informed advocacy work based on factual, accurate data and information rather than mere propaganda. Such use could certainly help counter criticism that, in their work, NGOs mostly use empty jargon and rhetoric (Tvedt, 1998). Furthermore, the IGJ case shows that such strategic use of the Internet could have further organisational consequence: NGOs can be transformed from information and issue consumers into information and issue producers.

The case of YDA shows that through Internet use, NGOs can really empower their beneficiaries by broadening their perspectives towards various global issues that resonates with their local context. Just like most Indonesian NGOs which apparently have no luxury to afford an IT specialist to help them using the technology, YDA chose social learning as strategy for Internet implementation because it suits well the way that NGOs work. The case further suggests that organisations could actually exploit and explore the technology more effectively to improve operational management and provide strategic management information to achieve their missions and goals. But more importantly, the use of technologies like the Internet can be used by NGOs to help their beneficiaries widen their perspectives about global issues. This is of paramount important because a lot of problematic global issues need to be disentangled, and one way to do so is to articulate the issues in local circumstance – to understand the implication in actual context (Khor, 2000; 2001).

Based on these three cases, this study argues that in the universe of Indonesian NGOs, although the advent of Internet technology is considered to be revolutionary, in that it fundamentally empowers the

role of civil society in social movements as observed by some scholars (e.g. Hill, 2003; Hill and Sen, 2005; Lim, 2003), the adoption in NGOs, especially to respond to globalisation issues, seems to follow an evolutionary path. This is because the Internet and its use in Indonesian NGOs cannot be seen as homogenous. While large parts of the population neither have equal access nor similar capabilities to use the Internet, NGOs still need to “translate” and “interpret” the unadapted content of the Net. Not only that it is true for technicalities like language, but substantially, a lot of the content that the Internet brings, especially the global issues, needs to be rearticulated and understood within the local contexts. Only if such problems can be properly tackled, can the use of the Internet can significantly impact upon Indonesian NGOs’ relationship with their national and international partners and contribute to the integration of Indonesian NGOs into global civil society. While this all shows some potential roles that the Internet can play in the globalisation processes of social movement (Bennett, 2003; Sey and Castells, 2004) and the fact that in social movement cyberactivism is instrumental (as theorised by McCaughey and Ayers, 2003), undoubtedly, the real social change can only take place in the ‘off-line’ realm, in the same way that the re-articulation of globalisation issues can be understood and reacted upon in the same realm.

5 CONCLUDING NOTES

Globalisation has been claimed elsewhere to have been bringing groups and communities across the globe together into a ‘global village’ where ideas and knowledge from the farthest corners of the world can converge into a global idea (Castells, 1997). However, what happens at a more local level may be different. This is what has probably been observed by civil society and NGOs. Indeed, the critical views on neoliberal globalisation that have developed over the last decade can be identified as originating in the civil society sector (Fischer and Ponniah, 2003; Kaldor, 2000; Khor, 2000; Lynch, 1998). This is also true in Indonesia. The civil society sector, with NGOs as the main actors, has always been critical to the practice of globalisation, reflected in its strong reactions to the implementation of economic policies. This account is important when examining how NGOs use the Internet –the technology of globalisation—to help them to take globalisation discourse onboard in their activism, because both their adoption of technology and their response towards globalisation issues cannot be taken for granted.

This study offers some concluding remarks. Firstly, working at large in local contexts, while maintaining global network, has enabled Indonesian NGOs, to some extent, to spot increasing disillusionment about globalisation, as also reflected at the global level with the failure of the Seattle

WTO's ministerial meeting in 1999 (Kaldor, 2000; Khor, 2000). But being critical and being able to address adequate criticism towards globalisation issue is not always easy for many Indonesian NGOs. This is why both national and international networking among Indonesian NGOs remains important after the fall of Soeharto: understanding and rearticulating global issues in local contexts will be very difficult, if not impossible, to be carried out by individual NGOs without resourceful networking.

Secondly, there are a lot of difficulties faced by NGOs in their endeavour to respond to issues and broaden their perspectives. This is deemed an important purpose in reaping the benefit of utilising new information and communication technology, especially the Internet (other purposes being, for example, democratisation or widening public participation in national politics, amongst others). Driven by criticism towards globalisation issues, NGOs start deploying different strategies in using technology to deal with the issues. Among many possible strategies, three are mapped in this study through case observations: networking of advocacy (as shown by INFID), spreading awareness about globalisation issues (as demonstrated by IGJ), and broadening beneficiaries' perspective about the local implications of global policies (as illustrated by YDA).

Lastly, however, these three strategies are not generic. They serve more as examples, or as instances of good practice on how the Internet can be used strategically and politically to respond to globalisation issues, rather than to generalise the approach or strategy of Indonesian NGOs as a whole. In an attempt to portray the big picture, however, it is confirmed that although currently there are a number of Indonesian NGOs embracing particular issues and concerns in globalisation, this trend is quite recent. Yet, despite fact that globalisation issue is relatively difficult to comprehend at large, Indonesian NGOs seem to be able to incorporate the issues and put them into wider, more contextual –and possibly more relevant– perspectives in their organisations.

Unless the adoption of the Internet in NGOs can be properly understood, it is impossible to explain its effect in the dynamics of NGO's engagement with globalisation issues, as envisaged by Sri Palupi in the quotation at the beginning of this paper. (*)

REFERENCES

- Advokasi (2007) *Fakta CERDP (The facts of CERDP)*. Advokasi, Issue No. 21
- Aidit, D.N. (unknown) Kaum tani mengganjang setan-setan desa: Laporan singkat hasil riset mengenai keadaan kaum tani dan gerakan tani Djawa Barat (Indonesian). Report. Jakarta: Yayasan Pembaruan.
- Bennett, W.L. (2003) New Media Power: the Internet and Global Activism. In N. Couldry & J. Curran (Eds.) *Contesting Media Power*. London: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Bird, J. (1999) Indonesia in 1998. The Pot Boils over - A Survey of Asia in 1998. *Asian Survey*, 39(1), 27-37.
- Bresnan, J. (2005) Economic recovery and reform. In J. Bresnan (Ed.) *Indonesia: The great transition*. 189-237. New York: Rowmann & Littlefield.
- Castells, M. (1996) *The Rise of Network Society. The Information Age – Economy, Society, and Culture – Volume I*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- _____ (1997) *The Power of Identity. The Information Age – Economy, Society, and Culture – Volume II*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- _____ (1999) Information technology, globalization and social development. Report. *UNRISD Discussion Paper No. 114*. UNRISD.
- Chandhoke, N. (2001) The limits of global civil society. In H.K. Anheier, M. Glasius & M. Kaldor (Eds.) *Global Civil Society Yearbook 2001*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Coombs, R. & R. Hull (1996) The Politics of IT Strategy and Development in Organizations. In W.H. Dutton (Ed.) *Information and Communication Technologies: Visions and Realities*. 159-176. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Crossley, N. (2002) *Making Sense of Social Movement*, Buckingham Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Danermark, B., M. Ekstrom, L. Jakobsen & J.C. Karlsson (2002) *Explaining Society. Critical Realism in the Social Sciences*, London: Routledge.
- Deakin, N. (2001) *In search of civil society*, New York: Palgrave.
- Della-Porta, D. & M. Diani (2006) *Social Movements: An Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2nd Edition.
- Demos (2005) *Indonesia's post-Soeharto democracy movement*, Jakarta: Demos - The Indonesian Centre for Democracy and Human Rights Studies.
- Diani, M. (2003) Social Movements, Contentious Actions and Social Networks. From Methapor to Substance? In M. Diani & D. McAdam (Eds.) *Social Movements and Networks: Relational Approaches to Collective Action*. 1-20. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dutton, W.H. (1999) *Society on the Line: Information Politics in the Digital Age*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____ (2004) Social transformation in an Information Society: Rethinking access to you and the world. Report. *UNESCO Publications for the World Summit on the Information Society*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Edwards, M. (2004) *Civil Society*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989) Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 532-550.
- Eldridge, P.J. (1995) *Non-Government Organizations and democratic participation in Indonesia* Kuala Lumpur: OUP South East Asia.
- Fakih, M. (1996) *Masyarakat sipil untuk transformasi sosial: Pergolakan ideologi LSM Indonesia (Civil society for social transformation. Ideological dispute among Indonesian NGOs)*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Falk, R. (1999) *Predatory globalization: A critique*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Feridhanusetyawan, T. (2000) Globalization, poverty and equity in Indonesia. Report. *Country background paper for the OECD conference on Poverty and Income Inequality in Developing Countries: A Policy Dialogue on the Effects of Globalization, Paris, 30 November - 1 December 2000*. . Paris: OECD.
- Fischer, W. & T. Ponniah (Eds.) (2003) *Another World Is Possible: Popular Alternatives to Globalization at the World Social Forum*, London: Zed Books.
- Friedman, T. (1999) *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, New York: Farrar Straus Giroux.
- Fukuyama, F. (1992) *The End of History and the Last Man*, New York: Free Press.
- Ganie-Rochman, M. (2000) Needs assessment of advocacy NGOs in a New Indonesia. Report. *Report to the Governance and Civil Society of the Ford Foundation*. Jakarta: Ford Foundation.
- _____ (2002) *An uphill struggle: Advocacy NGOs under Soeharto's new order*, Jakarta: Lab Sosio FISIP UI.

- Giddens, A. (1999) Globalisation: The Reith Lectures. London: BBC News Online, available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/english/static/events/reith_99/week1/week1.htm (viewed April 2003).
- _____ (2000) *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives*, New York: Routledge.
- Gilbert, N. (1992) *Researching social life*, London: SAGE.
- Hadiwinata, B.S. (2003) *The Politics of NGOs in Indonesia. Developing Democracy and Managing a Movement*, London, New York: Routledge Curzon.
- Hertz, N. (2001) *The silent takeover: Global capitalism and the death of democracy*, London: Heinemann.
- Higgott, R. (2000) Contested globalization: The changing context and normative challenges. *Review of International Studies*, 26, 131-153.
- Hill, D.T. (2003) Communication for a New Democracy. Indonesia's First Online Elections. *The Pacific Review*, 16(4), 525-548.
- Hill, D.T. & K. Sen (2000) *Media, Culture and Politics in Indonesia*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____ (2005) *The Internet in Indonesia's New Democracy*, London and New York: Routledge.
- IGJ (2001) Why Global Justice? IGJ's profile. Jakarta: IGJ. Online profile available at <http://www.globaljust.org/profil.php>, visited 20 June 2007.
- INFID (1997) Advocacy Review 1997. Report. Jakarta and The Hague: INFID Secretariat.
- _____ (2000) Perjuangan demokrasi dan masyarakat sipil: Reposisi dan peran ORNOP/LSM di Indonesia. Report. Jakarta: INFID Secretariat.
- James, J. (2006) *Information technology and development*, London: Routledge.
- Johnston, J. & G. Laxer (2003) Solidarity in the age of globalization: Lessons from the anti-MAI and Zapatista struggles. *Theory and Society*, 32, 39-91.
- Kaldor, M. (2000) Civilising globalization: The implications of the battle of Seattle. *Millennium: A journal of international studies*, 29(4), 105-114.
- _____ (2003) *Global Civil Society*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Keane, J. (1998) *Civil society: Old images, new visions*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Khor, M. (2000) Globalization and the South: Some critical issues. Report. *Discussion Papers No. 147*. Geneva: UNCTAD.
- _____ (2001) *Rethinking Globalisation*, London and New York: Zed Books.
- Lim, M. (2002) Cyber-civic Space. From Panopticon to Pandemonium? *International Development and Planning Review*, 24(4), 383-400.
- _____ (2003) The Internet, Social Networks and Reform in Indonesia. In N. Couldry & J. Curran (Eds.) *Contesting Media Power. Alternative Media in a Networked World* 273-288. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- _____ (2004) Informational Terrains of Identity and Political Power: The Internet in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, 27(73), 1-11.
- _____ (2006) Cyber-Urban Activism and the Political Change in Indonesia. *EastBound*, 1(1), <http://www.eastbound.info/journal/2006-1/>.
- Lounela, A. (1999) Development in Indonesia. Some regional and national NGOs in Indonesian democratization process: Need assessment study on Indonesian NGOs. Report. *KEPA's reports No. 31/1999*. Helsinki: KEPA Service Centre for Development Cooperation.
- Lynch, C. (1998) Social Movements and the Problem of Globalization. *Alternatives*, 23(2), 149-173.
- MacCutcheon, A.L. (1987) *Latent Class Analysis*, London: Sage.
- Magidson, J. & J. Vermunt (2002) Latent class models for clustering: A comparison with K-means. *Canadian Journal of Marketing Research*, 20, 36-43.
- Marcus, D. (1998) Indonesia revolt was Net driven. *Boston Globe* (23 May), available at http://www.boston.com/dailyglobe/globehtml/143/Indonesia_revolt_was_Net_driven.htm consulted 3 September 2004.
- McAdam, D. (2003) Beyond Structural Analysis. Toward a More Dynamic Understanding of Social Movements. In M. Diani & D. McAdam (Eds.) *Social Movements and Networks. Relational Approaches to Collective Action*. 281-298. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McCaughy, M. & M.D. Ayers (Eds.) (2003) *Cyberactivism*, New York: Routledge.
- McConnell, S. (2000) A champion in our midst: Lessons learned from the impacts of NGOs' use of the Internet. *Electronic Journal on Information Systems in Developing Countries*, 2(5), 1-15.

- Motoyama, H. & N. Widagdo (1999) Power Sector Restructuring in Indonesia – A preliminary study. Report. Tokyo and Washington: Friends of The Earth, Japan & Bank Information Center, USA.
- Newell, S., J.C. Huang, R.D. Galliers & S.L. Pan (2003) Implementing Enterprise Resource Planning and Knowledge Management Systems in tandem: Fostering efficiency and innovation complementarity. *Information & Organization*, 13, 25–52.
- Nugroho, Y. (2006) Globalisation: Neither nirvana nor armageddon. Solo: Business Watch Indonesia.
- _____ (forthcoming) *Diffusion and impacts of the Internet in Civil Society Organisations: A research into the appropriation of the Internet in Indonesian CSOs for social reform and social development programmes*. PhD thesis. Manchester: The University of Manchester (provisional title).
- Nugroho, Y. & G. Tampubolon (2006) Mapping the network society: Network dynamics in the transition to democracy in Indonesia. *CRESC Working Paper No. 15*. Manchester: The University of Manchester.
- Purbo, O.W. (1996) Internet utilization in Indonesia. Report. *Computer Network Research Group*. Bandung: Institute of Technology Bandung.
- Raynolds, L.T. (2002) Consumer/Producer Links in Fair Trade Coffee Networks. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 42(4), 404–424.
- Rogers, E.M. (2003) *Diffusion of Innovations*, New York, NY: Free Press. Fifth Edition.
- Sen, J., A. Anand, A. Escobar & P. Waterman (Eds.) (2004) *The World Social Forum: Challenging empires*, New Delhi: Viveka Foundation.
- Sey, A. & M. Castells (2004) From Media Politics to Networked Politics: The Internet and the Political Process. In M. Castells (Ed.) *The Network Society: A cross-Cultural Perspective* 363-381. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Shiva, V. (1999) Ecological balance in an era of globalization. In N. Low (Ed.) *Global Ethics and Environment*. 47-69. London: Routledge.
- Sinaga, K. (1994) *NGOs in Indonesia: A study of the role of Non-Governmental Organizations in the development process* PhD thesis. Saarbrücken: Bielefeld University.
- Stake, R.E. (1995) *The art of case study research: Perspectives on practice*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Surman, M. & K. Reilly (2003) Appropriating the Internet for Social Change. Towards the Strategic Use of Networked Technologies by Transnational Civil Society Organisations. Report.: Social Science Research Council.
- Tilly, C. (1984) Social movements and national politics. In C. Bright & S. Harding (Eds.) *Statemaking and social movements: Essays in history and theory*. 297-317. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Tjondronegoro, S.M.P. (1984) *Social organisation and planned development in rural Java*, Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Tvedt, T. (1998) *Angels of Mercy or Development Diplomats. NGOs & Foreign Aid*, London: James Currey.
- Uhlen, A. (1997) *Indonesia and the Third Wave of Democratisation. The Indonesian Pro-Democracy Movement in a Changing World*, Surrey: Curzon.
- Vermunt, J. & J. Magidson (2002) Latent class cluster analysis. In J. Hagenaaers & A. McCutcheon (Eds.) *Applied latent class models*. 89-106. Cambridge University Press.
- Wainwright, H. (2005) Civil society, Democracy and Power. Global Connections. In H. Anheier, M. Glasius & M. Kaldor (Eds.) *Global Civil Society Yearbook 2004/5*. 94-121. London: SAGE.
- Warkentin, C. (2001) *Reshaping World Politics. NGOs, the Internet, and Global Civil Society*, Boston: Rowman & Littlefield.
- World Bank (2001) Attacking Poverty. Report. *World Development Report*. Washington: World Bank.
- _____ (2003) Sustainable Development in a Dynamic World. Report. *World Development Report*. New York: The World Bank.

Appendix 1. Analysing adopter category using MIMIC-LCA

The multiple indicators multiple causes (MIMIC) latent class analysis (LCA) model is a classification method when researchers cannot find a “gold standard” to classify participants. The MIMIC-LCA model includes features of a typical LCA model and introduces a new relation between the latent class and covariates (MacCutcheon, 1987; Magidson and Vermunt, 2002; Vermunt and Magidson, 2002).

In this case, the covariates are: length of the Internet use (*intsinc*), PC use (*pcsinc*), IT expenditure as percentage of annual turnover (*itexpproc*), and IT expenditure in nominal (*itexpnom*); while variables being estimated are the demographical data: age of organisation (*est*), no of staff (*staff*), and annual turn over (*ato*). The task is to find out the patterns of internet adoption and their stratification based on demography variables, given that there are many items and multiple stratification factors. The criteria for choosing among various models is based on the goodness of fit, with the lowest BIC (Model 1) is preferred (Magidson and Vermunt, 2002; Vermunt and Magidson, 2002).

The goodness of fit of the MIMIC model

Model		LL	BIC(LL)	Npar	L ²	Df	p-value	Class.Err.
Model 1	2-class	-795.019	1816.7598	42	1096.2965	179	1.50E-131	0.0395
Model 2	3-class	-736.693	1851.2579	70	979.6461	151	2.00E-121	0.0568
Model 3	4-class	-696.628	1922.275	98	899.5146	123	2.70E-118	0.0413

The profile of indicators is tabulated below.

	Class1	Class2		Class1	Class2
Class size	0.7556	0.2444	Class size	0.7556	0.2444
Indicators			Covariates		
est			pcsinc		
0-1yr	0.0431	0.0003	3-5 yr	0.3025	0.0451
1-2 yr	0.0493	0.0004	5-10 yr	0.3644	0.2431
10+ yr	0.2038	0.8581	<3 yr	0.1555	0
2-5 yr	0.2711	0.0023	>10 yr	0.0774	0.6885
5-8 yr	0.299	0.0717		0.1002	0.0233
8-10 yr	0.1336	0.0672	intsinc		
staff			3-5 yr	0.3309	0.0871
11-15	0.1478	0.0343	5-10 yr	0.2104	0.5356
16-20	0.0461	0.1303	<3 yr	0.2562	0.0218
21-25	0.0001	0.0575	>10 yr	0.0049	0.2633
6-10	0.3259	0.2658		0.1976	0.0922
<5	0.4798	0.0891	itexpproc		
>25	0.0003	0.4229	25-50%	0.1428	0.2995
ato			50-75%	0.0239	0.0186
1-2b	0.079	0.2935	<25%	0.6949	0.4798
100-500m	0.3541	0.1738	>75%	0.006	0
500m-1b	0.1556	0.1838		0.1323	0.2021
<100m	0.3809	0.0043	itexpnom		
>2b	0.0303	0.3446	100-500m	0.018	0.1112
			50-100m	0.0536	0.2608
			500m-1b	0.0179	0
			<50m	0.741	0.3926
			>1b	0	0.0186
				0.1695	0.2168

Final parameter estimation using MIMIC-LCA is presented below.

Characteristics of Indonesian NGOs as adopter

Estimated Variables	Late majority and laggards (75.56%)	Leaders and early majority (24.44%)
<i>Period of Internet use (years)</i>	<3; 3-5	5-10; >10
<i>Age of the organisation (years)</i>	0-1; 1-2; 2-5; 5-8; 8-10	>10
<i>Number of staff (persons)</i>	<5; 6-10; 11-15	16-20; 21-25; >25
<i>Annual turn over (IDR)</i>	<100 million; 100-500 million	500 million - 1 billion; 1-2 billion; >2 billion

N=268. Latent Class Analysis. BIC(LL)=1816.7598; NPar=42; L²=1096.296; df=179; p<0.0001; and Class.Err=3.9%

Appendix 2. Analysing Indonesian NGO's issues and concerns using MIMIC-LCA

Using exactly the same method as explained in Appendix 1, in this case, the covariates remain: length of the Internet use (*intsinc*), PC use (*pcsinc*), IT expenditure as percentage of annual turnover (*itexpproc*), and IT expenditure in nominal (*itexpnom*); while variables being estimated are the issues and concerns data: *ic_env* (environment), *ic_glob* (globalisation), *ic_rural* (rural), *ic_urban* (urban), *ic_devp* (development), *ic_hrights* (human rights), *ic_justpec* (justice and peace), *ic_democ* (democratisation), *ic_gender* (gender), *ic_child* (children and youth), *ic_poverty* (poverty alleviation), *ic_educ* (education), *ic_disabl* (disable), *ic_labour* (labour and trade union), *ic_farmer* (farmer), *ic_prof* (professional worker), *ic_gov* (governance), *ic_csemp* (civil society empowerment), *ic_confres* (conflict resolution), *ic_plural* (pluralism), *ic_idigns* (indigenous rights), *ic_ecosoc* (economic, cultural and social rights), *ic_oth* (other issues). The results from multiple indicators multiple causes (MIMIC) latent class analysis (LCA) models and the profile are presented below.

The goodness of fit of the MIMIC model

Model		LL	BIC(LL)	Npar	L ²	Df	p-value	Class.Err.
Model 1	2-class	-2553.67	5420.4256	58	4421.7976	163	1.8e-811	0.0153
Model 2	3-class	-2450.18	5407.792	94	4214.8303	127	1.3e-794	0.0258
Model 3	4-class	-2363.57	5428.8913	130	4041.5957	91	1.7e-786	0.0384


Profile

	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3
Class Size	0.6674	0.1973	0.1354
Indicators			
ic_env			
0	0.5716	0.4027	0.0051
1	0.4284	0.5973	0.9949
Mean	0.4284	0.5973	0.9949
ic_glob			
0	0.8782	0.4172	0.2107
1	0.1218	0.5828	0.7893
Mean	0.1218	0.5828	0.7893
ic_rural			
0	0.7605	0.6886	0.1612
1	0.2395	0.3114	0.8388
Mean	0.2395	0.3114	0.8388
ic_urban			
0	0.905	0.7422	0.2401
1	0.095	0.2578	0.7599
Mean	0.095	0.2578	0.7599
ic_devp			
0	0.5659	0.6272	0.0066
1	0.4341	0.3728	0.9934
Mean	0.4341	0.3728	0.9934
ic_hrights			
0	0.7764	0.0299	0.0399
1	0.2236	0.9701	0.9601
Mean	0.2236	0.9701	0.9601
ic_justpec			
0	0.8419	0.2439	0.074
1	0.1581	0.7561	0.926
Mean	0.1581	0.7561	0.926
ic_democ			
0	0.782	0.1033	0.1059
1	0.218	0.8967	0.8941
Mean	0.218	0.8967	0.8941
ic_gender			
0	0.711	0.2742	0.0735
1	0.289	0.7258	0.9265
Mean	0.289	0.7258	0.9265
ic_child			
0	0.7512	0.5723	0.1091
1	0.2488	0.4277	0.8909
Mean	0.2488	0.4277	0.8909
ic_poverty			
0	0.6424	0.2548	0.0053
1	0.3576	0.7452	0.9947
Mean	0.3576	0.7452	0.9947


	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3
Class Size	0.6674	0.1973	0.1354
Indicators			
ic_educ			
0	0.5788	0.559	0.0427
1	0.4212	0.441	0.9573
Mean	0.4212	0.441	0.9573
ic_disabl			
0	0.9661	0.9995	0.6334
1	0.0339	0.0005	0.3666
Mean	0.0339	0.0005	0.3666
ic_labour			
0	0.8936	0.5822	0.4291
1	0.1064	0.4178	0.5709
Mean	0.1064	0.4178	0.5709
ic_farmer			
0	0.6726	0.6555	0.0413
1	0.3274	0.3445	0.9587
Mean	0.3274	0.3445	0.9587
ic_prof			
0	0.959	0.9764	0.5684
1	0.041	0.0236	0.4316
Mean	0.041	0.0236	0.4316
ic_gov			
0	0.8184	0.5605	0.4299
1	0.1816	0.4395	0.5701
Mean	0.1816	0.4395	0.5701
ic_csemp			
0	0.5163	0.2241	0.1035
1	0.4837	0.7759	0.8965
Mean	0.4837	0.7759	0.8965
ic_confres			
0	0.8924	0.6059	0.2333
1	0.1076	0.3941	0.7667
Mean	0.1076	0.3941	0.7667
ic_plural			
0	0.9312	0.7507	0.1986
1	0.0688	0.2493	0.8014
Mean	0.0688	0.2493	0.8014
ic_idigns			
0	0.9032	0.7488	0.3728
1	0.0968	0.2512	0.6272
Mean	0.0968	0.2512	0.6272
ic_ecosoc			
0	0.7567	0.1437	0.0716
1	0.2433	0.8563	0.9284
Mean	0.2433	0.8563	0.9284

	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3
Class Size	0.6674	0.1973	0.1354
Covariates			
pcsinc			
3-5 yr	0.2305	0.3224	0.1653
5-10 yr	0.3106	0.4337	0.3107
<3 yr	0.148	0.0267	0.0996
>10 yr	0.2255	0.1622	0.3233
Mean	0.0853	0.0549	0.101
intsinc			
3-5 yr	0.2298	0.3716	0.3324
5-10 yr	0.2875	0.3399	0.2267
<3 yr	0.2261	0.1974	0.0674
>10 yr	0.0679	0.022	0.1346
Mean	0.1887	0.0691	0.2389
itexpproc			
25-50%	0.1685	0.2757	0.1047
50-75%	0.0135	0.023	0.0673
<25%	0.6418	0.701	0.5607
>75%	0.0068	0	0
Mean	0.1694	0.0003	0.2673
itexpnom			
100-500m	0.0262	0.0716	0.068
50-100m	0.1121	0.1033	0.065
500m-1b	0.0068	0.046	0
<50m	0.6645	0.6891	0.566
>1b	0.0068	0	0
Mean	0.1836	0.0899	0.301

Appendix 3. Internet adoption in Indonesian NGOs: Drivers and impacts



N=268, multiple responses possible



N=268, single response, Likert-scale