University of Groningen

The Motivating Role of Perceived Right Violation and Efficacy Beliefs in Identification with the Italian Water Movement

Mazzoni, Davide; van Zomeren, Martijn; Cicognani, Elvira

Published in:
Political Psychology

DOI:
[10.1111/pops.12101](https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12101)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2015

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Mazzoni, D., van Zomeren, M., & Cicognani, E. (2015). The Motivating Role of Perceived Right Violation and Efficacy Beliefs in Identification with the Italian Water Movement. *Political Psychology*, 36(3), 315-330. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12101>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

The Motivating Role of Perceived Right Violation and Efficacy Beliefs in Identification with the Italian Water Movement

Davide Mazzoni

University of Bologna, Italy

Martijn van Zomeren

University of Groningen, The Netherlands

Elvira Cicognani

University of Bologna, Italy

Because individuals' fundamental right to water is often taken for granted, little is known about why individuals participate in water activism. We examine how individuals identify with and intend to participate in the Italian Water Movement to defend the "public management" of water supply. Building on the collective-action literature, we test an explanatory model in which the perceived violation of the right to water and group and participative-efficacy beliefs increase movement identification, which predicts subsequent activism. Study 1 (N = 153 activists) largely confirmed our hypotheses: right violation and participative efficacy uniquely influenced movement identification, which in turn predicted activism. Study 2 corroborated these findings by employing a broader sample of 132 Italian citizens, with right violation, participative and group-efficacy beliefs predicting movement identification, which in turn predicted activism. We discuss the theoretical and practical implications of these findings.

KEY WORDS: collective action, moral conviction, right to water, group efficacy, social movement

Water is not only a natural resource to preserve, but it can be considered also as a commons and an important human right (according to the United Nations; CESCR, 2002). In the last decade, it is possible to observe an increasing international interest for the right to water, especially from political and economical perspectives (e.g., Smets, 2006; UN, 2010; WHO & UNICEF, 2010). Accordingly, like other human rights, water must be accessible to all, including the most vulnerable or marginalized sections of the population (CESCR, 2002). Moreover, from recent resolutions and publications, it is possible to derive the content of seven dimensions of the right to water (see appendix).

Yet, despite its status as a fundamental right, worldwide hundreds of millions of people do not have access to safe, clean water (WHO & UNICEF, 2010), and hence they are denied this human right. Even in Europe, the main objective of EU water policy is to ensure access to good-quality water in sufficient quantity for all and to ensure the good status of all water bodies across Europe (EC, 2007). The right to water, therefore, is politically and societally relevant also in EU countries,

even if only a minority of citizens participate in the defence of the right to water from its possible violations and develop the agency of preserving this right collectively.

Indeed, precisely because most people may take their right to water too much for granted, in developed countries few people seem interested in how water-service management contributes to or undermines the guarantee of an adequate water supply. In fact, only a minority decides to voluntarily engage in some forms of action to defend or implement the right to water (de Albuquerque, 2010) with a consequent lack of psychological research focusing on right to water and individuals' commitment to defend it. Thus, individuals may become aware of their human rights especially when these are violated; and without the perception of right violation, individuals might not even be interested in their preservation or defense.

In the current research, we took advantage of the political situation in Italy where the issue of the right to water has become politicized. In response to a recent process of liberalization, several networks of local communities, civil society groups, and citizens' associations joined together within the Italian Water Movement in support of a public management of water resources. This movement represents a large-scale participative phenomenon, but unlike other Italian movements (e.g., Della Porta & Piazza, 2008; Gelli & Mannarini, 2007), it remains largely understudied. The Water Movement explicitly rejects the definition of water as a "service with economic value" (Law Decree 135/09, art. 15), and in 2009, it started a campaign titled "Water is not for sale" whose main objective was to support a legislative referendum. This mobilization offered a unique opportunity to study individuals' motivation for collective action in the context of the Italian Water Movement.

Within this context, the specific aim of this article is to test an explanatory model of movement activism based on recent advances in the collective action literature (e.g., Klandermans, 1997; Van Zomeren, Postmes, & Spears, 2008). This model, tested using quantitative data from a sample of 153 Italian activists (Study 1) and a more diverse sample of 132 citizens (Study 2), predicts that individuals' *identification with the Water Movement* motivates their activism and proposes innovatively that two variables feed into such identification: namely, *perceived right violation* and *participative-efficacy beliefs*.

Motivations for Movement Participation

Collective action is typically defined, in a psychological sense, as any action that individuals undertake as group members, with the aim to improve the group's conditions (Wright, Taylor, & Moghaddam, 1990). One implication of this definition is that many different behaviors can be classified as collective action (e.g., participation in strikes, demonstrations, and the signing of online and/or off-line petitions; see Van Zomeren et al., 2008). Within the psychological literature on collective action and activism,¹ a triad of variables has been found to consistently predict collective action: group identification, perceived group-based injustice, and beliefs about the group's efficacy (Klandermans, 1997; Van Zomeren et al., 2008).

First, evidence abounds that identification with a social movement is a strong predictor of individuals' social-movement participation because movement identification arguably includes an "inner obligation" to participate in movement activism (e.g., Simon et al., 1998) and thus encompasses strong group norms about undertaking action (Van Zomeren et al., 2008). For example, Stürmer and Simon (2004) reviewed support for the role of identification with the gay movement in

¹ "Activism" refers to a more specific term that is reserved for describing different degrees of individuals' participation in collective action organized by social movements (e.g., the peace movement; Klandermans, 1997; Van Zomeren & Iyer, 2009) which can be conceived as the result of a gradual process of psychological involvement with the movement (Klandermans & Oegema, 1987). In the current article, however, we refer to activism as individuals' willingness to invest time in movement activities. As such, it resembles the typical definition of collective action or at least more so than the typical definition of activism.

promoting participation in actions organized by that movement. Similarly, Cameron and Nickerson (2009) found further support for the predictive role of such group identification in the context of antiglobalization protests. We therefore consider identification with the Water Movement as the most proximal predictor of water activism. However, this does not mean that the psychology of activism can or should be reduced to movement identification. Other variables are important to consider because these may affect activism indirectly through movement identification (Van Zomeren et al., 2008).

In this respect, perceptions of injustice play a key role in gearing individuals up for collective action (as argued in relative deprivation theory, for example; Runciman, 1966; Walker & Smith, 2002). However, even if the literature largely investigated the perceptions of injustice as “unfairness,” it is now clear that they can sometimes reflect perceived violations of moral principles (Simon & Klandermans, 2001; Van Zomeren, in press). This line of thought resonates with recent work on collective action in which it was found that moral convictions, defined as strong and absolute attitudes on moralized issues, play an important motivational role in predicting identification with the relevant group that is mobilizing for collective action. The rationale behind this idea is that moral convictions do not tolerate any violations of the principle on which they are based and thus, when violated, instantly create identification with a moral “group of believers” that wants to protect them (Skitka, Bauman, & Sargis, 2005; Van Zomeren, Postmes, Spears, & Bettache, 2011). Unfortunately, these studies mainly focused on the personal beliefs about the “moral” character of the issue, while they did not actually measure perceptions of *violated* rights (or principles more generally). In this article, we therefore focus on perceived right violation as a different and more specific operationalization than the mere endorsement of moral principles.

Indeed, even though many people may endorse human rights “in principle,” typically only a minority decides to act in order to defend them (Cohrs, Maes, Moschner, & Kielman, 2007; Stellmacher, Sommer, & Brähler, 2005). For example, according to Ellis (2004), people often allowed themselves to distance from injustices (e.g., against lesbians and gay men) failing to see them as human rights violations. For this reason, a focus on perceptions of right violation seems important in order to validate assumptions in previous work about the psychological process involved. Moreover, a specific focus on right violation is in line with the idea that although individuals’ moral convictions may bring them together for collective action, the perception of right violation should have arguably stronger and more powerful effects (because it is the violation of the moral conviction that evokes the motivation to act). We therefore consider *perceived right violation* as an important antecedent of movement identification and thus of water activism.

Third, a key predictor of collective action is the belief in *group efficacy*, i.e., individuals’ efficacy beliefs relating to the group’s ability to solve group-related problems (e.g., Mummendey, Kessler, Klink, & Mielke, 1999; see also Bandura, 2001). Higher levels of group efficacy generally increase the probability of group identification (Van Zomeren, Leach, & Spears, 2010) and of undertaking social and/or political action (Hornsey et al., 2006; Niemi, Craig, & Mattei, 1991; Van Zomeren, Spears, Fischer, & Leach, 2004). People typically rely on their group-efficacy beliefs to assure themselves that collective action itself will be effective, and hence their efforts will be rewarded achieving group goals (e.g., Mummendey et al., 1999).

However, recent research has suggested in this respect that a strong focus on group efficacy neglects the importance of the role of the individual actor participating in, and thus contributing to, collective action. For example, Van Zomeren, Saguy, and Schellhaas (2012) found in three studies with different samples (from Israel, the Netherlands, and Germany) that although group-efficacy beliefs predicted collective action tendencies as well as actual behavior, it was their *participative*-efficacy beliefs that were even more predictive. Participative-efficacy beliefs revolve around the belief that one can make a valuable contribution to the group’s effort to achieve group goals through one’s own participation (i.e., whether one can make *a*, not *the*, difference). This line of thought fits with the

literature on political self-efficacy (e.g., Bandura, 1997; Caprara, Vecchione, Capanna, & Mebane, 2009), in which it has also been found that activists' perceived effectiveness of their own contribution to the group increased their motivations for activism. We therefore consider participative as well as group-efficacy beliefs as predictors of movement identification and thus of water activism.

Overview

The aim of the present research was to explain individuals' intention to participate in the Italian Water Movement. More specifically, we wanted to test an explanatory model based on different motivational pathways that lead individuals to identify with and to intend to participate in this movement, including perceived right violation, participative- and group-efficacy beliefs. Because identification with the movement has been shown to depend on several psychosocial factors and represents one of the strongest predictors of activism (Simon et al., 1998; Van Zomeren et al., 2008), we hypothesized a mediation model, predicting that the other factors (right violation, participative- and group-efficacy beliefs) explain activism through identification with the movement. To strengthen the external validity of our model, Study 1 employed a sample of Italian water activists, whereas Study 2 employed a broader sample of Italian citizens.

Study 1

Aim and Hypotheses

In Study 1, we wanted to test our model with a sample of water activists. We predicted that stronger right violation increases movement identification and thus increase intended activism (Hypothesis 1). Showing support for this hypothesis would add to the literature by offering a specific factor (perceived right violation) that represents an accurate indicator of the underlying process leading to moral motivation for identifying with a group and acting collectively. Second, although group-efficacy beliefs are generally important in predicting collective action, we hypothesize that, at least among activists, *participative*-efficacy beliefs will be more predictive of identification and therefore activism (Hypothesis 2). This is in line with the view of activists as individuals who strongly believe that their actions matter and wish to personally contribute to the group effort to achieve group goals (Mazzoni & Cicognani, 2013). Thus, we expect participative-efficacy beliefs to feed into activists' identification with the movement, which predicts individuals' activism.

Method

One-hundred-and-fifty-three Italian activists (91 men and 64 women) participated voluntarily by completing an e-mail questionnaire delivered through the main Italian Water Movement mailing list, with a response rate of 24%.² Their mean age was 44.55 years ($SD = 12.43$); 66.7% were members of political organizations, parties, associations, or trade unions. Activists were invited to take part in a study about the topic of water services management and mobilization.

We measured *identification with the Water Movement* with four items adapted from Van Stekelenburg (2006) and Mannarini, Roccato, Fedi, and Rovere (2009). Items employed 4-point response scales (ranging from 1 = "not at all" to 4 = "very much"). The scale showed acceptable reliability ($\alpha = .69$). Examples of items were: "To what extent do you define yourself as a "public water activist?" and "How many things do you have in common with other people in the Italian Water Movement?"

² This rate is comparable to most of e-mail surveys without incentives (e.g., Sheehan, 2001).

Building on and moving beyond previous work on moral convictions and collective action, we measured *right violation* by a multiplicative index based on its two components of “value of the right to water” and “perceived threat of right violation.” Each component was composed by eight items, corresponding to the specific dimensions of the right to water (see the appendix): quantity, quality, physical accessibility/access, affordability/price, information, participation, environmental respect, and nondiscrimination. The first component (named “value of the right to water”) referred to the perceived importance of the right to water. We measured this component by asking how much it would be serious if, in times of crisis, each of the eight dimensions of the right to water was implicitly not respected. An example item for the dimension of quantity was: “How serious do you think it would be if the water for personal and domestic use would be reduced or discontinuous?” Answers ranged from 1 (“not serious at all”) to 7 (“extremely serious”). The second component referred to the perceived threat of violations of the right to water in the Italian context, in its eight dimensions. An example of an item, for the dimension of quantity, was “According to the current Italian law, what do you think will happen in the future with respect to the quantity of water for personal and domestic use?” Answers ranged from 1 (“improvement”) to 7 (“worsening”). Being a multiplicative index, the right-to-water violation increases when each couple of items on the eight dimensions, increases simultaneously. A principal axis-factoring analysis extracted one factor that predicted 64.98% of the variance, with factor loadings ranging from .55 to .93. Thus, this measure confirmed its adequate-construct validity, and the geometric mean of the eight couple of items was adopted as in the analyses ($\alpha = .93$).

Furthermore, we measured *group-efficacy beliefs* with four items adapted from Van Stekelenburg (2006) and Mannarini et al. (2009). This measure employed 7-point response scales (ranging from 1 = “not at all” to 7 = “completely”) ($\alpha = .72$). An example was: “To what extent do you think that the Water Movement will be able to realize a large referendum campaign?” By contrast, we measured *participative-efficacy beliefs* by focusing on the perceived ability to contribute personally to the movement efforts. Four items were created following guidelines for constructing self-efficacy scales (Bandura, 2006). This measure employed 7-point response scales (ranging from 1 = “not at all” to 7 = “completely”) ($\alpha = .86$). Examples were: “How much do you feel capable of actively contributing to the Water Movement success?” or “How much do you feel capable of convincing people to vote for the referendum promoted by the Water Movement?” Factor analysis confirmed the existence of two corresponding factors explaining, respectively, 32.52% (participative) and 21.34% (group) percentage of variance, with all items loading on their corresponding factor. All factor loadings were $>.56$ (only one item, “To what extent do you think that the Water Movement will be able to obtain more votes ‘Yes’ than ‘No’ at the Referendum?” showed a loading of .37, but we decided to retain it as it did not reduce the reliability of the scale).

Finally, we measured *intended activism* by asking participants to indicate the future time investment (in hours per week) they were willing to spend for the movement in the next year. Answers were recoded into a 5-point scale: 0–1 hours, 2–4 hours, 5–10 hours, 11 or more. Table 1 provides means, standard deviations, and correlations between the key measures.

Table 1. Study 1: Correlations Between Key Variables, Means, and Standard Deviations

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	2.	3.	5.	5.
1. Right violation	6.13	0.91	.13	.16*	.23**	.11
2. Participative efficacy	5.16	1.07		.56***	.47***	.30***
3. Group efficacy	5.42	0.88			.38***	.17*
4. Identification with the Water Movement	3.20	0.57				.33***
5. Activism	2.35	1.15				

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. $N = 153$.

Results and Discussion

We used structural-equation modeling to test our model on the data of the Study 1 activist sample. Using Amos 5.0, our path model predicts that movement identification predicts intended activism and that it is predicted by right violation, participative- and group-efficacy beliefs. The model further assumes correlations between right violation, participative- and group-efficacy beliefs. This model fit the data well ($\chi^2 = 5.21$, $df = 3$, $p = .16$), which indicates that the hypothesized covariance matrix did not significantly differ from the actual covariance matrix. Other fit indices corroborated this evaluation of the model: $CFI = .98$, $GFI = .99$, $SRMR = .04$, $RMSEA = .07$ (see Kline, 1998). As can be seen in Figure 1, parameter estimates supported the significance of the different motivational pathways per our hypotheses. In line with previous results, movement identification predicted activism, whereas movement identification was predicted by right violation and more strongly by participative- than group-efficacy beliefs. Similar results were obtained while controlling for age and gender.

Structural-equation modeling also allows for the set-up and test of plausible alternative models. For instance, one could argue that identification with the movement may predict the other variables that in turn predict intended activism. We therefore tested an alternative model that would conceptualize identification with the movement as predicting right violation and efficacy beliefs, which predict activism in turn. However, this reversed-causal-sequence model did not fit the data well ($\chi^2 = 45.54$, $df = 4$, $p < .001$; $CFI = .65$, $GFI = .90$, $SRMR = .11$, $RMSEA = .26$). Thus, results were in line with our explanatory model but not in line with a theoretically plausible alternative model.

Having found support for our model and no support for a plausible alternative, we then proceeded to test the expected significant indirect effect between our predictor variables and outcome variable (i.e., full mediation via movement identification). We thus examined the estimates of these indirect effects with the bootstrapping technique (Hayes, 2009) using AMOS. The variables of right violation, group efficacy, and participative efficacy were inserted as independent variables, identification with the Water Movement as the mediator, activism as the dependent variable, and gender and age as control variables. An estimate of confidence intervals for the indirect effect in each resampled data set is calculated from the sampling distribution. We used 5,000 bootstrap resamples to generate 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals (CI). Results showed that the rights-violation standardized CI was significant and ranged from 0.00 to 0.12 ($p = .04$), whereas the estimate of the participative-efficacy indirect effect was also significant ($p = 0.01$), with a 95% CI ranging from 0.03 to 0.20. By contrast, the indirect effect of group efficacy was not significant.

In sum, as predicted, we found in Study 1 that the perceived violation of the right to water, together with participative-efficacy beliefs explained intended activism through identification with the Water Movement. Nevertheless, a potential limitation of this study is that we restricted our

Figure 1. Study 1: The explanatory model. Reported coefficients are standardized. $p < .05$; $N = 153$.

analysis to activists. This restriction should be unnecessary because even those uninvolved in the Water Movement should be able to identify with and intend to act on its behalf due to the perceived violation of the right to water or their group or participative-efficacy beliefs. Therefore, in Study 2, we employed a broader sample than we did in Study 1 (i.e., including nonactivists as well as activists). We reasoned that replicating support for the model across different populations (but within the same context of the Italian Water Movement) would support the external validity of our findings. Furthermore, in Study 2, we wanted to explicitly test our assumption that the rights-violation measure predicts movement identification above and beyond a measure of moral conviction (e.g., Skitka et al., 2005). This should be the case because the moral motivation we theorize should be based more precisely in perceived right violation than in individuals' convictions about that issue. We therefore included such a measure in Study 2.

Study 2

Aim and Hypotheses

The aim of Study 2 was to test our explanatory model on a broad sample of Italian citizens. We expected that the model would replicate, with one potential exception. That is, we predicted as in Study 1 that perceived right violation increases identification with the movement and therefore increases activism (Hypothesis 1a), and, unique to Study 2, that the rights-violation measure would predict movement identification above and beyond the newly included moral-conviction measure (Hypothesis 1b). Furthermore, given the more variable sample in Study 2 (as compared to Study 1), we expected that not only participative- but also group-efficacy beliefs would emerge as a significant predictor of movement identification (Hypothesis 2). This is because group-efficacy beliefs have been shown important in predicting collective action intentions among nonactivists (e.g., Mummendey et al., 1999). We thus reasoned that group-efficacy beliefs should come more to the fore in a sample that includes nonactivists as well as activists.

Method

During the month before the referendum (May 1–June 1, 2011) a convenience sample of 132 adult Italian citizens completed a questionnaire online. The link was published on the web page of five thematic groups about “water” and on five groups of university students in Facebook. One € 50 prize (voucher), which was awarded randomly, was offered as an enticement to participate. Males were 36.40% of the sample, while females were 63.60%. The mean age was 28.08 y.o. ($SD = 9.09$). Of this group, 50.8% were members of political organizations, parties, associations, or trade unions. The questionnaire covered the following areas.

Similarly to Study 1, we measured *perceived right violation* by a multiplicative index based on its two components of “value of the right to water” and “perceived threat of right violation.” Each component was composed of seven items, corresponding to a different dimension (see the appendix). In order to improve the measure adopted in Study 1, we decided to include the “nondiscrimination” aspect in each item and specifying that every statement should be valid for everyone. The rationale for this choice is that “nondiscrimination” (i.e., “it should be valid for everyone, without discrimination”) represents an intrinsic feature of all human rights. The first component referred to the perceived *importance of the right* to water. We measured this component by asking how much it would be serious if, in times of crisis, each of the eight dimensions of the right to water was implicitly not respected. An example item for the dimension of quantity was: “Even in a period of economic crisis, how much it is necessary that everyone will have access to a minimum quantity of water for personal and domestic uses?” Answers ranged from 1 (“strictly necessary”) to 7 (“not necessary”).

The second component referred to the *perceived threat of violations* of the right to water in its seven dimensions (“Without substantial law changes, how probable is it that we will face the following violations of the right to water?”). An example of an item for the dimension of quantity was “Someone will have no access to a minimum quantity of water for personal and domestic uses.” Answers ranged from 1 (“very unlikely”) to 7 (“very likely”). Being a multiplicative index, the right-to-water violation increases when each couple of items on the seven dimensions increases simultaneously. A principal axis-factoring analysis extracted one factor that predicted 53.40% of the variance, with factor loadings ranging from .57 to .80. Thus, this measure confirmed its adequate-construct validity, and the geometric mean of the seven couple of items was adopted as in the analyses ($\alpha = .88$).

Moreover, as noted in this study, we introduced a measure of *moral conviction* with a single-item measure, specifically: “How much are your feelings about the liberalization of water services connected to your core moral convictions?” (see Skitka et al., 2005). Answers ranged from 1 (“not at all”) to 5 (“very much”).

We further measured *group-efficacy beliefs* with four items with a 7-point response scale (ranging from 1 = “not at all” to 7 = “completely”) ($\alpha = .83$). An example was: “To what extent do you think that the Water Movement will be able to realize a large referendum campaign?” By contrast, we measured *participative-efficacy beliefs* by focusing on the perceived ability to contribute personally to the movement success through the referendum. This measure employed four items with 7-point response scales (ranging from 1 = “not at all” to 7 = “completely”) ($\alpha = .87$). Examples were: “How much do you feel capable of actively contributing to the Referendum success?” or “How much do you feel capable of convincing people to vote for the Referendum?” Factor analysis confirmed the existence of two corresponding factors explaining, respectively, 32.52% (participative) and 28.34% (group) percentage of variance, with all items loading on their corresponding factor. All factor loadings were $>.54$.

We measured *identification with the Water Movement* with three items employing a 7-point response scales (ranging from 1 = “not at all” to 7 = “very much”) ($\alpha = .86$). The items were: “To what extent do you define yourself as a “public water activist?”; “How many things do you have in common with other people in the Italian Water Movement?”; and “How many things do you have in common with other people in the Water Movement worldwide?”

Finally, we measured *intended activism* by asking participants to indicate all the activities they are willing to do in the next month from a list of seven (possible answers: “no/yes”): giving money, suggesting to relatives to go to vote, suggesting friends to go to vote, wearing movement/referendum symbols, delivering communication materials (e.g., flyers), taking part to public activities supporting the referendum (e.g., demonstrations, meetings), and others. An index was thus created counting the number of activities ($\alpha = .66$). Table 2 provides means, standard deviations, and correlations between the key measures.

Table 2. Study 2: Correlations Between Key Variables, Means, and Standard Deviations

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
1. Right violation	5.68	.096	.10	.06	.08	.35***	.16
2. Moral conviction	3.77	1.08		.12	-.01	.25*	.11
3. Participative efficacy	4.88	1.30			.34***	.45***	.42**
4. Group efficacy	5.05	1.09				.44***	.29*
5. Identification with the Water Movement	5.05	1.25					.46***
6. Activism	2.42	1.66					

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. $N = 132$.

Results and Discussion

As in Study 1, we tested our predictive model on the data through structural-equation modeling (using Amos 5.0). However, modification indices suggested that, at least in this dataset, the model needed to be adjusted slightly to include the estimation of the relationship between participative efficacy and activism. Given that recent work found evidence for such a direct effect of participative efficacy among nonactivists (e.g., Van Zomeren et al., 2012), we decided to allow this adjustment. The resulting adjusted-path model thus assumes that movement identification and participative efficacy predict activism, whereas identification is predicted by right violation, moral conviction, and group- and participative-efficacy beliefs. The model assumes correlations between right violation, moral conviction, and efficacy beliefs.

This model fit the data well ($\chi^2 = 0.90$, $df = 3$, $p = .82$; $CFI = 1.00$, $GFI = .99$, $SRMR = .01$, $RMSEA = .00$), since the hypothesized covariance matrix did not significantly differ from the actual covariance matrix (see Kline, 1998). As can be seen in Figure 2, movement identification and participative efficacy predicted activism, whereas movement identification was predicted by right violation, moral conviction, and by participative- and group-efficacy beliefs. Similar findings were obtained controlling for age and gender. Thus, results were largely in line with our explanatory model.

Structural-equation modeling also allows for the set-up and test of plausible alternative models. As in Study 1, we therefore decided to test an alternative model that would conceptualize identification with the movement as predicting right violation and efficacy beliefs, which predict activism in turn. However, this reversed-causal-sequence model did not fit the data so well ($\chi^2 = 17.54$, $df = 7$, $p = .014$; $CFI = .91$, $GFI = .96$, $SRMR = .06$, $RMSEA = .11$). Thus, results were more in line with our explanatory model than with a theoretically plausible alternative model.

Having found support for our model and no support for a plausible alternative, we then tested for direct-indirect effect with bootstrap (Hayes, 2009). The variables of right violation, moral conviction, group efficacy, and participative efficacy were inserted as independent variables; identification with the Water Movement was inserted as the mediator; and intended activism was inserted as dependent variable, while controlling for gender and age. We used 5,000 bootstrap resamples to generate 95% confidence intervals. As in Study 1, the estimate of the right-violation indirect effect CI was significant, ranging from 0.02 to 0.15 ($p = 0.003$). Unique to Study 2, the estimate of the moral-conviction indirect effect CI was significant, ranging from 0.01 to 0.13 ($p = 0.008$). As in Study 1, the estimate of the participative-efficacy indirect effect was significant ($p = 0.005$), with a CI ranging from 0.02 to 0.18, while, unique to Study 2, the CI of the group-efficacy indirect effect

Figure 2. Study 2: The explanatory model. Reported coefficients are standardized. $p < .05$; $N = 132$.

ranged from 0.02 to 0.18 ($p = 0.006$). Moreover, and in line with the path-model results, identification with the Movement (CI: 0.06–0.46; $p = 0.008$) and participative efficacy (CI: 0.11–0.46; $p = 0.002$) showed also a significant direct effect on intended activism, while other independent variables did not.

In sum, Study 2 corroborated support for our explanatory model that suggests that stronger right violation increases movement identification and thus activism (Hypothesis 1a); that perceived right violation would predict movement identification above and beyond moral conviction (Hypothesis 1b); and that both participative- and group-efficacy beliefs would predict movement identification given the broader sample we used in Study 2 (Hypothesis 2). The only unexpected result was the direct predictive effect of participative efficacy on intended activism. However, this dovetails with recent research (Van Zomeren et al., 2012) showing that participative-efficacy and group-efficacy beliefs can both have predictive validity among nonactivists. Thus, we believe that this unexpected result can also be explained by our broader sample in Study 2.

General Discussion

In two studies related to the Italian Water Movement, we investigated two potential antecedents of movement identification and activism for “public water” on the basis of quantitative survey data. The results of Study 1, conducted among water activists, largely confirmed the hypothesized pathways about the perceived violation of the right to water and participative-efficacy beliefs as antecedents of movement identification and intended activism. Employing a broader sample of Italian citizens, Study 2 provided further support for these hypothesized pathways and further insights in the connection between right violation and moral convictions. Moreover, results showed that group-efficacy beliefs appeared more important with respect to identification and activism in the broader sample (Study 2) than in the activist sample (Study 1). These findings may have a number of important implications for theory and research on movement-identification activism, as well as a number of important practical and political consequences.

Theoretical Implications

Our results stress the importance of the perceived violation of a principle (i.e., the right to water) as a specific psychological process underlying activists’ moral motivation to identify with the Water Movement and act on its behalf. In this sense, the two studies confirm and extend the relationship between moral motivation and increased identification (e.g., Van Zomeren et al., 2011). However, moving beyond this recent work, the two studies introduced a specific measure of the value and right components of right violation to illuminate this specific process. This enabled a specification of the exact process underlying moral motivation, namely the violation of moral standards. Moreover, the different samples in Study 1 and 2 enabled us to test whether this specific process would have external validity. Generally speaking, our findings affirm the power of moral motivation to gear individuals up for collective action in the political and politicized context of the Italian Water Movement.

Specifically, this article suggests that the right to water (like other human rights) can be viewed as a “sacred value” that individuals seek to defend when threatened (e.g., Tetlock, 2003). Indeed, such sacred values are seen as absolute, nonnegotiable, and inviolable, thus leading individuals to respond strongly to any violation of them (Baron & Spranca, 1997; Tanner & Medin, 2004; Tetlock, Kristel, Elson, Green, & Lerner, 2000). Our results thus suggest that activists’ movement identification might have a considerable moral basis and more specifically has to do with the moral motivation derived from the violation of rights (or violated principles in terms of

Klandermans, 1997; Van Zomeren, *in press*). In this sense, the current study adds to the growing interest in morality in the collective action literature (e.g., Van Stekelenburg, Klandermans, & Van Dijk, 2009).

Furthermore, the Study 1 findings demonstrated, consistent with predictions, the stronger predictive effect of activists' participative- more so than their group-efficacy beliefs on identification with the Water Movement (cf. Mazzoni & Cicognani, 2013). In fact, the results of Study 1 showed that, although activists' group-efficacy beliefs were positively related to movement identification, participative-efficacy beliefs were a stronger predictor (even stronger than right violation), suggesting that activists firmly believe that their own actions (must) matter. In other words, the beliefs that, even through their "small contribution," the activists' participation is efficacious for collective goal achievement will allow them to identify with the Water Movement and act on its behalf. This effect of participative efficacy was also confirmed with the sample of citizens in Study 2, although an unexpected direct, predictive effect of participative efficacy on activism occurred. This suggests that, at least sometimes, participative efficacy has a unique motivational power that is independent of (movement) identification (see also Van Zomeren et al., 2012).

Moreover, the observation that group efficacy appeared less predictive of right violation among activists (in Study 1) resonates with the results of a recent study (Zaal, Van Laar, Ståhl, Ellemers, & Derks, 2012) that showed that for individuals under "prevention focus" (e.g., moved by individual responsibility and moral convictions), the motivation to engage in collective action was unaffected by the likelihood of social change (i.e., group-efficacy beliefs). On the other hand, group efficacy was also a significant predictor of identification and activism in Study 2, suggesting that for this sample of citizens, both psychological foundations (i.e., moral/human rights and instrumental/efficacy) underlie the motivational mechanisms (cf. Van Zomeren et al., 2004). Focusing respectively on real activists and on common citizens, the results of the two studies together thus suggest an important pointer for future research toward the question of which type of efficacy may be more characteristic of activists' (vs. nonactivists') motivations to act collectively.

Finally, we believe that our data can be interpreted as suggesting that perceived right violation and efficacy beliefs can be viewed as important *facets* of a politicized identity (which is often operationalized as movement identification; see Simon et al., 1998; Simon & Klandermans, 2001). Indeed, it also confirms the results of a recent qualitative study with water activists about the perceived importance of right violation and the role played by participative (with respect to group) efficacy (Mazzoni & Cicognani, 2013).

Practical and Political Implications

Our studies took advantage not only of previous theory and research on collective action but also of a real politicized context for collective action that puts the human right to water on the center stage. Indeed, human rights can be conceived as (cross-cultural) moral norms (e.g., Wellman, 2010) or ethic universal principles guiding human actions (Blau & Moncada, 2009) and intergroup relations (Doise, 2001). However, unlike other subjective universalist stances, human rights are also formalized in declarations and thus play a major role in the political realm outside of individuals' subjective reality (e.g., a country can be economically punished for violating human rights). The right to water, for instance, has been regarded as a critical issue in problems of water resources, but previous literature typically discussed it from economical and political perspectives (for a rare exception, see Lam, 1999). Our approach acknowledges these perspectives but at the same time focuses on the *psychology* of rights and their perceived violation.

At a practical level, our results suggest that the acknowledgement that "water should be treated as a social and cultural good, and not primarily as an economic good" (CESCR, 2002, p. 5), could have strong political but also strong psychological consequences. We believe this is because human

rights have a *dual capability* to be implemented or realized—through top-down political processes and through psychological commitment. One important insight from the current study is that the motivation for being activists can be distinctly moral (in the sense that individuals respond to principle violations; Klandermans, 1997). Recently, Van Zomeren et al. (2011) suggested that such moral motivations are not only powerful motivators of collective action, but in fact can unite disadvantaged and advantaged group members to fight for a joint cause. Our results, therefore, add that movement campaigns should emphasize the violation of the right to water if they want to attract as many people as possible (cross-cutting different group memberships). Moreover, according to the results about participative efficacy, we suggest that movement campaigns should focus on the important contribution that every individual can make. On the contrary, the opportunity of really reaching the group goal (i.e., group efficacy) should be emphasized with citizens, but it seems to be unnecessary with people already active in the movement.

Limitations and Directions for Further Research

Our results are based on two studies in the Italian Water Movement context and thus have some clear limitations in terms of the ability to generalize to other movements or to individuals in other countries. Nevertheless, given the convergent support for our predictions across the two studies, we believe that our focus on only one movement and country can be considered a strength of our research because it enabled a test of the generality of our findings across different populations related to the same movement. Future research should examine whether these results can be generalized to other contexts that fall under the general activism or collective action headings. Given the fit between our findings and other theory and research on activism and collective action (e.g., Klandermans, 1997; Van Zomeren et al., 2008), we have confidence that such research will be able to corroborate and extend our findings.

Another potential limitation is that we did not employ experimental methods and that our cross-sectional data did not include measures of the actual behaviors of activists (but intentions). In this sense, we cannot infer causality from our design. Although this is true with respect to the current studies, at the same time, it is also true that our predictions are based on the collective action literature, which has the strong benefit of including both experimental and field work. In this sense, our assumptions about causality in our model have a strong grounding in previous theory and research. For instance, causal assumptions in the model are in line with the idea that the strongest explanatory power with regard to collective action across many studies would come from movement identification (Van Zomeren et al., 2008). These assumptions also fit with findings that individual differences in moral convictions predict such identification (Van Zomeren et al., 2011) and that efficacy beliefs can affect group identification and collective action tendencies (Van Zomeren, Leach, & Spears, 2010). Furthermore, in both studies, we tested an alternative model in which we reversed two aspects of the causal chain to find that this model did not fit our data. In sum, we do believe that our methodology largely endorses our interpretation of findings.

Future research should do well to investigate activists and broader samples (including activists and nonactivists). These comparisons are rare, but they are quite informative about the *relative* importance of predictors of collective action among activists and nonactivists. This is important conceptually because activists are located at least in the third step of mobilization process described by Klandermans and Oegema (1987). This model suggests that in the first two steps toward actual participation in a social movement, people become part of the mobilization potential and targets of mobilization attempts by the social movement. Only in the third and fourth steps are they motivated to participate in specific activities overcoming concrete barriers to actual participation. Comparing nonactivists and activists thus effectively means comparing individuals in

different phases of the mobilization process. More specifically, our results show the importance of right violation in predicting collective action among activists as well as among citizens. This resonates with the findings by Van Zomeren and colleagues among nonactivists (e.g., Van Zomeren et al., 2011), as well as with ideas about the moral connotation of activists' presumed politicized identity (Simon & Klandermans, 2001). At the same time, however, the type of efficacy might be an important difference between activists' (participative efficacy) and nonactivists' (group efficacy) motivation. Of course, more research is necessary to establish these potential relationships. Future theory and research should, therefore, more systematically compare activists and nonactivists (using Klandermans and Oegema's framework) to discover motivational similarities and differences between them.

Finally, we recognize that emotions represent a topic of great interest in the recent collective action literature (Iyer, Schmader, & Lickel, 2007; Thomas & McGarty, 2009). Even if we did not consider them in the present studies, qualitative evidence suggests that illegitimate out-group behavior can result in shared emotion amongst crowds that can lead to increased ingroup identification and to subsequent intention to continue attending protests (Cocking, 2013; Drury & Reicher, 2009). Preliminary evidence from survey data on the Water Movement suggests also that emotions such as anger can explain why right violation increases movement identification and activism. This is in line with other work showing that anger is an important response to perceived violations of moral principles (e.g., Skitka et al., 2005). Future studies may also clarify to what extent right violation could specifically foster "moral emotions" (Haidt, 2003; see also Cronin, Reysen, & Brascombe, 2012), not only anger, but also indignation and disgust, and what their power is in predicting movement identification and activism.

Conclusion

This research shows that moral (i.e., right violation) and instrumental (i.e., efficacy) pathways feed into individuals' movement identification, which in turn predicts their intended activism. The added value of these results includes our ability to generalize most of the results across an activist and a broader sample, as well as our more specific measurement of right violation (which enabled the test of a specific moral motivation). Moreover, these studies make clear that the right to water is a topic that individuals were ready to fight for, at least in the context of the Italian Water Movement. We hope that our studies inspire future work on water activism and more generally, on activism in defense of human rights.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to Davide Mazzoni, Department of Psychology, viale Europa 115, 47024 Cesena (Italy). E-mail: davide.mazzoni@unibo.it

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory. An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 1–26.
- Bandura, A. (2006). Guide to the construction of self-efficacy scales. In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (Vol. 5, pp. 307–337). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Baron, J., & Spranca, M. (1997). Protected values. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 70, 1–16.
- Blau, J., & Moncada, A. (2009). *Human rights: A primer*. London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Cameron, J., & Nickerson, S. (2009). Predictors of protest among anti-globalization demonstrators. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39, 734–761.

- Caprara, G. V., Vecchione, M., Capanna, C., & Mebane, M. (2009). Perceived political self-efficacy: Theory, assessment, and applications. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 1002–1020.
- CESCR—Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (2002). *General Comment No. 15. The right to water*. New York, NY: UN Economic and Social Council.
- Cocking, C. (2013). Crowd flight in response to police dispersal techniques: A momentary lapse of reason? *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*. doi: 10.1002/jip.1389
- Cohrs, J. C., Maes, J., Moschner, B., & Kielman, S. (2007). Determinants of human rights attitudes and behavior: A comparison and integration of psychological perspectives. *Political Psychology*, 28, 441–470.
- Cronin, T., Reysen, S., Brascombe, N. R. (2012). Wal-Mart's conscientious objectors: Perceived illegitimacy, moral anger, and retaliatory consumer behavior. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 322–335.
- De Albuquerque, C. (2010). *Report of the independent expert on the issue of human rights obligations related to access to safe drinking water and sanitation*. New York, NY: UN Human Rights Council.
- Della Porta, D., & Piazza, G. (2008). *Le ragioni del no. Le campagne contro la Tav in Val di Susa e il Ponte sullo Stretto* [The reasons of the "No"]. Milano, Italy: Feltrinelli.
- Doise, W. (2001). *Droits de l'homme et force des idées*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Drury, J., & Reicher, S. (2009). Collective psychological empowerment as a model of social change: Researching crowds and power. *Journal of Social Issues*, 65, 707–725.
- EC—Commission of the European Communities (2007). *Addressing the challenge of water scarcity and droughts in the European Union*. COM(2007) 414 final.
- Ellis, S. (2004). Young people and political action: who is taking responsibility for positive social change? *Journal of Youth Studies*, 7, 89–102.
- Gelli, B., & Mannarini, T. (2007). *La partecipazione: modi e percorsi. Dai papa boys ai no global* [Participation: Methods and routes]. Milano, Italy: Unicopli.
- Haidt, J. (2003). The moral emotions. In R. J. Davidson, K. R. Scherer, & H. H. Goldsmith (Eds.), *Handbook of affective sciences* (pp. 852–870). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hayes, A. F. (2009). Beyond Baron and Kenny: Statistical mediation analysis in the new millennium. *Communication Monographs*, 76, 408–420.
- Hornsey, M. J., Blackwood, L., Louis, W., Fielding, K., Mavor, K., Morton, T., O'Brien, A., Paasonen, K., Smith, J., & White, K. M. (2006). Why do people engage in collective action? Revisiting the role of perceived effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36, 1701–1722.
- Iyer, A., Schmader, T., & Lickel, B. (2007). Why individuals protest the perceived transgressions of their country: The role of anger, shame, and guilt. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 572–587.
- Klandermans, B. (1997). *The social psychology of protest*. Oxford, UK: Basic Blackwell.
- Klandermans, B., & Oegema, D. (1987). Potentials, networks, motivations, and barriers: Steps towards participation in social movements. *American Sociological Review*, 52, 519–531.
- Kline, R. B. (1998). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Lam, S. P. (1999). Predicting intentions to conserve water from the theory of planned behavior, perceived moral obligation, and perceived water right. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29, 1058–1071.
- Mannarini, T., Roccato, M., Fedi, A., & Rovere, A. (2009). Six factors fostering protest: Predicting participation in locally unwanted land uses movements. *Political Psychology*, 30, 896–920.
- Mazzoni, D., & Cicognani, E. (2013). Water as a commons. An exploratory study on the motives for collective action among Italian Water Movement activists. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 23, 314–330.
- Mummendey, A., Kessler, T., Klink, A., & Mielke, R. (1999). Strategies to cope with negative social identity: Predictions by social identity theory and relative deprivation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 229–245.
- Niemi, R., Craig, S., & Mattei, F. (1991). Measuring internal political efficacy in the 1988 National Election Study. *American Political Science Review*, 85, 1407–1413.
- Runciman, W. G. (1966). *Relative deprivation and social justice: A study of attitudes to social inequality in twentieth-century England*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sheehan, K. (2001). E-mail survey response rates: A review. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 6(2). Retrived from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol6/issue2/sheehan.html>
- Simon, B., & Klandermans, B. (2001). Politicized collective identity: A social psychological analysis. *American Psychologist*, 56, 319–331.
- Simon, B., Loewy, M., Stürmer, S., Weber, U., Freytag, P., Habig, C., Kampmeier, C., & Spahlinger, P. (1998). Collective identification and social movement participation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 646–658.

- Skitka, L. J., Bauman, C. W., & Sargis, E. G. (2005). Moral conviction: Another contributor to attitude strength or something more? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(6), 895–917.
- Smets, H. (2006). *The Right to Water in national legislations*. Lyon, France: Agence Française de Développement.
- Stellmacher, J., Sommer, G., & Brähler, E. (2005). The cognitive representation of human rights: Knowledge, importance, and commitment. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 11, 267–292.
- Stürmer, S., & Simon, B. (2004). The role of collective identification in social movement participation: A panel study in the context of the German gay movement. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 263–277.
- Tanner, C., & Medin, D. L. (2004). Protected values: No omission bias and no framing effects. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 11, 185–191.
- Tetlock, P. E. (2003). Thinking the unthinkable: Sacred values and taboo cognitions. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 7, 320–324.
- Tetlock, P. E., Kirstel, O. V., Elson, S. B., Green, M. C., & Lerner, J. S. (2000). The psychology of the unthinkable: Taboo trade-offs, forbidden base rates, and heretic counterfactuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 853–870.
- Thomas, E. F., & McGarty, C. A. (2009). The role of efficacy and moral outrage norms in creating the potential for international development activism through group-based interaction. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 48, 115–134.
- UN Human Rights Council (2010). *Human rights and access to safe drinking water and sanitation*. New York, NY: UN General Assembly.
- Van Stekelenburg, J. (2006). *Promoting or preventing social change: Instrumentality, identity, ideology and group-based anger as motives of protest participation*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Vrije Universiteit.
- Van Stekelenburg, J., Klandermans, B., & Van Dijk, W. (2009). Context matters: Explaining how and why mobilizing context influences motivational dynamics. *Journal of Social Issues*, 65, 815–838.
- Van Zomerén, M. (in press). Psychological processes in social action. In J. Simpson & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.), *APA Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology: Interpersonal Relations and Group Processes*. Washington, DC: APA Press.
- Van Zomerén, M., & Iyer, A. (2009). Introduction to the social and psychological dynamics of collective action. *Journal of Social Issues*, 65, 645–660.
- Van Zomerén, M., Leach, C.W., & Spears, R. (2010). Does group efficacy increase group identification? Resolving their paradoxical relationship. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 1055–1060.
- Van Zomerén, M., Postmes, T., & Spears, R. (2008). Toward an integrative social identity model of collective action: A quantitative research synthesis of three socio-psychological perspectives. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134, 504–535.
- Van Zomerén, M., Postmes, T., Spears, R., & Bettache, K. (2011). Can moral convictions motivate the advantaged to challenge social inequality? Extending the Social Identity Model of Collective Action. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 14, 735–753.
- Van Zomerén, M., Saguy, T., & Schellhaas, F. (2012). Believing in “making a difference” to collective efforts: participative efficacy beliefs as a unique predictor of collective action. *Group Processes Intergroup Relations*. doi: 10.1177/1368430212467476
- Van Zomerén, M., Spears, R., Fischer, A. H., & Leach, C. W. (2004). Put your money where your mouth is! Explaining collective action tendencies through group-based anger and group efficacy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 649–664.
- Walker, I., & Smith, H. J. (2002). *Relative deprivation: Specification, development, and integration*. Cambridge, UK: University Press.
- Wellman, C. (2010). *The moral dimensions of Human Rights*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- WHO & UNICEF (2010). *Progress on Sanitation and Drinking-water: 2010 Update*. WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply and Sanitation.
- Wright, S. C., Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1990). Responding to membership in a disadvantaged group: From acceptance to collective protest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 994–1003.
- Zaal, M. P., Van Laar, C., Ståhl, T., Ellemers, N., & Derks, B. (2012). Social change as summarizes the content of the right to water as derived from an important goal or likely outcome: How regulatory focus affects commitment to collective action. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 51, 93–110.

Appendix

Objective Dimensions of the Right to Water

<i>Quantity</i>	The water supply for each person must be sufficient and continuous for personal and domestic uses, according to World Health Organization guidelines.
<i>Quality</i>	The water required for each personal or domestic use must be safe, therefore free from threats to a person's health.
<i>Physical accessibility</i>	Water must be available within, or in the immediate vicinity, of each household, educational institution and workplace. Even physical security should not be threatened during access to water.
<i>Affordability</i>	Water, and water facilities and services, must be affordable for all.
<i>Information</i>	Access to information includes the right to seek, receive and impart information concerning water issues.
<i>Participation</i>	This dimension includes also the right of individuals and groups to participate in decision-making processes that may affect their exercise of the right to water.
<i>Environmental respect</i>	The right to water is consistent with the right to a healthy and balanced environment, as it assumes that environment law is respected and benefits from the implementation of integrated water resource management.