

Challenging the Hegemony of the Grand Paradigm of Social Movement Studies: A Review of Paradigmatic Weaknesses

Joni Rusmanto¹, Ester Sonya Ulfarita², Muhammad Farid³

¹ Jurusan Sosiologi, FISIP, Universitas Palangka Raya (UPR). Email: jorusmanto@gmail.com

² Jurusan Ilmu Pemerintahan, FISIP Universitas Palangka Raya (UPR). Email: estersonya6@gmail.com

³ Institut Agama Islam (IAI) Dalwa, Bangil, Jawa Timur. Email: muhammadfarid@iaidalwa.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The study of social movements today is dominated by three grand paradigms (grand theory) in the 1980s, and even in Indonesia since the 70s. The three major paradigms of study are the "structural tension paradigm", the "resource mobilization paradigm", and the "identity-oriented paradigm", all of which have become the main sources of reference in various studies that have been developed. Through the literature review method, the critical analysis in this article aims to map, classify and categorize the grand theory and its influence on various social movement studies in Indonesia. The findings of this article show that the "structural tension" paradigm fails to consider how individuals experience dispossession as embedded in broader social structures. The "resource mobilization" paradigm places too much emphasis on collective action, which tends to be squeezed into market theory and consumerism. Placing the target achieved is only a political target, oriented towards the "economic man" (socio economicus), which merely calculates a deterministic hedonistic calculus. While the "identity-oriented" paradigm fails when positioning the identity of new collective actors is recognized, then by themselves their expressive actions can be transformed into instrumental actions whose names can be seen clearly as a case of institutionalizing collective mobility. In conclusion, in many cases today's theorists have synthesized the insights of earlier older schools while adding dimensions that they overlooked. The overall trend, which one would like to focus on, is the clustering of large structures in favor of a concern with the micro-foundations of social and political action.

Keywords: Paradigm; Grand Theory; Structural Strain; Resource Mobilisation; Identity Oriented

INTRODUCTION

The development of social movement studies today is still dominated by themes derived from the grand paradigm, namely; structural tensions, resource mobilization, which are oriented towards identity where these themes have so far been in a stagnant position or slow in developing further ideas (Vidickienė, 2021). The lack of influence of the grand paradigm of social movement studies as a grand theory in various original research on various cases and events, on the one hand, has contributed to the development of existing social movement sub-disciplines (Ormandy, 2022). But on the other hand, various study results have boosted the popularity of the movement paradigm, which previously in the West began to slowly recede in influence, even its hegemony has been challenged (Maglalang et al., 2022).

This paper is an analysis of the weakness of the grand paradigm of social movement studies as a grand theory (Dzhengiz et al., 2023). The review is directed through a critical literature approach, namely a review of various main literature sources from many major social movement studies paradigms (grand theory) which have always been the main reference for social movement studies researchers in various themes of study and analysis in various research areas, including Indonesia (for example Bambang Tri, Admojo, Yumalaksmi and Anggi, Safara 2001; Desi Rahmawati 2003; Annisa Innal Fitri and Idil Akbar, 2017

METHOD

The literature review method used in this paper aims to map, categorize and analyze the grand theory and its influence on various social movement studies in Indonesia (MacLean, 2020). The literature study method in a qualitative approach is essentially mapping, understanding, explaining and analyzing research data from several sources of study work on social movements in various themes and research studies of the main researchers of the study (Nkomo, 2021). Literature study is another term for literature review, literature review, theoretical study, theoretical basis, literature review, and theoretical review. More simply, this study is a kind of conceptual review (Streets, 2022).

A qualitative approach is very appropriate and relevant to be used as tools to understand and explain data sourced from references or primary and secondary literature materials written by experts as theorists and the main researchers of social movement studies that have been classified, grouped and categorized based on their respective study perspectives into a unified grouping of studies in a particular community so as to form a paradigm of thinking of social movement studies.

RESULTS

In the literature of social movement studies, there are three major paradigms that are considered to still have a strong influence in movement studies, namely the structural strain paradigm (structural strain perspective), the resource mobilization

paradigm (resource mobilization perspective) which emerged and developed widely in America, and the first identity-oriented paradigm in European countries.

Structural Strain Paradigm

The main theorists of the structural strain paradigm are Robert Ted Gurr (in R'boul, 2022). However, among the aforementioned theorists, the strongest influence in contemporary movement studies is Robert Ted Gurr in his well-known work among movement researchers, *Why Men Rebel?* The work is widely referred to as the main source of reference for researchers in various social movement studies in the world in general, including in the study area in Indonesia in particular. Gurr's basic assumption emphasizes the importance of the concept of deprivation which is the main reason for resistance, namely if people feel that something they believe and value is deprived, then that feeling is called relative deprivation, which is a perception of the gap between the expected value as a value expectation and the capability to achieve the value of the required value capabilities. (in Yelvington, 2022). Value is an event, goods and conditions that humans want to have. While value expectations are objects and living conditions that people believe that they are the rightful and authentic owners. The capability value is the objects and conditions that they think they are capable of acquiring or maintaining, agreed upon social assets available to them (in Das, 2020).

In relation to the "feeling of deprivation", according to Gurr (in Clelland & Dunaway, 2021), it has the potential to ignite discontent in the form of anger, anger, irritation or hurt, depending on the depth of the feeling of deprivation. The level of dissatisfaction will be reduced if there is a means to channel it and the channel is called value opportunities. If dissatisfaction is not channeled or is at a dead end, it can potentially metamorphose into violent rebellion in the form of chaos, conspiracy or domestic war (Barnett & Guzmán-Valenzuela, 2022). Thus, relative deprivation describes the level and quality of anger and frustration as emotional movements caused by social tensions at the macro level. The level and quality of anger as an emotional movement caused by social tensions at the macro level are tensions that originate in the available political structure (political opportunity structure). The political opportunity structure, in other words including the form of political institutions, is a major factor in movement behavior which can then force various movement strategies to follow the patterns outlined in the structure.

Based on this assumption, Gurr developed quantitative measures of the reasons for tensions and rebellions in a society (Swerzenski, 2022). Likewise, outbursts of hostility in the broader data category of political violence are all collective attacks within a political community against the political regime in power, both against its actors including political parties and competitors as well as those in office or the policy products it has produced. The concept presents a set of events that have the common trait of actually threatening violence, but the concept cannot in principle be explained solely on the basis of generality. Included in this

concept is revolution, which is usually defined as fundamental socio-political change achieved through violence, including guerrilla warfare, resistance, riots and ending in the dynamics of a coup d'état. According to James Davis (in Davis & KIM, 2021), the driving train of reform is tension itself, where the initial efforts of the elites (both political and economic) to create reform create higher expectations, and when these expectations are not achieved or even the opposite, social movements emerge. In this context, it is the question of dispossession that is addressed and the point of comparison lies in the future.

In a more inclusive view of the structural strain paradigm, Neil Smelser's (in Boersma, 2019) six-stage value-added theory includes structural strain as an explanatory factor. In addition, there are also other components that are more psychological, ideological and processual in nature which he termed as generalized beliefs, leadership and communication as well as precipitating incidents. Smelser also includes another structural factor, structural conduciveness, as the first element of the model. These elements refer to the possibilities for movement organizations to survive in the political and social spheres of a society.

Resources Mobilization Paradigm

The next paradigm that is no less important and even quite strong in its influence in the study of social movements is the resource mobilization paradigm with several main theorists such as Mancur Olson, 1965, Anthony Oberschall, 1973, McCarthy and Zald, 1977, Gamson, 1975, Charles Tilly, et.al 1975, Tarrow, 1982 and so on. The resource mobilization paradigm focuses full attention on movements whose processes on organized mobilization systems are more rational, more sophisticated than the elements and characteristics, models and forms of movements carried out by constituents as members of new social movements in contemporary society.

In general, some of the key elements of any movement are the institutions of the movement, rather than the role of the personalities or individuals involved. The driving force of social movements in this paradigm is identified as rationality rather than rational emotions, in contrast to previous perspectives (Seikkula, 2020). Thus, for an action to be more effective, the actions of movement participants must go through various organizations that are created and formed in a more sophisticated, effective and optimal manner.

In recent years, the focus of research has gradually shifted to resource mobilization theory. In general, this paradigm is able to distinguish between different levels and types of individual involvement in a movement, differentiating between adherents, i.e. regular members as movement participants, constituencies, i.e. sources of resources, and last but not least, benefit-seekers, called beneficiaries. Individuals then need to be mobilized to take part in activities that form part of the strategy and tactics of a movement organization. However, the members gathered in a movement are not the only ones to be mobilized. The role and benefits of money

as a source of funds from elites, weapons and media support and the formation of public opinion that tends to be more inclined to support the movement, in this case, are also other resources that can potentially support the success of a movement that is formed and created together (Atay, 2019).

Likewise, Zald and McCarthy (in Shultziner & Goldberg, 2019) argue that in order for the mobilization system to be fully optimized and successful, it is necessary to have a movement organization led by a movement professional. It is the professionals who play an important role in a movement organization, because towards the end of the twentieth century all societies were characterized by organizations. The characteristic of an organized society is that every action for social change requires a high level of technical expertise, especially in managing resources, planning strategies, raising funds, putting pressure on elite groups including establishing relationships with the mass media (Khan & Khan, 2020).

In that context, further according to Mancur Olson (1965), the logic system of the rationality of the movement's collective action is presented in the role of certain objective factors as interests, organizations, resources, strategies, and opportunities in any collective mobilization on a large scale. The most basic and significant thing to note is that there is a fundamental difference with LeBon's classic conception in *The Crowd*, which considers men and women as a form of crowd collective action as irrational individuals. It is Olson's view that can be considered more adequate than George Rude and E.P. Thompson's construction of the crowd in the perspective of previous movement history, whose conception has been widely referred to in writing on social movements from a historical perspective, which is very different from the situation of the actors in the contemporary New Social Movement. In contrast, according to Olson, individuals are considered as rational beings capable of reasoning and skillfully calculating the success or failure of action. The frame of reference is largely utilitarian instrumentation, meaning that the construct of utilitarianism has permeated the works of most of the major figures in the contemporary New Social Movement, especially the aforementioned Mancur Olson, an economist who has had a major influence on this paradigm (McGovern, 2020).

Somewhat different from the views of Olson, McCarthy and Zald (1977) above, which place the role of entrepreneurial spirit and spirit (organizational entrepreneurship) in the mobilization of contemporary social movements, then Oberschall 1973; Gamson 1975; C. Tilly et.al 1975; Tarrow 1982, it is more difficult to accept Olson's individual calculus perspective which is too positive rational. On the contrary, however, they strongly emphasize the role of solidarity groups with collective interests in various collective actions. Oberschall recognizes that the existence of non-conflictual variations of collectivity in society, refers to the existence of 'associational groups' in society. Associational groups are organized for non-conflictual purposes. Here there is some reference to the

existence of Charles Tilly's collective interests, Fireman and Gamson's social incentives, and McCarthy and Zald's conscious constituencies. These Olsonian theorists offer resources to collective action groups and are the non utilitarian embodiment of an increasingly dynamic society. Furthermore, Charles Tilly, et.al (in Fillieule et al., 2022) predominantly emphasized the importance of the existence of collective interests that changes in society affect social movements. Major shifts from local to national power structures have consequences for the organization and form of social movements. Based on the historical data collected by them, it is helpful to strengthen this debate and provide justification for the assumption that the rationalistic paradigm of social movements operates on the presumption of the emergence of capitalistic economies and nation states. They reject the failure of the social thesis and reject outright the Durkheimian and Smelserian idea that major structural transformations lead to disorder and even situations of chaos or social anomalies.

The question even arises as to whether discontinuity automatically produces anomia and whether anomia automatically produces individual or collective indeterminacy and disorder (Shivji, 2020). Economic transformation, urbanization and state formation generate shifts in the character of social movements and actions, the reorganization of everyday life transforms the character of conflict. To that end, Tilly, et.al, use action repertoire to refer to specific forms, methods and means of expression of collective behavior and action. Changes in the daily life of the population, the environment of kin, changes that invite migration from villages to cities, shifts in the terrain of power and the economic system, have replaced communal solidarity (*gemeinschaft*) with associational solidarity (*gesellschaft*). Certain changes have altered the terrain of communal gatherings, from night markets, festivals, local markets, etc. to deliberate calls or invitations to gatherings from and by movement organizations.

Like Tilly et al above, on other occasions for example G. Rude (1964) laid out various changes in the nature of collective mobilization. His conception of the transformation of the crowd from its pre-industrial form describes the changing repertoire of collective action in the 18th century. The explosive quality of collective action also changed, from food riots, tax revolts, and appeals to paternalistic authority to the 19th century repertoire of collective action characterized by demonstrations and strikes. Tilly (1978), in particular, explains the dynamics of this repertoire of collective action, by exploring how the war on tax collection in the eighteenth century received direct support from the wealthy classes of the various institutional combinations of the modern national state. Thus Charles Tilly found that, in the national state, a movement took on new forms and the various forms of resistance had a more national target, and did not resemble the way forms of protest had always been.

Thus, food riots, shortages of foodstuffs such as bread for example, have paved the way for the emergence of more structured associations for popular resistance (Taylor et al., 2021). C. Tilly (1990) sees collective behavior as involving the study of crowds, fashion shows, disasters, panics and social movements. He argues that these behaviors can take place spontaneously and unpredictably in many geographical areas and involve very large numbers of people as in the case of riots. He believes that the use of the terms "spontaneous", "sudden onset", "surge", "explosion", and "overflow", will make it more difficult to study collective behavior in such events. In short, the aforementioned mobilization theory and process theory focus only on the structural shifts that give collective actors the resources to act collectively on long-standing grievances. But their emphasis on the how of mobilization rather than the why focuses only on the state as the target of action, and their reliance on a rationalistic picture of individual action leaves important issues unexamined (Markey et al., 2022).

Identity Oriented paradigm

A major paradigm of social movement studies that has influenced social movement research based in Europe, especially France, is the identity-oriented paradigm. The theorists who are at the forefront of this thinking are Pizzorno, (1978, 1985), then a pure identity model academic, Jean Cohen, (1985), including post-Marxist academics such as Laclau and Mouffe, (1985), to the new color of New Social Movement thinking in the postmodern centrality of Alain Touraine (in Briscoe-Palmer, 2021). The basic assumption built in this perspective is to elaborate on the fundamental question of integration and solidarity of members. Movements are not always expressions of strategic calculations against enemies, but they mobilize something else.

Likewise, the role of its members is seen only as subjective beings. While the identity model paradigm questions the issues of integration and solidarity, it does not find relevance in the Durkheimian concepts of anomia and failure or the Smelserian notions of tension, short circuit, generalized beliefs and so on to explain collective behavior. Social deviance as implied by the terms anomia or social failure, hardly offers a window on the multiple dimensions of social movements (Dey et al., 2023).

The "identity-oriented" paradigm, tries to re-understand the appearance and formation of New Social Movements that emerge in the context of dynamic contemporary society. The faces and formations of the New Social Movements can for example be found in the patterns of ecological movements (environmentalism), feminism, peace movements and grassroots mobilization, crossing the notion of class and cutting across the boundaries of material conditioning. Thus, according to this perspective, movement participants assert their actions not in terms of being bearers of labor values, but as authentic and voluntaristic human beings. There is a general argument in this perspective that identity-oriented movements and

collective action are expressions of humanity's search for an autonomous and free identity to be recognized. Furthermore, Pizzorno's (Jay, 2022) analysis of the logic of collective identity formation has involved the direct participation of actors in collective action. According to him, identity cannot be formed through indirect participation, delegation or representation, but identity production involves collective interaction itself (Museus & Sifuentez, 2021).

In looking at the production of collective identity directly in action, Pizzorno further argues that the logic of collective action is essentially a form of expression. The social actors in the New Social Movement have sought identity and recognition through expressive action, through universalistic and non-negotiable demands. That all this has to be done through direct participation means that at the same time these actors have built and recognized collectivities (such as associations and political parties) and generally approached the use of strategic instrumental rationality (the construction of resource mobilization paradigms). In other words, it can be interpreted that the direct participation of actors in the same time span recognizes collectivity, which means that the results of their demands can be renegotiated and even include the character of participation will become more representative.

Jean Cohen (in Manning et al., 2020), however, goes on to give a slightly different view of the fundamental feature of New Social Movements which does not rely on the fact that their actions are expressive for the sake of asserting their identity. Instead it rests on the capacity of the self to create identities and the power relations involved in their creation. This assumption then becomes an important source of debate between Pizzorno and Jean Cohen, which lies in the orientation of their assessment of the actions of the New Social Movements, whether they are expressive and as a space to express the identity of the collective doing the movement? According to Cohen, the New Social Movements do not rely on expressive action and the assertion of the identity of the group that performs the social movement action, basically it has relied on their awareness of the capacity to create a new identity that is more basic and authentic. Thus, he argues, contemporary collective actors consider that identity creation involves competing issues around the reinterpretation of norms, the creation of new meanings, and a challenge to the social construction of the boundaries between public action, the private and the political domains. Therefore, when viewed from this perspective, Pizzorno's pure identity model of collective action appears too hostage and too narrow in scope and ability to explain new social movements in the context of contemporary society.

Then a more open view of the New Social Movement emerged from one of the French sociologists, Alain Touraine, and his thoughts can be politically categorised in the identity-oriented paradigm. According to Touraine, the main element of a social movement is the action itself, which is an action against the

social system. In fact, Touraine, in his later works, has shown how such an emphasis on action does not necessarily lead to total voluntarism and individualism. Neither voluntarism nor individualism provides insight into the subject of action (Girschik et al., 2022). In assessing the New Social Movements, Touraine emphasises the importance of social action, that the action taken by individuals in the form of social movements is an attempt to produce and transform existing social structures and orders. And social action in the movement can be understood as normal action towards a change that is expected by society. Touraine argues that society is nothing but social action, because the social order does not have metasocial guarantees for its existence.

Touraine's (in Savolainen & Ylä-Anttila, 2021) concept of social movements in general is unlike collective behaviour which is always reactive and instead that social movements are an active force. In general, social movements struggle to control historicity. Historicity refers to the general cultural forms and structures of social life. If the term society refers to social integration, then social movements suggest acts of conflict that challenge existing social integration. This challenge to existing social integration does not necessarily equate to a crisis of society and the collapse of social organisation. Therefore, changes brought about by social action should not be seen as pathological or dysfunctional in Parson's sense. When understood further in Touraine's analysis of the New Social Movements of contemporary society, it must be understood in terms of the link between self-understanding and the ruling ideology of contemporary society and social movements. In his analysis, Touraine develops his investigation on three levels firstly, an elaboration of the social, structural and cultural representations of contemporary society, Secondly, an interpretation of the conflicts and tensions involved in the process of human identity search and its analysis in terms of action orientation, Thirdly, Touraine recognises the importance of individual consciousness as a specific feature of living beings (Iurchenko et al., 2023).

In the same context of thought, Tourain (2019), explains social movements as normatively oriented interactions between enemies or rivals, along with conflict-laden interpretations of opposing societal models of a shared cultural field (Touraine, 1981). In this case, Touraine made an effort to transpose the analysis of New Social Movements from the territory of Pizzorno's pure identity model above, to the social space of civil society. If one follows Touraine's view, then one can see a dangerous interpretation (especially by Pizzorno's pure identity model) in terms of the growing demands of communal, sectarian, ethnic and fundamentalist revivalist groups in their search for identity, autonomy and recognition. Touraine illustrates that the conception of the movement is situated neither in the category of pure psychologisation of identity (Pizzorno's construction, 1978) nor in the rationality of achieving utilitarian goals as displayed in Olsonian~Oberschall's theory of resource mobilisation. Instead it lies at the centre of an area of overlap between cultural innovation and social conflict (La Torre et al., 2022).

Touraine's repeated references to the centrality of the New Social Movements the central conflict and its underlying analyses bring it closer to Max Weber's methodological concept of the ideal type. By tracing the location of Touraine's social conflict centrality, it is essentially aimed at not only providing a sociological understanding of social movements, but also developing a broader and more complete typology of movements. The representations of society associated with the centrality of specific social conflicts and these conflicts, in turn, produce a typology of ideal types of social movements. That is why Touraine treats social movements as social agents defined by conflict-laden relations, and the agency of agents, in turn, appears to define the social and cultural representations of society. (Touraine, et.al 1987). Likewise, Pizzorno states that the logic of collective identity formation involves the direct participation of actors in collective action. Identity cannot be formed through indirect participation, delegation or representation, but identity production involves collective interaction itself (Campos & Marín-González, 2020).

KESIMPULAN

Based on the above primary analysis of the shortcomings of the structural strain paradigm, particularly in its basic assumptions, Gurr and his colleagues fail to consider how individuals experience dispossession as embedded in broader social structures. In the weakest societies, the marginalised are usually poorly positioned to be directly involved in highly risky political actions. Lacking economic security and with no guaranteed income or benefits, they cannot afford to take on many of the risks or costs. Faced with discrimination from the stronger majority, they may try to remain visible or involved but in the form of symbolic resistance as an attempt and mechanism just to survive in society.

The structure of political opportunities, such as the shape of political institutions, is stated to be a major factor in movement behaviour, which may force movement strategies to follow the patterns outlined in these structures. Here we can see how the weakness of Gurr's and others' perspectives only limit the structure of political opportunities as the main factor, while not looking at the diversity of other factors that can potentially influence the dynamics of movement behaviour and the various strategies that may be taken by individuals in the movement. In that context, the structural strain paradigm is too excessive and even strain to formulate a structure that exists objectively, the objective structure is only a construction in the imagination of the followers of a movement, whether the perception of strain and the goals of a movement is rational or not or which symbolic form is given by the followers of a movement to the existing tension.

The Paretean conception of a self-equilibrium mechanism in social systems is reflected in Smelser's central proposition, and he says; people under strain mobilise to reconstitute the social order in the name of a generalised belief. The

concept wants to explain that Neil J. Smelser's main idea contains its own shortcomings because it explains collective behaviour from the point of view of what he calls general beliefs which are intended to explain hysterical group dynamics, panic and outbursts of hatred and anger collective behaviour in terms of pre-existing belief systems. It is precisely here that Smelser is unable to prove whether there is such a thing as a single belief system or whether it varies according to the class hierarchy of society. This is one of the most fundamental contributions to the weakness of Smelser's idea of general beliefs, which then fills the list of shortcomings of the structural strain paradigm above (Spears, 2021).

Thus, the weakness of the resource mobilisation paradigm is that collective action tends to be squeezed into market theory and consumerism. We can see this from Olson's view, explaining that the actors mobilised into collective action are individuals who are like atoms decomposing separately and generally unorganised, so it is questionable. Individuals who play a role in movements are only instrumentally motivated utilitarian beings, beings who are more rational and capable of reasoning and more skilful in calculating success or failure. A movement is always an expression of strategic calculation against the enemy; it also mobilises something else. Various actions and actions in a movement are more influenced by the motivation of self-materialisation that comes from the power or ability of economic potential. The purpose of the actions taken is only seen as pursuing material targets on the distribution of potential resources. In this context, the individuals who play a role in a movement are only participants with self-materialisation motives with the aim of mobilising the various resources at stake in social groups in society. The theoretical view of the resource mobilisation paradigm foregrounds collective action within the framework of strategic interaction logic and cost-benefit calculations. Olson's view contains its own weaknesses, it can be found in everyday life that many individuals are ready to live and act in solidarity groups. According to Donatella della Porta and Mario Diani resource mobilisation is a collective movement that is an extension of conventional forms of political action, where the actors involved in the movement act rationally, pursuing targets and interests, the entrepreneurial movement organisation has an important role in the mobilisation of collective resources built into action.

Fireman and Gamson argue that there is an increasingly superficial dominance of modernist industrial culture in the American mind. The emergence of solidarity groups, communities, informal groups, kinship groups, primary groups and the formation of what McCarthy and Zald call conscious constituencies, are types of collective action that cannot be explained in terms of utilitarian rationales and in terms of the individual choice skills implied earlier by resource mobilisation theory. Hence, these three scholars disagree with the somewhat hyper voluntarism of resource mobilisation theory in that its central focus is based on a relational system of axiomatically interwoven and illogical assumptions. As such, Donatella della Porta and Mario Diani sharply criticise the assumption that these movements

are considered part of the normal political process. Movements that emphasise external constraints and seek opportunities that benefit the organisation, formulate the range of potential resources to be mobilised, the extension of social movement networks to their elite allies, and the various tactics or strategies that people use to control or combine collective action, along with the outcomes to be achieved. The fundamental question they seek to answer is related to the evaluation of the costs and benefits of participation in social movement organisations (della Porta, 2020).

It can be concluded that the weakness of the resource mobilisation paradigm is that it places the goals achieved only in pursuit of the political targets expected to be fought for. But apart from that motive, it has been ignored, so that the members of the movement are economists (socio economicus) deterministic hedonistic calculus. The weakness in this paradigm is that the theory of collective action tends to be squeezed into market theory and consumerism. In that context, it is precisely Nil Cokluk Comert, (2019); Ozen, (2013) who provides an assessment of this resource mobilisation paradigm, that elsewhere new approaches have developed various differences that exist over time based on similar ontological and epistemological assumptions. The emergence of significant critiques of the resource mobilisation approach creates a complementary intellectual space in perspective, or in other words an alternative for them to further analyse the social dimensions of social movements. One of the potential theoretical contributions of the strategic interaction perspective discussed in these works is through cataloguing, as in cataloguing the formulation of different types of arenas or different types of actors. However, such cataloguing is ultimately very useful for determining and even developing better and more useful theoretical tools (Hodge & Hallgrímssdóttir, 2021).

If the centrality of thought in the resource mobilisation paradigm is oriented towards rationalism and materialism, then the identity-oriented perspective instead focuses on movement phenomena that tend to be non-materialistic, but rather expressive behaviour. The identity-orientated perspective bases its perspective on the role of identity that underlies the spirit of individuals in a movement. However, it is necessary to focus theoretical attention on the shortcomings of the identity-oriented paradigm, so that this paradigm pays more attention to the production of identity that can be directly produced in the action activities of new social movements in contemporary society. The logic of collective action that occurs in a movement is just pure expression. Conceivably, social actors in the New Social Movement seek identity and recognition through expressive action, through universalistic and non-negotiable demands. All of this has to be lived through direct participation, which means that at the same time the actors have built and recognised collectivities such as existing associations and political parties. This construct of thinking essentially approaches the use of strategic instrumental rationality as proposed in the previous resource mobilisation paradigm. The direct participation of actors at the same time as recognising collectivities means that as a

result their demands can be negotiated and the character of their participation becomes represented and more representational.

In the context of the logic of such thinking, the identity-oriented paradigm theorists have in principle made a fatal mistake, namely, once the identity of the new collective actors is recognised, their expressive action can be transformed into instrumental action and this concept is seen as a case of institutionalising collective mobility. Thus, expressive collective action in the construction of the thinking of the theorists of this paradigm is not too different from the expressive action of the classic mob, rable and crowd of the crowd school in the perspective of social psychology such as Le Bon and the neoclassical construction of the crowd in history such as the earlier writings of George Rude (Spears, 2021). That their identity theory models of more communicative collective action and action are too broad in macro terms, have not really touched on micro-level units of analysis, sometimes tend to be abstract, complicated and even repetitive. As such, in many cases today's theorists have synthesised the insights of earlier older schools while adding dimensions they overlooked. The overall trend, which one would like to focus on, is the clustering of large structures in favour of a concern for the micro-foundations of social and political action.

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Atay, S. (2019). *Analyzing The Hizmet Movement Schools In Three Different Countries From The Perspective Of The Resource Mobilization Theory*. Rutgers University-Graduate School-Newark. <https://doi.org/10.7282/T3-Jatb-B241>
- Barnett, R., & Guzmán-Valenzuela, C. (2022). The Socially Responsible European University: A Challenging Project. *International Journal Of Sustainability In Higher Education*, 23(4), 752–766. <https://doi.org/10.1108/Ijshe-03-2021-0100>
- Boersma, M. (2019). *Exploring Legitimacy And Exposing Legitimising Myths: A Critical Analysis Of Corporate Social Responsibility In Global Supply Chains*. <http://hdl.handle.net/10453/133351>
- Briscoe-Palmer, S. V. (2021). *The Politics Of Black Caribbean Masculinities:(De) Constructing The Postcolonial 'Other.'* University Of Birmingham. <http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/11636>
- Campos, I., & Marín-González, E. (2020). People In Transitions: Energy Citizenship, Prosumerism And Social Movements In Europe. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 69, 101718.
- Clelland, D. A., & Dunaway, W. A. (2021). Toward Theoretical Liberation: Challenging The Intellectual Imperialism Of The Western Race Paradigm.

Journal Of Labor And Society, 24(4), 487–524.

Cömert, N. Ç. (2019). Postmodern Status Of New Social Movements: A Research On Yellow Vests. *Connectist: Istanbul University Journal Of Communication Sciences*, 56, 1–29.

Das, S. (2020). Queer Methodologies And Social Science. In *Companion To Sexuality Studies* (Pp. 95–121). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119315049.Ch6>

Davis, G. F., & Kim, E. (2021). Social Movements And Organizational. *The Oxford Handbook Of Organizational Change And Innovation*, 209.

Della Porta, D. (2020). Protests As Critical Junctures: Some Reflections Towards A Momentous Approach To Social Movements. *Social Movement Studies*, 19(5–6), 556–575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2018.1555458>

Dey, P., Fletcher, D., & Verduijn, K. (2023). Critical Research And Entrepreneurship: A Cross-Disciplinary Conceptual Typology. *International Journal Of Management Reviews*, 25(1), 24–51. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12298>

Dzhengiz, T., Miller, E. M., Ovaska, J., & Patala, S. (2023). Unpacking The Circular Economy: A Problematizing Review. *International Journal Of Management Reviews*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12329>

Fillieule, O., Dafflon, A., Bendali, Z., Beramendi, M., & Morselli, D. (2022). From Uprising To Secession: A Plea For A Localized And Processual Approach To The Avatars Of The Yellow Vest Movement. *French Politics*, 20(3–4), 366–394. <https://doi.org/10.1057/S41253-022-00198-6>

Girschik, V., Svystunova, L., & Lysova, E. I. (2022). Transforming Corporate Social Responsibilities: Toward An Intellectual Activist Research Agenda For Micro-Csr Research. *Human Relations*, 75(1), 3–32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726720970275>

Hodge, E., & Hallgrímsdóttir, H. K. (2021). Networks Of Hate: The Alt-Right, “Troll Culture”, And The Cultural Geography Of Social Movement Spaces Online. In *British Columbia’s Borders In Globalization* (Pp. 102–119). Routledge.

Iurchenko, D., Petty, J. S., & Jain, S. (2023). Collective Entrepreneurship Makes Strange Bedfellows: Examining Framing Activity In Construction Of The Equity Crowdfunding Market. *Journal Of Small Business Management*, 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2022.2161555>

Jay, L. (2022). The Disciplinary And Critical Divide In Social Studies Teacher Education Research: A Review Of The Literature From 2009–2019. *Theory &*

Research In Social Education, 50(3), 339–374.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2022.2077156>

Khan, H., & Khan, M. U. (2020). The Aligarh Miracle A Reappraisal In Context Of The Causal Dimensions Of Contemporary Social Movement Theories. *Journal Of History And Social Sciences*, 11(1), 17–38.
<https://doi.org/10.46422/Jhss.V11i1.102>

La Torre, M., Di Tullio, P., Tamburro, P., Massaro, M., & Rea, M. A. (2022). Calculative Practices, Social Movements And The Rise Of Collective Identity: How# Istayathome Mobilised A Nation. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 35(9), 1–27.
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>

Maclean, K. (2020). *Giving Back Or Fighting Back? A Transatlantic, Qualitative Study Exploring Citizenship, Social Movement Learning And Mental Health*.
<https://doi.org/10.48730/6yvk-Pq61>

Maglalang, D. D., Sangalang, C. C., Mitchell, F. M., Lechuga-Peña, S., & Nakaoka, S. J. (2022). The Movement For Ethnic Studies: A Tool Of Resistance And Self-Determination For Social Work Education. *Journal Of Social Work Education*, 58(4), 733–746.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2021.1963895>

Manning, J., Asante, G., Huerta Moreno, L., Johnson, R., Lemaster, B., Li, Y., Rudnick, J. J., Stern, D. M., & Young, S. (2020). Queering Communication Studies: A Journal Of Applied Communication Research Forum. *Journal Of Applied Communication Research*, 48(4), 413–437.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2020.1789197>

Markey, S., Halseth, G., Ryser, L., Argent, N., & Haslam-Mckenzie, F. (2022). Neither Prepared Nor Transformed: Institutional Responses To Unconventional Oil And Gas Development In Australian And Canadian Communities. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 90, 102584.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.Erss.2022.102584>

McGovern, S. J. (2020). Analyzing Urban Politics: A Mobilization–Governance Framework. *Urban Affairs Review*, 56(4), 1011–1052.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087418820174>

Museus, S. D., & Sifuentes, B. J. (2021). Toward A Critical Social Movements Studies. In *Higher Education: Handbook Of Theory And Research: Volume 36* (Pp. 275–321). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-44007-7_4

Nkomo, S. M. (2021). Reflections On The Continuing Denial Of The Centrality Of “Race” In Management And Organization Studies. *Equality, Diversity And Inclusion: An International Journal*, 40(2), 212–224.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/Edi-01-2021-0011>

Ormandy, M. (2022). *Sport Evangelism: A Critical Discourse Analysis Of Sport For Development And Free Play For Kids*. <https://doi.org/10.7939/R3-Z40j-4889>

R'boul, H. (2022). Postcolonial Interventions In Intercultural Communication Knowledge: Meta-Intercultural Ontologies, Decolonial Knowledges And Epistemological Polylogue. *Journal Of International And Intercultural Communication*, 15(1), 75–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17513057.2020.1829676>

Savolainen, S., & Ylä-Anttila, T. (2021). The Climate Change Movement And Political Parties: Mechanisms Of Social Media And Interaction During The 2019 Electoral Period In Finland. *Nordic Journal Of Media Studies*, 3(1), 40–60. <https://doi.org/10.2478/Njms-2021-0003>

Seikkula, M. (2020). Different Antiracisms: Critical Race And Whiteness Studies Perspectives On Activist And Ngo Discussions In Finland. *Publications Of The Faculty Of Social Sciences*. <http://urn.fi/urn:isbn:978-951-51-6314-1>

Shivji, I. G. (2020). Practice Teaches Paradigm: Reflections On Radical And Liberal Law Perspectives. In *The Limits Of Law And Development* (Pp. 109–124). Routledge.

Shultziner, D., & Goldberg, S. (2019). The Stages Of Mass Mobilization: Separate Phenomena And Distinct Causal Mechanisms. *Journal For The Theory Of Social Behaviour*, 49(1), 2–23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/Jtsb.12187>

Spears, R. (2021). Social Influence And Group Identity. *Annual Review Of Psychology*, 72(1), 367–390. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-070620-111818>

Streets, M. D. (2022). *Bridging Souths: Interdisciplinarity And Knowledge Production In Southern Studies*. The University Of Mississippi.

Swertzski, J. D. (2022). *Enacting A Critical Media Production Pedagogy*. <https://doi.org/10.7275/30555584>

Taylor, R., Fuller, A., Halford, S., Lyle, K., & Teglberg, A. C. (2021). Translating Employee-Driven Innovation In Healthcare: Bricolage And The Mobilization Of Scarce Resources. *Public Money & Management*, 41(5), 376–386. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2020.1824408>

Vidickienė, D. (2021). Social Movements As Drivers Of Paradigm Innovations In Rural Development. In *Rural Economic Developments And Social Movements: A New Paradigm* (Pp. 45–89). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71983-8_3

Yelvington, K. A. (2022). *The Sociocultural Anthropology Of Afro-Latin America. Routledge Handbook Of Afro-Latin American Studies.*
<https://doi.org/https://books.google.co.id/books/publisher/content?id=idyieaaqbaj&pg=pt86&img=1&zoom=3&hl=en&ots=Iz78mrndjr&sig=acfu3u3bmqdh-gzb2amxzokmau59qtyag&w=1280>